'A very indifferent small city': the economy of Carlisle, 1550-1700

John Stedman

Abstract

This thesis sets out to discover the principal facts concerning the economy of Carlisle in this 150 years and to try to explain them and their significance. A wide range of sources has been used, including: the administrative papers, court records and accounts of the corporation of Carlisle; gild records; parish registers; state papers, taxation records and other documents generated by central government; the records of the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle; and probate records. Only the latter covered the bulk of the period.

Carlisle was the largest town in Cumberland until about 1690, when it was overtaken by Whitehaven. The city's population reached a peak of just under 2,000 in 1597, then fell, but climbed back to 2,000 by 1700. Its economy rested on its functions as garrison, county, cathedral and market town, but tanning was important before the Civil War. The three special functions gave the town an unusually high proportion of lawyers, clergymen and soldiers among its inhabitants, but otherwise its occupational structure was essentially that of a market town, and its economic hinterland was surprisingly restricted. Specialisation within trades was limited and secondary occupations were very common, especially farming and victualling.

Carlisle was the most important town of a poor region, and this poverty was reflected in the town's economy, especially in the lack of specialisation in the town's economy as a whole and in individual economic activity. It benefited little from the economic changes that affected early-modern Cumberland, or from the diminution of Border violence, and the early seventeenth century may have been a period of economic difficulty. It was small in comparison to other towns of similar status and relatively poor, with old-fashioned housing. Carlisle was economically backward, and insofar as its economy was typical of small towns, reveals a weakness of the pre-industrial economy.
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Introduction

This thesis sets out to describe and discuss the economy of the Border city of Carlisle in the period 1550-1700. Carlisle was chosen as an object of study for a number of reasons. First, it was a small town. The general pattern of the history of English towns in the early-modern period has been fairly well established over the last 30 years. Nevertheless there are still a number of under-studied fields about which relatively little is known, and one of these is the smaller town. There has been only one monograph published recently on a small town, for example, T.S. Willan's *Elizabethan Manchester*, although there have also been several theses dealing with market towns.

Second, Carlisle was chosen because it was a northern, Highland Zone, town. Again, relatively few northern towns have been studied in depth in the period 1550-1700. The position in the two north-western counties of Cumberland and Westmorland has been improved in the last few years. Dr Beckett's *Coal and Tobacco*, however, although important, is as much a history of the West-Cumberland coal industry, tobacco trade and the enterprise of the Lowther family as of the new towns of Whitehaven and Workington, and neither it nor Dr Marshall's interesting articles on Cumbrian towns are concerned with the period before 1620. Dr Millward's article on Cumbrian

towns is brief and also not concerned with the sixteenth century. Dr Phillips has published some valuable material on early-modern Kendal, however, covering the sixteenth century. On Carlisle itself there is recent work on several aspects of the town's history, but no picture of the town's economy as a whole.

Third, Carlisle was situated on the Anglo-Scottish border. This was the most violent region in England, subject until the Union of Crowns to frequent raids from across the border and to lawless behaviour by English Borderers. Its strategic position brought Carlisle the role of a garrison town, and the violence would have been expected to affect its prosperity. The city therefore had two almost unique features whose effects could be explored. Moreover in the seventeenth century an extensive cross-border trade in cattle is known to have begun, while coal mining on the west coast of the county developed very rapidly. This too might be expected to have affected the town's economy in an interesting way.

Carlisle was probably not typical of small English towns. It was unusual in its extreme northerly position and the violence of its region, moreover it was a garrison town, county town and cathedral city, whereas most of England's small towns were merely market towns. Yet these features

suggest a number of questions about the town, which this thesis will try to answer. Little is known about how the economy of a town in such a position actually worked or how important its obvious economic functions of garrison, cathedral and county town were to its inhabitants. It might be expected, for example, that such a town might have a particularly extensive hinterland and that it would have had zones of influence of different sizes for different functions. It is not clear whether other functions developed or what effect the economic changes in the county had on the city. Could a town in such a position prosper, or would its economy be backward? There is even uncertainty about how big the town was.

The study of Carlisle's economy has been approached in two parts, moving from the general to the more specific. In the first part the local background to the town's history will be outlined - the condition of the county and the town itself as it was during this 150 years. Following this the pattern of population growth and distribution in the county will be discussed, and the population of the town considered. The sphere of influence the town exercised will be plotted in the light of the presence of rival market centres: how extensive its hinterland actually was. The town's various special roles and the benefit they brought will be discussed and the occupational structure considered in their light, while the changes in the town's prosperity, as far as they can be determined, will be related to these facets of its economy. In the second part of the thesis the economic

1. Necessarily this study has been closely limited by the sources available. Those surviving for Carlisle are frustratingly discontinuous although in some areas quite rich. Probate inventories, for example, have been an invaluable source, but almost all those for the diocese have been lost for the years 1621-1660, and after the Restoration inventories are fewer and less detailed. Comprehensive corporation accounts survive only from 1597; other administrative minutes are patchy before 1685; the records of three of the town's eight gilds survive from the early seventeenth century while the others begin after 1650; the registers of one of the two parishes begin about 1650, while the other starts only in 1693.
activity of individual townsmen and occupational groups will be discussed. These chapters will illustrate and expand on themes identified earlier. The section will close with a consideration of how the economy was regulated. In conclusion the most significant aspects of the town's economy will be discussed and the town related to the local and national urban system.
Part One

A survey of the economy of Carlisle
Chapter One
The background: Cumberland and Carlisle in the early-modern period

a. Cumberland in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

Cumberland in 1550 displayed two striking characteristics: it was poor and it suffered badly from violence. Both were the result of a combination of factors, geographical, political and social. The succeeding 150 years saw an intensification of both the poverty and the violence, subsistence crises occurring three times before 1630, followed by an amelioration of the two problems. This amelioration was accompanied by remarkable industrial growth and the creation of one of the larger new towns of early-modern England; western Cumberland became a dynamic industrial region.

Cumberland was remote from most of the prosperous and dynamic areas of the country. Carlisle itself was some 250 miles from London, and the post between the Privy Council in Westminster and the Lord Warden of the West March took four days or more.¹ The carrier between London and Kendal in 1685 took 12 days, and probably another two to reach Carlisle.² To the problems of distance were added those of relief. The county was cut off to the south and east by the Pennines and the Lakeland Dome. The road to Newcastle through the Tyne gap was so bad in the mid-eighteenth century that the government built a new one because of problems encountered in moving troops.³ Communications within the county were also difficult at times. In September 1592 Richard Lowther, the acting Warden, was unable to

1. CBP, I, *passim.*
Interview the Grahams because "of the greate waters and flouds".¹ The provision of bridges was better by the end of the seventeenth century, but there was none over the Esk or Sark until the nineteenth century.² No significant trade routes ran through the city before the growth of the cattle trade in the seventeenth century, and even this was of little direct benefit to the inhabitants. Shipping provided no alternative in 1550. Cumberland had no navigable rivers and a survey of ports and shipping in 1565 found that Cumberland men owned only 15 ships, and these were merely large fishing boats occasionally used for coastal trade to Liverpool and Chester.³ Harbour facilities at Workington, the principal haven, were so poor that the Company of Mines Royal shipped most of its needs overland from Newcastle.⁴

If the county was isolated, its climate and geology contributed to still more to its economic backwardness. The Lake District is the wettest area of England. The Solway Plain receives on average between 30 and 35 inches of rain a year, Inglewood and the Pennine edge country between 30 and 40 inches, and most of south-west Cumberland over 40 inches. The high rainfall and the accompanying cloudy conditions discouraged the cultivation of wheat.⁵ In 1795 the harvests were said to be "very precarious and expensive" because of frequent autumn rains.⁶ The soils too are mostly poor, the boulder clay which composes most of the Solway Plain and the Eden

¹. CBP, I, no.773.
². R.S. Ferguson, 'Ancient and County Bridges in Cumberland and Westmorland; with some Remarks upon the Fords', CW1, 15, 1897-8, pp.114-132; R. Hogg, 'The Historic Crossings of the River Eden', CW2, 52, 1952, pp.144-6
³. P.H. Fox, 'Cumberland Ports and Shipping in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth', CW2, 21, 1921, pp.74-8.
valley being badly drained and the soils of the uplands being acidic. It has recently been argued that these problems, compounded by border violence, a social and tenurial structure which encouraged the formation of small farms and the lack of alternatives to farming, led to subsistence crisis and actual famine on three occasions in the period under study: 1587-8, 1598 and 1623. To these harsh conditions were added the problems of violence. In 1550 Cumberland and Northumberland were undoubtedly the two most violent counties in England. This situation was a product of the Anglo-Scottish wars of the late middle ages and, particularly, of the campaigns of Henry VIII. The normal English social structure had been replaced in the area north of the River Eden by a social structure based on the surname. Surnames were kinship-based groups similar to the clans of Highland Scotland; each was a loose union of related or nominally related families that banded together for self-protection and aggression. The group was defined by use of the same surname, but among the larger surnames, such as the Grahams, the support of the unit was extended to the sub-tenants of surname leaders. Partible inheritance, which was the general practice in the border area and caused excessive subdivision of holdings, poor soil, demographic pressures and, possibly, inefficient farming methods, combined to make raiding endemic. Indeed for some it was virtually an economic necessity.

2. Appleby, op. cit.
Map 1.1 Early-modern Cumberland
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The raids were at times severe. From July 1588 to August 1589, for example, Scots stole some 511 cattle, destroyed a mill and 21 houses, and killed 10 people, including burning a man and his pregnant wife to death.\textsuperscript{1} Dr Dixon has mapped all the recorded incidents, and it is clear that most of the reiving took place north of the rivers Eden and Irthing, but raids were not unknown as far south as Gilcrux, Ireby or Kirkoswald.\textsuperscript{2} Naturally the raids interfered with normal economic life. In 1588 the tenants of the northern part of the barony of Gilsland did not dare to use their northernmost common pasture for fear of losing their cattle.\textsuperscript{3} Agricultural profits were creamed off by the stronger surnames in the form of protection money.

Before 1603 the Wardens were unable to take effective action to control the situation. International politics meant that the necessary cross-border co-operation was usually impossible - the raid on Carlisle castle to free Kinmont Willie in 1596 was led by a Scottish Border official. Firm action against the most aggressive of the English surnames, the Grahams, was prevented by the crown; the government would not provide an adequate garrison; local officials were divided in their loyalties. Once James was king in England, however, the situation was resolved. The Grahams were transported \textit{en masse} to Ireland; the administrations on each side of the border co-operated in suppressing the remaining reivers.\textsuperscript{4}

The problem of border raids did not end then, however. During the Civil War it revived and parliament stationed troops in Carlisle to control it. Even after the Restoration the area remained lawless although probably less blood was spilled - in 1666 it was said to groan under theft and rapine.

1. CBP, I, no.677.
2. Dixon, \textit{op. cit.}
4. Spence, 'The Pacification'.
and the Earl of Carlisle wanted power to exile suspects without trial. At
the 1676 gaol delivery in Carlisle six Border thieves were hung and two
others branded on the hand. In 1662 a statute was passed which allowed
Cumberland and Northumberland J.P.s to raise a force to catch moss-troopers;
it also created a form of insurance system, which recompensed those whose
horses or cattle were stolen. So useful was the act that it was renewed
periodically until 1757.

The effect of the violence on the town is impossible to quantify
but was doubtless considerable. First, the resulting impoverishment of the
area to the north of Carlisle restricted its hinterland although, as the
evidence discussed in Chapter Three indicates, the citizens continued to
trade with it. Second, the reputation of the northerners was such that in
the sixteenth century the citizens refused to draw apprentices from the
region. The Dormont Book, for example, ordered that no-one was to take as
an apprentice anyone born north of Blackford (about 4 miles north of the
city), and in 1602 the rule was amended to exclude also those from beyond
the Irthing, to the east.

Third, there were the preparations necessary in case the violence
reached the town. Although the corporation was not responsible for the
maintenance of the walls, it saw to the nightly watching of the walls and
gates. Extra men were employed during the 'Ill Week' raiding after Queen
Elizabeth's death. The inhabitants also provided themselves with weapons to
perform their military service, for many of them held property by tenant

1. CSPD 1649-50, p.360; CSPD 1665-6, p.205; CSPD 1676-7, p.143.
   Cumberland force was 12 men.
3. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of Carlisle,
   CWAAS, Extra Series, IV, Carlisle 1887, p.66.
4. Ibid., pp.57, 63-4; Ca4/1, sub 1602-3.
right, a form of customary tenure which required military service. Thomas Stoddert, for example, in 1595/6 bequeathed to his son John "all the furniture for my body in the service for my prince".\(^1\) Of the inventories for 155 male inhabitants of Carlisle proved before 1603, 62 (40 per cent) listed weapons of a variety of types, swords, bills, bows, lances and guns, as did six of the 11 inventories proved between 1603 and 1610. Once the pacification had begun to take hold there was a drop in the proportion of inhabitants owning arms; of the 35 inventories proved between 1611 and 1620 only 11 (31 per cent) listed weapons, and of 84 proved 1660–1700, only 24 (29 per cent). In contrast, in the peaceful Midlands town of Chesterfield only 23 inventories of those of 158 men proved between 1550 and 1603 (15 per cent) listed weapons.\(^2\)

Lastly, although the town was attacked only once, the inhabitants themselves became involved in fighting on occasion.\(^3\) The townsmen as a whole, not merely the citizens, were expected to come to the aid of the mayor in the event of a fray.\(^4\) This ordinance seems to have been interpreted fairly broadly, for in September 1582 inhabitants of the city "followinge the troade" (i.e. in hot pursuit) with some soldiers chased some Scots to Gretna.\(^5\) In the 1590s Robert Cary, the Deputy Warden, pursued a malefactor to his house, a stone tower few miles north of Carlisle. Finding that he needed infantry to break in through the roof he sent to the city and

1. P1603.
2. J.V. Bestall and D.V. Fowkes, eds., Chesterfield Wills and Inventories, 1521–1603, Derbyshire Record Society, 1, 1977, pp.33–294. Fowling pieces were counted as weapons, as was armour. Alan Macfarlane was incorrect in arguing that northern England was relatively free of violence in the early-modern period; on the other hand, the violent conditions were localised to the Border area and untypical of the north as a whole. Macfarlane, The Justice and the Mare's Ale, Oxford 1981.
3. See Chapter Four.
5. CBP, I, no.133.
three to four hundred inhabitants came at once.' Not surprisingly, inhabitants of the city occasionally were killed. Edward Aglionby, for example, a former mayor, was murdered in 1599 in the course of a blood feud.2

The other great change in the county during the early-modern period was the growth of industry. Cumberland's industries in the early-modern period were essentially extractive; there was no cloth production for more than local consumption. There was coal mining in the Pennines near Brampton from the mid-sixteenth century, but not on a significant scale.3

The mining of copper in the Keswick area which began in the 1560s was far more important, however, and it brought population growth and valuable employment to the area. The project was ultimately a failure, however, and mining ceased during the Civil War.4 Important too was mining and smelting iron. In the sixteenth century production was low and iron was imported in the coastal trade, while Carlisle obtained its supplies from Newcastle.6 In the following century, however, a number of water-powered bloomsmithies were established in south-western Cumberland, and a blast-furnace at Cleator in 1694. By 1660 output more or less met local demand.6 Most important of all, however, was the dramatic growth of the coal industry

3. Ibid., p.xliv; Ca2/19, sub Nov. 1562.
5. Fox, loc. cit., p.79; P1574 John How.
of south-western Cumberland from about 1630. Not only did production increase very significantly, but a complete new town, Whitehaven, was created to serve as an outlet for it, and shipping grew to carry the coal to the principal market for it, Ireland. By the 1680s merchants from Whitehaven had also begun to trade with America and the West Indies, importing tobacco, in particular.'

These changes helped to overcome some of the problems of the county. Cumberland was no longer so isolated now its communications by water were so much improved. The new industries provided alternatives to remaining on the land, and the industrial workers doubtless provided a new market for the county's farmers, although many miners and others were still smallholders. The growth of the cattle trade probably also helped the region's farmers, although the degree to which they took part in it is uncertain. The decrease in violence must have been extremely welcome. The 'Great Rebuilding' began in Cumberland around 1660, which suggests some increased prosperity for the yeoman and husbandman class, and this may have also been enjoyed by some of the towns. Celia Fiennes in 1698 initially mistook Penrith's red-sandstone buildings for brick (some of these still stand), although she was not impressed by the rural houses she saw.2

Nevertheless the economy of the county as a whole was not transformed. Industrial growth was very localised and there is little evidence that the north and east of Cumberland benefited significantly from it. C.B. Phillips found that "contrary to expectations, it is not possible to point out any marked economic changes in the two counties [Cumberland and


Westmorland] after the union [of crowns]. The gentry of Cumberland was relatively poor and remained so during the seventeenth century.1 Using the amount of tax paid per head, Professor Jones calculated that Cumberland was one of the poorest counties in the country in the late seventeenth century. He was sceptical of the degree to which this was actually the case, arguing that the north as a whole was generally underassessed. Nevertheless, even if the amounts of tax collected from Cumberland he quoted were doubled, they would still not have approached close to the average paid by the nation except in the case of the excise on beer and ale.2 Cumberland was still a poor area in 1700.

b. The City of Carlisle

We lay at Carlile a very indifferent small city stands on a flat all walled and the Cathedrall but indifferent onely two churches3

Carlisle actually stood on a slight hill, a deposit of boulder-clay rising above the flood plains of the rivers Caldew, Eden and Petteril. The ground sloped gently to the east and south, but dropped quite steeply to the west and north – the city's western wall disguised the fall in level and probably misled the anonymous visitor who wrote the description quoted above. This was a good site for bridging the Eden since the flood-plain here is relatively narrow and the northern bank firm. It was also a defensive site, chosen originally by the Romans and probably occupied continuously ever

3. PRO, C106/149 Pt. 2.
Map 1.2 Early-modern Carlisle
since, although tradition states it was abandoned during the Dark Ages.

Immediately to the west flowed the Caldew, providing a defence and also water for leets to power the four mills which lay immediately below the west walls. The Petteril flowed past a mile to the east - on this side the town had a ditch. To the north the Eden ran close by; in 1550 its course lay in a great loop past the end of Rickergate Without, but about 1570 the river broke through the neck of the ox-bow, forming an extra channel known as the Priestbeck and necessitating the construction of a second bridge.¹

In common with most of the visitors to Carlisle and others who wrote descriptions of the town, this anonymous traveller remarked on the city's walls. He was right to do so. Town defences were, of course, a symbol of urban status and civic pride, but in Carlisle they still had military significance even in 1700, and they dominated the town. Map 1.2 shows the plan of the town in the period 1550-1700. To north lay the castle, the seat of the Warden of the West March. A medieval structure, it was repaired periodically during the early-modern period but never thoroughly modernised. It consisted of a square Norman keep, lowered during Elizabeth's reign because the explosion of gunpowder stored in it had weakened its walls, an inner ward which contained the apartments where Mary Queen of Scots was housed in 1568, and a large outer ward. Its official boundaries stretched almost to Annetwell and Finkle Streets, an area occupied by an orchard and gardens. The main gate faced down Castlegate towards the market-place.²


At the southern end of the city stood the Citadel, a small fort constructed by Henry VIII. It was triangular in shape, the apex of the triangle pointing up Botchergate towards the market-place. At the two southernmost corners stood large round towers intended to carry artillery. These were converted into court-rooms for the county courts by Robert Smirke in the early nineteenth century. The original southern gatehouse to the city was built into the wall between the two towers, forming part of another gun-platform. Since the Citadel blocked Botchergate a new south gate had been built in the west wall just to the north of it. The undated sixteenth-century map shows this to have been undefended, but by 1672 it had a small barbican. The town walls, often in rather poor condition, were broken by three main gates: Botchergate or English Gate, already mentioned, Scotch Gate or Rickergate, facing northwards towards the bridges over the Eden, and Caldew or Irish Gate, facing westwards towards the Caldew. Rickergate was used as the town gaol. There was also at least one sallyport on the west side and probably a couple more on the east.¹

The skyline was marked by the town's two churches. The cathedral was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, although the nave was used as a parish church for the northern part of the town and the countryside to the west and was dedicated to St Mary. It was also used as the civic church; when the west end of the nave was demolished during the Commonwealth the corporation moved its pews to St Cuthbert's.² The cathedral had been a


2. D. Perriam, 'An unrecorded Carlisle church: the church of the Holy Trinity, Caldewgate', CW2, 79, 1979, p.51; D. Perriam, The Demolition of the Priory of St Mary, Carlisle', CW2, 87, 1987, pp.125-58; Ca4/139, f.93v. Perriam argues that the nave was demolished because it was unsafe after decades of neglect, rather than as an act of destruction by the Scots. The reference in the Audit Book supports his case, for it suggests that the nave of St Mary's was still standing in 1649, when the Scots had gone. The pews may, of course, have been taken from the choir, not the nave.
cathedral priory until the Reformation. Its monastic buildings housed the chapter until most of them were demolished during the Civil War; new houses were later built there. St Cuthbert's church, the parish church of the southern part of the town and an extensive rural area to the east and south, lay south of the cathedral precincts. It was a relatively small building, completely rebuilt in the eighteenth century.

Central both physically and to the town's economic life was the market place. Here the city's craftsmen bought raw materials and sold their finished goods, here the inhabitants of the town's hinterland brought foodstuffs to be sold to the townsmen or other countrymen. The city's fairs were held just outside the town, on the Sands between the Priestbeck and Eden bridges, however, and this area was used as a beast market in the late seventeenth century if not before. In the middle of the market place was the market cross. In 1683 this was rebuilt as a simple Ionic column on a circular, stepped plinth and surmounted by a shield bearing the city arms and a lion as pinnacle. The shambles lay along the south-east side of the market place; 26 butchers each occupied half a shamble in 1594/5. On the south-west side, opposite the shambles, was the pillory. In the undated sixteenth-century map this was drawn as a high structure with a pillory on top; the space under the pillory was used as a weigh-house and place to store the city's weights and measures on market days. Beckman's map of Carlisle, drawn in 1672, indicates that it was demolished in the Civil War when the Scots built a guardhouse on the site with stone from the cathedral precinct, but a new pillory was provided in 1694, if not before.

1. Perriam, 'Demolition', loc. cit.; and see below, Chapter Four, pp.154-5.
2. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.
3. TL542/1, Articles against J.R.
5. BL, Cotton Mss Augustus I.1 no. 13; BL, Add Ms 16,371e; Ca3/2/8; Ca2/2, f.22v.
There were several encroachments on the market-place. On the west, north of the pillory, was a line of houses known as Glover Row. More important was the Moothall or town hall. This was a two-storey structure, the lower housing a number of shops, the upper the civic offices. These consisted of the hall itself, a "high chamber", a "low chamber" and a loft. In 1621 it was whitewashed. The Moothall was completely rebuilt in 1669 at a cost of over £200, in addition to which the corporation may have provided materials. The front of the new building was of red sandstone; the rear may have been of brick. The front windows were four-light casements, dormers were to be provided, and the door, reached by an external stone staircase, was placed centrally. At the west end two chambers and a loft, all with chimneys, were constructed. Both ends and the staircase have subsequently been rebuilt and the facade refenestrated. Between the Moothall and Glovers Row lay the Grassmarket, otherwise known as the Bullring. A new bull ring for tethering bulls to be bated was purchased in 1619-20.

It can be seen from the map that the main streets of the city radiated from the market-place. On the west side of Fishergate, at the corner where it debouched into Grassmarket, stood the Gildhall, occasionally called Redness Hall. This building was the gift to the city of Richard Redness in at the end of the fourteenth century. It stood three storeys high, the 8 gilds having their chambers or 'halls' on the top two floors, the

1. Chamberlains' Accounts, Ca4/1-4, passim.
2. Ca5/1/47. The sandstone was perhaps from the Dean and Chapter's quarry at Newbiggin. Ca4/3, sub 1668-9; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, f.9.
3. See the water-colours in Carlisle Museum. The rendering of the facade has recently been stripped off.
ground floor and basement being let out. Castlegate or Castle Street led to
the main gate of the castle. Bruce Jones has argued that the northern end
of this street and Abbeygate, running parallel to it and to the west, were
laid out only at the end of the thirteenth century after a disastrous fire.
Previously a street known as the *Vicus Hibernicorum* had run from the corner
of the cathedral precinct to Irish Gate.¹ There were also a number of side
streets and an intramural street ran all the way around the town. Besides
these a variety of documents record vennels, or alleys, running back from the
principal streetfronts down the tenement plots. These were the origins of
the Lanes, the area north-west of the market place, which until recently was
a marked feature of Carlisle’s topography. Archaeological excavation has
shown that many of the paths were of considerable antiquity; the sixteenth-
century map reveals that houses stood along some of them before 1600.²

The extent of open ground and garden in the town is striking.
The site of the Greyfriars, which fronted on to Botchergate, remained
undeveloped garden from before 1550 until the early nineteenth century. The
site of the Blackfriars was also mostly garden in 1652.³ Gardens are often
mentioned in the parliamentary survey of the Dean and Chapter’s property in
Carlisle and in court leet records, as are barns and stables.⁴ Orchards
inside the walls also appear occasionally in the records; there was a garth
or orchard attached to a “backhouse” in St Alban’s Row in 1653, for example,
and in 1662 Timothy Tullie was fined for not keeping up the dike to his

2. BL, Cotton Mss Augustus I.1 no. 13 (printed in R. Spence, The Backward
North Modernized? The Cliffords, Earls of Cumberland and the Socage Manor of
Carlisle, 1611-1643, Northern History, 20, 1984, opposite p.66).
3. Various late-eighteenth-century maps illustrate this; PRO,
E317/Cumberland/No.3, m.1.
4. Ca3/2/1-25; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1.
orchard. Hedges were one of the commonest forms of fencing, if not the
commonest. Complaints of neglect of hedges, along with dunghills being left
too long in the streets, appear in almost every surviving court leet roll.2

Table 1.1 Households exempt from the Hearth Tax, Michaelmas 16731

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Ward'</th>
<th>H'holds paying</th>
<th>H'holds exempt</th>
<th>Total H'holds</th>
<th></th>
<th>% exempt</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rickergate Within</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeygate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botchergate Within</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botchergate Without</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldewgate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickergate Without</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. PRO, E179/90/76. Those listed in the Hearth Tax returns as discharged by certificate are the same as those named as exempt in the contemporary exemption certificates, PRO, E179/326/6, ff.35-9. Householders automatically exempt from the tax because of their poverty are not recorded in the returns and therefore do not appear in this table. It is impossible to say how many of Carlisle's inhabitants fell into this category.

Nevertheless, although there was plenty of space inside the walls
the town still spread beyond them outside each gate. There were suburbs in
the Middle Ages - the Scots burnt them in 1296.3 They were not shown on
the sixteenth-century map of the city, but they existed: men from outside
the walls left probate documents from the earliest years of the period under
study. The Hearth Tax presents the best picture of the suburbs available.
The only complete Hearth Tax returns surviving for Carlisle are those for
Michaelmas 1673 and Lady Day 1674, which are analysed in Tables 1.1-3.

2. Ca3/2/1-25.
Table 1.2 Mean number of hearths per household, Michaelmas 1673

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Hearths 1-9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Av, no.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rickergate Within</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeygate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botchergate Within</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botchergate Without</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldewgate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickergate Without</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. PRO, E179/90/76.
2. Analysis here excludes two households where the number of hearths is obscured by a repair to the document: Edw. Bleamire's house in Caldewgate, almost certainly 1 or 2 hearths, and John How's house in Botchergate Within, probably 9 or 10 hearths. Neither household was exempt from the tax.

Table 1.3 Number of households by numbers of hearths, Michaelmas 1673

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of households with 1-9 hearths</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total hearths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickergate Within</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeygate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botchergate Within</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botchergate Without</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldewgate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickergate Without</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. PRO, E179/90/76.
2. See Table 1.2 note 2.

The three suburbs in 1673 contained 32 per cent of the town's households. Caldewgate, with 66 households, most of them beyond the city liberties, was the largest; Botchergate Without was small, having only 15 households. Before the Civil War the Hospital of St Nicholas (an almshouse)
stood there, but it was destroyed during the siege and not rebuilt. The suburbs plainly were the poorest districts of the town, having the smallest average number of hearths per household of all the areas distinguished in the returns and, but for Abbeygate, the highest proportion of exempt householders. Only Rickergate had households with more than two hearths. The number of hearths belonging to a household is not necessarily a good indicator of the size of the structure it occupied, since houses were frequently divided between several families, but it seems probable that the houses in the suburbs were genuinely small. During the Civil War the suburbs were razed by the royalist garrison and for a period this would have discouraged anyone rebuilding other than cheap structures. Indeed, the suburbs may well have become more exclusively the dwelling-place of the poorer inhabitants as a result.

Some contemporary comments on the housing of Carlisle have survived. An account of the county, datable from internal evidence to 1715-17, described Carlisle as "at present a wealthy and populous Place, the Houses are well built...", but this was possibly the work of William Blennerhasset of Flimby, a Cumberland man. Southerners were critical. Three Norwich men who visited the city in 1634 thought Carlisle could chiefly boast of its antiquity and strength, "it being otherwise both for Revenues, Buildings, and the Inhabitants, and their Condition very poore".

1. W.G. Wiseman, 'The Medieval Hospitals of Cumbria', CW2, 87, 1987, pp.84-5; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, m.4.
2. S. Jefferson, ed., A Narrative of the Siege of Carlisle, in 1644 and 1645, by Isaac Tullie, Carlisle 1840, p.12. The returns for Abbeygate presumably include houses in Annetwell Street, an unimportant side street, and in Paternoster Row.
3. D/Lons, Denton Mss Box, An Historical Account of Cumberland, p.385. A printed document, it is paginated 365-416 and is probably a section of a topographical account of England.
Defoe thought "the buildings old". Celia Fiennes wrote:

there was some few houses as the Deans and Treasurer and some of the Doctors houses walled in with little gardens their fronts looked gracefully, else I saw no house except the present Majors house of brick and stone, and one house which was the Chancellors built of stone very lofty 5 good sarshe windows in the front, and this with a stone wall'd garden well kept and iron gates to discover it to view with stone pillars; the streetes are very broad and handsome well pitch'd.²

The evidence discussed below in Appendix One indicates that these observers were correct. Carlisle's housing was genuinely small and old-fashioned compared with that of other cities, containing fewer rooms on average, and not being as tall and impressive. There were probably many surviving houses similar to that described in the medieval building contract discussed by Mr Jones - a building with an open hall, a pantry and buttery with a loft over, and a detached or lean-to kitchen.³ Its housing was, nevertheless, superior to that of the surrounding country districts, if the number of hearths per house is a guide.⁴

Before the Restoration the principal housing building materials were probably timber and clay. The Gildhall is a timber-framed structure of considerable sophistication and there may have been other similar buildings, but cruck-framed buildings were perhaps more common. Cruck-framed buildings with clay walls were general in the rural area surrounding. The building specified in the contract of 1392 could equally have been a cruck structure as a more sophisticated one.⁵ There were some stone buildings, however.

One, built perhaps early in the sixteenth century, stood in Kings Arms Lane until early this century.1 Brick came into use after the Civil War, however, although, judging from Fiennes' description, there can have been few houses built entirely of it. George Wilson, a glover, owned £3 worth of brick in 1681.2 Certainly many houses had been built of brick before 1750, and it seems probable that substantial rebuilding took place in the last decades of the seventeenth century and the first decades of the eighteenth.

Roofs were of thatch, slate or turf. Thomas Sowerby owed George Sowerbye 12d. for "thachinge" in 1566 and during the siege thatch was used to feed horses.3 In 1581 Mathew Wilson was to receive allowance from his landlady for laying 800 'flackes', or turves, on his house.4 Slate was quite cheap, however. The two carloads owned by Thomas Peyrson, a merchant, in 1607 were valued at only 2s.5 It is possible that by 1649 thatch was becoming less common, since Thomas Fisher's house in Fishergate was remarked upon as being "a strawe thatched buildinge", but the Dean and Chapter were still having buildings in the close thatched in 1677.6

Three of the fundamental elements of Carlisle's economy, therefore, were highly visible: its role as a market town, its function as a military centre, and its role as an ecclesiastical centre. But Carlisle appeared to southerners as a rather unimpressive place. Only its walls and castle were remarkable and even the cathedral failed to please.7 With its hedges and

1. J.H. Martindale, 'The old building in Kings Arms Lane, Carlisle', CW2, 15, 1915, pp.121-4. This building might have lain in the precinct of the Greyfriars.
2. Jones, 'Brickmakers...', loc. cit.; P1681; see below, Chapter Seven.
4. P1581. This house may have lain outside the town.
5. P1607.
6. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1 f.80; Discharge Books I, p.23.
7. PRO, C106/149 Pt2; Legg, op. cit., p.37.
dunghills it must have had a rustic atmosphere, although it was strikingly
different from local rural settlements. The town would seem to have been
poor and backward compared with places in the south, characteristics which
will be discussed further throughout this thesis.

c. Conclusion
The city of Carlisle stood in an unpropitious place for a successful town.
Its hinterland was unusually violent for much of the period under study and
not very fertile; the inhabitants of the region were relatively poor.
Although the county experienced economic growth during the early-modern
period, none of the changes benefited the city directly and most took place
in areas distant from it. Carlisle inherited from its past the physical
presence of a town: a range of civic buildings, walls, houses of an urban
character. Nevertheless its housing was small and old-fashioned compared
with southern towns, and perhaps even with that of Penrith. The strength of
the city's defences reflected the violence of the area and the town's
location on the Border; indeed it could be argued that its role as a
stronghold was the primary reason for its refoundation in 1092. Other
economic roles the town enjoyed, diocesan centre and market town, were also
prominently expressed physically. The significance of these roles, and the
relative poverty implied by its housing, will be discussed in later chapters.
In the chapter immediately following, however, the effects of these problems
and developments on the population of the county and town will be explored.
Chapter Two
Population Change in County and City

The previous chapter outlined some of the more important changes in the county as a whole in the early-modern period and described the town of Carlisle; this chapter will explore an aspect of the county's history, its population, and will relate the findings to the story of population change in Carlisle itself. "The study of population changes is absolutely fundamental to economic history." Considering them here should illuminate the course of economic change in both county and town. Changes in the size and distribution of the population of the county will be examined first, then the population of the city.

a. The population of Cumberland, 1550-1700

This section will look at the county's population history from two viewpoints. In the first part the number of the county's inhabitants will be discussed; in the second the distribution of those inhabitants will be considered.

The population of Cumberland can be calculated for dates near both the beginning and the end of the period under study from the ecclesiastical census of 1563 and the figures collected by Thomas Denton in 1687-8.\(^2\) The first of these records the households in 96 parishes.


2. These figures are printed in A. Appleby, Famine in Tudor and Stuart England, Liverpool 1978, pp.198-201, and the Denton figures also in D. and S. Lysons, Magna Britannia, Vol. IV, Cumberland, pp.xxxxv-xliv. Denton's figures are for population, but all are multiples of five and it has been assumed that they were calculated from a household count using a multiplier of five. See Appleby, op. cit., p.24. It is not known how Denton arrived at his figures, his manuscript states only: "The numbers of the Inhabitants in each Parish I could not  [cont. at foot of text of following page]
Excluding the parish of Alston, it totals 8,603 households. In 1688 the same 95 parishes contained 12,764 households, an increase of about 48 per cent. The population of Cumberland grew faster in this period than that of Cambridgeshire, which increased by only 34 per cent between 1563 and 1664, but slower than those of Leicestershire and Hertfordshire, which both grew by 58 per cent. It also grew more slowly than that of England as a whole, which probably grew by 55.5 per cent between 1566 and 1686.

This population growth was not smooth, however. Dr Appleby argued that Cumberland and Westmorland experienced "three severe demographic crises" between 1550 and 1700, in 1587-8, 1597-8 and 1623. These he attributed to malnutrition as a result of harvest failure, going so far as to argue actual famine in the latter two crises. He thought that the population of the two counties grew during the late sixteenth century, reaching a peak about 1600, then declined fairly sharply during the first half of the seventeenth century, before growing again by 1688. Although

[Note 2. cont from previous page] so exactly calculate, as may be expected; but by the methods I proposed, I have gone as near as was possible to number them; the whole amounting to 66375 Persons." D/Lons, Thomas Denton's Ms History of Cumberland, introductory section, n.p.

1. Nigel Goose has recently argued that the 1563 returns underestimated the households of Cambridge and probably undercounted other populations too. Using the same methodology and applying it to the baptismal figures for four Cumberland parishes in the 1570s quoted by Appleby, it seems probable that the returns underrepresented the households of Cumberland also. N. Goose, 'The Ecclesiastical Returns of 1563: A Cautionary Note', Local Population Studies, 34, 1985, pp.46-7; Appleby, op. cit., p.30.


3. E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, The population history of England 1541-1871: a reconstruction, 1981, Table 7.8. If the figures of 1563 are an undercount then Cumberland's growth was, of course, still less.

4. Appleby, op. cit., Chapters Two, Seven and Eight. Much of Appleby's argument hangs on the assumption that the figure for the number of communicants in the diocese of Carlisle in 1603 is actually total population, in which case the population of the diocese grew by about 43 per cent between 1563 and 1603. Parish registers he analysed give some support to his argument, but do not suggest an increase of that magnitude.
Map 2.1 Population density in Cumberland, 1563
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his figures can be challenged and he may have overestimated both the increase and the subsequent fall in population, the general pattern of change seems likely to be correct.¹

The ground is rather safer when relative density of population in the county is considered, for here the only assumption necessary is that the sources used are internally consistent. The population density of Cumberland was low compared to that of other counties. In 1563 there were only about 9.52 households per thousand acres.² By 1688 the density was still only 13.25 households per thousand acres.³ In the heavily populated county of Cambridgeshire in 1563 there were 18 households per thousand acres, and in Leicestershire there were sixteen.⁴ Such low densities in Cumberland are hardly surprising, since the county included large areas of uncultivated waste and since dispersed settlement was the rule over large areas of it.

Population density within the county in 1563 and 1688 broken down by parishes is shown in Maps 2.1 and 2.2. Before considering the information they contain it would be wise to note the disadvantages of this method of presenting the data. The most obvious is that several parishes, those containing the larger market centres, have large populations which boost the average density while occupying only a small proportion of the area. One example is Penrith, another is Brigham, which contained a large area of sparsely inhabited fell as well as the town of Cockermouth. For this reason the positions of market centres are marked on the maps. A second problem is

1. If the 1563 returns under-counted households and a higher multiplier, say four, is used on the Protestation Returns then the size of the population increase and decrease is very much reduced.
2. Population densities here and in Maps 2.1 and 2.2 have been calculated using the figures for 1563 and 1688 printed in Appleby, op. cit., pp.198-201, and the areas of parishes given on the index sheet to the first edition of the Ordnance Survey six inches to the mile survey of Cumberland.
3. In the whole county including Alston.
Map 2.2 Population density in Cumberland, 1688
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parishes like St Bees', where the density of settlement in the coastal portion was probably akin to that of other coastal parishes in the south-western lowlands, but the average density of settlement in the parish as a whole was drastically lowered by the vast area of mountainous terrain in the detached portion of the parish in the Lakeland dome. Density of settlement must have varied quite sharply within parishes which included areas of upland and lowland, such as those on the edge of the Pennines, Millom, and Keswick, where settlement was almost entirely on the valley floors.

What do the maps tell? In 1563 the least densely populated areas were the Lakeland Dome, the Pennine-edge parishes and those near the border, all areas of upland, poor soils and, in the last instance, particularly vulnerable to reiving. The parish of Westward (south-east of Wigton), then under forest law, was also sparsely inhabited. The areas of heaviest settlement were the south-western lowlands and western Solway Plain, although a few parishes near Carlisle were also populous. In 1688 the pattern was not dissimilar, although the contrast between upland and lowland parishes was sharper. The Lakeland Dome and border region were still the least densely populated areas. The parishes along the scarp of the Pennines were a little more heavily settled, presumably because rather more arable land was available there than in the Lakes or Borders. The lowlands of the coastal strip and the Solway Plain were still the most densely inhabited, however, especially those parishes on or near coal-bearing land.

Map 2.3 shows the percentage change in the number of households between 1563 and 1688. As might be expected in view of the industrial history of the county, the area of fastest growth was those parishes which lay on the coal measures, around Whitehaven, Egremont and Workington. In the far south, however, the population actually fell, perhaps because labour

1. For sources see p.30 n.2.
was attracted north. Growth on the Borders was slow, probably hampered by infertile soils and perhaps by the remnants of an outmoded social system. The northern Pennine-edge parishes grew quickly, however. Perhaps these parishes, and Rockcliffe, benefited most from the decline of violence. Inglewood and the Solway Plain had very mixed experiences, some parish populations increasing markedly while others grew only slowly and some declined.

If Appleby is right, then Carlisle was the county town of a region which suffered considerable hardship in the early-modern period, greater
hardship than most of the rest of England. The regional economy was too weak to support the local population adequately at a moment of crisis. Over the period as a whole population growth took place, however, albeit slower than in the country as a whole. Some parts of the county grew faster than others, in particular the coal-mining areas and parishes adjacent, and the parishes along the Pennines. Some of the parishes immediately around Carlisle enjoyed very rapid growth, while others experienced sharp decline, but if the sources can be trusted, then the population of its immediate hinterland grew more slowly than the county as a whole.

b. The population of Carlisle, 1550-1700

The first reliable count of the population of the town of Carlisle is probably the Rev. Henry Robinson's, made in 1763, when there were 4,158 inhabitants living in 1,059 families. A number of sources exist which allow an estimate of the population to be made before then, however, although all require interpretation; all suggest that the town was very much smaller. Most of them, of course, were not intended to describe the town's population, and so require adjustment, while in some cases the sources inspire great suspicion. Nevertheless population changes within the town may influence or reflect economic change, and therefore an attempt must be made here to determine the course of population change in early-modern Carlisle, even if the result is no more than a series of educated guesses.

In 1377 Carlisle had at least 1,000 inhabitants, and possibly 300-400 more. In 1534-5 a muster return listed 274 laymen, including 17

1. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Rev. Henry Robinson's Census, 1763, copy in the CRO.
2. J.L. and A.D. Kirby, 'The Poll Tax of 1377 for Carlisle', CW2, 58, 1958, pp.110-17. I am grateful to Dr. Henry Summerson for allowing me to see a draft of the chapter of his forthcoming book which discusses the Poll Tax.
servants, and 41 clergymen.¹ If it is assumed that this represented three-
quaters of the adult males in the town, then the inhabitants must have
numbered around 1,260; if it represented only half of the men, which seems
unlikely since a number of servants were definitely included, then they
numbered about 1,870.² At this date, then, Carlisle had no more than the
population of one of England's larger market towns, although it was not alone
among county towns in this.

The first source available within the period under study is the
ecclesiastical returns of 1563.³ This document records 249 households in
the parish of St Mary, Carlisle, which includes 27 in the chapelry of Wreay,
and 228 in the parish of St Cuthbert. Not all of these households were in
the town, however, for the two parishes comprised a number of rural
settlements as well as the city.⁴ Those in the town were probably about 274

¹. PRO E101/549/13, mm.190-4. I am grateful to Dr Summerson for this
reference and for discussion on the population history of Carlisle in the
sixteenth century.

². Multipliers of 4.44 and 6.67, both based on the assumption that males
were half the population and 40 per cent were below military age.

³. BL, Harleian Ms 594, f.85r-v.

⁴. The parish registers for St Mary's Carlisle (PR47/1) begin only in the
mid-seventeenth century, and those for St Cuthbert (PR79/1) begin only in
1693. Both can be supplemented by bishops transcripts, which survive for
odd years from the mid-seventeenth century for both parishes, including the
early 1690s for St Cuthbert's. During the decade 1691-1700 697 baptisms and
burials were recorded in St Cuthbert's parish and 774 in St Mary's. Of
these, 662 and 751, respectively, were noted as relating to inhabitants of
either the town or the rural settlements, the remainder being unassigned or
relating to outsiders. If it is assumed that the proportion of these
registered events reflects the proportions of townspeople and countrymen, then
41.09 per cent of the population of St Cuthbert's lived in the town, and 78.03
per cent of the population of St Mary's. Roughly the same figure is reached
using the Protestation Returns (House of Lords Record Office, and photocopy
in the CRO) since in 1642 43.54 per cent of the St Cuthbert's parishioners
taking the oath lived in the town and 69.97 per cent of the St Mary's
parishioners.
of the total, suggesting a population in the town of about 1,160. The returns probably underestimated Carlisle’s population, however, so a more accurate figure may be about 1,550. The town can have grown little during the first half of the century, and may even have shrunk.

The second half of the sixteenth century seems to have been a period of growth. In December 1597, as part of its response to the plague epidemic which began that year, the corporation of Carlisle made a list of the householders within the walls. This list records 323 householders, and there were probably another 96 households in the suburbs. If there was no under counting then there were about 1,780 people in the town. Although it seems likely that the list of householders was fairly accurate, some underenumeration is probable; if 10 per cent of householders were not counted, then the total population would have been about 1,980.

This figure may have been a high point in the town’s population history. The plague undoubtedly reduced the number of inhabitants, and it is not clear whether the town had fully recovered by 1642. That year

1. A multiplier of 4.25 has been adopted here. Laslett’s calculations suggested that the mean household size in England between the end of the sixteenth century and the early nineteenth century was 4.75. His figures were inflated by the inclusion of some central London parishes where households were unusually large and Laslett himself comments that the households of tradesmen, craftsmen, labourers and paupers, groups which predominated in early-modern Carlisle, tended to be smaller than that average. Figures he quotes from late-seventeenth century towns also suggest a smaller household size. (P. Laslett, ‘Mean household size in England since the sixteenth century’, in P. Laslett and R. Wall, eds., Household and Family in Past Time, 1972, pp.125-58.) The limited evidence available from Carlisle also points to a low household size: Haddock’s population count of 1685 suggests a mean household size of 4.05 or less. (See below.)

2. See above, p. n.3. The final population figure for Carlisle has been inflated by 25 per cent. This is an arbitrary figure, suggested by Goose’s work. N. Goose, loc. cit..


4. 78.9 per cent of the townsmen taking the protestion oath lived inside the walls, and 75.8 per cent of the baptisms and burials of townsfolk recorded 1691-1700 were for those living inside the walls.
396 inhabitants, males over 18, took the protestation oath, which suggests a total of some 1,320 inhabitants.1 If only 75 per cent of the men were listed in the returns, however, the town may have had as many as 1,760 inhabitants. In the following decade the town took some further knocks. The siege probably resulted directly in few townsmen's deaths, but malnutrition probably weakened the inhabitants, and plague recurred in 1645-6 and 1649-50.2 It may also have been present in 1647, for a list of the members of the Tanners' Gild on 6 August 1647 gives 52 names, and a second list compiled on 5 November records only 36. Fifteen of the names in the first list were marked "mort", indicating that they had died between the dates the two lists were drawn up.3 The suburbs were destroyed during the siege and in 1649 a number of houses within the walls were derelict, which suggests some of the population may have left the town.4

A number of sources survive which allow the population to be estimated in the later seventeenth century. The Hearth Tax returns for Michaelmas 1673/Lady Day 1674 list 327 householders in the city and suburbs, including both those who paid the tax and those who were exempt by certificate. If these were the only households in the town its total population would have been about 1,390. There were in other towns householders who were so poor they did not need exemption certificates, however, there were probably a number of persons who escaped assessment,

1. House of Lords Record Office, Protestation Returns for Cumberland (photocopy in the CRO). This is based on the assumption that males were half of the population and children 40 per cent, giving a multiplier of 3.33. W.G. Hoskins, Local History In England, 2nd edn., 1972, p.173.
2. Ca4/139, f.92; PRO, C3/463/10; Ca4/3 sub 1649 and 1650; M.A.E. Green, ed., Calendar of the Committee for Compounding, etc., 1643-1660, I, 1889, pp.285, 287, 297.
3. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Bk 1, sub 6 Aug. & 5 Nov. 1647.
4. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1; see Chapter Four, pp. 137-9.
and there were probably also a few divided houses assessed as one building and charged on the landlord. If those householders not recorded constituted 25 per cent of the total in the town (probably an overestimate), then the actual population would have been about 1,850.

The Compton Census, taken three years later, provides a puzzling figure. There were 346 persons recorded in St Cuthbert's parish, and 563 in St Mary's, suggesting some 580 in the town. On the basis of comparison with the Protestation Returns and the Denton Returns, Whiteman suggested this figure was the number of households, but on the interpretation of these two sources given here, it is more likely to have been adult males. The uncertainty renders it unreliable as a population source for Carlisle.

In September 1685, probably in response to a request from Sir John Lowther of Whitehaven, a Carlisle merchant, Timothy Haddock "did take a true Accompt of what Numb(e)r of Houses there are in this place" and found them to be 309. In a second letter in December he amplified this information: there were 1,790 inhabitants, and 133 of the houses had more than one family in them. It is unlikely that Haddock was able to make a completely accurate count; he probably undercounted. Nevertheless his count compares well with the population estimate obtained from the Hearth Tax returns.

1. PRO, E179/90/76; T. Arkell, 'A Student's Guide to the Hearth Tax: Some Truths, Half-truths and Untruths', p.25, in N. Alldridge, ed., The Hearth Tax: Problems and Possibilities, Humberside 1985. Twenty names appear twice in the Hearth Tax returns of 1673-4, a few of them three or four times, not all of whom can have been namesakes. One of these people, Peter Norman, who was assessed on houses with 3 and 5 hearths, owned a house let as furnished bedsits in 1687. P1687.
Of three more estimates of the population of Carlisle at the end of the century, two can probably be rejected. Thomas Denton, formerly recorder, thought that there were 2,640 people in St Mary's parish, and 2,420 in St Cuthbert's, suggesting he had begun with household counts of 528 and 484. Of these, probably 611 would have been in the town, suggesting a population of 2,600. This was very much higher than previous estimates and if accepted would indicate that almost half of the townsfolk escaped mention in the Hearth Tax returns, which is highly improbable. As discussed below, the parish register figures also contradict it. The other figure which seems unlikely is William Gilpin's estimate of the population of Carlisle in 1697/8 as 210 families containing 996 people, excluding soldiers. Finally, Hugh Todd, one of the prebendaries, writing about 1690 or 1700 estimated the inhabitants at "near two thousand", living in about 400 houses. There is no reason to prefer Todd's estimate to Denton's other than that it is closer to that from other sources.

Lastly, it is possible to use the parish registers to obtain an idea of the town's population in the last decade of the seventeenth century. There were 478 recorded baptisms in St Mary's parish in the decade 1691-1700, of which 78.06 per cent probably related to town dwellers, and 368 in the parish of St Cuthbert, of which 39.83 per cent related to the town. Wrigley and Schofield argue that birth rates in pre-industrial Europe rarely

4. For sources see above p.35, n.4. The proportion of baptisms relating to the town have been worked out in the same fashion.
fell outside the range 28-40 per 1,000.\textsuperscript{1} If it is assumed that the baptismal rate in Carlisle was 34 per 1,000, then the population of the urban part of St Mary's parish was about 1,097, and that of the urban part of St Cuthbert's, around 431, giving a total for the town of some 1,530. Underregistration was probable, however, and may have been increasing — certainly there were fewer baptisms recorded in St Mary's parish in this decade than in 1661-1670.\textsuperscript{2} Nonconformity was not particularly strong in the town, but it was growing. A Quaker meeting was established in the town during the Commonwealth, but was suppressed before the Restoration. Another meeting existed in Scotby, two and a half miles to the east of Carlisle, from about 1653, and around 1693 a meeting was held in the city once every three weeks while in 1702 a meeting-house was built.\textsuperscript{3} Only 10 people were presented by the churchwardens of St Cuthbert's for not attending divine service in 1666, however, and the Compton Census said there were only two Catholics, 15 Quakers and 11 Dissenters in St Mary's parish and four Quakers and 11 Dissenters in St Cuthbert's. In 1698 Dissenters were said to be of negligible political importance in Carlisle as "their number is soe small".\textsuperscript{4} If 33 per cent is allowed for underregistration, therefore, the town had about 2,030 people.

Some population growth, albeit not fast growth, took place in the town between 1650, when the last outbreak of plague ended, and 1700. It is obvious that some of this was the result of immigration: the register of apprentices in the Dormont Book records the enrollment of some 45

2. There were 623 baptisms recorded 1661-70, i.e. just under one-third more than in 1691-1700. It could be, therefore, that the population of the parish, including the town, had fallen since this decade. PR47/1.
4. St Cuthbert's, Carlisle, Bishop's Transcripts for 1666-7; Whiteman, op. cit., p.628.
apprentices from outside the town between 1675 and 1700, and the place of
origin of the other 87 boys was not always given. The parish registers
indicate that there was natural increase also. Table 2.1 shows the number
of baptisms and burials recorded in the two city parishes in those years
where registration appears to have been uninterrupted. The St Mary's

Table 2.1 Natural increase in Carlisle, 1661-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year range</th>
<th>Bapts</th>
<th>Burs</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661-1670 (8 years)</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>+130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1680</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>+118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1690</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>+151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700 (8 years)</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>+134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St Cuthbert's^2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year range</th>
<th>Bapts</th>
<th>Burs</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>+39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. PR47/1.
2. PR79/1; DRC6/28.

register shows a substantial surplus of baptisms over burials in the lastour decades of the century. The large number of events unassigned to urban
or rural parts of the parish in the earlier decades unfortunately makes it
pointless to try to distinguish between town and country before 1691, but
the population of St Mary's was predominantly urban. In the last decade the
urban population of St Mary's grew by natural increase by 113 or more, and
that of St Cuthbert's by ten. Natural increase in a town of Carlisle's size
and character is not surprising: the city was so sparsely inhabited that it
can have been little more unhealthy than a village and a large proportion of
the parishes studied by Wrigley and Schofield were market centres. What is
a little surprising, however, is that the town showed a surplus of baptisms
over burials in the 1660s, 1670s and 1680s, during much of which period the
country as a whole experienced population decline. The absence of plague
2. Wrigley and Schofield, op. cit., Table 7.8 and Appendix One; list of
market centres in late seventeenth-century England compiled by the Small
Towns in England Project, Centre for Urban History, Univ. of Leicester.
In Carlisle during the 1660s explains much of this. Over the 140 or so years from 1563 to 1700 the population of Carlisle probably grew by something like 29 per cent. This growth was not even, however. The last decades of the sixteenth century saw very rapid growth, and Carlisle was probably as populous in 1597 as it was a century later. The intervening period saw population decline; the number of inhabitants in 1642 was lower than in 1597, although it is not clear by how many, and the population probably fell further as a result of the siege and subsequent plagues. Thereafter, however, there was probably fairly steady growth. Natural increase in at least one of the town's two parishes was so strong that there was quite probably net emigration from the city.

c. Conclusion
Carlisle was barely larger than about 2,000 people in the early-modern period. This was a modest size for a town in this period, below the thresholds "for distinctly 'urban' centres" suggested by Drs Corfield and Goose. It was a small town, therefore, in a sparsely populated county, two facts which are probably related. Moreover Carlisle not only lay on the fringe of the more densely settled areas of the county, but was also distant from the area which grew fastest. Its own hinterland experienced a mixture of growth and decrease. A larger population in its hinterland would have encouraged the town's growth. As it was, the pattern of change in the town's population seems to have followed that of the county as a whole, which suggests a link between the two.

Chapter Three

Neighbours and Rivals: The Urban Hierarchy of Cumberland and the Hinterland of Carlisle

Central place theory, an analytical tool of geographers which "seeks to provide an explanation of the numbers, sizes, and locations of urban settlements in essentially rural, farming regions," rests on the simple concept of a hierarchy of urban places. This concept is one which has often been used by historians, for example Charles Phythian-Adams, Peter Clark and Paul Slack. The theory argues that the towns in a particular area will fall into a hierarchy of size and range of functions. Some towns will offer relatively basic services, others will provide additional services. The more specialised the services, and so the fewer other places which also provide them, the wider the particular sphere of influence and also the wider the overall hinterland.

Carlisle, because of its relative size, its sophisticated political organisation and its great range of economic functions, was obviously at the head of Cumberland's urban hierarchy. Penrith, Cockermouth and, later, Whitehaven were also high in it. But what of the other towns and market centres in the county? Although a couple of articles have recently been written about towns in Cumbria as a whole, little attention has been paid to the lower end of the hierarchy in Cumberland. It is not known whether they represented effective competition to the city, and in what economic field.

1. For a brief account of the theory see L.J. King, Central Place Theory, 1984.
2. C.V. Phythian-Adams, Desolation of a City, 1979, Ch. 1; P. Clark & P. Slack English Towns in Transition, 1500-1700, 1976, Ch. 1.
If they are discussed here it should be possible to interpret the evidence for Carlisle's spheres of influence more fruitfully. Moreover, studying the other towns in the county in the period has further advantages. They, like Carlisle, were affected by economic change in the region. Their failures reflected the problems of the county's economy; their successes reveal the failure or inability of Carlisle's inhabitants to overcome the problems of geography and inertia and take advantage of the new opportunities of the seventeenth century.

The first part of this chapter will explore the urban hierarchy of Cumberland, examining briefly the various market centres of the county; the second will look at the evidence for Carlisle's spheres of economic and social influence and so see how far the city's hinterland was impinged upon by neighbouring towns.

a. The smaller towns of Cumberland

Some 16 other places had markets in the period 1550-1700. They are listed in Table 3.1, together with the number of households in 1563 and 1688 in the parishes in which they lay, and whether markets were recorded there at various dates in the period. Map 3.1 shows their locations.

Not all of these places could be called towns. Possession of a market was essential to a town, if only to improve its food supplies, but because a place had a market does not necessarily mean that it was a town. All of Cumberland's towns should have been included on the list, but so are a number of places which were merely market villages. Nevertheless nothing was more natural than that a place which held a regular market should attract craftsmen and become a service centre for its market hinterland. Even a small place could provide competition for some of the services offered by a larger.
Table 3.1 Market Centres in early-modern Cumberland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date market recorded</th>
<th>Households in parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1576 1610 1671 1673 1688 1690</td>
<td>1563 1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiston</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>unk. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blennnerhasset¹</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>120 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootle</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>120 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>66 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>477 1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>374 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egremont</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>80 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeytown²</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>300 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireby</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>46 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick³</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>320 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkoswald</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>60 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longtown⁴</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>100 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>140 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenglass⁵</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>70 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven⁶</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>464 669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>220 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>140 189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Parish of Torpenhow
2. Parish of Holme Cultram
3. Parish of Crosthwaite
4. Parish of Arthuret
5. Parish of Muncaster
6. Parish of St Bees

Sources:
1576: Saxton's Map of Cumberland, reprinted by the British Museum.
1671: 'Sir Daniel Fleming's Description of Cumberland, Westmorland and
furness, 1671', in E. Hughes, ed., Fleming-Senhouse Papers, Cumberland
Record Series, II, Carlisle 1962, pp.1-64.
1673: R. Blome, Britannia, 1673, ch. on Cumberland, passim.
1688: CRO, D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.10.
1690: J. Adams, Index Villaris, 1690.
A. Appleby, Famine in Tudor and Stuart England, Liverpool 1978, appendix
A, pp.197-201.
D. & S. Lysons, Magna Britannia vol. IV, Cumberland, London 1816,
pp.xxxv-xliv.

One indicator which might possibly be used to show how sophisticated market settlements in Cumberland were is the nature of their housing. As noted in Chapter One, the 'Great Rebuilding' came late to the county, after the Restoration, and even then most of the new rural buildings
Table 3.2  Number of hearths per house in Cumberland market settlements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>NO. OF HOUSEHOLDS:</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>WITH</th>
<th>WITH</th>
<th>WITH</th>
<th>WITH</th>
<th>WITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KNOWN</td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OF no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>69 58 6 10 26 45 8 14 7 12 11 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>146 128 65 51 21 16 21 16 12 9 9 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>269 243 156 64 36 15 28 12 10 4 13 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>51 42 18 43 12 29 7 17 3 7 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egremont</td>
<td>115 99 77 78 15 15 2 2 2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenglass</td>
<td>45 38 24 63 9 24 4 11 1 3 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkoswald</td>
<td>51 51 42 82 5 10 - - 2 4 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Cultram</td>
<td>35 31 21 68 8 26 - - 1 3 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Cultram²</td>
<td>53 53 43 81 10 19 - - - - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigton¹</td>
<td>103 91 73 80 13 14 3 3 2 2 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton⁴</td>
<td>68 61 50 82 9 15 2 3 - - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alston¹</td>
<td>131 122 104 85 16 13 2 2 - - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longtown²</td>
<td>49 43 39 91 3 7 1 2 - - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington⁵</td>
<td>74 74 69 93 3 4 - - 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootle³</td>
<td>97 81 75 93 4 5 1 1 - - 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireby⁶</td>
<td>61 58 56 97 2 3 - - - - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not every total is that of a whole parish, the areas covered in each are specified below. Where two returns survive the longer or fuller has been used.

1. PRO, E179/90/76 mm.37-8. Garragill and Nether End Quarters of the parish of Alston.
2. PRO, E179/90/76 m.34r,v. Nether Quarter of the parish of Arthuret.
3. PRO, E179/90/76 m.82r,v. Parish.
4. PRO, E179/90/76 mm.29v-30v. Brampton Towne.
5. PRO, E179/90/76 m.62r,v. Town.
6. PRO, E179/90/76 m.81r,v. Parish.
7. PRO, E179/90/76 m.88. St Cuthbert's Quarter of Holme Cultram parish.
8. PRO, E179/90/74 m.38. Abbey Quarter of Holme Cultram parish. Returns for both quarters have been analysed here as it is not clear in which Abbeytown lay. It was probably in Abbey Quarter.
9. PRO, E179/90/77 m.38. Parish.
10. PRO, E179/90/76 m.103. Keswick, Castrigg and Darwen Water Quarter of Crosthwaite parish.
11. PRO, E179/90/76 m.37. Kirkoswald Lordship.
12. PRO, E179/90/76 m.77. Parish of Muncaster.
13. PRO, E179/90/76 mm.54v-56v. Town only.
14. PRO, E179/90/76 m.71v. Badly damaged - part of town only.
15. PRO, E179/90/76 mm.19v-20. Wigton Quarter of Wigton parish.
16. PRO, E179/90/77 m.20. Parish.

had only one hearth.¹ The Hearth Tax returns for 1673-4 record the number of hearths in 249 houses in the villages and hamlets of Harraby, Upperby,

¹. This is not stated but is implicit in R.W. Brunskill, *Vernacular Architecture of the Lake Counties*, 1974, pp.16-17, 50-59.
Cummersdale, Newby, Botcherby, Carleton, Brisco, Aglionby, Wreay, Blackwell and Cotehill, all in the vicinity of Carlisle. In 225 of these (90 per cent) there was only one hearth, 17 (seven per cent) had two hearths, only five (two per cent) had three hearths and just two (one per cent) had four hearths. None had more than four hearths. In the larger towns, Carlisle, Cockermouth and Penrith, less than 70 per cent of houses had only one hearth and there were considerable numbers of houses with three or more hearths. Houses in the larger towns, then, differed from rural houses in the numbers of hearths they contained. This difference reflected the more complex social and wealth structure of the towns; it was also a consequence of larger households among the upper ranks of urban society, cramped urban sites and perhaps also of a distinct urban taste. The degree to which each settlement conformed to urban or rural patterns may be an indicator of its urbanity, but on the other hand the housing of a small market town may have borne no relation to that of larger towns.

Table 3.2 provides an analysis of Hearth Tax data for 15 of the 16 places known to have had markets in the early-modern period. The interpretation of this data is beset with problems. The Hearth Tax Returns for Cumberland are in very poor condition, no one return being complete for the whole county. In order to get data for most of the places it was necessary to use returns from three separate dates: Michaelmas 1673 and Lady Day 1674; Lady Day 1673; and 1662. Even then no return for Blennerhasset was discovered. Moreover in most cases the number of hearths in some of the households has been lost; in Table 3.2 the percentages are the number of households with a given number of hearths expressed as proportions of the number of households with a known number of hearths, not

1. PRO, E179/90/96, mm.1v-4v.
as a proportion of the total number of houses. This difficulty has introduced an unavoidable distortion: in the case of settlements where these lacunae come among the list of those exempt by certificate, for example, the proportion of single hearth households must have been greater. In the worst case, Whitehaven, even the best surviving return is badly mutilated and a large part of the town including all those discharged by certificate has been completely torn off. Finally the structure of the returns has created a further problem. Almost all Cumberland market centres lay within large parishes which included substantial areas of countryside containing dispersed farms and even other villages. The returns generally list the householders parish by parish and, with some jumbling, break the parishes down by 'quarters' or other units. Despite this breakdown of parish returns, in only a few cases it is possible to isolate the information concerning the market settlement from that relating to its immediate rural neighbours. Most of the data analysed in Table 3.2, then, includes some definitely rural element, and in a few cases relates to an entire parish.

What does the table reveal? First that four places appear to have had a distinctly urban pattern of housing: Cockermouth, Keswick, Penrith and Whitehaven. These places each had at least a modest number of houses with three or more hearths, and such houses were more than 20% of the total. They also had more than the median number of houses with two hearths. The total number of houses recorded for the "Keswick, Castrigg and Darwen Water" quarter of Crosthwaite parish is suspiciously low, however, although the return is not damaged. None of the other places had more than a handful of houses with three or more hearths, not enough to think of them as distinctly urban since the houses can be explained away as the homes of

1. There were 45 households exempt by certificate in the town in September 1673. All would have had one or at most two hearths. PRO, E179/326/6 f.155.
gentlemen or clergymen. Four places, Longtown, Bootle, Ireby and Workington had a clearly rural pattern of housing. This evidence and that of the size of the places indicates that only a few places in Cumberland were large enough and sophisticated enough to challenge seriously Carlisle's pre-eminence.

Six of the market settlements, Blennerhasset, Bootle, Abbeytown, Ireby, Kirkoswald and Ravenglass, are not towns today and were at the bottom end of the urban hierarchy in the early-modern period. None were large enough to have developed more than the most basic of urban functions and none were close enough to the city to affect Carlisle's market hinterland. The most southerly of these places was Bootle. Supposed to be the smallest market town in England at the end of the eighteenth century, Bootle had been granted a market in 1347 and still had one in 1671. The population of the parish fell between 1563 and 1688, and again during the eighteenth century, but the settlement cannot have been large even in 1563, and was only of local importance. A few miles north lay Ravenglass, in the parish of Muncaster at the mouths of the Rivers Mite and Esk. Ravenglass had an ancient market, noted by all the principal commentators on the county. Sandford, however, in 1675 described the market as small and Fleming, writing in 1671, implied that it had only recently been revived. In a survey of 1565 Ravenglass was named as one of the creeks of the port of Carlisle and the base of four 'pickerdes', fishing vessels of 9-10 tons with four-man crews, involved in the coastal trade to Chester. Sandford commented also

2. Lysons, Magna Britannia, p. 141; Table 3.1.
3. Sandford, Relation, p.5; Hughes, ed., loc. cit., p.34.
that there was a large fair for cattle from Ireland and Man as well as local beasts, implying that shipping was still landing there. The 1565 commissioners found only 10 households at the harbour, however, and in the early seventeenth century John Denton described it as "now a village".

Ireby was also a small place, tucked away in the foothills of the Lakeland Dome. There is no doubt, however, that the market itself was popular. Ireby appears on every list of markets in the seventeenth century and is described with approbation. The 1610 edition of Camden's *Britannia* called it "a good big marcate towne"; Richard Blome said it was "at present a good Town", but that the market for corn and provisions was "indifferent"; Sandford described it as "a pretty corne markett towne". Denton commented that the profit of its market and fair tolls was £10. Like a number of bigger centres, it had a moot hall, but there is nothing to suggest it had a hinterland wide enough to compete with Carlisle.

Blennerhasset was a hamlet in the parish of Torpenhow. It was recorded as having a market only by Sir Daniel Fleming, in 1671, and by Blome, two years later, who said it was "a small Town, and hath a mean Market newly erected on Saturdays". Fleming said that the market had been established about 1661. In October of that year Fleming himself, as Sheriff, presided over an *Inquisition ad quod damnum* which declared that no-one would be injured if Sir Francis Salkeld was granted a weekly market


3. Blome, *Britannia*, p.72; Hughes, ed., *loc. cit.*, p.48. Many of Blome's remarks about Cumberland towns are obviously derived from Fleming's work. They are used here to amplify Fleming's *Description*, and not with the expectation that they will contradict it. Clearly they do not deserve the same weight as an independent survey would.
there on Saturdays. Blennerhasset was only 4-8 miles from the established market centres of Cockermouth, Ireby, Wigton and Abbeytown, the latter market also being on held on a Saturday. Its new market stood little chance of thriving and must have failed soon after Blome wrote.

Holme Cultram market was held at Abbeytown, the site of the former abbey. Its market was still held in 1816, although only for butchers' meat and for just part of the year. Only one early-modern writer, Blome, commented on the market: it was "very mean." Presumably the dissolution of Holme Cultram abbey robbed it of most of its raison d'etre.

Kirkoswald lay on the other side of the county, east of the Eden. Like many other market centres in the county its market grant was ancient, dating from the twelfth century. The Dacres had one of their principal seats in the castle here, but after 1570 it fell into disuse and it was stripped by Lord William Howard. It is possible that the market ceased to be held at this time, if it had survived the fifteenth century. Argument from silence is not conclusive, especially when the sources are so poor, but Kirkoswald was not marked as a market town by Saxton or Speed, nor was a market mentioned by Camden although he mentions them in other places. No sales or purchases of stock were made here by the Lowthers in the early seventeenth century, although they used more distant markets and fairs such as those at Ireby and Rosley. More definite are the comments made by

1. PRO, C202/45/1
2. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.10
4. Blome, Britannia, p.72. The village was only the largest settlement in a very extensive parish.
7. Table 3.1; Camden, Britain, p.777.
Fleming, who called Kirkoswald a small town and said that for many years it had had no market, but one had lately been set up.¹ The new 7lb weight and half-bushel measure provided for Kirkoswald in 1662 and 1667 were probably related to this revival of the market.² The Hearth Tax Returns are at first sight suggestive of some urban presence, eight per cent of the houses having four or more hearths. Closer inspection, however shows this to be illusory. In absolute terms the number of these houses was small, only four, and one of these was owned by a local gentleman, Thomas Featherstonehaugh, and another by 'my Lord', presumably an heir of the Dacres.³

Table 3.3 Occupations recorded in Kirkoswald parish register, 1686-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some occupational data available for the last years of the century are summarised in Table 3.3. The presence of a mercer, who lived in Kirkoswald throughout this period, and the two surveyors, one of whom was there for at least three years, are suggestive of some urban status for the place, but the other occupations were found equally in villages and towns. Nevertheless their presence, even in such low numbers, suggests that Kirkoswald had some limited role as a central place, providing certain simple

1. Hughes, ed., loc. cit., p.52; Blome, Britannia, p.73.
3. PRO, E179/90/76 m.37.
services for a wider area than most villages did. Interestingly, the fullers and dyers point to the existence of a rural cloth industry in the district.

Five other places are towns now but were small, perhaps only villages, in 1700: Alston, Brampton, Longtown, Wigton and Workington. This was certainly true of Longtown, situated in the extensive but lightly populated parish of Arthuret. Sir Richard Graham of Netherby, Bt., acquired a market grant for it in 1632.1 The settlement was slow to grow, however, as Thomas Denton's graphic description reveals. Its name, he wrote, came not because it was long, but because the neighbouring inhabitants had no other place like a town or village near them, and

There are not above 12 houses in ye Town, & the Walls of ye b[es]it of ym are either Turf or clay. The Court house or Town hall excepted, wh(ch) is built of freestone, & slated, which makes it a more com(m)odious market, it being the onely marcat in all that Countrey, & of more benefit to Scotland than to this Countrey.2

Smaller than many southern villages, Longtown can only have provided the simplest of urban services.

Alston, likewise was small. The parish held some 111 households in 1688, distributed over a wide area, 36,967 acres.3 Much of this was inhospitable moorland, however, and the bulk of the inhabitants may well have lived in the principal settlement. Neither Saxton nor Speed mark Alston as a more significant place than neighbouring villages, but the late seventeenth-century sources all record a market there, if a small one.4 Blome, for example, described Alston as "a large stragling Bailifwick Town" with "a little Market on Saturdays". Its hinterland must have been severely

3. Table 3.1; Index Sheet to Ordnance Survey 6" to a mile survey of Cumberland, 1st edn.
4. Table 3.1.
restricted by the local topography and it probably served little of Cumberland. Besides agriculture, in which grazing necessarily predominated because of the altitude, the inhabitants lived by mining lead ore. Denton (quoted by Lysons) said that the mines had first been worked by Sir Francis Radcliffe, which would be in the second half of the seventeenth century. If this is correct it would explain why no other commentator but Sir Daniel Fleming noted mining there.

Workington had the most important harbour in the county before the 1630s, but probably only became a town in the course of the seventeenth century. In 1565 Workington had only 30 householders, perhaps 140 people, it being only the principal settlement of a fair sized parish. Three 'pickerdes' of 7-8 tons were based there, fewer than at Parton or Ravenglass, and at this date Workington was essentially a fishing village. However, did give it significance. It was there that Mary, Queen of Scots, landed in 1568. The Company of Mines Royal, working the copper mines near Keswick negotiated for ground to set up a wharf there in 1568, but although they used the harbour occasionally, most of their supplies came overland from Newcastle. In the first decade of the seventeenth century troops were embarked there for Ireland, and when the Grahams were expelled from the Borders, they too were shipped to Ireland from Workington. The village was marked as a more important place than the generality on Saxton's and Speed's maps, but it does not appear to have had a market in the early-

1. Blome, Britannia, p.73; Lysons, Magna Britannia, pp.cxx, 7.
2. Fox, loc. cit., p.77-8.
modern period - none of the late seventeenth century commentators noted one. The period saw growth, however, because of the coal trade. The parish held 189 families in 1688, 11 ships belonged to the port in 1682 and 60 seamen in 1690. Coal was mined nearby and exported through Workington in the early seventeenth century. Disputes between landowners and miners, and lack of an effective entrepreneur prevented, however, dramatic expansion of output as was achieved at Whitehaven. Production probably fell after the death of Sir Patricius Curwen in 1664. Workington may have developed as a port, but its lack of a market indicates that it was as yet of little further importance to the surrounding countryside.

Wigton and Brampton were, with Longtown, the market centres closest to Carlisle and therefore those most likely to impinge on its immediate hinterland. Wigton was only the most important settlement in a large parish, but the population of the parish was sufficiently large to suggest that the town's population even in 1563 was above the 400 person threshold proposed by the Small Towns in England Project. Contemporaries thought the place unremarkable: Blome described it as "a small Town, and of very little account, having an inconsiderable Market on Tuesdays". Camden, John Denton and Sandford ignored it, and Wigton was not even marked on Saxton or Speed's maps. On the other hand Thomas Denton said it was a famous market for "the sale of corn and linen yarn wrought into webbs by

2. BL, Harleian Ms 594, f.86.
3. Blome, Britannia, p.70; Camden, Britain; Sandford, Relation; John Denton of Cardew, An Accoempt of the Most Considerable Estates and Families in the County of Cumberland..., ed. R.S. Ferguson, CWAAS Tract Series, no. 2; Saxton's map of Cumberland, reprinted by the British Museum; J. Arlott, ed., John Speed's England, Pt IV, 1954.
the linen weavers, and bleached by their wives, and fitted for Rosley and Carlisle fairs". Wigton would seem to have become a focus for rural cloth manufacture by the end of the seventeenth century, if not a centre in its own right. It definitely was a manufacturing centre by 1745, albeit a small one.

It is possible to say rather more about Brampton. The population of the parish in 1563 was low, only 66 households, and there were a number of isolated farmsteads so that Brampton itself was still smaller. The place may already have been in economic difficulties, for, although it had been granted a market as long ago as 1252, Lord Dacre chartered again the market there some time before his death in 1563. An Inquisition of 1588-9 found that the lord had had 14 shops rented out there, but, it was implied, had them no longer; that the market was still kept each week but its tolls yielded no profit; and that its fair had not been held "of late years". Naworth Castle, the principal seat of the lords of the barony of Gilsland, was in very great decay. There was still a grammar school, however. The strife over the inheritance of his property which ensued after the death of George, Lord Dacre, in 1569, the ramifications of which included the battle of Geltsbridge and the removal of the aristocratic household from Naworth Castle, can only have aggravated the town's problems. The endemic violence in the north of the region it served must also have been a factor. Its fair was being held again by 1618 when the tolls brought in 20s. In 1688

3. Table 3.1. 65 per cent of the households in the parish lay in the town according to the 1674 Hearth Tax Returns. PRO, E179/30/76 mm.29v-30v.
4. CSPD, Addenda 1566-79, p.419; Bodleian Library, Ms Ashmole 836, f.181r (transcript deposited by Dr Summerson in the CRO).
5. Hutchinson, History, 1, p.123.
Denton had noticed recent improvement both in the trade of the town and its buildings, although the latter does not come out in the Hearth Tax Returns. Most contemporary commentators considered the place to be small, however. Blome, for example, described it as "at present a small (though ancient) market-town".

Brampton benefited from having the only market in the barony of Gilsland. About 1587 Francis Dacre complained that tenants of the barony favourable to him were being intimidated on market days there by armed supporters of Lord William Howard. This market was lively enough to attract Carlisle's shoemakers to attend it in such numbers that they decided only half the gild should go to it each week in order to avoid competing with each other. During the seventeenth century the profit of the tolls of Brampton rose from £11 6s. 4½d. in 1633-4 to £15 for 1660-1, reaching a peak of £18 for the year ending Martinmas 1652. This rise may have been partly due to the encouragement of trade by Lord William Howard and his successors. In 1630 Lord William paid 40s. "for buildinge 2 markett houses" in the town, separate structures from the Moothall for which he bought a new lock and key the same year. This Moothall was the meeting-place of the barony's Court Leet, held twice a year in the late seventeenth century. These courts must have brought considerable numbers of potential customers to the town.

1. Denton, p.128; PRO, E179/90/76 mm.29v-30v.
2. Blome, Britannia, p.73.
4. CRO D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Shoemakers Gild Book 1, p.13. The order is undated but judging from its position in the book was probably made in or shortly before 1600.
In the early seventeenth century Naworth Castle was reoccupied by an aristocratic family, the Howards, who later became Earls of Carlisle. It remained their principal seat for most of the century. The survival of a number of account books from before the Restoration gives the opportunity not only to examine the family's pattern of expenditure, but also their attitude to the shopping facilities of Brampton, the town on their doorstep. Naturally, given their extensive estates in the vicinity and ownership of tithes and parks, the Howard household was almost self-sufficient in grain and most types of meat. They made only small purchases of these items in local markets, usually at Brampton or Carlisle. Wildfowl was generally bought directly from hunters. Groceries, wine, hops and salt fish were purchased in bulk at Newcastle or Carlisle. Cloth was also usually bought in one of the larger towns, or woven by local weavers from yarn spun in the castle. No items were bought consistently at Brampton, although its tradesmen were patronised more frequently in the 1650's than earlier. Instead its shops were used much as people in modern cities use corner shops: to buy things in small quantities when a journey to a more sophisticated or cheaper shopping centre would not be justified or when need was too urgent. For example, in 1618-9 £76 2s. 5d. was spent on wine, but only 11s. 6d. of this at Brampton where quantities of a gallon or less were bought on five separate occasions. The range of goods that the Howards did buy in Brampton was wide, as in a modern corner shop. Besides wine it

2. Extensive extracts from these books are printed in Ornsby, Household Books and Hudleston Estate & Household Accounts. The following paragraph is based on an analysis of these two volumes.
included herrings, leeks, starch, indigo, pepper, prunes, cloth, thread, sugar candy, salt, soap, powder sugar, candles, hops, lace and buttons.

The range of goods Brampton's shops carried indicate that the place had an economic specialisation, as a shopping centre, in addition to its role as a market centre. Moreover it possessed a grammar school, founded by Lord Dacre and supported by Charles Howard, which must have drawn pupils from surrounding parishes. Its urban status was further enhanced by its role as court-town for the barony of Gilsland. Both these facts indicate roles as a central place. The district it served, however, was circumscribed on the west by Carlisle's superior attractions, and included to north and east the unproductive and sparsely populated Borderlands and Pennines.

These factors alone must have seriously limited the prosperity Brampton's tradesmen could attain and checked the town's growth, but there were further reasons why the town never became a real challenge to Carlisle. Competition from the city was direct. At least one of the Howard's Carlisle suppliers, William Atkinson, had a second shop in Brampton. At his death in 1661 its stock was valued at far less than that of the Carlisle shop. The nature of his shop goods was not specified in the inventory, but he supplied Naworth Castle with salt beef, herring, eels, butter and beer. If he was not unique, Atkinson and men like him, together with other Carlisle tradesmen who like the shoemakers mentioned above attended Brampton's market days or the tanner who sold horse-leather there in 1624, must have taken much business which otherwise would have gone to Brampton-based tradesmen and craftsmen.

2. Hudleston, Estate & Household Accounts, p.111; P1661 Wm Atkinson.
3. Hudleston, Estate & Household Accounts, pp.30, 37, 104.
4. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild bk 1, sub St Helen's Quarter, 1624.
A further five places were towns in the early-modern period and are still towns today: Egremont, Cockermouth, Keswick, Penrith and Whitehaven. Egremont was the furthest from Carlisle, about 50 miles by road, and probably too small to attract more than local custom. Sir Daniel Fleming thought it "a good market Towne", but no other contemporary made significant comment on it. Keswick's history in this period is one of rise from a modest level of prosperity and economic activity to a high one, and then decline to its former position, reflecting the fortunes of the copper mining and smelting which began just outside the town in the 1560s and ceased during the Civil War. Before then Keswick must have been a small place, certainly with poor commercial and shopping facilities. In their early years in the town the miners bought much of their supplies in London and Newcastle, including not only wine, relatively exotic groceries, iron and hops, but also such basic goods as tallow, candles, paper, vinegar and rhubarb (as a drug). The only items noted in Collingwood's transcript of their account book for 1569-70 as purchased in Keswick were a brass pot to warm glue in, a bedcover and sackcloth. Even the latter was not always available, as journeys to buy it in Cockermouth and Carlisle were recorded. Still, this period of prosperity left its mark: Keswick was one of the few towns in late seventeenth century Cumberland whose Hearth Tax Returns suggest had a distinctly urban pattern of building. Twelve of those houses where the number of hearths is known had three or more fireplaces, nearly 30 per cent,

which was a high proportion for the region. It seems unlikely that all households in the town were listed in the returns, however, so the real proportion is probably lower. Nevertheless the town consisted of no more than one long street.

Keswick was not wholly dependent on copper mining; it had a marketing role. In the late seventeenth century this was largely for meal and meat, therefore rather for foodstuffs than as a major exchange of agricultural produce. It was apparently also a centre for leather production. Thomas Denton wrote that "The number of tanners and shoemakers which dwell in and about the town, causeth the markets to abound with raw hides and leather". There was also an attempt to set up a manufacture of coarse cottons in the town, funded by a legacy from Sir John Bankes, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, who was born in Keswick. Bankes died in 1644; his scheme was in operation with some success at the end of the 1650s. Coarse woollen goods were still made in the town in the late eighteenth century when the leather trades had disappeared. The picture of Keswick which emerges, however, is of a small market centre tied to the rural economy of its region. Although temporarily enlivened by its mining industry, it failed to develop the specialisations which might have allowed it to continue to grow after this industry contracted and vanished. It was no rival to Carlisle.

Cockermouth was Keswick's western neighbour. It lay astride the confluence of the Cocker and the Derwent, where the Lakeland Dome met the

1. PRO, E179/90/76 m.103.
3. Ibid.
coastal plain — altogether a better spot for a market town. In the 1670s it was said to be "ye best Market TOWNE in this part of ye county", and that "its Market... is esteemed the best in the County for corn next unto Perith".1 Fortnightly cattle fairs were held throughout the summer.2 Cockermouth also had the concomitant function of shopping and service centre. The Keswick miners in the year 1568-9 bought wine, draperies, string and tallow in the town, and expected also to be able to buy sackcloth there but were disappointed. Their principal supplier in Cockermouth was Henry Fletcher, whose family rose to gentry status largely on the profits of their trade in the town.3 The town's most recent historian concluded, however, that in 1600 "As in the late 13th century, Cockermouth's main function was as a centre for the exchange and primary processing of farm produce, particularly animal products, from the surrounding countryside". The inhabitants were themselves also directly involved in farming.4 In the seventeenth century Cockermouth became a small-scale cloth producing town. Fuller, writing about 1660, described the manufacture of coarse broadcloth as having been lately set up there, the product being sold "at home". By the 1670s the town enjoyed "a good trade" especially for this type of locally made cloth.5

Cockermouth stood out from the places discussed above in rather more significant ways than the relative prosperity of its economy. Most important was its political role. An ancient seigneurial borough governed by

1. Fleming, Description, p.35; Blome, Britannia, p.70.
5. Fuller, Worthies, p.106; Blome, Britannia, p.70.
a court leet, much in the fashion of a rural manor, in 1640 the town
'recovered' the privilege of electing M.P.s last exercised in the reign of
Edward I. The electors were those inhabitants who held by burgage tenure.
There were about 130 of them in 1688, not a large number and doubtless very
subject to influence by ambitious members of the county's political elite.'
The January quarter sessions were held in the courthouse of Cockermouth
Castle.2 This gave the town an extra function as an administrative centre
for its part of the county and an extra cause for members of the gentry to
visit it. Another distinction was its size. The population figures in Table
3.1 are, unfortunately, for the parish of Brigham, of which Cockermouth was a
chapelry. The Hearth Tax Returns of 1674, which list some 146 households,
agree fairly well with Denton's estimate of the number of burgesses, allowing
for those inhabitants who were not so privileged. They suggest that the
town had 150-170 households in the late seventeenth century, or a population
of 730-800.3 Lastly, the urban character of Cockermouth's housing stock was
very marked and starkly contrasting with that of most of the other market
centres. Of the places discussed above only Keswick matched it, and there
the total number of 'urban' houses was not very high. Cockermouth had 12
houses with four hearths and a further nine with five or more; in both
categories Keswick had only five houses so large. As early as 1610
Cockermouth was described as "built faire enough".4

1. Hutchinson, History, II, p.111; Bouch & Jones, Lake Counties, pp.165-6;
Thomas Denton quoted in Lysons, Magna Britannia, p.42n.
2. Ibid., p.42.
3. PRO, E179/90/76 m.62r,v; The population may have been growing rapidly in
this period, or these figures are underestimates: in 1714 Browne Willis
wrote that there were 235 houses in the town. Browne Willis quoted in
Lysons, Magna Britannia, p.42. Winchester's recent article on medieval
Cockermouth also implies a higher burgess : household multiplier.
Winchester, loc. cit., pp.110-112.
4. Table 3.2; Camden, Britain, p.768.
Penrith was a larger town than Cockermouth: "It is a large Towne,... accounted [in 1671] ye second in this county; nay it outgoes most Townes that are (as it is) neither Boroughs nor Corporations". The number of households in the parish was given by Denton as 270 and in the Hearth Tax Returns as 315; these figures suggest a total population around 1,500. Since there was only one hamlet and a number of isolated farmsteads within the parish, the bulk of these people must have lived in the town itself. If the 1563 diocesan returns were accurate the number of inhabitants doubled in barely 110 years; even if they were defective there must still have been very substantial population growth despite the disastrous plague of 1597.

Local commentators were very enthusiastic about the town, although they may have lacked perspective. To Edmund Sandford, for example, it was "A very fine Towne & great markett and merchants for all kinde of comodities...". All the late-seventeenth century observers laid particular stress on the importance and size of the town's markets and fairs. Three repeat the rather dubious story of up to 400 cattle being butchered there in one day around Martinmas. Penrith was well situated to take advantage of the growing cattle trade of the seventeenth century. The droving routes to the south through the Eden valley and the bridge over the Eamont at Penrith was a major crossing point, and the fairs and markets in the town were an easy spot for those farmers in the central Eden valley participating in the trade to buy cattle for fattening and then sell them again to be driven on south. Penrith appears far more often than Brough under Stainmoor in the

2. Tables 3.1 & 3.2; PRO, E179/90/76 mm.54v-56v; Appleby, p.109.
3. E. Sandford, A Cursory Relation of all the Antiquities & Familyes in Cumberland, ed. R.S. Ferguson, CWAAS Tract Series, no. 4, 1890, p.36.
4. Hughes, ed., loc. cit., p.52; Blome, Britannia, p.73; Denton, p.112. In the late eighteenth century about 1,100 cattle were slaughtered for the market annually. Hutchinson, History, i, p.320n.
early-seventeenth century farm accounts of the Lowthers, for example. This particular factor must account for much of its growth.

Table 3.4 Occupations in Penrith Parish Registers, 1556-1600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercantile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>cutler</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>locksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedlar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tinker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clopser</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaver</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glover</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saddler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoemaker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpenter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fletcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarrier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheelwright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gent.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The town's occupational structure can be recovered from its parish registers. Table 3.4 gives a breakdown of all occupations recorded in the registers between 1556 and 1600; Table 3.5 provides a similar breakdown of

Table 3.5 Occupations in Penrith Parish Registers, 1651-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercantile</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mercer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>armourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>hook &amp; eye</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedlar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tinker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>tin worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knitter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>baker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>butcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>cheesemonger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beltmaker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>farrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>gardener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glover</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>yeoman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saddler</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoemaker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skinner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanner</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misc. Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpenter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>apothecary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>barber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glazier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>official</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>physician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plasterer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>schoolmaster</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plumber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>gent.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>knight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thatcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>servant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waller</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. CWAAS Parish Register Section, vol. 27, *The Parish Registers of Penrith, part II, 1605-1660*, 1939, vol. 28, *The Parish Registers of Penrith, part III, 1661-1713*, 1940. This data was provided by The Datatown Project, a Community Programme Scheme based jointly at Leicester and Loughborough Universities. The burial and marriage registers were searched for 1651-1700, but were not cross-checked for duplication of individuals.

occupations given in the marriage and burial registers for 1651-1700. The agricultural sector of the town's economy is certainly under-represented.

There were 68 men recorded in 1651-1700 but excluded from Table 3.5 who
were described as householders, for instance, most of whom were probably farmers; at least one of Penrith's pewterers was involved in agriculture and it is unlikely that he was atypical of the town's craftsmen in this respect.'

The general picture that is revealed is probably otherwise more or less accurate. It depicts a middle ranking country town, providing craft services for its hinterland, with a few general retailers, some special services such as those offered by the medical men and schoolmasters, and perhaps a base for itinerant traders. Its leather-workers were comparatively numerous, which was natural given the local bias towards pastoral farming and the town's site astride the droving routes. Possibly some leather and leather goods were exported. It was symbolic of their importance that three of the town's four gilds, Tanners', Shoemakers', Glovers' and Merchants', served leatherworkers. An increase in the number of light leatherworkers over the period is apparent, which is similar to what seems to have happened in Carlisle, but in Penrith there was no decline in the heavy leather trades.

Penrith also had another specialism, in the manufacture of pewterware. It "appears to have been the main centre of the craft in the county in the second half of the 17th. and first half of the 18th. centuries". The primary trade of the 10 or so pewterers active in the town in that period was that of brazier, however, and at least one was also a plumber. In many respects this occupational structure was very similar to that of Carlisle itself, except that the city would seem to have had more pure retailers, lawyers and medical men, while the number of occupations

2. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.112. The importance of tanning in the town was also noted by Sir Daniel Fleming. Hughes, ed., loc. cit., p.52.
recorded in Penrith was smaller.

Penrith had a final role which detracted from Carlisle's dominance: as a minor administrative centre. It was the usual site of the Michaelmas quarter sessions. As at Cockermouth, this gave the gentry of the county further reason to visit the town and patronise its tradesmen. The County Committee also met in the town during the Commonwealth. The town was also the caput of the Honor of Penrith, and so the monthly meeting place of the courts of the Queen's Hames, an extensive manor embracing much of the forest of Inglewood. Penrith's influence over the forest, most of which could be served by the markets at either Penrith or Carlisle, must have been enhanced by this function. Certainly Penrith's inhabitants benefited from the range of the town's functions. Their houses were "well built" and clearly urban in character; many were of sandstone and a number still stand.

The most remarkable town in Cumberland in this period was the newcomer, Whitehaven. Whitehaven was only a hamlet in 1565, whose six households owned only one boat, a nine-ton 'pickerde', between them. In 1633 there were 9 or 10 cottages there; by 1685 it had 268 families and 1,089 inhabitants, nearly as many as Penrith; in 1696 there were 454 families numbering 2,281 persons, possibly a couple of hundred more than lived in Carlisle; by 1702 the number of families had risen to 567 and the total of

4. Sandford, Relation, p.36.
5. Hughes, ed., loc. cit., p.52; Table 3.2. Celia Fiennes would seem to have been more impressed by them than by the houses of Carlisle. See Ch. One, p.13.
inhabitants to 2,977. In the space of less than 70 years its population had surpassed that of the largest town in the county by about 1,000 people.

The rise of the town owed much to the entrepreneurial skills and commitment of the Lowther family. The Lowthers acquired Whitehaven in 1630 and it became the inheritance of a younger son, Christopher. He built a pier there in 1632-4 and exported coal to Ireland mined in pits adjacent to the town. Shipowners came and growth began; by 1640 Whitehaven boasted a chapel and a school. Lowther died in 1644 and as a consequence the development of the town was slowed. Nevertheless in 1655 the inhabitants thought it worthwhile to obtain the right to hold a market - a symbol of the town's advance. Christopher's son Sir John, who came of age in 1663, was determined to foster the town's growth and exercised a close and paternalistic if autocratic control for the rest of the century. Besides improving the harbour and trying to attract new trades there, he laid out a new town on a gridiron plan to the north of the original hamlet on land he bought in 1675. Instructions as to height and style of the new houses were enforced to create an Augustan uniformity. The Hearth Tax Returns of 1673/4 show that the old centre of Whitehaven already had an urban character, however.

3. PRO, C202/39/3.
However much the Lowthers may have encouraged the growth of Whitehaven, in the last resort its expansion was due to the mining and export of coal (which was, of course, the Lowthers' main motive in promoting the port). Sir Christopher Lowther sold 2,400 tons of coal in 1636. His son dug 17,717 tons in 1695 at two collieries, Howgill and Greenbank. Parallel with the growth of the collieries was growth of the town's shipping to export the coal. There were 12 ships owned by the port in the early 1630's, by 1688 there were 50. This increased shipping was stimulated by the growing tobacco trade with America as well as by the coal trade to Ireland; 15 ships sailed to Virginia from Whitehaven in 1697. Besides mariners, who were about 15 per cent of the town's population in 1690, many were employed in the ancillary trades to both shipping and mining, such as ropemaking.

Whitehaven had become an important place by 1700 and at least one tradesman, a bookbinder, was enticed from Carlisle to meet its needs. Its primary roles as a coal-mining centre and port were not in competition with Carlisle's roles as an administrative and social centre, however, its marketing function was almost certainly limited to provisioning the town and shipping, and there is no evidence to suggest that Whitehaven became a manufacturing centre before 1700 for other than marine equipment. Indeed, the difficulty that Sir John Lowther had encouraging the cloth industry indicates the contrary. Whitehaven's development did not detract from the city's place in the regional economy in any but the most minor ways.

1. Beckett, Coal and Tobacco, pp.43, 65, 229
2. Chalklin, loc. cit., pp.231-2; Eaglesham, op. cit., p.41.
3. Ibid., pp.60, 176-185, 331.
Carlisle faced competition from a number of places within the county, therefore, but on the whole that competition was limited. Although Whitehaven grew dramatically, its growth was based on economic activity which conflicted little with that of Carlisle. The three market centres closest to the city, Longtown, Wigton and Brampton, were small and Brampton at least was under Carlisle's influence. Although the competition that Wigton presented must remain enigmatic until more research has been done on the town, it seems unlikely that any of the three rivalled the city in any field but the marketing of agricultural produce, and even there Carlisle should have been far more important. Most other market centres were too small and distant seriously to rival the city. Only Penrith, which had an occupational structure little less sophisticated than Carlisle's, and perhaps Cockermouth, were economic rivals to the town, and only these two could have been rival county centres. Although both had administrative functions, in neither, however, were they developed enough to undermine Carlisle's dominance.

b. The hinterlands of Carlisle

The concept that a town has a number of different if overlapping spheres of influence has often been used by historians as well as by geographers. It is implicit in Alan Dyer's study of Tudor Worcester, for example and explicitly used by Michael Reed in his study of seventeenth century Ipswich. Such spheres existed both for economic matters and for social ones; although it is sometimes difficult to separate the two, this chapter will deal primarily with economic spheres of influence. Carlisle had three functions unique to it within the north-west for which the boundaries of its

region are easily defined. Before the union of crowns it was the seat of
the Warden of the West March, and thus the centre of a military jurisdiction
covering the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland. It is doubtful that
this role attracted much extra custom to the city's tradesmen from the
distant parts of this area, however, although it was highly significant for
social and political reasons. Rather more important were its roles as
administrative centre of county and diocese, the latter having a similar area
to that of the county, but excluding the ward of Allerdale above Derwent and
including northern Westmorland, the southern half of the Vale of Eden. The
effect these three functions had on the town's economy will be discussed
more fully in the following chapter. Many of Carlisle's other functions,
however, were in competition with those of the other market centres
discussed above, and the town's hinterlands for those services were
correspondingly restricted. Nevertheless it might be expected that in view
of the weakness of so many of Carlisle's local rivals shown above, the city's
hinterlands would have been relatively large both in comparison with those
of its rivals, and in comparison with those of similar sized towns in other
regions. This would be the case particularly for the more sophisticated
services. A number of sources exist which allow limited re-creation of
Carlisle's hinterlands; some of these will be explored in this section with
these points in mind.

Perhaps the area of greatest competition with local market centres
was in the marketing of agricultural produce and in the distribution of the
most common goods and services. One of the more important ways this was
done was through fairs. Almost every market centre had fairs. Carlisle had
three at the end of the seventeenth century, one of which had been added by
the charter of 1684.¹ The newest of the three began on the first Monday in

¹. R.S. Ferguson, ed., The Royal Charters of the City of Carlisle, CWAAS Extra
June and lasted three days; it was principally for horses. The second was held for three or four days from 15th August "and is a great Beast Fair". The third began on 10th September. At these times all persons were free from arrest.  

Little is known about Carlisle's fairs in this period, but they were obviously important times in the commercial year of inhabitants of the city and its neighbourhood. Two of the debts due to Thomas Wilson of the Lough near Brisco in the parish of St Cuthbert, were payable at Carlisle fairs, for example, and it was presumably extra business from visiting countrymen at fair time which caused Carlisle tailors to work in their guild chamber in the early seventeenth century. The corporation doubled the tolls it collected at the gates to exploit the extra trade at the fair held at the Assumption.

Other things besides the horses and cattle mentioned above were bought at the fairs but perhaps metalware in particular. In 1592 for example, Leonard Aglonbie had bought a great caldron at the "laste faire". In 1618, at the August fair, a mortar was changed for 7s. 6d., and a brass pot, a skillet, six candlesticks, three basins and two salts were bought for 21s., for Lord William Howard's household at Naworth. Seventeen years earlier Mrs Salkeld of Corby, 4½ miles from Carlisle, had her purse picked while bargaining for brassware at the September fair. This incident tantalises in what it hints. Mrs Salkeld was accompanied by menservants,

1. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92. He earlier dates them as being held on the first Wednesday in June (the day appointed in the charter), 15th August and 8th September. Ibid., p.10.
2. P1620 Thomas Wilson; Ca3/2/7.
3. Ca2/413.
which implies her household was attending in some force. Evidence was given
by a brazier with a neighbouring stall, who came from Kendal. The 'little
wench' he accused of the theft he had seen some two months before at
Ravenglass where she had been arrested on suspicion of felony. It suggests
that there were peripatetic traders in the region who travelled considerable
distances from their homes to attend fairs, and perhaps also a similarly
peripatetic underworld.1 The purchase of metalware at the fairs suggests
that they were particularly used for special and more costly acquisitions,
fulfilling a different role to that of the weekly market, and supplementing
the activities of the craftsmen and shopkeepers. Carlisle's fairs were, not
surprisingly, less splendid than those of Newcastle; it was at the latter
that the Howards of Naworth purchased the bulk of their groceries.2

An analysis of the Horse Toll Books for Carlisle allows one of
Carlisle's spheres of influence to be established, that from which it drew
buyers and sellers of horses.3 These toll books are valuable sources.4

2. Ornsby, passim.
3. There are three horse toll books surviving from Carlisle from the 1630s
and three from the 1650s. This section is based on an analysis of that for
Michaelmas 1631-Michaelmas 1632, Ca4/152, supplemented by information from
the books for Carlisle, 1653-4 and that for Rosley, 1650, analysed by Dr
Peter Edwards. I am very grateful to Dr Edwards for allowing me to use his
analysis. As noted above at least one of Carlisle's fairs was principally for
horses. The Horse Toll Book for Michaelmas 1631-Michaelmas 1632 shows that
horse trading went on at Carlisle all year round, although the bulk took
place in the summer and at fairtime. For example, there were only three
recorded transactions on 5th November 1631, and three on the 12th, none at
all from then until 24th January, when there was one, and no more than 20 in
any subsequent week before 9th June. Thereafter the number increased
sharply, so there were 57 transactions involving 61 animals on 30th June, 82
on 7th July and 98 on 14th July. No fewer than 187 transactions took place
on 15th August, and 149 on 8th September, the two fair times. Over a third
of the 1,010 sales or exchanges of horses which took place in Carlisle this
year occurred on these two days. (Dates and notes of toll money received are
given in the book in such a way as to suggest that each group of
transactions took place on a single day rather than over several days.)
4. There is a general discussion of horse toll books in P.R. Edwards, 'The
Horse Trade of the Midlands in the Seventeenth Century', Agricultural History
Review, 27, 1979, pp.90, 98.
They give the name and address of each vendor and purchaser and occasionally also of the vendor's surety, plus the age, price and type, e.g. nag, filly, of each horse. When beasts were exchanged rather than sold it gives the sum paid in 'boot'. The transactions are listed in chronological order with the toll received each week noted, and occasionally the toll paid for individual sales is given. The places of residence of people trading in Carlisle's horse fairs can therefore be plotted. Those for 1631-2 are marked on Maps 3.1 and 3.2.1 There are some problems in interpreting the evidence of the books, however. It is impossible to know how many sales escaped the attention of the toll collectors, nor how representative those that are recorded were of the whole. Some individuals may be counted more than once because their names were spelled in very different fashions in different entries. John Leathat and John Lightfoot, for example, both of Wigton and both relatively prominent traders, have been counted as separate persons but may have been the same man. Equally problematic are the difficulties in locating the residences of some traders. The homes of 10 sellers and 55 buyers were not named. 63 sellers and 110 buyers lived in places which could not be identified. Since the English Place-name Society volumes for Cumberland were used to locate places in conjunction with a large scale atlas of the British Isles, most of the unidentified settlements probably lay in Scotland or Northumberland. This fault may weaken the argument developed below about the general pattern of the movement of horses in the region, but it does not destroy it since men from unidentified places were rarely purchasers of more than one or two horses and so were not a very significant group. There were also a handful of places, such as Esk in Arthuret parish, or Leaven in

1. Each cross represents the place of residence of a seller or buyer. Where more than one person came from that place, a numeral represents the number of them. In the case of market centres the number of contacts, if any, is represented by a numeral.
Kirklinton, which cannot be found on modern maps, but here the argument is strengthened since these places mostly lay north of Carlisle and the individuals concerned were mostly sellers. There were, for example, 11 sellers of horses whose homes are not marked on Map 3.1 because they came from 'lost' settlements in the parish of Kirklinton.

What despite their faults, do these maps reveal? The area served by Carlisle's horse market was very extensive although not as wide as the areas served by Midlands fairs. Not only were purchasers and vendors from the furthermost ends of the county, rather than simply from the immediate vicinity of the city, but there were substantial numbers from the adjacent counties of Dumfriesshire, Roxburghshire, Northumberland and Westmorland, and a significant number from County Durham, Lancashire and Yorkshire. There were even 12 sellers from Ireland. These latter may have actually been living in England or Scotland at the time and dealing in locally-reared horses, but since all were vendors and none purchasers, and since some, like William Howen of Armagh, sold a number of animals, it seems more likely that they had brought the beasts from Ireland.

They also show a marked pattern in the distribution of buyers and sellers. On Map 3.1 the homes of the great majority of the sellers lie north of the rivers Eden and Irthing. They came from all the northern parishes but especially from Kirkandrews-on-Esk, Kirklinton, Arthuret, Crosby and Scaleby. Thomas Denton wrote of Scaleby in 1688 that "the Tenants are most of them, breeders of Horses or Horsecowpers". The crosses marking the dwelling places of vendors are not only more thickly distributed north of Carlisle, but more of them represent the homes of several men: 29 were said


2. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.137.
Map 3.1 Places of residence of sellers of torses at Carlisle, 1631-2

Number of sellers from places outside Cumberland
- County Durham: 2
- Ireland: 12
- Lancashire: 3
- Northumberland: 13
- Scotland: 66
- Westmorland: 2
- Yorkshire: 3

Other market centres: Whitehaven, Ravenglass, Bootle, Allonby.
to have lived at Guards in Kirkandrews alone. Far fewer vendors lived south of the city: although the barony of Gilsland was moderately represented, very few men came from the forest of Inglewood and the Solway Plain, and only a handful from further to the south and west. Similarly the bulk of the vendors living outside the county came from north of Carlisle: 66 lived in Scotland, but only two or three in each of Westmorland, Lancashire, Yorkshire and Durham. The majority of the purchasers, by contrast, lived south of Carlisle. Map 3.2 shows southern Gilsland, Inglewood and the eastern parts of the Solway Plain thickly dotted with the homes of buyers, many places being the location of a number of men. 23 buyers were supposed to have lived in Caldbeck, for example, although it is likely that many of these lived in small settlements within the parish rather than in the village of Caldbeck itself. Purchasers also came from places in the county much further south and west than did sellers. Among purchasers from outside Cumberland, men from Scotland were less prominent than men from Lancashire or Durham, and barely more numerous than men from Yorkshire. They were completely outnumbered by buyers from Northumberland.

Clearly there was movement of horses southwards and eastwards through Carlisle from breeding areas in the north of Cumberland and in Scotland, and this movement is yet more marked when the number of horses sold is taken into account. Maps 3.1 and 3.2 show the residences of the sellers and buyers; they make no allowance for the number of animals bought or sold by individual purchasers or vendors. Most vendors sold only one or two horses, but many of the vendors living in northern Cumberland or Scotland sold more, sometimes many more. This was particularly true of men from Kirkandrews-on-Esk: Robert Lenix and Edward Urren of Guards sold, respectively, 26 and 21 horses, young Sime Steel of Mosband sold 17. No one

1. Possibly the demand for horses in this area was for mining.
Map 3.2 Places of residence of buyers of horses at Carlisle, 1631-2

Number of buyers from places outside Cumberland
- County Durham: 18
- Lancashire: 7
- London: 1
- Northumberland: 71
- Scotland: 8
- Westmorland: 21
- Yorkshire: 7
- Other market centres: 0

10 km
10 miles
N
living in Cumberland south of the Eden and Irthington, on the other hand, sold more than three horses except John Leathat and John Lightfoot of Wigton, and both of them bought more than they sold. Multiple purchases were more common by men from northern Cumberland than men from the south, but were much less frequent and of fewer animals than were the multiple sales. This sort of pattern would be normal in a horse-rearing area where fresh stock had to be acquired. Most of the southern Cumberland buyers bought no more than one or two beasts, probably no more than enough for their own needs. John Leathat, who made 12 purchases, and John Lightfoot, who made eight, were exceptional. Some of the Northumberland men bought quite large numbers, however, and were plainly dealers. One was Corbet Henderson, sometimes described as 'miller', of Hadonbridge Mill, who purchased at least 10 animals, another was Thomas Croser of Crowfield in Haltwhistle who bought at least 15.

Carlisle men appear to have played only a small part in the trade. The toll book names only eight purchasers, who bought 11 horses, and five sellers, who sold nine. Only one man, Geo. Barnfather, did both. The low numbers recorded might have been because freemen were exempt from toll; four of the 12 men can be identified as freemen but only tentatively since they had common names. On the other hand their partners in the transactions were not freemen and therefore not exempt and it is not clear from the books whether toll was paid by buyer, seller, or both. It is therefore impossible to say whether participation in the trade by Carlisle men was significantly under-recorded. Although two men, Barnfather and Wm Blakelocke, were probably dealing since each bought or sold three or more

1. Edwards, loc. cit., p.90. Freemen have been identified by comparison with the freemen's register, Ca2/27.
animals during the year, most of the known Carlisle men were merely using the trade in horses through the town to satisfy their own needs.

This general pattern, of a movement of horses from north to south, was still apparent 20 years later. Dr Edwards' analysis shows that the majority of sellers and of horses sold came from northern Cumberland and Scotland and that most buyers lived south of the city although Northumberland men played an important role. As in 1631-2 a handful of buyers came from Copeland. The principal difference in the locations of buyers and sellers was that Scaleby had become the most frequently named parish in northern Cumberland for men engaged in either activity, which adds weight to Denton's comment about the place quoted above. Besides the Carlisle Horse Toll Book for 1653-4, Dr Edwards also analysed that for Rosley for 1650. Comparison revealed that no fewer than 63 of those trading at Carlisle had also traded at Rosley three years earlier. They included many from north of the city, among whom were some of those most active. As might be expected, therefore, Carlisle's horse-fair hinterland overlapped that of at least one other fair; in fact the extent of its catchment area suggests it must have overlapped significantly with those of every other horse market in northern Cumberland. Dr Edwards' figures suggest that Carlisle's markets were much more important than Rosley's to those who attended both, however, and the city was probably the most important horse mart in the region.

Carlisle's other market activity was of more immediate importance to the city's inhabitants. In contemporary documents there is a marked concern about the workings of the market but, horse sales and the cattle sales which also took place on the Sands, are barely mentioned. Although Carlisle had been granted two weekly markets by the charter of 1352, only
one was held in the early-modern period, on Saturdays. Late seventeenth-century accounts agree that it was a well-stocked provision market—so much so for corn, according to Denton, that it attracted "great numbers of Northumberland Badgers as well as our own Countrey men". A document of 1599 specifies the tolls payable at the gates on a variety of items: bread, butter, cheese, onions, nuts, apples, cherries, pears, plums, various meats including goat, corn, salt, fresh and salt fish, eggs, poultry and wildfowl. A later document mentions tolls on wool, but foodstuffs dominate the list, just as offences concerning food predominate among the Court Leet presentments for marketing misdemeanours. Although yarn, cloth and hardware were sold in Carlisle's market, food was the most important commodity dealt in.

The presentments of those breaking the market's rules allow an assessment of the extent of Carlisle's market area. Many if not the bulk of those presented must have come from the city or its suburbs; it is not surprising that the place of residence of many offenders was not given. Curiously, however, the homes were named of only one of those (mostly women) who were presented for offences concerning dairy produce, fruit and nuts; the exception was a man from Stanwix buying cheese and selling it on the same day. It seems improbable that all these people came from the town; some must have lived in neighbouring hamlets. Perhaps they were simply

2. Hughes, loc. cit., p.57; R. Blome, Britannia, 1673, p.69; D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.
3. Ca2/413.
5. Ca3/2/23 f.9.
too well known for stating their addresses to have been necessary, or perhaps it was because they were women. More probably, however, it was the low status assigned to the commodities they handled which inspired this slack treatment: a number of those selling meat and corn were fined several times and were obviously regular traders in the market, yet their residences were given while those of the mostly-male fishmongers, amerced equally often, were given very infrequently. Although, then, two forestallers of herrings in 1625 lived in Burgh-by-Sands, salt was sold by a Kirkbride man in 1633 and a Cockermouth saddler was illegally selling metal horse-furniture in 1651, most is known about those dealing in corn, meat and cloth. However important these particular commodities may have been, we do not have a full picture of the area served by Carlisle's markets.

A second caveat should be considered before the distribution of these traders is considered. Those most likely to be prosecuted were gross offenders, those who offended persistently, or those who appeared to be a threat to the livelihoods of Carlisle's own tradesmen, such as the 16 butchers presented in 1681 for not having served a seven-year apprenticeship. These latter two groups must have comprised people who traded in the town often and who would have lived fairly near it. People living further from the city would be less likely to trade there frequently and so less likely to be presented. The sample would be biased in favour of those living in the core of Carlisle's market area, especially in the case of those dealing in meat and corn, which were available in every market centre.

What, then, does Map 3.3 reveal? Those trading in corn were concentrated north-east and south-west of Carlisle, with a particular cluster in the Dalston area. The bulk of the presentments were for forestalling;

1. Ca3/2/6, 10 & 12.
2. Ca3/2/33 ff.16-18.
there was no obvious division between a supplying and a consuming region. Nevertheless most of the offenders came from south of the city, where arable farming probably played a more important role in farm economies than in the north. All market activity, but especially corn-dealing, was a low-level urban function shared by central places throughout the hierarchy. Carlisle’s market area for this commodity was clearly circumscribed by the rival spheres of influence of markets at Brampton (in whatever other way the city dominated it), Penrith, Wigton and perhaps Longtown, even though the needs of its townsfolk may have encouraged sellers to come from longer distances than to other markets. Those presented about meat were butchers, their crimes mostly being selling unfit meat or failing to bring the skins with the carcass. The distribution of their homes followed a similar pattern to that of the corndealers, if a little wider. The majority of the butchers, however, lived north of the Eden, the southernmost, more far flung, saltires on the map representing single individuals whereas the more northerly ones often represented the homes of several men. There were 7 butchers from Tarraby presented in 1681, for example, but only one from each of Alketgate, Hutton and Plumpton.¹

The distribution of those fined for buying yarn and cloth before the market bell rang was very different. Here were purchasers from two other market towns, besides men from rural places. It is probably significant that the great bulk of the presentments were made after the Civil War. They may have reflected the origin of a county-wide trade in cloth, especially linen, which was the precursor of the important cotton manufacture of the region in the eighteenth century. Presentments for forestalling, etc., corn, on the other hand, were at their highest in the 1620s and were clearly related to dearth.

¹. Ibid.
Map 3.3 Places of residence of persons presented in Carlisle Court Leet for marketing offences
- offences relating to corn
- offences relating to meat
- offences relating to cloth or yarn
- other market centres

Map 3.4 Places of residence of Carlisle guild members, 1647 and 1684
- Shoemakers in 1647
- Shoemakers in 1684
- Weavers in 1684
- Butchers in 1684
- Tailors in 1684
- Smiths in 1684
- Glover in 1684
- other market centres
Carlisle's core market area, then, that from which men came to its markets fairly regularly, was modest, roughly five miles in radius. It was slightly eccentric in shape, extending further to the south, where the nearest rival market was more distant, than to east or west. A more extensive if untraceable influence probably made itself felt over the countryside outside this core area, competing with that of neighbouring markets. The town's market area for yarn and cloth was more extensive, embracing most of northern Cumberland.

Other craftsmen from outside the city liberties who traded in Carlisle like the butchers discussed above, can be traced through the town's gilds. Most of Carlisle's eight gilds had members who were not resident in the city liberties. A handful of these non-residents, the Earl of Carlisle for instance, who joined the Tanners' Gild in 1681, were clearly members for social or political reasons. Such men have been ignored for the present purpose. The others must have become gildsmen for economic motives: the creation of freemen was not significantly exploited for political purposes in the town before the 1680s and country brothers did not usually become freemen anyway; the new brothers often paid substantial sums for admission; restrictions were imposed on their rights to trade and employ apprentices and journeymen. For example, Geo. Brown of Kirkandrews-on-Eden was admitted a brother of the Weavers' Gild in 1674 with freedom to work at the trade himself but not to employ a journeyman or apprentice. He paid £1 17s. for his brotherhood, the usual payment being 3s. 4d. for a brother's son or 6s. 8d. for someone who had served an apprenticeship. William Pattinson of Orton was admitted in 1691 on condition that neither he nor anyone on his behalf go to Carlisle to carry away work, and that he would not take any apprentice

for a term of less than seven years. Plotting the locations of these 'country brothers', therefore, will show an area within which outside craftsmen found it advantageous to acquire special trading rights in the town.

Two documents are of particular use. One is a list made in 1647 and after of 21 members of the Fraternity of Shoemakers not resident in the city who had "liberty to sell Boots & shoes with[in the city] during their lives naturall". Unfortunately no similar list survives for any of the other gilds. The other is a list of freemen and gild members in 1684 entered in the back of the freemen's register. It lists separately those members of the gilds who were not freemen and gives their homes, however none of those in the Merchants' Company were unfree and both the two non-freemen in the Tanners' Fraternity were Carlisle men. The homes of those located in these two documents are shown on Map 3.4. Of the 21 shoemakers listed in 1647, the homes of 17 are known. Most came from Inglewood Forest, a few from the foothills of the Lakeland Dome, including two from Ireby, and three came from Penrith. The town appears to have attracted shoemakers from a very wide area of northern Cumberland, including from rival market centres. The 1684 list contains fewer locations for each of the individual gilds, but is still useful. In the case of the Shoemakers, where eight men can be located, its evidence confirms the general pattern suggested by the earlier list. Not much can be deduced from the solitary Tailor

1. D/Lons/L, 1786 Election, Weavers' Gild Books, no.1, n.p. sub 2 Nov. 1674 and 2 Nov. 1691. Quite what Pattinson gained by this arrangement is not clear, but perhaps he had extra privileges in selling in the town what he had made. He must have acquired some benefit.
2. DCG/2/1 n.p.
3. Ca2/27.
4. In this and the two subsequent maps, as in Maps 3.1 and 3.2, a cross represents one person, and where more than one person came from a particular place, the numeral expresses the number of them.

- 87 -
and single Glover whose residences were given, but the locations of the six
Butchers were similar to those in Map 3.3 above, the Weavers were
concentrated south and west of the city, in the Solway Plain, and all the
Smiths came from neighbouring market centres. The overall impression from
the evidence here and in the preceding section is that men trading in
manufactured goods in Carlisle's markets came from a wider area than did
those trading in foodstuffs. This wider area would seem to have overlapped
the hinterlands of, and attracted tradesmen from, other market centres.

Another group of Carlisle's judicial records, the Court Entry Books
of the mayors' Monday courts, also permit a sphere of influence to be
plotted. These courts were for trial both of real and personal actions of
any value. Three entry books seem to have been made for each year. They
record the names, status or occupation, attorneys and often the place of
residence of the litigants and pledges, with a note of the cause of the
action. These latter were very varied. The first 20 cases entered in a
1599 book included suits about a debt for beef; the detention of a pair of
iron sleeves, belt and bassinet; a debt of 50s. 10d., probably a loan; debts
for drink, wages, malt, barley, a buckle, a horse, cows, a gold ring and a
razor. A later case was over a debt for shoes. Debts recorded in later
books were for bark, non-payment of tolls and childrens' portions, a bet and
food and drink. The lawsuits were the result of a number of activities:
transactions in Carlisle's markets and fairs, which might explain why
occasionally neither plaintiff nor defendant were from the town; sales by
Carlisle's shopkeepers and tradesmen; money-lending. The latter of course
was frequently not merely commercial, but had social overtones or sprang
from social contacts. Rarely would an early-modern lender entrust his money

1. Ca3/1/126.
2. Ca3/1/202, 204, 205 & 263.
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to a stranger and debtors were sometimes related to their creditors. In the final analysis, of course, mapping the places of residence of the litigants shows only the area of influence of this particular court, but the origins of the lawsuits mean that a wide range of commercial and social relationships are also being plotted.

Maps 3.5 and 3.6 show the places of residence of suitors named in the Court Entry Books for 1596 and 1686-9. The first map shows litigants living in a broad area about the city. Although most dwelled within 7-8 miles of it, many others came from considerable distances including one man from Brighouse in Millom, on the other side of the Lake District. There was a scatter of litigants in all directions, but most notably along the river valleys radiating from the city and on the road westwards to Bowness. Brampton would appear to have presented little effective competition in so far as this source reflects economic activity. The second map presents a very sorry contrast. Far fewer litigants from outside the city were recorded and most of these lived within five miles of the town. Only two lived more than 10 miles away. It suggests a dramatic contraction of the level of commercial activity in the city and a parallel contraction of its hinterland.

A more probable explanation, however is that the two sets of evidence are not comparable. The 1596 book contains many more entries than those of the 1680s, indeed it has nearly as many entries as the eleven others analysed here put together although it is only a little larger than other sixteenth-century entry books. This may represent a genuine fall in the number of cases as a result of a contraction of commerce as outlined above, but though Carlisle probably experienced economic problems in the early seventeenth century, the town would seem largely to have recovered by 1680. Alternatively though implausibly, during this 90 years the people of

1. Ca3/1/125; Ca3/1/262-72.
Map 3.5 Places of residence of litigants named in Carlisle Court Entry Book, 1596

other market centres
Map 3.6 Places of residence of litigants named in Carlisle Court Entry Books, 1686-9

other market centres •

Map 3.7 Places of residence of debtors and creditors of Carlisle Butchers, etc

Butchers 7 inventories, 1566-1673 •
Miller 1 inventory, 1592 •
Baker 1 inventory, 1597 •

off the map - Baker
1 further creditor in Newcastle

other market centres •
Carlisle's hinterland may have become less litigious, but this would not explain the fall in the proportion of rural suitors to the court. A third answer is that the records were no longer kept so well, and there is evidence to support this hypothesis. Although the format of the entry books is much the same over the whole period, the later ones are less detailed, especially in stating what the case was about. This third explanation is not sufficient on its own, however, since it does not properly explain the fall in the number of cases. What seems most probable is that this decline in the quality of the record and apparent fall in the proportion of rural litigants is related to the decreasing popularity of the court. Inhabitants of Carlisle's hinterland and to a lesser extent the townsmen themselves, were using other courts, though probably still those belonging to the city. The Civil War was perhaps a watershed here. A contraction of the town's sphere of attraction by the late seventeenth century cannot be regarded as proven, and evidence discussed below tends to contradict it.

If the reasons why litigants brought their cases in Carlisle's courts were varied and often unclear, so were the reasons for the debts and credits recorded in probate inventories. Such debts were often the result of trade - goods sold on credit - but loans were also common, and not only commercial, money-making loans, but also loans to relatives and friends for other than commercial motives. Even purely commercial loans had a personal element:

...the network of credit-relationships revealed by mentions of debts in inventories helps to expand our knowledge of the extent of regional communities, since in the early modern period few local lenders would be so rash as to lend to borrowers whom they did not themselves know or who were not known to their friends and relatives."

For these reasons the spheres of influence which can be plotted by mapping the places of residence of debtors and creditors recorded in probate inventories is complex. It represents not only an area with which the inhabitants of Carlisle had commercial dealings, but also a zone of social contacts. To an extent the latter is determined by the former, but not wholly. The relationship between the two is impossible to disentangle.

Carlisle's sphere of influence as revealed by these documents will be discussed in the following pages, but first some further notes of caution should be sounded. The problems of using probate inventories are enormous and have often been discussed, but it is worth recapping here some of the more important ones. Perhaps the greatest is that they survive in disproportionately high numbers for the better-off men, with fewer for the less well off and none for the poor or for married women. Fortunately the better-off men were the most commercially active group in urban society, so this bias is not an especial drawback when examining economic horizons, as here. Second, although Carlisle was the largest town in the county it was small in absolute terms, so the size of the will-making class was limited. As a result some occupational groups are significantly under-represented compared with others and samples for these in particular may be unbalanced. Third, not every inventory gave places of residence of debtors, and even where they were given it was generally for only a few individuals, not for all. Obviously many of the unlocated debtors lived in Carlisle, it being thought unnecessary to give their addresses, but it is highly unlikely that

1. See for example the essay just mentioned, pp.11-21, and D.G. Vaisey, 'Probate Inventories and Provincial Retailers in the Seventeenth Century', pp.91-111, in the same collection.
all of them came from the town. The located debtors and creditors are only a sample of the total number, and it is impossible to know how, if at all, this sample was biased. Fourth, a peculiarity of the Cumberland inventories is that those made before 1620 are much more detailed than those made after 1660. In the latter debts and credits are often given as lump sums, not in lists. Only a handful of inventories survive from the intervening period. Analysis over time is therefore difficult. The sample of inventories which locates debtors and creditors, then, is small and may be biased in unforeseeable ways: for some occupations it is too small to be statistically significant. Three debts in two inventories tell us little about the area served by Carlisle’s medical men for instance. Nevertheless this is all the evidence we have and it should still be examined however tentative the conclusions that can be drawn from it.

Those for whom food processing was a primary occupation and those engaged in the clothing and textile trades were all among the less prosperous occupational groups in Carlisle. Each has, unfortunately, left only a few inventories in which the locations of debtors and creditors were named. This evidence is plotted on Maps 3.7 and 3.8 where a single cross represents mention of one debtor or more in one inventory. Where debtors from a place are recorded in more than one inventory, the numeral represents the number of inventories. The samples are not large enough to be conclusive but they suggest that neither the butchers nor the tailors had dealings outside the city’s core market area. Two of the three weavers’ inventories recorded debtors over 10 miles from the town, however, and if these were in any way typical, the whole trade may have attracted business

1. P1598 Edward Albourght; P1689 Thomas Dykes.
Map 3.8 Places of residence of debtors and creditors of Carlisle Tailors and Weavers
Tailors 2 inventories, 1579 and 1594
Weavers 3 inventories, 1585, 1614 and 1669

other market centres

Map 3.9 Places of residence of debtors and creditors of Carlisle Metalworkers and Building Workers
Metalworkers 6 inventories, 1571-1681
Mason 1 inventory, 1569
Joiner and Tanner 1 inventory, 1670

other market centres
off the map - metalworker
Newcastle 1
to the city from a considerable distance. For example, the Keswick copperminers on occasion came to Carlisle for sackcloth although they normally bought it elsewhere.

Carlisle's metalworkers had rather wider horizons. This was partly because the iron they used was not smelted locally. Two inventories record debts to Newcastle men for iron, for example that of Edward Atkinson proved in March 1572, includes a debt of 20s. to a Newcastle merchant "for arne". The majority of the recorded debtors lived within 5 miles of Carlisle, as might be expected since many villages would have had their own smiths. Nevertheless a few debtors were recorded quite far away on the Solway Plain.

The evidence is better for Carlisle's leatherworkers. Although the number of inventories of glovers and shoemakers where debtors and creditors were located is not great, rather more places are given in each than in the inventories discussed above. Map 3.10 shows the glovers' evidence. As with the other trades, most debtors and creditors lived close to Carlisle, within its core market area, but there were more distant men named, living in the parishes of Alston and Bewcastle, and even in Northumberland and the rival market town of Penrith. It seems likely that the craft drew customers at least occasionally from all over northern Cumberland, but that their market was circumscribed by the activities of craftsmen from Wigton, Brampton and Penrith. The debtors and creditors of Carlisle's shoemakers, on the other hand, were mostly from the town's market area. Map 3.11 shows none in the

2. P1571 Edward Atkinson; P1574 John How. It was not clear whether How lived in the urban or rural part of the parish of St Cuthbert.
Map 3.10 Places of residence of debtors and creditors of Carlisle Glovers
6 inventories, 1574-1676
other market centres

Map 3.11 Places of residence of debtors and creditors of Carlisle Shoemakers
7 inventories, 1574-1615
other market centres
off the map
Kendal
vicinity of Wigton or Penrith, although a few were from more distant places. It does look as though Carlisle men had encroached significantly on Brampton's hinterland but this may have been short lived: the inventories analysed were made between 1574 and 1615, a period when Brampton was in decline. Map 3.12 suggests that most of the tanners' commercial activity was confined to the market hinterland of Carlisle, but like the glovers, they too had contacts with a wider area embracing most of northern Cumberland. There is a hint that the trade may have been of more than local importance in the 40s. owed for leather to William Barne by Gilbert Pigge of Thirsk, but two of the other distant credit links, with Workington and Kendal, were debts owed by the Carlisle men, and the third, with Hexham, was a debt of £5 for an unspecified reason.

The credit links of three of the highest status occupations in Carlisle, merchants, lawyers and surgeons, are shown in Map 3.13. Once more the samples of inventories are too small to be thoroughly convincing, nevertheless the evidence is suggestive. An obviously remarkable point about the five merchants whose inventories locate their creditors and debtors is the long-distance links. Richard Bock, who was actively trading at his death in 1577, had three creditors in Kendal, one in York and no fewer than five in London; Symond Willson, who also was still keeping a shop at his death some 10 years later, had creditors in London, York and Halifax. Such distant links were presumably related to purchasing stock for their shops. Determining the area of Cumberland which these shopkeepers served is rather more difficult from such a small number of debts. It seems probable, however,

1. See the discussion of Brampton, p.56.
2. P1589 Wm Barne; P1579 Wm Harryson; P1602 Rich. Jonson; P1587 John Pattinson.
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that they drew customers from the western parts of the Solway Plain, the southern parts of the Forest of Inglewood, and east of the Eden, as well as from Carlisle's immediate vicinity. The more distant parts of this area, however, were perhaps more usually served by local market towns. Only two lawyers' Inventories, and two for medical men, name the homes of their debtors and creditors. One of the lawyers, Thomas Tallentyer, had creditors in London, Newcastle and Kendal, but he was perhaps untypical since he was also postmaster. His other credit links, and those of Edward Southalke, a proctor in the diocesan courts, suggest a wide range of contacts extending over most of northern Cumberland. Only three debtors of the two surgeons can be located, but one of the debts, the £1 10s. owed by Mr Hugh Todd, was for the cure of a woman from Lazonby. Carlisle's surgeons, then, at least occasionally treated people from an area much closer to Penrith than to the city. It seems likely that they too served a larger hinterland than the immediate market area of Carlisle.

Three of the remaining five groups of Carlisle people whose Inventories may be analysed were defined by social status, a fourth by gender. Only three Inventories provide usable information for both Carlisle clergymen and three for its gentlemen; this is plotted in Maps 3.14 and 3.15. Clergymen could be expected to have wide social and economic horizons: they had to leave their home settlements for training, might serve in a number of parishes during their careers and had professional contacts with fellow clerics from elsewhere in the diocese. The cathedral prebendaries all had livings elsewhere besides their posts at Carlisle. It is not surprising

1. The inventory of John Mouncke names debtors from Highfield and Whitrigg, neither of which places can definitely be identified with any of the modern places of those names. The latter, in each case roughly equidistant from Carlisle, are marked as alternatives on Map 3.13. P1579.

2. P1578 Thomas Tallentyer; P1613 Edward Southalke.

3. P1689 Thomas Dykes.
that even such a small sample shows credit links with the relatively distant towns of Cockermouth and Keswick, as well as with villages close to Carlisle. The three gentlemen appear to have had very limited horizons, whereas it might have been expected that such a high status group would have had contacts over a broad area. The sample is very small and probably unrepresentative, but an explanation may be that these men, like many other Carlisle 'gentlemen' were not of true gentry status but were 'pseudo gentry' of the type identified by Professor Everitt, successful and socially-aspiring businessmen and professionals. Moreover, in Carlisle 'gentleman' was a courtesy title given to aldermen. These three were not obviously involved in any trade or they would have been considered with that occupational group, but they could well have been retired businessmen or civic officers. It is possible, then, that they were not very untypical of Carlisle gentlemen as a group. The yeomen too included retired tradesmen as well as farmers and are best thought of as a social rather than occupational group. Their credit-link network was wider than that of the gentlemen, perhaps a statistical accident because the sample was twice the size, and it included a number of links with places over 10 miles away. They do not appear to have had wider contacts than the moderately-prosperous occupational groups.

A different pattern emerges from examining the credit links of Carlisle's women. Ten inventories survive giving usable information and several mention the homes of a number of debtors; this information is plotted on Map 3.16. Although a few of the places marked were quite far from the town, only one was over 10 miles away. The bulk fell within a circle only four miles from Carlisle. It suggests that for most women the economic and social horizon was quite restricted, no wider than that of the

Map 3.16: Places of residence of debtors and creditors in the inventories of Carlisle Women

10 inventories, 1576-1686
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Inventories which locate debtors and creditors were left by 22 Carlisle men whose occupations cannot be deduced from their probate records. The places named are plotted on Map 3.17. A little is added to the general picture in that it suggests links with places between Carlisle and Wigton should perhaps be more stressed and it gives a reminder that ties with other market towns in the region were important.

Finally, Maps 3.18, 3.19 and 3.20 record the homes of debtors and creditors recorded in the inventories of people living in the hamlets of the rural parts of Carlisle's parishes. The area in which these debtors lived represents a yardstick to compare against the area from which those of Carlisle's inhabitants came. Such a comparison should show what difference being a townsman made to an individual's economic horizon, for it is there in particular that different urban and rural experiences might be expected. The approximate boundaries of the the parishes are marked by a dotted line, and places within them have been left out: almost every hamlet and farmstead in the two parishes was mentioned at least once. There were a sufficient number of inventories recording debtors homes to allow change over time also to be considered.

In the period 1550-1600 59 inventories record addresses of debtors and creditors: only four are the inventories of women. All but seven creditors and debtors lived within 10 miles of Carlisle, almost all were within five miles of the parish boundary. Few came from the western half of the Solway Plain or southern Inglewood, and only one from north of the river Lyne. The more distant places, including Kendal and Penrith, were each mentioned in only one inventory. The great majority of those located lived within the two parishes, and Carlisle was, not surprisingly, the most common address, home of some 25 debtors and creditors. The impression is
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that most credit links were over distances of little more than seven miles. Map 3.19 for 1601-1650 (in effect 1601-1620) is based on just 11 inventories, of which one belonged to a widow. As in the earlier period most debtors and creditors lived within five miles of the parish boundaries. Very few credit links had been made on the Solway Plain or east of the Eden, however, although this could be statistical fluke. Map 3.20 for 1651-1700 is based on 13 inventories proved between 1662 and 1689. Four were for women, including the inventory with the greatest number of located debtors and creditors. Again most credit links were within the parish boundaries or with settlements only a short way beyond them. There seem to have been fewer long-distance links than earlier in the period, but this impression could be because the sample was so small. As before the Civil War, there were few contacts on the Solway Plain.

The impression throughout the 150 years is of predominantly short-distance credit links, of seven miles or less. These links were still, however, wider than those of certain occupational groups within the city, such as the tailors or butchers, but were narrower than those of others such as the merchants. In particular the countrymen lacked the extra-county contacts of the townsmen. It is possible that their credit horizon shrank, but this could be a chance result of the smaller number of inventories giving places of residence in the later periods.

Despite the difficulties of using the inventories as a source, it is clear that there was a hierarchy of occupational groups with differing credit horizons or spheres of influence. The size of the credit horizon partly reflected the competition to the occupational group from outside the town, and hence the area it served, and partly also reflected characteristics of the occupation such as the need to purchase stock outside the county. The hierarchy of credit horizons broadly followed that of the hierarchy of
wealth and social status. The match was not perfect but was significant; although it might be expected that wealthy people would have had wider credit links than poorer ones, the wider areas served by those trades with the broader hinterlands would have enabled them to make greater profits than those with smaller ones and so allowed those following them to become wealthier.

The last set of evidence to be considered is the places of origin of apprentices of Carlisle's tradesmen, which show the zone from which the city attracted immigrants. The sources are the records of the eight gilds and a register kept by the corporation from 1675. The Merchants', Shoemakers' and Tanners' Gilds have records surviving from the early seventeenth century, the other five gilds only from the last half of the century. The data is therefore biased towards the late seventeenth century and little can be said about this form of migration into the town before that period. There are also hidden temporal biases since the homes of apprentices were not necessarily recorded throughout the period from which gild records survive. The clerks of the Tailors' Company, for example, noted the place of origin of almost every apprentice enrolled between 1664 and 1677, including those from Carlisle itself, but recorded few homes thereafter. In the other gilds the places of origin of apprentices were generally not stated at all regularly. Many of those not located were probably from Carlisle and therefore giving their home was thought to be unnecessary, but this is unlikely to have been true of all. There is no reason to think that the sample of apprentices whose places of origin were recorded was atypical, however.

The interpretation of Maps 3.21 to 3.31, where this data is plotted, is much more straightforward than that of some of the material

1. This register was written in the Dormont Book, Ca2/17.
discussed earlier, but some caveats should be entered. First, although the potential economic benefit was probably always the first consideration, the recruitment of apprentices to a town was linked significantly to social contacts. A boy might be apprenticed in a particular place because one of his relatives or a family friend was already established there. That this was true of Carlisle is obvious from the frequent coincidence of surname of apprentice and master in all of the city's gilds, and such evidence takes no account of links with affinal relations, nor cases where a relative had been an intermediary between apprentice and master. Second, a family with strong ties to a town might apprentice a number of children there even though it was quite distant. Distribution maps such as those discussed below might then suggest a stronger or wider sphere of influence for the town than really existed: the link was actually with the family, not the place they lived. These two points are both illustrated by the Wilkinson family. In 1627 Matthew, son of John Wilkinson of the parish of Crosthwaite, was apprenticed to Matthew Calpe, a member of the Carlisle Merchants' Gild. 17 years later, Hugh, son of John Wilkinson of Thornthwaite in the parish of Crosthwaite, was apprenticed to Matthew Wilkinson; Matthew was presumably Hugh's brother, or perhaps an uncle. He took subsequently two other apprentices from different places, but in 1663 again took an apprentice from Thornthwaite, Thomas, the son of James Stanger. It cannot be proved but some link of kinship or friendship must have existed there too: Thornthwaite was a very small place. 2

Lastly there is the problem of the actual occupations to which boys were being apprenticed. Sometimes it was explicitly stated: the Shoemakers'
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Gild records, for example, contain several cases where the trade was given as shoemaking. Most of the actively trading gild members followed the eponymous trade of their gild, but not all, however. Richard Lowrye who died in 1605 was a member of the Merchants' Gild although a goldsmith, and Edward Atkinson, admitted to the Smiths' Gild in 1688 was actually a glazier.

Although such men may have been exceptional, it should not be assumed too confidently that the area from which members of a gild recruited their apprentices is the same as that of the occupational group the gild was named after.

Table 3.7 Average Distance from Carlisle of Places of Origin of Apprentices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company &amp; Dates</th>
<th>Number of apprentices</th>
<th>Distance from Carlisle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers' Co., 1656-1700</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glovers' Co., 1675-1700</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants' Co., 1622-1650</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants' Co., 1651-1700</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers' Co., 1595-1650</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers' Co., 1651-1700</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths's Co., 1671-1700</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors' Co., 1652-1700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners' Co., 1612-1650</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners' Co., 1651-1700</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers' Co., 1648-1700</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence can be presented in two ways: statistically, as in Table 3.7, or graphically as in Maps 3.21 to 3.31. The two approaches complement each other. Examining Table 3.7 it is clear that the majority of Carlisle's apprentices were recruited from within its core market area. Only one company, the Merchants', drew more than half of its apprentices from

beyond six miles from the town. A rough hierarchy of gilds is apparent, with the Butchers' and Tailors' having the smallest average catchment areas. The Tailors' Company records provide the weakest picture: they gave the place of origin of only five apprentices from outside the town, compared with 12 from the city and suburbs. This was a higher ratio of city:country recruits than recorded for other gilds, but it may have been so merely because in most other gilds the clerks did not usually bother to record the place of residence of the apprentice's father if he lived in Carlisle. On the other hand it may reflect the inability of the company to attract country boys to join a low-status occupational group. Such an explanation is supported by the meagre evidence for country-born apprentices: none lived far from the city, implying that the gild exerted a limited pull. The median distance of their homes from Carlisle was only two miles.

The statistical picture on its own is inadequate, however. The spatial representation of the data in the maps reveals patterns in the locations of the homes of apprentices and an idea of the breadth of the area in which they lay, something which is lost in aggregation of distances. Thus although the evidence is scanty also for the Glovers' and Smiths' Companies, the impression given is of a wider influence. Of the 11 Glovers' apprentices all but three came from within 5-6 miles of Carlisle. These others were from Kettleside near Penrith, Murton near Appleby in Westmorland, and Papcastle in the parish of Bridekirk, all well outside Carlisle's core market area. A cluster of Smiths' Gild apprentices from near Carlisle is apparent in Map 3.23, but recruits came also from well to the west and east of the city, as well as from Penrith. In both cases a zone of attraction overlapping the market areas of other market centres is suggested.

A contrasting pattern of recruitment was displayed by both the
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Weavers' and Butchers' Companies. The former drew all but two of its apprentices from a small area of the eastern Solway Plain and northern Inglewood, within six miles of the city. This was the same area in which most of the country members of the gild lived. Perhaps it represents an area of rural cloth manufacture focused on Carlisle and, possibly, Wigton. Certainly some such factor was at work: this concentrated pattern was unique. Although the great majority of recruits to the Butchers' Company lived close to Carlisle, they were drawn also from a broader area around the town and from every direction except due east. This area was wider than the core market area of the town outlined above, but still not particularly extensive. Only one apprentice, for example, lived more than 10 miles away.

The remaining three companies left records which permit not only the reconstruction of areas of recruitment in the last half of the seventeenth century, but also for the first half; some exploration of change over time is therefore possible. The pattern of recruitment indicated for the Shoemakers' and Tanners' companies was surprisingly similar in view of the marked difference in the mean inventoried wealth displayed by the two occupations. The principal difference was that the Tanners' lacked the long-distance contacts with Lancashire and Yorkshire shown by the Shoemakers', which was why the mean distance of places of origin of the latter's apprentices was higher in Table 3.7. The Tanners' recruited perhaps a little more widely within northern Cumberland in the early part of the century and less in the second than did the Shoemakers'. Both companies recruited more widely than the Tailors', Weavers' and Butchers', but not necessarily than the Glovers' and Smiths'.

Predictably the Merchants' Gild attracted apprentices from the widest area of all, including by 1700 boys from Copeland as well as northern

1. Above p.88 and Map 3.4.
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Cumberland and most of the neighbouring counties. From the maps it would appear that the area within the county from which all three companies recruited expanded during the century. Paradoxically Table 3.7 shows that the mean distance from Carlisle of the places of origin of their apprentices fell for all three companies and the median distance fell for two of them. Some of these falls were slight and, in view of the imperfections of the sources, may not be statistically significant. They suggest, however, that very long distance recruitment was becoming relatively less important, probably as the total numbers recruited increased. It is perfectly feasible that the number of apprentices recruited from near the city should increase at the same time as the area within the county from which apprentices were drawn grew, so producing a fall in the average distance from the town that they came from. If the experience of these three was shared by the other companies, then the influence of Carlisle, its attractiveness to betterment migrants, would seem to have been widening and increasing during this 100 years.

Of all the spheres of influence traced above, the widest was that for horse marketing. That this was so is hardly surprising since horses were the most mobile commodity in early-modern England, nevertheless it reflects Carlisle's strategic position in relation to local horsebreeding areas. The hinterlands from which apprentices were recruited to the more prosperous occupations were also quite wide and definitely impinged on the spheres of influence of Cumberland's other market towns. Carlisle obviously had a reputation as one of the best places in the county to get a living. The city's hinterlands for other services do not appear to have overlapped very extensively with those provided by other market towns, with the possible exception of Brampton. The evidence is not conclusive but it would seem that the town's tradesmen had relatively few customers from beyond its
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market area, although the market for manufactured goods was wider than that for other goods, and the merchants had a wider hinterland than other trades. Even their influence, however, was far from countywide.

Map 3.32 shows the range of recorded contacts between Carlisle and other places in Cumberland. The contacts have been divided into four groups: marketing offences, litigation in city courts, debts and credits recorded in the probate inventories of Carlisle’s inhabitants, and places of origin of apprentices. The map reveals a core area within which Carlisle was clearly dominant, extending about six miles northwards, seven miles west and south, and east and southwestwards perhaps a mile or two further. In this zone lay most of those places with the greatest variety of contacts, but the rival market towns of Brampton, Penrith, Keswick and Cockermouth each had two or more types of contact despite the distance of the latter two from Carlisle. Market centres naturally had close links with each other. It is surprising therefore that Wigton did not have a greater variety of links but, in view of its small size, not surprising that Longtown had none. Carlisle’s contacts with south-western Cumberland were few.

Comparable work has been published on two towns, Worcester and Preston. Worcester was a very much larger town than Carlisle, with an important industrial role, but like Carlisle it was also county town and a cathedral city. Preston was probably a little smaller than Carlisle, but was situated in "some of the most productive and populous districts" of Lancashire, and it was becoming the de facto county town. Worcester’s market region, defined by debt statements from probate inventories, was about 25 miles by 15. This was rather larger than Carlisle’s core zone of influence, which was about 17 miles by 13. The "Inner Zone of the Market Area" of
Map 3.32 Contacts with Carlisle, 1550-1700

Number of types of contact
+ - 1
o - 2
□ - 3
□ - 4

Other market centres:
- Newcastle
- Featherstonebridge, Northumberland
- Kendal, Westmorland
- Hexham, Northumberland
- Thirsk, Yorkshire
- Canonbie, Dumfries
- London
- York
- Halsall
- Brothamby, Durham
- Gretna, Dumfries
- Commestone, Lancashire
- Appleby, Westmorland
- Crosthwaite, Westmorland
- Kirkbarrow, Westmorland
- Leeds
- Cawthwaite, Yorkshire
- Spittle, Northumberland
- Newby Stoner, Westmorland
- Wilderton, Northumberland
- Newwham, Yorkshire
- Podham, Lancashire
- Patterthwaite, Westmorland
- Whalleyborpe, Yorkshire
- Warrington, Lancashire
- Cleburn, Westmorland
- Murton, Westmorland
- Millom, Cumberland
Preston, on the other hand, was only about 12 miles by 16. It can be argued tentatively, therefore, that there was a correlation between the size of a town and the area of its core hinterland. Market regions were probably also influenced, however, by the vigour of the economy of the town concerned, the density of settlement in the surrounding area and the proximity and prosperity of rival market centres. It is peculiar, however, that Carlisle's core hinterland was not more extensive in view of the limited competition from the three closest market centres. Northern Cumberland was sparsely populated and the lack of contacts with Carlisle from this area was probably for that reason. The limited contacts in central Inglewood cannot be so simply explained. Southern Inglewood must have lain under the influence of Penrith, but if that town's market area extended over central Inglewood, which was equidistant between it and Carlisle, then it had a larger hinterland than the city. This seems unlikely since Penrith was only three-quarters the size of the county town, but it may have had a more vigorous economy. A more plausible explanation is that inertia of distance discouraged frequent journeys to a market centre from further than about seven miles; as a result people from beyond that distance were seldom recorded in the market centre's records. If this explanation is correct then inertia was another important factor limiting the size of a town's core market area besides those of the place's own size and the distance of possible rivals.

c. Conclusion

Carlisle, then, was the leading town in the county's urban hierarchy, and for all but the last few years of the seventeenth century, the most populous place in Cumberland. Cumberland market centres were on the whole small, but such a lightly-populated county may not have needed many large towns, and it appears to have had few. Nevertheless in an area of such dispersed settlement an 'urban' place need not have been so large as in the south. The city appears to have provided certain services for much of northern Cumberland besides almost all those needed by the area immediately adjacent to it; it also drew recruits to the more prosperous trades from a considerable part of the county. Despite its pre-eminence, however, Carlisle's tradesmen did not dominate the county's trade in any detectable fashion. Presumably, therefore, the city was not sufficiently larger than its rivals nor its tradesmen sufficiently specialised to attract a substantial body of custom from all parts of the county; it cannot have helped that Cumberland was a particularly extensive shire, but commercial contacts south of the Derwent were almost non-existent. The evidence discussed above has been largely concerned with Carlisle's economic influences, but it provides little support for Prof. Palliser's supposition that in the absence of larger rivals Carlisle served the north-west as a provincial capital.

It has been noted above that one of the characteristics of towns is that they were places with specialised economic functions, and that those which rose above the lowest rung of the urban hierarchy acquired extra functions. One may appear to have been predominant, as did cloth production in early-modern Reading and Worcester, yet all but the smallest towns invariably had other roles which provided some of their inhabitants with their livelihoods. Both Reading and Worcester were also market and administrative centres for example. Carlisle had a number of functions. One, as a centre for the exchange of agricultural produce, was examined in the previous chapter, and the existence of another, as a service centre, was implicit in the discussion of the credit horizons of its craftsmen. These functions were shared with other towns in Cumberland, neither would seem sufficient to explain the city's place at the head of Cumberland's urban hierarchy. Its other obvious roles as a military, civil and ecclesiastical administrative centre, were presumably crucial. Yet it is not clear how far these functions provided employment for the citizens, or whether their effects were wholly beneficial. Their influence on Carlisle's occupational structure is also uncertain. Nor is it known whether Carlisle was a manufacturing centre in the early-modern period as it was in the late eighteenth century, or if there were some other important economic activity.

This chapter will survey the economy of Carlisle in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The first three sections describe the city's administrative roles and assess their impact. The fourth seeks to
reconstruct the occupational structure of the town and so obtain some idea of the balance of its economy. To clarify the argument in this section some of the technical discussion and more detailed occupational tables have been relegated to Appendix Three. Finally what evidence there is of the prosperity of the town will be examined to see how the economy performed in the light of these functions.

a. The Military Role

Carlisle castle was described as the key to Cumberland.¹ It had great strategic significance as the principal royal border fortress west of the Pennines and it was the logical place for a garrison to counter invasion from Scotland. The inhabitants of the city benefited from this military role in a number of ways, the most obvious of which was increased protection from reiving. Only one raid on Carlisle was recorded, on the suburbs in 1601, although the bishop's cattle were stolen from the city's fields the previous year.² The benefits were not as great as might first appear, however, and there were certain disadvantages also.

First, Carlisle, as the main royal fortress in the area and the only large town of the wardenry close to the border, was the headquarters of the Warden of the West Marches and so the seat of administrative activity related to the frontier. It was there, accordingly, that an army of 2,000 gathered in 1570 before raiding in strength across the border, there in 1584 that Lord Scrope assembled 5-600 men of the wardenry to discourage the Scottish borderers from going to Edinburgh, and there in 1598 that Scrope's son, also warden, was to gather the leading gentry of the wardenry to

¹. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Richard Bell's History of the Borders, ff.205, 207.
². CBP II, pp.661, 736-7.
discuss border laws and their reformation. Carlisle, since there was "no place elles either of thinglish or the Skottes fitt", was where the Privy Council proposed the commission for the division of the Debatable Lands should meet in 1552; Carlisle and Dumfries, the nearest moderate-sized Scottish town, were where the English and Scottish commissioners met in 1597, and the city was where the resulting treaty was signed. Besides these major events there must have been a continual stream of gentry and petitioners coming to see the warden and suitors attending the warden courts. Sir Charles Hales, an independent observer proposing a solution to Carlisle's poverty, wrote in 1606 that:

The Citie of Carliell having benne anuciently ye place of aboade of ye Lord Warden, and of receite of ye English forces from tyme to tyme before ye happie union of ye kingdomes... hath heretofore liued chiefly by victualling of such as repaired to the same for attendans on ye Lo. Warden...

Second, the presence of the warden himself was an advantage. For all of Elizabeth's reign the wardens were aristocrats: first William, Lord Dacre, a local man, then Henry, Lord Scrope of Bolton Castle, and finally his son Thomas. Aristocrats, even relatively minor ones such as the Scropes, maintained large households. Naturally the wardens turned to local people to supply their needs. Thus Henry Scrope in 1566 owed Esabell Scott, widow, 4s. 5d. for mustard, and in 1574 was indebted £26-2-8 to Edward Sewell of Blackwell, in St Cuthbert's parish, for malt; Thomas Scrope owed Thomas Strang, a blacksmith, 45s. for shoeing horses. The importance that the

1. CSPD Addenda 1566-79, p.294; CBP I, no.212; APC ns 28, p.612.
3. PRO, SP14/22/3.
5. P1566 Esabell Scott; P1574 Edw. Sewell; P1599 Thos Strang.
Table 4.1 Known Size of Carlisle Garrison, 1550-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Troops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>29 soldiers &amp; 22 gunners¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>65 including gunners &amp; officers²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>300 English troops until April, then 500 Irish infantry &amp; 1 troop of 50 cavalry, plus officers &amp; 5 gunners³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640 summer</td>
<td>5 foot cos &amp; 1 troop horse (approx. 380 privates, with officers, NCO's &amp; gunners, plus 50 troopers with officers &amp; NCO's)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>2 troops of horse + infantry⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>100 infantry⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651 Aug.</td>
<td>80 troopers, probably + infantry (the troop disbanded in Oct. or Nov.)⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3 foot companies (210 privates) &amp; 7 gunners⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>3 foot companies⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>3 foot companies¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>50 soldiers plus their officers¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>1 company of 50 men¹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. BL, Cotton Mss, Titus F xiii, ff.196v-197v.
2. PRO, SP12/257/91.
3. CSPD 1639, p.12; PRO SP16/438/2, f.18.
5. CSPD 1649-50, p.360.
6. Dept. of Palaeography, Univ. of Durham, C49/2.
7. CSPD 1651, pp.367, 476.
8. PRO, SP18/99/43, ff.110, 115v.
10. CSPD 1667, p.555.
11. CSPD 1677-8, p.468.
12. BL, Sloane Ms 2724, f.96.

A wealthy aristocrat might have for a small town can be demonstrated through the "extended visit" of the 4th Earl of Cumberland to Carlisle castle in October 1607. "The earl was accompanied by fifty household officers and servants and was met by twenty persons at Carlisle." He was visited by two other noblemen and a number of gentlemen. "Weekly household expenses were £20 and stable charges £10." Subsequent visits may not have been so splendid, but in Feb. 1610 the Cliffords bought gloves and salmon at Carlisle, and in 1611, wine, horseshoes and girths.² It is wholly

1. R. Spence, 'The Pacification of the Cumberland Borders, 1593-1628', Northern History, 13, 1977, p.139 n.232. The earl was not only a local landowner but also heir to the administrative authority of the wardens.
2. Chatsworth House, Bolton Mss, Bk 230, ff.144a, 250a; Chatsworth House, Bolton Mss, Bk 231, f.39a, b. I owe these references to Dr Richard Spence.
understandable, then, that one of the 4 things that the Merchants' Gild petitioned James I for at his visit to the city in 1617 was "to haue a noble man to lye in Karliell castell..."

Perhaps more important to the town's economy was the garrison, however. Carlisle's garrison varied in size quite markedly over the 150 year period, but was small in comparison to that of Berwick. Its strength when evidence is fullest is shown in Table 4.1.

The official establishment allowed to the wardens of the West March was two deputies and two warden sergeants, and as captain of Carlisle castle, a further 20 cavalrymen. The captain of the citadel was allowed eight infantrymen, six gunners and a porter. These forces were deemed insufficient and were supplemented, but the wardens found even the augmented garrison inadequate for the task of controlling the borders and frequently appealed for more troops to be sent from Berwick. At periods of particular stress such extra soldiers were provided: 100 infantry in 1577, 1587 and 1595, for example. Soon after the union of crowns the garrison was abolished at least in part, although some of the cavalry serving the commissioners for the middle shires may have been based there until 1621. Soldiers of some sort remained until 1613 if not later, since at that date a "garison man" owed William Blacklock 2s. The crown still paid

2. There were 981 troops in Berwick in April 1595 and 722 in July, including officers. CBP II, pp.29, 43.
4. BL, Cotton Mss, Titus F xiii, ff.196v-197v; PRO, SP12/257/91.
5. CBP I & II, passim.
6. APC ns 10, pp.9, 53; APC ns 25, p.29; CBP I, nos.543 & 556.
7. CSPD 1639, pp.343-4; Spence, loc. cit., pp.107, 128; P1618 Wm Blacklock. The government was considering abolishing the garrison as early as Jan. 1604. PRO, SP15/36/7.
gunners in Carlisle in 1630, moreover, although these posts may have been sinecures and the holders not resident. The town was regarrisoned at the start of the Bishops' War, held for the king during the Civil War and then occupied by the Scots. Under Cromwell the garrison was the seventh largest in England, and it continued to be kept at a high level until the 1670s. During the last years of the century, if not before, the soldiers had their families with them.

The garrison not only provided armed protection but also a substantial cash input into the town's economy; its troops were a body that consumed the goods and services produced by local tradesmen but did not produce in competition with them, except, sometimes, in the sale of drink. The number of soldiers may rarely have been very large in absolute terms, but they and their families represented a significant addition to the population of such a small town. Although "the soldier was never rich, in fact he was one of the worst-paid men in the land", the spending power of the garrison as a whole was in theory considerable. Thus in 1596 its total pay was £949-19-1½ p. a., £400 of which went to the warden, in 1655 it was reduced to £365-8-0 a month (£4,384-16-0 p. a.), and in 1664 it was set at £3,367-6-0 p. a. All types of tradesmen must have benefited from the

1. PRO, SP15/540 part 1/23 & 231; CSPD 1623-5, pp.507, 508; CSPD 1629-31, p.555.
2. CSPD 1655, pp.238-9; Table 4.1, p.129.
3. PR/47/1, passim, 1658-1700.
5. J. Childs, The Army of Charles II, London 1976, p.21. In the sixteenth century the wardens' cavalymen received 10 marks p. a. and their gunners 8d. a day; the Citadel gunners and infantry received 6d. a day. In Charles II's reign private soldiers received gross pay of 10d. a day before 1672 and 8d. after that date, from which 2d. was deducted for 'Off Reckonings'. PRO, SP12/257/91; BL, Add. Ms 33,223, ff.41-2; Childs, op. cit., pp.258-9.
custom of the officers, and the tailors, merchants and shoemakers in particular from the need for uniforms, which in the late seventeenth century were paid for by deductions from the privates' pay. Since soldiers were paid so badly, however, the bulk of the money must have been spent on food, drink and accommodation; those who benefited most were the victualling trades. In 1585 John Stoddert was owed £13-12-3 "for Vittalinge the quenes ma jes Ju ses soldiers" and in 1570 William Carter was owed £13-11-2 by "Captayne Audley for the bord of viij soldiores xj wekes". A tanner, David Hodgson, in 1687 had a "Soldier loft" containing a bed and bedstead and Mr John Bushby, yeoman, in 1690 owned two old bedsteads in "The Souldiers room".

The benefit from the presence of the garrison was not always what it might have been, however. One problem was absenteeism. In 1563 four of the 22 gunners were marked "absent" and in 1596 a number were usually non-resident. The master gunner himself was a butcher who lived in Suffolk and provided no substitute. There were still non-resident gunners in 1599. Another factor was payment of soldiers' wages to men who were not serving as soldiers but who would have been resident in the town anyway. In such cases the money was not sent out of the town, as it was when paid to an absentee, but it lowered the number of potential customers. Richard Bell, for example, a Carlisle notary who served Lord Thomas Scrope as warden clerk, in 1596 received £12-3-4 p.a. as a gunner; Lord Henry Scrope in 1589

1. Childs, op. cit., p.50; P1584 Jn Stoddert; P1570 Wm Carter. Carter was also owed for board and drink by two other men, 2s. for surgery, 40s. for 19bz of malt, and £5-10-8 for wages. Other sources show that he was a gunner at the castle, and the wages were presumably for that. CSPD Addenda 1566-79, p.149.
2. P1687 David Hodgson; P1690 Jn Bushby.
3. BL, Cotton Mss, Titus F xiii, ff.196v-197v; CBP II, pp.105-6, 216-7, 222, 295-6, 606.
asked for the renewal of a patent of a gunner's post for his servant, William Feildinge.¹

Greater problems were those caused by arrears of pay. The garrison's wages were often if not usually in arrears, and sometimes badly so. In June 1582 the wages of the soldiers at Carlisle were £200 behind; in 1659 the arrears of the garrison and gunners were over £493; in 1682 the garrison had at one point been four months in arrears.² Naturally the troops suffered: in 1662 Sir Phillip Musgrave twice wrote to London that no-one in Carlisle could trust them for a month's diet since the town was in such low condition.³ The townsfolk suffered too: in Oct. 1587 the 100 soldiers from Berwick were ordered to return there and since they had not been paid for a year it was expected that "my Lord Scroope wilbe marvelously cryed out upon by all them that hathe victualled them all this tyme"; in 1697 some Carlisle victuallers complained that they had received only half what was due to them for quartering soldiers to 1 Jan., the rest having been kept by the mayor and lieutenant-governor to provide subsistence for the men after that date.⁴

Another way that the city gained from its role as a military centre was from expenditure maintaining its fortifications. Certainly the money spent on Carlisle was only a fraction of what Elizabeth I spent on Berwick; after the construction of the citadel under Henry VIII, further

1. PRO, SP12/257/91; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Richard Bell's History of the Borders, f.9; CBP II, pp.38, 805; PRO, SP15/31/30.
2. CBP I, no.127; CSPD 1659-60, p.579; BL, Sloane Ms 2724, f.96.
3. CSPD 1661-2, pp.381, 581. The garrison was 6 months in arrears that June, and Musgrave had to pay it from his own pocket because the townsfolk would not give credit. This suggests that Childs was over optimistic in stating that subsistence pay was always regularly paid before 1679. Childs, op. cit., p.50.
4. CBP I, no.556; CSPD 1697, p.289.
work in the city was merely repairs. Nevertheless the cash was another
injection of outside funds into the local economy. Table 4.2 contains a
summary of what is known of the sums spent; the actual total must have
been higher, especially in the seventeenth century, since it is unlikely that
every account survived, and other expenditure is known to have taken place
or to have been authorised. For much of the early-modern period Carlisle’s
defences were neglected, however, and nothing at all of significance seems to
have been done between 1605 and 1639.*

The town’s inhabitants did not receive the full benefit of this
expenditure, however. First there was the problem of materials. Items such
as stone and timber were not available in the town itself but had to be
quarried or felled in its vicinity and carted in. Those involved in these
operations may have been townsmen but many, perhaps most, were not: In
1604 20 trees were felled to repair the citadel and carried the 16 miles to
Carlisle by “divers countrie men(n)”. Other materials also had to be

1. For an account of royal building operations in Carlisle during the
sixteenth century, see H.M. Colvin, J. Summerson, M. Biddle, J.R. Hale and M.
Merriman, The History of the King’s Works, 1485-1660, Part II, 1982, pp.664-
673 & Plates 46-48. For Berwick see ibid., pp.613-664.

2. Unspecified repairs were made in 1564; repairs were made to the castle
in 1572 and to the city gates in 1576; a Dutch engineer was working on
Carlisle’s defences in July 1639 and £1,000 was allowed for further repairs
the following Dec. and March; orders for payment of over £1,500 for wages
of the garrison and repairs were made Sept. 1650-Jan. 1651; £200 was
provided in 1658; repairs costing about £30 were made to the town walls in
1681 and other work was needed. CSPD 1547-80, p.242; CSPD Addenda 1566-79,
pp.431, 505-6; CSPD 1639, pp.414-5; CSPD 1639-40, pp.143, 596; M.A.E. Green,
ed., Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for the Advance of Money,
1642-1656, 1888, pp.84-5, 86, 88; CSPD 1657-8, p.360; BL, Sloane Ms 2724,
ff.96, 98.

3. A major breach in the wall of the castle’s outer ward remained
unrepaired between 1558 and 1567. BL, Cotton Mss, Titus F xiii, f.194; PRO,
E101/545/15; Colvin et. al., King’s Works, pp.664, 672-3. In April 1655 the
garrison commander complained that the defences were ruinous and the only
repairs that had been made over the previous three years he himself had paid
for. M.A.E. Green, ed., Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for
Compounding, etc., 1643-1660, p.1169.

4. PRO, LR2/257, f.11.
Table 4.2 Government expenditure on Carlisle’s defences, 1550-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>£100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>£45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>£25-6-9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>£823-1-11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557-8</td>
<td>£87-11-2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>£102-14-0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577 (1)</td>
<td>£520-2-0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577 (2)</td>
<td>£59-12-8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>£243-2-6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>£220-15-3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>£119'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>£100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>£101-10-11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595-1602</td>
<td>£206-11-4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>£118-13-10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604-5</td>
<td>£141-12-0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-7</td>
<td>£219-3-2'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. *King’s Works*, p.672 & n.8.
2. PRO, E101/63/18.
3. PRO, E101/483/17. Those executing the works accounted for £20 more, but the extra was not allowed and was deducted from their fees.
4. PRO, E101/545/15. There is a copy of this document in CRO.
5. PRO, E101/545/16, Bk 1.
6. PRO, E101/545/17. See *King’s Works*, p. 673.
7. PRO, E101/545/18.
8. PRO, E101/545/16, Bk 2.
10. PRO, E101/545/16, Bk 3.
11. PRO, E101/545/16, Bk 4.
12. PRO, E101/545/16, Bk 5.
13. PRO, LR9/83. This sum was claimed by Scrope but not allowed as his accounts were not detailed enough. It may also have been included in the 1595-1602 account, PRO, E101/545/16, Bk 5.
14. PRO, LR2/257, ff.9-16.
15. PRO, E351/3606.

Imported into Carlisle. Lead was bought in Newcastle in 1604. Iron might be bought from local men or in Newcastle although steel, purchased in small quantities, was bought in Carlisle. Nails were bought in 1557 from "the nailman of Rotheram" and in 1604 from a Carlisle hardwareman. Similarly

1. PRO, LR2/257, ff.11v, 12; PRO, E101/483/17, ff.9, 12; PRO, E101/545/16 Bks 3 & 4; PRO, E101/545/18.
glass would probably have been brought from elsewhere since it may not have been made in Carlisle.

Second, not all of the craftsmen employed were Carlisle men. Certainly some were, probably most of those working any one year. Robert Rasshall, a smith who was employed in 1584 and 1587, died locally in 1592; all three carpenters working on the castle gatehouse in 1584, and the glazier, a plumber, a smith, two lorimers and two masons who carried out various repairs between 1595 and 1602 were listed as inhabitants of the city in 1597. At times, however, considerable numbers of craftsmen were employed at once. There were 13 carpenters working at the castle in Sept. 1557, for example, and 14 masons and four wallers employed April-June 1567.2 It is very improbable that so small a town as Carlisle could provide so many specialist workmen from its own population. Some at least must have come from outside. There is support for this supposition in that in 1578, 1584 and 1587 carpenters were brought from Whalley in Lancashire to work in the city.3

In a number of ways, then, Carlisle benefited from its role as a military centre, albeit not as much as might first appear. During the Civil Wars, however, the town suffered as a result of this military function. Although many other towns which were not normally military centres were besieged or sacked, Carlisle might have escaped serious involvement in the fighting if it had not had a strong castle and defensible walls and if it had not commanded the western routes from Scotland to England. Carlisle changed hands three times, once as the outcome of a protracted siege by the Scots,

1. PRO, E101/545/16 Bks 2, 3, 4 & 5; P1592 Robt Rasshall; D/MH/I, pp.130-2.
2. PRO, E101/483/17; PRO, E101/545/15.
3. PRO, E101/545/18; PRO, E101/545/16 Bks 2 & 4.
and Scottish armies passed southwards through the county twice.\(^1\) The war had a generally bad effect on the economy of the county and the trade of the city must have suffered accordingly. In 1646 Sir Patricius Curwen complained of the "want of trade"; in 1650 two former county commissioners wrote that because of the Scottish soldiers stationed in Cumberland Ward, "lands became destitute of tillage and occupation".\(^2\) In 1649-50 the city's tolls had to be re-let as a result of the "restraint of traffic to Scotland", and in 1651 the farm of four of the tolls was "Abated in regard of ye enemies coming in to this land" by £35 of the £150 which had originally been agreed.\(^3\) The division between the nations also encouraged a resurgence of border reiving.\(^4\)

The siege, which began in Oct. 1644 and ended on 28 June 1645, had a heavy impact on Carlisle. First there was an interruption of trade with its hinterland. Second, physical destruction was extensive. The suburbs were razed. At least three houses in Finkle Street, within the walls, were demolished, presumably to create a clearer field of fire from the castle although these particular buildings belonged to a parliamentary commander.\(^5\) The city walls were not subject to a cannonade but were nevertheless in need of repair when the siege was over; the Scots garrison found the materials for these repairs and to build a guardhouse in the

---


2. M.A.E. Green, ed., *Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, etc., 1643-1660*, pp.232, 986. Both examples have the ring of special pleading and may be exaggerated.

3. Ca4/139, ff.93, 94v, 95v.

4. CSPD 1649-50, p.360.

5. Tullie, p.12; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1, ff.25, 30, 31, 83 & unfoliated memoranda at end of survey.
market-place by demolishing most of the conventual buildings.¹ Secular
buildings within the walls also suffered, but perhaps more because of
economic disruption than direct military action. Eight of 44 Dean and
Chapter houses in the city were specifically described as ruinous in 1650,
and the parliamentary survey of their property noted of the whole:

That the Burgage houses and Buildings held by Lease of the late
Deane and Chapter w(I)thin the City of Carlile are all together
very Ruinous and not Tenantable Scarse to live in.²

The people of Carlisle suffered personally. The town was starved
into surrender. Almost all the cattle in the city were consumed by mid-
April, which presumably included the townsfolk's farmstock. Horseflesh,
linseed bread, hempseed, dogs and rats were eaten. Although rationing was
introduced, malnutrition must have affected many; by June even the gentry
were underfed and laughed to see how badly their clothes now fitted them.
No epidemic was reported by the contemporary who chronicled the siege,
perhaps because the blockade took place over the winter, but the inhabitants
were weakened and plague visited the town at least twice in the following
five years.³

Finally the town suffered direct financial losses. The garrison
borrowed money from the city, and collected and melted down plate belonging
to the corporation and citizens. At first this collection was voluntary,
later the citizens money and plate were seized.⁴ A great number of

1. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1, ff.91-3; D/Lons, Thomas
Denton's History of Cumberland, p.91.
2. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1, ff.36-90 & unfoliated
memoranda at end of survey. The houses within the cathedral precincts were
not included in this total.
3. Tullie, pp.xii, 12-13, 20, 29, 43, 44; see above, Chapter Two, p.37.
4. Nanson, loc. cit., pp.49-51; Ca2/328; Tullie, pp.13-14. The Merchants' Co. gave the mayor £18-10-10 on 20 Nov. 1644, presumably to be given or
lent to the garrison. DGC4/1 f.104v. The plate was used to coin money. two
examples are in the British Museum, and copies are in Carlisle museum. See
also Tullie, p.13.
townsmen must have lost much of their liquid capital in this way. Those unlucky enough to be identified as staunch royalists also found their estates and goods sequestered. Four of them, all leading citizens, compounded for sums ranging from £13-4-8 to £153-3-4, totalling £248-4-2. Not all the money was lost from the town's economy, however. Some of the estates of the sequestered royalists were farmed by prominent Carlisle parliamentarians and substantial sums were donated by the Commonwealth authorities to pay for repairs to the cathedral and local bridges.1

The city's role as garrison town was therefore rather a mixed blessing. For long periods it was profitable, particularly for the victuallers, but even then there were the dangers of giving extended credit to soldiers. At other times the garrison was so small that it could make only a modest contribution to the city's prosperity. The Civil War severely damaged the town's economy, damage that was probably only partially made good by increased military spending in the following decade. The net effect of this military function was positive, however, and it is unlikely to have been a coincidence that the period when the population of the town is known to have fallen was also that when the military presence was at its nadir.

b. Civil Administration

Besides being the centre of the military administration of the region, Carlisle as undisputed county town was the principal centre of the civil administration. As with the military role the town gained from its civil role in a number of ways. There was no single major input into the town's economy, however, as the wages of the garrison provided. Instead the

benefits of greater demand for the townsmen's services and extra jobs were small when considered individually but taken cumulatively must have been quite substantial. How the town actually did benefit from the role can be appreciated by examining the civil administration from three angles: the local, county, administration; the national, royal, administration; and where the two strands met, the assizes.

Carlisle was a natural centre for administrative and judicial meetings. The most important of the local government officers, the sheriff, probably had relatively little to do officially with the city, but in the mid-sixteenth century, if not later, held a county court there about once a month. In 1545 this court amerced 4 or 5 people at each sitting for failing to prosecute complaints against others. These people came from all over Cumberland. Rather more important were the quarter sessions which in the second half of the seventeenth century were held in Carlisle twice a year. Between April 1669 and April 1672 the number of J.P.s attending the sessions there varied from three to 11, and was usually around six. The number of jurors recorded fluctuated between 13 and 15, many of whom were gentlemen. A considerable amount of business involving a good number of people might be heard. The Easter 1688 sessions, for example, dealt with 25 petitions and 14 indictments.

The city was also an obvious meeting-place for the J.P.s and others on less formal occasions. Thus in May and June 1622 the justices wrote to the Privy Council from the town, the May letter being signed also by the sheriff. Other county officers also used the city. The Deputy

1. PRO, E370/11/6, m.2.
2. Q1/1, Quarter Sessions Minute Bk, 1668-1695, ff.5-44. The other sessions were held at Cockermouth and Penrith.
3. Q11/7/1-25; Q11/9/1-14.
Lieutenants wrote from Carlisle to Henry Lord Clifford about the militia in 1628, and assembled there in 1640 on instructions from the Council. The Cumberland County Committee decided in 1650 to have weekly meetings in turn at Carlisle, Penrith and Cockermouth, and James Jackson of Swinsty in the parish of Holme Cultram was ordered to appear before the Commissioners for Sequestration at Carlisle twice in 1653.

The main beneficiaries of these activities must have been Carlisle's alehouse and innkeepers although other tradesmen, both craftsmen and retailer, would have gained from the number of extra potential customers brought into the town. All the gentlemen attending these meetings would have been accompanied by servants and perhaps members of their families. They, the litigants, witnesses and petitioners, and all their horses, would have to be fed and accommodated. The charges of Charles Howard of Naworth and his attendants at the sessions of Jan. 1652, for example, were £6-10-6, with a further 10s. "Given to the servants of the Inne". For want of alternative venues the meetings and possibly also the sessions courts themselves would have been held in the town's inns.

Carlisle gained also from other facets of the county's government. The town was the site of the county's gaol and house of correction. The gaol was in the castle during the middle ages, but was moved to the citadel in the early seventeenth century. Although the citadel was repaired by the government in 1604-5, it was already in a bad state in 1611.

1. CSPD 1628-9, p.374; CSPD 1640, p.331.
it were highly unpleasant in 1653; in 1686 the prisoners in the close gaol petitioned the magistrates because they had no shelter. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the county ever spent much on maintaining it. At the 1684 assizes Judge Jefferies ordered the county to provide a better gaol. A site was purchased c.1686 to house both the gaol and the house of correction, but the new structure, a substantial building with 14 rooms for prisoners, does not appear to have been built until after 1688.¹ A "correction house", presumably the county bridewell, was mentioned in the Chamberlains' Accounts for 1614 and the house of correction was certainly in existence by 1667. Its location is uncertain but was probably in Carlisle.²

The county employed a few townsmen. Both the two institutions had salaried officers, the salary of the Master of the House of Correction being £15 a year in 1697. The gaoler's pay would certainly have been supplemented by fees charged the prisoners. There must have been junior officers also, although the county was miserly about providing them: in 1688 the debtors in the gaol petitioned for the appointment of a turnkey during the daytime so victuals could be delivered to them.³ The prisoners' food was probably mostly bought in Carlisle. Their numbers fluctuated, but in the late seventeenth century seem rarely to have fallen much below 10 or risen much over 25, although the county supported 31 prisoners in Oct. 1699.⁴ Some prisoners, perhaps the majority, were supported from the

2. Ca4/2; Q1/1, f.11
4. No source has been found which gives unambiguously both the number of felons and debtors. Minimum numbers can be calculated from the Gaol Book of 1665-1676, PRO, ASSI42/2, which gives the number of prisoners at gaol deliveries, and from petitions to the Quarter Sessions for the relief of pauper prisoners, Q11/2-74, passim.
public purse, but those in gaol were allowed only 6d. a week each, so the total rarely exceeded £30 a year. This money was usually paid to the gaoler and to the Master of the House of Correction, but on at least one occasion was given directly to the Carlisle widow who had supplied the bread.

Finally there were other county officials resident in the town: Edw. Lowry was High Constable in 1672; James Nicholson oversaw the repairs to the Eden, Priestbeck, Petteril and Caldew bridges in the 1690's; from 1662 there was always a booker to record details of stolen animals. These last two were part-time rather than full-time tasks.

The activities of central government also provided a number of extra jobs for Carlisle people, or paid the salaries of outsiders brought in to work in the town. A few of these, such as the Excise officers, appeared only in the last part of the period and were present also in other towns in the region. Other posts were established earlier and were more particular to the city. The customs provided one such set of jobs. From 1483 all goods entering England from Scotland were supposed to be brought to Carlisle or Berwick to be searched and customs duties paid. Orders to that effect were reissued in 1583, 1601 and 1674 since the instruction was being flouted, and in 1660 the customer reported that he was having difficulty in settling the receiving of customs at Carlisle, "they being so long discontinued". Nevertheless surviving customs accounts suggest that as a result a considerable amount of trade was passing through the town which otherwise might not have done.

1. For example the petitions to the Quarter Sessions: Q11/17/27, Q11/26/18, Q11/28/1, Q11/35/1 & 2; Q11/7/5.
2. D/MH II, f.163; Q11/45/4, Q11/58/16, Q11/65/3; CRO, Calendar of Cumberland Quarter Sessions Petitions, Q11, passim. There appear to have been bookers in every market centre.
3. Information courtesy of Dr H. Summerson; APC ns 32, pp.400-1; BL, Sloane Ms 2725, f.9; CSPD 1660-1, p.353.
4. PRO, E190/1448/1 & 10.
After the Restoration (if not before) the crown maintained a custom house at Carlisle. It was staffed by a comptroller and a customer, together with a collector, a surveyor and 4 waiters and searchers. One of the latter was based at Bowness; one or two of the others may also have worked outside the city. By 1688 the officers' salaries had been supplemented to raise them above the standard rates. The collector and surveyor each received £50 p.a., one of the waiters and searchers £30 and the others £25. They also received fees for goods searched. Contemporaries clearly thought the offices valuable and were prepared to compete for them. Nevertheless they were still sometimes, if not usually, held in conjunction with some secondary employment. Richard Eaglesfield, Collector of the Customs at Carlisle in 1698 and earlier a deputy searcher, was a maltster. When he was ordered to quit the trade it was thought to be "a certainty not to be parted with", possibly more profitable than his office. Earlier a searcher, Thos Addison, had left his place rather than give up trading. Before the Civil War control of customs officers may have been laxer and the profits of their places were not always pumped into the town's economy. In 1599, for example, the customer was not resident in Carlisle and in 1623 Richard Graham, a courtier, was appointed to the office with permission to execute it by deputy in his absence at court.

Another government job was that of postmaster. As with places in

1. BL, Sloane Ms 2725, f.53v.
2. CSPD 1660-1, p.187; BL, Sloane Ms 2725, ff.74v-75r, 94r, 213r, 234r, 237r.
3. BL, Sloane Ms 2725, ff.70-76.
the custom house, this too was worth competing for. One applicant in 1667 was willing to pay £20 for the place.¹ The previous postmaster, John Pattinson, paid a fine of £30 on the expectation of a salary of £40 p.a., but at first, at least, was disappointed.² Nevertheless his widow Mary, described as a poor woman, sought to continue in the place.³ John Pattinson, described in both his will and inventory as "gent", was a notary, town clerk and also a farmer.⁴ His place as postmaster was only a sideline and perhaps not a very profitable one. Thomas Tallentyer, who died in Dec. 1578 or Jan. 1579, can also be identified as postmaster. He too was a notary and a farmer, and was registrar of the Dean and Chapter. In his case, too, being postmaster was merely a supplementary source of income.⁵

Lastly, the city was a logical meeting-place for government commissions and judicial proceedings. Thus in 1569 when the Justices of Assize met the Earl of Sussex to execute a commission of Oyer and Terminer on enclosure rioters in the Forest of Westward, it was at Carlisle that they sat.⁶ In 1574 the Council of the North received reiteration of the instruction of 1561 that it was to sit for 8 days a year at Carlisle. In 1568 no sittings had been held in the town or in Newcastle for three or four years, however, and it seems unlikely that the council sat in Carlisle again.

1. CSPD 1667, pp.44, 52.
2. CSPD 1661-2, pp.119, 122.
3. CSPD 1667, pp.20, 127.
4. P1667 John Pattinson; CRO, Mrs Beatte's Indices to the Carlisle City Court Books, 1630-9; CSPD 1666-7, p.436. Pattinson names his wife as Mary in his will dated 11 Dec. 1666; his inventory was made on 26 Dec. 1666. Pattinson the town clerk died on 16 Dec. John Pattinson was a common name in Carlisle, but the coincidence of names and dates is so strong that they must refer to the same man.
5. P1578 Thos Tallentyer; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Carlisle Chapter Register II, Thos Tallentyre's Reg., f.164. Although he was not described as postmaster he was owed £9 "behind of his poost wages", and owned a postbag, a post horn and "thre mailipilyons".
6. CSPD Addenda 1566-79, p.82.
A conflict of authority with the warden may have been one reason, but there was little business there anyway. "To haue one of the three sittyngs of York ouse in the yeare to be keapt in Carlyell" was another of the requests made to James I by the Merchants' Gild in 1617.

The most important judicial proceeding and a particularly important contact point between the central and local administrations, was the assizes. In Cumberland the assizes were held once a year, usually in Aug. and always in Carlisle. They brought a great concourse to the town.

By the mid-seventeenth century, if not before, the importance of the assizes was stressed by complex ceremonial. The sheriff's duties were outlined in memoranda written in 1661 and 1662. Accompanied by an honour-guard of county gentry and liveried retainers, he had to meet the judges at the county boundary and convoy them to the city. Besides ensuring the paperwork for the trials was done correctly, he had to arrange accommodation for the judges and their retinue in local inns, provide a room for the grand jury, supply candles, obtain the daggers worth 2s. 6d. each customarily given the judges and their staff (18 were needed in 1661) together with a pair of white gloves if it were a maiden assize, find a cleric to administer the book to those who claimed benefit of clergy, and employ at least 4 bailiffs to guard prisoners and with the undersheriff precede the judges on their way to and from the church and courtrooms. He also had to outfit and provision a "Lordly like house" for himself, since on the first day he was expected to entertain to dinner the judges, all the J.P.s, the Clerk of the Assizes, some or all of the Grand Jury and perhaps some of his friends and acquaintances, on the second to dine the "whole Council" serving the court, and on the day the judges left to dine the mayor, aldermen, "other select persons of the

In 1695 the conclusion of the assizes was marked by cannonfire.²

The expense of all this was prodigious. Sir John Lowther reckoned he spent in 1662 "in Provision for the housekeepinge at the Assises in Wine Beare Beefe Mutton Breade Wheate guifts for presents above £120", besides £60 in household goods such as linen and brass bought over the whole year of his shrievalty.³ John Lamplugh, Esq., sheriff in 1664, laid in for assize week: 10 hogsheads of beer, two runlets and three dozen bottles of sack, a butt of white wine, a runlet of claret and two firkins of ale. Similar quantities were got in by Wm Orfeur 11 years later.⁴ This aspect of the assizes was certainly much the same as in the sixteenth century when the sheriffs were expected to find the whole cost of board and lodging for the justices and their staff.⁵ Richard Lowther's estimate of the cost of the assizes for his shrievalty in 1567 was over £67. Carlisle was not to receive the full benefit of this expenditure, however: oxen, sheep, malt, wheat, wildfowl and chickens were all to be provided from his estates or from the countryside, wine was to be purchased at Newcastle and spices in London, only calves and kids, and some household equipment, were to be bought at Carlisle.⁶

1. D/Lons/Box 245, Sir Daniel Fleming, Sheriff of Cumberland, Register 1660-1661, pp.115-8, & papers marked 'Shrievalty re assizes 1662'. Sir John Lowther was sheriff the following year and the memoranda are among the Lowther family papers. Substantial extracts from these documents are printed in J.S. Cockburn, A History of English Assizes 1558-1714, Cambridge 1972, pp.297-302.


5. Cockburn, op. cit., pp.54-5.

6. D/Lons Box 245, loose paper endorsed 'The Justice Diet 1567'. The expenditure at the Carlisle assizes does not appear to have been unusually extravagant. See the accounts for assizes in Norfolk and Suffolk, 1564, printed in Cockburn, op. cit., pp.294-6.
Naturally the assizes attracted numbers of litigants who needed food, accommodation and lawyers. In 1600, for example, Walter Graham of Netherby was sued by his tenants of Stonethwaite and Watendlath because he was trying to sell the woods there to the Company of Mines Royal. Presumably the tenants would have sent several representatives even if they did not most of them come in person. There were also the criminal trials, such as those for witchcraft, barratry, selling coin clippings and burglary heard in 1684. The latter case, the trial of William and Henry Smorthwait, involved eight witnesses.

Perhaps more important, however, was the gathering of the local gentry, the 'county community', at the assizes. According to Prof. Everitt:

Owing to the congregation of gentry in Maidstone and Canterbury at such times, the assizes had come to resemble a kind of informal county 'parliament' in this period [c.1640]; the verdict of the Grand Jury on political matters was regarded as the decisive 'voice' of the county. A similar development had taken place in other shires by this date, but it was more clearly marked in Kent than in some other parts.

Evidence of such a development in Cumberland before the Restoration is sketchy but suggests it was taking place. In 1568 a riot took place amongst gentlemen attending the assizes. In 1584 the warden asked "the gentlemen of the county present at [the] last assizes" their opinions about the state of the area. By 1665 so many Cumberland gentry came to the assizes that the Norroy King of Arms could threaten to pull down or deface Sir Patricius


5. CBP I, no.256.
Curwen's hatchments, if they were wrong, "in the face of the country".¹ The
Howards, the local aristocratic family, frequently were there also throughout
the seventeenth century.² Certainly large numbers of gentry would attend
the assizes by reason of their offices as J.P.s, to occupy a place on the
Grand Jury, or perhaps as litigants, but many others came as well.

The presence of the local gentry in large numbers would have
encouraged the development of social events. In 1731, for example, on the
evening of the first day the judges sat a ball was held in the castle
attended by most of the gentlemen and ladies in the county, about 300.³

Horse-racing had been known in the town from about 1550 if not before, both
privately and publically. A race on Carlisle sands in the sixteenth century
between horses belonging to a citizen and an outsider ended in accusations
of cheating and a suit in Chancery; two sixteenth century race bells in
Carlisle museum are "the earliest known racing plate in Britain".⁴ The
citizens were certainly aware of the potential benefits of attracting people
to the town for social purposes. In 1619 the court leet jury called on the
mayor and his brethren to provide a silver-gilt cup as a prize.⁵ The
corporation provided plate for horse-race prizes throughout the seventeenth
century, although the decision to do so was often controversial. Plates were
also provided or subsidised by the gilds. In the late seventeenth century

1. CSPD 1664-5, p.272.
2. G. Ornsby, ed., Selections from the household books of the Lord William
Howard of Naworth Castle, Surtees Soc., 68, Durham 1878, pp.9, 52-3, 95, 130,
182, 197, 209; CSPD 1667, pp.409-10; CSPD 1675, pp.268-9.
3. W.A.J. Prevost, ed., 'A journie to Carlyle and Penrith in 1731', CW2, 61,
4. PRO, C1/1209/35 & 36, (I owe this reference to Dr H. Summerson); G.H.
5. Ca3/2/2.
plates were also given for cock-fighting. These civic-sponsored sports were generally held in Whit Week or in early June, however. Although some tailors found it worthwhile to employ extra journeymen in assize time to cope with the trade brought by the congregation of gentry, there is no evidence to indicate the establishment before 1700 of a social season in Carlisle associated with assize week.2

Those in Carlisle who gained most from the town’s role as an administrative centre were probably the victualling trades, and in particular the alehouse and innkeepers. They benefited from the dramatic if episodic increase in custom when the courts sat, the regular passage of traders through the town going to the custom house and the less regular visits of gentry and aristocrats on official business. Other tradesmen found extra custom, but not to the same extent. A few jobs in local and national government service were created, but even these were often only part-time. They did not represent a major source of employment.

c. Ecclesiastical Administration

Carlisle’s third administrative role was as the centre of the diocese. As cathedral city, Carlisle housed not only the cathedral itself and its staff, but also the central diocesan courts. As with the other administrative roles, the townsmen benefited in a number of ways: by supplying the needs of the clergy and their households; by maintaining the ecclesiastical

1. Ca3/2/10; Ca2/13 nos 4, 18, 25, 44, 59 & 62; D/Lons/L 1786 Election, Tailors’ Gild Minute Bk 1659–1703, n.p. sub 28 Mar. 1665; D/Lons/L 1786 Election, Weavers’ Gild Bk no. 1, n.p. sub 5 May 1662. The horse races were usually held on Kingmoor.

buildings; by serving the courts and servicing those who came to them; through the clergy as patrons. As before, however, the benefits were not as great as might have been expected. One theme of Prof. Dobson's article on the cathedrals and cathedral cities of the northern province in the fifteenth century was that Carlisle gained least of the three towns from the presence of its cathedral priory.¹ The picture was very much the same in the early-modern period.

The principal figure in the ecclesiastical hierarchy was, of course, the bishop. He had a house in the city, but his principal residence was Rose Castle, 6½ miles to the south. He stayed there most of the time he spent in the county in the late seventeenth century and probably earlier also.² Although the bishops were important political figures in Carlisle, their economic relationships with the town were probably no greater than those of neighbouring gentry or aristocratic households such as that of the Howards of Naworth.³

The Dean and Chapter were rather more closely associated with the town. Carlisle was a poorly endowed cathedral and it had only four prebendaries. This was a small number compared with the 24 in Exeter or the 12 in Winchester.⁴ The dean and the prebendaries were the most highly paid members of the cathedral establishment, and were those best placed to

---

² CSPD 1601-3 & Addenda 1547-65, p.360; E. Sandford, A Cursory Relation of all the Antiquities and Families in Cumberland, c.1675, ed. R.S. Ferguson, CWAAS Tract no.4, Kendal 1890, p.46.
³ See above, Chapter Three, p.58.
exploit the cathedral revenues. Indeed it was possible for churchmen of this level of the hierarchy to become quite rich. Before the Civil War they occupied sets of lodgings in the conventual buildings. After the Restoration they had their own houses. Nevertheless their household expenditure did not represent a very significant input into the city's economy because they were often away. Most if not all the prebendaries held livings elsewhere. Edward Mytchell, for example, who held the second stall and died in 1565, was vicar of Aspatria and rector of Rothbury in Northumberland; Richard Wallis alias Brandlinge, who held the fourth stall and died in 1571, was vicar of Thursby; Hugh Todd, collated to the same stall in 1685, was vicar of Penrith and rector of Arthuret. The same is true of the deans. Thomas Musgrave, dean 1664-6 and earlier both prebendary and archdeacon, was also prebendary of Durham Cathedral where he was buried in the latter year. Two of the early deans served Queen Elizabeth as secretaries. Naturally the Dean and Chapter were often away from the city attending to their legitimate duties, but it would appear too that they were not always in Carlisle as often as they should have been. A visitation in 1585 discovered that only two of the prebendaries had kept residence since the previous visitation (by inference at least two years previously), and that one of these two had failed to do so the previous year. It was ordered that at least one prebendary should be resident and "keep


3. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Carlisle Chapter Register II, Thos Tallentyre's Reg., f.101; P1566 Edw. Mytchell. These lodgings were suites of rooms, three of the 5 including kitchens. Browne Willis, a Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, Man etc., London 1727, p.287.

hospitality" in the precinct at all times.¹ More important, therefore, was the Dean and Chapter's role as an employer. The foundation charter of 1542 set the cathedral establishment at 44 officers, including the dean and prebendaries. Later evidence shows that it was maintained at about that level. The 1585 visitation named 47 men on the foundation including "all inferiour officers". In 1677 the chapter paid salaries to 42 men, counting themselves. The staff included eight minor canons, four or six lay clerks or singingmen, six choristers, a schoolmaster, six, later nine almsmen, a cook and under-cook, porter, plumber, glazier and slater, a barber, sacristans, and a deacon and subdeacon.² A staff of around 45 persons of whom six were choirboys was probably not large compared with those of other cathedrals. Carlisle was a smaller place than most cities, however. It is likely that those directly salaried by the cathedral comprised about seven per cent of all householders in the town, a fair-sized proportion.³

The benefit to the town's economy from the chapter's role as employer was not straightforward. Many of the salaries paid were low, and certainly by the 1670s insufficient to support a family in any comfort. The pettycanons, the best paid cathedral staff after the prebendaries, were given only £8 p.a. in 1677. As a result, by that date many of the offices were held in plural. John How, a minor canon, was also Master of the Choristers, Organist and 'curandis libris'; Robert Edmundson was minor canon and schoolmaster; John Pattinson, lay clerk, was also precentor and a subsacrist.⁴ This was one reason why the number of men on the cathedral

1. DRC 3/52.


3. If the almsmen are not counted as householders, then those salaried by the cathedral made up about six per cent.

establishment in 1677 was smaller than it had been in 1585 even though it
included three more almsmen. In some offices the salaries were supplemented
by fees. When Edward Alburgh was appointed subsacristan or bellringer in
1571 he was to receive a salary of £3-6-8 p.a. and half the profits of
office.¹ But most of the posts were, presumably, only part-time: the
plumber and the glazier in 1677 were each paid only £5, or not quite 4d. a
day, far too low a rate for them to have been full-time employees.²

Further qualifications should be made. As with the Dean and
Chapter, in the sixteenth century if not later the other officers were not
always resident. At the 1585 visitation one of the singingmen was absent
and was ordered to return within the next four months or to provide a
deputy, and a pettycanon who lived in the country was to return and exercise
his office personally.³ The Dean and Chapter also held the livings of the
two city parishes, the services of one of which were held in the cathedral
nave. Instead of providing vicars to serve them, the work was done by
curates who were members of the cathedral staff. In 1677 these were two of
the minor canons.⁴

Besides employing the permanent salaried staff discussed above,
the Dean and Chapter provided temporary work for a number of people in
building and maintenance. Little is known of such work before the
Restoration, but afterwards it was quite extensive. The houses in the close
were largely in ruins in 1650; those of the 4 prebendaries and two for the
minor canons were rebuilt. The dean's house was substantially enlarged by

1. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Carlisle Chapter Register II, Thos
Tallentyre's Reg., f.95.
2. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Books vol.1, 1677-1690,
p.13.
3. DRC 3/52.
4. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Books vol.1, 1677-1690,
pp.3, 4, 6, 21
Thomas Smith. A new registry was constructed in 1699. Even when no major new work was undertaken, maintenance employed a fair number of people. From Jan. to Nov. 1677, £82-16-11 was spent on repairs, the largest operations being ceiling the roof of the choir, which cost £17-6-8, and flagging the "church alleys", which cost £16-16-4. At least 15 men were employed at various times over this 11 months.

As well as being the most important single employer in the city, the Dean and Chapter were also the largest property-owner. In 1650 they owned over 50 properties outside the cathedral close, including shops. In 1679 they held 36 freehold tenements of a total in the own of 239 freehold and 61 customary properties. Some of these 36 were probably subdivided and occupied by two or more families. Besides this urban housing the cathedral was endowed with very substantial amounts of farmland immediately adjacent to the city: the manors of St John de Capello and Botchergate. The importance of the urban property to Carlisle's inhabitants is obvious. Agricultural land was also vital to the city's economy as a whole, and to the livings of very many individual townsfolk, as will be discussed in the following section. The Dean and Chapter's muniments record many leases of farmland to townsmen, often in association with urban tenements. The chapter therefore played an influential role in the lives of many Carlisle people.

The patronage of the Dean and Chapter was, then, very important.

1. Browne Willis, Survey, pp.287, 301; D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.91; N. Pevsner, Cumberland and Westmorland, 1967, p.95. Both buildings are still standing.
2. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Books vol.I, 1677-1690, p.23 & loose leaf. This may, of course, have been an exceptional year.
3. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1, ff.36-90.
4. Ca3/3/29, n.p. sub 1679. The total of 61 customary properties excludes the eight chambers used as gildhalls.
5. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.93.
When in 1704 they decided not to renew leaseholds held of the church by any member of the corporation, in view of the "evil consequences" of this and other actions the common council sent the Recorder and two aldermen to patch up the quarrel. Certainly if the property had been owned by others it would still have been let to townsmen, but the Chapter would consider other factors than the economic when granting leases and could be expected often to give them on easier terms than would most landlords. For example in 1675 Widow Guy, since she was a poor widow, was allowed to renew a lease of two acres in Spittle Dubb for only £1-10-0. In 1689 the fine paid by Thomas Pattison, a weaver, for 2 acres at Stone Cross Gate, near Carlisle, was set deliberately low, he being "a poor man brother to Mr Pattison ye Proctor who came with him". 5 years later the lease of a housestead near the castle which had lain waste for several years was renewed without a fine since the lessee "intended to erect a manufacture for employing ye poor".2

The Chapter also had a valuable source of potential patronage in tithes. It was well endowed with tithes, more so than any secular landowners would have been. Besides leasing its lands and houses the Chapter also leased the right to collect these tithes. The lessees could find their leases very profitable. Sir Christopher Musgrave's lease of Carlisle Field tithes was in 1688 said to be worth £100 p.a.; John Thompson had a lease of "St Cuthbertes tyeth" valued at £40 in 1573; Symond Wilson, a merchant who died in 1587, left a claim to a lease of the tithe corn of Stanwix, Cummersdale and Brownelston valued at £150 if it could be recovered

1. Ca2/2, f.49.
2. D/MH/Lease Book 1672-1707, p.64.
at law. A dispute over one such lease led to violence in 1590. Table 4.6, below, shows that many inhabitants of Carlisle were granted leases of tithes in the vicinity of the city.

Finally, as the cathedral city, Carlisle was the centre of the diocesan administration, and this role benefited the town in two ways. First meetings of the bishopric's clergy were held there, thus bringing visitors to Carlisle. Twenty-seven clergymen, curates and parish clerks attended a general chapter held in the cathedral in Jan. 1574, for example. At least 83 clergy besides the cathedral staff met at a synod held there the following April, and another synod was held in Sept.

Second, most of the diocese's legal business was dealt with in Carlisle. "In his [the bishop's] Ecclesiastical or Consistory Court, he hath one Chancellor, one Register, 4 Proctors, 1 Aparator generall, & four Deputies, one for each Deanerie". Here was employment for a number of lawyers as well as other officials. The bishop's registrar in the 1570's, Barnard Aglionby, was a notary who lived in Carlisle, as did George Tully, registrar in the early seventeenth century. Edward Southaike, who died in 1613, left a double ruff band to his friend and fellow proctor Thomas Gibson, a notary who died in 1618. Both must have worked in this court. If the fees charged were anything like those described by Christopher Hill in *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, then the income

1. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.93; P1573 John Thompson; P1587 Symond Willson. The valuation of Musgrave's lease was possibly an exaggeration: it was valued at £80 when it was renewed in 1682 and £75 at renewal in 1695. D/MH/Lease Book 1672-1707, pp.17, 53.
2. PRO, STAC5/559/1 m.2. I owe this reference to Dr H. Summerson.
5. DRC3/2, passim; P1579 Barnard Aglionby; PRO, C3/416/146.
generated must have been considerable even though the see was sparsely populated.1 Matters dealt with by the court are known to have included suits over testamentary matters and tithes.2 A deposition book dating from 1663-1684 concerned, among others, suits over a handfast marriage, defamation, tithes and Wreay chapel stock. This book suggests that it was common for three or four witnesses to attend a hearing besides the parties involved.3 The courts themselves appear to have usually been held in the cathedral.4

Not all the judicial and legal business of the see was carried out at Carlisle, however. The commissioners to determine ecclesiastical causes in the diocese appointed by Elizabeth I, who included the lord warden and two prebendaries as well as the bishop, conducted their business also at Rose Castle and Carlisle Castle.5 Presumably their jurisdiction overlapped with that of the consistory court, certainly some of the same officers attended meetings of both. The late seventeenth century probate act book shows that granting of probate took place at a number of places rather than just centrally at Carlisle. In 1663 (old style) 89 probate acts were made at nine visits to Torpenhow, 66 at nine visits to Penrith, 44 at 10 visits to Appleby and four at the single visit to Wigton. In previous years probate acts had also been granted at Ireby and Keswick. These places were presumably acting as regional centres. The largest number of acts, however, 110, were granted at Carlisle, where 42 sittings took place.6

3. DRC 3/49.
5. DRC 3/1.
The advantages of being a cathedral city, then, were very considerable. Although the numbers employed directly and permanently were neither large nor highly paid, and some may have spent their income elsewhere, they were a significant proportion of the city's population. Occasional employment on maintenance and building work benefited still more townspeople, and the presence in the city of the principal church courts of the diocese brought not only increased numbers of visitors, but employment for at least five lawyers plus subordinate officials. Moreover the chapter had a wealth of patronage at its disposal. In one of these ways or another the presence of the church in Carlisle must have touched directly the lives of very many of the town's inhabitants.

d. The Economic Structure of Carlisle

The previous three sections of this chapter examined Carlisle's more unique functions. They suggested that opportunities in the town for making a living from victualling and the law should have been particularly good, even if the trade of the building crafts would not have been much enhanced. To test these hypotheses and to answer the other questions posed in the introduction to the chapter, namely whether Carlisle had any sort of specialist manufacturing role or other leading economic activity, the occupational structure of the town must be described.

Most recent work on urban economies has adopted a quantitative approach to occupational structure. Such an approach permits an estimate

of the relative importance of employment in the various sectors of a town's economy, allowing identification of particularly important trades. It also facilitates comparison between towns, although most historians have adopted classification schemes slightly different from those used by others. These advantages are so valuable that it will be exploited here. As Dr Patten has pointed out, however, economic activity before industrialisation was essentially individual and highly varied. Moreover, status descriptions were often used imprecisely in the early-modern period and the same occupational label may describe individuals of widely differing economic role. A merchant, for example, may be a shopkeeper or a trader of regional or international importance. Any attempt to quantify the activities of a group of people is bound to produce a distorted picture.

Two sources would seem to provide occupational information about Carlisle people for long periods of the 150 years being studied. These are the Freemen's Register and probate records. Freemen's registers are a commonly used source for exploring the economic structure of early-modern corporate towns. Their disadvantages include that they ignore two large sections of the labour force, women and the unfree. They cannot show, therefore, the real proportions of people engaged in various occupations, but only of the master craftsmen and, in some towns, most of the journeymen. Certain occupational groups such as labourers, and casual work such as marketing and washing, are particularly badly under-represented. These drawbacks are shared by most other sources, however.

The Carlisle Freemen's Register presents particular problems in interpretation. The book, a small notebook, records entries to the

1. Patten, loc. cit., p.296.
2. Ca2/27.
freedom from 1612. Judging from the handwriting it was first compiled in 1661 and earlier entries were transcribed from another source. There are occasional gaps in these early decades which suggest that the transcriber was unable to find admission records for every year, but some of the lacunae in the 1620's can be filled from notes in the Chamberlain's Accounts. A corner of the book has been damaged by damp and a few more names have been lost in that way. The most important problem, however, is that in most decades about a fifth of the freemen are not described by occupation, and in the years 1631-70 this proportion rises to 80 per cent or more. For this reason Table 4.3 shows admissions to the freedom only for the years 1612-1630 and 1671-1700.

Most of those admitted came from one of only eight occupations, the eight after which the city's gilds were named. The Freemen's Register must have recorded the new freemen's gilds rather than their actual occupations and it is not, therefore, a clear guide to the occupational structure of the town. Nevertheless it can be taken as a rough indicator of change in the occupational structure as although not every gild member followed the trade from which his fraternity took its name, the gild records show that the majority probably did, certainly the majority of those actually trading.²

1. Ca4/2.
2. See below, Chapter Nine, pp. 306-7.
Table 4.3 Admissions to the Freedom of Carlisle, 1612-1700

A. Numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Occupation'</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Occupation'</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
<th>1612-1621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent.</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others²</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ca2/27.
2. 3 clerks, 1 glazier, 1 labourer, 1 scholar, 1 gaoler and 6 army officers, admitted in 1688.

The table suggests an economy in which the leather crafts played a leading role. Gentlemen took up the freedom in surprising numbers, but it is likely that some of these were actually lawyers rather than local landowners. Over the course of the century the Tanners' Company suffered a dramatic loss of popularity, the numbers of new freemen from this gild...
falling both absolutely and relative to other gilds. From the highest ranking company it fell to lying equal sixth. Its position as most popular gild was taken by the Butchers' Company. The other two leading gilds remained those representing the leather trades, but all the other companies made striking increases in the numbers of their members taking up the freedom, especially the less prosperous crafts of the weavers and tailors. Since comparison of gild membership with the Freemen's Register shows that it was usual for a new gildsman to take up the freedom soon after entering the gild, the figures indicate growing membership of the gilds concerned. Although the town's economy remained biased towards the leather trade, this bias was decreasing and tanning in particular was becoming less important.

The second source for studying the town's occupational structure which covers most of the period under study is probate records. As with freemen's registers, probate records are not an ideal source for recovering occupational structures. The richer townsfolk were more likely to have left a will or an inventory than were the poorer, so some occupational groups, such as labourers, are very under-represented, while others, such as merchants, are over-represented. No married women at all left wills and women's occupations were never specified although they can sometimes be deduced. The occupation of the testator was not always given. There is also always the danger when comparing samples of probate records over long periods of time or between communities that fashions in will making may differ, that, for example, a larger proportion of the poorer craftsmen may have made wills at one date than another. Nevertheless two urban historians have concluded that probate records are as accurate a means of recovering the occupational structure of a town as freemen's rolls, and for many places they are the best available source. For Carlisle they give a wider range of

occupations than the Freemen's Register, and also cover a longer period.

To make understanding of the probate evidence easier the occupations recorded can be grouped. The results of such a grouping are presented in Table 4.4. The rationale behind this choice of categories is explained in Appendix Three, where Tables A3.1 and A3.2 show the data in full, but some further comments should be made about the way the table was constructed before discussion of what it reveals. First, unfortunately not all the wills and inventories of people living in Carlisle's two parishes proved before 1640 state whether or not the deceased lived in the town or surrounding settlements. Part A. of the table shows the information known about those definitely living in the town, part B. shows that about those who might or might not have been townsmen. Since probate records for those known to have lived in the countryside included very few craftsmen, the great majority of those whose occupations were clear must have lived in the town. Second, when a man was described by status as well as by occupation, i.e. as gentleman and merchant like Wm Browne was in 1615, he has been tabulated under his occupation alone. Third, if a man's occupation was not stated then where possible it has been deduced from the contents of his will or inventory. Approximately 14 per cent of the men recorded before 1620 have occupations ascribed to them in this way and six per cent of those recorded after. The danger of this approach is that the number of men counted in occupations whose trade goods and tools are very obvious in inventories, like tanner or weaver, will be boosted more than the number in occupations whose tools were inexpensive and may have escaped valuation, such as tailor. The very high proportion of those who have no known occupation can be significantly reduced in this way, however, which is important because many of that group were probably full-time farmers. Table

1. P1615 Wm Browne.
A3.3 in Appendix Three shows the occupational structure of the town using only the occupations actually stated.

The probate records confirm the picture suggested by the Freemen's Register of an economy where leather crafts played a leading role, but their pre-eminence was being eroded. Cloth was made by a small number of craftsmen, but since only one of the textile workers, John Love, was a dyer, the town was not a finishing centre of any significance. The clothing trades, here represented only by tailors, seem to have been insignificant. This is surprising in view of what an essential set of occupations they were, one of three identified by Hoskins as such. Of all the crafts their numbers in particular were under-recorded, however, largely due to the relative poverty of the occupation. The same phenomenon can be seen in other studies of urban occupational structure based on probate material, whereas freemen's registers usually give them more importance.

Metalworkers were not very numerous, reflecting the lack of any local advantage which might have given the trade regional importance. Building workers and woodworkers also made up a small proportion of the town's workforce, moreover it should be noted that a majority of those described as woodworkers have been deduced to be such because of the presence of unusual quantities of woodworking tools in their inventories. Two factors may explain the low number of building workers. First only a limited amount of new building seems to have taken place in the town before c. 1680 and, second, clay was the predominant building material in the neighbourhood of Carlisle, and needed no formally-trained craftsmen in its use.

1. P1607 Jn Love.
4. See Chapters One and Seven, pp.24-5.
Three of the occupational groups were particularly related to the functions of the town discussed in the previous three sections: Food and

Table 4.4 Occupations from Carlisle Probate Records, 1564-1700

A. Known townsmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1564-1620</th>
<th></th>
<th>1621-1700</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Woodwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Uncertain if testators lived in the town or adjacent countryside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1564-1620</th>
<th></th>
<th>1621-1700</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Woodwork</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture¹</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 6 yeomen, 1 husbandman
Drink, Professional and Gentlemen. The numbers of probate records for the
first group is surprisingly low, not at all swollen by the need to meet the
demands of the numerous visitors to the city or victual the garrison. Closer
examination of the figures, broken down by actual occupation in Tables A3.1
and A3.2, suggests that apparently no inn or alehousekeeper left a will and
only one tavernkeeper, Christopher Slee, did so. Even he can only be
identified as such since he owned a wine cellar and requested that his wife
get a licence to draw wine. The term 'innkeeper' appears only once in a
Carlisle document, and 'vintner' is used only by outsiders. There were,
however, substantial numbers of inns and alehouses in the city: 12 of the
former, 60 of the latter, and three taverns in a survey of 1577, or around
one in six of the households in the town at that date. Alehousekeeping was
presumably usually a part-time occupation, perhaps only followed by most
practitioners during times of high demand such as market days, and probably it
was an activity undertaken largely by the women of a household. The civic
ordinance restricting brewing and baking for sale to freemen, their wives and
servants would have encouraged such developments.

The other two branches of the drink trade needed more capital and
should have had a higher profile in the records. Innkeeping may also have
been part-time, however. Certainly those practising it are disguised in the
probate records by other occupational names; they cannot, of course, be
identified from probate inventories with any confidence since the goods
required were indistinguishable from those of any large household. It has
been possible to identify a number of tavernkeepers in the period before
1620, however, through references to wine and winecellars in their

1. P1624 Chris Slee.
2. Ca3/2/1; PRO, E176/3/21.
3. PRO, SP12/117/83.
4. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of the City of
Carlisle, CWAAS Extra Series, IV, Carlisle 1887, p.69.
inventories and the names of those fined for breaking price regulations. One of these men was not given an occupation in his inventory, but three others were described as merchants although they owned none of the stock usually associated with merchants in Carlisle. One at least was a member of the Merchants' Company, as was Christopher Slee. All were presumably described by their gild in their wills and inventories rather than their actual occupation. The occupational data analysed in Table 4.4, like that from the Freemen's Register, does contain some conventional descriptions, therefore.

The other victualling trade which seems to be under-represented in Table A3.1 is the bakers. This trade too was affected by the civic ordinance noted above, and the actual work may have been done by women — wives and servants. Four of the five keepers of common bakehouses amerced in 1629 for taking excessive dues were male, however. Only two bakers appear in Table A3.1, both of whom have been identified from mentions of bakehouses in their wills and neither having another known occupation. There were also a number of others who had other occupations, but bakers do seem to have been genuinely few in the city. A survey made in 1640 found only five ovens there, although 103 inhabitants had brewing leads.

The 'professional' category in Table 4.4 includes the town's clergymen. Not surprisingly in view of the numbers of cathedral clergy noted above this group was quite numerous, bigger than some of the less important crafts. Even without the clergy, however, the professional sector was substantial for such a small place. Six lawyers can be identified before

1. P1571 Anth Rompney; P1573 Wm Talentyer; P1586 Jas Broadrigge; P1598 Thos Monke; PRO, E176/3/21; R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of the City of Carlisle, CWAAS Extra Series, IV, Carlisle 1887, p.89.
3. PRO, SP16/444/2411.
1620, more than in the larger county town of Warwick and perhaps as many as Dyer found in Tudor Worcester. Moreover there were more who are counted in the tables under the title gentlemen. William Mulcaster, for example, cannot be identified as other than a gentleman from his will, but is named as a public notary in Carlisle’s Court Entry Books. John Pattinson, notary and town clerk, is another example. True, lawyers would have been relatively well-off people and therefore likely to have left probate records, but the number recorded suggests they were, as expected, an important occupational group. Other ‘professionals’ recorded included medical practitioners, who would have benefited from the concourse of gentry to the town; two musicians, one a walt, the other cathedral organist; and a schoolmaster. Carlisle had a grammar school funded jointly by the cathedral and city, which employed a master and an usher.

If some of the ‘gentlemen’ were actually professionals rather than members of the gentry, others were also called gentlemen by virtue of the status of their occupations or the office they held. One of the 21 gentlemen who died after 1620 was as noted above, a lawyer. Of the others, one was an officer of the Earl of Cumberland, a second was customer and a third was postmaster. Another eight were former mayors who acquired the title by serving as aldermen. Most of them were members of the Merchants’ Gild and had traded as merchants.

Some of those in the miscellaneous category reflect the city’s

2. P1613 Wm Mulcaster; CRO, Mrs Beattie’s Index to the Carlisle Court Entry Books for 1600-1609.
3. See above, p.145 n.4.
4. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Books vol.1, 1677-1690, p.4; Ca4/1-4, passim.
military role. Two of those who died in the sixteenth century, cousins named Lockwood, were gentleman servants of the warden. Three of the others were gunners. In the late seventeenth century two of the garrison left wills: one was the Lieutenant-Governor, Christopher Dalton, Esq., the other a soldier who described himself also as a yeoman.

Table 4.5 The Leading Occupations of Carlisle, 1564-1700 (Known Townsmen only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1564-1620</th>
<th></th>
<th>1621-1700</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>% rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most important trades in the town was that of merchant. In Carlisle those described as merchants were retailers who sold goods imported into the town. Most specialised in cloth, but all except a few sold a wide variety of things, including groceries, medicines, haberdashery and, sometimes hardware. This sort of tradesman was elsewhere usually called a mercer, as one or two of the Carlisle men were. In Tables 4.5 and A3.1 the merchants appear as one of the largest occupational groups in the city, ranking equal third in numbers recorded before 1620 and equal first there after. Moreover, although some of those described as merchants in the early period have been identified as tavernkeepers and vintners, many of those called gentlemen were also merchants, so the trade was even more dominant than first appears. Their numerical strength in the tables and

wealth as revealed by their wills and probate inventories is a tribute to the importance of the distributive trades in the city's economy. Clearly Carlisle had an important role as a distributive centre for goods not made in the region. It is likely however that their numbers relative to those in other occupations are exaggerated in surviving probate documents. The amount of capital required to follow the trade and the wealth it brought placed the merchants in the category most likely to have left wills and inventories.

As in most other towns in early-modern England agriculture was a vital feature of Carlisle's economy, yet the proportion of townsmen engaged in agriculture does not show up well in Table 4.4. No husbandmen were recorded. The number of yeomen recorded before 1620 is small, only four, being 1.9 per cent of the men whose wills or inventories survived. After 1620 the numbers of yeomen increased dramatically, to 19 (10.6 per cent), and they became the third largest occupational group. This apparent growth was more probably due to increasing popularity of the term than to increasing involvement in farming by townsmen. The term 'yeoman' was rarely used in sixteenth-century Cumberland. Its more frequent use in the seventeenth century probably reflects growing interest in status and perhaps an inflation of honours. Most of those called yeomen were styled so by themselves, not by their appraisors, and not all can be demonstrated to have had an interest in farming. A more accurate idea of the number of farmers living in the town might be gained by considering also the number of men who had no occupation either stated or obvious from their probate records. The great majority of these men were certainly involved in agriculture, although not all can have been full-time farmers. Together with the yeomen this group made up 30 per cent of the sample under study. If only half of them were full-time farmers then agriculture would have been the most popular occupation in the town, a situation paralleled in sixteenth-century Warwick.
and sixteenth and seventeenth-century Lutterworth. Even if fewer than half were full-time farmers they were still probably a very numerous occupational group.

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 seriously underplay the importance of agriculture in Carlisle's economy in another way, for it was also an extremely popular by-employment. Table 4.6 shows some subsidiary methods used by testators from the town to increase their income. The figures include all those concerned in farming in any degree, from those who had only a pig or two to those who were full-scale farmers. Most fell between the two extremes, having a couple of animals and a few acres of corn. It should perhaps be emphasised that the testator himself was not necessarily personally heavily involved in agricultural work, what is recorded is an activity of his household. Almost 70 per cent of those whose wills or inventories were proved before 1621 had some involvement in farming, and nearly 50 per cent of those whose probate records were proved after 1620.

Table 4.6 Subsidiary Sources of Income from Probate Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Tithes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 1564-1620</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 1621-1700</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Clear if Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564-1620</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agriculture was evidently of direct importance for the livelihoods of most of Carlisle’s wealthier inhabitants, and the rhythms of the farming day and year strongly influenced daily life in the town. As a secondary employment farming appears to have become less popular during the seventeenth century, but the extent of this decline is slightly exaggerated in the records since the later sample of probate records includes a smaller proportion of inventories, and wills made less mention of farmstock. Finally, the leather trades should be discussed. These trades, including here the shoemakers, were of marked importance in early-modern Carlisle, employing nearly a quarter of those known to have lived in the town who left wills or inventories before 1620, and about a sixth between then and 1700. These proportions would of course be very much larger if those without obvious occupations other than agriculture were removed from the calculations. Even including those without known occupations, however, leatherworkers made up so high a percentage of the workforce in the earlier part of the period that it should be asked whether Carlisle was a specialised leatherworking town.

Before this question can be answered another should be asked, namely how can a specialised town be recognised in the early-modern period? Nigel Goose addressed the question in an article published in 1982. He argued that because of low productivity a large proportion of the inhabitants of any town were engaged in the basic occupations of providing food, drink, clothing and shelter. As a result the historian should set a low threshold for the proportion of a town’s population employed in one trade to exceed in order for that trade to be considered a specialism. He did not specify a figure but was thinking of about 20 per cent of the recorded

1. As in other analyses such as that by Palliser in Age of Elizabeth, pp.243-4.
workforce. This figure could perhaps be justified for the cloth manufacturing trades, where many of the processes could be carried out by women, children and men who lacked formal training. The leather trades, however, followed a different pattern. There was less opportunity for work to be done outside the workshops of the master craftsmen, especially in the case of tanning, and no reason to assume that the leather trades employed higher numbers of persons too poor to appear in the sources than did other trades. The trades themselves should not be considered as a whole but as two distinct groups: those whitawing and using whitawed leather, and those tanning or using tanned leather. The difference between the two was much greater than the difference between linen and woollen weavers, it was more akin to that between blacksmith and brazier or goldsmith. To lump them together hides an important distinction. Moreover as L.A. Clarkson pointed out, even in areas where pastoral farming did not predominate, "the leather crafts assumed a large importance in the absence of any other dominant industrial activity". A higher threshold, of perhaps 25 per cent of the recorded workforce, would be more appropriate.

Was Carlisle, then, a specialised, leather town? From Table 4.5 it can be seen that the tanners were the town's leading trade during the first half of the period and that shoemakers were its third most numerous trade group. The heavy leather trades alone accounted for over 20 per cent of the recorded workforce, the leather trades as a whole were almost 24 per cent of it. The town would seem to have had a distinct bias towards leather production, particularly of heavy leather. As has been argued above, however, the proportion of the population engaged in the basic drink and

clothing trades are under-represented in these figures and therefore the percentage of those in the leather trades must be exaggerated. Moreover contemporary descriptions of the town make no mention of the leather trades as being especially important there. Sir Charles Hales in 1606 went so far as to say:

the City is become poore and daily is like to grow greater pouerty not having in ye same any such trades w(hi)ch may suffice to sett their poore on work:

Nevertheless it is likely that before the mid-seventeenth century Carlisle did specialise in leather. Besides those whose wills or inventories make it clear that they lived in the town, there were many others who left probate documents which did not indicate whether they lived in the urban or rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes. This latter group are analysed separately in Table 4.4 and Appendix Three. It may be divided into two parts: first the farmers and those without an identifiable occupation who might equally well have lived in the town or surrounding hamlets, and second, the craftsmen. Since very few craftsmen, and those mostly weavers, appear among the probate records of people known to have lived in these rural settlements, the great majority of the craftsmen in the uncertain location category must have lived in the town. Gild regulations also encouraged craftsmen to live in Carlisle rather than near it. Leather craftsmen made up 21.6 per cent of all those who may have lived in the town or the countryside, with the heavy leather crafts alone accounting for 18.8 per cent. If most or all of them and the other craftsmen did live in the town, then leather craftsmen were over 25 per cent of the recorded workforce. It would appear, therefore, that before the Civil War Carlisle’s economy had a distinct specialisation in the production of heavy leather.

1. PRO, SP14/22/3.
2. See p.395.
By 1700 this specialisation had disappeared. The tanners fell to fourth most numerous trade group in the town and the shoemakers to equal seventh. As a proportion of the recorded workforce they dropped to just over 10 per cent. Their gilds fell from providing 27.3 per cent of those taking up the freedom to providing only 19.3 per cent. Dr Hugh Todd, a member of the Chapter who knew the town rather better than did Sir Charles Hales, wrote of Carlisle at the end of the century that the inhabitants "live ordinarily in a middle and some what poor condic(i>on having no manufacture nor stable [sic] commodity to enrich themselves by". Curiously this decline in the importance of the heavy leather trades was paralleled by a rise in the ranking of the glovers from eighth to fourth place, and a doubling of their proportion of the workforce. By 1697 Carlisle and Brampton were centres of glove-making in Cumberland.

One change in the town's economy over this 150 year period has been identified, but there must have been others. John Patten has suggested that "there was a slow increase in the number and types of occupations in most towns of any size over the pre-industrial period". This idea ties in with Peter Borsay's concept of an 'urban renaissance' in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Patten also suggested an allied trend for 'higher-level occupations', i.e. the more specialised and sophisticated ones, to filter down from the larger to the smaller towns. How these wider trends were reflected in Carlisle's economy can be traced by looking at the range of occupations recorded there.


Table 4.7 shows the range of occupations recorded in Carlisle in three 50 year periods. Civic offices and military ranks have not been included. All sources have been used to construct this table, not just those which give quantifiable data. The sources available at different periods vary in quality, however, and this has affected the information which can be abstracted from them. Probate records are particularly useful before 1620, but less so after that date, parish registers and bishop's transcripts survive only from the 1650's. Perhaps most important, an analysis of occupations in all the city court entry books surviving from 1600-1656 has been made by Mrs E. Beattie and used here, whereas it has been possible only to sample these books for earlier and later decades. The number of occupations listed for the period 1601-1650 has undoubtedly been boosted above those in the other two periods as a result. Many of the occupations recorded only in this period, such as fishmonger, fowler, collier and carter would certainly have been present in the other two periods.

The overall total of occupations recorded was 111. This was a respectable total for a town of Carlisle's size and status, but was inflated markedly by the presence of the cathedral staff and central government officials. The problem of the sources makes comparison of the number of occupations across the three periods dangerous, but there do seem to have been fewer trades in the town before 1600 than after 1650. The gains were not straightforward, however. There is always the danger that an apparent change is actually only a change in nomenclature, but a number of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1551-1600</th>
<th>1601-1650</th>
<th>1651-1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weaver/Textor/Webster</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaloner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Organiemaker'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker/Cordiner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler/Sword Sliper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesmith</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewterer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorimer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurrier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armourer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwareman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason/Freemason</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilemaker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwright</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaywright</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauber</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishmonger</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller/milner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltster</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheeseman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring Nicker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedlar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber-surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing-master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organist/master</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinder</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prebendary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettycanon/Minor Canon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singingman/Lay Clerk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deacon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdeacon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almsman/Beadman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Colman'</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant/Servingman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaoler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaster</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer [customs]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector [customs]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller [customs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter &amp; Searcher [customs]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor [customs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciseman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  60  87  80

a. Recorded in 1595-1602
b. Recorded in 1645-1656
occupations, mostly in metals or the related armaments trades, disappear from the records before the Civil War. Their disappearance was probably linked to the fall in the city's population in the early seventeenth century and perhaps to the pacification of the western border and withdrawal of the garrison. In the later seventeenth century a number of new trades are recorded: whitesmith, pewterer, confectioner, joiner, bricklayer and Japan worker, for example. In the first years of the eighteenth century two more new occupational names appear: stationer and apothecary. With the exception of the Japan worker and perhaps the pewterer these trades were not actually new to the town; the same work had been done by men under other occupational labels. The appearance of the new names suggests an increased level of specialisation, however. In the final decades of the seventeenth century Carlisle would seem to have experienced a limited 'urban renaissance'. It was preceded by a period of decline, however, which on the evidence of this table produced some narrowing of the town's occupational structure.

The sources for analysing the occupational structure of Carlisle in the early-modern period are not ideal, therefore. In particular the use of gild names as descriptions of individuals rather than their actual occupations causes problems. Nevertheless it can be seen that the city's economy showed a bias towards the production of tanned leather in the first part of the period, but the town lost this specialism during the seventeenth century. The conjunction of civil and ecclesiastical administrative roles caused the numbers of lawyers and clergymen to be especially large for such a small place, but in all other respects but one the town's occupational structure was fairly typical of towns its size. The exceptional area was in the victualling trades, where much of the activity was as by-employments rather than being jobs in their own right.
e. The Performance of the Town Economy

The previous sections looked at some major areas of the town's economy and its occupational structure. This section aims to explore how the economy performed - how successful it was and whether it experienced any periods of crisis. This will be done first by examining contemporary opinion, then by looking at changes in the level of economic activity in the town and region as revealed by the tolls the city was entitled to collect.

Contemporaries who commented on Carlisle's economy generally said that the town was poor, and were at times disparaging. In June 1582 and in May and Dec. 1662 the commanders of the garrison wrote asking for the arrears of pay due to their soldiers, claiming that the town was poor and its inhabitants unable to give the troops credit. In 1606 Sir Charles Hales, who had no connection with the town, wrote to the Earl of Salisbury from Carlisle stressing the town's poverty and suggesting that as Cumberland produced lots of wool, if the city was made a clothing town like Halifax and Leeds then "it would be a great good meane for setting ye poore on worke & drawing of wealth and civility into ye Countrie". Two years later a letter was "In zeale drawn by Thos Denton of warnafull [Warnell Fell] clk for to be exhibited to the king's most excellent majesty" about the poverty of the city and, like Hales' letter, its decay since the Union of Crowns. Snowden, the Bishop of Carlisle, wrote to the king in 1617 along similar lines. In January 1638/9 the mayor and leading inhabitants described their city as weak and poor, and its people "greatly impou(er)ished"; Sir Jacob Astley, Charles I's commander, wrote at the same time "The Towne is por". His

1. CBP I, no. 127; CSPD, 1661-2, pp.381, 581.
2. PRO, SP14/22/3, and see above, pp.128, 175.
5. PRO, SP16/410/74 & 99.
view was shared by the three inhabitants of Norwich who visited the city in 1634.¹ The opinion of Dr Hugh Todd, one of the prebendaries, has been quoted above.² Defoe wrote that "There is not a great deal of trade here [in Carlisle] either by sea or land...".³

On the other hand, some descriptions of Carlisle are more positive. Thomas Denton and Sir Daniel Fleming, both local gentry, praised its market, as did Richard Blome, who also said it was "a place of good trade, chiefly for Fustians". An anonymous description of the city written between 1715 and 1717 called it "at present a wealthy and populous Place".⁴

Most of the negative descriptions of the town were written in circumstances which suggest special pleading. The county descriptions which presented Carlisle more favourably were also written with an audience in mind, however, and may have been intended to avoid offending local sensibilities. It is probably significant that most county descriptions of the period are silent about Carlisle's economy. On balance the descriptions and comments imply that the town was relatively poor.

Statistical information to back up this impression is scanty. As noted elsewhere in this thesis, the Hearth Tax returns reveal an unusually low average number of hearths per household and relatively few households living in multi-hearth dwellings.⁵ It has been argued, however, that an old-fashioned housing stock was the reason, and therefore the Hearth Tax returns do not prove that the town was markedly poor; but that Carlisle's

2. See above, p.176.
5. See Chapter One, Tables 1.1-3, and Appendix One.
houses were small and old-fashioned does suggest that the city may have been relatively poor.

The tolls the town was allowed to collect reveal something of the changes in the level of economic activity in the town and region. Carlisle had the right to collect a number of tolls, which it leased to the highest bidder to collect on the corporation's behalf. The sums bid naturally reflect two things: the competition to lease the toll in question, and the amount of revenue the prospective toll collector thought the toll would produce. The latter would be based on how much had been received the previous year and on the bidder's forecast of economic conditions in the coming one. If the successful bidder had under-estimated the revenue generated, then naturally he kept the windfall, but if he renewed the lease he might have to pay more for it next year. If he over-estimated badly because of some event out of his control, however, such as Charles II's invasion in 1651 or the resistance to the collection of the tolls at Alston Moor in 1676, then the corporation usually reduced the rent he was to pay. The tolls therefore crudely reflect the volume of trade on which they were levied, if it is assumed that the level of evasion remained the same. Unfortunately there is no way of knowing whether that was the case, but if it increased, which seems likely in view of the lawsuits about the tolls in the late seventeenth century, then it can only underestimate the general increase in trade the tolls reveal.

There were five tolls of particular interest, the revenue from which is tabulated in Appendix Four. The Small Toll

1. For the tolls in general see W. Nanson, 'The Shire and County Tolls Belonging to the City of Carlisle', CW1, III, 1876-77, pp.144-56. The demissions of tolls, until 1633, list all the bidders and their bids, thereafter they list only the successful bidder. Ca4/141. Toll revenues were accounted in the Audit Books, Ca4/139 & 140, and are mentioned frequently in administrative and other city financial records.

2. Ca4/139 sub 1650-1; Ca2/13/30.
was levied on animals' and goods passing into and out of Carlisle, taken at the city gates. The toll was calculated on the value of some items, but on the size of the load of most. It was thus little affected by inflation. Freemen were exempt. It provides an index of the increasing trade which the city enjoyed. The Shire Toll, also known to contemporaries as the Eamont Bridge Toll, was levied on animals and goods leaving Cumberland, not merely across the Eamont Bridge (just south of Penrith), but by fords across the Eamont, at Pooley Bridge, Dunmail Raise, Alston Moor and even through Long Marton in Westmorland. It was always let jointly with the Small Toll from 1635. The Scotland Toll was collected on animals entering the county from Scotland and Ireland, whether by land or sea. Many of the cattle must therefore have paid toll twice, entering and leaving the county.

The Scotland Toll behaved much as might be expected. It almost always produced less revenue than the Shire Toll, showing the movement of cattle through the county. From a modest level in the mid-sixteenth century it fell, perhaps because of increased unrest on the borders inhibiting trade. Surprisingly it began to increase in the 1590s, and from 1603 the trade obviously grew rapidly. By 1640 the toll produced over 20 times the revenue it had in 1600, evidence of a dramatic increase in cross-border trade in cattle. The growth of the trade was not without hiccups, however, it was plainly badly affected by the crisis of the 1620s, when for three years revenue was halved. The Civil War inevitably interrupted the trade, but the toll was still let for half of its pre-war total in 1648-9. Thereafter the trade plainly recovered after a difficult period in the 1650s, but the

1. Ca2/413.
3. For the evidence of poor harvests in the north-west in the early-modern period, see A. Appleby, Famine in Tudor and Stuart England, Liverpool 1978, Chapters Seven and Eight.
revenue produced reached its previous levels only briefly for three years in the 1680s. Evasion was probably the reason for this, although it is possible that the trade actually did not recover completely. There was then another slump, probably mostly the result of political troubles in Scotland.

The Small and Shire Tolls display an interesting relationship. From the earliest records until 1630-1 the farm of the tolls on the city gates produced more than that on the export trade of the county, but it was then overtaken dramatically. The city's trade rose gradually through the sixteenth century, the revenue it generated roughly doubling to reach a peak in 1581-2. It rose gradually through the 1590s, in spite of the harvest crisis, to peak again in 1596-7. The effect of the plague was very marked, however, and the city's trade fell back to the the levels of fifty years before. It was 10 years before it recovered. Thereafter it increased gradually to a new peak. The contrast between the apparent effect of the plague on the town's trade and that of the harvest crises of the 1590s and 1620s is sharp; it would seem that harvest crisis had little impact on the town's trade and that people went on trading regardless of the price of grain, whereas the level of trade was linked in the short term to population, so a sudden drop in the latter produced a fall in trade. The exclusion of outsiders during plague months would not explain the slowness of the recovery.

The Shire Toll began its upward creep about 1557, suggesting that it was from then that the cattle trade to the south began to develop, before the trade with Scotland began to grow. Its increase was slow and was affected by the crises of the 1590s and 1620s, but recovered quickly. From about 1616 the growth of the trade was rapid, and by 1635 it had grown more than twelvefold from the level of the 1550s.

Both tolls produced their maximum revenue in the years just
before the Civil War. The following decades were difficult ones for the
town, but the revenues had practically recovered by 1670. The figures for
the last decades of the century suggest trade at a sustained level, but
these years saw a series of lawsuits over collection of the tolls. It seems
unlikely that the rents bore the same relation to the level of trade as in
former years, and although they are static, trade probably continued to grow.

To these three can be added the Weley, or Weights, and the Horse
or Sand Toll. The former appears to have been charges made for using the
standard weights and measures at the corporation's weighing machine in the
moothall or pillory. The sums for which it was demised should,
theoretically, be another indicator of the economic life of the town. The
rent paid for leases of it, however, are hard to interpret and do not move
in proportion to the those of the Small Toll, or even always in the same
direction, as might be expected. There is a sudden and sustained drop in the
farms paid in the 1660s, perhaps due to a decrease in the rates the farmers
were allowed to charge or an increase in a fixed payment charged on the
revenue which would make interpretation of the figures over the whole
century impossible although short-term variations are probably still
significant. Putting aside these doubts, there seems to have been a sharp
increase in the revenue from this source in the early 1590s, bringing it to
a peak never regained. After the plague of 1597-8 there is a dramatic fall,
presumably because a smaller population transacted much less business, but
the decline is proportionately much greater than the fall in population could
possibly have been. Just before the Union of Crowns trade picked up again,
but only to slump once more between 1609 and 1614. After a further
recovery, the revenue fell coincidentally with the harvest crisis of 1622-3.

1. Ca2/2, passim; Ca2/13/28, 30 & 32.
Clearly the Weley was affected by the state of the harvest, although in opposite directions in the 1590s and 1620s. The slumps in revenue in the 1630s, therefore, may well indicate other difficult periods.

The records of the demission of the tolls on the sale and exchange of horses, which was linked with the registration of buyers and sellers, began in 1624. The revenue climbed immediately, peaking in the 1630s and 1650s, then fell slowly to about or below its original level. The early rise was probably due to growing trade, its fall may have been because of a general fall-off in trade, increasing popularity of the fair at Rosley or market at Longtown, or to increasing evasion. The tolls unfortunately, therefore, are not of much value for this analysis but suggest a gloomy situation in the later seventeenth century.

Carlisle in the early-modern period was probably, therefore, a relatively poor place. It never impressed outsiders and favourable comments on its economy were far outnumbered by complaints of its poverty. The coincidence of Hales', Denton's and Snowden's complaints of poverty with a decline of population and the virtual disappearance of the garrison, identified as a cause of decay by all three, suggests that the town may have experienced economic malaise in the first decades of the seventeenth century; the fall in the revenue generated by the Small Toll and Weley supports the theory, whereas the town probably weathered the harvest crises of the period better than the countryside. The disappearance of some of the more specialised metalworking trades in the same years, discussed in Chapter Seven, is also evidence of difficulty. The other tolls show a healthy growth in the cattle trade in these years, however, increasing almost unchecked until the Civil War.
f. Conclusion

Carlisle, like most early-modern towns, had a very mixed economy. The city played a number of roles. It was a marketing centre for agricultural produce, a distribution centre for goods imported into the county, a provider of manufactured goods such as shoes and cloth and of services such as tailoring and medical treatment, and a central place for both civil and ecclesiastical administration, providing both the necessary meeting place and the legal services required. In addition to these functions the town had two more: as a centre of the local military administration, a role peculiar to few other towns in the early-modern period, and before the Civil War as a centre for the manufacture of tanned leather, a role it lost in the course of the seventeenth century. This latter role was not unusual since the leather trades were ubiquitous in pre-industrial England, and Carlisle was certainly not important in the national economy as a leather town. There is no evidence to indicate that leather was regularly exported from the county on any scale, and however important Carlisle's tanners were as a proportion of the local workforce, in absolute terms their numbers were insignificant. There probably were more of them in most large lowland towns even though the trade may have been relatively less important there.

In many respects the occupational structure of the town reflected these roles. The distributive trades were prominent. Lawyers were numerous. In others, however, it appeared not to. Despite the number of visitors brought to the town by many of the functions it fulfilled, the victualling trades were very little represented in the records. Instead, brewing, baking, alehouse and innkeeping appear to have been subsidiary occupations carried out in addition to a craft, or in one case, to being a notary.

These activities of other members of a household than its head.

occupations were undoubtedly extremely important in the town's economy, and perhaps all the more so because the trades were spread among a large number of people rather than concentrated in the hands of a few. And despite the extra functions the town still had a relatively unsophisticated occupational structure, with little specialisation of function among its craftsmen.

Secondary occupations or means of increasing income were a very marked feature of Carlisle's economy. It is likely that well over 50 per cent of all households in the town had some means of supplementing the income generated by the head of the household's trade and spinning by its womenfolk. The most important and widespread of these activities was farming, a very common by-employment in all but the biggest towns. Brewing for sale and alehousekeeping was probably second in popularity, and baking was an option taken by a few. Malting was another possibility. For those with sufficient capital to pay the fine of a lease or to buy property the opportunities were wide. Leases of tithes were bought, the right to collect tolls or run a mill was rented from the corporation or local landlords, urban or rural property was purchased and rented out, or the money simply lent at interest. It is not claimed that such activities were unusual elsewhere nor that they were necessarily particularly widespread in Carlisle, although they may have been. The variety of economic activities undertaken by individuals or their households have rarely been more than noted in passing in studies of early modern towns. The prevalence of such subsidiary activities in Carlisle meant, however, that in a very important sense the town's economy was unspecialised.

It would seem also that the town was relatively poor, and

experienced particularly difficult periods in the early seventeenth century and perhaps immediately after the Civil War. The first of these two periods reinforces the importance of the garrison to the town before 1603, in spite of the caveats discussed above; contemporaries certainly believed it to have been important. The relative poverty of the town, its small size, the unspecialised character of its economy and the variety of the economic activities of its individual inhabitants were surely all linked, and were symptomatic of the backwardness of the economy of the area as a whole.
Part Two

Patterns of economic activity
In the previous chapter, in which the occupational structure of Carlisle was outlined, it was shown that agriculture was a mainstay of the town's economy. Not only was farming perhaps the single most important full-time occupation, although that could not be conclusively proved, but it was also an extremely common secondary occupation, in which a majority of the will-making class were engaged. In this chapter the agricultural activity of Carlisle's inhabitants will be surveyed in order to explore more fully their involvement in it, and to determine whether any changes took place in the 150 years under study, in particular changes with resulted from the growth of the cattle trade described in the last chapter. To set what can be discovered about the townsmen in context the agriculture of the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes will be discussed and that of the county as a whole described.

a. Agriculture in Cumberland

Cumberland's agriculture, it is generally agreed, was backward and unproductive. Dr Appleby has argued that it failed to provide the needs of the inhabitants of the county at least three times in the early-modern period, resulting in significantly increased death rates. Change and improvement presumably took place during the seventeenth century, however, since there was no catastrophic harvest failure after 1650.

Climate and geology combined to fit the county better for pastoral than arable agriculture: the rainfall and cloud-cover were too great and the

soils mostly too poor to make arable farming easy. The value of crops recorded in inventories examined by Appleby and by Bouch and Jones was almost invariably lower than that of the livestock. The considerable extent of wasteland available as common pasture, even in the lowlands, naturally encouraged rearing and grazing.

Cattle rather than sheep were the most important animals, even in the uplands. J.D. Marshall in a study of Lake-District farmers in the later seventeenth century found that more of them kept cattle (87%) than sheep (70%), and the same would appear to be true of the lowlands earlier in the century. Only in very exceptional cases were men's flocks worth as much as their herds. There were at least two reasons why. First the value of sheep as a meat animals was low since it was much more difficult to drive them long distances to market. Second, Cumberland sheep yielded small fleeces, Marshall reckons 7-10 to the stone, and this wool was amongst the coarsest produced in England. Although sheep were sometimes exploited for milk, it seems improbable that this took place on any scale. Nevertheless inventories of upland farmers suggest flocks of an average size of about 50 in the later seventeenth century. Cattle, on the other hand, could be moved to market much more easily. This was, of course, very important in the

5. F. Grainger, 'James Jackson's Diary, 1650 to 1683', CW2, 21, 1921, p.113. This entry also demonstrates the ubiquity of dairy farming in Holme Cultram.
latter part of the period, but even in the 1550s the city of Carlisle's Shire Toll, levied on cattle leaving the county, suggests some sales southward. Cattle may also have been easier to manage; owning a trained dog would have been less necessary, for example. Marshall believes that they were primarily used for dairying. Only 22% of the cattle kept by the upland farmers in his sample were beef animals. The transhumance which place-name evidence suggests was once so widespread appears to have been restricted to the north and east of Cumberland by the mid-sixteenth century.

Despite the predominance of pastoral farming, corn production was still of crucial importance: cereals were the staple foodstuff and communications were too poor to allow their cultivation to be neglected. Most farmers probably aimed to grow enough for their own needs and perhaps produce a small surplus for the market in fruitful years. The crops most generally cultivated were oats and barley, spring-sown grains. The climate militated against wheat and rye although some farmers grew a little of them. Peas and beans were grown but not in large quantities. James Jackson, for example, the bailiff of the manor of Holme Cultram, in 1675 grew 505 stooks of bigg, 755 of oats, 47 of beans and 10 of peas, but no wheat or rye. The inventories analysed by Bouch and Jones, Appleby and Marshall confirm this picture. It was very different from the pattern of cropping in southern

1. See Appendix Four.
England, and even in Northumberland, where wheat was quite common.\(^1\)

Some of the agricultural methods were also very different to those in the south. True, a great deal of the arable farming took place in common fields. G. Elliot found evidence of common fields in 220 townships in Cumberland. They were absent only in the border region. There is no evidence of crop rotation of the southern pattern, however. Dilley discovered only one township, Bowness on Solway, where the land belonging to individual tenants was distributed evenly enough between fields to have made it possible. Instead, the town fields appear to have been cropped continually although particular strips may have been fallowed occasionally.

In some townships, mostly on the western side of the Solway Plain, infield/outfield cultivation took place, with areas of common pasture being periodically ploughed up. Dilley found firm evidence for the practice in only six places, however. Elsewhere, essentially, infield/outfield cultivation was taking place without the outfield.\(^2\)

Without doubt there were changes on the pattern of agriculture in Cumberland, even though the majority of farmers were conservative. The most important development was the growth of the cattle trade with the south.\(^3\)

In 1640 the rent received by the city of Carlisle for the right to collect tolls on this trade had risen to as much 22 times the sum paid in 1605. It


3. See Chapter Four, section e. and Appendix Four; Appleby, *Famine*, p.179-81.
is probably fair to assume that the rent paid for the right to collect the
tolls, which was bid for, reflected the number of animals on which toll was
paid, so these figures indicate real increases in the trade. Evasion of the
tolls was probably increasing rather than falling, so the actual trend was
probably greater still. Certainly in the early eighteenth century local
farmers participated in the trade and it would be very unlikely if they had
not done so before.¹

Second, there were changes in arable farming. The use of lime
was more common in the later seventeenth century than before. Dr Todd, a
prebendary of Carlisle writing around the end of the century, noted that the
limestone areas produced the best cattle, wheat and other crops, and that the
use of alkalis such as marl, burnt lime and marble was "much improved of
later years".² A great part of Cumberland and Leith wards was supplied with
lime for building and "for imprement of their lands" from Warnell Fell in the
parish of Sebergham, in 1688.³ Third, enclosure of the common fields was
under way, although it had probably not affected much of the county by
1700.⁴ Fourth, the potato was introduced by 1664, although it may not have
spread widely or been grown as more than a garden vegetable before the end
of the century.⁵

Nevertheless the changes in the general pattern of activity was
limited. No-one seems to have followed the example of Sir John Lowther of
Lowther in creating water-meadows. Nor is there any reason to think that
most farmers managed to raise their yields as much as the Lowthers did.⁶

². H. Todd, Account of the City and Diocese of Carlisle, ed. R.S. Ferguson,
CWAAS Tract Series no. 5, Kendal 1890, p.32.
³. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.85.
The pace of change was slow.

b. Landholding in the vicinity of Carlisle

Carlisle’s two parishes included an extensive area of land outside its walls. Over this countryside were scattered a number of settlements, some being hamlets or small villages, others isolated farmsteads. The following two sections will examine the pattern of agricultural activity in the two parishes, beginning here by looking at landholding.

The two parishes included a number of manors. The most important to Carlisle’s inhabitants was the socage manor of Carlisle. This manor included most of the land immediately adjacent to the town, and some lying in the parish of Stanwix. Its extent is shown in Map 5.1. In the early-modern period it was in the hands of the Wardens of the West March, then it was leased to the Earls of Cumberland and subsequently to the Earl of Carlisle. The land in this manor, as in the others, was held by a mixture of freehold and customary tenures, and tenure at will. During the sixteenth century the administration of the manor was neglected and the nature of the tenure of many of the pieces of land within it became obscure. By 1600 much customary land was claimed by its occupants as freehold. When the Earl of Carlisle took over the manor he embarked on a lengthy series of legal actions to recover the crown’s lost rights and clarify the legal position.

Three of the other four manors in the two parishes belonged to the church. The Dean and Chapter owned the manors of Botchergate and St

1. The total area of the two parishes including the city in the mid nineteenth century was 14,205.39 acres. Index sheet to the O.S. Six Inch to the Mile Survey of Cumberland, 1st edition.

Map 5.1 The Sogage Manor of Carlisle in 1610, after Howard Ms C49/1, Dept. of Palaeography, Univ. of Durham.

The solid lines represent hedges. The dotted lines were probably field boundaries marked by baulks or mere stones.
John de Capello. The former was composed of the suburb of Botchergate and the townships of Botcherby, Brisco and Carleton, all in St Cuthbert's parish, and Wreay, a chapelry of the parish of St Mary. It lay to the south and east of the city. St John de Capello lay to the west of Carlisle, across the Caldew in the parish of St Mary. It included the town's western suburb and most of the townships in the parish. The parish was sparsely populated, however, for

Many Citizens of Carlise haue lands within this Manor, and threfore there are not many Houses within ye same by reason that they bring all their Corn & Hay growing upon those lands into ye Citty; divers Citizens haue good estate here as Mr Stanwix worth 80. a year,...

The Dean and Chapter's lands in this parish were intermixed with those of the bishop's manor of the barony of Dalston. Besides these properties they also owned the grange of Newbiggin, which was leased out. The other manor in the two parishes was the lordship of Blackhall. This belonged to the Dacres, passing by 1688 to the Earl of Sussex as Baron Dacre of the South.

Surveys were made in 1649-50 of three of these manors, and of Newbiggin Grange, in preparation for their sale by parliament. These surveys name all classes of tenants, leasehold, copyhold and freehold, although only for leaseholders do they give the acreage of land occupied. In the manor of St John de Cappello there were 73 tenants (which may have included one or two who only held tofts in Caldewgate); in the manor of

1. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of Botchergate; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of John de Chappell.
2. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.79.
3. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, Parliamentary Survey of Newbiggin Grange.
5. PRO, E317/Cumberland/No. 2, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of the Socage of the Castle of Carlisle; and see above, notes 1. and 3.
Botchergate there were 122 tenants (which, similarly, may have included one or two who held only tofts in the suburb); in Newbiggin Grange there were 4 tenants; and in the socage manor there were at least 27. The latter figure was a substantial undercount, as comparison with the earlier surveys discussed below reveals; the surveyors named only the first three or so tenants in each field. At least thirteen of these people held land in more than one manor. In all there were 31 female landholders recorded and 184 men. The 1642 Protestation Returns recorded some 712 men in the two parishes, a total which had probably fallen by 1650 because of the siege and subsequent epidemics. It also included the population of the manor of Blackhall. More than one in four of the adult male population of the two parishes held land directly from the manorial lords, therefore, perhaps as many as one in three. This seems a strikingly high proportion when so many were townsmen.

Most Carlisle landholders held their land in the areas close to the city. This was to be expected: the furthermost parts of the two parishes were 4-5 miles from the city and to have farmed land there would have involved time-consuming journeys. The parliamentary surveys reveal a couple of exceptions to this general rule, however. Thomas Bacon held land in Sheriff's Bit, in the socage manor, two leasehold burgages in Botchergate without the walls which had been burnt during the siege, freehold, leasehold and customary property in Botchergate, together with customary property in Carleton, two-and-a-half-miles to the south. John Orbell, gent., of Carlisle, leased over 53 acres at Woodhouse, part of Newbiggin Grange, as

1. House of Lords Record Office, Protestation Returns, 1641/2, Cumberland. There is a copy of these returns in the CRO. The total is incorrectly given as 726 in Appleby, Famine, p.198.

2. PRO, E317/Cumberland/No. 2, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of the Socage of the Castle of Carlisle; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of Botchergate.
well as 2 acres 1 rood at Caldcoat Bank, and held customary land rented for
11s. p.a. in Caldcoats and Caldewgate. But such men were unusual and in any
case Orbell probably sublet his extensive property.

The wills of Carlisle people present the same picture. Few if any
record land owned in Blackwell, Carleton, Cummersdale or Wreay, although
occasionally men are shown to have held land in more distant places. Thus
Richard Hodgson, a whitesmith living in Botchergate, owned an acre of land in
"Micklebrough" as well as another acre and a close adjacent to Carlisle, but
he was probably a native of Burgh [by Sands], where one of his brothers
lived.\(^2\) James Mandgie had a tenement in Greystoke.\(^3\) But such properties
were probably let. Thomas Syde, a butcher who died in 1612, was a complete
exception, however. He had bought two tenements and some closes in Scotby,
all copyhold, three miles from Carlisle, and his inventory indicates that he
was farming on a large scale both there and near Carlisle.\(^4\) More typical
were men such as Patton Bell, also a butcher, who had an acre of arable in
Seven Acre Close and an acre on Legathe Hill, George Wilson, a glover, who
owned an acre of free land at Redbankhead and three acres at Almery Holme
and Hunge Hill, or, among the better-off inhabitants, John Pattinson the town
clerk, who held 9 acres in Wearyholme, one at Murrahill, across the Caldew, 6
acres in Stonecrossgate, an orchard in Castlegate and two cow grasses,
grazing rights, in the Willows.\(^5\)

How much land did the typical farmer in these two parishes
occupy? No clear answer is possible to this question, but some hints can be

1. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, Parliamentary Survey of
Newbiggin Grange; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1,
Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of John de Cappello.
2. P1667 Richard Hodgson.
4. P1612 Thomas Syde.
5. P1667 John Pattinson, and see Chapter 4, p.145.
Table 5.1 Landholding in the Socage Manor of Carlisle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of acres</th>
<th>No. of tenants</th>
<th>Percentage of all tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 1608'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1'-2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'-5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'-20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20'-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30'-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>99.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 1611²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1'-2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'-5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'-10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20'-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30'-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Durham University, Dpt of Palaeography & Diplomatic, C49/1.

Gathered. Only two of the surveys consulted gave the area of land in the possession of each landholder. These were both surveys of the socage manor, and, unfortunately, were made only two-and-a-half years apart, one in 1608 and the other in 1611.'

The socage manor was extensive. Its land stretched from Horsemanfield, beyond Stanwix, in the north, to Upperby and Blackwell fields in the south, and from Wearyholme and the Willows, west of the Caldew, eastwards as far as the River Petteril. It included the hamlets of Upperby, Currock and Stanwix, as well as the city and all its suburbs except that lying west of the Caldew. According to the 1611 survey the farmland...
totalled 1,138.25 acres. Many of the tenants were townsmen, but people from the other settlements naturally occupied land within it, and people from neighbouring villages and hamlets also did so. The figures in Table 5.1, therefore, represent the holdings both of townsmen who mostly had alternative occupations to farming, and villagers for whom it was the principal means of livelihood.

The surveys reveal that land in the manor was held in very small parcels. Between 60 and 70 per cent of the landholders held 5 acres or less, 76-80 per cent held 10 acres or less and 89 per cent, 20 acres or less. Some of these plots were garths attached to the dozen or so houses recorded, but even if they were discounted the proportion would still be very high. Although the surveys were probably made in statute acres, it is possible that a customary acre was used. In that case the acreages might have been over 1.5 times as great if expressed in statute measure; nevertheless the landholdings would still have been relatively small. In contrast, in two of the Cambridgeshire manors studied by Margaret Spufford, Chippenham and Willingham, 40 per cent and 46 per cent of the landholders held less than half a yardland (15-20 acres) in the sixteenth century; by the early eighteenth century 44 per cent and 73 per cent, respectively, held under half a yardland. Part of the explanation must lie in the socage manor's urban context. Because many of the tenants were townsmen who farmed only as a by-employment, much of the land was in effect used as a smallholding. Large units would naturally be less common than in purely agricultural communities. But this was probably not the sole reason.

Appleby found small farm sizes elsewhere in Cumberland, and the smallness of the tenurial unit in Carlisle was probably linked also to the pastoral

2. M. Spufford, Contrasting Communities, 1974, pp.34-5 & Table 13, p.166.
orientation of agriculture in the north-west and to the backwardness of Cumberland farming, which undoubtedly had a greater subsistence element to it than did farming in southern counties like Cambridgeshire or Essex.

The size of the tenurial unit on a manor did not necessarily reflect farm size, however. Work by C.J. Harrison on Cannock using field books revealed a pattern of occupation radically different to that suggested by manorial surveys and rentals of the same property. Subletting of customary and leasehold land was in practice as easy as renting out freehold. Even when a family normally farmed directly the land it owned, periods of youth, infirmity or financial embarrassment might have made renting it out a better strategy in the short run. Moreover there was certainly land in the manor to be rented. The analysis above of the 1611 survey included some 161 acres belonging to the Dean and Chapter, and 30 acres belonging to 'Lady Arundall', neither of whom would have farmed it themselves, and it excluded the 59 acres of demesne land attached to the castle which was probably also let. As well as these opportunities, a farmer in the socage manor would have been able to rent land in neighbouring manors if he so desired, even though the evidence discussed above suggests that to do so was not common. Those who did become subtenants need not, of course, have been numbered among the freeholders or direct manorial tenants. Harrison found that only half of the cultivators of the land of the manor of Cannock held land directly from its lord.

When considering farm size, then, it is necessary to fall back on the unsatisfactory evidence found in wills. For the inhabitants of Carlisle the picture seems to have been much as suggested by the analyses of the socage-manor surveys. Farms were small, almost invariably under 15 acres

2. idem, p.87.
and generally less than half that. Some examples have been quoted above (on p.200). Others are Thomas Stanger, who died in 1578 bequeathing one-and-a-half acres on Gallow Hill and three roods in Almery Holme, Robert Stevenson, a tanner, who left half an acre of land in Almery Holme, and John Sealbbye, who listed his land in 1600 as six acres, held in six pieces, and two linriggs. Thomas Browne, merchant, who held 12 acres of freehold and seven acres and two closes of tenantright (customary) land, was one of the exceptions. It is rarely possible to be certain that all a man's lands were recorded in bequests in his will and in many cases where lands are mentioned their area was not specified. It seems probable, however, that if extensive landholdings were common they would have appeared more frequently in wills.

Fewer wills of inhabitants of the rural portions of the two parishes give acreages of holdings. Farmland was usually described by some all-embracing term such as "my farmhold". Even where the acreage of some parcels was specified, others were named only as closes or leaseland. Where acreages were given the total tended to be small. Humphrey Musgrave of Bocherby, for example, a yeoman, bequeathed to his daughter Ann a freehold messuage and tenement of only 10 acres of arable and meadow which he had recently bought. His son Thomas received a legacy of a horse, a cow, farm equipment and weapons, however, which suggests Humphrey may have already passed land to him. John Stronge of Rotten Row left his grandchildren two acres at Currock, which sounded from the phraseology to be all he possessed. Thomas Wilson of Caldcoats owned a close and seven acres of land. On the other hand Thomas Marchal of Flshes specifically bequeathed

1. P1578 Thomas Stanger; P1598 Robert Stevenson; P1600 John Sealbbye.
2. P1615 Thomas Browne.
3. P1697 Humphrey Musgrave.
4. P1674 John Stronge.
six acres one rood in the socage manor, but also owed at least £11 rent to two individuals for other land.¹ The evidence is too uncertain for firm conclusions to be drawn, but country farmers probably had more land than their urban counterparts. The rural landholders do appear to have occupied land within the socage manor, moreover, sometimes at a fair distance from their homes. Thomas Bowman of Blackhall Wood, in the far south of St Cuthbert's parish, held half an acre of freehold land about two-and-a-half miles away in Almery Holme, on the north-west side of Gallow Hill; Edward Robinson of Woodside, near Newbiggin, held an acre in Carlisle Field, at least the same distance away.²

The farmland of the two parishes was broken up into a great number of fields. The map of the socage manor drawn in 1611 depicts some 66 separate enclosures; the parliamentary surveys record many more.³ The great majority of these fields were held by many tenants rather than just one. Swifthill, for example, an 18¾ acre field to the east of the city, was in 1611 held by 10 tenants, who had between one-and-a-half and four acres each. Wearyholme, a field of mixed arable, meadow and pasture west of the Caldew, was split between 39 tenants, customary and freehold, who held property there ranging from a single 'gate' (a grazing right) to over 26 acres.⁴ A few fields were shared by just a couple of people. Horsemanfield in Stanwix, 44 acres of meadow, pasture and arable, was divided equally between Thomas Blacklocke and Robert Allensone; Paradise, a meadow

1. P1668 Thomas Marchal.
2. P1616 Thomas Bowman; P1619 Edward Robinson.
3. The map was drawn to illustrate the survey of that year, Durham Univ., Dpt of Palaeography & Diplomatic, C49/1. See Map 5.1, p.197.
4. Many fields described in these surveys contained such a mixture of land use. This may indicate that individual pieces of land may have been rested periodically under grass - in essence a form of ley farming. There is no Carlisle evidence of regular fallowing.
on an island between two channels of the Petterill, was held in 1608 by Thomas Middleton and Thomas Dalston. Other fields were in the hands of single individuals. Sewell Close, three acres of arable, belonged to Christopher Kirkbryde in 1611, Sheriff's Bit, one acre of meadow, was in the hands of Adam Clether. Almost all the grange of Newbiggin was held in this way in 1650 and there were many closes held by single tenants in the manor of St John de Cappello.

Most of the fields held by single tenants were probably farmed in severality, if not all of them. The closes shared between only a couple of people may have been also. The majority of fields, however, were farmed under a common-field system. Joan Thirsk defined common-field agriculture as having 4 essential elements. To paraphrase her words, these were: the arable and meadow must be divided into strips and these strips must be shared out among the cultivators; both arable and meadow must be thrown open as common pasture after harvest and hay-making; waste-ground must be common for pasture, fuel and fodder; and the farming year must be regulated by some assembly of the farmers, whether in a manorial court or a township meeting.

A glance at the manorial surveys suggests that the first of these conditions was met, as do the descriptions of property bequeathed in wills. Most holdings were made up of parcels of land of one or two acres or less; the smallness of such units implies that the holdings were divided into strips. Stronger evidence comes from the description of the land leased by Thomas Bacon of Carlisle from the Dean and Chapter. It included two pieces

1. See above p.200, text and note 5.
2. PRO, E317/Cumberland/No. 2, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of the Socage of the Castle of Carlisle.
of arable each of one rood, described as a 'Ridge' and defined by abutments to other land. This land lay near Botchergate and must have been part of the ground the chapter held of the socage manor.¹

The evidence to answer Thirsk's second requirement is less equivocal. The surveyors of the socage manor in 1611 closed their survey by stating forthrightly:

It is to be noted that these lands would be valued at a far higher rate were they inclosed and occupied in seu(e)rall. But their usuall custome is, that ymediatelie after ant(a)nte hathe taken his first croppe from(e) his meadowe or arrable, he then casts the same grounde into common(e) receaving verie little or noe benefite at all thereby duringe the residue of the yere.²

Certainly as far as these men were concerned, Carlisle's town fields were common fields. Common-pasture rights over the fogg and stubble were still exercised in the early eighteenth century. In 1712 two men were amerced by the court leet of the socage manor for their horses "goeing in the comon feilds before the corne was Inn...".³

All the moors in the vicinity appear to have been used as commons. The citizens of Carlisle had their own common north of the Eden at Kingmoor. The city employed a herdsman to look after beasts pastured there.⁴ The parliamentary survey of the manor of Botchergate implies that the moss on its southern boundary, Carleton Moor and Brisco Moor were all common land, and Thomas Denton described these moors as commons. The tenants of the manor of St John had 300 acres of moor and common pasture.⁵

1. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of Botchergate.
5. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/1, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of Botchergate; D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, pp.88-9; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1, Parliamentary Survey of the Manor of John de Cappello.
They were not enclosed until the second half of the eighteenth century.1 Evidence on the fourth point, however, is sketchy. All the manors are known to have had courts, and summons to at least one are recorded.2 Their records for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have not survived, however. But the socage court presentments quoted above show that at least one court was regulating activity within the common fields soon after the close of the period under study. Moreover the city's court leet dealt with infringements of the townsmen's common rights on Kingmoor by the inhabitants of settlements near the common.3 It seems likely that the other manorial courts would have dealt with disputes between farmers, including those resulting from infringements of communal-farming regulations, but they would probably have done the same even if the fields were not true common fields but merely shared closes. There is no evidence of any of the manor courts within the two parishes actually making such regulations, however.

Several conclusions can be drawn. Carlisle men, with few exceptions, farmed land in the vicinity of the town. They held land in all the adjacent manors, but probably mostly in St John de Capello and the socage manor. Those parts of the socage manor closest to the city were described in 1650 as "being in the Townefields and Territories of Carlisle", and a similar description was used by Thomas Syde of his property in Almery Holme, Legert Hill and Seven Acre Close.4 Most of the townsmen held and farmed small acreages; this may have also been true of the full-time farmers of the neighbouring settlements, although their holdings were

1. There are copies of the two acts in the CRO.
2. See the parliamentary surveys cited above; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM1/4.
4. P1612 Thomas Syde.
probably a little larger. The land was broken up into many small and medium-sized fields, but most of it was farmed under a common-field system. Some contemporaries believed that this fostered conservative farming patterns.

c. Corn and cattle: agricultural practices in Carlisle and area

In order to look for changes in farming in Carlisle and its neighbouring settlements, it is necessary to turn to probate inventories. These documents, for all the problems they present, provide the only quantifiable information on agriculture in the period which allows some assessment of change over time. The following discussion is based on an analysis of 218 'farming inventories', proved in the old-style years 1565-79, 1611-20 and 1660-1700. These periods were chosen to examine the pattern of local agriculture before the Union of Crowns, while the pacification of the borders was taking effect and after the Restoration, when the cattle trade with Scotland and southern England was well established. The aim was to discover the short and long-term changes brought about by the pacification. The choice of sample years is not perfect for this purpose, however, but has been dictated by the loss of almost all probate inventories for 1621-42 and the need to make sample sizes as statistically valid as possible.

For this analysis a 'farming inventory' has been defined as that of a man who owned either livestock or corn. Women's inventories have been excluded because the number of them was small and the property recorded too likely to have been untypical and distort the sample. Men who owned only horses, or grain which might have been obtained as tithe or moulter payments, have also been excluded, as have those whose probate records do not make it clear whether they lived in the town or countryside. The sample does contain a handful of men whose farming interests appear to have been
limited to a few pigs or sheep: they were exceptional, however. Certainly it includes many smallholders, as the figures in the tables below will reveal, but it has been argued above that smallholding was a characteristic feature of farming in the district.

Table 5.2 shows the percentage of the inventories which recorded ownership of crops and of broad categories of livestock; it says nothing about the scale of ownership, only about the fact of possession. Some interesting trends are apparent even though the small samples of 1611-20 may have been distorted. First the possession of cattle was universal throughout the period among country farmers, and very important to townsmen although it became less so during the seventeenth century. Second, ownership of horses was growing amongst country farmers, a point which will be expanded upon below, while, as with cattle, horses were a decreasingly common possession of townsmen. Third, ownership of sheep by Carlisle men fell dramatically after the Restoration whereas it may have grown among country farmers. Fourth, more farmers, both urban and rural, kept pigs in the late seventeenth century than did in the mid-sixteenth. Fifth, the number of men growing hemp and flax fell, perhaps because of imports from Scotland. Certainly the customs books of the late seventeenth century record duty paid on very substantial quantities of Scottish linen cloth and yarn. Finally, corn production seems to have been more or less equally popular at all periods, probably a reflection of grain's importance as the basic foodstuff. Although the area was one of pastoral farming with subsistence cultivation of corn, there were a good number of 'mixed' farmers. The figures for poultry keeping are too varied to indicate clear trends, but suggest a marked growth in it by country farmers and a slight growth among townsmen.

1. PRO, E190/1448/10.
Table 5.2 Ownership of stock and crops recorded in inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of proof</th>
<th>No. of Invs.</th>
<th>% of inventories' recording ownership of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All percentages are expressed to one decimal place.
2. Inhabitants of the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes.

Table 5.3 Crops recorded in inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of proof</th>
<th>No. of Invs.</th>
<th>% of these recording:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>listing crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unspecif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All percentages are expressed to one decimal place.
2. Inhabitants of the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes.

Table 5.3 looks at arable farming in more detail. The Carlisle probate inventories generally recorded corn in bushells or merely estimated its value. Only three inventories in the sample gave the acreage sown:
Edward Carlill of Cummersdale in Sept. 1576 had 9 acres of corn growing;
Thomas Scarrow of Carlisle had in Sept. 1677 an acre of oats, one of barley
and two of peas and beans; his fellow townsman Robert Raven, a glover, had only one-and-a-half acres of corn sown in July 1683. It is impossible, therefore, to discuss the acreages of different types of corn, as Hoskins and Skipp did. The impression is that barley was slightly more important than oats, however. These two grains, the table indicates, were by far the most important cereals; their value was almost invariably much greater than other crops. The bulk of the unspecified corn must also have been barley or oats, such was their popularity. Wheat was not much cultivated in the sixteenth century, but became more common as the seventeenth century wore on. Rye perhaps suffered a decline in favour, especially among townsmen. Both remained minority crops, almost always cultivated in addition to barley and oats, and rarely in large quantities. The pulses were also subsidiary crops. In the sixteenth century peas were the favoured crop of the two; beans were not grown by any of the farmers in the sample. During the seventeenth century beans became fashionable and outstripped peas in popularity among townsmen. It was more usual for a farmer to grow both, however, than just one or the other. The trend is not clear, perhaps because the early seventeenth century sample is small, but cultivation of pulses seems to have become increasingly common although never on a large scale. One other type of grain was recorded: Edward Sewell of Brisco Hill had £10 worth of buckwheat. Sewell, a yeoman, was a very substantial farmer and one of the few whose crops were valued at more than his livestock.

1. P1576 Edward Carlill; P1679 Thomas Scarrow; P1683 Robert Raven.  
Table 5.4 shows the mean number of cattle and other animals kept by the sample as a whole in each period, Table 5.5 shows the mean and median sizes of the herds and flocks of those who kept each type of animal. Table 5.6 gives the number of each category of cattle recorded and the percentage they were of all cattle recorded. From these figures it is clear that the farmers living in the countryside kept larger flocks and herds than did townsmen. This is what might be expected since farming would have been the primary occupation for more countrymen.

Table 5.4 Mean number of livestock per farm recorded in inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of proof</th>
<th>No. of Invs.</th>
<th>Stirsks Oxen</th>
<th>Etc.²</th>
<th>Heifers Calves</th>
<th>All Cows</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Swine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.6+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.9+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.8+</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3+</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All percentages are expressed to one decimal place. A superscript + indicates that one or more inventories included an unspecified number of animals in that category.
2. Includes stots and steers.
3. Inhabitants of the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes.

Cattle were the most valuable animals recorded in most inventories and, as was clear from Table 5.2, were the beasts most commonly owned. The average number of cattle kept appears to have risen between c.1575 and c.1615, after which in the countryside it fell back to about its old level and in the town it dropped dramatically. This rise may have been a response to less troubled conditions in the border region after the pacification, but if so then it is surprising that so marked an effect was produced so
quickly; alternatively the high figures could be a statistical anomaly generated by the relatively small samples of inventories available from 1611-20. The figures for the country farmers in the later seventeenth century suggest that, in the longer term at least, the pacification and growth of the cattle trade had little effect on the scale of cattle rearing in the Carlisle area.

Table 5.5 Mean and median size of flocks and herds recorded in inventories'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of proof</th>
<th>Stirks</th>
<th>Heifers</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>etc.²</td>
<td>Calves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Medians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All percentages are expressed to one decimal place. A superscript + indicates that one or more inventories included an unspecified number of animals in that category.
2. Includes stots and steers.
3. Inhabitants of the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes.
* figure meaningless, see text.
Fewer of the town farmers were keeping cattle by 1700, and the herds of those who did were smaller. Moreover kine, already the most important type of cattle owned by townsmen in the sixteenth century constituted 60 per cent of their herds, implying greater stress on milk production, or rather the limiting of cattle kept to house cows. Three possible trends might explain this. First, the men whose inventories have survived from the late seventeenth century might have included more from the lower end of the socio-economic scale, and therefore relatively fewer who could afford to keep cattle. There seems no reason to think that this was the case, however. Second, more of the poorer members of the will-making class may have been involved in agriculture; since they lacked the resources of their richer fellows, their involvement was on a lesser scale and so the average number of beasts per farmer fell although there were now more farmers. This explanation seems unlikely since a smaller proportion of the wills and inventories surviving from after 1620 show agricultural activity than those from before then. The most probable explanation is that as the numbers of townsmen engaged in agriculture fell, the scale of the activity of those still farming also declined. Carlisle's inhabitants were specialising more heavily in the urban activities of trade, manufacture and service.

There were significant changes in the composition of cattle herds. In the countryside the average number and size of herd kept of cows, calves and stots, stirks and steers either remained much the same or fell slightly between 1579 and 1700. In the town the numbers of these classes of animals fell. The number of heifers, known locally as 'whies', kept by country farmers rose, however, and the average number kept by those townsmen who owned heifers also rose, if slightly. Possibly this meant more beasts for breeding. The number of stots, stirks and steers kept by countrymen was
high, almost as high as in Myddle in Shropshire, and higher than in Skipp's samples for the forest of Arden. It emphasises the importance of beef production in the area.1 The mean number per farm of these beasts, the mean herd size of them and the percentage they made of the number of cattle as a whole all increased marginally over the period while the numbers of cattle kept fell. This implies that raising beef cattle received some fillip from the growing cattle trade, if a limited one. The increases were marginal, however, and in view of the uncertainties in interpreting this type of evidence they should not be regarded as conclusive proof that the trade affected the area's economy.

The last category of cattle to be examined is the oxen and bulls. Only a handful of bulls were recorded, none being owned by townsmen, probably because the corporation was supposed to keep a bull for the use of the inhabitants. The figures relate almost completely to the ownership of oxen, therefore. It is clear that there was a marked decline in the number of farmers keeping oxen, so that in the last 40 years of the seventeenth century only two Carlisle men had them, and only 12 countrymen. The number kept by the individual farmer fell also, but less markedly; a single ox would not have been much use. The number of country farmers keeping horses rose reciprocally and the size of their herds also grew, while in the town, although fewer farmers kept horses in the later sample periods, the average herd size was stable. Oxen were clearly being supplanted as plough-beasts by horses.

Some more can be said about of cattle farming in the two parishes from the wills and inventories. Most obvious was the practice followed by a

small number of Carlisle farmers of placing cattle in the hands of others. It is best illustrated by the inventory of Richard Bell, gent., made in February 1614/5. Bell owned 20 cattle, a horse and three pigs, 12 bzs of oats, 15 of barley, 2 bzs of beans and one of peas. Since he leased the tithes of Banckend he may not have actually have been much of an arable farmer, and despite his large number of animals he was not personally much of a pastoral farmer either. Only one of his cows was in his own hands. The others, 10 whies, 4 cows, two oxen, two stirks and a stot, were with 8 other men, mostly living in parishes north of Carlisle where pasture would have been plentiful. These beasts were described as "Cattell Remaing in Certayne mens handes p(ar)te for friste nolte & p(ar)te for wintering & foddering". The whies were two to four years old and 6 were "friste nolte" (presumably having their first calves), one of the stirks was 5 years old, the oxen were 6 years old. A stirk and three cows had been put "to fodder till whitsondaye next". Presumably these animals were stock that he did not have the resources to winter at home in Carlisle or have the skill, inclination or staff to look after. Bell was a Carlisle lawyer, had been clerk to the warden and was mayor at the time of his death, clearly he was unusually wealthy, but other inventories of townsmen also reveal the practice, although none give reasons as Bell’s did. It was perhaps more common among the better-off than among the middling groups. Moreover Robert Baynes, a pettycanon, had some of his sheep as well as part of his herd in other men’s hands. But poorer men followed it too: Robert Pearson, a tanner who owned two cows, a calf and a whye, had entrusted his whye to another man, and one of James Barne’s two cows was with a man living at Warwick Bridge.

1. P1614 Richard Bell.
Table 5.6 Types of cattle recorded in inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of proof</th>
<th>Oxen</th>
<th>Stirs etc.</th>
<th>Calves</th>
<th>Heifers</th>
<th>Cows</th>
<th>All Cattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>337.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>236.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Percentages

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Countrymen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Townsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-1579</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1700</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All percentages are expressed to one decimal place.
2. Includes stots and steers.
3. Inhabitants of the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes.

Only three examples of the same practice have been found among the inventories of countrymen, however, which suggests that time and fodder were the chief motives, as Bell's inventory indicated, rather than payment or security for debt, or some personal reason such as helping a relative.

The inventories reveal very little about dairying. No cheese presses are recorded. Cheese itself, like other foodstuffs, is mentioned very rarely. One exception was the inventory of Henry Foster, a glover of
Carlisle, who had nine cheeses valued at 18s., although only one cow. Other dairy equipment such as churns, milk kits and cream pots, are valued for small sums in a number of documents scattered over the 150 year period, but not sufficiently often to indicate whether dairying was increasing in importance, as Victor Skipp was able to argue for the Solihull district. Presumably only the simplest and cheapest of equipment was used and this was either not appraised or usually indistinguishable from other household equipment. It would seem from the inventory evidence that dairying was not nearly as important around Carlisle as it was in seventeenth-century Myddle, Cambridgeshire or the Forest of Arden, nevertheless the keeping of cows was so common as to suggest that dairying on a small scale was the norm. Probably it was almost wholly for consumption by the farmer's own household.

Horses, sheep and pigs were the principal animals other than cattle. As noted above, horses became more important in the local economy in the course of the period. It is not surprising that a few men bred them, although only as a supplement to other activities. More country farmers kept sheep in the late seventeenth century than earlier, and the size of their flocks seems to have increased also, but these figures should be regarded with particular caution since sheep were often valued as a group rather than their number specified and the sample of inventories which gives flock size is particularly small. Sheep were less important around Carlisle than in the uplands, where 70 per cent of the farmers kept some of the animals. The number of pigs kept by townsmen underwent a marked

1. P1672 Henry Foster.
3. John Holme of Botcherby, had 5 horses in March 1670, three mares and two colts; Thomas Phillipson of Wreay, weaver, had 4 horses, two mares and two colts; Edward Sewell of Brisco Hill, yeoman, owned 4 mares, two colts and a foal. P1670; P1682; P1688.
increase in the seventeenth century. Not only were more of them keeping swine, but the average number owned rose also. In the last four decades of the century two men had 10 and one man had as many as 20 pigs, although three or four were more usual. Pig-keeping was also on the increase among country farmers. Only five men of those recorded 1565-79 had swine, although they had over 26 between them. Twenty-one of those farmers recorded 1661-1700 had them, although the sample size was smaller. The country farmers did not raise pigs in the same numbers as the townsmen, however.

There was another contrast between the country farmers and the townsmen in the keeping of poultry. Poultry was very much more common in the countryside than the town, perhaps because the birds would have been less vulnerable to theft there, or because more pasture would have been available for geese. In the city the proportion of people keeping poultry grew only marginally during the period, whereas there would appear to have been a very sharp increase in the proportion of rural farmers keeping chickens and geese during the late sixteenth century. Thus only one townsman is known to have kept chickens in the period 1565-79, only four of the 1611-20 sample had poultry of all types and three of the 1661-1700 group, while in the country samples the numbers keeping poultry were eight, 19 and 23. The number of birds kept by the townsmen was lower also: the three men dying between 1661 and 1700 had only five chickens between them, while seven of the countrymen had 40 birds in all. Geese and chickens were kept about as often as each other, although geese may have been owned in slightly higher numbers. Nothing conclusive can be said about numbers of birds since poultry was so often valued collectively, but country farmers may have had an average of about 10 birds and owning more than 20 was not

Edward Robinson of Woodside who had 20 geese, four hens and a
cock when he died in 1618 was certainly raising them for the market and a
few others had almost as many birds.¹ Besides hens and geese, turkeys were
occasionally noted. Turkeys were introduced to Europe from Mexico. The
*Oxford English Dictionary* first records the word in England in 1555. They
were first mentioned in a Carlisle inventory in 1579 - Mr Barnard Aglionby,
a notary, owned a turkey hen and three birds, valued at 1s.² No farmer
owned more than a handful, however. Ducks were absent from the Inventories.
They may have been included under the general category of "poultry" in a
good number of the documents, but if they were a common domestic fowl then
it is surprising that they are never mentioned. Rather more probably they
were not domesticated in the region.

The only other farm animal which was mentioned in wills and
inventories was the goat. Dogs were not usually included in inventories in
other parts of the country and were not in Carlisle either. Probably they
were not regarded as chattels, which is surprising since song thrushes
were.³ Goats, although found in a couple of documents, were very uncommon.
James Stanwix of Carlisle, gent., who in 1567 had two, worth 3s. 4d., and
Richard Richardson, a merchant, who had one in 1675, were the only men in
the sample analysed who owned goats.⁴ Nevertheless goatskins were used by
local glovers in the sixteenth century, sometimes in large numbers. The
inventories of Richard Wyllson, made in 1576, and Thomas Slaiter, made in
1584, both record substantial numbers of kid and goat skins. Wyllson had
1,040 kid skins of two qualities, worth £3-8-2, Slaiter possessed kid leather

1. P1619 Edward Robinson.
2. P1579 Barnard Aglionby.
3. P1588 Catherine Stoddert.
4. P1567 James Stanwix; P1675 Richard Richardson.
in lime pits priced at £2 and over 200 more skins outside the town worth £1-13-4. Presumably these skins were imported from outside the region, or at least some Cumberland farmers were breeding goats on a large scale.

There is evidence for both conservatism and change in farming methods. Inventories record ploughs and harrows, as might be expected, but no rollers. The appearance of harrows specified as being of iron in the course of the seventeenth century suggests an improvement in the quality of farming equipment. A handful of inventories made in the sixteenth century record sleds: Mathew Sealbe of Blackwell had one in 1578 and one is listed 10 years later in Thomas Pattinson's inventory. Carts, known locally as 'cars', were general, but wains also appear in sixteenth-century inventories and those of the early seventeenth century. Since they were often listed together with cars they must have been a distinct type of vehicle, and they were usually valued at a higher sum. William Blaicklock of Harraby owned a wain and wheels appraised at 13s. 4d. and two cars worth 2s. 8d., for example. Neither wains nor wain gear are found after about 1620, however, and the abandonment of the more sophisticated vehicle was probably a retrograde step by local farmers.

Finally there is evidence of liming in the fields around Carlisle in the last decades of the seventeenth century. In 1692 Mr Wilfrid Lawson leased Newlaithes from the Dean and Chapter, an estate in St Mary's parish about a mile west of Carlisle, and was at great expense "in Lyme" and improvements. Unfortunately these did not produce the expected returns. At the same time John Pattison, a pettycanon, limed and improved Harraby Grange, which was also leased from the Chapter. Similarly the Musgrave family limed the land they leased in Carlisle Field. There is evidence of liming in the fields around Carlisle in the last decades of the seventeenth century. In 1692 Mr Wilfrid Lawson leased Newlaithes from the Dean and Chapter, an estate in St Mary's parish about a mile west of Carlisle, and was at great expense "in Lyme" and improvements. Unfortunately these did not produce the expected returns. At the same time John Pattison, a pettycanon, limed and improved Harraby Grange, which was also leased from the Chapter. Similarly the Musgrave family limed the land they leased in Carlisle Field.

1. P1576 Richard Wyllson; P1584 Thomas Slaiter.
2. P1578 Mathew Sealbe; P1588 Thomas Pattinson.
no way of knowing whether poorer farmers followed suit, but some of them probably did. Certainly the fields around Carlisle were made more fertile by the use of dung and nightsoil from the city. ¹

Some comparisons can be made with other regions. Certainly the countryside around Carlisle was not a great grain-producing area like Essex or the Cambridgeshire uplands.² The emphasis was on pastoral farming, particularly cattle, and seemingly no greater on beef than on dairying. The scale of this pastoral farming was smaller than that of the pastoral farming of Myddle in Shropshire or of the Forest of Arden in the mid-sixteenth century although it was larger than in Arden after the 1570’s. The average number of cattle kept per farmer and average size of herd was smaller. To an extent this may have been because the samples used by Hey and Skipp excluded the smaller farmer: Skipp deliberately ignored smallholders. But the Cumberland farmers were probably genuinely poorer and their farms smaller. There were few of the substantial farmers found by Skipp, and farm sizes would seem to have been smaller than those he deduced to have existed in Warwickshire. Conversely the value of the arable produce of the Cumberland farms was proportionately higher than in Myddle or mid-sixteenth century Arden.³ Mixed farming was more important in the Carlisle area.

d. Conclusion

The agriculture of Carlisle and district was, then, fairly typical of agriculture in the county. Pastoral farming was the rule, but most farmers also grew corn. A few farmers placed greater emphasis on corn than beasts.

1. D/Lons, Thomas Denton’s History of Cumberland, p.90.
Cattle were of far greater importance than sheep or other animals. Sheep were less important than in the Lakeland dome. Oats and barley were by far the most common grains. Farming took place mostly within the restrictions of the common-field system, but the greatest restriction was probably the conservatism of local farmers. Yet there was change. There was diversification in the crops grown: more men grew wheat, beans and peas at the end of the seventeenth century than in the sixteenth. Some of the richer farmers were trying to improve their land. Horses ousted oxen as draught animals; pigs and poultry were kept by more people. There were hints that the cattle trade with Scotland and the south was having an effect, even if less than might be expected. Most important for the town, its inhabitants appear to have involved themselves less in farming as the seventeenth century wore on. Fewer of them farmed, and those that did farmed on a reduced scale; the city was becoming more urban. Farming in Carlisle's two parishes remained essentially much the same over this 150 years, yet it was not static.

1. Both Skipp and Hey, who have studied the pattern of farming in pastoral areas, remarked on the high proportion of cows and heifers among the herds although those particular areas were best known for beef. Similarly these categories of cattle formed a high proportion of herds in the Carlisle area, which was also more renowned for beef than dairying. Probably, however, these proportions were to be expected. All three regions were rearing rather than fattening areas. Young beef cattle would presumably have been sold a few years after birth to drovers or farmers from areas nearer to the great cities. Their sisters would be kept to provide fresh breeding-stock. The farmers of a rearing area might therefore be expected to have a higher proportion of beef cattle recorded in their inventories than farmers where dairying was paramount, but it would be much lower than where fattening stock for slaughter was general. Dairying on at least a modest scale would be a natural concomitant of keeping cows for breeding where labour to milk them was reasonably plentiful and marketing the cheese and butter was not too difficult. If this argument is correct then the cattle trade with the south was more important to the farmers of the Carlisle district than has been implied in the preceding chapter.
Chapter Six
Leather and Cloth

The previous two chapters have examined the bases of the town's economy and discussed Carlisle's occupational structure and how it changed, and looked at agriculture, one important facet of townsmen's economic activity. The following three chapters will explore the patterns of economic activity within particular trade groups, concentrating on what, besides agriculture, individual townsmen depended to earn their livings. In doing so some of the themes outlined before will be developed.

One of these themes was the lack of 'industrial' activity in the town - industrial in the sense of manufacturing for the national market, not just to satisfy local demand. Such production was significant because the relationship between the producer and the consumer was at its most distant. Both parties were reliant on a third, the middleman, and the mechanisms determining price were completely impersonal. Since tanning was identified in Chapter Four as a major trade in the city and therefore one of those most likely to be industrial in this sense, the first of these three chapters will begin by looking at the leather trades, and then look at the cloth trade, another section of the economy so often identified as a regional specialism and associated with such market-oriented production.

a. The leather trades

The evidence discussed in Chapter Four shows that before the Civil War the tanners were the leading leathercraft occupation in Carlisle. More probate records survive for them than for any other occupational group except the merchants, and corporation records indicate that they played a larger role in the government of the city than members of other handicraft trades. The
evidence suggests, however, that the tanners declined both in numbers and relative importance in the city economy during the seventeenth century. During the 25 years 1586-1610, the wills and inventories of 14 tanners definitely resident in the city were proved. By contrast, over the 40 years 1661-1700, only 10 tanners' wills or inventories were proven, although probate documents survive for almost twice as many men in the later period as in the earlier. Similarly, during the seventeenth century the number of members of the Tanners' Gild admitted to the freedom of the city, a crude guide to the numbers involved in the trade, fell both absolutely and as a proportion of all freemen admitted.¹

Unfortunately it is impossible to say for certain whether the relative prosperity of the tanners also fell during the seventeenth century, although that seems probable. In the late sixteenth century they owned markedly more moveable property at their deaths than did other craftsmen. The median net inventoried wealth among tanners between 1563-1610 was £25-3-10 (41 inventories), compared with £18-5-0 (151 inventories) among all male inhabitants.² But only five inventories survive from the last four decades of the seventeenth century, one of which was valued at £106, one at £44, two under £10 and the fifth at less than the testator's debts.³ Such a small sample is unfortunately of no use for comparative purposes. Of these five, the 'poorer' three apparently owned no leather or tanning gear, and may have retired. The wills of other tanners surviving from this period give no suggestion of marked wealth, however, with the possible exception of

1. See Table 4.3, p.162.
2. Of these 41 tanners' inventories, 19 relate to men who may have lived in the rural parts of Carlisle's two parishes, although for reasons advanced below, this is unlikely and they have therefore been included in this analysis. If these 19 are excluded, the median is £32-17-2.
3. Respectively: P1670 Robert Hodgson; P1670 Hugh Hodgson; P1687 David Hodgson; P1688 William Bewley; P1675 Charles Atkinson.
that of Robert Wilson, gent., who left 16 acres of land and cash legacies totalling £36. He is only revealed to have been a tanner since he left his barkhouse and tan vats to his servant for seven years.

There are two possible explanations for this decline in the position of the tanners in the town. The first is a possible increase in tanning in the surrounding countryside. Although it is nowhere specifically stated in the city charters or Dormont Book, Carlisle appears to have restricted trade activities of non-freemen. In the sixteenth century the Tanners' Gild insisted that all its active members live within the city liberties. In 1587 and 1592 those failing to do so were to lose the benefit of membership of the gild and to be forbidden to buy rough leather (i.e. raw hides) or sell tanned leather in the market. According to orders of the gild it was to be written into apprenticeship indentures "that ye prentice shall not occupy his Trade or Occupation in ye Country after his years be expired...". In 1651 a member of the gild was called to answer why he had broken these rules. But in 1673/4, the restrictive orders of 1586 and 1587 were deleted and a marginal note added beside each of them: "This order is adjudged unreasonable". In November 1674 an order refers to brothers living in the country. There is little other evidence to support this argument, however. The only probate material that survives for a tanner who lived outside, but near, the city is that of Edward Sewell of Blackwell, who died in 1574, an exceptionally wealthy man whose barkhouse and leather may in any case have been inside the town. The names of no tanners working outside

2. Ca2/126.
3. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Book, no.1, sub Orders, 1 and 33, 9 May 1651.
4. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Book, no.2, sub 6 Nov. 1674.
5. P1574.
the city in the late seventeenth century are known.

The alternative explanation is rather more plausible but difficult to prove. Throughout the period the local agricultural economy was biased towards stock-rearing. Exports of cattle south to the metropolis and other large urban centres increased, however, as the figures for the city's tolls indicate. If there was not an equivalent expansion of beef production as a result, fewer cattle would have been slaughtered or died locally, and so there were fewer hides for Carlisle's tanners to process. The town's glovers were largely unaffected by these developments, since moving large flocks of sheep long distances was impracticable. If this thesis is correct it might be possible also to interpret the change in attitude of the city's tanners to rural rivals, noted above, as a response to the more difficult conditions.

Carlisle tanners worked in much the same way as those described by L.A. Clarkson in his general essay on the leather industry.\(^2\) Flesh and hair adhering to the raw hides were loosened in pits of lime and water and then removed by scraping with knives. The hides were then soaked for long periods in handlings and tan vats, containing solutions of tannin of graduated strengths. The inventories rarely record much of the processes, that of John Haithway being exceptionally full. He had a tan vat in his barkhouse containing 19 pieces of leather and two handlings with 19 pieces of leather, all worth £7, bark valued at 10s., working and chipping knives worth 1s. 6d., a lime croke worth 2d. and a tan vat worth 10s.\(^3\) Hides owned by Carlisle tanners came from the usual range of animals, Anthony Bell,

1. See Chapter Five, pp.194-5.
3. P1596.
for example, owned 14 pieces of neat leather, two nag skins and three veal skins, besides other leather in his vats. Most tanners had stocks of bark, probably the only source of tannin used locally. Wherever the type was specified it was oak bark. Rather surprisingly no stores of lime are recorded; this raw material would also have been available not far away, at Warnell in the foothills of the Lakeland Dome or In the Pennines.

Compared with most other trades, tanning required a large investment in materials. To tan a hide took up to two years; in order to ensure a regular supply of finished skins to sell, a tanner had to have a large number of hides at various stages of production. Seven inventories of tanners were proved in 1587, the men owing stocks of bark and leather of values ranging from 14s. to £36-13-4 and representing between eight and 52 per cent of the net value of their goods. But despite such relatively high capital investment, the scale of tanning business in Carlisle was small. There is no evidence that any tanner employed more than a couple of men, and most of those whose wills or inventories record a servant of apprentice also had other interests, in, for instance, agriculture. An attempt to create a larger commercial operation was made at least once, however. In 1618 a widow, Elizabeth alias Thompson, in partnership with a cordwainer, Symond Brathewate, seems to have tried to corner the market in leather and bark, to the detriment of the poorer master craftsmen. Their scheme was defeated by the Tanners' Gild, which forbade any member to work for them until they agreed to give over the business.

1. P1598. Calfskins could, of course, also be made into leather by whittawing.
2. P1587 Thos Calvert; Jas Calvert; Thos Thomson; Geo. Ladyman; John Pattinson; Robert Gate; Rich. Kirkhawghe.
3. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners Gild Book, no.1, sub St Helen's Quarter 1618, and Candlemas Quarter 1618/9.
The shoemakers were the principal identifiable purchasers of tanned hides and often appear as debtors of tanners in inventories and court entry books. They too were a relatively prosperous group in the late sixteenth century. The median net value of the 20 surviving shoemakers' inventories from the period 1563-1610 is £21-12-3½, which was rather above the median for all male inhabitants. It is few pounds below that of the tanners' inventories, a difference partially explained by the greater capital invested in stock by the latter.

As in the case of the tanners it is impossible to be certain how prosperous the trade was in the late seventeenth century. Only three shoemakers' inventories have survived from that period, only two of which record shoemakers' tools and stock. One of those, Hugh Dobinson, had moveable goods, credits and debts of a net value of £80-15-8. The other, John Nicholson, owned property worth only £18-1-1, and had an unknown but probably substantial sum of debts. Wills are no more helpful since besides Hugh Dobinson's there are only three others. Thomas Jackson, long-serving city chamberlain, owned a fair amount of property, but his inventory did not include shoemaking equipment. Robert Pattinson, a Carlisle shoemaker who died in London in 1700, left cash legacies totalling £79, although he did not specify any other property. John Dobinson, who died in 1676, may have left legacies of only £2, but in addition possessed a house.

1. "Cordiner" or "cordwainer" and "shoemaker" were used interchangeably in Carlisle in the sixteenth century, the former term falling out of use in the last decades of the century.

2. Of this 20, 11 were not definitely inhabitants of the city rather than the rural parts of its parishes, but no shoemakers are known certainly to have lived outside the urban area before the Civil War. The median value of the inventories of those stated to be living in the town was £22-3-6.

3. P1681.
4. P1686.
5. P1688.
6. P1700.
shop and stable. In 1684, however, nearly 48 per cent of the members of the Shoemakers' Company had not taken up the freedom of the city, and many of those non-freemen lived outside the town. It may be that this had always been the case, but it is also possible that the trade had become more subject to competition from rural shoemakers. In 1661 the Shoemakers' Company sent two members to Kendal to purchase shoes which were then resold by individual brothers. Carlisle's shoemakers were unable to satisfy local demand at that date, but why is unknown. If the shortfall was frequent it would have encouraged shoemaking in the surrounding countryside. That no rural shoemakers in the two Carlisle parishes left probate records suggests that they were relatively poor.

The shoemakers' principal investment in their trade was, like the tanners, in circulating capital. Tools such as lasts, hammers, knives, cutting boards and pincers appear in inventories of all dates, and these are still the basic tools of the craft. Their capital value was low, however. Of the two shoemakers with the most valuable stock, Hewe Bowe's "worklumes belonging to his occupa(tion)" were worth only 3s. 4d., and Hugh Dobinson's lasts, seats, heels and other working tools were valued at £1. Raw materials and finished footwear were generally worth much more. The number of ready-made boots and shoes held by individual craftsmen ranged from the 204 pairs valued at £24, in the hands of Hugh Dobinson, to the 4 pairs worth 3s. owned by Richard Dalton, but most shoemakers held a fair stock, worth

1. P1676. He was Hugh Dobinson's brother.
2. Ca2/27.
4. P1587 Hewe Bowe; P1681 Hugh Dobinson.
between one and two pounds. It was rare for a shoemaker not to own some unwrought leather, often of greater value than his finished shoes.

Like the tanners the shoemakers seem to have operated on a small scale and for the local market. Although some masters employed other workmen besides apprentices, Thomas Stoddart for example owed 2s. 6d. "to the journeymen", there is no evidence to indicate that any Carlisle craftsman had an especially large workshop. In Chester, by contrast, it was not uncommon for master shoemakers to employ three or more journeymen. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that Carlisle’s shoemakers were supplying a wider market than northern Cumberland, in the way that those of Northampton came to do after the Civil War and those of Chester may have done before. They did play a major part in the manufacture of footwear in the county, however, at least in the early seventeenth century. Carlisle shoemakers were then attending the markets at Brampton in greater numbers than the trade could comfortably bear.

Although working techniques remained the same, there was probably a significant change in the activities of the shoemakers. Before freshly tanned leather could be used, it had to be curried to soften and waterproof it. Curriers were few in early modern Carlisle, no more than two ever being recorded contemporaneously. The sole surviving currier’s inventory, that of Richard Harresson, appraised in 1587, reveals him to have been a poor man, his working tools and equipment comprising only a shaving knife and two graining boards: he owned none of the necessary oil or grease, and no leather.

1. P1681 Hugh Dobinson; P1587 Richard Dalton.
2. P1615 Thos Stoddart.
6. P1587. His "Iron" and "Lanstaffe" may also have been part of his equipment; even with these his tools were worth only 3s.
These commodities were, however, owned by shoemakers, who were, as noted above, the major purchasers of tanned leather. Two orders in their gild book dating from the early seventeenth century (and later deleted) forbid any brother to sell oil to rural shoemakers and command the fraternity to keep a measure for oil.¹ Nineteen of the 25 inventories of working shoemakers proved before 1621 contain reference to oil, tallow or both in connection with their working equipment.²

There are two possible explanations to all this. First, that the shoemakers were employing the few, possibly only one, curriers in the city to work with leather and materials owned by them, but there is no evidence to support this hypothesis. The second, and more likely, is that the shoemakers were currying leather themselves. Mr Woodward believes this to have been so in Chester, where only two curriers became freemen between 1558 and 1625.³

In late sixteenth-century Worcester it was apparently the practice among the corvisors, a group rather wealthier than the mass of shoemakers, one of whom was certainly currying leather for sale. It was also true of early-modern Kendal, at least in the sixteenth century.⁴ This pattern may well have been a national one, with full-time curriers restricted to the largest towns while shoemakers, and perhaps also other users of tanned leather such as saddlers, did most of the essential currying work. Curriers were not included among the 72 most common occupations in Norfolk towns in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, i.e. they were not recorded in any but the largest towns; Dyer found only one in Worcester; no curriers appear among the 266 published probate inventories from Devon in the sixteenth and seventeenth

1. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Shoemakers' Gild Book, no.1, p.6.
2. A further three mention "rosett", or resin.
centuries, the 259 from Oxfordshire, 1550-1590, or the 72 for Ipswich proved
before 1631. The latter two collections both include shoemakers' 
inventories which list substantial quantities of tallow, rosen, and in one 
example, train oil.  

It is possible, however, that Carlisle's shoemakers abandoned the 
practice after the Civil War. Neither of the inventories of working 
shoemakers surviving from the late seventeenth century records stocks of oil 
or tallow, although both describe the deceased's stock and tools in 
considerable detail. As noted above, the early seventeenth century gild 
regulations about oil were deleted, presumably because they were no longer 
of value and were now burdensome. No increase in the number of curriers is 
apparent, as might be expected, but the will of the only known currier from 
that period shows him to have been a wealthy man. He owned at least two 
houses, a stable, a barn, a garden and a free rent in Penrith worth 4s. 8d. 
p.a.  

Evidence of the manufacture of other goods from tanned leather is 
rather scanty. Shoemakers certainly made the footballs used in the Shrove 
Tuesday games, but no journeyman or apprentice was to make any footballs to 
sell or play with without the consent of their masters. This was a means 
of social control, since the same gild ordinance forbade them to play 
football within the liberties of the city. If, as is likely, shoemakers made

1. J. Patten, English Towns, 1500-1700, Folkestone 1978, pp.254-283; Dyer, 
op. cit., p.122; M. Cash, ed., Devon Inventories of the Sixteenth and 
Seventeenth Centuries, Devon and Cornwall Record Soc., new series, II, 1966, 
p.xii; M.A. Havinden, ed., Household and Farm Inventories In Oxfordshire, 
1550-1590, 1965, pp.6-7; M. Reed, ed., The Ipswich Probate Inventories, 1583-
5. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Shoemakers' Gild Book 1, p.13. This order was 
subsequently deleted.
other items, such as harness or buckets, they maintained no stock of them, for none is recorded in their inventories. No-one is known to have specialised in the production of harness alone; the principal other "heavy leather" trade being the saddlers. Little is known about the latter although they were rather more numerous than the curriers. One of the few men whose occupations are given in the 1597 list of householders was a saddler; seven saddlers appear in the city court entry books between 1630 and 1656; in 1675 George Langcake, saddler, acknowledged himself a debtor to the Glovers' Gild; and two saddlers appear in the baptismal registers of St Mary's parish, in August 1699 and January 1699/1700. No probate records survive for anyone indubitably a saddler, however, and only two inventories for men who might have been. These were Anthony Nanson, who owned "one newe saddle 3 saddle stocks a cvver in unp(er)feted w(I)th all his worcken geare & a male pilyen", all valued at 10s., and Alexander Monk, whose inventory records "Brydles, brestgirthes, girthwebbes & other broken leather", five old saddles and a rough neat hide. Neither was well off; Nanson's goods were valued at £3-3-0 and Monk's at £14-15-10. Clearly they were working on a small scale. Most of the references to saddlers in the town date from the mid or late seventeenth century. It is probable that as a specialised occupation saddlemaking was rare before the mid-seventeenth century, but became more important thereafter.

Dr Clarkson divided the leather crafts into two groups, heavy and light leather trades, each being distinguished by the type of hides used and the method of turning them into leather. The light leather trades in

1. D/MH/I, p.131; Mrs E. Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle City Court Entry Books, 1630-9, n.p. sub Saddlers, 1645-56; D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Glovers' Gild Day Book, 1674-1729, sub 4 Nov. 1675; PR/47/1, Baptisms, sub 26 Aug. 1699 and Jan. 1699/1700.
2. P1581 Anth. Nanson; P1596 Alexander Monk. It is unlikely that either of these men were carriers since they owned no horses.
Carlisle, working on sheep and goats leather, were wholly encompassed by those described as glovers. They were a numerous occupational group, whose gild was by far the largest in the town in the late seventeenth century. The craft increased a little in importance in the town's economy during that century. More wills and inventories survived for members of the trade after 1621 than before then, and members of their gild admitted to the freedom rose from the third largest group in the early seventeenth century to the last three decades. Why their numbers grew in this way is not clear.

There is nothing in their probate inventories, such as credit relationships with men from outside the country or merchants who might have been exporting their gloves or white leather, to indicate that the trade had become of more than local importance. In 1697 the "greatest returns" of glove manufacture in the country, however, were said to have been from Brampton and about Carlisle.

Although the popularity of gloving as an occupation was increasing, it does not appear to have been a particularly profitable trade. The median net value of the nine inventories surviving from before 1611 was only £7-14-6, and none of the three inventories from 1611-1620 were worth as much as £8. After the Restoration the situation was barely improved. The median of the nine glovers' inventories was worth just £22-13-6, two-thirds of the overall median of £33-0-846. Only three glovers left moveable property apprized at more than this average. The general picture provided by the inventories of, at best, moderate prosperity, is supported by the evidence of their wills, few of which suggest substantial wealth. The only

1. See Tables 4.5 and 4.3, pp.170, 162.
2. Hainsworth, no.396. Presumably these "returns" were in response to a government enquiry.
3. Four of the former and one of the latter are the inventories of tradesmen whose exact place of residence is unknown. There is no evidence, however, that this trade was practised in the rural parts of Carlisle's parishes before the Civil War.
glover known to have been markedly wealthy was Robert Wilson, who died in 1648. A prominent parliamentarian, he owned a farm and was probably also dealing in wool.

There were no skinners or whittawers recorded who might have provided the glovers with white leather: in Carlisle whittawing was carried out by the glovers themselves. This practice was reflected in the name of their gild, which from 1730 was called the Skinners' and Glovers' Company, and was implicit in its ordinances. An order made by the gild in 1665 stated that no brother was to sell any skins to any baconer "until they be converted into white leather or gloves". There is also plentiful evidence from probate inventories that glovers were preparing leather. They owned alum vats and alummmed leather, and leather in lime pits, used as in tanning for the removal of wool and hair. Hewghe Stubb, for example, left "III dossen allamb sheep leather" and "vii dossen sheape leather in the lyme pytte", John Raven junior owned "III dussen of leather in the lime pittes" and John Beck left his alum vat and working knife to his brother. Among the debts owed by Robert Fisher, who was certainly whittawing and was probably also a glover, was 15d. for three pounds of "allom". Many glovers had substantial stocks of skins, although to dress leather by whittawing was a much quicker process than tanning so that a glover did not require the same volume of skins as a tanner needed hides to keep himself constantly at work. Richard Wyelson, for example, had 1,076 skins. But the value of such skins, like their size, was small. Wyelson's skins were

1. P1662.
2. Ferguson and Nanson, op. cit., p.209; D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Glovers' Gild, Skinners' Book 1, cont., n.p. Order no.9.
3. Glovers also used lime for this purpose in Chester. Woodward, loc. cit., p.69.
5. P1574.
appraised at only £3-9-8. Similarly, the tools required were cheap. The
most valuable working equipment recorded belonged to John Beck the younger.
It consisted of "Wood vassail: one greet fatt: and one alum fatt & a
working knife" valued at 3s. 4d., and two pairs of shears, some weights and
scales worth 4s. The low investment in capital required must have been a
contributory factor to the low value of the glovers' inventories when
compared with those of other leather craftsmen. It must also have made it
relatively easy for a journeyman to set up as a master.

The glovers did not only make gloves from this whittawed leather,
but certainly gloves were their principal marketable product. All those
glovers who owned finished or partly-finished goods at the time of their
deaths had gloves. Richard Wylson, for example, had 17 pairs of gloves
unfinished, valued at 2s. 6d., and was owed 5s. for a dozen gloves. Henry
Foster had gloves and leather in his shop worth 12s. The market for gloves
was wide: the Earl of Cumberland bought gloves in Carlisle, George Denton, a
Carlisle gentleman, had a pair of Carlisle gloves at his house at Warnell,
worth 4d., and gloves were widely used by agricultural workers. It is more
difficult to prove that the glovers made other soft leather products, such as
purses, bags and, possibly, leather clothing and parchment although they
almost certainly did so. Only one inventory records any such goods, that of
Hewghe Stubb, appraised in 1587, who had gloves and purses worth 3s. 4d.
among his stock.

1. P1576.
2. P1671.
3. P1576.
4. P1672.
5. Chatsworth House, Bolton MSS., Book 230, f.144r. I am indebted to Dr R.
   Spence for this information; P1605 Geo. Denton; J. Thirsk, ed., The Agrarian.
6. P1587.
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As elsewhere the leather-dressing side of the glovers' activities spawned a subsidiary occupation. When leather was tawed the wool or hair was usually removed. This could be done without damaging it, and the wool sold. Of the 18 inventories surviving for working glovers, eight recorded stocks of wool. Two were valued at 6s. each, the rest at £1-10-0 and upwards, the most valuable being worth £28. None of these glovers had any sheep of their own. For some of them the wool recorded had probably been removed from fells which they had tawed. Others, however, had more wool than could have come from the skins in their possession, and in several cases it was worth considerably more than their leather.¹ Thus Hewghe Stubb, died 1587, owned wool worth £14 and leather worth £2-1-8, Thomas Threlkeld, died 1666, had 15 stone of wool, worth £2-14-0 and leather valued at 8s., and Robert Wilson owned 80 stone of wool of three grades, worth £28, his leather being appraised at over £17.² It is probable that these men had taken what Dr. Bowden describes as a "short step" and had begun collecting and dealing in wool.³ Stubb, indeed, may also have become a small scale clothier. This development from leatherworker to wool dealer was common in Tudor England, and has been noted in Melton Mowbray and Chester.⁴ The Carlisle glovers so engaged do not appear to have traded on anything approaching the scale Bowden describes in the Midlands, probably because of the distance from potential markets and the poor quality of Cumberland wool.

1. Dr Marshall reckons that in the late seventeenth century Cumberland and Westmorland wool was worth 3-7s. a stone, and the fleeces of 7-10 local sheep weighed a stone. J. Marshall, 'The domestic economy of the Lakeland yeoman, 1660-1749', CW2, 73, 1973, p.193.
2. P1587 Hewghe Stubb; P1666 Thos Threlkeld; P1662 Robert Wilson.
b. Textile manufacture

For all the city's later importance in the cotton industry, Carlisle was not a significant centre of cloth manufacture in the early-modern period. It was common for contemporary local histories and topographical descriptions to note dominant local manufactures. Only one such description, in Richard Blome's Britannia of 1673, which calls Carlisle "a place of good trade, chiefly for Fustians", hints at large scale cloth production. Cloth exported through Whitehaven to America came from Yorkshire and Kendal, not Carlisle, however, and when Sir John Lowther considered encouraging cloth manufacture in the Whitehaven district, it was to Kendal that he sent for expert advice.

Nor was Carlisle a centre for the production of other woollen goods, such as knitted stockings, as Kendal became in the seventeenth century. An attempt was made to promote knitting as an employment for the poor of Carlisle in 1649. From November 1649 until October 1650, the corporation spent £66-8-6 on maintaining 24 poor children and teaching them the trade of knitting. No more is heard of this project in subsequent accounts, however, nor is it mentioned in surviving corporation minutes. Presumably it was unsuccessful. Stockings occasionally appear among the stock of Carlisle merchants, and one man, Thomas Dixon, seems to have been a specialist trader in them. At his death in 1679 he owned a stock of £5-3-2 worth, and owed £2-14-0 for stockings, but his source of supply is unknown.

Although no cloth manufacture of national significance took place in the town, Carlisle had a cloth industry of local importance. It was based

1. R. Blome, Britannia, 1673, p.69.
5. P1678.
on locally produced materials: wool, flax and hemp. The coarse, short-staple
wool of northern Cumberland was amongst the lowest quality in the kingdom
and was suitable only for the poorest woollen cloth.1 As a result greater
emphasis may have been placed on linen cloth in the town than elsewhere in
England; but linen manufacture received added stimulus from the supplies of
linen yarn imported from Scotland in the later seventeenth century, if not
earlier. It was linen cloth which the Penrith merchant Joshua Collison,
contracted to supply in considerable quantities to London drapers, in the
early 1690s.2 Local production probably satisfied local demand for all but
worsted, the new draperies, finer varieties of woollen cloth, and exotic
textiles such as silks. Consequently all manufacturing processes, with the
exception of shearing, are recorded in the district.

The first process was the conversion of the basic raw materials
into yarn. In the case of flax and hemp, the stalks of the plants were
soaked for a period to rot and soften them, and then combed with ripple comb
or heckle to separate the fibres. Heckles and ripple combs are fairly
frequently recorded in probate inventories from both urban and rural parts
of Carlisle's parishes. Since Cumberland wool was of short staple, it was
carded to prepare it for spinning. Cards also appear often in probate
inventories, and among the stock of merchants' shops. There is no evidence
of local manufacture of such items, although it is quite possible that they
were made by Carlisle men. Spinning wheels were in use from the earliest
years of the period, being first recorded in an inventory appraised in
January 1566/7 and quite common in those proved in the 1570s.3 Over the

1. Bowden, op. cit., p.36.
2. Q/11/26, Epiphany 1691/2.
3. P1566 Thos Sowerbye. Only a handful of the surviving inventories were
proved before 1566.
whole period they appear in just under 13 per cent of all inventories. They were probably used indiscriminately for spinning wool or flax, only occasionally being distinguished as wool or linen wheels. Rarely were two or more wheels in the possession of one individual; these were mostly well-off country dwellers. The distaff and spindle was probably also still in common use, at least in the sixteenth century, but appear in only three inventories because they were worth so little: Symond Willson's "certayne Rockes & Real(e)s" were valued at only 2d.1

The impression given by the probate records is that it was common to be as self sufficient as possible in the production of linen and woollen yarn. Many households produced their own raw materials to be spun at home. Additionally, some inventories list yarn without processing equipment or raw materials. These testators had, presumably, bought yarn in Carlisle's market, providing custom for "professional" spinners amongst the town's poor or absorbing the surplus yarn produced by wealthier households. Although there is no evidence that the poor spun, it is unlikely that they did not. Few well-to-do households had no stock of yarn at all - this had important implications for the structure of the local cloth industry.

A variety of types of cloth were woven from this largely homespun yarn. In 1594, Matthew Munke, a merchant and innkeeper, had fine linen cloth, "Rowndlynne" and harden at bleaching, presumably all made locally.2 Symond Willson had "X yardes of Twyse Tow Att ye webster".3 The range of woollen cloth manufactured included kersey, of which Hewghe Stubb had three webs at the walker's, perhaps frieze and possibly a small amount of worsted, for in 1661 a weaver, Thomas Shepard, bequeathed a "worsitt" gear with other

1. P1587 Symond Willson; P1592 Robert Rasshall; P1594 Elizabeth Chamberlaine.
2. P1594.
3. P1587.
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weaving equipment.’ Lindsey-woolsey and stuff were both woven for Lord William Howard of Naworth, and so were probably made in Carlisle too.\textsuperscript{2}

Coverlet looms are recorded throughout the period. There is no evidence, however, to support Blome’s assertion about fustian-making.

It was more common for Carlisle weavers to own two or more looms than just one, the total value of their capital equipment usually being around £1 and seldom much over £2. In part this was to enable them to weave different types of cloth. Thomas Drurye, for example, owned a coverlet loom and a linen loom.\textsuperscript{3} But many fabrics could be produced on the same loom, using different gearing. The real explanation lies in the structure of the trade in Carlisle. It is clear from the gild records that many weavers took apprentices for whom they would provide looms, and who stayed on for an eight year as a “hireman” (that is, a servant contracted for a long period such as a year), and some master craftsmen employed extra hiremen or journeymen.

In contrast, fewer weavers working in the surrounding countryside are known to have owned more than one loom. The Carlisle Weavers’ Gild had effective control over weaving within the city which it exercised for the benefit of its members, and although it could not prevent weavers living nearby, it did restrict their trading rights in the town. Outmen, members of the gild not resident in the city, were in most cases limited in the number of journeymen they might employ, had to pay fines for taking apprentices and were forbidden to take work from Carlisle.\textsuperscript{4} Presumably there was still less freedom allowed to those not in the gild, for in 1656 Thomas Grame,

1. P1587 Hewghe Stubb; P1661 Thos Sheppard.
3. P1578.
4. D/Lops/L-1786 Election, Weavers’ Gild Book no.1, sub 8 Aug. 1692, 4 May 1685, 5 May 1679, no.18.
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The town's weavers were able to operate on a larger scale and presumably at a more commercial level, than their rural competitors. It is improbable that many master craftsmen employed journeymen, however. Weavers were supposed to pay a fee of 8d. to the gild for each journeyman employed; gild minutes rarely record more than four or five journeymen each year, and only a few masters had more than one at a time. 2

Without manufacture for more distant markets the amount of work available cannot have been very great or very profitable. It was noted above that the majority of households, certainly most wealthy households, made or bought their own yarn. This yarn was put out to craftsmen for weaving into cloth for a fee. For example, James Nicholson, a tanner, owned at his death "certayne cloth at John cruckdayke at workinge" and Symon Brisco owed Edward Calvert "for weving of seckcloth - vid.". 3 Other examples have been quoted above. Most weavers must also have made cloth for sale in the markets and fairs: in 1691 the gild amerced one of its members for engrossing yarn on its way to Carlisle market and in 1697 the company wrote to the customs commissioners about interference with yarn being brought to Carlisle for weaving. 4 But such manufacture on their own initiative was on a small scale and the cloth produced sold almost at once. Only one inventory reveals a weaver holding more than a small stock of yarn, or

2. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Weavers' Gild Books, passim.
3. P1598 James Nicholson; P1572 Symon Brisco.
4. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Weavers' Gild Book no.1, sub 2 Nov. 1691, 8 Nov. 1697.
significantly more cloth than most householders had for their own use. No weaver died, it seems with an unfinished web of his own on his loom.

Not only was cloth production for the market on a limited scale, there was also no apparent attempt to extend control of manufacture introducing the putting-out system prevalent in the West Country and found occasionally in sixteenth-century Worcester. There is no evidence that any weaver put out yarn to other weavers, nor that any weaver employed spinners, and only one may have owned more than one spinning wheel. This exceptional man, John Crawe, is the closest that can be found to a clothier among Carlisle's clothworkers. He owned two linen looms, two coverlet looms, linen and harden cloth worth £6-0-2, linen and harden yarn valued at 21s., a spinning wheel and "2 little wheeles", probably also for spinning. He was also owed 5s. "for dyeinge of 2 coverclothes" although he owned no dyeing equipment.

Two other men might have been entrepreneurs in cloth manufacture. One was Matthew Munke, mentioned above. He had a store of linen, Scottish twill and black frieze valued at £3-6-6, of which no piece was longer than nine yards, a further five pieces of linen of four qualities, worth £3-16-4, "at bletching", plus 22 yards of fine linen at the webster's, worth 22s., and 20s. worth of "lyne tow & garne". That there was so much variety of cloth, however, and that the finished cloth was in such short pieces suggests that Munke had had it made for domestic use rather than for sale. Although

2. Joshua Collison, a Penrith merchant, may have done both over a wide area in the early 1690s but the phraseology of his petition suggests that some at least of his weavers bought their own yarn. Quarter Sessions petitions, Q/11/26, Epiphany 1691/2.
3. P1581. It is not clear from his will and inventory if Crawe was resident in the town, but almost certainly he was.
4. P1594.
nominally a merchant, his principal trade at his death was probably as an innkeeper, for which he needed great amounts of linen - he had 12½ pairs of fine linen sheets alone. A more likely clothier was Hewghe Stubb, a glover and dealer in wool. His stock of wool was worth £18; he also owned 20 yards of "frese", 20 yards of "blake graye" and 60 yards of kersey in three webs "at the walkers", in all worth £5.¹ It seems unlikely that Stubb would have wanted so much woollen cloth for his own use.

None of these three bears much comparison with the clothiers found in areas where cloth was produced for export. Neither this, nor the absence of the domestic system is surprising: both were linked closely with manufacture for national and international markets. The function of the clothier was as an intermediary; "his distinctive service" was "the willingness of the clothier to confront the market".² The role was valueless where weavers were in direct contact with the consumers.

The failure to participate in distant markets must have contributed to the poverty of the weavers compared with the prosperity of their contemporaries who followed other occupations. The median value of weavers' inventories was less than two-thirds of that of the median of all Carlisle inventories. Nevertheless, the central place which clothmaking held in Carlisle's economy, as it did in most places in the early-modern period, was reflected in the number of members of the Weavers' Gild. In 1684, the weavers' fraternity, most of whose members practised the trade, was the third largest of the 8 in the city.³

Much less information survives about the finishing trades than about weaving. Most of the woollen cloth produced would have fulled; as

1. P1587.
3. Ca2/27.
noted above, Hewghe Stubb's kersey was at a walker's.\footnote{P1587. Walker was the local term for a fuller.} A small number of fullers are recorded in the city court books, but none of their wills or inventories has survived.\footnote{Mrs E. Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle Court Entry Books, 1600-1656.} The demand for fullers must have been significantly reduced by the local heavy emphasis on linen cloth. Linen was bleached, or like woollen cloth, dyed, but was not fulled. That there are no probate records of fullers is perhaps the result of chance, the occupational group being very small, with possibly only three or four men being active at any one time. It does suggest, however, that they were not among the more prosperous craftsmen. Mechanical fulling had been introduced into the Lake Counties in the Middle Ages; there was a "walkmill" at Paradise, east of the city on the River Petteril, in 1617 owned by a merchant, Michael Warde.\footnote{P1617.} A fulling mill was an expensive piece of capital equipment which few of Carlisle's craftsmen could have afforded. They would have been owned by capitalists such as Warde presumably was, from whom the fullers would have rented or leased the mills, or by whom the fullers would have been employed. Either way the craftsmen would have been unable to enjoy the full returns of their labour, as most master craftsmen could. Besides fulling they may also have acted as shearmen, as fullers did in Worcester.\footnote{Dyer, op. cit., pp.101-2.} No-one was recorded as a shearman in early-modern Carlisle: the need for their services, like those of the fullers, was reduced by the importance of linen cloth.

The other principal finishing trade was dyeing. It took much less time to dye a piece of cloth (or the thread for it) than it did to weave it, so one dyer could serve a number of weavers. As with fulling, the demand for dyers was lowered by the production locally of considerable amounts of linen as well as woollen cloth. For these reasons there were few dyers in

1. P1587. Walker was the local term for a fuller.
2. Mrs E. Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle Court Entry Books, 1600-1656.
3. P1617.
Carlisle. A handful are recorded in the city court records, although little else is known about them. The merchant, John Thomlinson the younger, may have been a dyer as well as a shopkeeper. At his death he had £8-10-0 worth of "Dyenge stuffe" in his back shop, besides groceries, drugs and tobacco in his fore shop. More illuminating than Thomlinson's probate documents, however, are those of John Love. Although he owned his lead and vats, Love was not well off, his goods being valued at only £9-17-4, and he owned less than £1's worth of dyestuffs - galls, alum, madder, brazil and Indigo. From his will it appears that he was dyeing cloth for a fee - for "brough" brown, 3d. per yard, and for red, 20d. per coat cloth, the cloths being identified by the owners' marks. He did not apparently own any cloth himself or take an entrepreneurial role in the cloth industry.

c. Conclusion

Two of the most significant points which emerge from the above discussion of the leather and cloth trades are the small scale of operations of the individual businesses, and the apparently local nature of the markets served. None of the trades had significant numbers of customers outside the county, not even the tanners who were so important in the town before the Civil War. Indeed, as the mapping of credit contacts in Chapter Three shows, for the most part their customers were drawn from northern Cumberland. Another point clear from the account of cloth manufacture, was that individuals did not specialise in particular types of cloth as they did in larger cloth producing areas. Much of the work done by the cloth workers of Carlisle, apparently by the dyers as well as by the weavers, was directly commissioned

1. Mrs Beattie's Indices, passim.
2. P1663.
3. P1607. Love may have lived in the rural part of St Mary's parish. His inventory was valued at £9-9-2 net.
by customers who provided materials to be worked up. Cloth produced as a
service in this way may have accounted for as much or more than was woven
directly for the market, on the weavers' own initiative. In this the cloth
workers showed in a contrasting pattern to the leather workers, all of whose
goods were produced, apparently, for sale as finished items. Like the
clothworkers, however, some at least of the leatherworkers may have produced
a variety of finished items, and a number of the glovers were seriously
engaged in the sale of wool, albeit not on a large scale compared with
others elsewhere.
In this chapter the economic activity of individuals involved in three more areas of the Carlisle economy will be examined: clothing, the manufacture of metal goods and armaments, and building. These trades have a certain unity in that in all three, as in the leather and textile trades, the work of men's hands was a crucial element, and those following the trades were considered to be craftsmen. The activities of each group of tradesmen, however, differed widely from those of the others, and in some cases varied greatly, or had divergent experiences within a particular occupational group. Nevertheless they illustrate some of the points mentioned earlier, especially inefficient working practices, lack of opportunity to specialise, and diversity of activity by individual craftsmen.

a. Tailoring

Working up cloth into garments was one of the least prosperous and less important trades in Tudor and Stuart Carlisle. Table 4.4, based on surviving probate records, might suggest that only a handful of inhabitants pursued the occupation. This impression is certainly erroneous, however. They were far more numerous than the dyers and fullers discussed above, or the building craftsmen considered below. The Tailors' Gild, although the smallest of the 8 companies, seems to have been composed almost entirely of practising tailors, and at any moment in the period there were probably as many active tailors as there were merchants.

The explanation for the poor representation of tailors among the surviving inventories lies in their poverty. Only one of the four surviving
wills, that of John Barker, proved in 1683, suggests more than moderate prosperity. Of the five surviving inventories only Barker’s was valued at as much as two-thirds of the median inventoried wealth of the period in which they were proved, and two show the deceased died owing greater debts than they owned moveable goods.2

The working practices of the tailors were responsible in two ways for the low value of their inventories. First, the inventory totals were not inflated by the inclusion of working capital and equipment. Only one inventory records any fabric: Robert Stevenson had 60 yds. of round cloth, 18 yds. of linen cloth and 15 yds. of harden cloth, worth in all £2-8-6.3 In other inventories, shears, pressing irons and in one instance a "tailer boorde" were the only equipment.4 The value of these items in no case exceeded 2s., being usually just a few pence. No-one had any needles, thread or buttons worth appraising, nor a stock of finished clothing.5 The inference is that these tailors worked up cloth provided by a customer or specially bought for each commission. This conclusion is supported by the debt of 6d. owed to Clement Railton by Thomas Sanderson "for a dublet".6 For this price Railton could hardly have provided the fabric as well as sewing the garment, as the cheapest harden cloth cost 4d. per yard. Less ambiguously, in 1614 and again in 1617, the corporation bought cloth and

1. P1683.
2. P1588 Edw. Paine; P1594 Clement Railton.
3. P1587.
4. P1588.
5. The context implies that the three gowns owned by Robt. Stevenson were his personal clothing, not stock kept for sale. P1587.
6. P1594. Sixpence may not have represented the full cost, of course, but only what was still owing.
thread for the fool's coat, and made a separate payment of 5s. for making it.¹

Second, merely making up clothing to order cannot have been very lucrative. Tailoring required little capital and the manufacture of simple garments needed relatively little skill. Carlisle's tailors therefore suffered from domestic competition in a way which other of the town's tradesmen did not, since many people's clothing was doubtless home-made. For example, in 1594 Matthew Munke, merchant, innkeeper and alderman, died possessing "a homemade gowne - 16s" and Richard Dowson of Cawdowhill owned "one gowne off howsewyff makinge & a yacket - vijs."² Moreover demand for more complex and fashionable clothing, which would encourage more frequent recourse to a tailor, was likely to be limited in an area as remote and relatively poor as northern Cumberland. Visitors to the town in 1634 were struck that the city aldermen wore Scottish-style blue bonnets rather than the more sophisticated beavers general in southern England.³

Given the problems facing the city's tailors, it is not surprising that most appear to have worked alone or with just an apprentice. The apprenticeship contract stipulated by the Tailors' Gild called for 7 years service as an apprentice and an eighth as a hireman.⁴ Once out of this eighth year most tailors set up as masters themselves: it must have been easy to do so since the trade needed so little capital. It was customary for many tailors to work in the gild's room in Redness Hall at fair-times,

4. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tailors' Gild Minute Book, 1659-1703, n.p., Gild Orders and sub Midsummer Quarter Day 1652. These orders were copied from an old book and reflect earlier practice as well as the rules current in 1659/60.
presumably because they were too poor to own a shop. A gild ordnance
dated 31 Oct. 1603 laid down that no servant was to be hired for less than
a year, and the master was to pay the gild 8d. quarterly for each man.2
Probably in compliance with this order, the gild minute book sporadically
records payments made to the company for keeping journeymen. Never did
more than five masters make payments at once, usually only two or three.
Most paid for only one journeyman; Edward Monkhouse, who several times
employed four or five and once as many as six journeymen, was exceptional.3

There are also occasional references to one other clothing trade
in the city, that of hatter. One lived in Fishergate in 1597.4 Two appear
in the Bishop's Transcripts for St Cuthbert's in the 1670s; one of these was
a Scot, the other, Richard Heath, was described at his death in 1692/3 as a
haberdasher. He then had two shops, with a stock of hats, linings and hat
bands valued at £40, which was his only trading stock. No tools or raw
materials were specified but that does not prove conclusively that he was
not making hats since Carlisle inventories at this date were laconic.5
Hatters, or haberdashers, were few in the town, probably because they had to
compete against the merchants, who sold hats and caps along with needles,
thread, lace, buttons, points and stockings.

1. Ca3/2/7.
2. D/Lons/L-1786 Election Tailors' Gild Minute Book, 1659-1703, n.p., Gild
Orders.
3. Ibid. passim. The entries seem to imply, however, that journeymen were
employed for far shorter periods than a year.
5. DRC6/28, 1673-4, 1678-9; P1692. Heath was also farming in a small way.
b. The metal and armaments trades.

In every early modern community of any size one would expect to find a number of metalworking craftsmen. There would always have been certain amount of ironmongery which had to be made locally to fit a particular situation, repairs to be done and, of course, horse shoeing. Moreover there were many autonomous branches which could be practised, in contrast to, say, clothworking, where the raw material was worked on by a variety of craftsmen in succession, so the metal trades had an unusual diversity. In some areas, for example around Birmingham, circumstances might favour the development of greater specialisation among metalworkers, to serve markets far beyond their immediate neighbourhood and perhaps to become of national importance. Carlisle had no such advantage. The nearest supplies of iron ore, for example, were over twenty miles away and were not exploited to any substantial degree until late in the seventeenth century. In the late sixteenth century several Carlisle smiths obtained their iron from Newcastle. The only encouragement the city could provide to specialisation and a wide variety of metal trades lay in the size of its population and its position as the largest town and administrative centre of Cumberland. Consequently there were not large numbers of metalworkers of the more specialised trades living in the town. Because the town was so small and the separate metal trades so diverse changes in the variety of them present in the city reflect changes in Carlisle's economy better than in other occupational groups.

The most numerous metalworkers were the smiths or blacksmiths. Horse shoeing was, naturally, much of their work. For example, at his death

1. Plumbers will be discussed under the heading of building craftsmen.
Thomas Strang was owed 45s. by Lord Thomas Scrope for horse shoeing, and John Atkinson at his was owed 20d. by Lord Henry Scrope. They also make tools and agricultural equipment. Atkinson was also owed for a socke and other gear, and John Barrne had a stock of nine sockes. They also provided iron bands for wooden tubs and barrels, and architectural ironwork like crooks and staples. The corporation often paid for such items, and private individuals too, such as James Hardin who owed John Slaiter 3s. for "bandes for a beefe fatt", staples, mending a trunk, crooks, "a snecke for ye hecke" and a number of locks and keys. Alexander Knagg made some special large nails for the corporation, but apart from such occasions Carlisle smiths do not seem to have made nails and there were no specialist nailers in the town. Edward Atkinson owned a "nayll towll", whatever that was for, but his stock of wrought work included sockes. Nails appear in large numbers in the inventories of the shop goods of several merchants, in 1557 the crown bought nails "off the nailman of Rotheram" and in 1604 thousands of nails for repairing the citadel were purchased from John Kendall, who was a hardwareman, not a smith. Presumably already by the last decade of the sixteenth century nails were imported into the region.

The only other metalworking trade to appear persistently in the records was that of cutler. There were probably few cutlers in the town at any one time, only a handful of names being listed contemporaneously.

1. P1599 Thos. Strang; P1587 John Atkinson.
2. P1580 John Barne. A socke is a ploughshare.
3. Ca4/1-4, passim; P1664, John Slaiter.
4. Ca4/1. It is unlikely, however, that one could tell a nailer from a smith from the equipment listed in probate inventories since so often it was described in very general terms. Nails were not listed among smiths' trading stock.
5. P1571.
7. Mrs Beattie's Indices, passim.
Only one is known to have left probate records, which suggests that the trade was not prosperous; the inventory which does survive, however, that of John Dowson, who died in 1587, was valued at £33-10-3, placing him among the richer metalworkers. His "workelomes belonging to my shope" were appraised at only 10s., half of the value of his brewing equipment (he probably also ran an alehouse), and substantially less than his farmstock and crops. Among his debtors was a fletcher, Thomas Wilson: perhaps Dowson supplied Wilson with arrowheads. Little can be said about the other cutlers. Edged tools were a necessity, and presumably the trade benefited from the violent conditions on the Borders before 1620, and from the presence of the garrison after 1640.

Craftsmen in a number of metal trades seem to have disappeared from the town during the early seventeenth century. These included spurriers, braziers, locksmiths and gunsmiths. There was also an armourer recorded before 1550. None is known to have more than a couple of practitioners at any one time. A single scythesmith was also recorded in 1577, the creditor of a merchant.

The similar disappearance of the goldsmiths has been described in detail by Mr B.C. Jones, who found no evidence of any in the town after 1625. Like the other specialised metal trades there was rarely more than a couple of goldsmiths active in the city at once. Two wills and inventories relating to followers of the trade have survived. The inventory of Richard Lowrye, styled Mr, shows him to have been very well off, owning over £2 worth of tools and working in gold, silver and jewels. That of Thomas I.

1. P1587.
2. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Thomas Tallentyre's Register, f.30a.
3. P1577 Rich. Bock. It is possible that this scythesmith was not a local man.
Wilkinson alias Barker was worth in all only £9-9-3 gross (£8-2-7 net), his tools being valued at 20s. and his finished and unfinished silver worth only 25s. Carlisle goldsmiths were meeting outside competition as early as 1570, possibly because their work was not of a very high standard. Carlisle was the only place in the county where such work was done, yet only 10 of some 40 or more pieces of sixteenth-century communion silver surviving in the modern diocese of Carlisle, and less than half those in Cumberland itself, were made in the town. A handful of the others were made in York, the great majority in London. None of the seventeenth-century ecclesiastical silver was made in Carlisle, not even that of St Mary’s or the cathedral, dating respectively from 1636 and 1679-80. The disappearance of the trade is symbolised in the origins of the gild and corporation silverware acquired in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries to replace that melted down in the Civil Wars: all was manufactured in Newcastle, York or London.1

There are three possible reasons, none of which are mutually exclusive, for the apparent disappearance of these trades. First, local production may have been undercut and destroyed by the rise of the West Midlands and Sheffield iron industries and the consequent growth of a national market in metal goods. This is presumably why there were no nailers in the town; the import of prefabricated locks and horse-furniture may similarly have curtailed the business of Carlisle locksmiths and spurriers. The city accounts show, however, that throughout the seventeenth century locks and keys were fitted and probably made by men known as smiths.

1. P1579. The references to Thos. Wilkinson alias Barker in the city court entry books between 1560 and 1594 must be to both this Wilkinson and to his son Thos., who inherited his father’s tools.

Second, there may have been a change of taste or attitude which made 'smiths' a preferred occupational description in the same way as the great majority of retail tradesmen called themselves merchants. What evidence there is of the activities of the more specialised metalworkers implies that most were unable to make a living from their specialisation alone. Henry Tallentyre, one of the two known braziers, was also described as an armourer in the early seventeenth century; a bowmaker, a fletcher, a spurrier and a smith appearing frequently in the city court records between 1600 and 1639 were all called Thomas Wilson and may well have been one individual; the competition between smiths and locksmiths has been noted above; and Robert Rasshall, a metalworker who died in 1592 owning gun-making equipment and owed money for the boring of a gun, was also owed for mending fire gear and for a pair of spurs. Thus for many specialised metalworkers 'smith' would have been as accurate a description as any other. Such a change in attitude seems improbable, however, especially in view of the appearance of whitesmiths as a separate occupational group in the late seventeenth century.

The third possible explanation is related to the economic fortunes of the town. The population of Carlisle certainly fell between 1597 and 1642, as did that of Cumberland as a whole; there may have been accompanying economic difficulties. The decline of the county population must have reduced the size of the market served by Carlisle's craftsmen. Specialist metalworkers were a particularly vulnerable group since the demand for their individual skills was already limited. The decrease in the variety of specialist metalworkers was, therefore, probably a further

1. Ca4/1-4, City Chamberlains' Accounts, 1602-1700, passim.
2. Mrs Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle City Court Entry Books, P1592.
3. See pp.36-7, 187.
symptom of the town's economic problems. It is also possible that a contributory factor was an expansion of the economic influence of Newcastle. It is more likely, however, that such an expansion was rather the result of Carlisle's economic troubles than a primary cause of them: the earliest ecclesiastical silverware made in Newcastle found in the diocese, for example, dates from after the Civil War, long after the last goldsmith was recorded in Carlisle.\(^1\)

After the Civil War a couple of new metalworking occupations appeared, although, again, the numbers of craftsmen engaged in them were low. Several men were called whitesmiths. The *Oxford English Dictionary* states that the term was ambiguous, used both to describe tinsmiths or finishers of metal goods and general workers in metal. The two whitesmiths' inventories reveal nothing of their business: one, indeed, owned no tools at all and was possibly retired.\(^2\) There being no other helpful evidence it is impossible to say whether a genuine new occupation had emerged or if there had simply been a change in terminology. The appearance of a pewterer and a Japan worker in the parish registers for the last decades of the seventeenth century does reveal, however, the introduction of new specialised trades.\(^3\) With the arrival of new occupations in other fields, it points to an increasing sophistication in the urban economy in those years.

Closely linked to the metalworking trades in techniques and personnel was the manufacture of armaments. One might have expected Carlisle to have had a large and visible armaments trade, because of its role as a military centre and its position on the fringe of the most violent area

1. Ferguson, op. cit., p.297.
In early-modern England. This was not the case, but armaments did play a larger role in the town's economy than in contemporary towns of similar size elsewhere in the country. The manufacture of armaments and sporting weapons in provincial England was generally on a small scale. In sixteenth-century York the trades were so unimportant in the urban economy as to receive only a passing mention in a recent history of the town. Of the 443 male testators of known occupation who died in Salisbury before 1640, only one, a bowyer, worked in this field. In sixteenth-century Norwich, the second largest town in England, only one armourer became a freeman, and in 1589, there were only one armourer, three bowyers, two fletchers and eight cutlers in the city. In East Anglia as a whole, Patten found armourers in only three towns between 1500 and 1599, and bowyers and fletchers in only six; between 1600 and 1649 a mere two towns had armourers and two had gunsmiths; even in the late seventeenth century there were gunsmiths in only 4 towns. It seems that armament manufacture was concentrated in London and, perhaps, in the metalworking areas. Carlisle had few if any specialist weapon makers: being such a small town it would have been extraordinary if it had.

There were two interrelated reasons why the armaments trade in Carlisle and elsewhere was so limited. One was low demand. In comparison with most other goods produced in the early-modern period, weapons were durable, gunpowder and arrows excepted. They would not have to be replaced frequently like a man's coat or his horse's shoes. Demand from local people was not high and must have been fitful, even in a turbulent area. The

2. I owe this information to Dr S. Wright.
requirements of the garrison were mostly imported into the town by the government. Presumably armaments makers in Carlisle were incapable of producing the qualities and quantities demanded, although it is hard to see how they could have built up the skilled workforce to do so without regular orders. Lacking sufficient demand to allow them to specialise full-time in weapons manufacture, the town's weapon makers combined these trades with other related trades: the examples of Henry Tallentyre, armourer and brazier, and Robert Rasshall, gunsmith, general smith and, perhaps, spurrier, have been quoted above.

The second reason is that not only did weapon makers have dual occupations but weapons were made by men in related occupations, the result being that the importance of the arms trade is disguised in the picture of the economy of the town shown by the occupational tables. The most obvious example is that of the cutlers. Several of Carlisle's cutlers were also described, in the mid-seventeenth century, as sword-slipers. Their activities probably paralleled those of the cutlers of Tudor Worcester, who made swords and daggers as much as they did knives. Most early-modern weapons required only simple maintenance and repairs and some needed no specialised skills to make. A smith could easily repair a seventeenth-century matchlock or forge a spearhead; any carpenter could put a staff to a pikehead. Moreover, rarely did contemporary inventories record a craftsman's tools in great detail. Among the unspecified equipment could have been tools to do anything.

Besides those making weapons there were a number of individuals retailing them. For most it was clearly only a sideline, since their activities in the field were on a limited scale. Several merchants fell into this group. Thus Robert Pattinson, besides his personal weapons, had two

steel bonnets, valued at 2s., among his shop goods and William Tallentire had two long swords, a black armour and old harness "in the shopp", although this may have been where he kept his private armoury since he had no other shop goods and had either retired from active trade or was principally an innkeeper. The involvement of others is harder to classify. Robert Fisher, whose inventory indicates that he was a glover, was owed 30s. for 12 daggers. He may regularly have supplemented his income by trading in weapons; alternately the debt could merely have been the result of his taking advantage of a favourable opportunity. But even the most heavily involved did not live by selling weapons alone. Barnabe Toppinge was bailiff of the socage manor of Carlisle at his death in 1589. He owed a great number of weapons, including four swords, three daggers, two halberds, two bows and quivers, two dagges (hand guns), two brass guns, another gun, two jacks, two steel caps, a bill head, ten "English beakes" (perhaps also bill heads), a pound of match, a quarter staff and a buckler. In his shop he had eight arrows and a quiver, seven sheaves of arrows, a pair of (chain) "male" sleeves, a "mail" glove, an old buckler and a gauntlet. These were far more than he could have needed for his own use. It is possible that he owned them in connection with his function as bailiff, perhaps to arm tenants in an emergency, but it seems more probable that they were for retail. Besides his office Toppinge was possibly a fletcher and carpenter, since he owned so many arrows and a substantial amount of woodworking tools and timber, and also a variety of other goods. His shop also contained three plate locks, a box of broken iron, three pairs of gloves and three pairs of quilted leather britches (perhaps for wear with armour), three pairs of "spectakells", thread, three boxes with "cullers", a boot hide and seven weavers' shuttles.

1. P1571 Robt Pattinson; P1573 Wm Tallentyre.
2. P1574.
3. P1589.
Carlisle's weapon makers therefore faced competition from merchants and others who imported weapons from elsewhere in England. Competition did not come only from Englishmen, however. Before 1572, if not after, the Wardens licensed Scottish pedlars to trade in Cumberland, and to this the inhabitants of Carlisle objected. The goods these chapmen sold were bridles, saddles, daggers, spurs, stirrups, steel bonnets and skins for covering steel bonnets and coats of plate.

Merchants are also found with bowstrings and gunpowder among their stock. In 1611 the corporation bought gunpowder for the Ascension Day celebrations from three Carlisle merchants, Henry Monke, Michael Warde and John Jackson. This powder may have been imported, but gunpowder was certainly made in or near the town in the late sixteenth century, if not later. Robt Powlye, who died in 1580, owned £4 worth of "gonne powder made & to be made", plus a pair of balances and weights for weighing powder. A wealthy widow who died 14 years later, Elizabeth Chamberlaine, owned three barks for drying powder, a trough, sieves and powder made and unfinished also worth £4, and 6 pounds of match valued at 1s. 6d. Neither is known to have definitely lived in the city rather than in the rural parts of the two parishes, so the trade may have been excluded from the built-up area. It is impossible to say whether they supplied the garrison, but powder was brought in from outside for the soldiers. There is no evidence that the trade was carried on in the seventeenth century, and it may have died out with the pacification of the borders although gunpowder must have been made in Carlisle during the siege.

2. Ca4/1, 1610-11, sub May 1611; Mrs Beattie's Indices, 1610-19.
3. P1580.
4. P1594.
5. CSPD Addenda 1580-1625, pp.199, 238.
c. Woodworking and building

The building trades provided one of man's three necessities, shelter, while the woodworking trades, considered here with the building trades because the width of tasks undertaken by carpenters makes it impossible to distinguish between those engaged in building and those not, manufactured a variety of implements and furniture. The two groups of craftsmen had some unusual features in early-modern Carlisle, reflecting the peculiarities of the local economy. The most striking of these features is the relatively small number of men for whom they provided the principal source of livelihood. Professor Hoskins suggested on the basis of figures from Leicester, Northampton and Coventry that, in the early sixteenth century, building tradesmen constituted 4-7% per cent of the working population of towns. The figures Professor Palliser has collected for eight other towns for the reign of Elizabeth confirm Hoskins' suggestion, and indicate that in some places the building trades were even more important while the combined total of the two groups was in some towns over 10 per cent. In Carlisle, by all the available measures, the figure for the combined trades was under four per cent. Only two of Palliser's sample produced similar percentages to Carlisle: Hull and Worcester. In Hull over 56 per cent of the freemen were engaged in the distributive and transport sector, which probably included many woodworkers in shipbuilding, etc. The Worcester figures, unlike the others, were based on probate records like the best figures available for Carlisle, and it may be that the trades are under-represented in such documents. Nevertheless it still seems probable that there were not many of the two trades in the northern town.

The range of woodworking activities ostensibly carried out within the town was not extensive - other activities may have been undertaken, but not apparently by specialists. The city court records mention only a handful of coopers, a few "wrights", a millwright in the 1620s and, in the Commonwealth, a slaywright. Joiners are first found only in the parish registers and probate records of the later seventeenth century. No inventory, moreover, records planes or other joiner's tools before the Restoration. Jointed furniture does appear in pre-Civil War inventories, but the absence of individuals described as joiners may nevertheless signify a backwardness in working techniques locally, as well as the unsophisticated nature of the city's economy. In contrast, there was one joiner in Norwich in 1525 and 14 in 1569, and joiners appear among Salisbury testators from the 1580s.

The scarcity of men described as woodworkers in the probate records is puzzling. Only one man from either of the two Carlisle parishes is called carpenter, and only one a joiner. Others, however, can be deduced to have been woodworkers from the contents of their inventories. Robert Hodgson, for example, had "his work Towls as plaines & other things for his Joiners trade." John Dobson was owed money for two coffins and a bedstead, "work" in a church and at Mr Bassill Feilding's house, and was one of the rare woodworkers who owned a stock of timber. More dubious is the identification of Adam Pattinson as a carpenter because he owned "3 axes a quart sawe, w(r)th other w(r)olkte gear" worth 5s., but he had no other obvious means of support. Usually it is impossible to say from

1. Mrs E. Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle City Court Entry Books.
2. Pound, loc. cit., p.141; Information on Salisbury courtesy of Dr S. Wright.
3. P1608 John Sutton; P1686 Stephen Gill.
4. P1670.
5. P1690.
such evidence whether a man followed a particular branch of the woodworking trades, such as coopersy, but Thomas Pattinson was probably a wheelwright for his inventory lists immediately before his tools two pairs of wain wheels and one of cart wheels, but no bodies to go with them.¹

There may have been few woodworkers leaving probate records, even including those deduced to be woodworkers, because the trade was not a very prosperous one. Certainly few of them had very substantial inventories: John Sutton died with debts worth more than his goods, John Dobson's inventory totalled only £22 6s. and Robert Nixon's £9-1-4, although Stephen Gill, the joiner, left goods worth £68 5s.² The few who were better off mostly had other interests. Robert Hodgson mentioned above must have been a tanner foremost since he had over £50 worth of tanner's materials, some being worked. Thomas Scott was a weaver with three looms, but he also owned two little handsaws, two hammers, an iron wedge and a chisel.³

There were a number of reasons why there were few full-time woodworkers in Carlisle, and most of those were poor. First, since the city's woodworkers were not protected by their own gild, rural craftsmen were free to compete with them in the town. One of the woodworkers employed by the Dean and Chapter in 1676-7, and by the tanners' and smiths' company later, lived in Harraby in 1673-4 although he had come to live in Carlisle by 1687.⁴ No probate records have survived for men from the rural area of Carlisle's two parishes specifically named as woodworkers, however. Second, and more importantly, many men possessed carpenters tools and so could

1. P1579.
2. P1608 John Sutton; P1690 John Dobson; P1681 Robert Nixon; P1686 Stephen Gill.
3. P1585.
4. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Book 1, 1677-1690, p.23; D/Lons/1-1786 Election, Smiths Gild Book II, sub 1677-8; Tanners Gild Book III, sub 1691; PRO, E179/90/76; Ca3/2/49.
provide this competition. The inventories both of townsmen and those living in the immediately-adjacent countryside frequently record carpenters tools in the possession of men with other trades. Of 286 inventories of men known to have lived in the city and who had some obvious trade other than woodworking or building, 18 owned a significant number of woodworking tools and more owned a few tools. Carpentry tools were thought of as being part of a farmer's equipment, very much as they are now. For example, Anthony Rompney, a Carlisle merchant, in 1571 owned besides his plough and wain "other husbandrye [gear] as axes wombies".1

Third, a great deal of the carpenter's work which had to be done in the area was unskilled. House-building in the countryside offered few opportunities since even after the 'Great Rebuilding' had begun (after the Restoration) the predominant type of structure was based on simple cruck-frames with cob or stone walls rather than the complex framing usual in Midland and Southern England.2 House construction in the town may have offered more opportunities. Certainly the sole surviving pre-Reformation house, the Gildhall, suggests a tradition of multi-storey timber-framed buildings, but, as described in Chapter One and Appendix One, Carlisle's buildings were generally old-fashioned and that none has survived of those that were erected between 1540 and 1660 suggests that they were probably unimpressive or shoddy. Recent archaeological excavations have found little evidence of substantial early-modern building before the late seventeenth century, and cob was probably an important building material as in the countryside.3 Even the region's carts were old fashioned. Celia Fiennes described those of Westmorland as having wheels fixed to the axle which

1. P1571.
2. R. Brunskill, Vernacular Architecture of the Lake Counties, 1974; D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.94.
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turned together, and in 1797 such "tumble carrs" were still in use in Cumberland. If they were widespread it would explain the frequent references to pairs of wheels in Carlisle probate inventories.

Fourth, when substantial building work was undertaken carpenters were brought into the town to do it. Works to the castle in the late sixteenth century brought seven or eight carpenters to Carlisle from Whalley in Lancashire for at least three seasons. In 1575 the corporation employed a Berwick carpenter to build a dam across the breach in the riverbank caused by the Priestbeck, work which was to cost £250 and to take four months. And when the Moothall was rebuilt in 1668-9 the contract was awarded to a carpenter from Thackmore and two masons, one from Sebergham and the other from Skelton. Carlisle tradesmen were probably not picked for these tasks because they lacked the capital to carry them out successfully, and perhaps also the requisite skill and experience of large-scale organisation. But without the opportunity to undertake such contracts it is hard to see how they could have developed them, so in part this was a self-perpetuating situation.

The other building crafts were not subject to the same competition as the carpenters and woodworkers, but they too must have suffered from the limited building activity in the town. There was probably always a handful of masons in the town; three or four were recorded in the city court entry books in most decades of the early seventeenth century, for example. Two left probate records. Robert Barwyke, who worked on the

2. PRO, E101/545/16 Books 2 & 4; E101/545/18.
3. Ca5/1/35.
4. Ca5/1/47.
5. Mrs E. Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle City Court Entry Books.
castle, called himself a yeoman and made no mention of his trade. Although he did not describe his property in his will, it suggests he was well-off, since he owned three gowns, one furred with fox, and at least nine silver spoons. In his inventory, which totalled a modest sum, just under £30, he was called a mason. His tools were worth just over 7s., and he was also farming in quite a big way for a Carlisle tradesman, owning seven cattle and 21 sheep. The will of John Salkeld, who died in 1668, does not suggest that he was particularly well off, however. He too was farming, holding seven acres of land and two garths. The document says nothing about his building activities. Rather more is known of a third Carlisle mason, Alexander Pogmire. He, at least, was rather more than a craftsman. During the middle years of the seventeenth century he worked at both Lowther and Hutton-in-the-Forest, designing and constructing large-scale extensions to those houses for their gentry owners. It seems probable that much of the work done by other Carlisle masons was also in the surrounding area, rather than in the town where it is highly unlikely that there would have been enough building to keep them fully occupied. For this branch of the building trade Carlisle was probably a marked local centre.

For at least a brief period the town was also the county centre of another building trade, brickmaking and laying. Carlisle's bricklayers were the only such craftsmen in the county in the 1670s. Sir John Lowther of Lowther employed William Agasman and his workmen to make brick at Crackabank and Yanwath in 1673, but the experiment was a disaster. A few years later Carlisle bricklayers were employed, again unsuccessfully, to make bricks in Whitehaven; the alternative had been to bring brickmakers from

1. P1569.
2. P1668.
Dublin. Bricks were made near the city and used to build the Tile Tower on the city wall near the castle during the reign of Richard III. They do not appear, however, to have been used again in Carlisle until after the Civil War. A tilemaker and his boy are recorded in the city accounts for 1652-3 and the corporation used brick to repair its property during the next decade. Bricklayers appear in the parish registers from 1672 although not all of them were townsfolk, and Matthew Wilman, a bricklayer who died in 1684, owned half a brick kiln at "Murrall hill", which was valued at £10. His inventory, including the kiln, totalled only £23 6s., so he was not well off, nor was William Agasman, who was exempted from paying the Hearth Tax in 1673. Another bricklayer however, Thomas Hartness, was certainly prospering by the end of the seventeenth century.  

The use of bricks did not catch on quickly, however. The contract for the rebuilding of the Moothall made in 1668 specified that the front wall of the building was to be of ashlar and the walls of the ground floor on the other sides were to be of stone (presumably coursed rubble would have been acceptable since ashlar was not specified), but the upper walls at side or rear could be of stone or brick. Clearly brick was not then considered stylish, and it was not used when Tullie House was rebuilt in 1689. The new and elegant diocesan registry in the cathedral close was built in brick in 1699, however, and most of the houses built around the market place in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were of brick.  

3. Ca5/1/47.  
4. The Registry, which is dated, still stands. The houses on the market place were demolished recently. They could be loosely dated on stylistic grounds.
There seems also to have been one or two plumbers in the town at most periods. Surprisingly some, at least, were not members of the Smiths' Gild and perhaps most had other occupations. Thomas Jefferson, for example, described himself as a glover and owned leather and wool as well as plumber's tools. The value of the latter, with some lead, was only 8s., while his wool and leather were worth £4. Two other plumbers, John and William Langshaw, cast three, possibly four, of the cathedral bells in the 1650s, but this commission was exceptional. The Dean and Chapter also retained a plumber, who they provided with a workhouse and materials and sent to repair churches in the possession of the college. As noted in Chapter Four, however, his fee was low and he presumably worked for them only part-time.

Other building crafts include slaters and glaziers. The slaters were the only roofing craftsmen recorded in the city, and although thatch is recorded, slate may have been the predominant roofing material. No slater left probate records, and it is likely that the trade was poor. The Dean and Chapter employed a glazier as well as a plumber, and there are likely to have been at least a couple of the trade in the town at any one time.

Window glass is found in the inventory of the schoolmaster, William Hay, in 1587, Hay being a lodger; later it is mentioned in the inventory of George Denton, a gentleman who died in 1598 and in bequests by John Ladsman in 1611/12 and Thomas Browne, a merchant whose inventory was proved in 1615. It is not clear whether glass was actually being made in the town

1. P1605.
4. Ibid.
5. P1587 William Hay; P1605 George Denton; P1611 John Ladsman; P1615 Thomas Browne.
or whether it was bought in Newcastle as it had been at least once before 1560. The sole identified glazier's probate records, those of Thomas Dunn who died in 1600, cast no light on his craft activities. He was one of those working at the castle in the late sixteenth century.'

d. Conclusion

Once more a diversity of activities and a lack of opportunities for specialisation are marked features of the trades discussed. The metal trades show these features most clearly. Although there were a myriad of branches of these trades, far from all were established in the town. Moreover the men following those specialities which were there mostly had to do other types of metalwork, while the variety of metal trades recorded fell in the seventeenth century. The tailors followed the general pattern of tailoring in England, making up clothes from material provided by their client. Presumably they could not sell ready-made clothing, which would have allowed them to keep themselves constantly at work and perhaps to take a small profit on the materials. Finally the building trades in the town were clearly weak. There were only limited opportunities for the woodworkers, who faced competition from non-specialists for much of the work that was available, while there was usually not enough work within the town to keep many of the other trades fully occupied. It would seem that some at least of the masons worked in the surrounding countryside, but as with the woodworkers, there was not enough to do to keep enough building workers resident in Carlisle to handle major building projects there when they took place.

1. P1600 Thomas Dunn; PRO, E101/545/16 Book 5; information from Dr Henry Summerson. I am also grateful to him for discussion on this point.
Chapter Eight
Publicans, Merchants and Lawyers:
The Victualling, Mercantile and Service Trades

In this, the last of the chapters devoted to the economic activity of particular occupational groups, the economic activity of the distributive and service sectors of the town's economy will be discussed. It is in these occupations particularly that Carlisle's administrative functions had their most marked impact, although the city's market-town role was equally important for the food and drink trades. Nevertheless, subsidiary employments were ubiquitous here too, especially in the latter trades.

a. Food and drink

Professor Hoskins described the food and drink trades in the early-modern town as "fundamental". Carlisle was not exceptional in this respect, although the importance of the victualling trades is disguised by the nature of the surviving documentation. Given the importance of the administrative, service and marketing functions of the town compared with its manufacturing role, nothing else would be expected.¹

In this occupational group only the butchery trade was formally organised. The Butchers' Gild was one of the largest of the eight companies, and by the end of the seventeenth century just provided more freemen than any other.² The trade was not only self-regulated, however, but like all the victualling trades was subjected to more city ordinances than other trades.

The butchers, in general, do not seem to have been rich. Of the seven living in the town at their deaths between 1566 and 1610, only two

2. See Table 4.3, p.162.
left inventories worth more than the general median, and four were worth under £10. Just three inventories survive from after the Restoration, only one of which was worth more than the overall mean. As in the case of several other trades their inventory values were not inflated by heavy investment in tools and trade-stock. The fullest range of tools described, comprising a flesh axe, two "gullyes", two ropes, a dressing knife and other shop gear, was valued at only 3s.¹ Shops were unnecessary, since the city butchers used shambles, rented from the corporation for 1s. a year, and only one inventory records a shop although there are passing references to shops in the gild records. Like the butchers of Worcester, Carlisle's butchers must have done their slaughtering in their gardens.² Most butchers farmed, but that few owned many animals suggests that they slaughtered beasts bought soon after purchase.

The major reason for the merely modest prosperity enjoyed by most of the town's butchers must have been the competition of country butchers. Apart from a toll of 1d. per carcass, the city authorities placed no restrictions on non-freemen selling meat on marketdays, and they too were able to rent shambles. Of the 26 butchers renting shambles in Jan. 1593/4 only nine are recorded as householders within the walls in 1597.³ Both the Butchers' Gild books and the court leet rolls record instances of foreign butchers being prosecuted for marketing offences.⁴

A few of Carlisle's butchers, however, were wealthy by local standards. The Syde family provide examples. When John Syde died at the end of 1598, his inventory was valued at only £9-1-4.⁵ He was probably

1. P1598, Robert Syde.
3. Ca2/413; Ca5/1/37; D/MH/1, pp.130-2.
4. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Butchers' Gild Books; Ca3/2/1-26.
5. P1598.
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elderly, having three adult sons, Robert, Thomas and James, and had perhaps passed on any interest in agriculture to them, for his inventory included little but household goods. His son Robert, whose will was proved over a month earlier, was very wealthy. Robert had some two and a half acres of ground sown, a few pigs and an unknown number of sheep, probably kept an alehouse, and presumably worked as a butcher, since he had the equipment. His principal wealth lay in gold and silver, and he was obviously lending money. His inventory totalled some £200. When Thomas died in 1612, he was richer still. Thomas may have been an innkeeper, was a working butcher and apparently lent money, although in smaller sums and to a larger number of people than his brother. The bulk of his fortune, however, was invested in farmstock. He owned two copyhold farms in Scotby, with other closes there, plus land around Carlisle. This property, and a share of the tithes of Scotby, brought him a large amount of corn, but it is clear that his dominant interest in the land was as grazing, particularly for beef cattle. Thomas Syde was unique; although two other butchers were substantial farmers, neither was comparable to him. If butcher-graziers were common in Carlisle more such inventories would have survived. It is plain that only those butchers exploiting other sources of income could become rich.

A second major source of protein in early-modern England was, of course, fish. Cumbria's rivers produced an abundance of fish and in the eighteenth century fresh salmon from Cumberland were sent to London. Carlisle had its own fisheries in the Eden, the Kinggarth, a fish trap a mile or so down river, and the Freeboat or Freenet, closer to the city. These two were let at auction like the city's other revenues. In the 1550s the

1. P1598.
2. P1612.
3. P1585 Richard Bell; P1619 Thomas Allinson.
Kinggarth was farmed for as much as £40 p.a. and the Freenet for up to £30, while the Shire and Scotland Tolls combined were worth less than £20. The combined value of the fishings fell markedly in the early seventeenth century, however, to between £10 and £20, and from 1652 fluctuated between £20 and £40.¹

In the late sixteenth century, at least, when the names of the bidders were recorded, competition for the fisheries was fierce. The occupations of the bidders were varied, including merchants, shoemakers, glovers and butchers. This suggests that, as with the mills, the rights to the fisheries were usually bought by entrepreneurs who then either employed the actual fishermen or sublet the fishing grounds. The will and inventory of one farmer survives, however, Henry Syd, who rented the Kinggarth in 1598 for 7 years for a rent of £20-3-4 p.a.² Syd died in 1607 owing the city £7 rent, presumably for this fishery which was then in the hands of men with whom he had been associated. He owned part of a ferry boat and a net, valued at 28s. 8d. No source states his occupation and it is not apparent from his inventory, for he did not even own farmstock. It seems likely that he was himself a working fisherman, not merely a capitalist.

Fishing was probably not itself a particularly important occupation in the town, and in fact only two men are described as fishers.³ Being inland, and with access to the official fishing grounds restricted, local opportunities would be few. Those working the Kinggarth and Freenet may not even have been townsmen. Probably fishing was an occasional, seasonal, source of employment for some of the poorer inhabitants.

Carlisle was supplied with fish not only by the farmers of its own fisheries, who were obliged to market half their catch there, but also

1. Ca4/139-40; Ca4/141. See Appendix Four.
2. Ca4/141; P1607.
3. CRO, Mrs Beattie’s Indices to the Carlisle City Court Entry Books.
from elsewhere in the county. Around 1600, fishermen from north of the Eden and the Barony of Burgh passed through or by the town en route for Kendal and elsewhere with fresh and salt fish. They must also have served the city. Salt fish probably also came from the west coast rather than from across the Pennines. Fishing was important to the economy of western Cumberland in the sixteenth century and remained at least a by-employment for local farmers to the end of the seventeenth century. Lord William Howard occasionally purchased at Workington salt fish for his household at Naworth, 12 miles east of Carlisle.

Fish seems to have been retailed in the market place. There is no evidence of a fishmonger's shop but before the Civil War there were frequent presentments in the court leet for forestalling salmon and herring en route to the market and for illicit dealing. A particularly full presentment of 1624 described how Thomas Rashell of Carlisle was fined 6s. 8d. for buying a barrel of herrings which John Callwell was going to sell for five a penny, and selling them for four a penny. Those selling fish were predominantly male, in contrast to those selling dairy produce or fruit, but included a number of women. All seem to have been of low status - none were called Mr, for example. A number are known to have had other occupations, notably as butchers. But other men of wealth and some status either were or may have been involved in the fish trade. William Garfourthe, who was an agent of the crown, owned salt fish worth 20s. at his death in 1566/7; John

2. Ca2/413.
Branche, a tanner, the year before was owed 26s. 8d. for salt fish; Thomas Lowson, who at his death in 1577/8 owned two fish vats valued at 13s. 4d. and 10 head of salt fish worth 33s. 4d., was a working weaver, a farmer and a moneylender; Peter Norman, the mayor, was fined by the Merchant Gild in 1656 for buying a barrel of herrings in partnership with two foreigners. It seems clear, therefore, that selling and dealing in fish was both an occupation of the poor or a by-employment of the prosperous.

The city of Carlisle owned three mills, sited under the western walls of the town, and a fourth mill there was owned by the Dean and Chapter, which was in the corporation's hands from 1657. Like the fishings, the mills were leased to individuals or partnerships, usually for periods of years. Leases or shares of leases of these mills appear occasionally in wills and inventories, for example those of Richard Robinson, a cordinner, and Thomas Calvert, a merchant. The lessees rarely if ever themselves worked the mills, but employed others to do so. Thus Thomas Calvert and James his son, who inherited control of New Mill from his father, both owed money to William Halliday, miller, and in 1597 the servant of Mr John Morasby, Mr Thomas Browne and William Willsone, John Preastman, was found to have conspired to pilfer the moulter corn. The court leet jury requested that he be barred from serving at any of the city mills. At his death about 18 months later, Preastman was owed 20s. by both Morasby and Willson, presumably for his wages. Preastman's inventory, like those surviving for two other millers, reveals that milling was not a particularly lucrative trade. All three supplemented their earnings by farming and one probably also by carpentry. The profits must have been taken by the lessees.

1. P1566 William Garfourthe; P1566 John Branche; P1577 Thomas Lowson; DGC/4/1, f.111v.
2. P1574 Richard Robinson; P1587 Thomas Calvert; P1587 James Calvert; Ca3/2/1.
3. P1592 John Preastman; P1592 William Blecloke; P1592 John Bell.
To protect the profitability of the city mills, and so their value as a source of revenue, the corporation gave them a monopoly of grinding the inhabitants' corn. This monopoly was not unchallenged, however. In the 1620s, for example, men were presented in the court leet for keeping horses to carry corn to Abbey Mill, Denton Mill and mills at Harraby and Upperby, and throughout the seventeenth century people were occasionally amerced for grinding corn and malt at "outen mills". Carlisle people do not appear to have tried to escape the monopoly by grinding corn at home, however. There are no presentments for so doing and no grindstones but mustard-wherns recorded in inventories.

Information about baking in Carlisle is not very full. As noted in Chapter Four, baking was a trade restricted to freemen, their wives and servants by city ordinances. It is quite possible that this ordinance was seldom enforced, however, since no presentments were made to the court leet for breaking it before 1682; those following the trade only appear for infringing the city's corn-milling monopoly or for charging excessive rates. Since most freemen already had a trade it is perhaps not surprising that no-one is named in the records as a baker, it is also possible that their wives and female servants did the work in bakehouses the freemen owned, since most of the recorded bakehouses were owned by men. Certainly women did own or control bakehouses. In 1628, for example, James Mandgie bequeathed to his daughter Mary a house and "oxenhouse" or bakehouse then held by Joyce Carliell, widow, and in 1613 three of seven bakehouses were controlled by women. Moreover in 1668 Anne Crookebaine, widow, was to provide a chimney for her newly-erected bakehouse, and it was a widow who was owed 22s. 8d.

1. Ferguson and Nanson, op. cit., pp.61-2; Ca3/2/1-26, especially 8 & 9.
2. Ferguson and Nanson, op. cit., p.69.
3. P1628; Ca4/1 sub 1613-4.
for supplying bread to the prisoners in the county gaol.¹ On the other hand
men as well as women were owed money for bread or baking and men did the
work in other communities so it is unlikely that there were no male bakers
in Carlisle although it may have been primarily their by-employment. James
Barne, for example, was owed 2s. 8d. for baking in 1598. He may have been a
tanner and an innkeeper, and he was certainly farming and lending money,
while court records suggest he was a lawyer.² Most of the non-freemen
prosecuted for baking in the late seventeenth century were male.³

The number of ovens and bakers in the town seems small. There
were only five ovens in the town in 1640, outside the castle, and probably
seven in 1613-4.⁴ It is impossible to say how many might be expected in a
town of about 1,500 people, but there are several reasons for thinking that
Carlisle bakers may have had a thin time. Part of the problem may have been
regulation by the city government. Not only were prices controlled, but the
number of servants employed was restricted to two. More important, however,
must have been competition from outside the town. Bread could travel easily
and was brought into the town for sale in the market. The tolls charged on
it were light, 4d. per horseload if it was baked in Cumberland and 1d. if
outside, plus 2d. a year towards the bonfires on St John's and St Peter's
Eves.⁵ Probably equally important was the pattern of local agriculture.
Oats were a principal foodstuff and could be prepared in the home as
oatcakes (clap bread) without the use of an oven and therefore without the
services of a baker.⁶ Bakers were also expected to bake other people's

1. Ca3/2/20; Quarter Sessions Petitions, Q11/7 Easter 1688.
2. Pi598; Ca3/1/125.
4. PRO, SP16/444/24 II; Ca4/1 sub 1613-4.
5. Ferguson and Nanson, op. cit., p.70; Ca2/413.
dough for them, a practice which would reduce their profits even though it might ensure sufficient custom before an oven was fired, so reducing waste."

Some of the more important features of the drink trades also have already been identified in Chapter Four. First, alehouses and inns were numerous in the town, and there were a few taverns also. In 1577 there were 60 alehouses in the city (a suspiciously round number), 12 inns and three taverns, while the entire county had 29 inns, four taverns and 623 alehouses. In 1680 a further survey of accommodation found that Carlisle's inns and alehouses could provide 413 beds and stabling for 522 horses. If each inn or alehouse could shelter 8 guests, probably an overestimate, then there would have been 51 victualling establishments in the town. These figures are borne out by other documents. In 1656, for example, 25 men were amerced for brewing and selling ale or beer, not being freemen, and similar presentments were recorded in most of the surviving court leet rolls; in 1690 two lists of those alleged to have evaded paying excise contained in total 39 names (11 being women). Clearly, therefore, the drink trades were an important part of the livelihood of a good number of Carlisle people.

A second characteristic was that alehousekeeping and innkeeping were not full-time occupations, but were by-employments or were a subsidiary activity of the household as a whole. It was presumably for this reason that the terms innkeeper, victualler and alehousekeeper were almost never used in the town, although they were not common elsewhere either. The civic ordinance against brewing for sale by non-freemen was probably partly responsible for this pattern of involvement, since most men would have had another occupation before they became free, but there were other, economic,

1. Ferguson and Nanson, op. cit., p.70.
2. PRO, SP12/117/83.
reasons. For freemen, brewing and selling alcohol was an easy trade to get into, for there appear to have been no licensing restrictions on them. Little in the way of equipment was needed; Peter Clark argues that besides normal household furniture, "only half-a-dozen or so" simple drinking vessels and perhaps some jugs were necessary. Almost 10 per cent of the known Carlisle inventories proved before 1621 listed brewing equipment and 10 or more alepots. Brewing the alcohol to be sold was a simple extension of normal household activity, for the majority of well-off households in Carlisle brewed their own drink. A survey of brewing and baking facilities in the town in 1639/40 found that there were 103 leads (including the one in the abbey kitchen), which could brew from three to 6 bushells of malt at a time. Thus almost one household in three brewed their own drink. It would be a simple step to brew more than the household could consume and to sell the surplus. The large number of alehouses in the town, probably one household in five sold drink in 1577, also indicates that selling drink must have been largely episodic. There cannot have been enough custom to keep every alehouse open throughout the week, so most alehouses and perhaps some of the Inns can have functioned only on market days and at fair and assize times. Part-time alehousekeeping was very common nationally, however, so Carlisle was not unusual in this respect.

The town may have been unusual in the social make-up of its alehousekeepers, however. Those selling drink can be identified from the presentments in the court leet for brewing and selling without being free, and from lawsuits over debts for drink. Their occupations included currier, milner, all ranks of soldier up to ensign, glover, shoemaker, tanner, merchant,

1. Ferguson and Nanson, op. cit., p.59.
3. PRO, SP16/444/24 II; the lead owned by Mr John Aglionby could brew 18 bzs at once.
butcher, glazier and weaver. Women obviously traded in their own right: for example Philip Pollard's wife was fined in 1670, and Alice Scotte and Dorathy Taller, both widows, sued for money for drink and bread in 1596. But those fined for brewing included several men described as Mr, women called Mrs, and also a notary, William Atkinson, who in 1628 was amerced both for forestalling corn to malt and for selling drink in his house. In 1658 it was ordered that no mayor was to sell beer or ale in his house during his mayoralty. Obviously these people came from the whole social range from the poor widow to the city elite. It is impossible to say who of them were alehousekeepers and who innkeepers, but it is probable that the prohibition against foreigners probably encouraged a trend for alehousekeepers to be of higher status than usual elsewhere.

There is little hard information about the innkeepers, either, or their inns. Two men and their wives were amerced for innkeeping and brewing without being freemen in 1597, the only time that the term "innkeeper" was used in a Carlisle document. Doubtless others were among those discussed above. A good number of inventories record more than enough household goods and brewing equipment to be inns. Fifteen per cent of the inventories proved before 1621 listed brewing equipment, a considerable number of drinking vessels and eight or more beds - enough for an inn - and 13 per cent of those proved after; there was potentially a good proportion of the town's inhabitants who might have been innkeepers. None of the inventories was specifically of an inn, although in one or two cases there is little doubt it did describe one. For example Thomas Jackson, a working shoemaker who died in 1620, lived in a house with 13 rooms, a brewhouse,

1. Ca3/2/1-26; Ca3/1/125 & 126.
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barn and shop - an unusually large house for the town. Two of the rooms were named "m' Pearesons Chamber" and "m' Sledles Chamber". He owned 23 beds, 43 pairs of sheets, 7 chamber pots, 8 dozen of pewter vessels and 6 dozen trenchers.¹ The names of a few inns are known. In 1633 Elioner Warwick kept the Red Hart, where government commissioners arranged to meet local tradesmen.² The corporation entertained the governor of the castle and other local gentlemen at the Sun in 1668, and the same year a duel took place after a quarrel there. In 1691 the house was described as "formerly the Sun Tavern & a good Inn, but now ruinous".³

Some tavernkeepers can be identified with more confidence. As noted in Chapter Four, at least four of the five known were members of the Merchants' Gild or called themselves merchants in their wills.⁴ One of these, Matthew Munke, owned at his death in 1594 a cellar with a shop above in Fishergate, with tables and benches, and which contained full and empty containers of beer and wine, a bottle of "aquavite", bottles and drinking vessels.⁵ The cellar passed to his wife Dorothee, and from her to his brother Thomas. When he died four years later he had a "saller or wine taverne" under Redness Hall.⁶ Both Matthew and Thomas may also have been innkeepers, having, respectively, 10 and 11 beds in their houses. Neither had any of the usual stock of merchant's goods although both were described as merchants in their inventories. Christopher Slee also had a shop with a wine cellar, and his will instructed his wife to acquire a licence in her name and
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⁴. See Chapter Four, p.168.
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those of their younger sons, William and Robert.¹ The mayor entertained
civic guests at Christopher Slee’s and later in Widow Slee’s parlour, while
the 1626-7 chamberlains’ accounts record payment of £3-15-2 to Richard Slee
for wine and sugar sent as a gift to the bishop.²

The principal drink consumed probably was beer. It appears
occasionally in probate inventories, whereas ale never does. Beer is also
the drink usually specified in the corporation and gild account books,
although ale appears too. Hops appear in an inventory as early as 1566:
William Garfourthe had 18s. worth.³ They were presumably imported by the
merchants, Thomas Ward, for example, had 16 lb. of hops in his shop in 1607;
attempts by Lord William Howard to grow them at Kirkoswald were not
successful enough to encourage widespread emulation.⁴ Malt was made from
local barley, purchased or self-grown. The first specialist maltsters appear
only in the later seventeenth century, but it may have remained a largely
part-time trade: one maltster was also a customs official.⁵ Several
maltsters can be identified from their probate records before the Civil War:
Thomas Calvert, a tanner, Thomas Pattinson, also a tanner, William Blacklock,
a shoemaker, for example.⁶ Perhaps not surprisingly, it seems to have been a
subsidiary occupation of several of those who leased the city mills. Wealthy
countrymen also sometimes malted on a large scale: in 1574 the Warden owed
Edward Sewell of Bleckell £26-2-8 for malt, Sewell being a large-scale
farmer and a tanner.⁷
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Wine was a favourite tipple of the corporation's, but appears surprisingly infrequently among inhabitants' property. It was among the commodities imported by the coasting trade in the mid-sixteenth century. Carlisle received at least part of its supplies from Newcastle, however. In 1586 James Broadrigge owed Christopher Helmore of Newcastle £4 for wine. For many of those engaged in the food and drink trades, therefore, it was a secondary, subsidiary activity. For only one group of tradesmen, the butchers, and perhaps for a handful of tavernkeepers and innkeepers, was it a primary occupation. On the whole the trades were not especially prosperous. The level of competition was high and the city government did little to restrict it, for everyone benefited from cheap food and drink. Thus country butchers and bakers could sell their products in the town market and although baking and brewing in the town were restricted to freemen, there were many who took advantage of the opportunity. The fines on non-free drink sellers may have been as much exploitation of them as an attempt to exclude them. They certainly were exploited in this way by 1739 and even in the seventeenth century a number of people brewed and sold drink for several years in spite of the fines. Only where capital was needed, notably in the wine trade, was there specialism of function.

b. The distributive trades

The mercantile and distributive trades followed in Carlisle can be divided into two groups. One comprises those itinerant small-scale traders, such as chapmen and hucksters, who used the town as a base for operations in the surrounding countryside and perhaps sold goods in the city markets. Such
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individuals probably bought their stock from Carlisle merchants or in its markets. There is, however, little evidence of their presence or activities save in the city court records. They would be unlikely to take up the freedom of the city, and no probate documents survive for any of this group. Chapmen and pedlars definitely did live in the town, however. A chapman, John Beaty, was among the 30 foreigners assessed for Ship Money in 1634, and chapmen and pedlars appear as city residents in the parish registers in the late seventeenth century.1 Most pedlars and chapmen in the area do not seem to have been inhabitants of Carlisle, however, and many were Scots. Scotsman was a local term for pedlar, and certainly Carlisle merchants were complaining of unfair competition from Scottish pedlars as early as 1572.2 It is impossible to say how prosperous these men were but their contribution to the economic life of the town, whatever their value to their customers, must have been relatively small.

The second group is composed of shopkeepers. By a local convention, almost every "pure" retailer, that is one who does not also manufacture what he sells, was called a merchant. The term draper or grocer does not appear in the records and only a handful of haberdashers are known, in any case these were probably hatters.3 Few men are recorded as mercers, but probate inventories show no difference in their activities from those called merchants. It was an alternative occupational description rather than an indication of separate work; in 1684, Mr Richard Monke called himself "merchant" in his will, but was described as a mercer in his probate inventory.4 Why the term merchant should have been in almost universal usage is uncertain, but the custom probably had some relationship to

1. Ca2/322; PR47/1; PR79/1.
2. CSPD, Addenda 1566-1579, pp.418-9, and see Chapter Seven, p.263.
membership of the Merchant Gild and the restriction of the freedom of the city to gildsmen. Certainly none of the four known haberdashers are known to have been freemen although evidence of the admission of three of them should have survived. Moreover, from the evidence of their wills and inventories, some of those described as merchants were not involved in "pure" retailing. As noted above, Thomas Monke kept a tavern and Richard Lowrie, described in his wife's will as a merchant, was, from his inventory clearly a goldsmith.

Surviving merchants' inventories show, however, that the majority were what would usually elsewhere be called mercers. Throughout the period the most important and valuable of the commodities sold by the merchants was cloth. In those merchants' inventories which specified their shop goods cloth was almost invariably listed. The range and variety of fabrics stocked was great, Thomas Ward for example, who died in 1607, had 37 different fabrics in his shop, small variations from or different colours of twelve basic types. James Halton's stock included 32 pieces of a variety of colours of an unspecified cloth, probably broadcloth, plus shaggs, friezes, kerseys, bayes, penniston, cotton "Kitterminster", motley, "Princes Sergh", "Castillon", "Royal oake", "Crowne stuffe", "Charles 2nd", grogram, satinesco, parragon, "chyna" Damisilla, stuffs, Tammies, Sempiterna(m), half-silk stuff, "hare" prunella, worsted prunella, callico, callico buckram, dimathy and canvas. The great majority of these cloths, both in variety and value, was made in England rather than being expensive imports from abroad. Nevertheless, none appears to have been of local manufacture. Cumberland had no cloth industry of more than local significance. Linen, 'twice tow',

1. P1598 Thomas Monke; P1606 Elizabeth Lowrie; B.C. Jones, 'Carlisle Goldsmiths, 1318-1625', CW2, 80, 1980, 37-44.
2. P1607.
3. P1662.
and harden cloths with sacking and course woollen cloth, perhaps similar to the 'cottons' made around Kendal, were the main local products, and they do not appear among the merchants' stock. Such cloth must have been sold in the market place or commissioned directly from the manufacturers by owners of the raw materials."

Besides cloth, most merchants also sold a variety of goods, perhaps best described as haberdashery. It included thread, buttons, lace, hose, silk stockings, ribbons, pins, hats and caps. It is probably because the merchants supplied such items, the range they sold, like the range of cloth they stocked, remaining as diverse at the end of the seventeenth century as it had been in the mid-sixteenth century, that more specialist retailers, drapers and haberdashers and certain craftsmen, such as hatters, were few or not present in the town.

The merchants also had most other retailing trades in their hands. There are no apothecaries recorded in early-modern Carlisle, nor any grocers, stationers or booksellers, although a stationer and an apothecary were parties in a deed dated 1704. Instead merchants often undertook their roles. One example was John Thomlinson the younger, whose probate documents were endorsed mercatoris. His inventory did not specify the property in his two shops in detail but valued it in lump sums under the headings "Druggs", "Grossery", "Tobacco", "Pins and Combs" and "hot waters vinigar ec". In his back shop he had "Dying stuffe" worth £8-10-0 so he was also either a dyer or sold dyestuffs. Thomlinson was atypical in that he did not sell cloth. For other merchants the stocks of pepper, aniseed, ginger, spermaceti, alum, verdigris and arsenic, etc, which the majority had, were subsidiary to their stocks of cloth. Suprisingly, however, no Carlisle merchant had stocks

1. See Chapter Six, p.244.
3. P1663.
of exotic or dried fruits, such as currants. Rather fewer men sold books or paper than drugs and spices, and their activities in that field were clearly small scale. The largest stock, carried was that of James Halton who had £3 "in Books". Robert Pattinson had a dozen primers and three dozen "Catychismes", as well as 14 quire of paper and a "Ryme" of brown paper, total value 11s., and Mr Richard Monke, only a bible, a music book, 22 school books, some paper books, some old books and an old shop book, the whole worth less than 34s. 6d. Besides these the merchants sold also a great variety of other items, including: gunpowder, arrowheads and weapons and armour; thimbles; tobacco pipes; nails; cords and combs; honey; wax; starch; cork; gloves; and even shovel board shillings. This variety of activity was typical of provincial retailers.²

Despite the near monopoly of retail trading exercised by the merchants a few other specialised tradesmen existed. One of these was Thomas Dixon, who died in 1679. He had a shop and a stock of "stockings of all kind in General" worth £5-3-2 and his principal debt was £2-14-0 "For Stockings". From his inventory he can have dealt only in stockings, but whether primarily as a retailer or merchant is impossible to say. Dixon was not a young man, having a married daughter and two grandsons, nor was he very well off although he owned his own house. His business in stockings may, therefore represent the run-down because of age and perhaps semi-retirement of a more extensive business.³ Also out of the ordinary was Mrs Anne Cape, a spinster who sold flax. Her shop contained over a ton of flax and lint, of four different varieties. It is possible that she was engaged in gathering locally produced flax for export to another area, but the

1. P1662 James Halton; P1571 Robert Pattinson; P1684 Richard Monke.
3. P1678.
variety of types she owned, which are not mentioned in other inventories, and
the generally small scale of flax production by local farmers suggest that
she had imported most of her stock. The five packsheets in her hands were
perhaps what the flax had been wrapped in.

It would be wrong to think that the town's merchants were solely
retailers; they also engaged in activities more usually associated with the
term 'merchant'. In the mid-seventeenth century, for example, Richard Monke
was amerced by the Merchants' Gild for taking a foreigner as partner in
buying and selling a tun of vinegar. Four years later, in 1654, Peter
Norman, mentioned below, bought a barrel of herrings in partnership with
foreigners, and in January 1659/60 bought and sold wool in league with a
Scot. In 1619 the merchants were accused of buying harden cloth in the
market with a long yard and selling with a short. In the early seventeenth
century they were certainly interested in dealing in wool and woolfells. One
of the four things the Merchants' Company asked the king for when he visited
the city in 1617 was "a lycense for transposing of wool and woolfells".4

When, however, in 1599 two Newcastle Merchant Adventurers tried to buy wool
and woolfells in Carlisle, it was the glovers who rioted against them.5 In
1655, "of late yeares the freemen of ye city haue not brought in woolle oute
of Scotland", and neither the customs books for the early seventeenth century
nor later decades give the names of Carlisle inhabitants, indicating at best
limited involvement in cross-border trade. This is surprising in view of the
official channelling of cross-border trade through the city.6

1. P1686.
2. DGC4/1, ff.108v, 115r, 111v.
3. Ca3/2/2.
4. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of the City of
   Carlisle, CWAAS Transactions, Extra Series, IV, Carlisle 1887, p.95.
5. Extracts from the Records of the Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-
   Tyne, I, Surtees Soc., 93 for 1894, 1895, p.104.
6. Ca2/329; PRO, E190/1448/1 & 10; above, p.143.
Nor do Carlisle's merchants seem to have exploited the opportunities presented by the development of the coal and colonial trade of the west-coast ports in the seventeenth century. Only one Carlisle man, Cuthbert Studholme, is known to have had a share in a ship, the Jacob of Whitehaven. Carlisle's merchants therefore engaged in non-retail trade only in a minor way, and on the whole only locally. Probably the town lay too much in the shadow of Newcastle for them to compete effectively, and, once Whitehaven began to develop, the port was a much more convenient place to operate from so those wishing to trade overseas moved there. The activity of the Carlisle men was in marked contrast to that of their Scottish neighbours in Dumfries, who engaged in similar retailing activities but also sold goods on the continent and in the capital.

The merchants were without any doubt the most prosperous and successful trading group in the town. Their median wealth was by far the highest of any socio-economic group identified in the city, both before 1610 and after 1660. Moreover the wealthiest citizens were merchants, although their riches and role in local government had also brought them the status of gentlemen. Considerable wealth could be acquired through what must have been principally retail trade. Isaac Tully, author of the account of the siege of Carlisle, wrote in his will on the 4 Feb. 1660/1:

now I declare that in July 1659 I cast up my shop computed what all my shop goodes debts etc amounted vnto as also what I was owen my selfe and the overpluss of cleare estate amounted vnto 1135.17s as may p(ar)ticulerly appeare by a Bundell of Papers in my deske bearyng date July 1659 as aforesd, synce which tyme I haue not cast vp shop but must needes suppose that being 1 yeare ½ synce it cannot but now be aboue twelve hundred, Howeuer because there are many desperatt debts I shall sett my Estate at no more then the sd twelve hundred

1. P1668.
pounds none of the goods within my house being at all accomph' apprized or reckoned in that summe.'

The trading stock maintained by most merchants was very substantial, and far exceeded that of others of town's tradesmen. Like men in other occupations the merchants used their accumulated profits to diversify their economic activities, which in some cases became more important than retailing. Peter Norman, a merchant whose inventoried goods were valued at over £4,000 making him the richest known inhabitant of Carlisle, still had a shop. The stock was worth £36-12-8, a large sum by comparison with the stock of most craftsmen, but miniscule in relation to his own wealth, and low when compared with the value of the stock held by most contemporary merchants. He was an elderly man by this time, however, having become a freeman in 1645. Norman also owned a house in Castlegate whose rooms were let furnished to seven tenants. The value of the furniture was £7-6-0, considerably less than that of his silver plate, at £21. But most of his wealth, £3,550, was invested in "Bond Bills Morgages and other Specialtys" and he had a further £270 in book and desperate debts. Norman's principal income must have been from lending money.2

If in Carlisle merchants were wealthy in comparison to their fellow townsmen, how did they compare with their equivalents in other cities? The merchants of Elizabethan Exeter were on average richer. Of 27 inventories surviving from that group proved between 1564 and 1618, fewer than 14 were worth over £1,000.3 Only three Carlisle merchants are known to have left estates of such size, and none died before the Restoration. The merchant classes of York and Newcastle-upon-Tyne were probably wealthy on a

1. P1661.
2. P1687; Ca2/27. See p.291 for some of his earlier activities.
similar scale to those of Exeter. These men were largely engaged in long distance and foreign trade, on a scale beyond anything a Carlisle merchant could hope to attain based in such an isolated community. Closer in terms of economic function were the mercers of Tudor Worcester. In this town, a county, market and administrative centre like Carlisle, albeit with some other functions, rather than a provincial capital, the general level of wealth among "pure" retailers is not dissimilar to the medians of £143-13-7 before 1610 and £296-10-0 after 1660 found in the northern town.

Many of the features displayed by Carlisle's retail shopkeepers, therefore, were common to those of shopkeepers in the country as a whole as T.S. Willan described them. There were a few specialist shops, but the great majority stocked a wide variety of goods and cloth, haberdashery, groceries and stationery were a common combination. The goods were bought in distant places – London, Leeds and York for example – and were bought and sold on credit, if inventoried debts and references to debt books can be relied on. There were some significant differences, however. Carlisle's merchants sold also hardware, unlike those that Willan studied, and by-employments, especially agriculture, were of much greater significance in the northern town than Willan allowed. Nine of the 21 men who called themselves merchants at their deaths after 1620 had a marked interest in farming, some of them a substantial one. This implies a less specialised urban economy in the border town than elsewhere.

4. See Chapter Three. Isaac Tullie's creditors are mentioned in his will, quoted above; Symon Briskowe, Gent., owed Mr Thomas Patynson, a merchant, 9s. 2d. for several wares in 1572; William Talentyer, merchant, had several debt books. P1661 Isaac Tullie; P1572 Symon Briskowe; P1587 Thomas Pattinson; P1573 Thomas Tallentyer.
c. The professions and service trades

The final sector of the economy to be examined is the service sector, the activities of those who sold their knowledge and skills rather than a physical product.

Probably the most important of these in the community were the lawyers. It has already been noted that Carlisle had a relatively large number of lawyers for its size. Not only was it the county town, and therefore a place convenient for the holding of county courts and for lawyers to live in, it was also the seat of the diocesan courts. Even its military role created work for the lawyers of the city, for they were the obvious group from which to recruit the clerk the warden needed, and there were also the wardens' own courts. One Carlisle notary who served as warden clerk in the 1590s compiled a memoranda book concerning border affairs. To these opportunities can be added work in the city courts. The court entry books indicate that these courts were very active.

Probate records reveal something about the lawyers' practices. In only one case, that of Edward Southalke, a proctor, were debts owed to the testator specified as being for fees. The sums involved were small, 7s., 10s. and 5s., but, of course, were not insignificant considering the general level of wages. One notary, Thomas Gibson, described another, John Pattinson, as his partner, but it seems unlikely that such partnerships were common. Relationships between lawyers, however, must have often been close, bred by regular contact. Gibson also described the registrar of the diocese as "my good frend", and bequeathed a lawbook to the chancellor; he himself was called friend by Southalke. Similar bequests were quite common. One

1. See Chapter Four, sections b. and c.
2. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Richard Bell's History of the Borders.
3. P1613 Edward Southalke; P1618 Thomas Gibson.
reason for this closeness is suggested by the inventories: Raynold Perkin was servant of Barnard Aglionby, registrar of the diocese, when Aglionby died in 1579, and Gibson was Perkin's servant at Perkin's death in 1596.¹ Probably each had been trained as an apprentice. Support for this supposition comes from the gild records: Thomas Jackson, later described as an attorney, was admitted a member of the Tanners' Gild in 1675 having served an apprenticeship to James Nicholson.² Finally, although before the Civil War the chancellors of the diocese were civil lawyers, university trained, other officers of the ecclesiastical courts seem to have undertaken ordinary notarial work. Barnard Aglionby, for example, described himself as a notary public, and Thomas Gibson did the same although Southaike called him a proctor.³

The lawyers' expertise also gave them opportunities in other fields. The career of James Nicholson provides a good illustration of the possibilities. Nicholson was town clerk - all of the town clerks whose occupations can be identified in the early-modern period were lawyers. He served as clerk of the Tanners' and Weavers' companies, and probably of the Smiths' also. He was auditor, seneschal, "supervisor opus" and registrar of the Dean and Chapter in 1676-7 for a salary of £10-6-8, and in the 1690s supervised repairs to local bridges on behalf of the county.⁴ Other lawyers seem to have become postmasters.⁵

The medical trades in Carlisle seem to have been very much as Margaret Pelling has depicted the trades in England as a whole - as a rather

1. P1579 Barnard Aglionby; P1596 Raynold Perkin.
3. The chancellors' legal qualifications were often given in endorsements on wills. P1579 Barnard Aglionby; P1618 Thomas Gibson.
4. CRO, List of Town Clerks; D/Lons/L-1786 Election, books of the Smiths', Tanners' and Weavers' gilds, n.p.; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Book I, p.13; see Chapter Four, p.143.
5. See Chapter Four, p.145, for examples.
disparate group, practising medicine without regard to the threefold division of physician, surgeon and apothecary. Only one physician per se, Dr Robert Law, who was admitted to the Tanners' Company in 1695, is known to have practised in the town at any time during the period 1550-1700, although Cuthbert Burstead died in 1570 owing 33s. 4d. for his charges in going to physicians, Thomas Bacon owed the "Doctor of phisick" £2 and John Wilson in 1687 owed the doctor and apothecary £5. Instead, most of the medical personnel of the town were described as surgeons if they were given an occupational description at all. Edward Albourght, for example, retained by the corporation during the plague of 1597-8, was called a "cherurgion" by the council, and Thomas Dykes' will and inventory were endorsed "chirurgeon" in 1689. They seem mostly to have called themselves gentlemen, a nice comment on their own idea of their status. The apothecary's function as supplier of drugs, if not as prescriber, was probably the province of the Carlisle merchant, for, as noted above, they generally sold spices and drugs. A possible exception was a surgeon, William Tallentyre, owed £3-8-11 by "diu(er)s people for Medicines" in 1684, but his only trade goods were glass bottles and "Gallypotts". He was a member of the Tanners' Company, not the Merchants'. The only other named medical worker was Ellanor Jackson, a


2. Raech found only one physician practising in all Cumberland. This was John Relf, who lived at Newbiggin, probably the Newbiggin near Ireby rather than that near Carlisle. J. Raach, A Directory of English Country Physicians, 1603-1643, 1962, pp.123, 126; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Thomas Talantyre's Register, f.7v; P1570 Cuthbert Burstead; P1680 Thomas Bacon; P1687 John Wilson; D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Book 3, sub 10 May 1695. It is impossible to be sure whether the handful of other men described in the records as Dr were physicians or clergymen.


4. P1684; D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Book 2; P1663 Mathew Wilkinson.
midwife, buried in 1693/4. She is very unlikely to have been the sole such midwife, certainly the amount of medical work carried out in the town is much under-recorded. Presumably, as Pelling suggests, a great deal was performed by non-specialists with little formal training.

Little can be said about the surgeons' activities from their probate records. Medical instruments were usually valued as a whole, for example Thomas Dykes the elder's surgical instruments and books were valued at £3 10s. Sometimes their glassware was valued separately: Dykes had some "Simply glasses", pots, three hanging shelves and broken plasters worth 6s., while his son and namesake had "Galley potts and bottells" valued at 1s. in addition to instruments worth £1-6-6. The younger Dykes, at least, had treated a patient outside the town, in Lazonby. The inventories of all five men identified as medical men included books. The titles of those belonging to John Mulcaster were given; seven of the 30 were concerned with medicine, and they included "the booke of Jherome of Brunswicke of Chringerye" and "a booke intituled Salernas verses for p(re)serving of health written in latten". Early in the period medicine appears to have been supplemented as a means of getting a living by other pursuits. William Carter, who in 1570 was owed 2s. for surgery and so presumably was working as a surgeon, was also farming, malting and lodging soldiers, while he is elsewhere described as a gunner. Albourght was appointed subsacristan in the cathedral in 1570/1. The later wills and inventories suggest greater

1. PR79/1, sub Feb. 1693/4.
2. P1682 Thomas Dykes; P1689 Thomas Dykes.
4. Besides the two Dykes, these included: P1598 Edward Albourght; P1594 John Mulcaster; and P1684 William Tallentyre.
5. P1570; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Thomas Talantyre's Register, ff.24v, 95.
specialisation of function, however, for they do not record any by-
employments, not even agriculture.

A few other service occupations appear in the records. The town
had an usher and a schoolmaster for its grammar school throughout the
period. If William Hay, who died in 1587, is typical, they had no financial
interests beyond their teaching. During the later seventeenth century these
schoolteachers were often clergymen and members of the cathedral
establishment; this caused the corporation disquiet in 1681. Even if not
clerks while teaching, a good number became beneficed clergy when they left
the school, so teaching would seem to have been for most merely a stage in
their careers. There were barbers in the town, for the Dean and Chapter
retained one. Surprisingly few appear in the sources, however, considering
how difficult shaving must have been without good mirrors and the medical
role barbers usually performed. At least one was a barber-surgeon.

There were also professional musicians in the town, employed by
both the corporation and the Chapter. The city made payments to musicians,
generally to a trumpeter, on election days and other special occasions such
as Ascension Day. It also had officially-sanctioned waits, who until the late
1620s and early 1630s, if not thereafter, paraded around the town in the
morning and evening. In 1633 there were three of them. These men were not
usually salaried, but received occasional gratuities such as the 2s. 6d. given
in 1605 to "George Wilson & his 3 sones being waits who offere them selves
to be hird", and sometimes liveries. In the early seventeenth century the
town was visited often by waits from other towns. In 1605, for example, the

1. P1587.
2. G.B. Routledge, ed., Carlisle Grammar School Memorial Register, 1264-1924,
1924, pp.33-5; Ca2/13/47.
waits of Penrith, Leeds, Kendal, Richmond and Wakefield were given one or two shillings apiece, and in 1614 (new style) waits from Lancaster, Penrith, Canterbury, Appleby, "Midlam", Lancaster, Halifax, "Altherton", Bristol, Knaresborough and Kirkby Stephen each received about 3s. 4d. The inventory of one of the waits has survived. Christopher Wilkinson owned musical instruments valued at £11, a sizeable sum far in excess of the value of the tools of the town's craftsmen, and his apparel was worth £6, again a large sum, perhaps reflecting the need to impress. Waits are not recorded in the town after the Civil War, but there were still musicians since gild accounts reveal that the companies employed musicians to play for them on their feast days and on Ascension Day. It is likely, however, that these men performed only as a subsidiary occupation. The only full-time professional musicians after the Civil War were probably the cathedral choir of 4 singingmen (6 in 1585) and 6 choristers, led by a master of the choristers who in 1676 doubled as organist.

Certain features stand out. The lawyers were on the whole wealthy, as were the medical men, although not as well-off as the lawyers or as the merchants. The activities of the lawyers were fairly diverse, and they used their money to increase their income by investing in property and agriculture. The surgeons, in contrast, would seem to have become more specialised in their professional activities, although the evidence is rather thin. The disappearance of the waits was probably more the result of cultural changes than economic change, the requests of the court leet juries in 1629 and 1633 that they be allowed to continue their traditional

1. Ca3/2/9 & 10; Ca4/1 & 2.
2. P1600. Only two of these instruments were named, and of those one is illegible. The other was a whistle.
3. DRC 3/52; Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, Discharge Book I, pp.5-12.
activities being perhaps a conservative response to a Puritan 'reformation of
manners'. The waiters would seem to have been only averagely prosperous if
Wilkinson was typical, and the cathedral musicians were definitely badly off.
Similarly, the barber employed by the Dean and Chapter, John Kenity, was poor — he was exempted from the Hearth Tax in 1673. By the end of the
seventeenth century, then, people were paying far more for the services they
could not do without, than for those which were not vital — hardly surprising.

d. Conclusion

The provision of food, drink and accommodation for the town's many visitors
was clearly very important to Carlisle's economy, yet, apart from the
butchers, most of those engaged in it were only so part-time. Presumably the trades offered little opportunity for successful occupational
specialisation. Similarly, all but a few of its retailers sold a wide variety
of items. Few specialised in a particular branch, such as linen-draping or
groceries. Although they bore the title of merchant, their activities appear
to have been extremely unadventurous. The town's lawyers too, although
numerous for such a small place, were unable to specialise in, say,
eclesiastical work. Members of other service trades were not numerous. All this points to an underdeveloped economy, where specialisation of function
was limited. Carlisle was, of course, not unique in this, such a pattern was
common in pre-industrial English towns. It is surprising, however, to find it
in such a marked degree in Carlisle, a town which from its position at the
head of the local urban hierarchy and with its extra roles as garrison town
and administrative centre would be expected to have a more sophisticated
economy and greater opportunities for specialisation.

2. PRO E179/90/176, f.6a.
Carlisle's economy was not subject only to the forces of demand and supply. As part of the kingdom of England it was influenced by the efforts of the government to manipulate the national economy in the best interests of the crown and commonwealth and, more particularly, by the local institutions which served as the state's agents. In Carlisle, a corporate town, these agents were the corporation itself and the city's eight gilds. Naturally each had its own interests and its own perception of the public interest, and the actions they took to regulate Carlisle's economy were determined accordingly. In this chapter the structure and personnel of the corporation and gilds and their activities will be examined to discover how the economy was influenced by them and, perhaps, something of the motivations and perceptions of their members. The gilds will be discussed first, then the corporation and finally the relationship between the two.

a. The gilds

There are a number of problems which need to be examined when considering the role of Carlisle's gilds in the town's economy. It should be determined whether the gild system was moribund or thriving. The proportion of the city's population that were members is uncertain, as is whether non-townsmen, journeymen and non-craftsmen also belonged to them, and whether all the members practised the trade. What powers did the gilds have and were they exercised? The section that follows will attempt to answer these questions.

Carlisle had eight gilds in the early-modern period: the Butchers', the Glovers', the Merchants', the Shoemakers', the Smiths', the Tailors', the Tanners' and the Weavers'. They called themselves 'trade',
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'fraternity', 'company', 'occupation' and sometimes 'brotherhood', 'gild' or 'mystery', apparently without distinction; their members were invariably called 'brothers' or 'brethren'. These names betray their origin as medieval craft fellowships although the gilds are first recorded only in the sixteenth century: the Glovers' Gild has a list of members which dates from 1521-2 and representatives of all the gilds signed the Dormont Book in 1561. They had certainly lost any religious functions they may once have had by the time the earliest surviving versions of their ordinances were compiled, although the Tailors' ordinances include one about assembling for a Corpus Christi Day procession.

How many gild members were there? Only one list of the gildsmen of all eight gilds has survived and an analysis of it is shown in Table 9.1. There were 400 members of the eight gilds in 1684, a large number when the population of the town was probably slightly less than 2,000. All of these 400 were men. Although women were not specifically banned from membership by any gild ordinance none is ever recorded as a member of any gild; de

1. The minute books of only three of Carlisle's gilds have survived, the Merchants', Shoemakers' and Tanners' companies. The first two are in the CRO, references DGC/4/1 and DGC/2/1, the third in Carlisle City Library. Fortunately, however, full transcripts of the gild books of all eight gilds were made in 1786, during the Mushroom Elections, and have survived in the Lowther family archives. They are now in the CRO, reference D/Lons/L-1786 Election. Extracts from the original minute books for seven of the companies together with introductory chapters on the corporation and its charters and the corporation and gilds were published in R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of the City of Carlisle, CWAAS Extra Series, IV, Carlisle 1887. These extracts include most of the ordinances and many of the more interesting minutes. The Merchants', Shoemakers' and Tanners' minutes begin early in the seventeenth century, those of the other companies only after the Civil War, but several companies have lists of members or apprentices which begin before their administrative minutes and accounts. All the minute books begin with ordinances which clearly were copied from earlier minute books.

The study which follows here was based on analysis of the original Merchants' and Shoemakers' gild books, and the eighteenth-century transcripts of the Shoemakers' and remaining six companies' records. References have been kept to a minimum, and unless otherwise indicated authority for the statements made lies in the appropriate gild's records. Most of the books are unpaginated, but generally gild ordinances are given in the front and after the first few pages minutes and accounts are arranged chronologically.
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f'acto they were excluded. A number of lists of the members of individual gilds have survived revealing the sizes of these gilds at various dates. They are summarised in Table 9.2. There is no information for the Glovers' Gild and not enough for the Smiths' Gild to indicate a clear trend, but the Merchants' Gild alone appears to have decreased in numbers in the later seventeenth century and the other five all grew, more than recovering from a slump in membership during the troubled years 1644-1650. The population of the town also grew during the same period, so the proportion of gild members in it probably remained roughly constant.

Table 9.1 Gild Membership and Freedom of the City in Carlisle, 1684

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gild</th>
<th>No. of gildsmen</th>
<th>% of all gildsmen</th>
<th>No. of gildsmen not free</th>
<th>% of gildsmen not free</th>
<th>No. of gildsmen also freemen</th>
<th>Gildsmen as % of all freemen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butchers'</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glovers'</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants'</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers'</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors'</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners'</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers'</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>349</td>
<td>93.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. CRO, Ts of the Register of the Trade Gilds of Carlisle, transcribed by E.E. Beattie, collated with the original, Ca2/27. The list of gild members in 1684 is in the rear of the original book.
2. Those men who were members of several gilds are counted only under their principal gild.
3. There were 25 freemen, 6.68% of the total of 374, who were not members of a gild.

Gild members were quite numerous when compared to the population of Carlisle, but not all of them lived in the town. The 1684 list analysed above noted that 26 of the gildsmen lived outside the city, mostly men who were not also freemen, and it suggested that many others whose places of residence were not given also actually dwelled outside the town. The attitudes of the gilds to members who did not live in the city varied.
notably the Weavers', Shoemakers' and Smiths', allowed outsiders to buy their way into the company and exercise trading rights in the city, albeit with limitations. The Tanners' on the other hand discouraged tanning by gild members living outside the city liberties. All the gilds had members who did not follow the trade of the fraternity, however, and no restriction was placed on where they lived. The number of such gildsmen in some fraternities was quite high by the end of the seventeenth century. The Tanners', an extreme case, had only 29 brothers living in Carlisle in 1691 and as few as 23 in 1698, less than half their total membership.

Table 9.2 Membership of Carlisle Gilds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Butchers'</th>
<th>Merchants'</th>
<th>Shoemakers'</th>
<th>Smiths'</th>
<th>Tailors'</th>
<th>Tanners'</th>
<th>Weavers'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ca2/325.
2. 7 May and 5 Nov. - the difference was probably due to plague deaths.
3. Ca2/331.

An idea of the proportion of the city's male inhabitants who were members of the gilds can be obtained by comparing the city's Court Leet Calls with the gild records. Five Court Leet Calls have survived, for the
years 1684, 1687, 1689, 1694 and 1699. Of these, that for 1699 has been used below since lists of gild members made almost contemporaneously with it have survived for seven of the companies. It was necessary to rely on lists of admissions and other references for the other gild, that of the glovers. The 1699 Court Leet Call lists 334 male inhabitants. Theoretically these were all the inhabitants of the city who owed suit to its court leet, i.e. all the adult males. It is unlikely that all the servants, journeymen and labourers were actually included, but most householders probably were. 179 (53.6 per cent) of the listed inhabitants were members of one of the gilds. This was a high proportion although probably not an unusually high one. There may have been a gild member in two households out of every five.

A number of these gildsmen followed other occupations than the one their gild was named after. A good number of the Merchants' and Tanners' companies, those with the greatest social cachet, were not tradesmen although one of the early Merchants' Gild ordinances forbade brothers to involve themselves in other occupations. The Tanners' Gild, for example, in the late seventeenth century admitted Dr Robert Law, a physician; Capt. Jeremiah Bubb, a soldier; the Earl of Carlisle; the Dean and Archdeacon of Carlisle, both later to be bishops of the diocese; the chancellor of the diocese; Thomas Dikes, a surgeon; and three men described as attorneys. The Merchants', politically a more independent gild, had no such distinguished brothers as the Earl or Dean, but they too had non-merchant members.

Richard Lowry and Gaires Orbell have been identified as goldsmiths, the


2. It has been estimated that in Coventry, in 1500, 80 per cent of all householders were members of craft fellowships. Almost half the adult male population of York in 1548 were freemen, the group from which York craft gild members were recruited. C.V. Phythian-Adams, 'Ceremony and the citizen: The communal year at Coventry, 1450-1550', in P. Clark and P. Slack, eds, Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700, London 1972, p.58; D. Palliser, 'The trade gilds of Tudor York', in idem, p.87.
William Atkinson admitted in 1635 was a notary, Richard Barwis, admitted in 1624, was a country gentleman and lawyer. Moreover their accounts for the 1630s show that only a proportion of those attending the company's annual dinner actually traded.¹

The situation was different in the humbler companies, the Butchers', Smiths', Shoemakers', Tailors' and Weavers': they do not appear to have had as many gentle or lawyer members. One member of the Shoemakers' Gild in the late seventeenth century was a minister. Another, Francis Atkinson, was a currier, but this was a related trade practised in addition to shoemaking by most shoemakers.² None of the others had any special status except Thomas Jackson, a notary, who was admitted to the gild in 1686 when he became its clerk. Most of the gilds had notaries or sometimes merchants as clerks, but these men were admitted specifically to fill the office and were untypical of the gild members as a whole. The Smiths' Company admitted a glazier, Edward Atkinson, in 1688, but he was admitted as a brother's son and on the understanding that he followed that trade only and not that of a smith. That he was admitted on such terms suggests that it was unusual for a non-metalworker to become a brother of the gild. Even most of the 'outmen' brothers of these gilds, those living outside the city, were admitted with caveats on their trading activities which indicated that they were following the gild's trade. A substantial proportion, perhaps the majority, of men in these gilds, therefore, worked at the trades their fraternity was named after.

It is not clear whether the gild membership included all journeymen and if not then whether journeymen had separate organisations as, for example, in early sixteenth-century Coventry.³ Journeymen were plainly

2. P1700 Francis Atkinson.
quite common although far from all masters employed them. For example the
Weavers', Smiths' and Shoemakers' had rules about taking other men's servants
and master craftsmen of the Weavers' and Tailors' companies were expected to
pay the gild a small amount annually or quarterly for each one employed.
Only one gild's records, the Shoemakers', imply the existence of a separate
Journeyman's organisation, however. Their ancient orders, copied up about
1600, included one commanding the undermasters of the gild "as alsoe the
Journeymen" to make account once a year "And the Jorneymen how it standeth
w(it)h them and how the Comoditie of their Stock and Box is used and
Imployed". This order was deleted at some unknown date, signifying it no
longer had force and implying that the journeymen's organisation had
disappeared.

Evidence as to whether journeymen were also gild members is
scanty and ambiguous. Some suggests that most journeymen were gildsmen.
Lists of gild members dating from before 1600 have survived for the
Merchants', Butchers', Glovers' and Tanners' companies and have been compared
with the surviving wills and inventories. This comparison showed that all
but one of those named in their probate records as tanners, all but one of
the glovers and all of the butchers were members of their respective gilds,
as well as most of those whose occupations have been deduced from the
contents of their inventories. The Merchants' Company list starts later than
the others but it includes all but one of the merchants whose wills were
proved after 1607. Probate evidence is biased towards the richer members of
the community, but if any of these testators were journeymen then they were
also members of their gild and it seems improbable that no journeymen at all
in these trades left wills. An early Shoemakers' Gild order, again later
crossed out, commanded that no-one admitted a brother was to set up shop
and work as a master for himself for a year or more, but was to work as a
journeymen. On the other hand two journeymen named in the Shoemakers' records for 1678 and 1680 were not among the apprentices enrolled with the company or any list of members. And in 1684 the journeymen and apprentices were ordered not to "trouble" the gild on Allhallow Thursday (Ascension Day), which implies that they were not full members of the company - if they had been they would have been admitted to the fraternity's celebrations.

There are two other approaches to the question. Journeymen could come from two sources. First there were the ex-apprentices who after finishing their term either did not set up as masters immediately or never did so. If there were significant periods between the time an apprentice finished his term and his entry to the gild, then clearly journeymen were not always allowed to take up full membership of the gild or did not usually do so. Second, immigrants to the city who had trained elsewhere could be employed as journeymen. Such men would not qualify for membership of the gilds as apprentices or children of brothers, the normal routes.

To take the second point first, such immigration took place and was sanctioned by some gilds. The Smiths' Company, for example, allowed their members to employ foreign journeymen for 14 days before consulting the masters of the trade. Mrs Studholme was ordered in 1668 by the Merchants' company not to employ James Moorehead to sell goods in her shop. This was apparently because Moorehead was a Scot and Scots were forbidden to retail in Carlisle, rather than because he was not a brother. The Glovers', however, forbade the employment of 'foreign' journeymen, who by inference had not been apprenticed in the city, and forced an offending master to pay a fine in 1685. Policy presumably varied from company to company, therefore, and probably also changed over time.

Taking the first point, it would seem that apprentices who became brothers were generally admitted to the fraternity shortly after finishing
their apprenticeships. Among the tanners, for example, in the seventeenth century 119 boys became apprentices whose admission to the company could be expected to be recorded in the surviving records. Seventy-nine of these, 66.4 per cent, were admitted as brothers of the gild, the proportion being slightly lower before 1650 than after. In all but nine cases the apprentice's admission came within nine years of his enrollment, or two years of the end of his term, usually on the first or second quarter day after it expired. A handful were not admitted for up to five years after finishing their apprenticeship, however. The picture was more complex among the shoemakers. Sixty-four apprentices were enrolled between 1652 and 1693. Of these 48 (75 per cent) became brothers before 1701. Of these, two were admitted two years, two three years and two as long as seven years from the end of their terms, the others were admitted within two years. Of 45 apprentices enrolled to the Smiths' Company, 1651-1694, 27 (60 per cent), were admitted brothers and all but two of them within a year of the end of their term. The odd pair each took six years to be admitted. The bulk of the apprentices in each company, then, were admitted very soon after completing their apprenticeships, a few took longer and a proportion were never admitted to full membership. This proportion was probably slightly larger than the number of apprentices who died, failed to complete their term for some other reason, or left the city. Although, therefore, most apprentices entered a gild as soon as they could, a number either worked as journeymen for a period before becoming gild members, or never took up gild membership although remaining in the city.

It must be concluded, therefore, that not all the journeymen in each trade were members of the appropriate gild. On the other hand, so many apprentices became gildsmen so soon after the end of their apprenticeships that a number of gild members must have worked as journeymen. The number
of journeymen in each craft who were not gild members was probably small, too small to support separate organisations. That the shoemakers once had such a body but that it disappeared suggests that it may have been increasingly common for journeymen to have become gild brothers.

A good case could be made for the argument that the primary raison d'etre of the Carlisle gilds was the regulation of the city economy for the benefit of the gild members. One aspect of this has been touched on already: the control of competition from outsiders. The gilds tried to prevent non-members following the company's trade within the town. For example in 1647 the Merchants' Gild ordered prosecution of those who followed the trade of merchant contrary to statute and in 1651 planned to present street hawkers to the court leet; the Butchers' prosecuted five country butchers at the 1682 assizes for following the trade unlawfully. Even when outsiders were admitted to a gild as an outman, often paying a fine, their economic rights were usually circumscribed. Those admitted to the Weavers' in the later seventeenth century had restrictions on taking journeymen or apprentices and were not to take work from the city. Outman brothers of the Smiths' Company were allowed to sell goods from stalls in the street on market days, at fairs and in assise week, but not to keep a shop or trade at other times.

Exclusion of outsiders extended to preventing gild members associating with them as partners or acting as their agents. Most of the companies had orders forbidding such activities, those of the Butchers' even forbidding the loan of tools and those of the Shoemakers' prohibiting the sale of oil to rural shoemakers. Occasional amercements for partnership with foreigners show that these rules were enforced. The policy seems to have been successful – as noted above, almost every tanner, glover, merchant and butcher who left probate records and who lived in a period from which gild
records have survived was a member of the appropriate gild. Moreover, when in 1633 royal commissioners summoned all the merchants, mercers, grocers, glovers and skinners, of the 22 who came 10 were members of the Merchants' Gild and 11 of the Glovers'. The exception, in the merchants, mercers and grocers list, was a woman, a widow probably of a member of the Merchants' Gild.'

The gilds were also very concerned to ameliorate the effects of competition between members. Gild members were forbidden to offer for animals, skins or other goods in the market when another brother had already started to bargain for them. The Tailors' forbade their members to undertake work which another brother had already cut out and the Weavers' to accept work which a colleague had warped. The Tanners' orders preventing the purchase of hides in Butchers' houses instead of the market-place or the sale of 'wet' leather can be interpreted as preventing unfair trading practices as well as controlling prices and quality in the public interest. Gildsmen were also forbidden to poach other men's journeymen or apprentices.

This concern extended to disputes between members. Every gild had orders that brothers were not to go to law with each other without first submitting the dispute to the gild for judgement or arbitration. This permitted a faster and cheaper resolution of conflict than did the public courts, and on balance probably an equally just one. For the gild it had the advantage of privacy - confining disputes within the gild meant that the public image of its members as good citizens was less likely to be tarnished. Naturally the policy also limited dissension within the fraternity, and the use of the terms "fraternity" and "brother" by the gilds says much about their self image.

Gild intervention in the town economy generally took place in the public interest if also in that of the tradesmen. The Glovers' Company in 1682 appointed searchers for unlawful leather or gloves, for example. The Shoemakers' ordered that an apprentice who had finished his term and intended to work as a journeyman instead of at the lesser status of a hireman should make four pairs of shoes which were to be inspected and approved by six of the "ancients" before he was permitted to do so. A tailor who failed to complete work by the promised time might be fined. Only rarely, it would seem, did the gilds act directly against the public interest as the Glovers' did on two occasions, in 1680 and 1684, when the fraternity tried to set maximum prices to be paid for raw skins. The secrecy such selfish activity demanded may have meant that decisions to embark on restrictive practices may not have normally been recorded in gild minutes, but there are no complaints of unsociable economic behaviour by the gilds in the corporation's minutes as might be expected if it was frequent.

The control of apprenticeship was also very important, for it allowed the gilds to regulate the entry of labour into their trades. In 1583/4 the Merchants' Company insisted that a master who took an apprentice should enrol him at the next quarter day, and the Smiths' had a similar order as early as 1562/3. Members of the Glovers' Company were permitted to take apprentices only with the consent of four of the "Seniors" of the gild. In every company but the Tanners' the gross exploitation of apprentices as cheap labour was prevented by orders that an apprentice should have served five or six years (depending on the company) before his master could take another. When in 1679/80 James Nicholson was allowed by the tanners' fraternity to take a second apprentice although his first had served only 4½ years, it was "... to be noe president to any other...". The term an apprentice was to serve was set with few exceptions at the legal minimum of
7 years, but several of the gilds insisted that he should be indentured for an eighth year as a "hireman". Presumably a hireman was a low-status journeyman since, as noted above, shoemakers intending to work as journeymen immediately after finishing their apprenticeship had to undergo a special test. Companies insisting on a year as a hireman included also the Tailors', Tanners' and Weavers'; the Tanners' appear to have abandoned the rule about 1620, however, and the Shoemakers' in 1662.

Closely linked to the length of apprenticeship was the age of the apprentice at the start of his term. Fourteen or older was the favoured age in Carlisle. The Glovers' and Merchants' companies both had rules that apprentices were to be at least 14 years old; the Merchants' allowed an exception to this rule in 1620/21 in the case of John Langhorne, apprenticed to his grandfather Thomas James, then mayor, but on condition he was not to be enrolled as a brother until he was 21. Certainly other apprentices were older: William Jackson, the son of James Jackson of Swinsty in Holme Cultram, was apprenticed to Mr Richard Monnks, merchant, in 1668 when he was just under 17 years old. One reason for this was that apprentices would not be able until they were 21 to take the legally binding oaths required when they took up gild membership at the end of their term, another was probably to ensure that they were mature and responsible enough to look after apprentices themselves once they were qualified to do so. An order of 1670 forbade any "Brother son" (who would not have had to serve an apprenticeship) of the Butchers' Company to take an apprentice before reaching 21, and the Glovers', Tailors' and Weavers' all had orders restricting or forbidding the taking of apprentices before the master concerned was married.

The relationship between apprentice and master theoretically was regulated for the benefit of both, and the gilds did sometimes enforce the apprenticeship contract in the interests of the apprentice. For example in 1697 Robert Hodgson, a tailor, was fined 13s. 4d. by his gild for not giving his apprentices sufficient meat, drink, washing and lodging and for "putting them to ye Cart and Coales". They also found new masters for apprentices whose original master had died. On occasion they arbitrated between master and apprentice, as in 1674 when the Shoemakers' allowed John Lowther to buy his way out of his apprenticeship but, still, later to become a gild member. Far more commonly, however, the gilds reinforced the authority of the master. During the seventeenth century the Shoemakers' Company debarred at least two apprentices for deserting their masters, another for outrageous behaviour and a third for theft. Cases where masters were disciplined for maltreating their apprentices were extremely rare in the records, and in the one quoted above the master was forgiven his amercement.

The gilds also served as the common voice of men working in a particular trade. Prosecution of outsiders was one facet of this, but the gilds acted on other occasions. Thus in 1618-9 the Tanners' Company took action against a widow, Elizabeth Parker alias Thompson, and her partner, a cordwainer named Simon Brathwate, who appear to have been pushing up the price of raw hides and bark to the detriment of the smaller tanners. The gild forbade its members to work for the partners or sell them bark; the two soon submitted and gave over tanning on condition they could sell their existing stock. The Weavers' in 1697 petitioned the Commissioners of the Customs "about the Stopping of the said Weavers from bringing Wollen and lining Yarn to be wrought at Carlisle or places adjacent and soe be Returned after made into Cloth".

Besides these largely economic functions, the gilds also were an
important social forum for their members.' One element of this was the
opportunity for office-holding, which brought prestige. Another was ritual
burial of members, their wives and children, and a third was commensality,
both on occasions like burials, and on quarter days, annual gild dinners and
on Ascension Day. Commensality must have played a particularly important
role in binding the gild members together, reinforcing the ties of mutual
economic interest and offsetting the divisive force of competition. There
was also a strong element of social control, especially over the behaviour of
apprentices, but also in such matters as the manufacture of footballs by
shoemaker journeymen.

There is plenty of evidence to indicate that the gilds genuinely
mattered to most if not all of their members. Quarterage money, a few pence
demanded by most gilds from their members at each of the four annual
meetings by the end of the seventeenth century, may have been resented,
drinkings after quarterly meetings may have become less popular, but most
members paid the one and attended the other as well as the five or more
annual meetings. They continued to enroll their apprentices and to
encourage their sons to join. More significantly, they were prepared to pay
fines imposed by the companies for transgressions of gild rules rather than
risk losing membership. What went on in gild meetings was able to arouse
great passions, leading to bad language and stormy, even violent, behaviour.
At Midsummer 1689, for example, two tailors were amerced 3s. 4d. for "evil
words" to the four wardens of the company, one of them, John Simpson,
"saying to ye occupation shit on my Arse and knocking on ye table and going
abruptly out of the gill without leve". Four years earlier another member

1. Phythian-Adams argues this strongly in the case of the gilds of Coventry.
Phythian-Adams, Desolation, pp.104-16. It is not appropriate here to discuss
at length the social role of the gilds of Carlisle, but it could be argued
that they were equally as important as social organisations as they were as
economic ones.
of the gild was fined "for laughing to scorne the Clarke when he was in his office and saying god damn you all". In November 1685 a member of the Butchers' Company was amerced for undecent words in the gildhall and "brawling" and then fined "again 4 times for saying he cared not a fart for ye trade and many undecent words besides". In 1616 a merchant beat on the table and threatened to pull the clerk's gown from his shoulders and put him down the stairs. Some men were prepared to put up with surprising humiliations to atone for misbehaviour. In January 1629/30 Clement Dalton was amerced 10s. for abusing John Pattinson, a notary and one of the table, or senior officers, of the Tanners', and rather than pay the fine, "before the wholl occupacion uponn his knees", asked Pattinson's forgiveness.

Clearly the gild system in Carlisle in 1700 was far from moribund. Membership would appear to have been growing and to have included half of the town's adult male inhabitants as well as many outsiders. All the master craftsmen in the eight trades were members and probably most of the journeymen. The companies exercised effective control over the trades they represented and played an important social role in the lives of their members and their families. As will be argued below the fraternities also had an important role in the government of the town before 1637, and even after then they were forums for the political activity of the freemen.

Looking forward, their eventual decay was perhaps a product of this political activity, but probably more so of the diversification and specialisation of the city's economy already beginning at the end of the seventeenth century. The gilds were unable to take control of the new economic activities and their usefulness decreased as the traditional economic activities declined in importance and traditional forms of social activity became outmoded. Industrialisation was merely the final stroke.
b. The corporation

The second of the two bodies directing Carlisle's economic life was its corporation, the civil government of the city, ostensibly the representative of the crown. This section will examine the structure of Carlisle's corporation, what powers did it have and what sort of people had effective control of the corporation's activities. It will show how they exercised their powers and what the corporation actually did.

The government of Carlisle was based on powers granted in a series of royal charters dating back at least to the reign of Henry II. The citizens had acquired, cumulatively, three mills under the west walls of the town, two fisheries in the Eden, vacant land in the city, common pasture on Kingmoor, free election of a mayor, two bailiffs and two coroners, independence from the county administration, and assorted powers of self-government including the administration of justice. In the fifteenth century the "Commons of Karllel... ordeynld..." that the government of the city should be in the hands of the mayor and 11 "worshipfull persons" of the city who were to watch over the activities of the mayor. Together the twelve were to choose another 24 men and the combined 36 were to elect the mayor in future years. This body was to be self-perpetuating, co-opting new members when the existing ones died. A two-tier council with a senior group of 12 and a junior body of 24 was thus established. This organisation received official sanction only in 1566 in the second charter of Elizabeth I to the town, her earlier charter merely confirming the charters of her predecessors.

In practice, however, the government of the town had a different structure. There was the 12, known as the aldermen or the mayor's brethren, one of whom was elected mayor. In fact 12 names rarely appear on any list

2. Ibid., pp.xxii-xxxiii, 112-128.
of them before 1636. It was presumably these 12 who were meant by the
term "the counsels" in the Dormont Book. But instead of a junior council of
24 there was one of 32, known as the "four of every occupation". This group
is mentioned several times in the ordinances made in 1561 recorded in the
Dormont Book; they, the mayor and his brethren displaced an illegally
appointed clerk of the city court in 1594; and in 1609 they, the mayor and
his brethren agreed that no-one could be arrested for debt in Carlisle
between noon Friday and noon Sunday unless the action involved a freeman
and an outman. A list of city officers made in 1636-7 described them as "y-
ffowers of everye Occupacion Caled y Comons Conncei1". This list and the
signatures to all the copies of the 1561 ordinances arrange the names in
groups of four under the names of the eight gilds. There is no doubt,
therefore, that the gilds each had equal representation in the junior part of
the corporation. Moreover the description of the junior council as "fower of
theleccion of everye Occupacion" in both 1594 and 1609 indicates that the
gilds had a direct say in who their representatives were, and that these men
were not chosen by the existing aldermen and councillors as the charter
suggested.

The charter of July 1637, known as the 'Governing Charter',
established the members and officers of the corporation on a more formal
basis. One of its more important provisions was to change the junior council
back to one of 24. The Fours of the Occupations were "Reduced to three",
one name from each gild in the 1636-7 list being crossed through. Those

1. Extracts from the Dormont Book, Ca2/17, are printed in R.S. Ferguson and
W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of the City of Carlisle, CWAAS Extra
Series, IV, Carlisle 1887. See especially clause 18, p.58, where one key to
the common chest was to be in the hands of the mayor, one in the hands of a
councillor, and two with members of the gilds. (Later one of the keys was
in the hands of the mayor, one in the possession of the senior alderman and
the third (only three keys were mentioned) in the hands of the chamberlain.
D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.) Ca2/17, f.87r,v; Ca2/18,
19 & 20; Ca2/326.
whose names remained were those who were named as the "Chief Citizens" in
the charter, so the new common council of 24 included three men from each
gild. The charter empowered the combined aldermen and chief citizens to
select new councillors, however, and the corporation minutes indicate they
exercised that power, so it is unlikely the balance was maintained.2

The most important officer of the corporation was the mayor.
Under the new charter he was to be one of the aldermen and it seems
probable that he was normally one before then also. In 1637 two former
mayors were not "sworne bretheren", but in the case of one of them at least
this was because of misdemeanors committed while he had been mayor.3

The mayor's effective power was considerable. Under the Governing Charter
he appointed the swordbearer and one of the three serjeants-at-mace, and by
1683 he may have also appointed the chamberlain.4 He was a J.P., Clerk of
the Market, and acted as magistrate in a number of the city's courts. As the
senior official he must have directed the day-to-day activities of the other
officers, including the chamberlains. He had authority to entertain visiting
dignitaries or to make repairs to city property to the value of 20s. without
consulting the rest of the council.5

Strict accounting procedures were laid down, but there were ample
opportunities for an unscrupulous mayor to abuse his office and the
corporation's revenues, and if he confused matters sufficiently he might
never be brought fully to book. Robert Dalton, for example, was accused in

1. Ca2/326; Ferguson, Charters, p.190. One man on the list, Randell Sewell,
a glover, was not named in the charter, but his place was taken by John
Barker, also a member of the Glovers' Company, admitted a freeman in 1633.
Ca2/27.
2. Ca2/2.
3. Ca2/236; Ca2/334.
4. TL 542/1, Articles exhibited against J.R. who was displaced as alderman
of the city. See also p.321 n.4.
5. Ferguson, Charters, pp.201-2; R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal
Records, p.60, clause 23; D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.
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In 1566 of getting himself elected illegally mayor in order to exploit the city revenues.¹ Unnamed mayors in the late sixteenth century were accused of taking bribes for appointing men to city offices such as Clerk to the City Court.² John Baines during his mayoralty, 1632-3, misappropriated the stipends of the gatekeepers and city preacher.³ Joseph Reed, mayor 1681-2 and deputy mayor the following year, was accused of getting himself elected to enrich himself from the corporation revenues, appointing an incompetent chamberlain whom he could manipulate, deferring the completion of his accounts for three years, falsifying the accounts, embarking on expensive and unnecessary lawsuits without consulting the corporation and then dropping them, doing expensive repairs without the consent of the corporation, cancelling bonds due to the city, all to the city's loss of some £250, calling Common Councils without due notice, fomenting faction and embezzling the records of the city's courts of record.⁴ Both Baines and Reed subsequently became mayor again, although the latter exploited the troubles of James II's reign to do so.

There were a number of other officials mentioned in the charters. Under the mayor were two bailiffs, two of the oldest civic officers. Their duties, as specified in the oath they took on election, were to empanel juries for the town courts, ensure justice was done impartially and, as the mayor was also expected to do, check that the watch was set and the basic

2. Ca2/17, f.67.
4. TL 542/1, Articles exhibited against J.R. who was displaced as alderman of the city; BL, Sloane Ms 2724, ff.157-8, 181-2; BL, Add. Ms 26,881, ff.569-74v. The reference to choosing the chamberlain is probably a reflection of the mayor's power in influencing his election rather than direct appointment - according to Denton, a former recorder of Carlisle writing in 1687 or 1688, the chamberlain was elected. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.91.
laws of the market obeyed. There were two coroners, who in the early-modern period seem usually to have been lawyers. The town or common clerk was also a lawyer, as was the recorder. The latter was usually a member of the local gentry but was expected to be actively involved in Carlisle's courts and other legal business. In 1673 the recorder's salary was docked for his negligence. There were three serjeants-at-mace. Their duties were partly ceremonial as they were expected to carry silver or gilt maces bearing the royal arms before the mayor, and on other occasions to carry halberds. Their chief practical functions were as judicial officers: they executed all judgements and made return of processes, frequently receiving "barr money" from the corporation in the seventeenth century. In 1637 a swordbearer was added to their number, fulfilling essentially the same roles. The swordbearer and one of the serjeants were chosen by the mayor and the other two by the mayor, aldermen, bailiffs and chief citizens.

The city had variety of other officials and employees not mentioned in the charters. The most important of these were the chamberlains. Before 1637 there were two chamberlains and new ones were elected each year; it was unusual for a man to fill the office more than once. After that date, however, there was only one chamberlain at a time, and some men held office several times, often in consecutive years. Only

1. Ferguson, Charters, pp.302-3.
2. Ca2/17, f.72r. Both of those appointed by the 1637 charter were lawyers.
3. List of Carlisle town clerks in the CRO. Most of the men on this list can be identified as lawyers; Ferguson, Charters, p.307.
4. Ferguson, Charters, pp.308-9. Repairs to halberds and maces appear occasionally throughout the Chamberlains' Accounts for the period, as does payment of "Barr money". D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92. The number of macebearers seems to have been reduced to one after James II gave the city a larger and far more elaborate mace. Ca4/3 & 4.
five men held the post between 1649 and 1680, and one of them, Thomas
Jackson, a shoemaker, was chamberlain from 1649-60, 1663-4, 1665-6, 1667-71,
1672-3, 1677-9 and 1680-1. The job was perhaps becoming more
'professional', the office of chamberlain more subject to control by the mayor
and the man himself less important; the name of the chamberlain is not
always recorded in the financial records in the last quarter of the
seventeenth century.' Other officers included two or more attorneys for the
city courts (not salaried), three porters at the gates, watchmen, a beadle
(sometimes three), who swept the moorthall and controlled begging, a gaoler, a
bellman who in 1649-50 did sterling service during plague, a cowherd who
looked after the inhabitants' animals on Kingmoor, sometimes also a
swineherd, and before the Civil War a drummer and a cook. Additional
payments were sometimes made for other services, such as ringing the curfew,
9 and 5 o'clock bells or keeping the town bulls. Some officers were given
gowns or cloaks, no doubt primarily to support the dignity of the city, but
also a valuable perquisite. On the whole, however, the salaries paid to the
junior civic officers were low and, although they may in some cases have
been supplemented by fees, quite obviously the posts were part-time.

In addition the corporation employed a number of people on an
occasional basis. These included lawyers and those involved in the
maintenance of public property – repairing bridges, walls, gates, roads, the
moorthall and gildhall, whitewashing out the royal arms in St Cuthbert's
church in 1651. It also included those who were employed for special
purposes such as the two bearers of the dead and the winder of corpses

2. Ferguson, Charters, Appendix III; see also the Dormont Book, printed in
R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal Records, pp.47-87, the Audit Books,
especially Ca4/139, f.94, and the Chamberlains' Books; Ca4/9, sub 1628-9.
3. Ca4/3 sub 1651-2.
employed during the plague in 1597-8 and the watchers at the gates during
the 'Busy Week' of 1603 and the time of the plague in Newcastle the same
year. ¹ Ceremonial occasions in particular led the corporation to hire extra
labour. Throughout the seventeenth century the mayor had from four to six
men attending him at fair and assize times, musicians on election days and
at Ascension Day. In the early seventeenth century there was a fool who was
not paid (although one man was given a shilling for being the fool on
Ascension Day 1605), but was supplied with a coat of red and white kersey,
bells and a feather. ²

There were also a few people in the town who received part of
their salaries from the corporation. The lecturer has already been
mentioned: he received £6-13-4 p.a. from the corporation from 1625, was
entirely supported by the city during the Interregnum, and was given £3-6-8
in 1677, which was not paid in 1678 but raised to £10 in 1679. ³ The
teachers of Carlisle's grammar school were in a similar position. Early in
the seventeenth century the usher was given £3-6-8 a year, although in some
years he received only £2. ⁴ In 1668 the master of the school was to receive
£6-13-4 from the city, and in 1679 the corporation were paying salaries to
both the master and usher. By 1692 the corporation paid the master £20 a
year, but in 1694, a period of retrenchment, it was decided he should get
only £10 and the usher 33s. 4d. ⁵ With payments being made to so many
individuals the corporation, like the cathedral, was an important

1. D/MH/I, p.68; Ca4/1 sub 1602-3.
2. Ca4/1-2, passim, but especially sub 1604-5 and 1613-4. This jester was
clearly different from the "natural fool" Miller, given a coat and hose in
1615. Ca4/2 sub 1614-5.
3. Ca2/334. R.S. Ferguson, 'The lectureship and lecturers at St Cuthbert's
Church, Carlisle', CWI, 7, 1883, pp.315-6, 321, 327-8.
5. Ca2/13/2 & 39; Ca2/2, ff.14, 24v, 28v.
employer in the city, if not a very generous one.

Effective power in the city undoubtedly lay with the aldermen. True, the common council was consulted on important occasions, by-laws could be made only with their consent, the city accounts were audited in their presence (and that of their predecessors, the fours), and the mayor, bailiffs and two serjeants were elected by the aldermen, bailiffs and common council acting together. Most, if not all, the votes to disfranchise freemen in the late seventeenth century were also made jointly by the aldermen and common council. But the aldermen were fewer and therefore a more convenient decision-making body than the combined council and aldermen, and met more frequently. They also had the key power, granted in the Governing Charter, of deposing members of the 24 without consulting it and they adopted the power, not given them, to displace fellow aldermen. For example in 1679 Timothy Haddock was deposed from the aldermanic bench by vote of his fellow aldermen, and the following year the aldermen removed a capital citizen for neglect and two more as aged and infirm; in 1700 three aldermen were removed by their fellows. Moreover the charter empowered the aldermen to fill any vacancies in their number themselves - they were a self-perpetuating elite. Both their status and power were enhanced by their role in the town's courts: from 1637 the mayor, recorder and two senior aldermen were ex officio J.P.'s, and the 1684 charter extended this privilege to the six senior aldermen.

1. For example Christopher Musgrave, M.P. for Carlisle, was disfranchised in 1692 at a meeting of six aldermen and nine capital citizens. J.A. Downie, *The Disfranchisement of Christopher Musgrave, M.P., by Carlisle Corporation in 1692*, CW2, 75, 1975, p.176. For other examples see: Ca2/13/1; Ca2/2 f.41r.

2. Ca2/13/32 & 37; Ca2/2 f.40 and passim for other examples.

3. Ferguson, *Charters*, pp.201, 257, 277-8. The charters of 1664 and 1684 changed little of the powers of the corporation, but made first the recorder and town clerk, and then any of the officers named in the charters removable by the crown at will. James II used this power in 1688. Ferguson, *Charters*, pp.xxv–xxx.
Unfortunately the names of the aldermen were not recorded with any frequency before 1637 and a comparison of changes in the occupational groups from which the bench was drawn would be based on data of widely differing completeness. Most aldermen became mayor, however, and the name of almost every mayor who held office during the 150 years 1550-1700 has been recorded. The mayoralty was also, as indicated above, the most powerful of the civic offices. An analysis of the occupational and social status of the mayors of Carlisle in this period, therefore, will show who Carlisle's political elite were and better reveal change within it.

Between October 1550 and October 1600 the names of 25 men who served as mayor are known. Thirteen of them held the office only once, eight held it twice and four held it three times. They comprised six merchants, a mercer, two vintners (both described in their wills as merchants), four gentlemen, a butcher, a tanner, a lawyer and seven of unknown occupation. Over the next 50 years 32 men served as mayor. Twenty served once only, nine served twice, one served four times and two served five times. Twelve of them (of whom one may actually have been a lawyer) were merchants, two were drapers, three were lawyers, one was a glover, three were tanners, seven were gentlemen and four were of unknown occupation, but one might have been a shoemaker. Between October 1650 and October 1700 36 men were mayor, 22 once only, 10 twice, three three times and one man four times. Of these, two were aristocrats (the earl of Carlisle and his son), six were gentlemen, 13 were merchants, one a draper, four were tanners, three were lawyers, one a surgeon, one a customs officer and five of unknown occupation. A number of these men, of various occupations, served as officers in during the Civil War; one of those of uncertain occupation served for a while as an officer later in the century.

Two points come across particularly strongly from this analysis.
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First is the predominance of the merchants and retailers. This is hardly surprising in view of the group's wealth, for although the mayor received a salary and entertainment allowance doubtless there were still expenses of office he had to bear. Moreover a pure retailer would better be able to spare time from his business to engage in local government than a craftsman, especially in view of the small scale on which most of Carlisle's craftsmen worked. Second is the extent to which members of the gentry were closely involved in the town's government. The Aglionby family were particularly closely associated with the city, four of its members being mayor between 1550 and 1700, holding office some 13 times between them, while another Aglionby became recorder. The Warwicks of Warwick Hall and the Musgraves were also important, while individuals like Sir George Fletcher of Hutton-in-the-Forest and Richard Barwise of Ilekirke were prominent too. The records give the impression that local gentry took an increasingly active interest in city politics as the seventeenth century advanced and party in politics became more important. The acceptance of the mayoralty by the first earl of Carlisle, Lord Morpeth and the third earl (in 1700-1701) is a symptom of it, albeit all three exercised the office by deputy. It is possible that this impression may simply have been created by the better survival of the corporation minutes in the later decades of the century, however.

Craftsmen, with the exception of the tanners, were effectively squeezed out of high office in the town. Curiously, this trade would appear to have provided more mayors at the moment it seems to have gone into decline. It would seem also that the role of the professional occupations were increasing, but this impression, too, may be the result of the poorer documentation surviving from the early years of the period.

The corporation's power was used to influence the town's economy in a number of ways. First, it spent money maintaining and improving the
economic infrastructure of the town. In the 1570s when the River Eden began
to cut a new channel across the floodplain north of the city, the Priestbeck,
the city fathers arranged to spend £250 to keep it in its original course.¹
The attempt failed and wooden bridges were erected. In 1600 when these
came to the end of their economic life and communications with the north
were again threatened, £32 3s. was spent getting an Act of Parliament
requiring the county to contribute to rebuilding them, 40s. having it printed
and £5 was given as a gratuity to one of the city's M.P.s.²
The chamberlains' accounts record many payments for later repairs to the bridges
over the Eden, and those over the Caldew. They also record paving of the
streets of Carlisle, frequent repairs to the leets of the city mills and
repairs to the mills themselves.³ In 1653-4 repairs to the mills cost
£42-1-2.⁴

Active steps were also taken over fuel supplies. In 1562 Lord
Dacre cut off the supply of coal to Carlisle from "Wyndyaltes", and despite
the protests of the mayor, bretheren and fraternities, refused to restore it.
The smiths could not get coal to work, so the mayor and brethren wrote to
the mayor of Newcastle asking him to send a miner to look for coal close to
the city. He sent Edward Casebey, who prospected all around the town but
could find no coal closer than Brocklebank in the parish of Westward. The
cost of extraction proved to be six times the value of the coal got, however.
Carlisle's corporation looked for coal locally at least twice more: in 1599-
1600 a collier was paid £4 for searching for coal on Kingmoor, and in 1650-1

1. Ca5/1/35 & 36.
2. R. Hogg, 'The historic crossings of the River Eden at Stanwix and their
associates road systems', CW2, 52, 1952, pp.137-8; Ca4/139 f.10v.
workmen trying for coal were given £12.¹

Second, the corporation provided a number of services for inhabitants of the city and for those using the markets. Most important of these was the regulation of the market itself. The 1561 ordinances instructed the mayor and council to appoint two clerks of the market and the 1637 charter made the mayor himself clerk.² Searchers of the market for fish and flesh, and sealers of leather were appointed in the 1630s and 40s, and presumably at other dates.³ The number of orders about marketing in the Dormont Book and administrative minutes testify to the importance laid upon it, and many presentments for marketing offences were made at the city's court leets. There were the usual rules about forestalling and regrating and the quality of goods presented for sale. No corn was to be sold privately in men's houses, but all was to be presented for sale in the market place. Fishmongers were to show all they had for sale at once, not keep some back to create the appearance of shortage. Butchers were not to rub suet on their meat to make it appear fatter than it was, nor were they to buy lambs or kids before one o'clock. The charges bakers could make for baking were laid down and they were not to buy grain before noon.⁴

Other services were perhaps not so important but were still useful. One of these was the provision of weights and measures. Buying a

1. "Wyndyaites" was presumably a mine in the Pennines south-east of Brampton. Ca2/19 n.p. sub Remembrance 1562; Ca4/139 ff.7v, 95. The corporation of Worcester actually ran a coal mine from 1566-8. A. Dyer, The City of Worcester in the Sixteenth Century, Leicester 1973, p.55. Probate inventories show that peat and turf were common fuels, perhaps more widely used than wood or coal.

2. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal Records, p.65; Ferguson, Charters, p.311.

3. Ca2/1, n.p. The administrative records of the corporation of Carlisle are very poor before the late seventeenth century. It is as probable that either the record of those appointed was lost or never even made as that the officials - or others fulfilling the same roles - did not exist.

4. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal Records, transcript of the Dormont Book ordinances and of court leet presentments (Ca3/2/1-26).
new brass bushell, gallon, pottle and pint in 1600 cost £8-11-5, and repairs were often made to wooden measures used for grain in the early seventeenth-century.¹ Another service was the provision of justice over commercial matters.² A third was keeping town bulls. In return for compelling all inhabitants of the city to grind their corn at the town's mills the corporation was obliged to keep bulls for their use. In 1604-5, for example, 30s. was paid for a bull, and in 1605-6 Wm Wilson was allowed 13s. 4d. for feeding and looking after the "City bull".³ In 1690 Mr Haddocke, a merchant, was to receive £3 in consideration for keeping two bulls for the corporation.⁴

Most of the marketing by-laws were for the benefit of the general public, but some of them were intended to give an advantage to the citizens or inhabitants of Carlisle. Foreign butchers were obliged to bring the skins of the animals they had slaughtered with the meat, thus increasing the supply of hides to the market. Outsiders were not allowed to buy corn or malt before 12 o'clock, or according to an order of 1658, before the market bell was rung. Freemen were not allowed to buy corn deceitfully for an "outman".⁵ Freemen were exempt from all tolls on goods being brought into or out of the city, but foreigners had to pay them and, in 1600, Scots had to pay double.⁶ And, of course, only freemen were allowed to set up shop and trade other than on market days.⁷

1. Ca4/139 f.10v; Ca4/1 & 2, passim.
2. See the cases in the series of court entry books, Ca3/1.
3. Ferguson, Charters, p.314; Ca4/139 ff.22v, 25v.
4. Ca2/2 f.5v.
5. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal Records, pp.82, 83-4; D/MH/I, p.218. The market bell was then to be rung at 10 a.m., and from 1661 at 11 a.m.
6. Ca2/413.
7. Ca2/126; Ca3/2/2; Ca3/2/12.
There were also a few economic by-laws which were really for the benefit of the corporation. The collection of tolls, of course, put money into the city coffers, but they were limited by custom and the freedoms of other bodies. The city mills, which all inhabitants had to use although there were frequent prosecutions for leading corn to nearby mills, were also a major source of income. Brewing for sale was also restricted to citizens and their wives on pain of a 40s. fine. Presentments in the court leet for breaking the regulation were very common, and so many offended so frequently that it is possible that in the seventeenth century the corporation was intentionally exploiting the by-law to raise money, as it did in the eighteenth century. But only one by-law benefited the members of the corporation before anyone else, and that is one of 1561 which ordered that the mayor should be served first with victuals in the market, next the aldermen, and only then the rest of the inhabitants of Carlisle "according to thare vocation". It seems unlikely that such a unegalitarian law was ever enforceable, however, and certainly not in time of dearth.

The corporation, therefore, had fairly extensive powers for the regulation of the economy. It was active in an enormous variety of fields which touched the economy directly: roads and bridges, civic buildings including marketing facilities such as the cross and shambles, weights and measures, trading standards and practices, justice and policing. It also was concerned in others of less direct impact, including public hygiene, politics, religion, defence, education and leisure, through the provision of butts for archery and prizes for games and horseracing. It should have had a greater influence over daily life than modern local government does. The power of

2. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal Records, p.69; Ca2/338; Ca3/2/1-26. The fine for illegal brewing was 6s. 8d. in 1562. Ca2/1.
early-modern government was limited by the general inefficiency of its part-time, non-professional officers and by custom, however. Carlisle's corporation could have acted only with difficulty in an effective fashion against the interests of the majority of the freemen, and it would appear that it did not try to do so. Its powers were exploited largely on behalf of the citizens as a whole and against the interests of foreigners, whether inhabitants or not. There is nothing to suggest that the occupational groups which dominated the offices of the corporation used their position to benefit themselves economically.

c. The Corporation and the Gilds

It is clear from the discussion of Carlisle's junior council, above, that the relationship between the city's government and its gilds was close. The evidence discussed there and below suggests that some sort of power struggle took place in the mid-sixteenth century between the freemen, represented by their gilds, and the oligarchy in power. This crisis gave the 'popular party' a foothold in civic government. During the first half of the seventeenth century the oligarchy reasserted itself, however, and during the second half of the century the gilds became subordinate to the corporation.

In July 1561 the town "counsale" - the mayor and alderman - and 4 representatives of each gild formally assented to the by-laws recorded in the Dormont Book. These by-laws gave the "fours of evere occupation" a regular role in the town's government, particularly in financial matters. The civic accounts were to be audited in their presence, for example, two of the 4 keys to the city chest were to be in their hands, and their consent had to

1. Which is not to argue that individual members of the corporation did not exploit their offices financially, obtaining for themselves and friends cheap leases of city property or tolls, and enjoying the entertainment allowed to mayors and aldermen to the full.
be obtained before the mayor could spend more than 20s. on repairs. But they were also to be consulted over the making of freemen. It seems as if they were concerned about maladministration. The by-laws made no mention of how the mayor was to be elected, but no "freeman appointed", especially not a council member, was to absent himself on election day in case of tumult among the commonalty.¹

That autumn Robert Dalton the younger, a merchant, was elected mayor. According to his detractors Dalton was a profligate young man who followed no trade and had spent his patrimony in frequenting lewd company and banqueting; his motive for seeking the mayoralty was to gain control of the city's revenues and so continue his high living. They claimed he achieved his election by fomenting faction in the town and was elected by the base sort, who outnumbered the good.²

Three years later Dalton stood for the mayoralty again. The government expected trouble and the Council of the North appointed the Bishop of Carlisle and others, including the two deputy wardens of the West March, as commissioners to calm the situation and oversee "ye quyet election of a newe maire". The government's concern was fully justified. The bishop and his associates did not achieve their mission "w(i)t(h)out some danger of our lives and by the good helpe & furtherance of Mr Lamplughe & terror of ye settydale".³ According to Dalton's opponents the citizens assembled in the market-place at his persuasion and would not leave although the sheriff made three proclamations in two hours that they should disperse according to the statute of rebellions. Instead the sheriff "was well nigh strangled with

2. Ca2/210. I am grateful to Dr Summerson for allowing me to use his transcripts of documents concerning these incidents.
3. PRO, E315/473, f.49. I am grateful to Dr Richard Hoyle for this reference.
his own chain" and Dalton burnt and broke open the door of the Moothall, where the commissioners and some citizens (presumably the aldermen) were, putting them in great fear of being murdered. The commissioners rejected Dalton's election but were constrained to leave without sanctioning a mayor; subsequently John Lamplughe, a local gentleman, a former mayor and an alderman as well as captain of the citadel, was appointed mayor. He was later described as "by the best and most citizens freely and orderly elected". On 3 October, the day after the election riot, Dalton and his adherents submitted to the bishop and the two deputy wardens and Dalton gave up his freedom of the city and was bound in £200 not to seek it again.2

In spite of this renunciation Dalton was elected mayor again in 1565. He seems soon to have come into conflict with the farmers of the city's tolls, a dispute in which the bishop and lord warden intervened in February 1565/6. As soon as Scrope left the town, however, Dalton was said to have broken the agreement reached. That year or the following one he imprisoned and displaced the farmer of the small tolls, taking over collection of them himself; he also fell out with the farmers of the city mills.3 Towards the end of his term 10 of the aldermen were driven to petition against him to one of the central courts; among many other charges they complained that he had refused to take their advice, as he was sworn to do.4

1. Ca2/214 & 216. By the 1680s the new mayor and other officers were chosen after a dinner for the corporation on St Matthew's day "In an amicable man(n)er, to pr(e)vent mistakes & faction, on ye Election day". D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.
2. Ca2/19.
3. Ca2/211.
Instead of leaving office at the end of this term, Michaelmas 1566, Dalton continued to exercise power. The other aldermen immediately began legal action to have him removed from office and forced to account for the revenues of the city during his two mayoralties. They claimed that Richard Blenerhasset, Esq., one of their number, had been elected mayor. Dalton stated that he had been re-elected, having received 380 votes to Blenerhasset's forty-four. He denied that there was an ancient order forbidding a man to be mayor a second time within three years. It must be significant that the second charter of Elizabeth I to the city, in which this order and the other restricting the election of the mayor to the alderman and common councillors are repeated, is dated 21 November 1566. The State acted, if slowly, to preserve the oligarchy. On 4 August 1567 Scrope, the bishop and two men almost certainly the assize judges for the year ordered Dalton to resign the mayoralty immediately in favour of Blenerhasset, and to surrender his freedom of Carlisle at the city court to be held on 11 August. The justice, or the strength, of Dalton's position was recognised, however, for the financial terms agreed appear to have been favourable to him and included his mayor's fee until the previous 29 April. Despite being thus disfranchised a second time Dalton served as mayor again in 1568-9.

Two points emerge from these events. The first is that Dalton was apparently the leader of a 'popular party' in the city, engaged in a conflict with the existing oligarchy; more was at stake than personal ambitions. His supporters in 1561 and 1564 were described by his opponents, using the classic language of the oligarchy, as "the base and vilest conditioned persons in that city, as websters, glovers, shoemakers, tailors

2. R.S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, Municipal Records, p.112.
4. List of mayors in the CRO.
and such like". He was said to have been elected in 1565 "only... by the said base number of handicraftsmen". Dalton himself declared in 1564 that "he was there ready to spend with them his heart's blood in defence of their liberties". This popular party, then, represented at least four of the town's eight gilds. The 10 alderman who denounced him to the government included two esquires, both local gentry, two gentlemen, one of whom was a notary, and six merchants or members of the merchants' gild. The bishop himself described part of his commission in 1564 as being to appease "the gret sedition that than was betwene ye magistrates & ye comons". In this light the Dormont Book by-laws can be seen as one stage in the conflict, presumably a victory for the anti-oligarchs, and the charter of 1566 and displacement of Dalton as mayor, as a counter-attack. It casts doubts on the accuracy of the aldermen's denunciations of Dalton as a wastrel - as one of the popular party's concerns was good government, especially in financial matters, such a man could hardly have commanded its support for at least five years. Dalton himself levelled charges of financial maladministration during their mayoralities against three of his accusers.

The second point is that the election of the mayor in the mid-sixteenth century was by a majority vote of all the freemen. Dalton described the procedure very specifically: on the Monday after Michaelmas all the freemen of the city assembled at the Moothall and proceeded to the election of the mayor, choosing one of their fellow freemen "by the most voices of the said citizens". He thought the practice was "of long time used". Even the aldermen claimed that John Lamplugh was "by the best and

2. Ca2/210; William Mulcaster is described as a notary in the court entry books for 1600-9. CRO, Mrs Beattie's Indices to the Carlisle Court Entry Books.
3. PRO, E315/473, f.49.
most citizens freely and orderly elected" and that Blenerhasset "orderly by
most voices and of the better sort was elected". They did not actually
challenge the right of the handicraftsmen to vote. The fifteenth-century
ordinance restricting the electors of the mayor to the aldermen and 24 had
obviously become a dead letter; the attempt to revive it by the 1566
charter must have been inspired by the election of Dalton and the challenge
he represented to the oligarchy. The surviving records do not make it clear
whether the charter did change electoral practices in Carlisle at once, but
by the early seventeenth century, from when memoranda of voting survive, the
mayors, bailiffs and coroners were chosen by a handful of voters, while the
chamberlains and two of the serjeants-at-mace were chosen by hundreds.  
The events of the 1560s may have represented a defeat for the
gilds, but they did not lose all power. They continued to provide
representatives who formed the junior part of the town council. Moreover
they had a strong influence over entry to the freedom of the city. An
ordinance of 1597, for example, prevented anyone becoming a freeman who had
not served an apprenticeship in the town or who was not the son of a
freeman. The Tanners' Company may have ordered all its members to become
freemen, but it forbade any apprentice to become a freeman of the city
before he became a freeman of the fraternity. In 1623 Mathew Taylor
submitted to the occupation for making his apprentice Robert Thomlinson a
freeman "before ye agreem(ent) w(1)th th occupacon" - presumably admitting
him as a brother. Almost four years later Thomlinson asked to be admitted
to the fraternity, but a decision was twice deferred and he never became a

2. Ca2/21/1-4.
3. Ca2/17, f.67r.
4. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Bk 1, Orders 1 & 15.
brother.' In 1687-8 Thomas Denton, a former recorder of the city, wrote that there were eight gilds "into one of which Trades every freman is to be admitted & Brothered". A comparison of admissions to gilds and freedom reveals that the former invariably preceded the latter.

The Governing Charter of 1637 represented a clear victory for oligarchy. Under it procedure for the election of all the principal officials of the town except the chamberlains was laid down; in every case the electors were restricted to the mayor, aldermen and common council, or the mayor and aldermen alone. The memoranda of voting, recording the votes cast for the annually-elected officials, show that the restriction was enforced, and the occasional records of elections of councillors and aldermen show that the voters there were also limited. The election of chamberlains may have ceased altogether after 1637, for it is no longer recorded by the memoranda. Not only was the last direct influence of the freemen over the choice of civic officers thus destroyed, but, as described above, the gilds lost their role in civic government as the "fower of theleccion of everye Occupacion" was replaced by a council of 24, new members of which were chosen by the existing members and the aldermen. The abortive attack on the right of the Weavers' Company to provide one of the 'fours' in 1619 presaged the elimination of this function of the gilds.

Later in the seventeenth century the independence and remaining functions of the gilds came under attack. By 1684 there were 25 freemen who were not actually members of gilds. These were mostly local gentry or clerics, men of important social or political standing. From 1675 the

1. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Bk 1, sub, Allhallow Quarter 1623 and St Helen's Quarter 1627.
2. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.
3. Ca2/21/5-18.
4. Ca3/2/2.
5. Ca2/27.
corporation kept a register of apprentices, thus avoiding relying on the records kept by the gilds. Blatant manipulation of the freedom took place in 1688, and in 1695 William Gilpin was confident that the creation of new freemen who would oppose the Lowther interest would be delayed. In 1691 the corporation went a step further and legislated directly for the gilds. An order was passed that the gilds were not to admit anyone as a brother without the consent of all the members who actually followed the trade, unless he had served an apprenticeship or was the son of a brother. This order was confirmed in 1696 when it was further ordered that no freeman living outside the liberties was to take an apprentice. A common council order of March 1697/8 forbade meetings of the gilds held at short notice, specifically to prevent abuse of entry to the fraternities. Gild books were to be opened to inspection by the common council to ensure gild rules were legal. This order was to be copied into the minute books of all the companies. From then on, presumably, the corporation had an effective veto over the activities of the gilds.

The account of the gilds and corporation given above is not the whole picture, however - the relationship between gild and corporation was normally harmonious. The actions and policies of the corporation, as described in the preceding section, were directed in the interests of the inhabitants as a whole, and more specifically in those of the freemen. In the early-modern period the freemen as a group were almost invariably

3. Ca2/2, f.10; D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Glovers Gild Bk 1, sub 29 July 1691.
addressed through their gilds. For example, in 1695 William Gilpin got the mayor to summon the gilds so he could persuade them to vote for James Lowther.¹

The role the gilds played as the organising bodies of the freemen was most clearly displayed in ceremonial. Every Ascension Day the mayor and citizens rode the bounds of Kingmoor, the city common, after which the gilds were each given 2s. 6d. and were visited by the mayor and sometimes the aldermen in their gild chambers. In 1630-1, for example, the Tanners' Gild accounts recorded 22s. "bestowed in this Chamber upon hallowe Thursdaye upon the wholl Brother hood havinge Accompanied Mr Mayor the Rydynge of the kings moore w(ith) all other Cittizens in Wyne Ayle Cakes & Cheese", similar expenditure being recorded annually.² In 1678 the Glovers' Fraternity agreed that bread, wine, malt, tobacco and biscuit be provided on Ascension Day "in order to Accommodate the Mayor Recorder Aldermen Bayliffs & other Gentlemen who Accompany him Or them into our S(a)d Guild", implying this was to be done every year.³ In 1684 the corporation ordered the eight companies to stand with their banners in the order they appeared in the call book, to welcome the city's new charter; in addition they were to be given a guinea each for their members to drink the king's health.⁴ The charter was met at Brisco by the sheriff, gentlemen and citizens "to the number of 300", received at the gates with a salute of 15 guns and by the gilds with their colours and by the garrison, and met by the bishop and clergy at the

¹ Hainsworth, op. cit., nos.227, 230.
² D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tanners' Gild Bk 1, sub account for 1630-1. The payments to the gilds appear in both chamberlains' and gild accounts throughout the seventeenth century.
³ D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Glovers' Gild Day Bk 1674-1725, sub 7 Nov. 1678. Thomas Denton confirms that it was customary for all the gilds to treat the mayor. D/Lons, Thomas Denton's History of Cumberland, p.92.
⁴ Ca2/13/54.
cross.' Occasions like this were reminiscent of the pre-Reformation religious ceremonial in which the gilds had participated; as late as 1659/60 the clerk of the tailors' company, for example, copied into the gild's new book an order that "... upon Corpus Christs Day as old use & Custom was before Time the whole Light with the whole Occupac(Don and Banner to be in St Marys Church Yard at the Ash Tree about 10 of the Clock...".²

The oligarchy which ruled Carlisle in the early-modern period faced a serious threat to its dominance at the start of the period under study, therefore, indeed it would seem to have lost some of its freedom of action. It is open to doubt, of course, whether the events of the 1560s made much real difference to the way the town was governed. The independence of the oligarchy was re-established in the seventeenth century and it extended its power over the freemen as a whole; the gilds lost their role as a check on it. Nevertheless the basic relationship between corporation and gilds remained harmonious. Together they represented the community, including within their ranks all but a few of the economically and socially important inhabitants, and together they were united to face the outside world.

d. Conclusion

Carlisle's gilds would seem to have been important organisations in the early-modern town, regulating recruitment to the leading trades and the economic behaviour of their members, defending their members' monopoly of trading and providing important social foci. They embraced a very considerable proportion of the city's adult male workforce. The corporation had an authority which in economic affairs sometimes complemented that of

1. The Bishop of Barrow in Furness, 'Bishop Nicolson's Diaries', CW2, 1, 1901, p.22.
2. D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Tailors' Gild Minute Bk, 1659-1703, n.p.
the gilds and sometimes overlapped with it, but was rarely exercised in opposition to the interests of the gildsmen. Nevertheless the city's elite was oligarchic, its topmost ranks recruited largely from one of the town's occupational groups (and, indeed, one of its gilds) and from the gentry of the surrounding area. The relationship between the two bodies was close and generally harmonious. The junior house of the corporation naturally included leading members of the gilds, even if the aldermen did not, and the interests of gild and corporation were seldom very different. In the sixteenth century, however, relations between some of the gilds and the corporation were at times acrimonious, and the gilds for a period forced the city's political elite to accept checks on its actions. In the seventeenth century the oligarchy broke free and began successfully to enforce civic authority over the eight companies.
Conclusion

Carlisle and the English Urban Economy

a. Continuity and change in Carlisle, 1550-1700

The principal features of Carlisle's economy remained essentially the same during this 150 years. The town fulfilled the economic functions of a garrison, county, cathedral and market town and its craftsmen produced entirely for the local market. True, there was an emphasis on tanning, but this disappeared in the course of the seventeenth century; in any case the number of men engaged in it was small in absolute terms although they constituted a significant proportion of the town's workforce, and there is little to indicate they produced on any scale for the supra-local market. No other trade approached being an industry. Agriculture may have been the most important single occupation. Economic, political and social control remained in the hands of an oligarchy despite the attempts of other groups to gain a share of power, while the gild system continued to function effectively.

Two characteristics of its economy which are particularly striking are the relative lack of specialised occupations and the diversity of the economic activities of the individual inhabitants. Few men specialised in particular branches of their trades, such as russet-weaving or locksmithing. Even the retailers each sold a variety of types of goods: fine cloth, haberdashery, books, groceries, etc. Only one or two specialised in, say, hats. Moreover many tradesmen produced goods only to order or worked on materials provided by their customers, including some who elsewhere produced directly for the market. Second, it was more common than not for a man to engage in a subsidiary occupation in addition to his principal trade. The
most common of these was agriculture, a by-employment to some degree of
more than half the better-off portion of the population. Judging from
probate inventories, alehousekeeping and innkeeping were almost as popular,
and the ubiquity of these trades as by-employments explains the lack of
full-time workers in them. Both characteristics, however, became less marked
as the seventeenth century progressed; new, specialist, occupations were
recorded and involvement in agriculture was less common and less heavy after
1620 than before. These were the first symptoms of an 'urban Renaissance'
in the sense described by Peter Borsay, although it cannot be said to have
got properly underway in the city until the next century.¹

This diversification of economic activity was characteristic of
small towns in the early-modern period; it was present both in the simple
market town of Ashby de la Zouch and in sixteenth-century Birmingham and
Manchester where burgeoning industry might have been expected to have
provided ample scope for specialisation.² In large towns such as London,
Norwich or Worcester, such great diversification of personal economic
activity was much rarer. Individuals were able to follow full-time
occupations never mentioned in Carlisle, such as silkman, tallow-chandler,
bell-founder, parchment maker, chandler or turner.³ Carlisle followed the pattern
of the small town rather than the large.

1. P. Borsay, 'The English urban renaissance: the development of provincial
R. Holt, The Early History of the Town of Birmingham, 1166-1600, Dugdale
3. D. Keene, The Walbrook Study: A Summary Report, TS at the Institute of
Historical Research, London, 1987, p.16; Corporation of London Record Office,
Husting Roll 335, no.39; J.F. Pound, The Social and Trade Structure of
Norwich, 1525-1575', in P. Clark, ed., The Early Modern Town, 1976, p.144; A.
Dyer, The City of Worcester in the Sixteenth Century, Leicester 1973, pp. 128,
130.
Carlisle was not a big town, however, probably not much over 2,000 people at any time before 1700. Over the period 1563-1685 its population grew by between 15 and 54 per cent, while the population of the county grew by around 48 per cent and that of the country as a whole increased by over 55 per cent between 1566 and 1686. Indeed if higher multipliers are adopted for estimating the early population figures than I have used above, then it could be argued that Carlisle hardly grew at all. The population growth was not steady, however. The last half of the sixteenth century saw rapid growth, then there seems to have been a decline in the early seventeenth century. This was probably a period of economic difficulty for the town. Not until after 1700 did Carlisle grow beyond its late sixteenth-century peak.

This restricted, small-town economy was the product of a number of factors. Carlisle lay at the edge of a very violent area, violence which must have affected the prosperity of its hinterland as well as the quality of life in both town and countryside. Second, its hinterland north of the Eden was particularly infertile and sparsely populated even after the violence declined. Its hinterland to the north-west was also restricted by the Solway. Third, Carlisle lay on no significant trade routes, nor was it a port. The main route from England to Scotland lay up the east coast - even Carlisle's post came via Newcastle for most of the period. Although trade across the western frontier grew, Carlisle's merchants seem not to have taken part in it, nor is there evidence that more than one Carlisle man took advantage of the opportunities created by the development of Whitehaven and the trade with Ireland and America. The growing cross-border cattle trade also had little detectable effect on the pattern of local agriculture.

Carlisle was more appropriately sited as a military strongpoint than as a major town, and the most significant advances in the regional economy passed it by.

Early-modern Carlisle, therefore, was small. Its economy was more characteristic of a market town than of the city it was, with the functions of a county town and cathedral city in addition to its marketing and service role. The city was particularly closely involved with the countryside, since agriculture played such a large and direct role in the daily lives of so many of its inhabitants. Outside these extra functions, the town's sphere of influence was limited to northern Cumberland. Even its housing was small and old-fashioned. It was integrated socially and economically, however, into national society. The following section will explore its place there.

b. Carlisle in the national urban system

"... there is always an ordering of towns and cities into an urban hierarchy." This opinion is generally accepted by English urban historians, appearing, for example, in the work of Clark and Slack, Phythian-Adams, Patten and Corfield.2 Carlisle's place in the urban hierarchy was a middling one. There is no doubt that the city was genuinely urban. It had walls and gates, symbols of the division between town and country. Its domestic buildings were urban in character, in comparison with those of the surrounding rural area, albeit they were old-fashioned compared with those of other English towns. It had a variety of public buildings: besides the gates, one of which housed the town gaol, there were the town hall,
gild hall, shambles and toll house or pillory. There were also the cathedral
and castle. It fulfilled all five of the defining criteria used by Clark and
Slack, including having a sophisticated political organisation and social
structure.1 Moreover, of course, contemporaries also had no doubt of its
urbanity, however little they were impressed by the town.

Certain of these characteristics set it above the level of the
mere market town. Few market towns had walls; few had more than a couple
of public buildings; few were corporate and had such an elaborate structure
of offices. Its cathedral was obviously something special. For all these,
however, its occupational structure was not very different from that of many
market towns - nearby Penrith, for instance.

In the urban hierarchy of Cumberland Carlisle was the principal
town. The city exercised a dominant role as county and diocesan centre and,
before 1603, as the seat of the Warden of the West March. It also enjoyed
economic dominance, particularly concerning manufactured articles, over some
of the neighbouring market centres, notably Brampton, although this would
appear to have been limited to the closer and smaller places. Its
hinterland, as defined by debt and credit relationships, did not spread widely
over the county, however, but was surprisingly restricted. It did not appear
to have impinged on the hinterlands of the larger market towns, Penrith and
Cockermouth, nor significantly on the market areas for foodstuffs of smaller
neighbouring towns. Few of the city's hinterlands which can be traced were
very extensive, with the exception of recruitment to the Merchant Gild and
the horse trade. The horse trade would appear normally to have involved
travel over great distances, and in any case it was not something generated
by the town - Carlisle was merely the locus of it. The wide area from which

1. Clark and Slack, op. cit., p.5.
the Merchants' recruited was exceptional in the town. In no real economic sense, therefore, can Carlisle be regarded as a regional capital, and except as a military and diocesan centre it had no detectable influence outside its county.

Equally, however, Carlisle was within the sphere of influence of other towns higher up the urban hierarchy. The bishop of Carlisle owed allegiance to the archbishop of York, and the York ecclesiastical courts thus exercised some jurisdiction over Cumberland. The courts of the Council of the North at York and the central courts in London were both acknowledged in Carlisle. York does not seem to have been very important to the inhabitants of Carlisle in economic affairs, however, nor, outside the provision of silverware, to have exercised much influence over Carlisle's hinterland. People emigrating to London were recorded fairly often, if casually, but none is recorded as migrating to York. Newcastle exercised a very strong attraction to potential apprentices in Cumberland. The Merchant Adventurers Company there recruited at least 71 boys from all over the country between 1578 and 1700, all of whom might otherwise have been apprenticed in Carlisle. The fathers of these youths were mostly gentlemen or clerks; quite possibly Cumberland gentry preferred to apprentice their children in Newcastle where opportunities for highly successful trading

1. See PRO, STAC5/P55/32 for a case which began in Carlisle and was afterwards pursued in York and London.
2. R.S. Ferguson, ed., Old Church Plate in the Diocese of Carlisle, 1882, passim, silver came also from London and Newcastle; D.M. Palliser, 'York Under the Tudors: The Trading Life of the Northern Capital', in A.M. Everitt, ed., Perspectives in English Urban History, 1973, pp.39-59, mentions a few contacts between Cumberland and York, but does not give the impression York was an important trading partner for men of the county.
3. PI700 Robt Pattinson; Ca4/1, sub Oct. 1618 for a boy being apprenticed in London.
were greater. The Howards went there, rather than to Carlisle, to buy the
bulk of their household needs.\textsuperscript{1} The port also supplied Carlisle retailers,
wholesalers and craftsmen with items as diverse as wine, and iron, and
probably also groceries, fine cloth and books.\textsuperscript{2} Although Carlisle was
geographically isolated by its mountains, therefore, this geographical
isolation did not bring complete economic isolation, and the influence of
Newcastle was strong.

Carlisle shared this middling position in the urban hierarchy with
the majority of county towns and cathedral cities, those which were not
provincial capitals. It was smaller than many county towns, but larger than,
or of similar size to, a few others, Bedford with 191 families in 1563 or
Stafford with 298 for example.\textsuperscript{3} It was a smaller place than every other
town which had the joint functions of cathedral city and county town in
1563, however, with the possible exception of Chichester, and almost
certainly much smaller than them all in 1700. The northern city was also
smaller than a number of southern market towns. Phythian-Adams, for
example, lists some eight market towns which were certainly larger in 1563
than the cathedral city, and Carlisle's rate of growth over the early-modern
period was so low that by the 1670's it had been overtaken by Andover and

1. Above, Chapter Three, p.58.
2. P1586 Jas Broadrigge; P1574 Jn How.
3. For population figures for English towns see: Phythian-Adams, op. cit.,
pp.8, 9, 12; Clark and Slack, op. cit., p.83; D.M. Palliser, The Age of
Elizabeth, 1983, p.203; N. Alldridge, 'The mechanics of decline: migration
and economy in early modern Chester', in M. Reed, ed., English Towns in
Decline, 1350 to 1800, Univ. of Leicester, Centre for Urban History Working
Papers No. 1, Leicester 1986, p.35; M. Reed, 'Decline and recovery in an
provincial urban network: Buckinghamshire towns, 1350-1800', Appendix 2, n.p.,
in Idem; J.R. Taylor, 'Disease, and Family Structure in Early Modern
Hampshire, with Special Reference to the Towns', Univ. of Southampton Ph.D.
thesis, 1980, p.119. Corfield, op. cit., fig. 1, p.12 shows Chichester and
Carlisle as being towns of 2,500 people or more, but in the case of Carlisle
is incorrect.
Portsmouth in Hampshire, Macclesfield in Cheshire, and by Marlow and possibly High Wycombe and Chesham in Bucks., while Whitehaven grew larger in only 70 years. There were many industrial and market towns in the West Midlands and Cheshire which were at least the size of Carlisle by 1700.¹

Carlisle was, therefore, a notably small place for a city with such a range of functions, and it was fitly described as "a very indifferent small city". Its economy was little more sophisticated than that of a large market town with a few extra professional and service trades imposed upon it; the town was smaller and had a much less sophisticated occupational structure than might be expected. In view of its dominance within the county this fact says much about the poverty of the region it served, and about the lack of demand there for urban services. Moreover, as discussed above, one of the most marked features of Carlisle's economy was the lack of specialisation by the town's workforce. Multiple occupations were known in all early-modern English towns, but perhaps not to the same degree as in this northern city—certainly they are rarely stressed by urban historians. This was a feature of the urban economy which Carlisle shared more with mere market towns which were of similar size to it, than with other towns of its own rank within the urban hierarchy; greater population must have brought more opportunities for specialisation within the larger urban centres.

Professor Wrigley has argued cogently that in a pre-industrial economy, specialisation of occupation is the key to economic growth.² It is certainly noteworthy that the towns which grew fastest in the early-modern period were the industrial and port towns, like Whitehaven, which had

2. Wrigley, loc. cit.
specialised economies and specialised workforces. An economy like that of Carlisle, with so few specialised tradesmen even at the end of the seventeenth century, could contribute little to the economic growth of its region and undoubtedly this lack was also the reason why the town itself grew so slowly over the period as a whole, lagging behind the national growth rate. The town's experience suggests that if its economy was at all characteristic of the economies of the smaller towns of England, then the changes remarked on by Peter Borsay - specifically of the growth of new specialised trades - were of great significance for England's future economic growth.'

Appendix One

The Housing of Early-modern Carlisle

In Chapter One it was noted that a number of southerners were critical of Carlisle's houses. Were these criticisms accurate? Were Carlisle's houses old-fashioned? This appendix will explore some of the evidence available to answer these questions.

There is a fair amount of evidence to suggest that the criticism was justified. First, apart from the castle, the defences, the buildings of the cathedral close and the Gildhall, there is not a single building in the town which dates from before the Restoration. Moreover, only the Town Hall, buildings in the close and Tullie House, which was probably the Chancellor's house described by Fiennes, were constructed between 1660 and 1700, although a few of the houses standing until recently on the north-east side of Scotch Street (Rickergate) may have been put up late in the seventeenth century. Late-eighteenth and nineteenth-century views of Carlisle show houses almost wholly of eighteenth-century date, themselves now mostly demolished. These facts suggest that by 1700 the town's housing stock was in poor condition and was replaced wholesale once the new prosperity the city enjoyed in the following century allowed it.

This is argument from negative evidence and therefore weak, but a number of sources throw light on the question. There are only four illustrations of the city before 1700, two maps which show the town in

1. See Chapter One, pp.23-4.
2. There was also a stone house of early-sixteenth-century date standing in Kings Arms Lane early in this century. It stood away from the street frontage, and may have been part of the Franciscan friary. J.H. Martindale, 'The old building in Kings Arms Lane, Carlisle', CW2, 15, 1915, pp.121-4. Tullie House is named after the chancellor of the diocese who rebuilt it extensively in 1689. The core of the house is medieval.
bird's-eye view, a sketch of the city in 1572 on a map showing the new branch of the Eden across Kings Meadow, and 'A Prospect of Carlisle towards the North', dated 1684/5. The last of these is drawn from too far away to show any detail of the houses, and the first three depict the domestic buildings conventionally. The convention adopted is of a single-storey rather than a multiple-storey building, however, and that might be significant. Certainly probate records record some small houses; in 1579 Thomas Falder bequeathed his son "one howse of twoe Rowmes... In Botchergate", for example, and in 1597 Archelles Dalton left to his son a four-room house in Myers Vennel, off Botchergate Within. On the other hand probate inventories reveal also some very large houses, such as that occupied by Robert Pattinson in March 1570/1, which had at least eight rooms — a shop, hall, three chambers, a kitchen, a loft and a closet — as well as a barn and stable.²

Probably the best document that illustrates the housing of Carlisle in the early-modern period is the parliamentary survey of the property of the Dean and Chapter in the town made in 1650, in preparation for its sale.³ The survey was intended to provide a picture of each piece of property and an accurate valuation. It listed the rooms of almost every house they owned, the names of the property holders on either side, the name


2. P1579; P1597; P1571.

3. Dean and Chapter of Carlisle Muniments, EM3/1.
of the current and original leaseholders, the date the lease was made, the
rent paid and the real annual value. The survey has a number of advantages
as source material. It appears to list every building and outbuilding in a
property, whereas in probate inventories, which may be used in a similar
fashion, rooms may not be listed because they contained no property
belonging to the deceased, were let to someone else, or the appraisors simply
forgot to name them. The parliamentary survey also described a reasonably
large sample of Carlisle's houses all at the same time; 37 houses are
recorded in detail, probably a little over 10 per cent of all houses then in
the city. Since the survey was made by only a couple of men it can be
assumed that they were consistent in what they described as halls or
parlours, lofts or garrets. The survey also has another advantage: it was
one of many carried out in towns all over the country according to
centrally-imposed guidelines, so there exists contemporary comparable
material for other places.1

Certain problems have to be borne in mind, however. It is
impossible to know how biased a sample those included in a survey may be of
all houses in a particular place. Most Dean and Chapter property was let on
repairing leases and the buildings were occasionally completely rebuilt by
the tenants, so there is no reason to think that the houses were untypical,
but the Deans and Chapters of Carlisle and St Paul's, London, seem to have
tried to avoid excessive subdivision of their property, so the sample may
include more large structures than a random sample would. More importantly
the Carlisle sample is restricted to houses within the walls, whereas many of

Parliamentary Surveys.
the poor probably lived outside them.' It is not possible to be certain that the surveyors were thorough, consistent, or thought the same way about what they saw as their contemporaries, although comparison with leases of the period, where possible, suggests that they did. Nor, of course, is it possible to be certain that what is being described is an individual structure. Indeed it is clear from the surveys of the property of the Dean and Chapter of St Paul's that some tenements were part of larger buildings and stood physically intertwined with their neighbours. For this reason the term 'house' is used here to mean a separate dwelling, not a physical structure; essentially the analysis is of living-space, not buildings.

Lastly there is the problem of multiple occupancy. The surveyors were primarily interested in the leaseholder, resident or not, not his tenants, so multiple occupancy was not recorded where it occurred. There is plenty of evidence of multiple occupation of houses in early-modern Carlisle. When Timothy Haddock counted the number of houses (presumably he meant structures) in Carlisle for Sir John Lowther in 1685 he found there were 309, "but there are several of these houses that have two or three Families in them", 133 in fact. Single gentlemen were often lodgers and remembered their hosts and hostesses in their wills, sometimes generously. The court leet amerced many people, at various times during the seventeenth century, for keeping or harbouring "inmates", sometimes also called "cottingers", and in 1668 42 people, including the two bailiffs and at least 10 present or

1. See Chapter One, p.23. It was usual for the wealthier inhabitants of large towns to live in the centre and for the suburbs to house a predominantly poor population, so the poverty of the suburbs indicated by the Carlisle Hearth Tax returns would have been a feature, if not such a marked one, before the Civil War. P. Clark and P. Slack, English Towns in Transition 1500-1700, Oxford 1976, p.58.


3. P1580 Nicholas Lockwood; P1596 John Skelton; see also P1587 William Hay, schoolmaster, and P1563 Alexander Stagg, clerk.
prospective aldermen and councillors, were presented for not entering bond
"fore theire tennants or ffarmers being Inmates and straingers" and likely to
be burdensome to the city.1 Some of those fined were probably
alehousekeepers, others were doubtless letting cottages and tenements they
owned in addition to their own dwellings, but it is likely that some at least
were subletting part of their own homes.

Where a man owned a second house it was not always let as a
single unit to one family. Mr Peter Norman, a merchant and one of those
presented in 1668, died in 1687 owning two houses, his own and one in
Castlegate which had at least 10 rooms let furnished to 7 tenants.2 If one
of the Dean and Chapter's tenements had been sublet in this fashion the fact
may not have appeared in the survey, although it might be expected that the
rooms would have all been described as chambers rather than as hall, parlour,
kitchen, etc.

The predominant impression obtained by analysing the survey is of
small and old-fashioned housing. Table A1.1 shows the number of rooms each
house had, plotted against its height. Of the 37 houses, three are of only
one storey, for example that of Thomas Kidd, tailor, in Abbeygate, which
consisted simply of a hall and parlour with a stable. The bulk of the
sample, 25, had a ground floor with one or more lofts, like William Wilson's
house in Botchergate, which had lofts over its hall, two parlours and
buttery, but not over his kitchen. Only nine Carlisle houses had two full
storeys, and only one of these had a cockloft as a third storey. Most of
the taller houses were in Castlegate, one of the more important streets, but
they did not necessarily front on to the market-place. Unfortunately most
of the houses owned by the Dean and Chapter lay in the Abbeygate/Castlegate

2. P1687.
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area, only one being in Botchergate, a nine-roomed house containing a hall, two parlours, buttery and kitchen downstairs, with lofts above all but the kitchen and with a stable and barn behind, and one in the Bullring, a six-roomed house having a little hall, kitchen buttery and three chambers. None of the houses in the sample had an underground cellar although there were cellars recorded in other documents; it seems unlikely that cellars were common in Carlisle. Another feature apparent from the survey was the large number of open halls. In at least 9 houses (25 per cent of the sample), and in perhaps as many as 15, the hall was open to the roof.

Table A1.1 Height of buildings compared to number of rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of rooms</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>No. of houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Number of rooms excludes outbuildings.

An analysis of similar surveys of housing in Newcastle and London indicates that Carlisle's houses were relatively short. The parliamentary survey of Newcastle gives usable information about 186 houses. Three of these were single-storey, another 49 were either single or two-storey, but over half of the sample, 95 houses, were of two full storeys and most of them had a garret, loft or cornloft as well. The remaining 30 houses, 16 per cent of the whole sample, were mostly of three storeys or three and a garret, but two reached to four storeys. In London a sample of 90 houses

1. P1624 Christopher Slee. Slee had a wine cellar and shop over it.
2. PRO, E317/Durham/5; Guildhall Library, London, Ms 11,816A.
recorded in the survey of the property of the Dean and Chapter of St Paul’s, included 51 of three storeys, mostly with both cellars and garrets, and a further 14 of four storeys, again with cellars and garrets. In neither of these two places were open halls discovered. Indeed, in London there were a number of halls on the second floor, and first-floor halls were common.

Table A1.2  Number of rooms per house, including outbuildings, 1649–50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 or 9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If number of rooms is considered then again the houses in Carlisle are revealed to have been smaller than those in most other places. The number of rooms per house, inclusive of outbuildings, in Carlisle, Newcastle and London are shown in Table A1.2. The mean number of rooms in Carlisle was smaller than in either of the other two cities, and, not surprisingly, the median and modal number of rooms were markedly greater in the capital. The median number of rooms per house in Newcastle was the same as in Carlisle and the mode even smaller, because the Newcastle sample included a large number of two and three room cottage-dwellings. The presence of so many of these small homes must be related to the pattern of its economy, providing work for many humble wage-earners. The Carlisle sample, however, may well under-record the presence of small dwellings in the town because it included no suburban houses. The poor of central London appear to have occupied parts of relatively tall although not always large buildings, usually as subtenants of the leaseholders recorded in views and surveys, whereas in the east of the capital smaller three-room and four-room houses occupied in
severalty were the rule.'

These figures can be compared tentatively with those calculated from analysis of probate inventories by Dyer for Birmingham, Coventry and Derby, and by Priestley and Corfield for Norwich. Dyer found that in the period 1630-49 the mean size of houses, including attics, cellars and outbuildings, in the first three of these places was, respectively, 5.5, 7.5 and 6.8; Priestley and Corfield calculated that 10 per cent of their sample of 127 had 1-3 rooms, 43 per cent had 4-6 rooms, 27 per cent had 7-9 rooms, 16 per cent had 10-14 rooms and 5 per cent had 15 rooms or more. Their figures are derived from probate inventories, which are biased towards the richer part of the population but "in general are likely to under-represent the total number of rooms"; moreover Dyer counted any garrets or cellars in a house as one room no matter how many of each there was stated to be and both he and Priestley and Corfield excluded inns from their samples, something which it was not possible to do with the parliamentary survey material for Carlisle. In spite of these qualifications the mean number of rooms per house in Coventry was substantially higher than that in Carlisle, and that of Derby was equal to it; if the qualifications are taken into account then the figure for Birmingham suggests a mean house size not very much less than that of Carlisle. The median number of rooms per house in the Norwich sample was probably 6, equal to that of Carlisle, while there were so many houses in Norwich very much larger than any recorded in the northern town that the mean number of rooms was presumably very much

1. The writer hopes to publish in the near future the work on which the first part of this statement is based. Tenements of this character in the parish of St Mary Woolchurch have been studied by the Social and Economic Study of Medieval London, whose reports and transcripts are available at the Museum of London and the Institute of Historical Research, London. See also M.J. Power, 'East London Housing in the seventeenth century', pp.250, 253, in P. Clark and P. Slack, eds., Crisis and Order In English Towns, 1500-1700, 1972.
higher. It would appear, therefore, that the houses of Carlisle, an ancient
town, were smaller on average than those of most large towns, and perhaps
not much larger than those of a rapidly expanding market and manufacturing
town of the more prosperous Midlands.

The relatively small size in Carlisle of the house as dwelling
unit occupied by a household is also demonstrated by the Hearth Tax returns.
The number of hearths a household had would have been related to the size
of its accommodation and how luxurious that accommodation was. It provides,
therefore, a crude measure of the standard of housing. Table 1.3 (p.22)
shows the number of households with a given number of hearths in Carlisle,
Table A1.3 summarises this information and gives comparable information for
a number of other towns. These towns are all considerably larger than
Carlisle, indeed they include some of the largest towns in the kingdom —
unfortunately figures for smaller towns were not available to the writer —
nevertheless a trend is clear. Carlisle had a significantly higher proportion
of one hearth households than all of them except Newcastle and Norwich, the
one a town with a substantial wage-earning class and the other one with an
important textile-manufacturing industry. Even when one and two hearth
households are considered together Carlisle still had the highest percentage
of the group. Looking at large houses Carlisle was again at the end of the
scale, having a smaller proportion of households in the 6-9 hearth range and
none, or perhaps only one, with 10 or more hearths. The situation was not
necessarily different in towns of a comparable size. Tewkesbury was a
lowland market town with 460 households recorded in the Hearth Tax returns.

1. A. Dyer, 'Urban housing: a documentary study of four Midland towns 1530-
Corfield, 'Rooms and room use in Norwich housing, 1580-1730', Post-Medieval
Archaeology, 16, 1982, pp.93-123. These writers included outbuildings in
their calculations, so the figures in Table A1.2 have been calculated on the
same basis.
of 1671. Of these not quite half were one hearth dwellings, and 129, or 28 per cent, had three or more hearths. The largest house in Tewkesbury had 12 hearths. The contrast between Carlisle and the houses of two central-London parishes, St Benet Sherehog and St Stephen Walbrook, is dramatic.

Table A1.3 Number of hearths per house from Hearth Tax Returns

| No. of hearths | 1   | 2   | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10+ |
|               | no. % | no. % | no. % | no. % | no. % |
| Carlisle (1673) | 198 | 61 | 57 | 18 | 55 | 17 | 15 | 4 |
| Bristol (1670s) | 714 | 20 | 1,150 | 33 | 1,312 | 37 | 338 | 9 | 67 | 2 |
| Exeter (1670s) | 1,073 | 45 | 579 | 25 | 451 | 19 | 203 | 9 | 62 | 3 |
| Ipswich (1674) | 210 | 13 | 480 | 29 | 470 | 29 | 218 | 13 | 62 | 4 |
| Leicester (1670s) | 537 | 52 | 175 | 17 | 236 | 23 | 58 | 6 | 18 | 2 |
| Newcastle (1663) | 1,536 | 62 | 349 | 14 | 438 | 18 | 124 | 5 | 33 | 1 |
| Norwich (1671) | 2,290 | 52 | 1,087 | 25 | 710 | 16 | 261 | 6 | 87 | 2 |
| York (1672) | 2,290 | 52 | 1,087 | 25 | 710 | 16 | 261 | 6 | 87 | 2 |
| London: St Benet Sherehog & St Stephen Walbrook (1666) | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 49 | 47 | 33 | 32 | 15 | 14 |


Table A1.4 looks at the Carlisle Hearth Tax data from a slightly different perspective, comparing the mean number of hearths per household in the town with that in a range of other towns, including those represented in Table A1.3 and a number of towns of a different character and of similar size to Carlisle. The northern city is shown to have had fewer hearths per household on average than all the places listed in the table, and it in fact

1. A. Jones, Tewkesbury, Chichester 1987, p.100.
had fewer than did 17 of the 20 market centres in Hampshire discussed by Dr J. Taylor; it just equalled the tiny towns of Christchurch (168 households) and Stockbridge (55 households) and only Whitchurch (149 households), with 1.8 hearths per dwelling, had a lower average. Even London, before the Fire, had a higher average despite its extreme poverty problems.  

Table A1.4 Mean number of hearths per household, 13 towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Total no. of h'holds</th>
<th>Mean no. of hearths</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Total no. of h'holds</th>
<th>Mean no. of hearths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover (1664)</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Leicester (1670s)</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke (1664)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Newcastle (1663)</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath (1664)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Norwich (1671)</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol (1670s)</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Portsmouth (1664)</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle (1673)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Winchester (1664)</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter (1670s)</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>York (1672)</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich (1674)</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The presence or absence of particular named rooms also reveals something of the character of Carlisle's housing. The bar charts of Table A1.5 show the percentage of houses recorded in the parliamentary surveys of Carlisle, Newcastle and the St Paul's property in London, which contained one or more rooms labelled by a particular name. Thus no houses in the Carlisle sample contained any closets, while 16 per cent of those in the London

Table A1.5 Percentage of houses containing specific rooms, four cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Houses in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample did. The principal problem with this analysis is that, especially in the London sample, many rooms are described simply as 'rooms'. The proportion of chambers, halls and kitchens in London is probably therefore under-represented. Similar data for houses in Norwich gathered from probate inventories for the period 1630-54 (127 dwellings) is presented also, but is not strictly speaking comparable; it possibly underestimates the presence of garrets in Norwich.1

Carlisle's housing is by these criteria also shown to have been old-fashioned and less sophisticated than that of the other cities. It had a high proportion of butteries, more reminiscent of rural than urban housing in the lowland zone. Similarly it had a very high proportion of parlours. Probate evidence implies these were still used for sleeping: Christopher Slee, a tavern-keeper, had a featherbed in his parlour in 1624 and James Mandie, possibly a lawyer, slept in his low parlour in 1628.2 Few of the Newcastle or London houses, in contrast, had parlours, but they had more chambers. Priestley and Corfield described vividly how over the early-modern period the hall in Norwich fell from a principal to being a unimportant room present in relatively few houses. The parliamentary surveys of Newcastle and London illustrate the same process well advanced by 1649, whereas almost every house in Carlisle still had a hall at that date. Kitchens seem to have been equally common in all three parliamentary surveys although in Norwich they were much more frequently recorded. The absence of cellars and relatively small proportion of shops in the Carlisle sample both perhaps reflect the comparatively lesser vitality of economic life in Cumberland.

The small number of Carlisle houses with chambers and the large number with lofts reflects the lowness of the structures. It seems probable

1. The Norwich data comes from Priestley and Corfield, loc. cit.
2. P1624; P1628.
that a loft represented in Carlisle a room of less than a full storey, and
many houses had one as its only second-storey room. Cocklofts or garrets
were distinguished and were presumably smaller still, perhaps fully in the
roof-space. Lofts were used as sleeping accommodation. Thomas Pattinson of
Castlegate bequeathed his son "I stand bed in ye Loft", and wrote that

my will is yt Elloner philipe my wife mother shall haue y* loft
over y* hall house where she is nowe dwellinge In duringe hir
naterall life painge to my sone xpofer pattinson 4d in y*
yeare"^1

In 1655 the court leet ordered that no fire be made in the loft adjacent to
Mr Norman until a chimney was built. The presence of so many garrets in
London, on the other hand, reflects the high price of land and the need to
squeeze as much living-space as possible on to a given plot.

To conclude, therefore, the impressions of Fiennes, Defoe and the
others were correct. Carlisle's houses were smaller on average than those in
many other towns. They included a high proportion of houses with open halls
and it is probable that a good number lacked a full second storey. There
were none of the very tall buildings found on the central streets of
Newcastle or Norwich, and in streets all over London.\textsuperscript{3}.

\textsuperscript{1} P1609.
\textsuperscript{2} Ca3/2/13.
\textsuperscript{3} See the illustrations in J.F. Pound, \textit{Tudor and Stuart Norwich, 1525-1675},
Appendix Two

Parish Register Statistics

The city of Carlisle lay in two parishes, St Mary's and St Cuthbert's. The earliest entries in the parish register of the former are dated 1649, and in the latter, 1693. Bishop's Transcripts are available for some of the earlier years, however.\(^2\) The years in the table below are new-style. A dash indicates no information, an asterisk a year for which registration is probably defective.

### Table A2.1 Parish register statistics, Carlisle parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>St Mary's</th>
<th></th>
<th>St Cuthbert's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bapt.</td>
<td>mar.</td>
<td>bur.</td>
<td>bapt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 366 -
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix Three
Occupational Structure From Probate Records

Table 4.4 in Chapter 4 contains a statistical analysis of the occupational structure of early-modern Carlisle based on probate evidence. More detailed analyses of the same information, listing all the occupations recorded, follow below in Tables A3.1, A3.2 and A3.3. The latter table shows only occupations stated in the documents, while the former two include occupations deduced from the information contained in will or inventory.

Two recent articles have looked critically at the way occupations have been categorised in such analyses. Patten identified two types of classification which had been used by historians. The more popular was "essentially descriptive of the raw material used and subsequent product manufactured"; the other was based on the type of activity. He did not feel that one or other type of scheme should be adopted as an Ideal, but proposed for comparability between studies, a classification based on type of work.

Dr Goose pointed out that Patten's first type of classification was "a combination of two slightly different criteria", type of raw material and type of product, and claimed that only one criterion should be used at a time.'

Both writers make important points. Unfortunately, however, some early-modern occupations do not fit conveniently into 'type of work' or 'type of product' schemes. Carpenters built houses but also made furniture. Were they therefore building workers or artisans ('type of work'), or should they be counted under housing or household ('type of product')?

a service by baking dough belonging to others, but also made bread for sale, thus acting like an artisan-retailer. Smiths made household items such as candlesticks, made and fitted horseshoes, and made and mended parts of ploughs and other tools. Each of these three activities produced a different type of product, and shoeing horses could be counted as providing a service. One strength of the combined type of raw material and type of product criteria is that the evidence fits the categories better. Another is that the specialisation, or lack of one, that gave a town its economic character appears much more readily when the occupations of its inhabitants are classified in this way than when they are classified by type of work. Of the 4 classificatory schemes, therefore, the composite one was used.

The following tables, A3.4, A3.5 and A3.6, give the number of probate records for men of each recorded occupation which reveal three types of subsidiary means of getting an income.
## Table A3.1 Occupations of Townsmen from Probate Records, 1564-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1564-1620</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1621-1700</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1664-1620</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1621-1700</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberrier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Woodwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Woodworker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavernkeeper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocking Merchant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Lawyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant of Warden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Clerk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>T60</td>
<td>175105.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One also Parish Clerk.
2. One also a joiner.
3. One described in his will as a merchant and in his inventory as a mercer.
Table A3.2 Occupations of Men of Carlisle Parishes from Probate Records, not clear if townsmen or countrymen, 1564-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1564-1620</th>
<th>1621-1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no, %</td>
<td>no, %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>10 4.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>46 21.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>22 10.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>16 7.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>5 2.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Leatherworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>12 5.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmith</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Woodwork</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif, Woodworker</td>
<td>6 2.8</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td>9 4.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>4 1.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavernkeeper</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Medicine</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>6 2.8</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbandman</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowdermaker</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almsman</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>115 54.0</td>
<td>88 88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273 Töö</td>
<td>89 Töö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Also a vintner.
2. One also a plumber.
Table A3.3 Occupations of Known Townsmen from Probate Records, 1564-1700. Stated Occupations Only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations of males</th>
<th>1564-1620 no.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1621-1700 no.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1621-1700 no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glove</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drink</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant of Warden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Clerk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alesman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Not Stated</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275100.7</td>
<td>775497.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One also Parish Clerk.
2. One described in will as merchant and in inventory as mercer.
### A3.4 Subsidiary Sources of Income from Probate Records, 1564-1620, Known Townsmen Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Occupation %</th>
<th>Agriculture No.</th>
<th>Agriculture %</th>
<th>Property No.</th>
<th>Property %</th>
<th>Tithes No.</th>
<th>Tithes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith/Blacksmith</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Metalworker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Woodworker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant of Warden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Occn</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3.5 Subsidiary Sources of Income from Probate Records, 1621-1700,
Known Townsmen Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>Agriculture no.</th>
<th>Property no.</th>
<th>Tithes no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith/Blacksmith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesmith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Metalwker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Woodwker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavern-keeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocking Merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Medical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-Govnr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almsman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Occn</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A3.6 Subsidiary Sources of Income from Probate Records, Not Clear if Townsmen or Countrymen

#### A. 1564-1620

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Agriculture no.</th>
<th>Agriculture %</th>
<th>Property no.</th>
<th>Property %</th>
<th>Tithes no.</th>
<th>Tithes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Leathrwkr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith/Blacksmith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Metalwker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecif. Woodworker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavernkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbandman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowdermaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almsman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Agriculture no.</th>
<th>Agriculture %</th>
<th>Property no.</th>
<th>Property %</th>
<th>Tithes no.</th>
<th>Tithes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Also a vintner.
2. One also a plumber.

#### B. 1621-1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Agriculture no.</th>
<th>Agriculture %</th>
<th>Property no.</th>
<th>Property %</th>
<th>Tithes no.</th>
<th>Tithes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Agriculture no.</th>
<th>Agriculture %</th>
<th>Property no.</th>
<th>Property %</th>
<th>Tithes no.</th>
<th>Tithes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix Four

Income from Five of the City's Tolls, 1516-1701

The table below lists the income the city received from letting 5 of the tolls it was entitled to collect. From 1635 the Small Toll and the Shire Toll were demised together for a single rent. The figures here are net of abatements to the farmers of the tolls which reflect problems in the local economy.

Sources: Ca4/141; Ca4/1-4; Ca4/139, 140; miscellaneous administrative records.

Table A4.1 Income from five of the city's tolls, 1516-1701

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Small Tl</th>
<th>Small Tl &amp; Shire Tl</th>
<th>Shire Tl</th>
<th>Scot' Tl</th>
<th>Weley Horse Tl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542-3</td>
<td>27 6 8</td>
<td>37 16 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 13 4</td>
<td>5 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543-4</td>
<td>27 6 8</td>
<td>37 16 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544-5</td>
<td>27 6 8</td>
<td>37 16 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549-50</td>
<td>36 13 4</td>
<td>46 10 0</td>
<td>9 16 8</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-51</td>
<td>36 13 4</td>
<td>46 10 0</td>
<td>9 16 8</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-52</td>
<td>36 13 4</td>
<td>46 10 0</td>
<td>9 16 8</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>2 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552-53</td>
<td>36 13 4</td>
<td>43 13 4</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>1 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553-54</td>
<td>36 13 4</td>
<td>42 6 8</td>
<td>5 13 4</td>
<td>3 13 4</td>
<td>1 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554-55</td>
<td>31 0 0</td>
<td>38 0 0</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>1 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556-57</td>
<td>40 6 8</td>
<td>48 13 4</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>1 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557-58</td>
<td>40 6 8</td>
<td>52 10 0</td>
<td>12 3 4</td>
<td>7 6 8</td>
<td>1 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558-59</td>
<td>40 13 4</td>
<td>55 0 0</td>
<td>14 6 8</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>1 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559-60</td>
<td>47 13 4</td>
<td>62 13 4</td>
<td>15 0 0</td>
<td>8 13 4</td>
<td>4 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-61</td>
<td>47 13 4</td>
<td>61 13 4</td>
<td>14 0 0</td>
<td>5 6 8</td>
<td>4 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562-63</td>
<td>45 0 0</td>
<td>55 0 0</td>
<td>10 0 0</td>
<td>3 10 0</td>
<td>4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563-64</td>
<td>54 0 0</td>
<td>63 0 0</td>
<td>9 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567-68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
<td>4 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55 13 4</td>
<td>12 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577-78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65 15 0</td>
<td>16 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578-79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71 4 0</td>
<td>18 10 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579-80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74 0 0</td>
<td>18 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83 13 4</td>
<td>23 6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582-83</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65 6 8</td>
<td>16 6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583-84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68 13 4</td>
<td>18 6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584-85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72 0 0</td>
<td>24 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592-93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81 10 0</td>
<td>29 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593-94</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>85 0 0</td>
<td>32 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594-95</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89 16 8</td>
<td>36 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595-96</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81 13 4</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596-97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51 9 8</td>
<td>20 13 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597-98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68 6 8</td>
<td>37 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598-99</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64 3 4</td>
<td>28 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599-1600</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75 0 0</td>
<td>34 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-01</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65 10 0</td>
<td>23 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-02</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81 0 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602-03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81 6 8</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603-04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80 6 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604-05</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87 10 0</td>
<td>36 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605-06</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82 15 0</td>
<td>26 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606-07</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88 16 1</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607-08</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85 0 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608-09</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84 0 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609-10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84 2 0</td>
<td>32 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610-11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85 5 0</td>
<td>33 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>91 3 4</td>
<td>38 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612-13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89 10 0</td>
<td>38 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613-14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 16 8</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614-15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 16 8</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615-16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 16 8</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616-17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 16 8</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617-18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 16 8</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618-19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 16 8</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619-20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>104 10 0</td>
<td>51 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620-21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94 13 4</td>
<td>41 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86 0 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622-23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78 0 0</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623-24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87 3 4</td>
<td>26 13 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624-25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98 10 0</td>
<td>38 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625-26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105 0 0</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626-27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120 0 0</td>
<td>60 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627-28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>135 0 0</td>
<td>67 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628-29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>130 0 0</td>
<td>60 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629-30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>132 0 0</td>
<td>62 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630-31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140 10 0</td>
<td>70 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>150 0 0</td>
<td>80 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632-33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>158 16 7</td>
<td>88 16 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633-34</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>179 0 0</td>
<td>109 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634-35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>185 0 0</td>
<td>112 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635-36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>205 10 0</td>
<td>127 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636-37</td>
<td>207 10 0</td>
<td>207 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
<th>Value 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1637-38</td>
<td>222 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638-39</td>
<td>236 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639-40</td>
<td>240 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648-49</td>
<td>136 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649-50</td>
<td>126 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-51</td>
<td>71 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-52</td>
<td>183 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652-53</td>
<td>135 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653-54</td>
<td>111 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654-55</td>
<td>107 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655-56</td>
<td>116 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656-57</td>
<td>98 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657-58</td>
<td>135 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658-59</td>
<td>160 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659-60</td>
<td>160 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660-61</td>
<td>153 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-62</td>
<td>176 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-63</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663-64</td>
<td>161 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664-65</td>
<td>171 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665-66</td>
<td>142 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666-67</td>
<td>125 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667-68</td>
<td>140 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668-69</td>
<td>174 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670-71</td>
<td>274 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-72</td>
<td>164 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672-73</td>
<td>224 14 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673-74</td>
<td>187 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674-75</td>
<td>230 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-76</td>
<td>180 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-77</td>
<td>227 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677-78</td>
<td>176 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678-79</td>
<td>227 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-82</td>
<td>176 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683-84</td>
<td>224 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684-85</td>
<td>205 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685-86</td>
<td>225 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686-87</td>
<td>250 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687-88</td>
<td>242 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688-89</td>
<td>236 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-90</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690-91</td>
<td>175 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-92</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692-93</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693-94</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694-95</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695-96</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696-97</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697-98</td>
<td>190 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698-99</td>
<td>200 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699-1700</td>
<td>192 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1701</td>
<td>192 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I Unpublished Primary Sources

The Cumbria County Record Office, Carlisle.

The bulk of the records relating to Carlisle are in the County Record Office, including those of Carlisle Corporation, the County of Cumberland, the Diocese of Carlisle and a variety of private papers. Access to the muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle can also be obtained through the CRO.

The City of Carlisle

Administrative records
Ca2/1, 2, 13/1-64, 17 (the Dormont Book), 18-21, 27 (Freemen's Register) and Mrs E. Beattie's transcript of it, 36, 80-1, 88, 93, 107a, 126, 137a & b, 139a, 140, 142, 152-4, 173a-5, 179, 209/46, 210-17, 243-4, 316-35, 338, 341-2, 413. Judicial records
Ca3/1/121, 125-6, 202, 204-5, 262-72, (Court Entry Books) and Ts index of books 128-79 by Mrs E. Beattie; Ca3/2/1-26 (Court Leet Rolls); Ca3/2/48-52 (Court Leet Calls); Ca3/3/1, 9, 10, 11, 25, 26, 29, 34-44, 45, 47.

Financial records
Ca4/1-4 (Chamberlains' Accounts), 9, 139-40 (Audit Books), 141-2, 152, 197-9. Deeds, etc.
Ca5/1/30-1, 33-38a; Ca5/3/2, 5, 7-11, 47, 50, 175.

County records
Q11 - Quarter Sessions petitions, and full Ts Calendar. Quarter Sessions Minute Book, beginning 1668.

Diocesan Records
DRC3/1, 2 & 4, Consistory Court Books.
DRC3/49 Depositions Book.
Probate Act Book, 1661-1670.
Probate records: boxed by (old-style) year of proof, call number: Pyear name of testator. All surviving wills and inventories for inhabitants of Carlisle's two parishes, both townspeople and countrymen, were examined. Bishop's Transcripts for the parishes of St Cuthbert and St Mary, Carlisle.
PR47/1 (Register of the parish of St Mary, Carlisle, beginning 1649).
PR79/1 (Register of the parish of St Cuthbert, Carlisle, beginning 1693).

Miscellaneous records
Book entitled Duke of Devonshire vs Pattinson and the Corporation of Carlisle (contains copies of surveys of the Socage Manor, the originals mostly being in the PRO).
Dev/Court Leet and Court Baron Book (of the Socage Manor of Carlisle) 1711-75.
DGC/2/1 (Shoemakers' Gild Book 1)
DGC/4/1 (Merchants' Gild Book 1)
D/MH, Dean and Chapter of Carlisle, Lease Book, 1672-1707.
D/MH/I, II, III, V & VIII (each volume contains miscellaneous documents and transcripts of documents relating to Carlisle and Cumberland, vol. I includes the list of householders and accounts relating to the plague of 1597).
D/Lons/Denton Mss, Ms accounts of Cumberland by John Denton and Thomas Denton, anonymous printed account of the county.
D/Lons/L-1786 Election, Minute & Account Books of the Carlisle Gilds.
(eighteenth-century transcripts of the records of the eight gilds).
D/Lons/L, Box 245, Sir Daniel Fleming, Sheriff of Cumberland, Register 1660-61; Shrievalty re Assizes 1662; The Justice Diet, 1567.
Protestation Returns for Cumberland (photocopies of originals in the House of Lords Record Office).
Mounsey-Heysham Mss, Miscellany Accounts of the Diocese of Carlisle by Bishop Nicolson, 1703-4, with additional notes by Archdeacon Waugh, 1747.
TL542/1 & 2 (documents relating to disputes within the the corporation of Carlisle and to a case in the consistory court of Carlisle, on temporary loan to the Record Office).

The Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle

These are held by the Chapter, and access to them can be obtained through the Cumbria County Archivist. I am grateful to the Dean and Chapter for allowing readers access to their records.
EM1/1, 2 & 4, EM3/1 & 2 (parliamentary surveys and manorial records of Chapter manors).
Chapter Registers I, John Smithe Registrar, & II, Thomas Talantyre Registrar.
Chapter Discharge Book I, 1677-1690.
Dr Todd’s Edition of Rentals, etc.
Hugh Todd’s History of Carlisle.
Richard Bell’s History of the Borders.

The Dept. of Palaeography and Diplomatic, University of Durham

The Howard family papers, and calendars of them. Principally manorial documents relating to the Socage Manor of Carlisle.
C9a/3, C49/1-7, 10, 12-16 & 18; N74/42.

The Guildhall Library, London

Ms 11,816A (parliamentary survey of the City property of the Dean and Chapter of St Paul’s).

The British Library

Cotton Mss, Augustus I.1, nos. 11-13 & Suppts 8 & 9; Titus, F.xii,
Harleian Mss, 36, 292, 433, 594, 2,262.
Sloane Mss, 856, 1771, 2723-5.
Stowe Ms, 150.

The Public Record Office

ASSI/42/2; 44/44.
C1/1209/35, 36.
C2/ELZ/I/4/1.
C3/44/75; 49/48; 50/13; 57/22, 64; 70/33; 87/35; 98/55; 122/98;
158/66; 168/76; 192/74; 214/50; 228/79; 229/62; 283/19; 300/75;
342/39; 396/95; 397/142; 416/146; 433/15, 82; 436/52; 439/43; 442/50;
444/27; 445/38; 446/101; 449/32; 456/83; 457/57, 62; 463/10; 456/92;
467/72.
C5/21/7; 144/84; 283/3, 8.
C93/19/24.
C106/149 pt 2.
C202/20/1; 39/3; 41/1; 45/1.
C244/187 no. 36.
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C260/164 no. 7.
E101/63/18; 462/3; 483/17; 532/1; 545/15, 16, 17, 18; 549/13, mm.190-4.
E164/37, 42.
E178/587, 2859, 3677, 6116, 6769, 3678.
E179/90/42, 43, 44, 46, 50a, 73, 74, 76, 77; 245/2, 3; 326/6.
E190/1448/1, 2, 4, 10.
E315/473 f. 49.
E317/Cumberland/2 & 3; Durham/5.
E351/3606.
E370/11/6.
LR2/212 ff. 129-158.
LR2/213 ff. 11-25.
REQ2/138/39.
SC11/986.
SC12/23/50; 29/6.
SP12/96/136, 405, 407, 409, 410, 421; 117/83; 257/91; 276/71.
SP14/22/3; 50/93; 63/7; 134/4.
SP15/31/29, 30; 12/67.
SP16/242/43; 410/74, 99, 165; 438/12; 441/42; 444/24; 540 part 1/23.
SP18/99/17, 43; 123/42, 47; 153/88.
SP46/162 f. 225.
SP59/28/804; 34/606; 39/1191; 40/1342, 1435.
STAC 5/P55/32; S59/1.

II Printed Primary Sources

J. Adams, Index Villaritis, 1690 edn.
The Bishop of Barrow in Furness, 'Bishop Nicholson's Diaries', CW2, 1, 1901.
R. Blome, Britannia, 1673.
Calendars of Patent Rolls, 1547-1553.
Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1547-1702.
W. Camden, Britain, trans. P. Holland, 1610.
W. Camden, Camden's Britannia, trans. E. Gibson, 1695.
John Denton of Cardew, An Accoumt of the Most Considerable Estates and Families in the County of Cumberland..., ed. R.S. Ferguson, CWAAS Tract Series,
R. S. Ferguson, ed., The Royal Charters of the City of Carlisle, CWAAS Extra Series, X, Carlisle 1894.

R. S. Ferguson and W. Nanson, eds., Some Municipal Records of the City of Carlisle, CWAAS Extra Series, IV, Carlisle 1887.


J. Foster, ed., Pedigrees Recorded at the Heralds' Visitations of the Counties of Cumberland and Westmorland... 1615... and... 1666, 1889.


F. Grainger, 'James Jackson's Diary, 1650 to 1683', CW2, 21, 1921, pp.96-129.


M.A.E. Green, ed., Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, etc., 1643-1660, 1889-92.


P. Heylyn, A Help to English History, 1680, first published 1641 under the nom de plume of Robert Hall.


L.G.W. Legg, ed., A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties (Observed in a seven weeks journey begun on August 11, 1634. By a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, All three of the Military Company in Norwich), London 1904.

W.H.D. Longstaffe, ed., Memoirs of the Life of Mr Ambrose Barnes, late merchant and sometime Alderman of Newcastle upon Tyne, Surtees Soc., 50 for 1866, 1867.


W. Nicolson, Miscellany Accounts of the Diocese of Carlisle, ed. R.S. Ferguson,


E. Sandford, *A Cursory Relation of all the Antiquities and Familyes in Cumberland*, c. 1675, ed. R.S. Ferguson, CWAAS Tract no.4, Kendal 1890.

Saxton's map of Cumberland, reprinted by the British Museum.


III Secondary Sources, Books and Theses


C.W. Chalklin & M.A. Havinden, eds., *Rural Change and Urban Growth 1500-1800*,
1974.


P. Clark and P. Slack, eds., *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500-1700*, 1972.


R.S. Ferguson, *A History of Cumberland, 1898.*

R.S. Ferguson, ed., *Old Church Plate in the Diocese of Carlisle*, 1882.


N. Penney, ed., *Quaker Beginnings in Cumberland*, 1907.


C.V. Phythian-Adams, *Re-thinking English Local History*, Dept. of English Local


Browne Willis, *A Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, Man etc., 1727*.


IV Secondary Sources, Articles


P. Clark, 'The migrant in Kentish towns 1580-1640', in P. Clark and P. Slack, eds., Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700, 1972, pp.117-63.


L.A. Clarkson, The Organization of the English Leather Industry In the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', Ec.H.R. 2nd Ser., 13, 1960-1, pp.245-56.


P.R. Edwards, 'The Horse Trade of the Midlands in the Seventeenth Century'.


W.G. Hoskins, 'The Leicestershire Farmer in the Seventeenth Century', in idem, pp.149-169.


J.D. Marshall, 'Kendal in the late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', CW2, 75, 1975, pp.188-257.


M. McCarthy, 'Excavations on the City Defences, Carlisle', CW2, 80, 1980, pp.69-78.
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W. Nanson, 'The Shire and County Tolls belonging to the City of Carlisle', CW1, 3, 1876-7, pp.144-56.

W. Nanson, 'On the Customary Tenure at Carlisle called "Cullery Tenure"', CW1, 6, 1881-2, pp.305-18.

W. Nanson, 'Carlisle during the Siege of 1644-5', CW1, 7, 1883, pp.48-63.


