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SECTION I

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

In the mid 1920's Tupling produced his pioneering work entitled *An Economic History of Rossendale*. This title is a misnomer in that the volume revolves around two major themes, those of enclosure, land holding and common land in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century and the history of the local woollen trade from the early seventeenth century to the mid nineteenth century.

The thrust of this thesis is substantially different. It is narrower in the sense of covering a much shorter time span, but is broader in that it attempts a more comprehensive survey of the local economy. In addition, much new evidence has become available in the intervening years to permit even those themes covered by Tupling to be substantially up-dated.

The primary purpose of this thesis is to examine the process of industrialisation in an essentially pastoral area. This has been a subject of considerable interest amongst economic historians in recent years. Rossendale provides a particularly interesting case study in this context in that it lies close to the heart of one of the classic areas of eighteenth century industrialisation.

For ease of analysis, the period 1650-1800 has been broken down into three sub periods each of which had distinct economic and demographic characteristics. In turn, each of the three sub periods and sub sections has been divided into chapters designed to cover the whole range of the local experience. To facilitate comparability, the same chapter order has been maintained throughout each subsection.
though the attention directed to them has been varied between the sub-sections to reflect changes in their relative importance over time.
CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND

Since April 1974, the unit of local government known as Rossendale has consisted of five distinct towns, namely Bacup, Haslingden, Rawtenstall, Ramsbottom and Whitworth. The historical area of Rossendale which will be the focus of this thesis, was restricted to the area of the first three towns. These three nineteenth century boroughs lie adjacent to each other on an east/west line. In the east, Bacup borough reached to the Yorkshire border, whilst in the west the borough of Haslingden ran to the borough of Blackburn and the lower land of central Lancashire.

A precise definition of the area covered by the term "Rossendale" prior to 1800 is difficult to establish, as the area was covered by a number of different and overlapping administrative units.

For the purpose of property and mineral rights all three boroughs fall within the Manor of Accrington, itself a sub unit of the Honor of Clitheroe. The boroughs of Bacup and Rawtenstall as well as part of the borough of Haslingden made up the largest sub unit within the manor known as the Forest of Rossendale, whilst the rest of the borough of Haslingden fell into a smaller sub unit of the manor known in the medieval period as the vill of Haslingden.

(1) A.M. Llewellyn, ed. Local Authority Survey 1974, 1973, p 226
(2) G.H. Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, 1927, p 1
For civil administration, Rossendale was divided into nine distinct and separate townships, the largest of which were those of Haslingden, Newchurch and Higher Booths.\(^{(1)}\) All but one of these townships lay to the north of the boundary between the Hundreds of Blackburn and Salford. Thus the bulk of the area can be said to have constituted the south eastern portion of the Hundred of Blackburn.

The ecclesiastical structure of Rossendale cut across both the sub manorial and township divisions. Most of the area, namely the townships of Haslingden, Henheads, Higher Booths, Lower Booths, Newchurch, and Yate and Pickup Bank belonged to the vast parish of Whalley. The size of the mother parish of Whalley was such that it was subdivided into chapelries. In 1650, two such chapelries, Haslingden and Newchurch were present in Rossendale. During the eighteenth century, these two chapelries were subdivided to provide two additional chapelries in Bacup and Goodshaw. Several local townships lay outside Whalley parish. Dunnockshaw was tied to the parish of Burnley, Yate and Pickup Bank to the parish of Blackburn and Musbury and Coupe/Lench/New Hall Hey and Hall Carr to Bury parish.\(^{(2)}\)

In 1851, Rossendale consisted of around twenty one thousand acres broken down thus:

---

\(^{(1)}\) W. Farrer, Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, vol III, 1913, p 419.
### Acreage of Rossendale in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Chapelry (Parish)</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coupe, Lench, New Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey, Hall Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnockshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henheads</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Booths</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Booths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yate and Pickup Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20,981</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Haslingden                   | 10,671            |
| Newchurch                    | 5,858             |
| Part of Bury                  | 3,213             |
| Part of Blackburn             | 850               |
| Part of Burnley               | 389               |
| **TOTAL**                     | **20,981**        |

This figure of nearly twenty one thousand acres had probably changed little over the centuries. Newbigging writing of pre-Conquest Rossendale estimated the area to have consisted of over nineteen thousand five hundred acres.\(^{(2)}\) Smith’s map of the boundaries of the Forest of Rossendale and the vill of Haslingden in the early fourteenth century is consistent with that provided by the first edition Ordnance Survey map of 1844.\(^{(3)}\) This view is confirmed by the mid seventeenth century manorial surveys of the area, and by sixteenth and seventeenth century descriptions of local boundaries.\(^{(4)}\)

---


\(^{(3)}\) R.B.Smith, *Blackburnshire: A Study in Early Lancashire History*, University of Leicester Department of English Local History Occasional Papers, 1st series, No 15, 1961.

CHAPTER II
EARLY HISTORY TO THE MID SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

There is no clear documentary evidence that Rossendale was permanently settled by man prior to the late thirteenth century. (1) Despite this the area certainly was used if not settled by man from a much earlier date.

Neolithic arrow heads have been found to the west of Haslingden and flint chippings in several areas of central Rossendale. (2) Place name evidence is available from the seventh century when the English conquered the Britons in Lancashire. Haslingden is derived from the old English for "hazel valley" and Bacup from the old English for "valley by a ridge". Other localities within Rossendale such as Kirk Hill near Haslingden are derived from Scandanavia suggesting an early tenth century dating. (3)

Taken together the evidence for pre-Conquest human association with Rossendale appears fairly strong. Yet the extent of such contact was probably modest. The limited natural attractions of the area would deter settlement. These limitations were accentuated after the Conquest when all of Rossendale outside of the vill of Haslingden was treated as a large hunting preserve by its owners, at various times

(1) The area is not covered by Domesday as it was a Crown possession.
(3) Wallis, A History of the Church in Blackburnshire, p 31-2 and 37.
the Crown or families close to the Crown. (1) As a result the area remained largely unsettled and economically underdeveloped until the thirteenth century.

From the mid thirteenth century this situation began to change as the area began to experience an upsurge in the level of its economic activity. This upswing was actually assisted rather than resisted by the then owner Henry de Lacey, Earl of Lincoln. Instead of maintaining Rossendale as a hunting preserve, he began to exploit the area's pastoral potential. This he did by developing ten specialist cattle rearing farms as vaccaries in the most favoured parts of the area. (2) Other areas with pastoral potential within Rossendale were leased to outside groups such as the abbot and monks of Whalley Abbey. (3) This two pronged development enabled the forest area alone to carry upwards of fourteen hundred cattle in the late thirteenth century, nearly nine hundred head being carried in the vaccaries alone. (4) The cattle stock of Haslingden is difficult to assess as it was not operated on the basis of vaccaries. Cattle keeping was probably widespread in the vill. In the early 1320's the local bailiff was charged with extorting two oxen from a local villager. (5) Thus it would not seem unreasonable to assume that the cattle

(1) ibid p 51. The area alternated between such hands until the early fifteenth century when it reverted to the Crown with whom it stayed until the mid seventeenth century. Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 3.

(2) ibid p 3

(3) ibid p 9

(4) ibid p 15-17

population of the vill raised the total for Rossendale as a whole to over fifteen hundred head. Though the de Lacey's activities undoubtedly increased the level of economic activity within the forest area, it is unlikely that the economic upswing had an equally significant impact on the size of the local population. The nature of de Lacey's support of pastoral farming based on a handful of dispersed cattle stations and the leasing of the remaining pasture to non-resident groups probably meant only a modest need for a resident labour force of either agricultural or forest employees.

The vill of Haslingden, unlike the employee residents of the forest, contained resident land holders, some on quite a considerable scale both within and outside the area. For example, in 1311 Adam son of Nicholas de Holden was a free tenant of thirty acres in Colne for a rent of 7s 6d per year, six acres one rood in Burnley for a rent of 3s 5½d per year; along with Henry de Birtwistle he held twenty oxgangs at Habergham Eaves for a rent of 6s per year and sixty acres for a rent of 2s in Haslingden.\(^1\) Other local men held land in other parts of Lancashire such as Simondstone near Burnley and in the Halmote of West Derby in south west Lancashire.\(^2\)

From the early fourteenth century the nature of economic organisation in the forest area underwent another change. The system of vaccary farming declined. Between 1300 and 1324 the number of cattle in Rossendale vaccaries fell from around nine hundred to under three hundred.\(^3\)

---


\(^3\) Farrer, "Lancashire Inquests, Extents and Feudal Aids," Part II, loc.cit p 198.
This does not necessarily indicate that the area experienced an economic decline as a result of this change as has been indicated by Tupling.\(^{(1)}\) The change may have been merely one of organisation; rather than providing a direct income for the de Lacey's by farming, the vaccaries were leased out to resident people farming on their own account under manorial regulations and providing the de Laceys with a rental form of income. Though local farming remained centred on the traditional sites of these vaccaries, the cultivated area grew as waste land was settled on a piecemeal basis. In addition to piecemeal enclosure, large scale encroachments were to be found not only in the case of Musbury Park. This substantial park was retained as a deer preserve during the era of vaccary farming but by 1480, it had been rented out for cultivation.\(^{(2)}\)

Despite such encroachments the waste area remained substantial. In the late medieval period between forty five and sixty per cent of the total acreage remained as waste.\(^{(3)}\) This view is confirmed rather more imaginatively by a contemporary description of 1476:\(^{(4)}\)

"the said forest of Rossendale is a fair and large ground of mountains and mooses wherein the red deer in grass ... be kept together by foresters."\(^{(4)}\)

The extent of this fourteenth century expansion is indicated by the growing value of the herbage of Rossendale which increased

---

(1) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 31
(2) ibid, p 33
from £5 1ls 2d in 1324 to £20 in 1361.\(^{(1)}\) This increase probably continued into the fifteenth century. In 1486, Musbury pasture was valued at £9 per annum compared with £8 10s earlier in the life of the same tenant.\(^{(2)}\)

Despite these suggestions of the increased economic value of the area, the pastoral nature of local agriculture ensured that the resident population remained small. At the beginning of the fifteenth century a list of freemen notes twenty six names in Haslingden township and only twenty five in the much larger forest area.\(^{(3)}\) Contemporary accounts indicate that the forest population had changed little by the beginning of the sixteenth century.\(^{(4)}\)

The early sixteenth century was probably a crucial turning point in the history of the forest, for it almost certainly saw the onset of not only faster economic expansion, but also for the first time, rapid demographic expansion. From the mid fourteenth century, Rossendale had been the property of the Crown, which from 1507 introduced a policy of disafforestation into the area. This policy led to a sub-division of the old vaccary based farm units and the old pastures which together subsequently became known as "old hold" tenures. In addition, the clearing and the settlement of the waste was also encouraged. Land thus reclaimed from the waste subsequently became known as "new hold" tenures. The old hold was originally sub divided


\(^{(2)}\) Myers, "An Official Progress through Lancashire and Cheshire," loc cit, p 26


\(^{(4)}\) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 115
amongst seventy two tenants but by the early seventeenth century this figure had more than doubled to over two hundred.\(^{(1)}\) By this time, few of the tenants held estates of above fifty acres, though a handful of larger estates often in the hands of non residents remained.\(^{(2)}\) The post 1507 encroachment on to the waste meant that by the late sixteenth century, the area's timber supply had been seriously denuded.\(^{(3)}\) This development of cultivation on the basis of smaller scale farming units meant there could be a swing away from common to individualistic forms of operation.\(^{(4)}\)

This extension of cultivation, and the development of smaller farming units, resulted in a substantial increase in the level of local agricultural production and thus the economic value of the area. In 1324, the rental value of the forest vaccaries had been £14 0s 8d., the value of the herbage £5 11s 2d, and the value of other forest materials, such as brushwood and nuts, £7 15s 3d giving a total of £26 3s 1d.\(^{(5)}\) By 1576, the rental value of the forest land increased massively to £80 1s 1d.\(^{(6)}\) No equivalent figure is available for the vill of Haslingden, which in 1324 had been valued at £6 3s 10½d plus

---

\(^{(1)}\) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 235

\(^{(2)}\) T. Woodcock, *Haslingden: A Topographical History*, p 255

\(^{(3)}\) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 235

\(^{(4)}\) ibid, p 69


\(^{(6)}\) J. Harland, ed, "The Lancashire Lieutenancy under the Tudors and Stuarts", *C.S.*, 1st Series, Vol 49, 1859, p 81
16s 2½d for a water mill giving a total of £6 18s 5d. (1) This suggests that medieval value of the vill of Haslingden was only around a quarter of the value of the forest area. More descriptively the change was described by one mid sixteenth century contemporary thus, this area "which served before that time (1507 disafforestation decision) but only for the increase of wild beasts, now is ... well and substantially manured and occupied to the increase of tillage, corn and cattle". (2)

This economic expansion appears to have had little impact on the structure of the local agricultural economy. Probate inventories of the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth centuries indicate that cattle continued to dominate a basically pastoral agrarian economy. Cattle usually accounted for over two thirds of the value of all farming goods in most inventories. Herd sizes of the larger farmers generally ranged from fifteen to fifty head though smaller farmers might only have one or two stock. (3) There is evidence that from this time sheep were emerging as an important supplementary type of livestock. In the mid sixteenth century Rossendale as a whole was annually sending seventy lambs and twenty shillings of wool to the abbot of Whalley as payment for tithes. (4)

Given the geographic remoteness of Rossendale from the major

(2) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 115
(3) LR&U, Probate Inventories, passim
(4) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 165-6
grain producing areas, the agrarian development of the area from the early sixteenth century would almost certainly have led to an expansion of the local arable acreage. This is clearly the implication of the aforementioned quotation on the impact of disafforestation. Further support comes from the fact that whilst Rossendale as a whole could only support one corn mill in the early fourteenth century, it could support three from the mid sixteenth century.\(^{(1)}\)

The gradual subdivision of tenancies given the availability of, and the opportunity to extend the cultivation further on to the waste, plus the growth in the importance of sheep rearing indicate that a local woollen industry could have developed during the sixteenth century. This period certainly saw the spread of the woollen industry into East Lancashire as a whole.\(^{(2)}\) That Rossendale was concerned in this development is confirmed by local probate inventories. These inventories show that those local people who did become involved in the woollen industry did so on the basis of by-employment, agriculture remaining the most important activity.\(^{(3)}\) Further evidence of textile activity comes from the proceedings of the halmote court of the Manor of Accrington. Thus in May 1518 Ottiwell Haworth claimed a debt of 6s 8d for twenty eight pounds of wool and a debt of 1s 6d pfor three webs of cloth from a Robert Priestley.\(^{(4)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Farrer, "Lancashire Inquests, Extents and Feudal Aids", loc cit, p 188
Anon, Rawtenstall Descriptive and Historical Notes, p 11
Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 19

\(^{(2)}\) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 166 and 172

\(^{(3)}\) eg LR0. Probate Inventory of Margery Duckworth of Musbury, 1597
LR0. Probate Inventory of John Heyworth of Wolfenden, 1624

\(^{(4)}\) Lowe, loc cit, p 21-2
Farrer, ed, Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, Vol I, p 13, 33 and 130
This new local industry was highly dependent on larger towns to the south and east for the finishing and marketing of their local cloth, though locals were independent producers undertaking carding, spinning and weaving.(1) Together the development of woollen manufacturing and the post disafforestation agrarian expansion led to accelerated economic expansion accompanied by growth in the size of the resident population.

The 1563 return to the Privy Council indicates that the chapels of Haslingden and Newchurch contained a total of two hundred and twelve households suggesting a total population of around one thousand.(2) This expansion continued beyond that date. The Bishop's Protestation return of 1641-2 lists six hundred and seventy nine names for Rossendale.(3)

The 1650 parochial survey of Chester diocese notes and six hundred and seventy families resident in Rossendale.(4) The 1660 poll tax return indicates a similar figure consistent with those of 1641-2 and 1660(5) Taken together these combined

(1) See Chapter IX, Section A
(2) BL/RD/7850845
(3) LRO/HF/25 Bishop's Protestation Return 1641-2
(5) RRO/E179/250/4
three sources suggest that the figure of nearly seven hundred families is a good estimate of the number of families of mid seventeenth century Rossendale.

However, before this figure can be used to estimate the size of the local population, some idea of the size of the average local household is required. Laslett puts forward an average figure of 4.75 persons per household as being the best approximation available. However, his figure for thirty six Westmoreland parishes was only 4.5 persons per household. This latter figure would appear to be more appropriate for Rossendale which was a remote northern pastoral upland area as severe as many of Laslett's Westmoreland parishes. In the absence of any evidence of a more localised nature this range of 4.5 to 4.75 would appear to be the best available choice of multiplier. On this basis, it would appear that by 1650 Rossendale contained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>670 households</th>
<th>670 households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 multiplier</td>
<td>4.75 multiplier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,015 population</td>
<td>3,172 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that since the mid sixteenth century the local population had grown by almost three fold.

Thus in summary, the area can be seen to have experienced minimal economic and demographic development down to the mid thirteenth century. This was followed by a half century of rapid economic though not rapid demographic expansion based on the de Lacey system of vaccary farming. Vaccary farming disappeared from the area in the early fourteenth century but this probably did not lead to economic decline though it may have meant a slower rate of growth. From the early sixteenth century, disafforestation and the development of a local woollen industry meant

the onset of an unprecedented period of both economic and demographic expansion that lasted into the seventeenth century.
SECTION II

ROSSendale 1650-1715
CHAPTER III

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE 1650-1715

SECTION A - THE TRENDS

An estimate of the size of the mid seventeenth century local population, can as was noted in the previous chapter be calculated from the 1650 parochial survey of the diocese of Chester. Such a calculation suggests a total population slightly in excess of three thousand. Yet this only provides a static picture and tells nothing of the demographic experience between 1650 and 1715. This can best be done via an analysis of the contemporary chapelry registers of Rossendale. (1)

For the period under review, registers are extant for two parts of Rossendale, namely Haslingden and Newchurch chapelyries, though a third chapelry, Goodshaw, was in existence, it did not keep its own register until 1745. Prior to that date, Goodshaw baptisms, burials and marriages were regularly recorded in the registers of Haslingden and occasionally in those of Newchurch.

A good chronological coverage of baptisms, burials and marriages is available from both Haslingden and Newchurch registers for most of the period from 1660 - 1715. (2) For those years where the original registers have not survived, the Bishop's Transcripts

(1) For a discussion of the limitations of such registers see Appendix I.

(2) Haslingden Chapelry: Baptisms 1650-1715, Marriages 1650-1680 and 1711-1715, Burials 1650-1715.

Newchurch Chapelry: Baptisms 1650-1715, Marriages 1650-1680 and 1694-1715, Burials 1650-1715.
of the original registers are available.\(^1\) A comparison of the data from the original registers and the transcripts in periods when both are available, indicates that the transcripts are generally an adequate substitute. However, before such sources can be evaluated it is essential to consider the adequacy of the register data. The only period for which this is not possible is the period from 1650 to 1660, when the impact of the interregnum appears to have severely hit the value of the registers. In consequence, the chapelry register data has been used from a base year of 1660 rather than 1650. Using the 1650 population estimates as the base figure, the register data can be used to plot the long term demographic trends in the area.

Natural population changes can be estimated by deducting annual totals of burials from annual totals of baptisms. The resultant figure can then be used to adjust the estimated natural change in population from year to year.\(^2\) On this basis, the population of Rossendale grew only modestly down to 1715.\(^3\) From the base figure of around three thousand, the population edged upwards to around three thousand two hundred by the early 1670's from when a short phase of decline occurred prior to the onset of a new phase of slow growth at the end of this decade. This recovery was so slow that the peak level of the early 1670's was only re-attained by 1690. This very slow growth slowly accelerated, but was checked by periodic

---

\(^1\) LR/B/ORB/Bishop's Transcripts of the Chapelries of Haslingden and Newchurch.


\(^3\) See Appendix II
short contractions which continued down to 1715. By 1715, the local population had attained a level of three thousand five hundred, an increase of nearly twenty per cent on the base level. This general pattern of growth followed by a sharp decline and a long but slow recovery remains valid even if the baptism figures are modestly inflated to offset the danger of under recording.

It appears likely that even the unadjusted figures present an over buoyant view of the local demographic experience of the time. Bishop Gastrell's survey of 1717 suggests that the local population may have been even smaller than that recorded in 1650. Gastrell's estimate suggests that in the mid 1710's Rossendale contained six hundred and twelve families, a drop of around ten per cent on the 1650 estimate. (1) If the assumption of 4.5 to 4.75 people per household is retained it would suggest a local population of between two thousand seven hundred and three thousand. (2)

This suggests that the area probably experienced a phase of net outward migration during the period. Certainly inward migration was modest, the small handful of surnames dominated the local chapelry registers throughout the period. Most of the migration in the period was extremely short distance. This was certainly true of the townships of Higher and Lower Booths in central Rossendale. Between 1693 and 1719 the township overseers received certificates for twenty...

(2) A multiplier of 4.5 = two thousand seven hundred and fifty four people
   A multiplier of 4.75 = two thousand nine hundred and seven people.
people settling in their area. Of these thirteen came from the township of Newchurch, six from the township of Haslingden, one from the small township of Henheads and only two from outside the Rossendale area. Yet this relates to the end of the period only when the problems were possibly easing. A more comprehensive chronological coverage is available from the Quarter Sessions records. Between 1650 and 1715, these sources note thirty nine petitions concerning the settlement of Rossendale families and individuals. Of these ten concerned disputes between different townships within Rossendale. Disputes with neighbouring townships and parishes account for all the remaining cases, but no distinct pattern of movement emerges.

The absence of any clear cut direction to this migration is not really surprising as most of Lancashire appears to have experienced serious demographic problems during this period. As will be indicated more fully later, at least part of the problem was economic in origin. In consequence, this was probably a period in which the most mobile groups in the local society moved around in an attempt to find a more favourable economic environment.

Howsan's work suggests that one such refuge may have been in the textile area of south and east Lancashire where the demographic problems of the period appear to have been relatively mild. On examination the figures for natural change in the population show such

---

(1) LRO/PR/2859/8

(2) LRO/QSP/passim - Accrington (5 cases), Bolton (2 cases), Burnley (8 cases), Bury (9 cases), Darwen (1 case) and Rochdale (4 cases).


(4) Ibid, p 42
a considerable discrepancy between the experience of the two Rossendale chapelries. The chapelry of Haslingden with limited textile penetration was demographically far worse hit than the more easterly chapelry of Newchurch, where textiles had a strong presence.\(^1\) The register data indicates that the population of Haslingden grew only slowly in the 1660's from a base of just under to just over one thousand seven hundred. From that time, the area experienced sustained demographic problems which meant that the area only returned to its early 1670's population level after 1715. In contrast, Newchurch only experienced a short and moderate set back in the mid 1670's. By 1678 its population was back to its 1673 peak. By 1715 it had grown by over fifty percent above its 1660 level to a total of nearly two thousand.\(^2\)

The reduction in the number of surnames tends to confirm the net loss of population through migration in the chapelry of Haslingden between 1660 and 1715. Indeed when the probability of net migration is taken into account it is likely that the chapelry of Haslingden experienced a substantial net fall in the size of its population between 1660 and 1715. Though net emigration may also have occurred in the chapelry of Newchurch, this is by no means a certainty. Even if this was so, the extent of any such loss would probably have been modest and only sufficient to marginally slow down the rate of growth of the chapelry population.

The foregoing sections indicate clearly that this was generally a period of demographic stagnation, but that considerable variation was observable between the two main chapelties of which Rossendale was

\(^{1}\) See Chapter VI

\(^{2}\) See Appendix II
largely comprised. The next stage in the analysis must be to con­
sider the fluctuations in the local birth and death rates that deter­
mained the key trends in natural population change. Given the nature
of the sources the best available approach would appear to be that
suggested by Eversley.\(^{(1)}\)

Here the annual average total of baptisms or burials over a ten
year period are divided into the estimated population in the middle
year of the same ten year period. In the Rossendale case, this exer­
cise produces significant findings on both the birth and death rates.\(^{(2)}\)
Both these key rates fluctuated in a way to positively influence the
local demographic experience.

The demographic crisis of the mid 1670's saw the Rossendale
birth rate fall to under thirty five per thousand from nearly thirty
eight per thousand in the mid 1660's. During the same period, the
death rate increased from under twenty eight per thousand to thirty
per thousand. Thus both elements contributed to the crisis.

This is also true of the subsequent period down to 1715. From
the mid 1670's the birth rate increased slightly for a short period
before beginning a long slow decline until the early 1710's by which
time it was only just over twenty nine per thousand. The 1670's also
saw a steady rise in the death rate followed by a decline almost back
to the levels of the 1660's during the 1680's. During the 1690's,
the death rate stagnated at around thirty per thousand before falling
sharply to under twenty five per thousand in the mid 1700's. From

\(^{(1)}\) D.E.C. Eversley, "A Survey of Population in an area of Worcestershire
from 1660-1850 on the basis of Parish Registers," \textit{Population

\(^{(2)}\) See fig. No 1, Rossendale Birth and Death Rates 1660-1715.
this point it rose again until the mid 1710's, when it was back to the levels of the 1690's.

However, these general figures hide considerable variations between the two chapelries. The most obvious variation between the two lies in the fact that the absolute birth and death rates varied markedly between them down to 1715. Throughout this period the Haslingden birth rate fluctuated in the range thirty four per thousand to forty two per thousand. In Newchurch, the fluctuation apart from one short period was in the range twenty eight to thirty four per thousand. In terms of the death rate the variation was even more marked. In the chapelry of Haslingden, it was nearly always in the range thirty to forty per thousand and was usually between thirty five and forty per thousand. In contrast, the death rate in Newchurch never reached thirty per thousand in this period, and was generally under twenty five per thousand.

This markedly lower death rate in Newchurch not only offset the higher birth rate of Haslingden, it also allowed Newchurch to support a growing population. Thus the essential difference in the demographic experience of the two chapelries before 1710 can be seen to revolve around their differing mortality rates.

Attention must now be given to a study of the possible factors underlying these variations in the birth and death rates both over time and between the two chapelries.

(1) See Figure : II.
SECTION B - THE BIRTH RATE

Birth rate trends in pre-Industrial England are generally seen to have been largely determined by a limited number of key variables. Most prominent amongst them are the proportion of the population who married, the age at marriage and fertility within marriage, in particular the spacing of births and foetal wastage. In this section, attention will be devoted particularly to the role these variables had in the determining of the differing birth rates found in the chapelries of Haslingden and Newchurch.

An idea of variations in the proportion of the local population who married can be gleaned by calculating the local marriage rate on the same basis as for the birth rate calculations used in the previous section. Such a calculation yields the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Combined Chapelries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall figure for Rossendale suggests a long term decline in the marriage rate down to 1706 from which time there was a recovery. Though this general pattern was present in both chapelries, the decline was much more pronounced in the chapelry of Newchurch than in the chapelry of Haslingden. In that chapelry the post 1706 recovery was also much more modest. At the same time, the absolute rate was also lower in Newchurch chapelry throughout the period from the mid 1670's. It therefore appears clear that this was certainly part of the reason for the relatively low birth rate in the chapelry of Newchurch.

Marital fertility must also be considered as a possible factor. At a general level, marital fertility can be calculated by dividing successive twenty year totals of baptisms by successive twenty year totals of marriages, the marriages figures half overlapping the baptism figures. (1) On the basis of the above method, the following figures have been derived:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Combined Chapelries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1690</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1700</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1710</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together the combined figures suggest a relatively stable level of fertility with baptisms per marriage averaging around five. However, the breakdown suggests that in the critical period from 1670

until after the turn of the century Newchurch chapelry recorded higher figures than could be found in Haslingden. This would tend to partly offset the higher proportion of the Haslingden population who married. As the rate of marital fertility tends to run counter to the difference in the birth rates of the two chapelries, it requires a rather more detailed analysis.

A major influence on marital fertility may well have been the age at first marriage of brides and grooms. If this was a major factor the age of Haslingden marriage partners could be expected to have been higher than at Newchurch. Such variations in age at marriage could be expected to influence family size by affecting the length of post marital fertility and by influencing the difficulty and hazards of conception and pregnancy.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to obtain direct or clear cut data from the local registers as these fail to specify the age of either bride or groom on marriage. Attempts to ascertain such ages by checking back for the baptism date of marriage partners is of little or no value due to several inherent weaknesses in the local data. Many marriage registrations fail to specify the place of residence of marriage partners except in the most general terms, such as "of this parish" or "Haslingden". In addition, many baptism entries fail to record the christian name of the child involved. Even where such key data is given, the tendency for a large proportion of the local population to have the same surname often with the same christian name, makes positive identification of distinct individuals often virtually impossible. Even when the data becomes more detailed from the early eighteenth century, the continued dominance of a narrow range of local surnames and christian names makes it impossible to positively identify more than ten to fifteen per cent of marriage partners. This
percentage is so low as to render untenable any results derived from this method. Therefore, alternative approaches must be considered.

One such method is to consider the situation in surrounding areas where the data is more informative. Howsan managed to obtain an approximation of fluctuations in the average age at marriage of females by analysing the published registers of all the churches in the Hundred of Blackburn.\(^{(1)}\) His results indicate that in the Hundred as a whole, the average female age at marriage increased from 1660 to 1680 to a seventeenth century peak, but from that time the average age gradually fell and remained at a "reasonably low level", down to 1720. If this general pattern was also true of men at first marriage, and if as appears likely, the experience of Rossendale is generally consistent with that of the rest of the Hundred, such trends could be applied to the Rossendale area. This would certainly be consistent with the observed trends in Rossendale marital fertility. The rising age at marriage from 1660-1680 co-incided with a low level of marital fertility, whereas the falling then stable age at marriage after 1680 co-incides with the rise recorded in marital fertility. Unfortunately, however, the nature of this data does not permit any explanation of the differing experience of the two Rossendale chapelries.

A second variable of possible influence on contemporary family size were fluctuations in the intervals between births within marriage. Such fluctuations may have been the result of the operation of some direct form of voluntary birth control or indirect and external pressures influencing the chances of successful conception and birth. In this latter case, the interval between births may be seen as at least

\(^{(1)}\) W.G.Howsan, loc cit, p 47-9.
partially a function of changes in the age of partners at first marriages. The local baptism registers which are required in any attempt to assess the significance of changes in birth intervals form a better source than the contemporary marriage registers. Though they are patchy in quantity and legibility of the information they provide, they generally do supply a reasonable number of positive identifying items. The full name and address of the father was given and in some periods the name of the mother and the occupation of the father. These details allow most local families to be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty. In the cases of contemporary families with identical or very similar identifying details which prevent any positive identification being made, the response has been to eliminate them from all samples taken.

A potential danger in calculating birth intervals from chapelry registers comes from the previously mentioned fact that the registers list baptisms rather than births. This is a potential danger for two main reasons. If this gap between birth and baptism varied over time, this could influence the spacing intervals between children. Even if such gaps were constant, a long interval would increase the chance of infant death and thus no baptism would be recorded, making the resultant interval much longer. Fortunately, in the Rossendale area, such birth/baptism intervals appear to have been both relatively constant and relatively short, thus significantly reducing the danger posed by such problems.\(^{(1)}\)

In order to calculate child spacing intervals, samples were taken at the beginning and the end of this period, of baptism intervals

\(^{(1)}\) See Appendix I
within family units. In each case, the sample consisted of the first forty men to have children baptised in the register of each chapelry. The baptism registers were then searched for five years to check on the time lag before subsequent baptisms. Though this approach fails to distinguish the gap between marriage and first child, first child and subsequent children and ignores time lags of over five years duration in birth intervals, it does have certain virtues. For the present purpose, there is no necessity to distinguish the gap between marriage and first children and the gap between a first and subsequent children. Though time lags of over five years duration are ignored, the figures resulting show that few baptismal intervals were of no more than three years in length and thus any distortion resulting from the imposition of a five year rule is likely to be of limited significance.\(^{(1)}\) The most important requirement for the immediate purpose of estimating variations in baptism intervals over time rather than absolute intervals, is for the method adopted to be applied consistently. It is on this assumption that this problem has been approached.

The figures derived from these samples suggest a steady increase in the baptism interval during this period:

**Rossendale Baptism Intervals: In Months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Neuchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Combined Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Interval</td>
<td>Number of cases</td>
<td>Average Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) Of a sample of one hundred and thirteen baptisms between 1661-5 all but thirty one (27%) showed more than one baptism during the same period. For 1701-5 the equivalent figures were twenty seven (20%) of one hundred and thirty five baptisms.
These figures tend to confirm the general marital fertility trends. The general stability from the early 1660's to the early 1700's in the average interval between births (baptisms) would help to explain the stability in marital fertility. The figures are less clear in explaining the differences in the experiences of the two chapelries. Until the turn of the century the baptism intervals appear to have been slightly lower in the chapelry of Newchurch which may help explain its higher rate of marital fertility. However, they do not appear to explain the downward fertility trend in the chapelry of Haslingden.

The trends in the Rossendale death rate may also have affected the marital fertility rate by influencing the number of marriages allowed to run their course during the period of female fertility. It is not possible to indicate the specific death rate of women in isolation, but the long term trends of the overall death rate would probably have had some impact on the adult female death rate. The Rossendale death rate rose only slightly from twenty eight to thirty three per thousand down to 1700 thus helping explain the stability of marital stability. Mortality was also much higher in the chapelry of Haslingden, which probably goes far to explain its lower levels of fertility than in Newchurch.
SECTION C - THE DEATH RATE

Though infanticide and abortion may have been factors influencing the local mortality rate, it is doubtful if they could have been of more than minor importance in determining the overall level of mortality. This leaves two major possibilities, the economic and non-economic. The traditional view that the prime factor influencing pre-industrial mortality in England was the contemporary economic situation. This view has recently come under increasing criticism by historians such as Chambers. He suggests that an autonomous death rate was operative in which the incidence and virulence of epidemic were the crucial factors. (1)

The relative importance of these two factors in the Rossendale area must be considered in detail. An increase in mortality due to economic factors would probably occur via a change in the balance between income and expenditure, in particular, the ratio between grain prices and income. Any attempt to examine the relationship between mortality and economic conditions must take both these possibilities into account.

In such a study two other factors should also be taken into account. To a considerable extent, the local economy was based on small pastoral farms so that the prosperity of this industry would have been of major local importance independently of grain prices or wages levels. The latter because local livestock farming appears to have


relied largely on family rather than wage labour.\(^{(1)}\) Given the rudimentary nature of the transport network, the difficulty of terrain and the harsh nature of the climate, the weather may have also had an independent impact on local mortality by causing economic dislocation.

In order to observe in detail the chronology of local mortality crises, the annual totals of burials from the chapelry registers were studied. All cases where mortality increased by more than twenty per cent above the average number of burials for the three preceding non-crisis years, has been deemed to justify the term mortality crisis for this study. On this criteria the following stand out as periods of crisis mortality, 1672-6 inclusive, 1683, 1700, 1712-13 inclusive.\(^{(2)}\)

The most detailed extant sources for such a study are two contemporary diaries. Oliver Heywood, minister of the chapelry of Coley on the far side of the Lancashire/Yorkshire border, left a valuable diary for the period from 1630 to 1702. William Stout, a merchant of Lancaster left an important record for the period from 1680 until after 1715.\(^{(3)}\) Yet, as neither of these diaries were written by men actually resident within Rossendale, some estimate of the applicability of their comments to the area is needed.

The chapelry of Coley was less than twelve miles distant from the east of Rossendale and was an area that had strong contacts with east Lancashire via the textile industry. Equally the two areas had similar geographic features, being part of the Pennine uplands and

---

\(^{(1)}\) See Chapter VIII, Sections B and C for a detailed discussion.

\(^{(2)}\) See Figure No II


almost certainly a similar interest in livestock farming. Heywood himself would appear to have no reason for bias in his diary which certainly appears to have a high degree of internal consistency. In contrast Lancaster lay about thirty miles to the north west of Rossendale, thus providing a view from the opposite direction from Yorkshire. Though not itself on the Pennines, it was surrounded to the east by these hills with their livestock farming. Stout had some contact with the northern woollen industry and thus can be expected to have had an interest in developments in the main woollen producing areas to the south east. Such an outside interest is indicated by many comments in the diary. The evidence of both these can be backed and a miscellany of local sources to provide corroboration.

The mortality crisis of 1672-6 is known to have coincided with a slump in the woollen industry if the West Riding of which the Rossendale area was an offshoot. The summer and early autumn of 1673 appears to have seen heavy rain and flooding in the Lancashire/Yorkshire border area that destroyed bridges and ruined much of the corn crop as well as disrupting further the local textile industry. Heywood indicates the severity of these floods when he comments "abundance of hurt is done in all parts by strange and almost unheard of floods". The spring of 1675 saw a drought that had a severe affect on livestock. 1675 also saw protests that the Irish cattle act of 1666 was hitting the exports of Lancashire manufacturers to Ireland. Heywood comments that 1675 saw an outbreak of the "Jolly

(3) ibid, Vol III, p 165
(4) J Thirsk and J.P. Cooper, ed, Seventeenth Century Economic Documents, 1972, p 156-158.
Rent", thought to be a form of severe influenza, on the Yorkshire side of the border.\(^1\) There is also evidence that smallpox was active in east Lancashire during this period of mortality crisis.\(^2\) Thus these years saw the area face a range of severe economic problems and the outbreak of a number of epidemics.

In contrast, there is no evidence of epidemic in the mortality crisis of 1683. Both Heywood and Stout make frequent references to outbreaks of epidemic but both are silent on this question, as are the quarter sessions records for 1684. The main problem in 1683 appears to have been the result of a mixture of economic and climatic problems building up from the beginning of the 1680's. The winter of 1680-1 was severe, resulting in both higher grain and fodder prices, this would hurt both local wage earners and pastoral farmers.\(^3\) Both Stout and Heywood confirm that the period from 1681-3 saw periods of severe drought which affected a large area around Rossendale. This also led to higher grain prices which would hit local wage earners and a fodder shortage hitting local livestock farmers.\(^4\) The winter of 1683-4 may also have been severe in Rossendale, Stout argues that snow and frost made this the most severe in memory in the Lancaster area and led to many sheep and cattle perishing.\(^5\) If the winter was severe it

---

\(^1\) ibid, Vol IV, p 326  
\(^2\) LRO/DD/Ke/9/44/21  
\(^3\) J.Horsfall Turner, op cit, vol II, p 185  
\(^4\) ibid, Vol II, p 185, Vol IV, p 69, 76, 97  
\(^5\) ibid, p 80  
E.L.Gones, Seasons and Prices, 1964, p 35 describes the winter of 1683-4 as one of the three longest and coldest winters in the last two hundred years.
would also have made the import of grain of the export of textiles
difficult for an area like Rossendale. The textile industry may also
have played a more direct role in the crisis, as from the end of 1681
it appears to have been hit by depression causing widespread poverty.\(^{(1)}\)
On this occasion, the main cause of the problem appears to have been
unfavourable climatic conditions, hitting local agriculture and trade
plus a possible depression in local textile activity.

The crisis of 1700 also appears to have been the culmination of
several years of adverse conditions. In 1697 and 1698 grain prices
were very unstable. A severe winter and spring drought in 1697 led
grain prices to rise from £1 2s. to £1 15s. per load whilst a wet summer
in 1698 forced prices up to similar levels again and forced the poor
to eat peas and beans.\(^{(2)}\) Though the price fell back in the Halifax
area following a late but good harvest, the harvest was very late and
prices remained high to the north of Rossendale.\(^{(3)}\) Stout argues that
1699 was also a year of dear corn, when oat meal reached 18s. per windle.\(^{(4)}\)
In Rossendale itself, a Quarter Sessions petition of 1699 complained
that corn was short and local badgers were giving short measure.\(^{(5)}\)
1699-1700 was also reputedly a famine year in the neighbouring parish
of Burnley.\(^{(6)}\) Such shortages would be made worse by the severe flooding

---

\(^{(1)}\) J.Horsfall Turner, op cit, Vol II, p 235
\(^{(2)}\) ibid, p 158 and 160
\(^{(3)}\) T.Whitaker, History of the Parish of Whalley, 1801, 4th edition,
1872, p 285
loc cit, p 125
\(^{(5)}\) LRO/QSP/822/3
\(^{(6)}\) W.Bennett, A History of Burnley, Part III, 1949, p 39
W.Bennett, A History of Marsden and Colne, 1957, p 140
which hit Rossendale during the winter of 1700-1. This flooding, as that in the 1670's, was of sufficient severity to damage bridges and therefore probably had a similar effect in disturbing local economic activity.

Little is known about the final mortality crisis of this period from 1712-13, as these years lie outside the coverage of the Heywood diary and prompt no comment from Stout. Stout's silence suggests that this may well have been a very localised mortality crisis.

These four periods of excessive mortality suggest that single factors in isolation were insufficient to cause the onset of crisis mortality.

This impression is strengthened by examination of those periods when one or more factors were present without the onset of excessive mortality. 1689 and 1690 were years of poor trade whilst the winter and spring of 1689-90 saw severe snow followed by drought by mid summer in east Lancashire. In addition, 1691 saw a severe outbreak of cattle plague (renderpest) which led to the suspension of markets and fairs and the discouragement of cattle movements in Blackburn Hundred. This disruption would have a severe effect on the beef/cattle trade based on Haslingden market and thus on a key sector of the economy of western Rossendale. Yet during these years mortality in Rossendale remained at unexceptional levels.

The same is true of 1696, when despite a trade depression, mortality remained stable, possibly due to a good harvest that year.

(1) LRiVQSP/857/8
(3) LRi/DD/Ke/2/1/11
In 1703, a further depression in the textile trade of east Lancashire had similarly little effect on local mortality.\(^{(1)}\)

---

SECTION D - CONCLUSION

Essentially this was a period in which the size of the population of Rossendale stagnated. Within the area, substantial variation was observable with modest growth occurring in the chapelry of Newchurch, but an absolute fall being recorded in the chapelry of Haslingden. In addition, the area as a whole appears to have recorded a net loss through migration.

In Rossendale as a whole both the birth and death rates made a positive contribution to the stability in population size. Surprisingly, Haslingden consistently recorded a higher birth rate than Newchurch, but this was more than offset by the much higher death rate recorded in Haslingden.

The general decline recorded in the Rossendale birth rate in this period appears to have been largely due to a decline in the marriage rate. This factor may also help explain why the Haslingden birth rate remained above that of Newchurch. Marital fertility probably played no more than a modest role in the fall, as it remained stable, as did its component elements. Yet this fertility pattern may help to explain, along with the marriage rate, the generally higher birth rate found in Haslingden than in Newchurch.

No simple mono causal explanation can be invoked to explain the periods of crisis mortality particularly in Haslingden chapelry prior to 1716. In each of the crisis period, a mixture of factors were at work, the most prominent of which appears to have been climate, grain prices and the state of trade rather than epidemic working independently. The isolated presence of one of these problems, particularly where it was short lived, does not appear to have been generally capable of causing a period of crisis mortality.
CHAPTER IV
THE PATTERN OF SETTLEMENT AND TRANSPORT
1650-1715

There is strong evidence for the existence of a comprehensive and fixed basic road network in mid seventeenth century Rossendale. Such a route running from north to south through Haslingden shown in an extant map of around 1580 whilst a similar north/south route through Bacup existed by 1608. Quarter Sessions petitions and orders show that by 1650 a number of subsidiary routes had developed, linking up the various settlements of the area particularly a route running from Haslingden via Newchurch to Bacup.\(^{(1)}\) There is no evidence of any major changes in this basic system down to 1715.

The quality of these local roads left much to be desired. Many of the smaller intra Rossendale routes were probably little more than crude track ways. This is clearly indicated by the fact that it was no means unusual for these routes to be obstructed by encroachments on to the waste and common in the early seventeenth century.\(^{(2)}\) Despite periodic protests about the decayed state of the roads, townships were often indifferent or apathetic when it came to making a

---

\(^{(1)}\) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 113-117
H. Fishwick, History of the Parish of Rochdale, 1889, p 81
LRD/Q50 & QSP/passim

serious attempt at road maintenance. (1)

Against this background of indolence, the harshness of the local climate could have a severe effect on the network. During the hard winter of 1701 it was noted that:

"The damages this last flood has made in Blackburn Hundred is so great that there is a present necessity for the repairing of our bridges which requires a great deal of pain . . . the ways and roads (at present) not being passable." (2)

Together with human apathy and a harsh climate the ruggedness of local terrain meant that the quality of east Lancashire transport remained rudimentary during the seventeenth century with the use of waggons being relatively rare. (3)

Despite the limitations possibly inhibiting local expansion it should also be noted that the same argument can also be put in reverse, that this network was adequate to meet the modest demands placed on it thus partly explaining the reluctance of townships to play a more active part in maintaining their roads.

The road network generally avoided both the valley bottom and the upland land peaks of Rossendale. (4) The human settlement pattern exhibited a similar distribution.

For present purposes the term "settlement" has been taken to cover all physically distinct named places of residence recorded in

(1) LRQ/QSP/10/11
LRQ/QSP/780/8

(2) LRQ/QSP/857/8


(4) See Map No IV
the contemporary chapelry registers of baptisms and burials. (1)

These registers indicate that as in most other parts of the northern uplands of England in the seventeenth century, dispersed settlement was the norm. (2) During the three sub periods under review never more than twenty five per cent of settlements recorded more than four baptisms and burials. (3)

In terms of entries and listings and therefore size, two settlements stood out, Haslingden in the west and Bacup in the east of Rossendale. The listings suggest that these two were twice as large as any other settlement. Despite this they only accounted for a tiny proportion of the local population, Bacup accounting for around only two per cent and Haslingden around three per cent of listings in the combined chapelries in each of the three sub periods. (4) Given the tiny size of even these two settlements it is likely that their birth rates were in line with their respective chapelries as a whole. If this assumption is accepted, the stability of the Haslingden and Bacup listings suggests that there was no significant trend towards urbanisation during the period.

(1) See Appendix III for a discussion of the limitations of this source.

(2) See Map No VIIa

(3) 1661-5 24% of eighty eight settlements
     1678-85 16% of eighty five settlements
     1701-9  19% of one hundred and thirty two settlements

(4) Total Entries for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>1661-5</th>
<th>1678-82</th>
<th>1701-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacup</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assumption about the birth rates of the two also permits a rough estimation of the growth trend and absolute size of the settlements. This can be done by converting the settlement's baptism listings into population figures at the rate suggested by the overall chapelry birth rate.

On this basis the population of Haslingden grew modestly in the third quarter of the seventeenth century after which an era of stagnation set in whilst at Bacup stagnation continued throughout the period. Thus whilst Bacup started as being substantially larger than Haslingden, by the end of the period the gap had narrowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bacup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661-5</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>1661-5</td>
<td>150-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678-82</td>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>1681-5</td>
<td>150-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705-9</td>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>1701-5</td>
<td>150-200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As ninety five per cent of the local population lived outside these two centres the focus of attention must now be shifted to the smaller population centres. Most of these were merely farmsteads though a few settlements particularly Newchurch, but also Tunstead and Constables, all in central Rossendale, appear to have rather larger than mere farmsteads.

More significant was the distribution of this population by altitude. Throughout the period a steady eighty five to ninety per cent of the population resided in settlements lying between the six hundred and eleven hundred foot contour lines with around two thirds
of the total residing in the much smaller band between the six and nine hundred foot contours.  

Distribution of Population  
by Altitude 1661-1709  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>1661-1665</th>
<th>1678-1682</th>
<th>1701-1709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-99</td>
<td>9 ( 4%)</td>
<td>6 ( 3%)</td>
<td>16 ( 5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-99</td>
<td>48 (21%)</td>
<td>37 (19%)</td>
<td>44 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-99</td>
<td>42 (18%)</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
<td>63 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-99</td>
<td>63 (28%)</td>
<td>54 (28%)</td>
<td>99 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-99</td>
<td>31 (13%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>43 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-99</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
<td>44 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100-99</td>
<td>8 ( 4%)</td>
<td>8 ( 4%)</td>
<td>4 ( 1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200-99</td>
<td>4 ( 2%)</td>
<td>3 ( 2%)</td>
<td>10 ( 3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,300-99</td>
<td>1 ( 0%)</td>
<td>4 ( 2%)</td>
<td>12 ( 3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,400-99</td>
<td>- ( 0%)</td>
<td>- ( 0%)</td>
<td>9 ( 3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>226 (100%)</td>
<td>196 (100%)</td>
<td>344 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern of avoiding the valley bottoms and upland peaks is not surprising. The exposed uplands had limited agricultural potential, were cold and exposed and were difficult for transport. The low lying areas were often marshy which limited agrarian and transport potential. In addition they were open to periodic malarial outbreaks.  

The low land areas adjacent to both Bacup and Haslingden were swampy prior to the nineteenth century.  

---

(1) These figures excluded the Bacup and Haslingden figures which would have increased the totals to ninety five per cent between the six and eleven hundred foot contours and over sixty five per cent between the six and nine hundred foot contours.

(2) See Map No VII a and b

(3) W. Lee, Sanitary Conditions in Bacup, 1849, p 6-8

(4) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 200
intermediate areas avoided these problems whilst having adequate supplies of running water and on occasion, outcrops of coal.¹

The majority of these small dispersed centres of population were on farmsteads. The majority of these appear to have been single units consisting of a farm house, farm buildings and land. The development of a number of these can be traced throughout this period. In 1657, part of the Carterplace estate at Haslingden consisted of two farm houses, buildings and land, a position that remained unchanged in 1726.² A property of Dadwencloough experienced similar stability between 1698 and 1725, and one at Turf House, Haslingden from 1673 until well after 1715.³ The increase in the rural population in Newchurch chapelry appears to have been largely met by sub-dividing farms. In 1688 a farm at Hugh Mill consisted of a single dwelling but by 1709 two houses were present on the farm.⁴ This was probably not true of Haslingden with its contracting population. Indeed in 1698 another farm at Carterplace was occupied by two families but by 1723 this had fallen back to one.⁵

Taken together it appears that this was essentially a period of stability for both the transport and settlement structure of Rossendale. The basic road network already existed by 1650 and remained little extended down to 1716. A combination of natural and man made factors meant that the quality of this network was low but

² E.Chadwick and J. Boardman, Reports on the Estates of Sir Andrew Chadwick with Life and History, 1881, passim
³ LRA/DD/Fo/38/1 and 3
⁴ LRA/DDX/118/103/2 and 7
⁵ LRA/DDX/118/129/2 and 3
against this the demands on the network were probably also modest. The pattern of settlement was one of dispersal with no evidence of moves towards urbanisation before 1716. Equally, the only two centres of any note, Haslingden and Bacup, remained unchallenged. Distribution by altitude showed equally little movement, virtually all the population resident between the six and eleven hundred foot contours especially between six and nine hundred foot.
CHAPTER V
PER CAPITA WEALTH 1650-1715

It is not possible to ascertain per capita wealth levels in late seventeenth century Rossendale with any precision. However, sufficient data is available to provide some general indication of the experience.

The subsidy return of 1660 provides an initial guide in this respect for the beginning of the period. This tax attempted to assess the annual value of local estates. The tax return covered a fairly high proportion of local households covering a total of four hundred and fifteen out of a total of six hundred and seventy families in the 1650 household estimate (sixty two per cent). A comparison between this return and the 1650 manorial rental and the 1662 hearth tax return suggests that the lay subsidy return covers virtually all of the wealthiest groups in Rossendale. In all three sources the same families appear as dominant and the values recorded, though not strictly comparable are generally consistent with each other. As a result, it appears

(1) For the purpose of analysis in all the non demographic chapters Rossendale has been divided into four sub areas: (a) Neuchurch Chapelry, (b) Haslingden Township, (c) Haslingden Chapelry i.e. those parts of the chapelry outside Haslingden Township plus the township of Dunnockshaw, (d) South Rossendale - the townships of Yate and Pickup Bank, Musbury, Coupe Lench, New Hall Hey and Hall Carr.

(2) PRO/E179/250/4


that the missing thirty eight per cent of the local population excluded from the survey were probably the poorest members of local society.

It is against this background that the evidence of the lay subsidy return must be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Value of the Estate</th>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Southern Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ 0–£4</td>
<td>99 (72%)</td>
<td>61 (72%)</td>
<td>68 (58%)</td>
<td>43 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 5–£24</td>
<td>33 (24%)</td>
<td>20 (24%)</td>
<td>49 (42%)</td>
<td>32 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25–£49</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (–)</td>
<td>– (–)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50–£75</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>– (–)</td>
<td>– (–)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td>84 (100%)</td>
<td>118 (100%)</td>
<td>76 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures indicate clearly that the level of per capita wealth in all parts of Rossendale was extremely low. In all parts of the area virtually all of the population had estates valued at under £50 per annum. The only two exceptions to this were assessed only a little higher at £50 and £60 respectively. Beneath this £50 per annum figure some variation is observable within the area. In the township and chapelry of Haslingden well under one third of the population recorded estates valued at over £5 per annum. In the

---

(1) The township of Haslingden is taken to cover, as the name suggests, the area within the township.

The chapelry of Haslingden is taken to cover those parts of that chapelry outside the township of Haslingden, namely the townships of Henheads, Higher and Lower Booths and Dunnockshaw.

The chapelry of Newchurch is taken to cover, as the name suggests, all the area within the chapelry.

Southern Rossendale is taken to cover all those parts of Rossendale being outside of the two above chapelries, namely the townships of Coupe, Lench, New Hall Hey and Hall Carr, Musbury and Yate and Pickup Bank. See Map No 7.

(2) Both were in the west of the area.
chapelry of Newchurch and in Southern Rossendale, the equivalent figure jumped to well over forty per cent. Thus within the low absolute levels of per capita wealth the levels recorded in the latter areas appears to have been generally rather higher and more evenly distributed than in the former areas.

This picture of poverty is generally confirmed by the Hearth Tax returns of the 1660's. In 1663 under two per cent of the three hundred and forty six Rossendale households to pay hearth taxes paid on more than two hearths, and under five per cent of households paid on more than one heath. If the figures for those exempted on grounds of poverty were included, these percentages would have been even further reduced. (1) A certain degree of geographic variation is also observable as in the poll tax data.

Rossendale Hearth Tax Returns 1663

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Hearths</th>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Southern Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) PRO/E179/250/8 Rossendale Hearth Tax return 1663
In all areas the majority of households were little above the poverty line adopted by the assessors. This was especially so outside the township of Haslingden. It was only within the township that any substantial households appear to have been found.

Together these two sources suggest two basic features about the wealth structure of Rossendale in the middle of the seventeenth century. Per capita wealth was usually very low especially in the west of Rossendale and was generally very evenly distributed especially in the east of Rossendale. (1)

There is an absence of comparable sources for the latter part of this period which makes it impossible to provide a similar analysis for the period up to 1715. However, the probate inventories do provide a limited guide to local wealth trends between the two dates. Before such trends can be considered the limitations of this source must be clarified.

Probate inventories have several weaknesses that may undermine their value as a source of an analysis of local wealth. Not all local residents left wills and thus inventories. This is thought particularly true of the poorest elements within any community. Yet within the Rossendale area there is evidence that this problem may not be a major danger. This is because of the nature of the local wealth pyramid in which the vast majority of the population were barely in or even below taxable levels. Thus the majority of local inventories relate to people on or near the poverty line. In consequence, the economic position of many of those leaving inventories was little better than those

(1) Against this is must be acknowledged that if wealth in the form of rights over waste and minerals were included, the level of per capita wealth would have been increased – see Chapter VIII Section A.
who did not. Equally problematic is that inventories ignore wealth in the form of real property.\(^{(1)}\) The importance of real property in the wealth structure was probably relatively stable as this was a period of demographic, and as will be indicated in later sections, relative economic stagnation. If this is so, fluctuations in the absolute level of personal wealth may well reflect fluctuations in overall wealth. On some occasions, it appears that much of an individual's personal estate had been transferred to beneficiaries prior to death leading to a falsely low reading of per capita wealth. This problem can be reduced by omitting all cases where the paucity of inventory goods suggest that such under recording is probable. A further problem concerns the accuracy of valuation by inventory appraisors. Such appraisors are generally felt to have tended to under value goods. Yet such appraisors were usually local and the appraisal done within a short period after the testator's death. Local inventories show that in many cases goods were given detailed individual valuation rather than a general standardised valuation. Thus, it is felt that the degree of inaccuracy from this source was probably modest. In addition, so long as the degree of inaccuracy was stable it would not diminish the value of inventories in plotting fluctuations in per capita personal wealth. A final problem concerns the number of inventories available for analysis. For the period 1650-1715 two hundred and fifty six local adult male inventories are extant.\(^{(2)}\) This compares with a total of around six thousand burials recorded in the same period. The size of the sample is not

\(^{(1)}\) Leasehold value is often given.

\(^{(2)}\) All subsequent references to inventories relate to adult male inventories unless otherwise specified.
as small as the above figures would suggest as women and children may well have accounted for over three quarters of these burials. Thus, the number of adult male burials was probably under one and a half thousand so that the inventories provide a sample of up to twenty per cent rather than the under five per cent that would be initially suggested. Thus, whilst the limitations of inventories are appreciated, it is felt that they do provide a crude general guide to local per capita wealth trends.

On this basis, the average net value of all Rossendale inventories between 1650 and 1715 comes out at £97 6s 4d. This overall average was close to the decadal average throughout the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century as the following breakdown indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average Values</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1651-60</td>
<td>£100 5s 3d</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-70</td>
<td>£100 3s 0d</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-80</td>
<td>£82 19s 4d</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-90</td>
<td>£112 5s 2d</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-00</td>
<td>£88 11s 2d</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-10</td>
<td>£94 0s 6d</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711-15</td>
<td>£91 9s 2d</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern suggests a stagnation in the level of per capita wealth during the period. It is perhaps also of significance that the most sluggish decade demographically was the 1670's which was also

(1) Within this pattern, seasonal variations were present. As this was generally a period of price stability, price fluctuations cannot be seen to undermine the trends revealed by the above figures.
the decade when average inventory values reached their lowest points.

The distribution of inventory values suggests that the pattern of wealth distribution in Rossendale remained relatively stable throughout the period whilst the vast majority of cases remained at a very low level of personal per capita wealth.

### Distribution of Wealth within Rossendale Inventories: By Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>1651-60</th>
<th>1661-70</th>
<th>1671-80</th>
<th>1681-90</th>
<th>1691-1700</th>
<th>1701-10</th>
<th>1711-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ 0-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 50-99</td>
<td>≤1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£150-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£200-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£300-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£350-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£400-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£450-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each decade over sixty per cent of inventories left under £100 with eighty five per cent under £200. More significant is that these trends were sustained throughout the period.
### Percentage Distribution of Inventories by Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Percentage of all Inventories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under £100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-90</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711-15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This general distribution was found in all parts of Rossendale.

### Distribution of Inventories by Value and Sub Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>South Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under £100</td>
<td>Under £200</td>
<td>Under £100</td>
<td>Under £200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1675</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1700</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1715</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No of Cases
- Haslingden Township: 71
- Haslingden Chapelry: 63
- Newchurch Chapelry: 65
- South Rossendale: 48

Yet though the wealth distribution was generally similar throughout Rossendale, the trends in absolute levels varied significantly.
## Rossendale Average Inventory Values by Sub Area and Sub Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Nouchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>No of Cases</td>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>No of Cases</td>
<td>Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-1675</td>
<td>£73 10s 7d</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>£97 4s 10d</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£77 13s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1715</td>
<td>£73 4s 7d</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£126 16s 10d</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£110 7s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-1715</td>
<td>£73 9s 0d</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>£118 9s 2d</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£95 0s 7d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures of lower and stagnant absolute per capita wealth levels in the township of Haslingden compared with the rest of Rossendale are probably linked to the more depressed demographic experience of the township down to 1715.

Despite the generally equitable per capita wealth distribution of Rossendale which allows the inventories to be of more than usual value, it would be useful to obtain some direct indication of the fate of the poorest elements in the local community in the period.\(^1\) Those who were not self supporting or supported by their family or friends would be forced to fall back on assistance from either private charity or township poor relief. The role of private charity in supporting the local poor appears to have been minimal. Gastrell's survey at the end of this period suggests that there were no charities within Rossendale for the support of the poor, though local charities did exist for other purposes.\(^2\) A modest amount of charitable poor relief may have come from outside the immediate area. This was certainly the case in the late sixteenth century when local paupers were in receipt of charitable relief from Read to the north of Rossendale.\(^3\) Yet it is extremely unlikely that charitable relief was of any significance in supporting the local poor before 1715, township relief must have shouldered virtually the entire burden.

Data is available on such poor relief for only a limited part of this period and for a limited part of the area. The poor relief

\(^1\) The structure of the local economy suggests wage labour was limited. See Chapters VIII and IX.


expenditure totals are available for Tottington Higher End from the late 1670's. This area was partially within Rossendale where it encompassed Musbury, Coupe-Lench, New Hall Hay and Hall Carr.\(^{(1)}\)

A more detailed breakdown is available from 1691 for the townships of Higher and Lower Booths which together virtually made up the chapelry of Haslingden, outside of the township of the same name.\(^{(2)}\)

Unfortunately neither provide data for the major demographic crisis period of the mid 1670's.

The available poor law data suggests that the level of expenditure on poor relief was generally stable from the 1670's until around 1710:

\[
\text{Annual Average Poor Law Disbursement in Parts of Rossendale}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Tottington Higher End</th>
<th>Higher and Lower Booths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Years Covered</td>
<td>Annual Average Disbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£16 9s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£19 2s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£20 13s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£37 0s 2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such figures cannot be taken as confirming a growth in the level of expenditure.

\(\text{(1) M&M/MF/117a} \)

\(\text{(2) LAA/PR/2859/8} \)

\(\text{(3) A similar pattern is observable in the neighbouring parish of Bury: 1691-1700 £78 0s 10d} \)

\(\text{1701-1710 £69 4s 0d} \)

\(\text{1711-1715 £60 17s 4d} \)

\(\text{See M.Gray, A History of Bury, Lancashire 1660-1876, 1970, Table JIIa} \)
of poverty within Rossendale, as by no means all the disbursements were spent strictly on poor relief. Yet if the annual average number of paupers in receipt of relief in Higher and Lower Booths is calculated, a similar picture emerges.\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Average Number of People in Receipt of Poor Relief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Booths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711-1715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet how applicable is the experience of these townships to the rest of Rossendale? The data on average inventory value shows that the chapelry of Haslingden had the highest absolute values throughout the period. Yet it is also clear that this was also the area where the distribution of per capita wealth was at its most equitable so that the majority of the local population were probably no better off than in the surrounding areas of Haslingden township and may even be worse off than in the surrounding of Rossendale where per capita wealth distribution was more equitable. In this sense, the townships may have been typical of Rossendale. Though the figures for Tottington Higher End show a much greater rise in poor relief expenditure, the bulk of this increase stems from the period immediately before 1715. Thus the two sources tend to tally in suggesting that the problem of poverty was relatively stable, certainly down to 1710.

Taken together the probate inventory and poor law data indicates that the absolute level of per capita wealth and the distribution of that wealth both remained relatively unchanged in this period.

\(^1\) The Tottington data does not permit the same breakdown.
Within the area some variations in the level and trends of absolute wealth were probable. In the township of Haslingden and in South Rossendale, the absolute levels of wealth stagnated whereas in the chapelries of Newchurch and Haslingden they grew. By 1715, the township of Haslingden appears to have been by far the most impoverished area of Rossendale.
CHAPTER VI
THE ECONOMIC FRAMEWORK 1650-1715

Any attempt to analyse the economic framework of an area must be heavily influenced by the nature of the society involved and the nature of the data available.

In pre-industrial societies, work of all descriptions was labour intensive, thus the best guide to the economic framework of an area probably lies in its occupational structure. In the case of Rossendale, this is the only practical way of undertaking such an analysis as it is only via the occupational data recorded in the local chapelries that anything like a comprehensive or long run set of data becomes available. Indeed, in this case, even the data from the local chapelry registers does not give a good long run coverage for the full period.

Before such an occupational analysis can be of any use, its limitations must be appreciated. Contemporary probate inventories indicate that any occupational title given to or claimed by an individual is likely to be an over simplification and thus be misleading as a guide to local economic activity or the income sources of the local population. This is because dual employment appears to have been the norm throughout the area. There are sufficient extant inventories for people of various social ranks, including labourers, to indicate that dual employment permeated all sections of local society.

It is almost impossible to estimate the overall relative importance of different sources of income either to an individual or to the
local economy in this period. This is because the inventories merely list the value of the personal possessions of the subject, and these are probably not a good indicator of the relative importance of those sectors to the income of the inventory subject. In the case of Rossendale, this danger was certainly present. The local economy was predominantly based on textiles and pastoral agriculture.\(^1\) Textiles, as will be indicated in a later section, required little fixed capital investment relative to that required in pastoral agriculture.\(^2\) This would be particularly true if there was an employee class of local textile workers. The best that can be done is to indicate that most local farmers had some income from textiles by-employment, whilst the majority of textile workers had some agricultural by-employment. Many local tradesmen and craftsmen were in a similar position, indeed some had income from both agriculture and textiles as well as their trade or craft. Thus, it is in this context of dual employment that the subsequent sections should be considered, for at best changes in the occupational structure can only provide an approximate indication of the nature of and changes in the local economic framework.

A further problem lies in the fact that the local chapelry registers only provide a limited chronological coverage of local occupations. The Haslingden and Newchurch registers only list male occupations from 1705, and in the case of Newchurch, such listings cease from 1707. This creates a major problem in getting any estimate of the occupational structure prior to 1705.

---

\(^1\) British Library/\textit{Stowe MSS} 132/ p 150. Haslingden and Rossendale were named as two of the thirty one centres of the woollen industry in Lancashire in a survey of 1611.

\(^2\) Though circulating capital was also required, the specifically textile element of circulating capital was not normally isolated in contemporary inventories.
Probate inventories despite their general limitations considered earlier can be of value here as they provide an abundance of economic data for the period prior to 1705 whilst also partly overcoming the problem caused by dual employment in the period from 1705. On the basis of the inventories one hundred and fifty two or nearly sixty per cent of the available inventories had some degree of textile employment. The importance of the textile sector is also indirectly indicated by the manorial rentals of the area of 1650 and 1662. In Wolfenden and Wolfenden Booth, both in Newchurch chapelry, land holders held an average of a mere eighteen and nineteen statute acres respectively.\(^{(1)}\) Given the limited agrarian potential of Rossendale, such a small average acreage would be insufficient to support a family without recourse to some form of by-employment. A comparison of the list of land owners recorded in the 1662 rental with the Poll Tax return of 1660 indicates that a substantial proportion of local inhabitants held no land at all.\(^{(2)}\) It is likely that some local inhabitants may have occupied land via sub-tenancies, but if this was so, the number of landless people involved would have reduced the size of the average tenancy even further below that required for the successful support of a family purely from the land. Thus, it is likely that a majority of the local population had some form of non agrarian income.

There are several reasons for the view that most of this non-agrarian income was derived from textiles. The chapelry registers of Newchurch at this time indicate that central Rossendale had no large settlements, indeed they were largely covered by small dispersed

\(^{(1)}\) PRO/E179/250/4 Farrer, ed. Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, Vol III, passim

\(^{(2)}\) PRO/E179/250/4
farmsteads. Such a distribution would not be consistent with the presence of a large number of trades or craftsmen, which would be likely to have led to the establishment of a more nucleated settlement. In a negative sense, this view is confirmed by the available documentary evidence which indicates that tradesmen and craftsmen were extremely rare in the Rossendale area. The view that textiles were an important source of local employment in the mid seventeenth century is also indicated by the more quantifiable evidence available from neighbouring areas. The occupational structure indicated by two hundred and forty six marriages registered in the parish of Rochdale between 1653 and 1657 shows fifty one per cent of grooms to have been employed in agriculture with thirty per cent employed in textiles.\(^1\) In Radcliffe, which like Rochdale lay just to the south of Rossendale, sixty one baptisms between 1657 and 1659 showed forty nine per cent of fathers to be employed in textiles and only twenty three per cent in agriculture.\(^2\) To the north west of Rossendale in the township of Accrington, the Poll Tax return of 1660 classified twenty out of ninety six recorded heads of households to have been employed in textiles.\(^3\) Thus Rossendale was bounded both to the north and south by areas where the occupational structure was dominated by textiles and agriculture. Rossendale had a similar physical structure and historical experience to many of these areas, and as such can be expected to have had a similar occupational and economic framework. This would suggest that by 1660 somewhere between twenty per cent and forty per cent of the population of Rossendale saw themselves as primarily employed in textiles, and between seventy and


\(^2\) ibid, p 49-53

\(^3\) RAN/E179/250/4/Poll Tax Return 1660.
eighty per cent in textiles and agriculture combined.

Though this data from neighbouring areas is limited and needs treating with caution it does imply a possible decline in the importance of textiles from the south and east to the north and west of Rossendale. Local probate inventories tend to confirm this impression.

### Distribution of Rossendale Inventories by Presence of Textile Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Textiles Present</th>
<th>Textiles Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Rossendale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above impression of the variable impact of textiles in differing parts of Rossendale is confirmed when the analysis is done on the basis of the extent of per capita financial involvement in textiles.

### Financial Commitment to Textiles in Differing Parts of Rossendale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Average Value of Textiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£ 9 18s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£10 1s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>£11 4s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>£ 4 9s 0d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable penetration seen in textile activity was not repeated in the case of agriculture as the following figures indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Agriculture Present</th>
<th>Agriculture Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>256</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus in the period down to 1700 it is clear that textiles and agriculture together dominated the Rossendale economic structure. In addition, it appears that the importance of textiles probably declined from the south and east to the north and west of the area. Only within the town of Haslingden was this general pattern significantly distorted by the presence of a number of tradesmen and craftsmen.

This outline of the economic structure of Rossendale can be built up in more detail by using, as indicated earlier, the occupational listings from the chapelry registers of Haslingden and Newchurch. Once the danger of double counting entries has been removed the local baptism and burial registers suggest the following occupational structure:
### Occupational Structure of Rossendale by Sub Area 1705-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Type</th>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>South Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Cases</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>No of Cases</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades and Crafts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paupers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) It must be acknowledged that such registers cover adult male occupations only and thus only cover a portion of the total economically active portion of the population. Nor do they distinguish between the economically active and the economically inactive members of even the adult male labour force.
The most obvious feature of these figures is that they clearly confirm that together agriculture and textiles dominated the local occupational structure. By the early eighteenth century, textiles were accounting for nearly forty per cent of all Rossendale listings. This figure is near the upper margins suggested for the neighbouring areas in the mid seventeenth century. This suggests that the period from 1650-1715 may have seen little change in the overall occupational structure of Rossendale. Further confirmation of this probable stability comes in the variation in the occupational structure in different parts of Rossendale.

These trends also tie neatly in with the observed demographic experience. This appears to have been a period of stagnation in both the demographic and economic structure of the area. It is also noticeable that the area of greatest demographic stagnation, the township of Haslingden was also the most impoverished part of Rossendale economically. In turn the most impoverished area was also the area where textiles appear to have made their least impact.

In order to consider these aspects more closely, it is now required to go more fully into the experiences of the different branches of the local economy in this period.
In the previous section it was made clear that the local occupational structure was dominated by agriculture and textiles. However, most of the residue was made up by a range of trades and craftsmen. In this section, the nature, extent and location of such activities will be explored in more detail.

The position of local trades and crafts in the mid seventeenth century can only be built up from a wide range of sources. This mixed nature of these sources prevent them being used to estimate the relative importance of different trades and crafts. Despite this, they do provide a rough estimation of the nature, range and location of such services.

Sixteen men can be identified as working in Rossendale trade and craft services in the 1660's. Of these three were blacksmiths, three inkeepers, two tailors, two shoemakers, two tradesmen, one corn nnuller, one mason, one carpenter and one pedlar.\(^{(1)}\) This suggests that the area could only support a very narrow range of basic services. The limited range of specialist retailers and the presence of a pedlar suggests that the area was still in the process of change from the era of the itinerant retailers to that of the resident retailer. In turn, this suggests a low but rising level of consumer demand.

\(^{(1)}\) Wills and Inventories. Haslingden and Newchurch Chapelry Registers.
PRO/E179/250/4.
Fourteen out of the sixteen men involved in local services were resident in the settlement of Haslingden, making this the only service centre in the Rossendale area. This paucity of resident service workers outside of Haslingden suggests that the rest of Rossendale relied on neighbouring market towns for the provision of basic services. In western Rossendale, Haslingden clearly acted as this centre, but in eastern Rossendale the pull of Rochdale and Burnley was probably stronger.

This provisional view of trades and crafts must be tested against the more abundant data available on local services in the period 1650-1700 as a whole. In this period, the occupations of thirty service workers are known. This list indicates that the local services remained extremely rudimentary. In addition to the earlier list, a mercer, a tanner, a cooper and a skinner were resident about two thirds of the list still consisted of innkeepers, blacksmiths, tailors, shoemakers and carpenters. The dominance of Haslingden remained with nearly fifty per cent of total listings, with the remaining fifty per cent being lightly scattered throughout the rest of Rossendale.

A more comprehensive guide is available from the occupational listings in the chapelry registers from 1705-1709. During this period, forty five service workers were recorded as resident in Rossendale. However, the range of services remained both extremely narrow and basic. The only occupational additions to earlier lists were three wrights, two carriers, a butcher and a painter. The predominance of innkeeping, blacksmiths, tailors, shoemakers and carpenters remained as

---

(1) The occupational listings in the Newchurch chapelry register suggest that even at the end of the period, Bacup was still a specialist textile manufacturing centre.
they accounted for over half of the list as compared with two thirds between 1650 and 1700. The dominance of Haslingden again remained strong with almost forty per cent of listings, the rest being widely scattered throughout Rossendale.\(^1\)

Taken together the period 1650-1715 appears to have been one of stability for the Rossendale service sector, the range and sophistication of services were minimal whilst the settlement of Haslingden was and remained the only centre of any significance.

In addition to its permanent resident services the village of Haslingden also possessed the right to a fair. The fair was in operation from the mid sixteenth century if not earlier.\(^2\) The right to the profits of this fair lay with the crown until 1662 when this right was granted along with the whole of the Honor of Clitheroe to George Monk, Duke of Albermarle.\(^3\) In 1639 the right to the profits of this fair plus those at Burnley and Colne were leased for thirty nine years to Jane Konyon of Parkhead.\(^4\) In 1670 this lease expired to be replaced by a new one for ninety nine years or three lives and the coverage extended to include the fairs at Blackburn and Padiham.\(^5\)


\(^2\) First Report of the Royal Commission on Market Rights and Tolls Vol I, 1889, p.108-130 lists all fairs and markets established by Letters Patent between I John and 22 Edward IV. Haslingden is absent from this list suggesting that the fair was not established until after that date.

\(^3\) Woodcock, Haslingden, A Topographical Survey, p. 80-81

\(^4\) LRQ/DD/Ke/5/173

\(^5\) LRQ/DD/Ke/5/174-180. In the value of these fairs over and above rent was put at £40 - ARQ/E317/2/p 78
The lease remained in the Kenyon family down to 1714, for in that year George Kenyon, one of the named lives in the 1670 lease, granted a seven year sub lease on all the fairs but that at Blackburn to Richard Brown, an innkeeper of Rumsworth and Syman Haydock, a husbandman of Over Hulton. (1)

The size of the rental involved in these leases and sub leases provides a crude indication of the profitability and growth of these local fairs. The figures available suggest that the value of east Lancashire fairs was generally downward from 1670 until after 1710:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Annual Value of Lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>£20 0s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>£20 0s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>£15 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>£16 0s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the seventeenth century, the fair at Haslingden was a twice annual event held on the 27th April and on the 21st September. (2) By the middle of the eighteenth century and possibly before 1715, these had been joined by an additional date on 24th June. (3)

The fairs at Haslingden appear to have been concerned with livestock and general commodities trade. There is no evidence that these fairs had any significant relationship with the growing local textile industry. The structure of the tollage charges suggests the presence of a livestock and general fair. From time immemorial a toll of 4d per horse, 2d per cow or calf, 3d per pig and ½d per sheep sold, had

(1) LRO/DD/Ke/5/182
(2) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 83.
to be paid and a tollage and stallage of 2d paid on every stall set up at the fair.\(^1\)

The trade in livestock attracted buyers and sellers from throughout Lancashire. The accounts of the Shuttleworth family of Burnley show them to have used Haslingden to dispose of stock in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In 1617, they sold an old ox for £4 14s and in 1621 sold twenty wethers for 7s 4d each.\(^2\) By the end of the seventeenth century people were attracted from over an even greater area. In the April 1704 fair, the agent of Nicholas Blundell bought twenty four wethers for £7 and paid the required 8d toll. At the September fair of 1709, the agent returned to buy two cows for £5 8s.\(^3\) The Blundell estates were at Crosby over forty miles to the south west of Rossendale.

Little detail is known about the fair's trade in general consumer commodities, though this too appears to have been capable of attracting people from outside the area. In 1705 Richard Kay, a wealthy yeoman and dissenter of Bury, bought a variety of religious tracts at Haslingden fair, which suggests that the market may have provided some quite sophisticated services.\(^4\) Despite this the main market services were probably supplying the more basic needs of the local inhabitants for such things as domestic utensils and agricultural equipment.

---

\(^1\) Woodcock, *Haslingden: A Topographical History*, p 82


\(^4\) M. Gray, *A History of Bury, Lancashire from 1660-1876*, p 27
In addition to the fair, Haslingden also appears to have been the site for a weekly market. In 1686, Blome described the town as "a very small town with a market on Wednesday".\(^{(1)}\) However, nothing is known about the activities of this market.

The overall position of trades and crafts in Rossendale between 1650 and 1715 is quite clearcut. The only centre of any significance was the village of Haslingden with its resident services, fairs and possible market. Within the village, this service sector was probably generally stable down to 1715 though no other centres emerged within Rossendale to challenge it. In consequence, the range of services provided remained very basic.

---

(1) RPL/Stephenson Notebook FSS, p 18
CHAPTER VIII
AGRICULTURE 1650-1715

SECTION A - NATURE OF LAND TENURE

As a pre-requisite to the study of the agrarian sector in Rossendale, some attempt should be made to understand the nature of land tenure in the area. This is particularly so as the system of land tenure in the Honor of Clitheroe is thought to have been unique. (1)

The Honor of Clitheroe was divided into seven manors, one of which was the Manor of Accrington. The Manor of Accrington was further subdivided into four units, two of which were Haslingden township and the Forest of Rossendale. (2)

Most of the acreage in the two Rossendale units were held in the form of copyhold. Freehold was restricted to less than three hundred acres all of which were located in the township of Haslingden. (3) This freehold had been granted at various times mainly in the medieval period to the Holden family of Haslingden. (4) There is no evidence that this freehold acreage was increased in the two centuries after the Restoration.

It appears that the customs of the Honor of Clitheroe were "substantially similar in all the Manors in the Honor". (5) The manorial

---

(1) LRO/DDX/152/39 Enquiry of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries into the Copyhold of the Honor of Clitheroe, p 1.
(2) ibid, p 2.
(3) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 9
(4) Woodcock, "Some Ewood Deeds, passim
(5) LRO/DDX/118/152/45
restrictions on this copyhold were very light so that the value of such copyhold "has always been equal to the value of the same land as freehold".\(^{(1)}\)

The copyhold of Rossendale fell into two types "old" hold and "new" hold. The copyholder of "old" hold land had to pay a fixed nominal rent of 4d per customary acre and 6d per customary acre for "new" land. There was no obvious divide between "new" and "old" hold. The land in Haslingden township was generally treated as "old" hold, that in the Forest of Rossendale as "new" hold. However, there are exceptions to this. Musbury, though in the Forest, was treated as "old" hold and Cribdenside, though in Haslingden, was treated as "new" hold. One farm in Oakenheadwood on the border between the two areas was part "old" hold and part "new" hold.\(^{(2)}\) The most likely answer is that all the land cultivated in the vill of Haslingden, the vaccaries of the Forest or the park of Musbury before 1507 was called "old" hold and that brought in following disafforestation was called "new" hold.

The land that remained unenclosed was treated as "new" hold in the manorial rental of 1662. The rental indicates that for common and waste land or land newly improved from the waste or common, a rent of 6d per customary acre was paid.\(^{(3)}\) The statute acreage derived from the rental closely coincides with the total statute acreage of Rossendale. It is also clear from the rental that most of common and waste

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/DDX/118/152/41

\(^{(2)}\) ibid, p 32

\(^{(3)}\) For the conversion of customary acres to statute acres see Appendix No II. Farrer, the Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, Vol III, p 422 sqq
acreage was held on an individual rather than a communal basis.\(^{(1)}\)

Yet not all such land was held individually. As late as 1675, Henheads Common was apportioned to the various booths of vaccaries that had made up pre disafforestation Rossendale.\(^{(2)}\) Eighteenth century land deeds reveal that the township of Haslingden also held waste land close to the heart of the settlement.\(^{(3)}\)

The extent of such waste and common in the later seventeenth century cannot be established with precision as it is not clearly distinguished from the rest of the newhold in the contemporary manorial survey rentals. Woodcock argues convincingly from the manorial court rolls that there was an extensive area of waste of up to five hundred and sixty acres at High Moor or the north western edge of Haslingden township.\(^{(4)}\) Extensive areas were also found at Horncliffe and Brandwood on the southern flanks of Rossendale.\(^{(5)}\) At Henheads to the north of Haslingden township, the common area consisted of eighty five acres in the mid seventeenth century.

In the period 1650-1715, the area of waste probably remained little changed. Indeed local wills confirm a possible desire by local landowners to keep the common and waste in an unchanged state. Thus in a surrender of 1680 attenement at Heyhead in Wolfendenbooth was surrendered: "without improvement to waste".\(^{(6)}\) Many other tenements

---

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/QSP/435/14
There is some evidence that though rented communally, the common land actually had been enclosed. One third of the area was rented by the neighbouring township of new Accrington: LRO/QSP/10/11.

\(^{(2)}\) See Chapter XV

\(^{(3)}\) Woodcock, *Haslingden: A Topographical History*, p 8

\(^{(4)}\) See Chapter XV

\(^{(5)}\) Farrer, *Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe*, Vol III, p 422 sqq

\(^{(6)}\) Will of John Kershaw of Wolfendenbooth 1702
were surrendered without "impeachment of waste" in the chapelries of Haslingden and Newchurch down to 1715.\(^{(1)}\) Waste also remained widespread in the township of Haslingden.\(^{(2)}\) A similar situation was found in Brandwood in the far south east of Rossendale. In 1713, a farm was surrendered at Rockcliffe in Brandwood with the same rights over waste as in a surrender of 1650.\(^{(3)}\)

There is only a single known case of enclosure in this period. In 1689, there was a single unenclosed acre at Ewood near Haslingden town but by 1718 this acre had been enclosed.\(^{(4)}\)

The position of all the aforementioned forms of land holding appears to have been strong. Subject to the lord's right over minerals and the possibility that an estate in tail male could not be created, the copyholder could deal with his land in the same way as a freeholder. He was able to build or demolish buildings and fences, alter boundaries, subdivide or consolidate tenements, lay out roads, divert streams, subject to the agreement of his neighbour or cut down timber without need for licence from the lord.\(^{(5)}\) All copyhold could be transferred via a system of surrender and admittance for a small fee and a nominal entry fine.\(^{(6)}\) A leaseholder also had the right to transfer lands at his wish, thus the 1666 copyhold customs of the

---

\(^{(1)}\) eg LRO/Will of James Haworth of Bank Top, Wolfenden, 1705-6
LRO/Will of Peter Ormerod of Goodshaw, 1706
LRO/Will of John Heyworth of Dean Head, Wolfenden, 1712-3

\(^{(2)}\) LRO/Will of James Chadwick of Haslingden, Innkeeper, 1665
LRO/DDX/9 and 13
E. Chadwick and J. Boardman, Reports on the Estate of Sir Andrew Chadwick with Life and History, 1881, p 14-19, 92-3

\(^{(3)}\) LRO/DDX/114/7

\(^{(4)}\) T. Woodcock, Some Ewood Deeds, p 13-16

\(^{(5)}\) LRO/DDX/118/152/39, p 46

\(^{(6)}\) T. Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 1
Honor states: "the surrenders, having an estate to him and his assignments for life, lives or years may assign over the same by either surrender by an assignment, last will and testament or other writing lawfully authorised." Though the 1665 customs roll states that tenements could not be leased for more than a year and a day without a surrender taking place, no penalty for failure to do this is mentioned. Many long leases in the area were done by deed with no evidence of any surrender. (1)

From the sixteenth century it was found that no part of any property could be forfeited for non payment of rent, but any arrears were to be paid off by a levy on the land. (2) In effect the only acts liable to lead to forfeiture were:

(a) working the lord's minerals in a manner outside the lord's custom;
(b) attempting to convey copyhold land as freehold;
(c) conveying copyhold by common law rather than by custom;
(d) committing the crime of treason or a felony;
(e) refusal to perform services such as jury service. (3)

The copyholders also had considerable rights over any timber or minerals located on their holdings. The lord claimed the right to work any minerals on or under any local copyfold. Yet this right was subject to certain restrictions. It only applied to "new" hold, "old" hold was free of this limitation. Even on "new" hold, the lord had to pay compensation for any damage done to a copyhold tenement due to mining. Agreement had to be reached between the lord and the

(1) ibid, p 47
(2) LAO/DDX/118/152/41
(3) LAO/DDX/118/152/45, p 8
copyholder before any mining could commence. Tenants of both "old" and "new" copyhold had the right to work minerals on their own tenement for use on the tenement, though not the right to work minerals for sale outside the tenement. For this purpose, the term tenement was taken to extend over the entire original tenement not the smaller contemporary unit, that is the term "tenement" was used to denote the entire vaccary, not simply the farmstead.\(^1\) The lord never claimed any right over the timber on any copyhold land. In fact, the copyholder could claim damages at the halmote court for trespass if any of his trees were attacked, this was unsuccessfully done as early as 1515.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) T. Woodcock, *Haslingden: A Topographical History*, p 103-4
\(^2\) W. Farrer, ed, *The Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe*, Vol I, p i - xi. The halmote was the court of the demesne manor covering land that had never been granted out, that is, land held directly from the lord via a copy of the Court Roll
SECTION B - FARMING UNITS

Both the 1650 and 1662 manorial surveys indicate that land ownership was widely dispersed within Rossendale. At the former date three hundred and ninety eight estates were recorded which by 1662 had grown to four hundred and forty five. This was accompanied by a decline in the average acreage from virtually fifty to under forty five. The subsequent trend in estate size cannot be plotted with any precision but the available evidence suggests that in at least the case of the largest estates, fragmentation ceased after 1662.

Of greater significance in the current context was the trend in average farm size. The small average size of estates in the mid seventeenth century manorial surveys in the Wolfenden and Wolfendenbooth areas of Newchurch chapelry suggests that these estates were too small to have been subdivided and thus probably represent farm units. This impression is confirmed by the poll and hearth tax returns of around the same date which indicate that these areas were populated entirely by men of modest means. Thus, the figures of eighteen to nineteen acres for the average estate found in these areas may well also reflect the size of the average farm in that locality. This figure can act as a starting point for a more precise analysis.

Clear cut cases of farms of a known acreage are difficult to obtain. Two main sources are available, land deeds and wills, but both often limit themselves to providing the name, location and the number of names of the fields (closes) involved. The size of each field varied to such an extent that they are of no value as even an

(1) All acreages are statute unless otherwise specified
(2) These surveys suggest that rent was paid for virtually the entire area of Rossendale.
See Appendix II for the conversion rates from customary to statute acres and for a consideration of the nature of 'new' and 'old' hold.
indirect guide to farm sizes. Fortunately, such sources do provide enough cases from which the acreage can be calculated to permit the basic patterns to be revealed. The average of the forty one farms for which the acreage can be calculated comes out at around twenty four acres. (1)

When broken down the figures indicate a decline in average farm sizes from twenty eight and a half acres between 1650 and 1679 to twenty two acres in the period 1680-1715. If the analysis is done geographically, a slightly different picture emerges:

**Average Farm Size in Rossendale 1650-1715**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Average Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of farm sizes in the sub areas is also of interest here. In the township of Haslingden, farms ranged in size from three and a half to seventy seven and a half acres with no less than four of the nine cases being under ten acres. In both the chapelries of Haslingden and Newchurch the range was both narrower and more tightly aligned to the local average. Given the economic structure of the area, these figures are not surprising. The presence of textiles

(1) See . . Table .II, Rossendale Farm Sizes
The figures include common and waste area where a specific area as opposed to a right was granted.

(2) See . . Table .II
particularly in the east of the area and the position of Haslingden as a small market town are probably sufficient to explain the low average acreages of these areas. The wider range of farm size around Haslingden is not really surprising, given the greater range of per capita wealth the area recorded in the 1660 Poll Tax and indirectly in the Hearth Taxes of the 1660's. The township appears to have consisted of cottagers near the town itself probably linked to its service activities and larger farms in the remoter parks of the township.

The significant discrepancy between the average estate acreage and the average farm acreage suggests that some degree of leasing must have been practiced. That this was so, is clearly shown in local probate and land deed data. The length and nature of these leases showed considerable variations as is indicated in the sample given on the following page.

Though the sample is small and biased towards the earlier part of the period, it does suggest that the practice of leasing, particularly of fixed term leases was widely practised, even in the mid seventeenth century.

A small number of cases where farms of a known size were sold for a known sum are also available, permitting a general indication of local land values to be obtained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Nature of Lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Broadclough</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>term of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Goodshaw</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>term of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Loveclough</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>2 1/2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>a term of years or lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Swinyard Low</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>a term of years or lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Greens</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>61 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Coldclough</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>199 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>1000 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Rawtenstall</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Hudhey</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Bacup</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Sources - LRO/Wills and Probate Inventories
LRO/DD/F0/39 and 44
LRO/DDX/114/9
Rossendale Land Values 1650-1715

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Price Per Acre</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 5 10s 4d</td>
<td>1 farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 3 2s 10d</td>
<td>4 farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 6 0s 10d</td>
<td>2 farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£11 18s 8d</td>
<td>2 farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 5 12s 8d</td>
<td>3 fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 5 1s 0d</td>
<td>1 farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 2 1s 10d</td>
<td>2 farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 6 1ls 5d</td>
<td>1 farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£ 6 5s 10d</td>
<td>1 farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of these figures it would appear that landed property values in Rossendale could vary between £2 and £6 10s per acre. The high value for the two farms in Haslingden township may partly reflect their proximity to the Haslingden livestock market.

Though the cases reveal no definite trend in land values over the period, the variations may well be a product of the small size of the sample and the varied state and location of the farms and land involved. The few known cases where valuations for the same property are available over an extended period of time lead to the same conclusion. In 1651 Rockcliffe farm on the border with Rochdale was sold with its common for £500. In 1713, the same farm with

(1) Sources

LRC/wills
LRC/DDX/3
LRC/DDX/103
LRC/DDX/118

T. Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 141
Chetham Library/Raines MSS/31/217-236
identical specification was sold for only £550.\(^{(1)}\) Carterplace farm in Haslingden township was sold for £110 in 1697 but in 1723 the same farm was re-sold for only £100.\(^{(2)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) Newbigging, *Notebook for the History of the Forest of Rossendale*, MSS, p 88-9

\(^{(2)}\) LRO/DDX/116/129/2-3
SECTION C - THE STRUCTURE OF LOCAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY

As was the case before the mid seventeenth century, agricultural activity pervaded the local economy throughout this period, especially that of western Rossendale.

By far the most comprehensive guide to local agricultural activity in this period is provided by the probate inventory returns. This is particularly true given the relatively narrow wealth range present locally.

Between 1650 and 1715, two hundred and twenty two out of two hundred and thirty eight extant male probate inventories indicate the presence of some form of agricultural activity. This pattern was repeated at all levels of local society. Of the ninety four 'infra' inventories with a net value of under £40, eighty (eighty five per cent) show evidence of farming activity. For the one hundred and forty four 'supra' inventories with a net value of over £40, the respective figures were one hundred and forty two (nearly ninety nine per cent). Thus, the vast majority in both cases were active in agriculture. The figures for the 'infra' inventories may even under estimate the pervasiveness of farming amongst the poorer classes. This is because a number of these inventories show no visible means of economic support for the individual. This suggests they may have been the elderly or chronically sick being supported by others. This impression is supported by the fact that a number of such individuals are described as 'husbandmen' or 'yeomen' in their inventories.

The relative importance of pasture and arable within local agriculture is difficult to assess with any precision. Probate inventories superficially appear to provide a good guide, but on closer inspection problems emerge. Two problems in particular stand out. In many
inventories, random items are bundled together for valuation, thus making it impossible to isolate the pastoral or arable element. The second problem is that many items cannot be specifically allocated to either sector or even agriculture as a whole. In this category would come horses, carts, hay, etc. The solution in both instances, has been to omit such cases from the analysis.

If the value of arable and pastoral goods is then calculated, it becomes clear, as one would obviously expect that the pastoral sector was dominant, accounting for around eighty per cent of farming wealth:

Agricultural Structure in Rossendale 1650

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
<th>Total Farming Wealth (Goods)</th>
<th>Pastoral %</th>
<th>Arable %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Rossendale</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As hay and horse values have been excluded from these figures, it is likely that if anything they under estimate the degree of pastoral dominance.

This pastoral dominance appears to have been maintained throughout the period:
Fluctuations in Rossendale Agricultural Structure 1650-1715

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
<th>Pastoral (%)</th>
<th>Arable (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650-1674</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-1699</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1715</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominance of pasture is not surprising. Natural conditions in the area made arable a difficult and uncertain activity. Yet the same natural conditions help explain why some degree of arable activity was found at all. The ruggedness and remoteness of the area would make the bulk import of foodstuffs both physically difficult and financially expensive. In winter, reliance on such imported grain could be dangerous as prolonged bad weather could easily isolate the area from suppliers. In such circumstances, it was prudent to maintain some level of local arable activity.

The presence of textile activity is often cited as a further reason for the predominance of pastoral activity in the Pennine area. To some extent, this must be open to doubt. The breakdown of agricultural activity within Rossendale indicates that pastoral activity was just as pronounced in western Rossendale as in eastern Rossendale, where textile activity was more firmly established.

This mixture of pasture and arable agriculture was to be found on most Rossendale farms. Inventories indicate that most local farmers undertook both corn growing and livestock rearing within their agrarian activities, i.e., there is no evidence of any specialisation on this basis within Rossendale farms.
The typical situation on local farms is indicated by the details of the following randomly selected cases from local inventories.

**Pastoral/Arable Balance on Individual Rossendale Farms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Farmer</th>
<th>Pastoral Goods</th>
<th>Arable Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Henry Hargreaves</td>
<td>£71 4s 8d</td>
<td>£14 0s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>John Haworth</td>
<td>£21 0s 0d</td>
<td>£11 0s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Ralph Rushton</td>
<td>£43 0s 0d</td>
<td>£10 10s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Lawrence Hey</td>
<td>£4 0s 0d</td>
<td>£13 0s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Christopher Holden</td>
<td>£15 0s 0d</td>
<td>£4 10s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>John Hoyle</td>
<td>£36 0s 0d</td>
<td>£13 12s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Edmund Hartley</td>
<td>£25 0s 0d</td>
<td>£16 13s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>John Holden</td>
<td>£14 0s 0d</td>
<td>£2 10s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>James Duckworth</td>
<td>£70 10s 0d</td>
<td>£13 2s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>George Haworth</td>
<td>£27 7s 0d</td>
<td>£10 0s 0d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D - PASTORAL FARMING

Within the pastoral sector, cattle were by far the most important form of farming and account for around ninety per cent of livestock by value. This heavy dependence upon cattle was probably typical of Pennine Lancashire in the late seventeenth century. (1)

Cattle were found on most Rossendale farms for which inventories are extant. Out of a total of two hundred and fifty five inventories two hundred and eleven (eighty three per cent) contained cattle. In one hundred and eighty seven of these inventories with cattle, the precise number of head is given. These cases suggest a small average herd size. Different parts of Rossendale did not always conform to the overall average:

**Rossendale Cattle Herd Sizes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Total Head</th>
<th>Average Head Per Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>1750</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in most parts of Rossendale average herd sizes were below the overall average levels. Most local herds conformed closely to

L. Ironfield, Chipping in the Seventeenth Century, 1974, p 54.
these arithmetical norms. Only two herds had over thirty head of stock and even those did not exceed forty head. (1)

Most local herds consisted of a mixture of beef and dairy cattle. In this context, the term dairy cattle has been taken to cover 'kine' and 'cows' and the term beef cattle to cover 'twinters', 'sterks', 'steers', 'whies' and 'heifers'. On this basis, one hundred and seventy one local inventories providing a breakdown by cattle type show a total of six hundred and one dairy (forty five per cent) and seven hundred and fifty five beef (fifty five per cent). Again variation on this situation was to be found in differing parts of Rossendale:

**Balance of the Rossendale Dairy/Beef Herd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Dairy %</th>
<th>Beef %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate a slight bias towards beef activity in all areas except the chapelry of Newchurch, and the greatest bias towards beef in the chapelry of Haslingden, where average herd sizes were also at their peak.

This pattern of activity with the beef bias in the chapelry of Haslingden and the dairy bias in the chapelry of Newchurch is not surprising given the contemporary demographic situation and the extent of textile penetration.

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of Ralph Holden of Holden, gent, 1675
LRO/Probate Inventory of John Coupe of Ashenbottom, yeoman, 1665
Much of the local dairy production was probably to meet the needs of the local population. This is suggested indirectly with the transport problems in such an upland area and its remoteness from large centres of consumption. More direct evidence comes from the inventories which suggest that the local diet had a high dairy content. Cheese and butter in particular, appear to have been widely consumed. The chapelry of Newchurch which was demographically the most buoyant part of Rossendale, as well as probably seeing the greatest concentration of textiles, would provide a growing market for local dairy produce. Certainly the growth of dairying in the sixteenth century in Rossendale has been accredited by Thirsk to the demographic expansion of the same period.\(^1\) The west of Rossendale being less involved with textiles and less buoyant demographically would provide a less attractive outlet for dairy produce. This area continued to specialise in the production and store and fat cattle for sale to distant markets and to the rather closer market of lowland Lancashire.\(^2\) This beef export trade was centred to the livestock market provided by Haslingden which had been selling livestock outside the area from at least the early seventeenth century.\(^3\) By the early eighteenth century, the market was attracting buyers from south west Lancashire.\(^4\)

The wide range of different cattle types found in local inventories indicates that as a whole the area was generally self sufficient in maintaining its own cattle numbers. Though many poorer men were

---


\(^2\) ibid, p 85

\(^3\) J. Harland, ed, "The Shuttleworth Accounts", *loc cit*, p 254

restricted in their cattle range, those with larger herds often had
a full range of cattle from calves to oxen and cows. The range of
cattle found in local farms is indicated by the following random selec-
tion of cases for Rossendale inventories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Cattle Types on Rossendale Farms 1650-1715</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Ormerod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Yate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hartley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Crankshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Baron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Duckworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Ashworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only cattle type absent for self sufficiency on most farms
was the absence of a resident bull. \(^{(1)}\) Yet given the small size of

\(^{(1)}\) This general self sufficiency and the balance of cattle types
found on local farms indicates that the area raised its own
stock from calving. There is no evidence that the area was in
receipt of cattle from Scotland or the far north of England.
local herds the lack of bulls in each herd is not surprising. Isolated bulls were found scattered throughout Rossendale. Between 1650 and 1714, bulls were generally found amongst the larger local herds:

**Distribution of Bulls in Rossendale 1650-1714**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bulls</th>
<th>Size of Rest of Herd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Taylor</td>
<td>Husbury</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Holden</td>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Haworth</td>
<td>Crawshawbooth</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Holt</td>
<td>New Hall</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Greenwood</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holden</td>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ashworth</td>
<td>Chamber, Wolfenden</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet, even these herds were in themselves insufficient to justify the retention of a bull. Thus, it is likely that these bulls provided a necessary service to neighbouring farmers with smaller herds. As a result, though the typical Rossendale farmer was probably not self-sufficient in terms of cattle stock, the area as a whole probably was.

Despite the harshness of the local climate and terrain which would restrict supplies of winter fodder, there is no evidence that local cattle were regularly slaughtered in the autumn to offset possible fodder shortages. The monthly average of the number of cattle per inventory indicates that the relationship was inverse.
### Three Month Averages of Average Livestock Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Average Per Inventory</th>
<th>Number of Inventories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-March</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-June</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-Sept</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This seasonal stability in the size of local herds appears to have been the outcome of several convergent factors. The dairy element of the local herd largely existed to meet the needs of the local market, this need required animals to be kept throughout the winter in considerable number. Similarly, the existence of a considerable amount of common and waste land providing additional grazing reducing the pressure for culling numbers as winter approached.\(^1\) The local beef herd which was probably marketed to meet the needs of outside consumers may serve to explain why the average herd size fell in Spring and Summer, a time when it would be logical to expect an increase with calving time. This is because the two main livestock markets of Haslingden through which surplus local stock was disposed of, were held in the spring and late summer.\(^2\) This pattern of seasonal stability in herd sizes does not appear to have been unique to Rossendale. Brigg notes that similar stability could be observed in the cattle herd sizes of the neighbouring Pendle area throughout the seventeenth century.

---

\(^1\) G.E.Fussell, *The English Dairy Farm 1500-1900*, 1966, p 33

\(^2\) April 27th and September 21st
During the sixteenth century, sheep appear to have been of substantial supplementary importance to local agriculture. Tupling has argued that during the sixteenth century, the traditional dominance of cattle was challenged by the emergence of sheep flocks. Tupling bases his view on the increasing number of references to sheep gates and cases of overstocking of the commons in the halmote court. Such evidence is of course impressionistic, but more quantitative data is available that leads to a similar conclusion. In 1535 Haslingden Township and the Forest of Rossendale paid tithes to the Abbot of Whalley consisting of seventy lambs and twenty stones of wool. If these figures represent the normal situation of ten per cent of total output, it would imply that sheep keeping was widespread. The spread of sheep keeping probably reflects the demand for wool from the local textile industry and the low capital cost of sheep compared with cattle.

The sheep reared in Rossendale were derived from the ancient Lancashire breed. By the nineteenth century these 'Haslingden sheep' were described as "a hardy animal of fair size, horned, with a grey face and bearing a fleece as heavy as the sheep of the Cheviots."(1)

However, by the mid seventeenth century and throughout the period down to 1715, sheep were of only marginal importance. Only forty five (under eighteen per cent) of inventories show evidence that sheep were kept. Sheep were of secondary importance in all parts of the area, eg they were to be found in sixteen per cent of Haslingden township inventories, and fifteen per cent of Newchurch chapelry inventories. This indicates that the extent of sheep farming was not entirely a product of the economic structure of the immediate area.

(1) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 166
Even where sheep were kept, the average flock consisted of a mere seventeen head with an average flock value of only £4 19s 10d. Unlike the cattle herds, sheep flocks varied considerably around this average. In 1665, John Coupe of Ashenbottom, south of Haslingden, left sixty three sheep worth £9 10s, whilst in 1712, John Nuttall of New Hall Hey left fifty eight sheep worth £9 9s. In 1703, Edward Hamer of Cockham, north of Haslingden, left sheep valued at £11 13s 4d, whilst in 1658 John Rothwell of Grane had left sheep valued at £13 6s 4d. Most flocks, however, were actually smaller than even the modest local average. Fifty per cent of all known flocks had under ten head.

Given such small flocks, it is not surprising that sheep were rarely kept in isolation. Even the largest flocks were no more than a secondary source of livestock wealth to their owners. In no cases were specialist sheep farmers to be found in Rossendale.

There is no reason to feel that the inventories fail to give at least a reasonable approximation of the importance of sheep in contemporary Rossendale. The average value of inventories containing sheep was significantly above the average for all inventories. Given the narrow wealth range within the area such a pattern indicates that the ownership of sheep was not the prerogative of the poorer sections of the local community.

Though the importance of sheep in this period was much less than appears to have been so in the sixteenth century, the extent of decline within this period appears to have been modest. From 1650 to 1674, the average flock numbered around eighteen head, whilst from

(1) L/R Probate Inventory of John Coupe of Ashenbottom, 1665
L/R Probate Inventory of John Nuttall of New Hall Hey, 1712
L/R Probate Inventory of Edward Hamer of Cockham, 1703
L/R Probate Inventory of John Rothwell of Grane, 1658
1675 to 1715 this average only fell to around seventeen head. Thus some explanation is needed of why the decline in the importance of sheep before 1650 was followed by a period of relative stability. The widespread presence of sheep during the sixteenth century clearly indicates that the area was capable of supporting a sizeable flock, certainly in excess of that found from 1650-1715. Closer examination however, suggests that during the sixteenth century, sheep were largely kept on the abundant waste and common land of the area.\(^{(1)}\)

This appears to have remained the case after 1650. In 1668, William Birtwistle of Loveclough was owed 14s for "wintering sheep".\(^{(2)}\) These were probably sheep brought from the moor top waste to spend the winter in the more sheltered valleys. The distribution of sheep suggests a strong correlation with areas of waste. Sheep appear to have been especially common in the Coupe, Lench, New Hall Hey area of South Rossendale which contained an abundance of waste in this period. Within the township of Haslingden, the main piece of waste was on High Moor which lay within Grane and Holden Post. It is surely not accidental that eight of the ten cases of flocks within the township belonged to those two posts whilst the remaining two cases lay on their border. Town post which had no common or waste land had no known cases of sheep rearing. Thus it appears likely that the decline of sheep within Rossendale was closely tied to the decline of waste and common. The period 1650-1715 saw a stable waste and common acreage and thus a stable sheep flock.

\(^{(1)}\) W. Farrer, ed, The Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, Vol III p 200

\(^{(2)}\) N. Lowe, "The Lancashire Textile Industry in the Sixteenth Century," loc cit, p 7 and 8

LRO/Probate Inventory of William Birtwistle of Loveclough

LRO/C. Ironfield op cit p 55 and J. Thirsk op cit p 86 both indicate that the limited importance of sheep applied to east Lancashire as a whole in the seventeenth century.
Though cattle and sheep were the only livestock to have been kept in sufficient quantity to have been of commercial significance, they were not the only stock to be found on local farms.

Eighteen per cent of inventories contain reference to the keeping of swine, though these swine were kept in very small numbers. Most cases record a single pig but in no cases did the number exceed two. Such small numbers suggest that pigs were kept for purely domestic purposes. This view tends to be confirmed by the widespread presence of "bacon" and "swine meat" in contemporary inventories.

Bees and poultry in the form of geese and hens were also present on a very modest scale, particularly in the earlier part of the period. Eleven of the fifteen cases of poultry keeping occurred before 1670 and all fourteen before 1690, whereas all three cases of bee keeping relate to the period before 1680. Until the late seventeenth century honey from bees was probably the only form of sweetener available in the area. The growing impact of sugar in the late seventeenth century probably removed the need for bee keeping and thus explain the decline in local bee keeping. (1) The decline in poultry is more difficult to explain. Given the low value of poultry in inventories, never more than a few shillings, it may be that they were excluded from inventory assessments in the late seventeenth century.

In a different way, the position of horses in local agriculture is also difficult to assess. The keeping of horses was widespread but the extent to which they should be considered an aspect of agriculture is uncertain. The number of horses in local inventories never exceeded two or three, therefore though the presence of "foals" and

(1) J. Holt, A General View of Agriculture, 1795, p 176
"colts" suggests some local breeding activity, it does not appear to have been on a truely commercial basis. The role of horses as sources of power on the farm is difficult to ascertain. The presence of a wide range of horse equipment on many farms suggests that they were probably used for such a purpose, in addition to being used for more general non agricultural purposes. Thus in 1669, Richard Fielden of Church Hill in Haslingden township left two mares and their gear "for carrying and drawing". In 1678, John Fielden of Haslingden left two mares for a similar purpose. (1) Inventories suggest that oxen were also a source of power on contemporary Rossendale farms.

(1) LR0/Probate Inventory of Richard Fielden of Church Hill, 1669
LR0/Probate Inventory of John Fielden of Haslingden, 1678
SECTION E - ARABLE FARMING

Comment has already been made on the reasons for the need for arable farming in Rossendale despite the underlying problems facing such activity in the area. Attention in this section can therefore be devoted to the analysis of the structure of local arable activity. Probate inventories indicate that arable farming was totally geared to the production of grain in the seventeenth century.

Such grain production was widespread throughout Rossendale. An early seventeenth century tithe schedule for Haslingden township shows no fewer than seventy seven farmers paying the corn tithe. (1)

A similar pattern appears to have been present on the small farms of the rest of Rossendale. This is the impression obtained from the corn tithe valuations of the area in 1634:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Annual Value of Corn Tithe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£41 18s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawtenstall</td>
<td>£5 6s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constables</td>
<td>£8 15s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakenwoodwood</td>
<td>£8 8s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveclough</td>
<td>£8 5s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawshawbooth</td>
<td>£6 19s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacup</td>
<td>£7 13s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunstead</td>
<td>£9 15s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>£6 15s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfendenbooth</td>
<td>£5 19s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedwencloough</td>
<td>£6 5s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockcliffe Wood</td>
<td>£0 16s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hall Hey</td>
<td>£2 6s 8d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) LRQ/DD/Ke/5/27
(2) LRQ/DD/Ke/5/130
If these figures are re-calculated in terms of the value of the corn tithe per acre, any variation in the extent of arable activity within Rossendale can be revealed:

**Rossendale Corn Tithe Per Acre 1634**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Tithe Value Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>2s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>3s 6d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)

The figures confirm that modest grain production occurred throughout Rossendale, possibly peaking in the east of the area.

Inventories indicate that grain production remained widespread down to 1715. Seventy six per cent of the two hundred and fifty five contemporary Rossendale inventories leave evidence of the growth of grain.(2) Though a modest decline in the extent of grain growing is observable in absolute terms, the proportion remained high:

**Extent of Grain Production in Rossendale 1650-1715**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Inventories</th>
<th>% of Total Growing Corn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650-1674</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-1699</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1715</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The figure for South Rossendale is omitted as it is based on only one small part of that area.

(2) Positive evidence based on references to seed, corn growing, corn, ploughs and harrows in inventories. References to meal or malt in isolation from one or more of the above are excluded.
This pattern was also maintained through Rossendale, Haslingden township with sixty-three per cent and Haslingden chapelry with eighty-four per cent marking the two extremes. (1)

As could be expected the extent of wealth tied up in the form of grain varied on a seasonal basis:

### Seasonal Variations in Grain Wealth
(Three Monthly Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Average Grain Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-March</td>
<td>£7 15s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-June</td>
<td>£7 10s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-September</td>
<td>£4 11s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-December</td>
<td>£7 11s 2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate a pre harvest low followed by a harvest surge in grain values.

References to the actual acreage devoted to grain production on individual farms is difficult to isolate. This is probably partly a function of contemporary agriculture practice in the area of varying land use between arable and pastoral, according to individual needs and circumstances. This much was stated in a survey of the Rochdale

(1) **Rossendale Grain Production by Sub Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Total No of Inventories</th>
<th>% of Total Growing Corn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The left hand figures base grain value on references to "corn" and corn growing, the right hand figures exclude the "corn growing" element.
area in 1610. Thus it would appear that very short term changes in land use were probable.

Despite this, a rough analysis is possible. The low value of arable as opposed to pastoral output in inventories suggests that the arable acreage would be very modest. In 1711, the arable area of Ewood estate in Town Post, Haslingden, was estimated at thirty seven per cent of the total of eighty acres. By 1722, the position on the same estate which had grown to two hundred and forty acres, was twenty one per cent. These figures probably over estimate the average local grain acreage. Ewood was a well watered low lying and south facing estate which made it one of the most favoured locations in Rossendale for grain production.

It should not be assumed that Rossendale was self sufficient in grain via subsistence production. In 1699, the curate, overseers and churchwardens of the chapelry of Rossendale petitioned the Quarter Sessions concerning what they described as wrongful practices in trade. Their petition claimed that:

"there is a vast number of badgers or sellers of corn bread and other grain in the Forest of Rossendale and other places adjacent ... where some ... persons are clothmakers and pay spinners and workmen in meal (and) corn".

This indicates that the locality was consuming commercially produced corn. The quantities produced on local farms was small, therefore much of this commercially produced corn must have been imported from outside the area. A legal decree of 1638 suggests that this situation may have

---

(1) LRA/DD/Ta/216
(2) T. Woodcock, "Some Ewood Deeds" loc cit, p 15-16
(3) LRA/QSP/822/3
been of long standing. This decree states that:-

"all the inhabitants and occupiers of the lands within the said Forest (of Rossendale) shall grind all their corn and grain growing in the said Forest which they shall spend in their houses or sell in meal, greats or sheilings at one of the said mills (of Rossendale) and all malt, corn, and grain they shall buy and spend in their houses or sell again ground (except oatmeal and flour only which is ground before they buy it) shall be ground at one of the said mills ... except for grinding of bought sheilings or greats growing forth (beyond) the said Forest." (1)

This extract indicates the presence of both commercial buying and selling of grain and of the import of grain from outside Rossendale.

It is not possible to clearly ascertain the relative importance of different types of grain in local arable output. This is because the inventories and all other available services generally use the generic term of "corn" when describing local grain. However, the inventories do indicate that oats, wheat and barley were all grown in some quantity within Rossendale. Local geographic conditions and the experience of the post 1715 period both suggest that oats were probably the dominant local grain. Inventories indirectly imply the same as the most usual method of recording was to list grain as corn, wheat and barley. This suggests the generic term of "corn" was being used as a pseudonym for oats. If so, this would confirm that oats were by far the dominant local grain. Virtually every inventory containing evidence of arable activity includes reference to the term "corn". Wheat and barley also appears to have been widespread, forty eight inventories

(1) Chetham Library/Raines MSS/378/517
referring to the former and fourteen to the latter. The figure for barley would be multiplied if references to malt were included. Wheat was being grown at Ashenbottom on the southern edge of Haslingden township as early as 1665, whilst a tenement near Rawtenstall in the chapelry of Haslingden was known as Wheat Head. Field name evidence indicates areas of barley cultivation at Ewood, Carterplace and Dearnsgreave in the township of Haslingden, and Gambleside in the chapelry of Haslingden. It is noticeable that all of these cases, other than Gambleside, were in relatively low lying parts of the area. Such areas were relatively few in number, which would suggest that much of the wheat and barley consumed in the area would have been imported from outside Rossendale. This appears to have been true of the early seventeenth century, when a local copyholder's petition noted that:

"the soil of their country is extremely barren, and as yet not capable of any other corn but oats, and that (only) in dry years and not without continual manuring every third year".

In the same period, the jurors of the forests of Blackburnshire, of which all of Rossendale outside of the township of Haslingden, constituted a part, reported that:

"the quality of the said booths and vaccaries is cold and barren; yet by manuring, marling and tilling will yeild a certain grain called oats; and, after such marling and tillage, in a short time it will grow to heath, ling and rushes." (3)

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Coupe of Ashenbottom, 1665
(2) LRO/DDX/8
   T. Woodcock, "Some Ewood Deeds," loc cit, passim
   LRO/DD/To/g/1/3
   LRO/DDX/116/129/5
(3) T. Whitaker, History of the Parish of Whalley, p 284-5
These comments indicate that Rossendale was on the extreme margin for arable production. Such production was restricted to oats and even that only with careful attention to the soil.

This situation appears to have remained throughout the seventeenth century, inventories and land deeds indicate widespread attempts to maintain soil fertility. Manure was being used at Edenfield in 1658 and Priestentax in the township of Haslingden in 1660. In 1691, James Hargreaves of Rossendale left "lime in mye land". Lime was also being used at Wolfenden in 1658, Constablee and Crawshawbooth in 1661 and Grane, Haslingden in 1671.\(^{(1)}\) The presence of lime on local farms reflects considerable effort on the part of at least some farmers, as Rossendale was nearly twenty miles from the nearest limestone deposits at Clitheroe in the Ribble valley. To bring such a high bulk/low value product over such a distance and terrain, given the poor quality of local roads suggests considerable enterprise.

Perhaps the most widely used fertilizer was marl. In 1607, Norden noted that this substance was widely used in Lancashire.\(^{(2)}\) Within Rossendale, several fields incorporated the term "marl" in their name. Many of these were the sites from which marl was obtained as at "marl pits" in Haslingden.

---

\(^{(1)}\) Urjo/Probate Inventories, passim

SECTION F - PRIMARY PRODUCE 1650-1715

Farming was by far the most important but by no means the only primary activity within Rossendale.

The area was probably self-sufficient in terms of fuel requirements. Fuel supplies would be crucial for the maintenance of civilised life in such a naturally inhospitable environment as Rossendale. Given the high bulk/low value ratio of fossil fuels and the difficulty of local terrain for transport, it would have been not only uneconomic but physically impossible to import coal in bulk over any distance. As a result, local fuel supplies would be a vital advantage in the demographic and thus economic development of the area.

The legal position relating to local fuel and mineral resources was clarified in the confirmation of local copyhold estates in 1608:

"according to the several customs of the said manors or lordships of Accrington ... all and every ... tenants and copyholders of the premises so called enjoyed and known by the name of the New Hold and their and every of their heirs and assignees should and might for ever thereafter respectively have hold possess inherit and enjoying the same and all and every such common of pasture, turbary of turfs, slates, stone, sand, gravel or marl as then was or at any time theretofor had been allowed or accustomed used or enjoyed as part or parcel of the same."(2)

Probate inventories suggest that this might to collect turf peat was widely used by local inhabitants between 1650 and 1715. References to turf, turf carts and turf spades are common in inventories throughout the area. However, the decline in size of the waste area and the

(1) LRA/DDX/118/130/6
growth in the local population up to 1650 probably made these turf sources inadequate, thus encouraging a partial switch to the use of local coal for fuel supplies. Certainly references to coal are quite widespread in local inventories throughout the period and throughout the area. Indeed, coal mining had probably been widespread long before 1650, particularly on the moorland between Rossendale and Rochdale and Bury. In 1681, Henry Scholefield, a clothier of Edenfield, claimed to have been getting coal from these moorlands for the last fifty four years. Roger Coupe of Whams, Newchurch claimed that over forty years earlier his ancestors had hired a man to find and dig coal on the same moorland.\(^{(1)}\)

Especially in the north and east of Rossendale coal outcropped onto the surface suggesting that coal may have been initially extracted directly from the surface. However, by the seventeenth century, these surface resources may well have been running out, forcing deeper mining to be developed. This is certainly implied by the presence of a "coal pit rope" amongst the goods of Christopher Nuttall of Dedwencloough in 1680, and the even earlier halmote court judgment against four people concerning a coalpit rope and breaking two wiskets or baskets.\(^{(2)}\)

Rossendale copyhold tenants appear to have mined coal only in modest quantities suggesting that the mining was not a commercial activity. Indeed, it was illegal for tenants to re-sell coal mined from within Rossendale. However, larger scale and more commercially based operations were also being developed. In 1626, a coal mine was operating

\(^{(1)}\) Chetham Library/Raines MSS/5/113 and 116

\(^{(2)}\) LRO, Probate Inventories, passim
G. Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 226
at Priestbooth on the border between Rossendale and Rochdale. (1) In
1635, Roger Nowell had been granted by the letters patent the right to
all coalmines, iron and lead mines in the Manors of Accrington, Hasling­
den, Rossendale, Musbury, Oswaldtwistle, Yate and Pickup Bank and
Hencroft, for thirty one years at 5s rent per annum. By 1650, Roger
Nowell of Haslingden was noted as holding a coal mine under the lease
of 1636. (2) The annual profit of this mine was estimated at £15 per
annum rather than as Nef suggests £50 per annum. Using Nef's conver­
sion ratio this would suggest an output of four hundred and fifty tons
per annum. (3) A similarly small undertaking was that at Brandwood with
an annual valuation of £9 in 1667. (4) The presence of colliers in the
chapelry registers in the first decade of the eighteenth century con­
firms that the commercial production of coal continued down to 1715.
These registers indicate that colliers were active at Dearpley Clough
and Rockley in Newchurch Chapelry and at Goodshaw. (5) In 1701, John
Nuttall was assessed at 13s 4d by the poor law authorities for a coal
mine in Wolfendenbooth. (6)

The right of copyholders to local stone resources was also
exploited. Inventories reveal that stone was put to a wide range of
use on local farms. Yet both the mid seventeenth century manorial sur­
vveys and the early eighteenth century chapelry registers indicate that

(2) RRG/E317/Lancs 8
(4) H. Fishwick, History of the Parish of Rochdale, 1889, p 80
(5) Haslingden and Newchurch Chapelry Registers
(6) LAA/QSP/891/48
commercial stone quarrying was absent. The related activity of slate mining had been found locally in the sixteenth century, but by the mid seventeenth century it had ceased to be of economic significance.\(^{(1)}\) The 1662 manorial survey commented that there had been no slate mining in Haslingden township since the expiration of a lease granted to an Edward Kippax. It concluded that the local slate mines were worn out apart from a part of the Grane area for which local copyholders were willing to pay a small rent.\(^{(2)}\) The absence of slate workers in the early eighteenth century chapelry registers suggests that slate mining remained unimportant down to 1715.

Despite the use of the term "forest" to describe much of the area, local timber resources appear to have been very limited by the seventeenth century. As early as 1610, a survey of woods in the Duchy of Lancaster noted of Haslingden and the Forest of Rossendale that there were no woods worth marking.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) LRJV DDX/118/130/1 Duchy of Lancaster: Pleadings and Examinations 1548

\(^{(2)}\) Farrer, *Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe*, Vol III, passim

\(^{(3)}\) D. Halstead, *Annals of Haslingden*, p 7
SECTION G - CONCLUSIONS

Land tenure in Rossendale was predominantly in the form of copyhold held on exceptionally liberal terms from the manor. These terms gave rights little inferior to those of the freeholder.

Though rent was paid for virtually the entire area by 1660, much of the land was held in the form of unenclosed waste on an individual rather than a communal basis. The generous terms of local copyhold tenure, particularly access to waste and fuel resources provided a valuable if indirect source of income for many residents. Property ownership was widely dispersed particularly in Newchurch chapelry, where small owner occupied farms of around twenty acres were the norm. Western Rossendale contained larger estates but via subletting average farm size was also very modest. Down to 1715, farm sizes remained at this average level whilst land values remained stable.

Farming was predominantly pastoral reflecting natural conditions within the area. Yet the same conditions ensured the continuation of a basic level of arable activity both for individual farms and the area as a whole. Though cattle dominated the pastoral sector, the small size of local farms ensured that individual herds were small, and though the Rossendale herd as a whole was self replacing, the herd of most local farms was not. Within the herd, a rough balance existed between dairying for the local market and beef rearing for outside sale. Some intra Rossendale variation was present to meet the varying market needs of each sub area. These varying needs also help explain the seasonal stability in herd size. Sheep were only of modest economic significance, flocks being both few and small. Despite this they retained their modest role reflecting the stability of waste for rough grazing. Other livestock were kept in
such small numbers to be of negligible commercial significance. Grain production occurred throughout Rossendale on a modest scale largely limited to oats in the most low lying areas. This limited acreage made the area dependent on imported grain.

Extractive industries were also present on a modest scale, particularly in the form of peat cutting, coal mining and stone quarrying, though only coal was organised commercially on a modest basis reflecting the size of the local market and problems of local transport.
CHAPTER IX
TEXTILES 1650-1715

SECTION A - TYPES OF CLOTH PRODUCED

By the mid seventeenth century, the woollen industry of Lancashire was becoming concentrated in a relatively small area of east Lancashire between the River Calder in the north and the River Tarne in the south. The heaviest concentrations of this industry were thought by Wadsworth and Mann to lie between the valleys of the Irwell and the Roch, that is in the southern part of Rossendale and in the Parish of Rochdale. (1)

The Lancashire industry was an offshoot of that of the West Riding of Yorkshire. The local centre of this industry for Rossendale appears to have been Rochdale, though contacts with the town of Halifax also appear to have been strong. As early as 1608 it was claimed by the inhabitants of Sowerby, Elland and Rochdale that there had been since:

"tyme out of mind of man a usual and common highway (for the use of the inhabitants of those towns) to pass about their trade being clothmakers and other business over a common called Troughs ... in the parish of Rochdale to a place called Rossendale." (2)

Both Sowerby and Elland were small settlements close to and dominated by Halifax. Local records to be considered were fully in the text of

(2) H. Fishwick, History of the Parish of Rochdale, p 81
this section suggests that the domination of the Rossendale industry by the men of Rochdale and the Halifax area continued until after 1715.

There is no doubt that woollens were the dominant textile in Rossendale throughout this period, both probate inventories and the chapelry registers conclusively indicate this. Yet this does not mean that woollens were the only textiles present.

Wadsworth and Mann note that the fustian industry was present by the early seventeenth century in the two parishes on the west and south western border of Rochdale, namely Blackburn and Bolton. This close proximity to the fustian area must open up the possibility of some degree of fustian penetration into Rossendale during the seventeenth century. Indeed, there is evidence that the Haworth family of Crawshawbooth in central Rossendale were involved in the linen and checks trade as early as the sixteenth century. Despite this early case, Rossendale's flirtation with linen and fustian appears to have been minimal after 1650. The limited references to fustian production in Rossendale after 1650 relate mainly to the far west of the area at Yate and Pickup Bank which actually lay within the parish of Blackburn. Thus, John Jackson of Pickup Bank was described as a fustian weaver when petitioning the Quarter Sessions for relief in 1689. Probate inventories show John Wright of Pickup Bank to have left eleven flax sheets and two stones of flax in 1675 and William Whittle of Yate Bank to have left a fustian wheel and spindles in 1692. Isolated references to the industry can also be found in central Rossendale. In 1690, Robert Halt of Edenfield

(1) A.P. Wadsworth & J. de M. Mann, op cit, p 23-5
(2) A.B. Grosart, The Towneley Navell MSS: The Spending of the Money of Robert Noulif of Read Hall, Lancashire 1568-1580, p 279
(3) LRO/QSP/648/13
left a linen wheel and linen, whilst in 1697, John Whittaker of Broadclough left a linen wheel and linen in the chamber.\(^{(1)}\) In 1710, William Booth of Rawtenstall described himself as a fustian weaver when applying to the Quarter Sessions for relief.\(^{(2)}\)

The small number of such references outside the far west of Rossendale, and the fact that in no case did the linen/fustian sector make up more than a tiny proportion of the total personal estate of the individuals concerned, together suggest that the industry was only of marginal importance. Indeed, as most of the references relate to the period from 1690-1700, the industry may have only had an intermittent presence locally. Indeed, it may be interpreted as a local response to a depression in the main local textile woollen.

The output of the woollen industry can be categorised into three basic types, pure woollens, pure worsteds and mixed woollen/worsted. The most basic distinction between woollen and worsted is that the former is made from short staple wool that has been carded, whilst the latter is made from long staple wool that is combed before spinning.\(^{(3)}\) In the period 1660-1715, no pure worsted was produced but the manufacture of both pure woollen and woollen/worsted mixtures appears to have been widespread.

In the late sixteenth century, the traditional output of the Lancashire industry namely cottons, rugs, friezes, kersies and peni-stones were supplemented by the introduction of a light woollen/worsted

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/Probate Inventories, passim. Evidence of linen activity was found in inventories relating to Bacup, Tunstead and Gambleside.

\(^{(2)}\) LRO/QSP/1005/15

\(^{(3)}\) F. Atkinson, ed, Some aspects of the Eighteenth Century Woollen and Worsted Trade in Halifax, 1956, p viii
mixture known as bays.\(^1\) In the 1610's the output of Haslingden, Rossendale and the rest of the Lancashire industry was said to be predominantly friezes and Manchester cottons.\(^2\) By the middle of the seventeenth century, evidence to the deputy ulnager of Rochdale, the main centre of the Lancashire woollen industry, indicated that local production was dominated by the old coarse narrow cloths such as kersey and the new light bays cloth.\(^3\)

The size of the local bays output in the 1660's is indicated by the scale of the trade between Lancashire, ie the Rochdale and Rossendale area, and London, which was estimated to amount to "several thousand pieces annually".\(^4\) Inventories confirm that Rossendale was fully active in this bays trade. Though references to specific cloth types are rare, there are sufficient to establish that production was carried on locally. Thus in 1691, Gilbert Rushton, a clothier of Holden in the township of Haslingden, left "base pieces" valued at £12, whilst in 1692, John Holden of Ravenshore on the edge of Haslingden township left wool, yarn and "5 bayse pieces" together valued at £13 10s.\(^5\) The widespread presence of combing equipment in Rossendale inventories throughout this period provides strong indirect evidence of widespread local bays production.\(^6\) Combining equipment could only be of use in the preparation

(1) In the 1640's bays (thirty eight per cent) and a pure woollen known as whites (fifty six per cent) together account for virtually all of over five thousand pieces sent by one large Rochdale merchant to London.


(2) British Library/Stowe MSS: 132/p 150

(3) A.P Wadsworth & J.de.L.Mann, op cit, p 93

(4) H. Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry, p 251

(5) LRO/Probate Inventory of Gilbert Rushton of Holden 1691

LRO/Probate Inventory of John Holden of Ravenshore 1692

(6) LRO/Probate Inventories, passim
of wool prior to spinning into worsted yarn. As no other semi worsted cloth was produced in the area prior to 1715, and because many of these inventories also contain references to spinning and weaving equipment, it would appear to confirm that Rossendale was a large scale bays producer.

The importance of traditional narrow woollens in Rossendale is more difficult to establish. The widespread presence of carding equipment may be related to the production of raw material for use in bays manufacture. Thus, we are forced back on to scattered inventory references of specific cloth types. Such a case was John Heyworth of Wolfreden in Newchurch who left a kersey piece and a wide range of textile equipment in 1624. In 1666 Ralph Duckworth of Musbury left a black kersey whilst in 1692 John Holden of Ravenshore left £1 10s of kersey cloth in addition to wool, yarn, cards, spinning wheels and a pair of looms. (1)

The probability is that the production of coarse woollen kersey continued to be important in the Rossendale and Rochdale woollen area throughout the period down to 1715. As late as 1724 Defoe writing about Rochdale and Bury commented that the town had a considerable trade in coarse woollen goods called half thcocks and kersies. (2)

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Heyworth of Wolfenden, 1624
LRO/Probate Inventory of Ralph Duckworth of Musbury, 1666
LRO/Probate Inventory of John Holden of Ravenshore, 1692

(2) D.Defoe, A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain, 1962 edition, Vol II, p 189 and 268
SECTION B - THE ORGANISATION OF PRODUCTION

The one hundred and fifty one extant Rossendale inventories containing evidence of textile activity indicate that the local labour force fell into three main categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosendale Textile Labour Force:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Worker</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothier</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Weaver</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Carder, Comber and Spinner</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures almost certainly under estimate the proportion of the local labour force engaged in the preparatory trades in two basic ways. Women who generally specialised in such processes are excluded from inventory totals. This should not be taken too far as Rossendale female inventories indicate that some at least of them undertook the all round functions associated with the clothier on their own premises. A second problem is that those engaged in the preparatory trades only, were generally of a lower financial standing, particularly than those classed as clothiers. (2) Individuals of such low financial

---

(1) Those classed as clothier incorporated the functions of both spinner and weaver and often those of carder and/or comber.

(2) Average inventory value of clothiers £132 8s 7d
Average inventory value of weavers £ 69 5s 10d
Average inventory value of preparatory workers £ 57 19s 10d
standing were probably less likely to have left inventory records than their more wealthy contemporaries. Given the equitable nature of local wealth distribution, this too is probably a limited problem. Yet together these two factors may well have increased the ratio of local preparatory labour to weaving labour from in the region of two to one as suggested by the male inventories, to perhaps four or five to one. Such a figure would be consistent with the ratio of five to one suggested by contemporaries for the woollen industry of the Lancashire/Yorkshire border in the late sixteenth century.\(^{(1)}\) If so, this would suggest that the area probably received virtually all its raw material needs in the form of raw wool and undertook all the basic production processes prior to finishing within the area.

There is no evidence of any large scale putting out activity within the area and certainly none by Rossendale based manufacturers. Though Rossendale clothiers were men of substantial means by local standards, they were only small scale cloth producers. Perhaps the largest local producer of the period was John Riley of Tunstead who left £180 of wool yarn and cloth and three pairs of looms in 1661.\(^{(2)}\)

More typical was Francis Bridge of Newchurch who in 1686 left looms with furniture £1 10s and combs, combstocks and wheels £5s. The presence of combing equipment suggests Bridge was a small scale bayns producer. Similar men could be found in kersey production. In 1692, Abraham Haworth of Haslingden left £6 of kersey cloth, £9 5s of sheeps wool and yarn, £1 10s of looms and furniture and 5s of spinning wheels and cards. In total only five out of the fifty three men classed as

\(^{(1)}\) Historical MSS Commission, The Kenyon MSS, p 108-9, Letter of Ralph Matthews to the Vicar of Leeds, 1588.

\(^{(2)}\) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Riley of Tunstead 1661
clothiers left wool, yarn and cloth stocks valued above £50 and few left more than a handful of pieces of cloth. In 1669, Richard Fielden of Church Hill, Haslingden, left four pieces of cloth plus wool, combs, wheels and looms, whilst in 1689 Abraham Dobson of Laund in the Henheads left a single piece of cloth plus wool, yarn, four spinning wheels and looms. Some producers were developing greater production capacity possibly involving outside labour working on the premises of the clothier. This is indicated by the ownership of four pairs of looms by Henry Ramsbottom of Rawtenstall in 1679, and Richard Pollard of Goodshaw in 1658. However, such men were untypical, the vast majority had only one or two pairs of looms. Further confirmation comes via the 1660 poll tax return which shows a paucity of adult males living in with their employers, which indicates that the local industry had a limited number of journeymen living in with their masters. This need not mean that the idea of apprenticeship was not widespread. As early as 1634, the justices of Blackburn Hundred claimed that within the previous two years they had apprenticed around two hundred boys and girls. Though not all need have been apprenticed to textiles, a large proportion almost certainly were. The accounts for the overseers of Higher and Lower Booths townships for 1691-1715 indicate that at the end of the period local authorities were making use of the apprenticeship system. In addition to these "pauper"

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of Francis Bridge of Newchurch, 1686
(2) RRO/E179/250/4
(3) LRO/Probate Inventory of Abraham Haworth of Haslingden, 1692
(4) RRJB/SPP/Clas 1/273/56
(5) LRO/Probate Inventory of Richard Fielden of Church Hill, 1669
(6) LRO/Probate Inventory of Henry Ramsbottom of Rawtenstall, 1679
(7) LRO/Probate Inventory of Richard Pollard of Goodshaw, 1658
(8) LRO/PR/2859/3
apprenticeship were undoubtedly a large number of privately arranged apprenticeships.

On completion of apprenticeship, most textile workers probably joined the ranks of the specialist weavers or spinners and combers/carders. The specialist weaving group was divided into two subtypes, those owning the wool, yarn or cloth which they wove, and those who owned nothing but the tools of their trade, ie looms and other furniture. The former sub group can probably be regarded as independent men, whilst the latter appear to have relied on others for the provision of materials and work, and thus were in a dependent status. The independent group were generally of substantially higher financial status than were the dependent group. The former had an average inventory value of £84 11s 7d, the latter averaging a mere £40 2s 1ld.

The ownership of raw material and or yarn by the "independent" group suggests that they either bought raw wool and put it out for carding and/or combing, and spinning, or bought material in the form of yarn from other producers. Typical of such men was Edmund Ratcliffe of Haslingden, who in 1679, left £6 of wool and yarn plus a pair of looms and equipment valued at 10s. His small debts to five named people were probably in payment for preparatory work already done. (1)

The "dependent" group of weavers were probably largely dependent on wages for their textile income. In the absence of any large local putting out manufacturers, it is likely that these men were employed by merchants and manufacturers in neighbouring market centres. The level of wages for these men is difficult to establish. The wage assessment for Lancashire of 1673 suggests a daily wage of around 4d

(1) Based on the inventories of eleven "independent" and ten "dependent" weavers.
with meat and drink and 8d without meat and drink for weavers. (1) This is identical to the West Riding assessment of 1647. (2) These figures may provide a fair reflection to the true rates prevailing locally until the early 1670's, for in 1673, the justices of the Blackburn Hundred were speaking of the high wages textiles offered, tempting labour from the land. (3) After this date, the level of wages probably fell. In the West Riding area, wage rates were down to 3d per day with meat and drink and 5d without them. (4) In the depression of 1700, rates were said to be down to 4d per day compared to a pre-depression level of 6d per day. (5) This pattern could also be observed in the Lancashire side of the border. (6)

The third group of Rossendale textile workers were those engaged in the preparatory trades. Most workers in this branch were engaged in all three of these processes. Thus in 1687, John Priestley of Cawshawbooth left three spinning wheels, one pair of combs, combstocks and cards. (7) Specialists in one of spinning or combing or carding were also found but they appear to have been few in number. There is no evidence that these preparatory workers were employed directly by people outside the area, thus they were probably supplying the raw material needs of local weavers and supplementing those of local clothiers. Wages in this sector were even lower than those of the

---

(1) A.R Wadsworth and J.de.L. Mann, op cit, p 50
(3) A.P. Wadsworth and J.de.L. Mann, op cit, p 50
(4) H. Heaton, "Assessment of Wages in Yorkshire" loc cit p 234-7
(5) W. Bennett, History of Burnley, p 66
(6) Journal of the House of Commons, 13, p 269-70
(7) UJO/Probate Inventory of John Priestley
"dependent" weavers. In 1676 they were said to be as low as 3d a
day without meat.\(^\text{(1)}\)

Taken as a whole it appears that a pyramidal structure existed
in the local industry. Small clothiers were the local elite followed
by independent weavers. At the base of the pyramid came the dependent
weavers and those in the preparatory trades. The poverty of the lat­
ter two groups is indicated by the fact that of the sixty three men in
these categories, twenty eight left inventories valued at under £40,
and eleven at under £20. It was these poorer groups that would be
most hurt by the trade depressions that hit the industry throughout
the period. Thus, it is not surprising that, at a time when the local
industry was hit by a slump in trade with Flanders around 1700,
there was an outcry from such people over the price of bread.\(^\text{(2)}\)

The occupational data available for the early eighteenth century
suggests that this pyramidal structure was becoming elongated in the
Rossendale area.

### Occupational Structure of Rossendale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woollen Workers 1702-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Clothiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Weavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of other Woollen Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{(3)}\)

\(^{\text{(1)}}\) H. Heaton, "Assessment of Weave in Yorkshire," \textit{loc. cit.}, p 234-7

\(^{\text{(2)}}\) LAO/QSP/822/3

\(^{\text{(3)}}\) Haslingden Chapelry Registers Baptisms and Burials 1705-9
Newchurch Chapelry Registers Baptisms and Burials 1702-6
This gives an overall ratio of one clothier to sixty five weavers. Yet given the divergent nature of the inventory and register data, it is dangerous to rely too heavily on such a conclusion.
SECTION C - RAW MATERIAL SUPPLIES

It is doubtful if the Rossendale or indeed the Lancashire woollen industry as a whole was self sufficient in terms of raw material supplies at any time in the second half of the seventeenth century. In the section on Rossendale agriculture in the seventeenth century, it was shown that though sheep were kept in the area at the time, it was in modest numbers. In addition to their limited number, Rossendale sheep like northern sheep in general, probably gave a very low fleece yield. The development of bays production with Rossendale during the century ensured that local wool was technically unsuitable for much of local cloth production. Bays being a part worsted product, would require long fibred wool that could not be obtained from the short fibred fleece of northern sheep. Thus, on grounds of both quantity and quality, the Rossendale woollen industry was probably forced to rely on imports of raw wool for a substantial proportion of its wool requirements between 1660 and 1715.

The inflow of raw wool came into Rossendale, as to the rest of the Lancashire industry, from two major suppliers - the Midland counties and Ireland. The main source of entry into Rossendale was the market town of Rochdale. As early as 1588, it was stated that "the Halifax men occupy fine wool most out of Lincolnshire, and their coarse wool they sell to the men of Rochdale." By the early seventeenth century

---

(1) H. Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry, op cit, p 328

(2) Historical MSS Commission, The Kenyan MSS Report No 14, pt 4, p 573 - Additional MSS, 34324 ff 14 and 15 - in a petition of Cumberland, Westmorland and Northumberland coarse wool producers of 1617, it was claimed that wool from these areas was sent to the West Riding and east Lancashire woollen industry. Though no direct contact between east Lancashire manufacturers and these suppliers can be established for the period after 1650, it is probable that these areas continued as suppliers on an unknown scale during the period under review.
this source had been supplemented by wool from Rutland, Leicestershire, Warwickshire and Buckinghamshire.\(^1\) By the second half of the seventeenth century, wool was being imported into Rochdale from Ireland.\(^2\) This Irish wool was especially useful in the manufacture of cheap kersey.\(^3\) In 1672, Isaac Ambrose of Dublin had a Rochdale man as his agent based in Liverpool to sell his wool to Lancashire and Yorkshire woolmen.\(^4\) In other cases, Rochdale men took a more positive role, having agents in the producing areas or in the importing ports, who bought raw wool in bulk. Some large producers such as James Whitworth of Buersit near Rochdale had agents in both the production areas and the ports.\(^5\) Though there is no direct evidence, it is possible that Ellis Chadwick of Carterplace in the chapelry and township of Haslingden was a Rossendale man operating in the Irish wool trade. Chadwick who was baptised at Haslingden chapel in 1664 was the son of a relatively wealthy local copyholder, and by 1604 he was described as a gentleman of Dublin on admission to his father's copyhold estate.\(^6\) Even if Rossendale men did not come large importers based in the production areas, they did become wool staplers based in Rochdale where they handled wool distribution to small scale producers in the surrounding areas such as Rossendale. In 1664, Lawrence Hardman of Greens, Bacup moved to Rochdale where he established himself as a wool stapler. The venture

---

(1) RRO/DSP/Jas I/80 (13)
(2) H.Heaton, *The Woollen and Worsted Industries*, p 205
(3) RRO/PL/6/31/126
(4) RRO/PL/6/38/25, 40, 48
proved sufficiently successful to form the basis of a very successful local business in the eighteenth century. (1)

Small Rossendale producers, especially those in the south and east of the area visited the Rochdale market probably quite frequently to replenish these wool stocks. Thus, in 1686, a Rossendale clothier was recorded buying wool from a John Pitts at Rochdale market. Pitts was the Rochdale agent of a wool supplier based in Ashby-de-la-Zouche in Leicestershire. (2) In 1675, the inventory of Henry Ramsbottom of Rawtenstall shows him to have left one pack of wool in Rochdale valued at £5 10s. In addition to buying wool in Rochdale, small producers also obtained wool supplies from local distributors resident in Rossendale itself. One such man was George Hargreaves, a clothier of Hall Carr in the south of Rossendale who in 1691 was described as a dealer in sheep's wool and a maker of woollen cloth. This suggests he had a local wool distribution function in addition to his normal cloth making activities. Such men were still closely tied to the Rochdale market, in Hargreaves' case it was claimed that he had bought his wool from Abel Whittaker and John Smethurst, partners in a Rochdale based business. The precise nature of the relationship between the Rossendale distributor and the Rochdale supplier is not made absolutely clear in this case. Whittaker claimed he was the partner of the other two, whilst they in turn claimed that he was only their factor. (3) Gilbert Rushton a clothier of Holden in the township of Haslingden, and thus in the remotest part of Rossendale from Rochdale, was probably fulfilling

(1) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 208

(2) A.P.Wadsworth, "Sidelights on Rochdale History," R.L.&S.S. Vol 16, 1926-8, p 64

(3) PRO/PL/6/4/100
a similar role in 1691. In his inventory of that year he left nearly £49 of wool and yarn which was far more than could have been consumed by his immediate family. The rest of his inventory indicates nothing to suggest he was employing people outside the family to work up the wool or yarn for him. In addition, his inventory was dominated by a debt of £90 to a Michael Fled of Manchester who was probably his wool and yarn supplier.\(^{(1)}\) Though only an isolated case, this may suggest that the hold of Rochdale may have been less firm over the far west of Rossendale than in the geographically closer areas of the chapelry of Newchurch. Another possible wool distributor in the Rossendale area was Evan Doe of Rossendale, who in 1683 left ten and a half stone of wool valued at £5 15s 6d.\(^{(2)}\) Though only modest by some standards it was far more than could be quickly consumed by his own efforts and was far more than the sums typically found in local inventories. There is no evidence that he was a large scale manufacturer in his own right.

It is difficult to obtain a precise estimate of the quantity of wool kept in stock by the typical local woollen cloth producer because at any given time an individual would have part of his stock in the process of manufacture and this would be either yarn or cloth. In consequence of this, most inventories lump yarn and raw wool together for valuation purposes. Fortunately, a handful of inventories survive which give a valuation to the raw wool stock in isolation. These show that few local producers were holding wool stocks valued at over £1 and most hold stocks valued at under 10s. If this is converted

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/Probate Inventory of Gilbert Rushton of Holden, 1691

\(^{(2)}\) LRO/Probate Inventory of Evan Doe of Rossendale, 1683
into weight on the basis of the value of Doe's stock it suggests few
locals held more than two stone of wool in stock, whilst most held
under one stone. If the valuation given in another Rossendale inven­
tory of 1683 is used, this situation is slightly altered. The valua­
tion of one stone of mixed wool at 7s in Thomas Key's inventory would
suggest that an upper limit of three stone might be more appropriate
as might a figure of one to one and a half stone for the average
producer. (1)

(1) Based on eight Rossendale probate inventories of 1672-1708.
SECTION D - FURNISHING, MARKETING AND FINANCES

There is no evidence of any finishing or marketing services within Rossendale during the seventeenth century. In consequence, local producers had to use the facilities offered by larger neighbouring towns especially Rochdale.

Local producers required two basic finishing services, fulling and dyeing. Dyeing facilities would be of value to both the bay and kersey trade whilst fulling would be required by the kersey producers only. Marketing services were required to enable small local producers to unload their cloth on to larger men who could undertake the responsibility and cost of marketing these goods outside the immediate area, either at larger regional markets such as Manchester and Halifax or at national markets such as London. (1)

Rochdale could provide all of these services. As early as 1626, it had six fulling mills to meet the needs of east Lancashire producers. (2) During the later seventeenth century, the town also contained a number of dyehouses. (3) At the same time, Rochdale was in close contact with the major regional and national textile centres. London dealers were in regular contact often via resident agents. (4)

Yet this picture of the Rossendale industry totally dependent on Rochdale is an over simplification. To some extent, other centres were used for the marketing of cloth. Thus in 1691, a Haslingden clothier was dealing via a chapman of Radcliffe Bridge near Bury. (5) Such a

---

(1) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 171-2
(2) ibid, p 190
(3) RRO/PL/6/19/209, PRO/PL/7/89 and 90
(4) A.P. Wadsworth, "The History of the Rochdale Woollen Trade," loc cit, p 92 and 97
(5) RRO/PL/6/41/100
centre may have been quite regularly used by the woollen producers of western Rossendale, as for many of them it was just as accessible as the Rochdale market. Equally, it appeared that Rossendale producers were dealing directly with West Riding merchants as early as 1608.\(^{(1)}\)

By the end of the seventeenth century, Rossendale producers were selling their goods on the London market both with the assistance of neighbouring chapmen and by visiting the London market in person.\(^{(2)}\)

Direct links with Manchester also existed. In 1665, Edward Pilling, a clothier of Goodshaw was owed £17 by Thomas David of Manchester. Similarly in 1661, John Riley of Tunstead a large Rossendale clothier with £180 of wool, yarn and cloth, was owed £37 by James Lancaster of Manchester. Both debts were probably for raw material purchases by the Rossendale men or finished cloth purchases by the Manchester men.\(^{(3)}\)

It is not possible from purely Rossendale sources to plot where the ultimate market for local cloth production was, largely because local producers were not involved in the trade at this stage. This evidence from Rochdale and the east Lancashire as a whole, must be used to construct an outline picture. Little is known even from these sources about the market within England.

From these neighbouring markets much of the cloth probably found its way to London. Throughout the seventeenth century, London dealers were in permanent and regular contact with the Rochdale market.\(^{(4)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) H.Fishwick, *History of the Parish of Rochdale*, p 81  
\(^{(2)}\) PRO/PL/6/41/100  
\(^{(3)}\) PRO/Probate Inventories, passim.  
\(^{(4)}\) A.P.Wadsworth and J.de Wilmann, op cit, p 38-46
This London market was probably a major consumer of local cloth. Between 1644 and 1650 one large Rochdale merchant alone sent over five thousand pieces to his London agent.\(^1\) During the 1660's London was estimated to handle several thousand pieces from the east Lancashire industry every year.\(^2\) By 1691, Henry Crooke, a Haslingden clothier, was trading with London via Henry Coulbourne, a chapman of Radcliffe near Bury. As Crooke was arrested in London, probably for debt, he was probably trading with London on his own account.

Throughout the period, the main export market was probably the north and west of Europe.\(^3\) The importance of this market in the eyes of contemporaries can be gleaned from the fact that the failure of these export markets was often used to explain periodic depressions in the industry. The depression of the mid 1670's was blamed by Lancashire producers on a slump in bays exports to France.\(^4\) A similar depression around 1700 was seen as due to a decline in the trade with Flanders via Amsterdam.\(^5\) During this depression, the Rochdale bays trade with Flanders was said to have fallen by two thirds, accounting for a thirty per cent increase in the cost of local poor relief. The downturn was also said to have had a heavy impact in the Halifax area.\(^6\) At the very end of the period, new and more distant markets

---

(1) T.S.Willan, op cit, p 109
(2) H.Heaton, *The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry*, p 251
(4) R.R/SPB/Chas II/361/No 171
(5) A.P.Wadsworth, "History of the Rochdale Woollen Trade," *loc cit*, p 90
(6) Journal of the House of Commons, 13, p 269-270
were being opened up. In 1716 Jones Robertshaw, a Rochdale cloth merchant, described himself as being well versed in the trade with Russia.\(^1\)

In the absence of finishing facilities, the Rossendale woollen industry would require little investment in fixed capital. Machinery was simple and cheap, a loom, spinning wheel, cards and combs could together be obtained for little over £1. Power was human and production was located in the home, thus there was no need for investment in power sources or industrial building. However, there was a requirement for variable capital to finance work in progress, i.e., the purchase of raw material to the sale of the finished product.\(^2\) As most local producers were men of modest financial resources, the provision of such capital could be problematic particularly given the danger of short term fluctuations in trading prosperity. To cope with this problem, a complex system of short term local credit was built up, using finance raised within Rossendale and in neighbouring finishing and marketing centres. As early as 1613, Richard Fenton of Rossendale had credit dealings of £23 4s with a fuller in Middleton, plus £20 15s with a R Gregory of Haslingden.\(^3\)

In the absence of anything resembling a formal banking system this credit was built up by issuing bills and bonds usually with a life of up to six months.\(^4\) Such a system was used in 1668 by James Haworth of Haslingden. In that year Haworth is recorded as owing £70 to Christopher Marsen off Bolton and James Catterall of Pendleton by bond. Funds were also generated locally. In 1663, Henry Ramsbottom of Haslingden bought two stones of wool on credit from an unknown source,
this was in addition to his existing stock of £10 of wool and yarn.

In addition, Ramsbottom was the centre of a credit network of small debts, he owed over £38 to a total of eight men and was owed nearly £11 by a total of forty one different Rossendale men and women.

Though he had two pairs of looms, he had no spinning, carding or combing equipment. Taken together, this suggests he was acting either as a small scale wool stapler selling small quantities of wool to local producers, or a weaver who had put out raw material to be spun, carded or combed.\(^1\)

In 1671 John Ormerod the younger of Grane was owed £6 4s by Thomas Baskerville of Rochdale, described in 1650's as a woollen draper, probably for cloth supplied to Baskerville.\(^2\)

The pattern revealed by the above cases is typical of the situation in Rossendale before 1715. Credit provided by outside men to local producers being in relatively large sums, whilst credit provided from within the area was usually for extremely modest sums, though in total they could add up to a more substantial sum. Yet this should be put into perspective. The inventories reveal no cases in which local men known to be engaged in textile activity left sums of credit in excess of £100, indeed few left sums exceeding £50. Such a picture would be consistent with the impression of small-scale Rossendale producers selling their modest output in neighbouring market towns. They probably did not have the financial resources to trade over long distances in the hostile climate with which they were faced. They would find it difficult to cope directly with raw wool suppliers and distant cloth markets from a small remote and hilly area, particularly given

---

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory

(2) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Ormerod the younger, 1671

Wadsworth, "Sidelights on Rochdale History," *loc cit*, p 66
the sudden fluctuations in fortune to which the industry was subject. Thus it is not surprising that the only known case of a Rossendale man trading with London before 1715 concerned a case in which the credit mechanism appears to have broken down. This was in 1691 when Henry Crooke a Haslingden clothier, appears to have traded directly with London on his own account and via Henry Coulbourne, a chapman of Radcliffe Bridge. Crooke was arrested in London for failing to settle his bills with Coulbourne. The action Crooke complained had been injurious both to his reputation and credit standing. (1)

(1) GPQ/PL/6/4/100
SECTION E - THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDUSTRY

It is impossible to quantify the trend in the output of the local industry down to 1715 due to the complete absence of any appropriate statistical data. However, enough is known to provide an approximate outline of the probable course of production.

The seventeenth century woollen industry was a labour intensive industry in which labour productivity was low due to the absence of modern technology and business organisation. In such a situation, the supply of labour would be critical in determining local production levels. Given the stagnation in the size of the local population in this period, the potential amount of labour available to the industry must also have been stagnant. An alternative was to attract labour from the main alternative occupation, agriculture. However, both inventories and chapelry registers suggest that the size and structure and therefore the labour demands of local agriculture altered little in this period as a whole. Thus, it could not have supplied significant amounts of extra labour for the local woollen industry. Though many other factors help determine the number of man hours available, such as the age at which children begin work, the length of the working day, seasonal fluctuations, etc, the impact of these was probably relatively modest over the long term, compared with the size and occupational structure of the active population. Neither can changes in the efficiency of the labour force be seen as playing an important role in this period. Inventions suggest no significant developments in the production technology of the industry. The spinning wheel had replaced the distaff before the beginning of the period, whilst major improvements in carding, combing and weaving did not come until later. Though small changes may have occurred based on trial and error and experience, it is unlikely that these could have
significantly altered the situation. Even the product structure itself appears to have been generally stable around the production of bays and kersies. Taken as a whole, the local situation suggests that there could have been no major or sustained increase in local cloth production in the period 1650-1715.

This view tends to be confirmed down to 1700 by general experience of the Halifax and Rochdale woollen industry of which Rossendale was a part. Heaton argued that the period from 1660-1700 was one of general stagnation for this trade.\(^1\) The industry was probably hit in the early 1660's when the Anglo-Dutch war hampered the export of northern cloth.\(^2\) The industry was certainly depressed in the mid 1670's. In 1674, one London commentator noted that the Lancashire-London woollen trade had previously involved "several thousand pieces of bays" per year, but was now down to "scarce one". He also noted that the West Riding industry was in a similar position, being down from ten thousand pieces per year. In the same year, there was a petition for action to stop the slump in bays exports.\(^3\) Though these complaints may exaggerate the extent of the problem, they are probably valid in providing an approximate outline. Thus, as the Rochdale and Rossendale industry was largely dependent on London for its foreign and many of its domestic outlets, such petitions can be taken as boding ill for the local woollen industry. The diaries of Oliver Heywood provide useful information on the state of the woollen trade in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Heywood was the son of a Lancashire dealer in woollen cloth and was himself the incumbent of the chapel of Coley.

\(^{1}\) H. Heaton, *The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries*, p 25

\(^{2}\) ibid p 240

\(^{3}\) ibid p 251

RAQ/SDP/Chas II/361/No 171
in the parish of Halifax. Whilst based in Halifax he appears to have retained his contacts with the Lancashire woollen area.\(^1\) Thus his background and location and contacts suggests that he would be knowledgeable of the textile trade without having a direct vested interest in exaggerating its problems. Together this suggests his comments would be worthy of attention. Heywood notes that in late 1681 there was great poverty in the area caused by the decay of trade. Similarly, 1689, 1690 and 1696 appear to have been periods of bad trade resulting in widespread bankruptcies and poverty.\(^2\) Periodic trade depressions appear to have continued into the opening years of the eighteenth century. Around the turn of the century the woollen industry of the Rochdale and Rossendale areas was severely hit by a slump in the trade with Flanders whilst in 1703 the clothiers of Halifax were complaining of a depression in the northern woollen trade.\(^3\)

From this date however, the fortunes of the industry appear to have taken a turn for the better. The letter book of Joseph Holroyd, a cloth factor of Sowerby between Rochdale and Halifax reveals that during 1706 and 1707, the local bays market was very buoyant:

July 1706 "Our bays market for the heavier sort (is) very brisk".

"Our markets still advance - in kerseys most demand for the best sorts".

August 1706 "Our Market(s) hold their advance and (there) is great Buying weekly of both kerseys and Bayses"

---

\(^1\) J. Horsfall Turner, \textit{Oliver Heywood's Diaries 1630-1702}, passim


\(^3\) Wadsworth, \textit{The History of the Rochdale Woollen Trade} \textit{loc cit}
Heaton, \textit{The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry}, p 251
January 1707  "yesterday was many bays sold more than any day before this 18 months. I do really believe all sorts will be no lower but rather advance for we have many buyers and they buy very freely." (1)

How long this period of prosperity lasted is impossible to say from Holroyd's letter book, but Defoe's description of the Rochdale area in the 1710's suggests that it may have marked the beginning of a long term expansion. Around 1714 Defoe described Rochdale as a "good market town and of late much improved in the woollen manufacture as are also the villages in its neighbourhood". (2) The villages concerned would have covered the settlements of Rossendale. There is evidence that within Rossendale itself the early eighteenth century saw a marked improvement in the woollen trade. In 1713, a new fulling mill was established at Brandwood in the south east of Rossendale. This probably reflects the improving prospects of the local woollen trade, production appears to have been sufficiently high and future prospects sufficiently prosperous to encourage the beginnings of a local finishing trade within Rossendale.

The picture of late seventeenth century stagnation is further backed by fluctuations in the average value of textiles within local probate inventories:

(1) Atkinson, ed, op cit, p 35, 37, 55
(2) Defoe, op cit, p 268
**Average Value of Textiles within Rossendale**

*Probate Inventories 1656–1715*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
<th>Number of Inventories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1656–1665</td>
<td>£8 15s 6d</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666–1675</td>
<td>£4 10s 11d</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676–1685</td>
<td>£2 16s 10d</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686–1695</td>
<td>£6 15s 1d</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696–1705</td>
<td>£2 7s 10d</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706–1715</td>
<td>£6 13s 4d</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION F - CONCLUSIONS

During the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the woollen industry of Rossendale was purely a manufacturing undertaking. For other functions, the area was virtually totally dependent on neighbouring and larger centres, mainly to the east and south east.

Amongst local textiles, traditional woollen kerseys and newer products such as mixed woollen worsted bays were dominant. Outside of woollens, linen and fustian had a peripheral and possibly intermittent role.

The industry was organised on the basis of small scale producers. There is no evidence of any extensive putting out activity in the area. Three basic occupational groups could be observed within industry, the clothier, the specialist weaver and the specialist in the preparatory trades. These groups declined in financial status from clothier downward, but probably increased in number in the reverse order. Of the two specialist groups, two sub types could be observed, the independent worker and those in a dependent employee status. For the latter group in particular, this was probably a difficult period in which wages were at a low level.

Despite the presence of sheep within Rossendale agriculture, the local woollen industry was heavily dependent on distant sources of wool supply which was imported via Rochdale or other neighbouring centres. Local producers either bought their wool direct from these towns or from the Rossendale based agents of men in these centres. As local producers were small scale operators, it is not surprising that individual purchases of wool were invariably small.

Rossendale was in a similarly dependent position for finishing and marketing facilities. As for raw wool supplies, the most important
of these centres was Rochdale, but in the west of Rossendale other centres were also used. There is some evidence that before the end of the period some local producers were trying to become more directly involved in the marketing of their products, but this was probably a limited attempt of uncertain success. Despite the small scale nature of production units, extensive use was made of short term credit. Though some of this credit came from neighbouring textile centres, Rossendale itself supplied much of its own financial needs. This, and the attempted direct marketing, were early signs that the local industry was taking the initiative in trying to reduce its dependence on its neighbours by entering the more sophisticated aspects of the woollen trade.

Both the explanation for these attempts and their limited success may be put down to the general stagnation that appears to have afflicted local cloth production. Equally such signs of vigour were beneficial in making the most in the improved economic climate for the local industry in the first decade of the eighteenth century.
SECTION III

ROSENDALE 1716-1780
CHAPTER X
DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE 1716-1780

SECTION A - BASIC TRENDS

At the beginning of 1716, the population of Rossendale stood in the range three thousand to three thousand five hundred. By 1780, this figure had grown dramatically. The Porteus survey suggests that by 1778 Rossendale contained around one thousand eight hundred and eighty households.\(^{(1)}\) The multiplier of four and a half used to estimate the local population in 1715 does not appear to be appropriate for 1778. Probably a better guide can be obtained from the 1801 census which suggests a multiplier of between five and a quarter and five and a half.\(^{(2)}\) By using either ratio a local population estimate of around ten thousand is obtained for 1778. This figure suggests that compared with the period prior to 1716 this was a period of rapid acceleration in the rate of population increase.

The role of natural increase in this change can be crudely estimated as prior to 1715, by deducting annual totals of burials from annual totals of baptisms, the resulting annual figures being used to adjust the estimated natural change in population.\(^{(3)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) Cheshire RO/EDV/7/1/238 and 240: Porteus Visitation 1778.

\(^{(2)}\) Abstract of Answers and Returns, Enumeration, Part I, England and Wales, p 163.

\(^{(3)}\) For a discussion of the problems involved for this period, see Appendix I.
This exercise confirms the general acceleration in the rate of population growth yielding a population estimate of around eleven thousand by the late 1770's.\(^{(1)}\) This figure indicates that rapid population growth was a feature throughout the period 1716-1780. In only one year, 1717, do the figures indicate a natural fall in the level of local population. If broken down by decade they indicate a rapid acceleration in the growth rate during the opening two decades followed by a long decline back to the levels recorded at the beginning of the period until the 1760's. This was followed by a new sharp upswing to an unprecedented level by the end of the period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Annual Average Increase %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1716-25</td>
<td>+ 483</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726-35</td>
<td>+ 917</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-45</td>
<td>+ 782</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746-55</td>
<td>+1,039</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756-65</td>
<td>+1,013</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766-75</td>
<td>+1,821</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776-85</td>
<td>+1,325</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall population estimate of eleven thousand from the natural increase approach compares with a figure of only ten thousand from the survey of 1778. Though this may reflect a weakness in the data used, it may also reflect net outward migration. Evidence for such migration is difficult to obtain for the period as

\(^{(1)}\) See Figure No I

\(^{(2)}\) Figure for 1776-1785 is 2,192
a whole but certainly substantial emigration out of the area to the Manchester area does appear to have occurred in the 1770's, possibly to the emergent textile mills of that area. Evidence of such migration comes from the Haslingden chapelty burial register. This register indicates eight Manchester area residents with Rossendale surnames were buried at Haslingden from 1776-1780. This outflow also appears to have affected other parts of Rossendale. The records of Higher Booths overseers suggest that other parts of Rossendale experienced a similar trend.

This general southward movement was probably a new phenomena. Quarter Session petitions concerning settlement disputes for the period 1716-1750 show a very uncertain pattern.

Sources of Immigrants and Destinations of Emigrants 1716-1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to</th>
<th>Immigrants from</th>
<th>Emigrants to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At best, these figures suggest a slight east-west movement.

Unlike the era prior to 1716, this period saw demographic buoyancy throughout Rossendale, no longer was the population of Haslingden chapelty periodically hit by demographic crises. The figures in

(1) Haslingden Chapelty Burial Register 1776-1780
(2) LRO/PR/2859/
(3) LRO/QSP/passim
(4) Based on a total of ninety cases involving Rossendale and non-Rossendale townships. During the same period there were thirty cases involving Rossendale townships alone.
Porteus when converted into a population estimate yield a figure of almost five and a half thousand for Haslingden chapelry by 1778 compared with under two thousand around 1715. The same source indicates that Newchurch chapelry grew from around two thousand to around five thousand in the same period. This suggests a roughly equivalent overall rate of growth between the two areas. This cannot be clearly confirmed from the natural increase figures for 1760-1772. Between those dates, entries relating to the Bacup and Goodshaw areas of Newchurch and Haslingden chapelyes are listed in a joint and separate register from those of the mother chapels. Despite this the figures for natural increase indicate that in both mother chapelyes the rate of growth was rapid accelerating from the 1760's:

**Natural Population Increase: By Chapelry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Increase</td>
<td>Average % Increase per Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-25</td>
<td>+255</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726-35</td>
<td>+297</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-45</td>
<td>+377</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746-55</td>
<td>+614</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756-65</td>
<td>+309</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766-75</td>
<td>+691</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776-80</td>
<td>+509**</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* +1,018 on a ten year basis
** +1,632 on a ten year basis

(1) Cheshire RA/EDV/7/1/238 and 240. Even in Newchurch the acceleration in natural increase was marked. Between 1660 and 1715 the increase was around fifty per cent, but from 1716-1780 it was around one hundred and fifty per cent.

(2) As around ninety per cent of the combined Goodshaw/Bacup figures relate to the Bacup area, the totals have been added to the Newchurch rather than the Haslingden chapelry totals. This creates a bias albeit a slight one, in lifting the Newchurch figures and deflating those of Haslingden from 1760-1780.
This detailed breakdown suggests that the rate of natural increase crudely followed a similar pattern in both areas.

Attention can now be turned to an examination of the basic demographic variables underlying this surge in demographic buoyancy. As in the period before 1715, the method adopted to calculate the crude birth and death rates is that suggested by Eversley.\(^1\)

Both the birth and death rates made a positive contribution to this natural increase. The birth rate rose rapidly from under thirty per thousand in 1716 to nearly forty one per thousand in 1731. For the next thirty years the birth rate stabilised just below this level at around forty per thousand. From the mid 1760's there was a further modest increase in the birthrate taking it to over forty three per thousand by the end of the period.\(^2\) In the early part of the period the death rate made an equally substantial contribution to this natural increase falling from over twenty seven per thousand in 1716 to under seventeen per thousand in 1736. From this point, the contribution of the death rate probably declined. In 1741, and 1746, the death rate jumped back to twenty four per thousand, after which there was a slow decline until another surge in mortality around 1761, to twenty six per thousand after which a further slow down turn occurred. Though the death rate never fell back to seventeen per thousand after 1736 it always remained below the level pertaining at the beginning of the period.\(^3\)

The more detailed position in individual chapelries can only be clearly established down to 1760 as after that date the aforementioned

---

\(^1\) Eversley, \textit{loc cit}, p 402-3

\(^2\) See \textit{Figure No II}

\(^3\) ibid
change in registering practices associated with Goodshaw chapelry makes it more difficult to establish individual chapelry rates with any precision. Between 1716 and 1760 the birth rate in both the chapelys rose and also gradually came into line with each other.

In 1716, the Haslingden birth rate exceeded that of Newchurch by over ten per thousand, but by 1731 Newchurch had virtually caught up with the increase recorded at Haslingden which had peaked as early as 1721. From 1731 the birth rate in both chapelys stabilised down to mid 1750's at around forty per thousand. From 1756 a variation emerged with a rising birth rate at Newchurch and a falling one at Haslingden, however by the 1770's the two areas had come back into line with each other.

In 1716 the death rate in Newchurch was substantially lower than that in Haslingden. From that date the trend in both chapelys was generally downwards until the 1730's, though the absolute level remained substantially higher in Haslingden. In 1731, the recorded death rate at Newchurch was only just over thirteen per thousand whilst at Haslingden in 1736 it was under nineteen per thousand. Both of these are exceptionally low by contemporary standards. From these dates, both chapelys experienced substantial increases in their death rates. This increase was short lived in Haslingden so that by the 1750's it was almost back to the 1736 level. In contrast the Newchurch death rate only fell back marginally. The result was that the absolute difference in the death rate of the two areas which had narrowed but little before the 1730's now shrank rapidly. Indeed, by the early 1750's, Haslingden for the first time, was recording an absolutely lower death rate than Newchurch. However, from this time until 1780 Newchurch recovered its usual position of having a lower death rate than its neighbour.
Though the pattern of the birth and death rate have been outlined, the factors underlying these trends remain hidden. It is to these underlying factors that attention must now be turned.
SECTION B - THE BIRTH RATE

As before, attention here will be focused on the potential variables most likely to have been of influence on the local birth rate, namely the proportion of the population who married, and fertility within marriage, particularly the spacing of births and foetal wastage.

The procedure for calculating the local marriage rate is the same as that utilised for 1660-1715.\(^1\) The figures resulting suggest that the early eighteenth century upturn in the marriage rate from the low levels of the late seventeenth century continued into this period:

**Marriage Rates 1706-1776**
(Marriages Per Thousand Population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Combined Chapelries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The problem posed by the Goodshaw register is not a danger, in this context as that chapelry did not conduct marriages in this period. In October 1794 what was claimed to be the first marriage for over forty years was conducted at Goodshaw - Blackburn Mail, October 29th 1794.
In 1706 the level recorded was six per thousand which by 1721 had risen to nearly ten per thousand. From this date, the rate stabilised then began a modest decline until the mid 1730's. After some hesitancy the rate began to recover and by the mid 1750's was at a new high of ten per thousand. Even at the low point in the mid 1730's the marriage rate remained above the levels pertaining even at the highest point in the period down to 1716, was a factor of some significance in explaining the early surge of the birth rate around 1716. This view is strengthened by the pattern of fluctuations as the slight fall in the marriage rate in the late 1720's and 1730's followed by a recovery in the 1740's and 1750's, is consistent with fluctuations in the birth rate. Yet the impact appears to have gradually diminished. Though the marriage rate rose after 1766 it generally remained below the peak levels recorded earlier in the century.

The marriage rate also helps explain both the absolute difference in the birth rate in 1716 and the decline in that difference down to 1736 that existed between the two chapelries of Rossendale. In 1716, the chapelry of Haslingden had both a substantially higher birth and marriage rate than Newchurch and in both criteria the difference declined to a negligible level down to 1736 from which time they moved in close unison down to the early 1760's. In Newchurch both the birth and marriage rate increased by just over thirty three per cent between 1716 and 1736. In the chapelry of Haslingden the relationship was less clear cut, the marriage rate declined by around forty per cent over the same period, whilst the birth rate only began to decline from 1721 and even then the decline was very modest. Even so the fact that both rates moved in the same direction at approximately the same level over the same period suggests that
even here the trend in the birth rate can at least be partially attributed to a change in the marriage rate. From the early 1760's the situation is less clear as the experience of the two chapelries again diverged though both did see a sharp fall in the marriage rate followed by a recovery.

The importance of marital fertility can also be estimated by the same method utilised prior to 1716.\(^{(1)}\) Until 1716 this was a factor of some significance for the local birth rate, and this continued to be the case in part of this period which opened with fertility at a stable level of around five children per marriage.\(^{(2)}\) From 1716 to the 1730's fertility remained at this level, but from the 1740's the level of fertility showed a steady though modest rise. Within the area, the position was rather more complex. In Haslingden chapelry both the birth rate and the level of fertility declined from 1721 until the mid 1730's from which time both recovered until both began a downward trend in the 1760's.

The reverse process occurred around Newchurch, both the birth rate and fertility rose until the 1730's and then began a decline until the 1750's when a recovery set in.

---

\(^{(1)}\) Eversley, loc cit, p 402-3

\(^{(2)}\) Marital Fertility Rate 1711-1770
(Baptisms per Marriage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Combined Chapelries</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1711-1730</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731-1750</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751-1770</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These complexities indicate a need to examine the factors potentially underlying these fertility trends. The age at first marriage was a significant factor contributing to marital fertility prior to 1716, but it is difficult to ascertain the importance of the factor for the period down to 1780. Local registers provide no indication of age at first marriage whilst the same registers provide insufficient data to permit estimates from reconstitution techniques. Of ninety marriages recorded at Haslingden in 1730 and 1731, a period providing more detail than most, positive identification was possible in only fifteen cases. This proportion is too small for any confidence to be placed in any trends they reveal.\(^1\) The registers of the neighbouring parish of Saddleworth can be used to provide limited supporting evidence. Saddleworth marriage register specifies the age of marriage of both partners throughout most of the eighteenth century. The Saddleworth area was geographically and economically very similar to the chapelry of Newchurch, both being outlying production areas of the Rochdale woollen industry which experienced rapid population growth from the 1710's. The registers of Saddleworth indicate that there was a significant fall in the median age of marriage partners in the eighteenth century. Indeed after studying Saddleworth demographic trends Wild suggested that the fall in the median age at marriage went:–

"a long way towards helping explain the increase in the rates of natural increase and, in turn, the parishes overall population growth."\(^2\)

\(^1\) The result is essentially the same regardless of the years taken.

If this pattern was applicable to Newchurch this would help account for the upturn in the chapelry's level of marital fertility down to the 1730's, but not the subsequent downturn. Indeed the fact that the trend in Haslingden was downward from 1726-1736 indicates that the pattern could vary sharply even in areas of close geographic proximity. As a result only very limited confidence can be placed on the applicability of the Saddleworth data to the Newchurch area.

Rather more can be said about a second variable, the interval between births within a marriage, which can be gleaned from the entries in the baptism registers. Yet as before, the success of such an exercise can only be estimated if the birth/baptism interval is known.

In Appendix No I, it is noted that between the 1720's and the end of the eighteenth century there was a considerable increase in average birth/baptism intervals. However, it is possible that much of this increase did not occur until after 1780. It is on the basis of this admittedly uncertain assumption that the birth spacing intervals have been calculated. (1)

The figures derived from such an approach suggest that the interval between births dwindled in this period as shown in the table overleaf.

The figures derived from such an approach suggested that the interval dwindled by over five months. (2) This trend is observable

---

(1) The method adopted is identical with that utilised for 1660-1715 with one exception. By 1781-5 this would have meant an exceptionally large sample, thus for practical reasons the survey for those dates has been limited to those families with surnames beginning with the first five letters of the alphabet. This enables a complete survey of entries for families with surnames beginning with such letters without introducing any observable bias.

(2) This interval reduction is too great to be explained in terms of lengthening birth/baptism intervals.
in both chapelries, though in absolute terms those of Haslingden remained just below those of Newchurch. The range of these intervals also remained modest, at both dates over eighty per cent of intervals were between one and three years in duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapelry</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average Monthly Interval</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>1721-5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td>1721-5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>1721-5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C - THE DEATH RATE

The study of influence on local mortality in this period can also follow the general methodology used prior to 1716. As in that period four basic elements can be isolated, namely grain prices, money wages, pastoral prosperity and the local climate. The switch in emphasis from agriculture to textiles based on putting out suggests that the level of money wages was of growing importance and pastoral prosperity of declining significance in determining the overall economic state of area in this period. (1)

"Mortality crises" can be defined as before, as a period in which the annual number of baptisms rose by more than twenty per cent over the average number of burials for the three preceding non-crisis years. On this basis the following emerge as period of crisis mortality, 1716-1717, 1722, 1726-8 inclusive, 1736-7 inclusive, 1740-1745 inclusive, 1754, 1756, 1762, 1769 and 1776. (2)

It is significant that though the number of mortality crises increased in frequency in this period compared to its predecessor, the long term consequences for local population levels were far less severe. After 1715, no mortality crisis succeeded in cutting the absolute size of the Rossendale population even in the crisis year itself. At their most severe they could only temporarily cut back the rate of nature increases. Thus in this period the long term impact of fluctuations in mortality were of declining significance.

It is perhaps also significant that the increased frequency of such crises after 1715 co-incided with what is thought to have been

(1) See Chapter XVI, Section B
(2) See Figure No II
a return of epidemic scourges to heighten the death rate in many parts of the South and Midlands. (1)

Major sources for the study of local mortality continue to be the regular listings of pauper burials in the Haslingden register and levels of local poor law expenditure. (2) Where the latter criteria surged in a period of mortality crisis, it has been taken as an indication of a powerful economic aspect to the crisis. The evidence from this source can continue to be supplemented by Stout's autobiography which runs until the early 1750's. (3) A second literary source is also available from the diary of Richard Kay from 1738 - 1751. Kay was a doctor resident in Bury but he had part of his practice in the Rossendale area. (4) Thus Kay provides a virtually local account of prevailing conditions in Rossendale.

In the period 1715-1717 there is no evidence of any significant increase in the level of local poor law disbursements. Stout records the years 1716-1717 as one in which provisions were plentiful and cheap despite the hard frost of the winter of 1715-1716. (5) This suggests that the crisis was not directly economic in origin.

More evidence is available for the crisis of 1722. Pauper burials and local poor law disbursements indicate that the problem of poverty was stable in this year though both note an increase in the following year. (6)

---

(1) J.D. Chambers, Population, Economy and Society in Pre-Industrial England, 1972, p 93
(2) See Table No III, Rossendale Poor Relief Expenditure.
(6) ibid p 182-3
Stout notes that during 1722 provisions were cheap but the collapse of the South Sea Company dislocated trade, thus depressing pastoral agriculture and manufacturing industry. In addition, snow and frost in the spring of the year hurt the local population and made fuel scarce. This probably led also to difficulties for transport in upland areas. These factors he saw as underlying a rise in local mortality during the year. The same factors may well have underlain the rise in Rossendale, but the question why this did not influence the level of pauper mortality remains.

The mortality crisis of 1726-1728 did co-incide with a rise in local pauper mortality. In 1727 high grain prices were prevalent in Manchester, whilst in North Lancashire a late spring and a cold summer in 1728 was followed by dear corn, in which oats reached 7s 6d per wintle, wheat £1, barley 10s and oatmeal 14s. In the same year a depression in the linen trade may have been matched by a depression in the woollen trade. According to Stout these developments meant that the local poor had a hard year. However, this cannot be seen simply as a case of crisis mortality due to economic problems, as it was also a time of epidemic during the sickly summer particularly in rural areas.\(^{(1)}\) Grain prices were probably not the most important factor influencing mortality in this crisis. Though mortality fell in 1729 grain prices remained at their high 1728 levels. However, high grain prices probably does explain the continued high level of pauper mortality in 1729. Despite this, it cannot be firmly established that the mortality crisis was primarily induced by the epidemic crisis, and even less that epidemic was the cause of the high mortality in 1726 and 1727. Thus a hybrid explanation appears to give the best fit.

\(^{(1)}\) ibid p 201

Bennett, *A History of Marsden and Colne*, p 140
Little information is available about the mortality crisis of 1736-1738. Local poor law expenditure remained at generally modest levels. 1736 was a year of epidemic in Nottinghamshire but whether this was a factor in east Lancashire is by no means clear. Stout comments that early 1737 was a period in which coughs and colds were high which may have had a consequential impact on mortality. The role of epidemic in 1738 must be considered doubtful. The contemporary doctor and diarist Richard Kay of Bury, who began his diary in 1738, makes no reference to any epidemic in that year, though it does appear to have been his practice to note outbreaks of epidemic on other occasions. The general paucity of information on this period prevents any realistic estimate of the causes of this year of mortality.

Fortunately more evidence is available for what was the severest and longest mortality crisis of the period, that of 1740-1745. The earlier part of this period Chambers sees as a period of heavy epidemic mortality in the Midlands. Local poor law disbursements soared more than threefold in the years 1740 and 1741. 1740 was said to be a year of famine and corn scarcity in neighbouring Burnley, where £20 was taken out of the poor stock to buy oatmeal for sale to the poor at cost. The problem would appear to have started in late 1739, which according to Stout saw a long sharp frost for two months, followed by snow and more frost which killed livestock and led to a rapid increase

(2) ibid, p 221.
in the price of fuel. This increase in the price of fuel suggests a disruption of transport that was probably sufficient to dislocate manufacturing activity. Kay confirms that the harsh weather hit the Bury and Rossendale areas by noting:

"we have had such a frost as is thought not to have been known in the memory of man."(2)

The spring of 1740 appears to have been little better, being cold and late. Stout notes that this led to a failure of the oats and barley crop and resulted in high corn prices, oats reaching 7s 6d per windle, barley 12s and wheat £1. Likewise, Kay blames the late spring for a lack of grass which must have hurt local pastoral farmers.(4) Kay also notes that drought hit Ireland killing many sheep which may have aggravated the disruption to the local textile industry caused more directly by local climatic conditions.(5) Trade may have been further disrupted by a renewal of the war with Spain both directly and through a consequential increase in the land tax.(6) Epidemic was also present. In the late spring and early summer of 1740 smallpox was present on the southern boundary of Rossendale.(7) The extent to which smallpox accounted for the high mortality in this period was probably limited,
the level of mortality in these months was not higher than the average for the rest of the year.

1741 was probably even worse than the two preceding years. Again the spring was backward and cold which delayed the growth of grass and hurt pastoral farmers and pushed up grain prices to new heights. Though the eventual harvest proved good leading to grain prices falling by a third, the woollen trade, particularly woollen spinning, was depressed. In consequence, Stout concluded that this was a hard year for the poor.\(^1\) This conclusion is probably also applicable to Rossendale where settlement disputes rose to ten times their pre-crisis level.\(^2\) Problems continued into 1742, storms, frost and snow delayed seeding and led to a scarcity of fodder for livestock. During the first half of the year the woollen industry probably remained depressed, for despite Stout's view that the harshness of the winters of 1739-1740 and 1740-1741 had reduced the sheep population by half, wool prices remained low.\(^3\) The autumn, however, saw improved fortunes, an abundance of grass and a plentiful harvest helped pastoral farmers and reduced corn prices. This was followed by a recovery in trade which probably included a recovery in the woollen trade.\(^4\) This recovery is reflected in Rossendale by a reduction in local poor law expenditure and a fall in the number of settlement disputes.\(^5\)


\(^{(2)}\) *LAD/QSP/passim.*


\(^{(4)}\) *ibid,* p 233

\(^{(5)}\) *Quarter Sessions Settlement Disputes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of Disputes</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of Disputes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, no concrete evidence remains as to the causes of high local mortality from 1743-1745. Stout's diary comes to an end as does much of the local data on poor law expenditure. The number of local settlement disputes declined during these years back to the pre-crisis levels. The level of local pauper mortality was also at a low level. Together these trends suggest that the economic recovery may have continued in these years. If so, this would imply the possibility of high epidemic mortality. Such an epidemic may have had a severe impact on mortality insofar as virtually three years of economic and climatic harshness may have weakened the surviving population and increased its susceptibility to epidemics.

The high levels of mortality recorded in 1754 and 1756 are difficult to explain. In both years the price of grain sold on the Manchester markets was extremely low apart from the final quarter of 1756. As Manchester was probably a major regional market, the pattern of prices here was probably reflected in Rossendale. The presence of low grain prices prior to late 1756 suggests that whatever else was the cause of high mortality it was not high grain prices. In contrast the high mortality of 1762 could well have been associated with high food prices. Certainly food prices in Manchester were sufficient to cause outbreaks of rioting in that year. Food prices were also high and wages were low during the high mortality of 1769. A similar situation was also present immediately prior to the crisis year of 1776. However, in the latter year epidemic may also have

(1) W. Bennett, *A History of Burnley*, Vol III, p 39 - 1756 was also a year of high mortality in the neighbouring area of Burnley.


(3) C. Aspin, *James Hargreaves and the Spinning Jenny*, p 18-19
been present. Certainly there was a severe outbreak of smallpox in the neighbouring area of Colne.\(^{(1)}\)

The importance of individual variables theoretically capable of accounting for levels of high mortality was probably limited. This can be observed by examining such factors in those years when mortality was known to be modest.

In 1723, Stout notes that summer drought hit both pastoral farming and the grain harvest. However, as this was also a year in which the woollen trade prospered, Stout feels that the poor did well.\(^{(2)}\) This latter comment would square well with the experience of Rossendale where mortality remained at normal levels.\(^{(3)}\) This was despite the fact that the number of pauper burials and the level of poor law expenditure both went up sharply. The same pattern occurred in 1725, a poor harvest was offset by buoyant textile activity, thus increasing pauper mortality and the cost of poor relief but not the overall level of local mortality. This suggests that the level of food prices was no longer in itself a major determinant of local mortality. It was only those in a marginal economic position that were now susceptible. Equally it emphasises the growing importance of textiles in determining the local economic climate.

This general position remained true into the second half of the eighteenth century when food prices are traditionally seen as having been on a generally upward trend.\(^{(4)}\) Grain prices were sufficiently

\(^{(1)}\) Carr, Annals and Stories of Colne and Neighbourhood, 1878, p86


\(^{(3)}\) ibid, p 193 and 275

\(^{(4)}\) A.P.Wadsworth and J.de.L.Mann, op cit, p 356.
high in Manchester in 1757 and 1759 to have led to severe rioting.\(^{(1)}\)

These high food prices probably hit Rossendale as the level of poor relief expenditure increased dramatically. Despite this the level of mortality in these years was actually below the level of the preceding year in both Rossendale chapelries.

The impact of epidemic disease when acting in isolation is difficult to assess. One indication may come in Kay's diary which refers to outbreaks of fevers in Rossendale in 1747 which may well have been quite frequent in the late 1740's.\(^{(2)}\) Despite this the level of mortality in Rossendale remained unchanged. In the same way the state of local pastoral agriculture was of modest impact. This was shown in 1747 following an outbreak of cattle plague which led to the suspension of all fairs in the surrounding area. When the fairs re-opened stock prices were very low and tenants were said to have struggled to meet their rents.\(^{(3)}\) Despite this, Rossendale mortality levels did not respond.

From the middle of the eighteenth century the most important single influence of mortality levels may have been the state of the textile trade, particularly for eastern Rossendale. 1766 and 1767 were years of depression in the textile trade. In early 1766 it was reported from the West Riding that trade was dull and unemployment and short time working were rife.\(^{(4)}\) By early the following year, the

\(^{(1)}\) A.Redford, op cit, p 143-4
Manchester Mercury for 1757 and 1759

\(^{(2)}\) Brockbank and Kenworthy, ed, "The Diary of Richard Kay: A Lancashire Doctor" loc cit, p 140 and 162.

\(^{(3)}\) K.J.Bonser, The Drovers, 1970, p 97

\(^{(4)}\) Williamson's Liverpool Advertiser, January 31st 1766
east Lancashire industry was being hit. A Rochdale JP noted the lack of employment and lowness of wages were causing great distress to the poor. (1) In Newchurch chapelry mortality jumped by over fifty per cent in 1767 and remained at this inflated level until the end of the decade. Yet in neighbouring Haslingden chapelry, mortality levels did not move in these years so that the Rossendale overall average rose only relatively modestly. (2)

(1) Manchester Mercury, January 20th 1767
(2) See Figure No II
SECTION D - CONCLUSIONS

The most obvious and yet the central conclusion here is that the period saw massive and sustained population growth throughout Rossendale. This growth appears to have been largely a product of natural increase. This growth was most rapid in two phases, 1716 to 1730's and from the 1760's until 1780.

The expansion down to around 1730 was attributable to both a rise in the birth rate and a fall in the death rate. From this date the continued buoyancy of the birth rate was the main factor influencing the natural growth rate.

This initial rise then buoyancy in the local birth rate reflected both a rising marriage rate and an increase in marital fertility. With rather less certainty, it can be argued that the increase in marital fertility may have been the result of a fall in the age at marriage and a narrowing of birth intervals within a marriage.

No single factor appears to have dominated mortality trends. Individual factors especially where shortlived were generally insufficient to dramatically influence the death rate. Where several factors combined and particularly if they persisted as in the early 1740's the impact could be severe. Yet even on these occasions, the increase in mortality was not of sufficient magnitude to cause a drop in the absolute size of the local population. The impact was merely to slow down the rate of increase. This provides the most dramatic contrast with the late seventeenth century when such crises could cut the absolute size of the population.
In 1716 Rossendale was predominantly an area of dispersed settlement with only two settlements, Bacup and Haslingden being of any size. Even these had probably under two hundred inhabitants each. There is little evidence of any change in the distribution of population by altitude or towards the two larger settlements.

In several respects, this general picture was altered in the period down to 1780, most significantly by the fact that this was an era of rapid population growth in Rossendale. (1)

Despite the rapid background expansion, the first moves towards urbanisation got under way. An increasing proportion of the local population came to reside in Haslingden and Bacup. At the beginning of the century these had accounted for only around three and two per cent of the population of the combined chapelfries respectively, but by 1781-5 they were each accounting for around ten per cent of the total. (2) In Haslingden, the increase had occurred before 1750 but

(1) For the background problems see Appendix III

(2) Growth of Haslingden and Bacup 1701-1785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bacup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1705-9</td>
<td>23 (3%)</td>
<td>1701-5</td>
<td>21 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>23 (3%)</td>
<td>1721-5</td>
<td>33 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>99 (10%)</td>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>42 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>98 (10%)</td>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>54 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>239 (10%)</td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>228 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures for Haslingden 1781-5 include the totals for Sheep Green, Lower Green, Higher and Lower Lane and Bell Row as well as Haslingden itself as the former were all integral parts of the town by this date.
in Newchurch the increase was largely delayed until after that date.

As the urbanisation was taking place against a background of rapid overall population growth, the expansion of both settlements must have been extremely rapid in absolute terms. Assuming that the birth rate in the settlements was in line with that of their respective chapelries as a whole, the approximate magnitude of this increase can be plotted:

**Population Estimates of Haslingden and Bacup 1716-1785**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bacup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>100 - 150</td>
<td>1721-5</td>
<td>150 - 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>450 - 500</td>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>200 - 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>650 - 700</td>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>250 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>1,000 - 1,100</td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>700 - 750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures suggest a steady increase in the absolute size of the settlements. Though both remained relatively small they did begin to develop more urban characteristics. As early as the 1750's a township survey of Haslingden and a poor law assessment of Bacup suggests that they were physically composed largely of virtually landless cottages. (2) In the case of Haslingden, the buildings around the open market square were multi-tenanted as domestic dwellings. (3)

One response to the demographic growth of these settlements was

(1) See Chapter IV for an explanation.


LRQ/DSR/2858

(3) LRQ/T.R. Allen Papers/DDX/416/Box 1351
to physically expand them. In 1752 and 1753 five hundred square yards of waste next to Haslingden school house was sold for building.\(^1\) In 1779, a further three thousand square acres were sold for a similar purpose on a nearby site.\(^2\) By this time pressure was acute and in the early 1780’s other similar sales occurred. A second response was to make more effective use of the space within the existing area by the erection of terraced housing. By 1780, Sheep Green had been built up with such houses in the heart of Haslingden often being multi-tenanted. In the north of the town terraced cottages had been built on Higher and Lower Lane with multi-tenanted properties at Bell Row.\(^3\)

Though Bacup and Haslingden remained the dominant local settlements, the period after 1715 saw the emergence of a new group of smaller settlements particularly in central Rossendale. In Newchurch chapelry three settlements in particular emerged at Newchurch, with a population of up to four hundred by 1785, Boothfold with up to two hundred and fifty and Edgeside with up to two hundred. In addition, rather smaller centres emerged at Cloughfold, Lumm, Tunstead, Waterfront and Whitewell Bottom in the same area and Lane Head, Old Meadow and Tong around Bacup. In Haslingden chapelry, Rawtenstall emerged with a population of up to two hundred by 1785 with smaller centres at Baxenden, Constablee, Oakenheadwood, Rising Bridge and Stonefold. Within Haslingden township, Deardengate and Laneside emerged as virtually a secondary settlement to Haslingden with a population of up to two hundred each, with other substantial centres at Flaxmoss and Heap Clough.

\(^1\) ibid
\(^3\) See Haslingden Chapelry Registers
In each case these embryo centres initially emerged in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. From that date, their growth, though rapid, ceased to outstrip that of Rossendale as a whole and fell behind that of the two leading settlements.

In contrast, the spatial distribution of population by altitude remained stable until almost the end of the period.

As before 1716, a steady eighty five to ninety per cent of the population resided between the six and eleven hundred foot contours despite the fact that the local population was now growing rapidly. In the final two decades, this pattern began to change with ninety three per cent of the population residing between these contours in 1781-1785.\(^\text{(1)}\) This increase was largely at the expense of the population residing above the twelve hundred foot contour which remained approximately stable in absolute terms.

The central point, however, is that population expansion occurred in virtually all local settlements, the bulk of it outside the two largest centres.

Yet how was this increasing rural population housed? As will be seen in a later chapter, it was not through the subdivision of farms.\(^\text{(2)}\) The major part of the answer lies in the construction of cottages. The extent of such cottage building was substantial even in the mid eighteenth century:

\(^\text{(1)}\) These percentages would be further boosted if the Haslingden and Bacup figures were included. The proportion of the population residing between six and nine hundred foot contours also relatively stable, usually at around sixty five per cent.

\(^\text{(2)}\) See Chapter XV, Section A
### Distribution of Population by Altitude 1701-1785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude (in feet)</th>
<th>1701-9</th>
<th>1721-5</th>
<th>1741-5</th>
<th>1745-9</th>
<th>1781-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-99</td>
<td>16 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>22 (4%)</td>
<td>29 (4%)</td>
<td>48 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-99</td>
<td>44 (13%)</td>
<td>76 (16%)</td>
<td>94 (16%)</td>
<td>88 (14%)</td>
<td>206 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-99</td>
<td>63 (18%)</td>
<td>70 (15%)</td>
<td>106 (18%)</td>
<td>105 (116%)</td>
<td>218 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-99</td>
<td>99 (29%)</td>
<td>159 (35%)</td>
<td>139 (23%)</td>
<td>172 (26%)</td>
<td>582 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-99</td>
<td>43 (12%)</td>
<td>63 (14%)</td>
<td>86 (14%)</td>
<td>123 (19%)</td>
<td>225 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-99</td>
<td>44 (13%)</td>
<td>48 (10%)</td>
<td>81 (14%)</td>
<td>78 (12%)</td>
<td>192 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-99</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
<td>19 (2%)</td>
<td>26 (4%)</td>
<td>50 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-99</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>33 (6%)</td>
<td>18 (3%)</td>
<td>19 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-99</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td>20 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-99</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
<td>8 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 344 (100%) 460 (100%) 597 (100%) 651 (100%) 1537 (100%)

(1) Haslingden and Bacup figures excluded. See Map No VII b and c
Many of these new cottages were attached to farms. The above sources indicate cottages attached to fifty local farms in this period. Land deeds provide further confirmation. In 1716, a farm at Miller Barn, Newchurch had two houses attached, but by 1760 this had increased to five.\\(^2\) Higher Parkhouse farm, Musbury had one house which increased to two by the 1770's. A farm at Flaxmoss, Haslingden had a similar experience between 1737 and 1764.\\(^3\) More

---

(1) Haslingden - Stevens and Hawkin, *passim*, figure given excludes cottages in the built up area of the town.

Dedwenclough, Tunstead, Wolfenden and Wolfenden Booth – LAD/QSP/2858

Constablee, Henheads, New Hall Hay, Oakenheadwood and Rawtenstall – RRL/RC 352.1 Ros, Valuation for parts of Rossendale, 1754.

Coupe, Hall Carr and Lench – RRL/RC 352.1 Ros Hall Carr Valuation 1768-1771

(2) LAD/DDX/118/103/8 and 16

(3) LAD/CTV/15/1 and 4

LAD/DDX/118/164/1 and 3
extreme was a farm at Carterplace, Haslingden which contained one house in 1723, two in 1750 and three by 1766. In all these cases the farms appear to have continued to operate as individual units.

In the larger centres such as Newchurch and Boothfold, many cottages were built with little or no land attached, due to the high density of building. Such groups of cottages are clearly recorded in the aforementioned surveys of the 1750's and 1760's. It is possible that by the end of this period landless cottages were being constructed on a terrace basis. These cottages were built into the valley side giving access to working quarters from above, with living quarters below. Houses of this style can still be found in the Helmshore area of Rossendale.

The expansion of population would in itself have increased the pressure on the local transport system. Despite this, the system was generally slow to respond. Turnpiked roads came to the edge of Rossendale with the Rochdale/Halifax road in 1734. It was not for a further twenty years that Rossendale obtained its first turnpike with the Rochdale/Burnley road of 1754. Both these roads suggest the importance of the local woollen trade in their origins as they both provided links between the major textile centres of the Lancashire/Yorkshire border area.

Progress was even slower elsewhere in Rossendale, no further turnpike routes were developed before the late 1780's. This reflects

(1) LRO/DDX/118/129/3, 6 and 8
(2) O·Ashmore, Industrial Archaeology of Lancashire, 1969, p 27-8
(4) ibid, p 99
the still limited importance of Rossendale. Rossendale marked the western edge of the woollen area. All the major centres of the industry lay to the east of the area, thus there was no need for these centres to build linking roads through west and central Rossendale to centres to the west. (1) The area itself appears not to have sufficient importance to overcome this and justify a turnpike road for itself.

This failure to develop further turnpikes may have been reinforced by the commercial experience of the Rochdale/Burnley turnpike. During the first decade of the operation, the debt on the road grew from £500 to £1,200 and by the 1780's reached £2,000. (2) However, the operations of the road may have been influenced by the prominent woollen manufacturers among its trustees who were more concerned about minimising transport costs than with maximising the direct profit of the enterprise.

A further problem in the early years was to ensure that users of the road paid the relevant tolls. The minutes of the road indicate severe problems with chapmen and carriers who tried to avoid paying tolls by skirting around the toll gates, or even breaking down the gates. (3)

The road itself was carefully constructed. One section at Deerpley in north east Rossendale was to be seven yards wide with a

---

(1) Centres to the west such as Bolton and Blackburn, had long ceased to be major woollen producers, thus reducing the west to east commercial traffic through Rossendale.

(2) Rochdale RL/RB 214/Rochdale and Burnley Turnpike Road: Minutes 1755-1791

(3) Rochdale RL/RB 214/ie October 20th 1757, April 6th, May 18th, August 3rd and 23rd, September 2nd 1758, March 13th 1766 and June 9th 1768
one yard drain on each side. The crown of the road was to have a
one foot covering of broken stone, to fall to six inches on the
edges. The whole surface was to be covered to a depth of six inches
with gravel. In addition, two foot square conduits with flagged bot­
toms were to be built on the road side. (1) Toll charges were struc­
tured to encourage customers to use vehicles with wheels less damag­
ing to the road surface. (2)

Though the road was not a direct commercial success, as an
underlying economic asset it was of growing value. This is indicated
by the steady rise in the lease values of the tolls which rose
steadily:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>£ 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>£ 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-5</td>
<td>£130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775-8</td>
<td>£140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside of the turnpike system, the increasing pressures placed
on the roads probably led to an awareness of their limita­
tions or to an actual deterioration in their quality. Both views are
tenable from contemporary descriptions of the 1780's. Wesley wrote

(1) ibid, October 20th 1757, November 23rd 1757, see also August 7th
1766, November 16th 1776, May 1st 1783

(2) ibid, December 5th 1765

(3) Toad Lane lay on the section between Bacup and Rochdale. The
sudden jump between 1771 and 1772-5 probably reflects an increase
in the toll charges and possibly the inclusion of the income
from the Bacup gate, for which figures were not kept separately.
of the roads from Haslingden north to Padiham. "They were sufficient to lame any horse and shake any carriages to pieces." (1) More specifically, it was said by another writer:

"These were such hollows to fill and hills to be taken down, to form the level, as was never done before: in several of the hollows the walls were ten yards high before the battlements were put on the top." (2)

The situation could be equally bad in eastern Rossendale. The road around Brandwood Brook on the Newchurch/Rochdale route was described in 1782 as "much shrunk owing to the clay or marl being washed out". (3)

The settlement and transport pattern of this period must in general be seen against a background of rapid demographic and economic growth.

Despite this, most of the local population continued to live in small dispersed settlements, though, the first moves towards urbanisation can be observed. The two leading settlements of Haslingden and Bacup grew around five fold, whilst a number of smaller, but still locally significant villages emerged as population centres. Within the larger settlements, this growth was housed by physical expansion, and by increasing housing density. In the rural areas, it was met by the widespread building of cottages often attached to local farms.

The impact of economic and demographic growth on transport was slower to materialise. By 1780, Rossendale possessed only one stretch of turnpiked road. This probably reflects Rossendale's position on

(1) J. Wesley, Journal, April 24th 1788
(2) Anon, The Life of John Metcalfe, 1795, p 150
(3) E. Holme, An Account and Admeasurement of the Public Bridges within the Hundred of Salford, 1782, p 8
the edge of the woollen manufacturing area which reduced the flow of Rossendale traffic through the area. Though not a commercial success, the first Rossendale turnpike was well built and was of growing importance as the local economy expanded. This expansion probably led to a deterioration in the quality of the turnpiked sector. It was certainly in poor condition by the end of the period.
CHAPTER XII
PER CAPITA WEALTH 1716-1780

The probate inventory and poor law evidence for the late seventeenth century suggests that the period down to 1715 saw a general stability in the level of per capita wealth, a low level and a wide distribution of local wealth and a stable problem of poverty. Within Rossendale, some variation appears to have been present in the level and trend of per capita wealth with a low stable level in the township of Haslingden and higher or rising levels in the rest of the area. The poor law data also suggests the possibility of a rise in the problem of poverty in the years immediately prior to 1715.

The main source for the analysis of per capital wealth trends in Rossendale certainly down to 1750, remains the probate inventories. The limitations of these inventories are different in degree though not in nature for this period, than for the period before 1716. In consequence, attention must initially be given to a consideration of these limitations. Inventories are generally restricted to middling to Wealthy people in local society. This is not a severe problem for the beginning of this period given the relatively equitable distribution of local wealth. However, this may well have not been so for the period around 1750 due to developments in the local economy to be discussed in the next chapter. Thus, there may have been a progressively increasing elongated local wealth structure which in turn means that inventories give an increasingly biased coverage in favour of the wealthier elements in the local community. This, to some extent, can
be overcome by the realisation that the extant poor law data may well cover an increasing proportion of the local population. The development of local industry may in one sense have had a compensatory effect in favour of increasing the value of inventories as a guide to per capita wealth. This is because the growth of local industry probably reduced the importance of real estate in the per capita wealth structure. In effect the personal wealth covered by the inventory would represent an increasing proportion of the total wealth of the average testator. The problem of testators transferring wealth to beneficiaries prior to death can be overcome, as before 1715, by omitting all such suspected cases from any calculations. There is no reason to believe that the precision of inventory valuations was in any sense less accurate than those before 1716. A final problem is much more severe, the extant probate inventories cover a rapidly declining percentage of local adult male mortality. From 1716-1750, approximately three thousand five hundred burials were recorded in Rossendale, for which only one hundred extant inventories are available. This suggests that inventories provide a coverage of only around eleven and a half per cent of all adult male burials compared with around eighteen per cent for the period prior to 1716. This reduction in the absolute and relative size of the sample must have a weakening effect on the value of inventories as a guide to per capita wealth.

Despite the limitations, inventories still provide the best available guide and thus provide the basis for the following discussion.

The figures from such inventories suggest that the level of per capita wealth certainly amongst those of middling and above standing, steadily increased throughout the period.
Inventory Values by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1711-15</td>
<td>£91 9s 2d</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-20</td>
<td>£101 10s 7d</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-30</td>
<td>£121 16s 0d</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731-40</td>
<td>£177 16s 0d</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-50</td>
<td>£229 15s 7d</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed the figures suggest a doubling in the level of per capita wealth during the first thirty years of the period. It is surely of significance that this dramatic upswing co-incided with the onset of a period of considerable demographic buoyancy. This point will be taken up at a later stage.

The distribution of inventories by value suggests that this increase in the level of per capita wealth also co-incided with a slow widening in the structure of local wealth distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>1711-20</th>
<th>1721-30</th>
<th>1731-40</th>
<th>1741-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£0-£49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50-£99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100-£149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£150-£199</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£200-£249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250-£299</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£300-£349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£350-£399</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£400-£449</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£450-£499</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 20 48 22 18

(1) As this is thought to have been a period generally free of inflation, these figures probably indicate real as well as monetary values - J. Burnett, *A History of the Cost of Living*, p 32.
After 1716, though the majority of men still left under £250 for the first time there were a number leaving in excess, often substantially in excess of £500.

The internal geographic distribution of per capita wealth also underwent significant change:

**Average Inventory Values by Sub Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>No of Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1715</td>
<td>£ 73 4s 7d</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-1750</td>
<td>£143 3s 2d</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>South Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>No of Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1715</td>
<td>£110 7s 4d</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-1750</td>
<td>£156 6s 8d</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these figures it is clear that all parts of Rossendale made gains in terms of per capita wealth in this period. However, even more clear cut is that the township of Haslingden, which had lagged behind all other parts of Rossendale prior to 1716 now virtually caught up, so that after 1716, the area presented a virtually uniform pattern.
Inventories also contain a second albeit rather more indirect way of checking over all per capita wealth trends in Rossendale. The reference to specific rooms in many inventories indicates that the area may have experienced a new housing boom perhaps similar to that found in the sixteenth century. This eighteenth century building was not restricted to the building of cottages to cope with the expansion of the local population. It also appears to have consisted of building new and often substantial houses, or extending or improving existing houses. Between 1650 and 1716 thirty inventories give a breakdown of the number of rooms in the house of the testator. The average for these cases comes out around four rooms per house. The equivalent figure for the forty seven inventories providing a room breakdown between 1716 and 1750 suggests an average of over six rooms per house. The figures cannot be taken at face value as there is no certainty that all rooms in a house were listed, therefore checks are needed. Such a check is provided by consideration of the pattern of new building indicated by inventories: (see next page)

These cases tend to confirm the pattern derived from the figures of the average number of rooms per house. Though some new building was apparent before 1716, it significantly increased after that date. Peel's comments on the Crawshawbooth area of Haslingden chapelry provide further confirmation. Peel cites eleven cases of new building in Crawshawbooth from 1619 to 1746 of which seven relate to the period 1700 to 1746.

However, such sources fail to indicate how that proportion of the population living in the growing number of small cottages found in

(1) U.G. Hoskins, Provincial England, 1966, p 137
(2) A. Peel, Crawshawbooth and District, 1960, p 106
**Building Extensions 1650-1780**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details of Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Rawtenstall</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>a new house and new parlour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Henheads</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>a new room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>a new parlour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>a new house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Balladen</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>a new house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Oakenheadwood</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>a new parlour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Yate Bank</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>a new house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>a new parlour chamber, (and parlour?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Friar Hill</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>a new parlour and parlour chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Horncliffe</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>a loft and a new house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>a new parlour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Constablee</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>a new shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Broad Holden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>a new room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Fears</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>a new parlour and new chamber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the area fared. By the mid eighteenth century poor law assessments, tax assessments and township surveys suggest that in all parts of Rossendale, such cottages must have housed a very substantial proportion of the local population:
Cottages in Mid Eighteenth Century
Rossendale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No of Cottages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>506</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of five people per household, this would suggest a cottage resident population around two thousand five hundred people.

Inventories provide a final guide to local per capita wealth trends via their data on the level of domestic comfort. On this basis those leaving inventories valued at under £50, i.e. those probably resident in cottages appear to have seen little or no improvement in their standards of comfort after 1715. Both before and after this date they were usually restricted to a narrow range of basic necessities, usually a bed, a little bedding, a table, a few chairs and stools, fire making equipment, a few wooden vessels and earthen pots plus a little brass and pewter ware. The wealthier sections of the local community leaving inventories of £100+ experienced a distinct improvement after 1715.

(1) P. Steven and R. Hawkins, A Haslingden Churchwardens List 1753 - covers all of Haslingden township.
    RAL/RC/352-1 ROS Valuation Book for Part of Rossendale, 1754 - covers Gakenheadwood, Constablers, Rautenstall and Henheads parts of Haslingden Chapelry.
    LRC/2SP/2858 Newchurch in Rossendale Poor Law Assessment 1757-8 covers Daducelough, Wolfenden, Wolfendenbooth, Tunstead, and Bacup parts of Newchurch Chapelry.
    RAL/RC/352-1 ROS Hall Carr Valuation 1760-71 - covers Hall Carr, Coupe and Lench parts of the Rest of Rossendale area.
Up to that date they too were restricted to the same narrow range of basic goods as their poorer brethren, their great wealth generally lay in their greater agricultural, textile or credit activity. After 1715 these households came to have basic necessities in greater quantity, instead of a single bed, three or four beds became more normal, instead of two or three chairs, a dozen or more chairs etc. At the same time these groups began to enjoy a new range of domestic comforts. The extent of this change is typified by the inventory of George Hindle of Laneside in the township of Haslingden, who in 1743 left three beds, twelve chairs, seven stools, plus such relatively sophisticated items as two "seeing glasses", four "candlesticks", a "map", five "pictures", and a number of "drinking glasses". (1)

Taken together these various indices of per capita wealth suggest a rise in per capita wealth in the period 1716–1750. This rise appears to have been concentrated in the hands of the wealthier elements of local society. The nature of the evidence does not permit any decision on the experience of the poorer elements. Did they benefit, but to a more modest degree, or did they experience a real decline in per capita wealth?

In reality, there is little evidence that per capita real income for the mass of the population experienced a decline between 1716 and 1750. Chambers argued that a tightening up of the system of poor relief provides a good indication of a local shortage of labour. (2) When employment is readily available and wages are good, poor law authorities are likely to be less sympathetic to requests for relief from the able bodied pauper. Such a tightening up occurred in Rossendale in the

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of George Hindle of Laneside.
(2) J. D. Chambers, The Vale of Trent 1670–1800, p 58
years around 1715.\(^{(1)}\) A further reflection of this new attitude may have been the erection of workhouses for the able bodied unemployed during this period. The townships of Higher and Lower Booths had a workhouse by the early 1730's, Haslingden by 1749 and Newchurch by 1759.\(^{(2)}\) Labour shortage may have lasted until 1780 for at that time the inmates of Haslingden workhouse were producing cloth on contract for neighbouring manufacturers and merchants.\(^{(3)}\)

To some extent, the plausibility of such a pattern can be tested against the available wages data for the period. First, however, the limitations of this data should be acknowledged. Many local families remained dual employed independent farming/textile undertakings in which wages as such were probably unknown and between which activity probably varied with changes in the local economic climate. Secondly, as Bythell points out, for the late eighteenth century wages rates and earnings were influenced by a whole range of variables which together make precise estimation impossible.\(^{(4)}\) Finally, the data available is limited in both amount and reliability. Despite this it was this period that saw the first emergence of a substantial wage earning element in the local community, some attempt must be made to outline the probable trends.\(^{(5)}\)

Against these problems are advantages. In general price levels appear to have been reasonably stable with modest inflation only creeping

\(^{(1)}\) ibid p 63  
\(^{(2)}\) LRO/PR/2059/8  
\(^{(3)}\) RRL/RCP 362/ROS Hospitals in Rossendale 1749-1930  
\(^{(4)}\) D. Bythell, The Handloom Weavers, 1969, p 94-133  
\(^{(5)}\) See Chapter XVI, Section 8
in from the middle of the century.\(^1\) Thus money wage trends appear to provide a reasonable reflection of the real underlying trends, at least until the 1750’s. Secondly, the essentially semi-skilled nature of much labour probably meant that wage trends followed approximately the same trends in all parts of the local economy.

During the late seventeenth century money wages and thus real wages are thought to have fallen sharply in the West Riding woollen area of which Rossendale was an offshoot. In the final quarter of the seventeenth century, weekly wages were probably in decline. Assuming a six day working week, which is probably over generous in a period of trade depression, weavers were earning around 2s 6d per week and spinning around 1s 6d per week, both plus food and drink, or 4s per week for weavers without food and drink.\(^2\)

In the period after 1715, these wage levels probably increased. The Lancashire wage assessment of 1725, though only a very crude guide which does not cover textile wages, suggests a sharply upward trend in Lancashire wages in the early eighteenth century.\(^3\) The pattern does appear to have been equally applicable to woollen textile belt of Lancashire. In the 1720’s two craftsmen were earning 10d per day whilst repairing a bridge at Burnley giving a wage of 5s per week for a skilled man.\(^4\) This increase may have soon petered out for in 1746 three building labourers at Bacup were paid an average of 5d each per day for one hundred and twenty six days work yielding a weekly average of 3s.\(^5\) By the 1760’s when modest inflation may well have

---

\(^1\) J. Burnett, *A History of the Cost of Living*, p 132

\(^2\) See Chapter IX, Section B

\(^3\) A. P. Wadsworth and J. de L. Mann, *op cit*, p 50-1

\(^4\) W. Bennett, *A History of Burnley*, p 36

\(^5\) L. Moffit, *op cit*, p 250-1
been present, Young estimated wages for Lancashire and West Riding textile workers at 7s to 8s 6d per week.\(^{(1)}\)

Wages could also be supplemented by less reputable methods, in particular via embezzlement of wool or yarn which was probably rife in the area in the second half of the eighteenth century. One local minister openly condemned local woollen workers who "received from their masters a certain quantity of oil to be used in the process, which by moral lèger demain they thought themselves to be at liberty to appropriate to their own use during the long winter nights."\(^{(2)}\) Though fragmentary, this data tends to support Burnett's comment that "If the historian is forced to generalisations, he would probably conclude that the standard of living of the northern labourer improved steadily and substantially throughout the century (eighteenth century)."\(^{(3)}\) Yet such a comment ignores the fact that many late eighteenth century writers suggest that there may have been a reduction of the number of working days in the week, possibly down to as few as four days per week for many domestic textile workers.\(^{(4)}\) Such figures were certainly recorded by one weaver on the Yorkshire side of the Halifax-Rochdale woollen industry, of which Rossendale was a part. In 1782, John Sutcliffe, a clothier of Ovenden near Halifax devoted an average of 4.6 days per week to textile activity over an eight week period from October to December. In the five weeks of June to August of the following year this average fell to 4.2 days per week devoted to textiles.\(^{(5)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) ibid p 116, 248 Bennett, op cit p 181

\(^{(2)}\) A Brief History of the Church and Congregation Worshipping in the Baptist Chapel Goodshaw, c 1860, p 14

\(^{(3)}\) J. Burnett, op cit p 166

\(^{(4)}\) D. Bythell, op cit, p 115-117

\(^{(5)}\) F. Atkinson, ed, Some Aspects of the Eighteenth Century Woollen and Worsted Trade in Halifax, p 28-32. Against this reduction it must be accepted that it may have been compensated by a proportionate increased time spent on non textile economic activities such as farming.
Such figures may indicate why the level of domestic comfort exhibited by many of the poorer elements in local society appears to have stagnated at a time when local wage rates appear to have been increasing. In consequence, this appears to confirm the impression obtained of the level of domestic comfort gleaned from the inventories of poorer men leaving inventories of less than £50.

All the sources considered so far ignore the fate of those on the poverty line. The fate of this group must be considered in some detail before any conclusion can be drawn about overall per capita wealth trends.

In 1716, the area had no charities to help support the local poor.\(^{(1)}\)

This situation began to change immediately by following that date in all areas apart from the townships of Higher Booths, Dunnockshaw and Musbury.

Charities in Support of the Poor 1716-1786

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>Benjamin Holden left £100 in 1716.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worth £4 10s pa by 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Hargreaves left £30 in 1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worth £1 7s pa by 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Hey left £30 in 1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worth £1 7s pa by 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Mills Left £20 at an unknown date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worth £3 pa in 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>John Ormerod left a rent charge in 1757.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worth £13 10s pa in 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupe, Lench, Hall Carr,</td>
<td>John Guest left £3 14s 1d at an unknown date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hall Hey</td>
<td>Worth 3s pa in 1786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(2)}\) Abstract of Returns of Charitable Donations for the Benefit of Poor Persons, 1706, 1816, p 574.

\(^{(1)}\) Anon., *Notitia Cestriensis*, _loc cit_, p 332

\(^{(2)}\) Abstract of Returns of Charitable Donations for the Benefit of Poor Persons, 1706, 1816, p 574.
These charities could have only had a modest impact on the local poverty problem apart from in the Newchurch chapelry, and even there the impact was restricted to the years after 1757. In consequence, the local poor law data probably provides a reasonably accurate indication of the extent of local poverty. For this period, poor relief disbursements are available for the townships of Higher and Lower Booths which together made up the bulk of the Chapelry of Haslingden and the Musbury and Coupe, Lench, New Hall Hey, Hall Carr areas covered in the Tottington Higher End figures:

The figures shown on the next page can be supplemented by the data for the average number of people in receipt of poor relief in the townships of Higher and Lower Booths.\(^{(1)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Higher Booths</th>
<th>Lower Booths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken with those on disbursements, the figures indicate clearly that poor relief expenditure remained generally stable between 1715 and 1750. As this was a period in which the population of Rossendale roughly doubled, it would appear that the problem of poverty was of declining importance, and the number in receipt of poor relief were a declining proportion of the population.

The situation after 1750 appears to have changed considerably. From 1746-1755, poor law expenditure in Tottington averaged £30 16s 10d

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/2859/8
### Poor Law Disbursements 1716-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Higher Booths</th>
<th>Lower Booths</th>
<th>Tottingham Higher End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Covered</td>
<td>Average Disbursement</td>
<td>Years Covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£40 10s 10d</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726-35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£39 11s 10d</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£39 0s 10d</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746-1755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) LRO/PR/2859/8  
NCLR/MF/117a  
See Appendix No. IIa.
whereas from 1755-1765 it nearly doubled to an average of £55 3s 4d.\(^{(1)}\) A similar trend is indicated by the fragmentary data available for the township of Haslingden. In 1753, the poor law disbursements of this township totalled £24 7s, whereas by the late 1770's they had grown dramatically to an average of around £225. The figures for the townships of Higher and Lower Booths show disbursements running at £122 16s and £101 11s 7d respectively.\(^{(2)}\) In all cases, the increase is dramatic and appears to date from the 1750's.\(^{(3)}\) Even when taking population growth and the possibility of inflation into account, the problem of poverty appears to have been a growing one in Rossendale in the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Though only isolated years, there is no evidence to suggest that they were in any significant way abnormal.

Yet this increase was by no means steady, considerable short term variations were observable. It is perhaps this that may help explain why the problem of poverty may have grown at a time of labour shortage. Two factors stand out, in particular, as possible influences. This was a period of generally rising food prices and increasingly frequent food price crises must hit those at the bottom of the financial scale most severely. At the same time, the growth of textile employment in an employee capacity may have led to the onset of a cyclical kind of unemployment. This was certainly the view of several contemporary

\(^{(1)}\) NCP\(L/\)MF/117a

\(^{(2)}\) Stevens and Hawkins, ed, *A Haslingden Churchwarden's List of 1753* passim

\(^{(3)}\) LRO/CTV/2/1. Other Rossendale townships also had high levels of poor law expenditure in 1778. Gray, *A History of Bury, Lancashire*, Appendix I indicates that a similar trend was observable in the neighbouring parish of Bury during the period 1750-1760.
Lancashire writers and is consistent with the rapidly fluctuating descriptions of the poor in east Lancashire at the time. For example, Wesley described the Lancashire/Yorkshire woollen industry as being severely depressed from 1773-1775, whereas by 1778, Curwen was claiming of Rochdale that everyone was employed with "not a beggar or idle person being seen".\(^{(1)}\)

To sum up, the per capita wealth trends within the area in this period were complex. The wealthier sections of the local community undoubtedly did well. The position of the poorer elements is rather more complex despite the possible presence of a long term labour shortage, and a general buoyancy in wages. This is because there may have been a trend to a shorter working week and a rise in poverty associated with rising food prices and the instability of full time textile employment.

---

\(^{(1)}\) Historical MSS Commission, Dartmouth MSS, Vol III, p 220
CHAPTER XIII
THE ECONOMIC FRAMEWORK 1716-1780

In the period down to 1715, the occupational and economic framework appears to have been static. The framework appears to have been dominated by agriculture and textiles. The penetration of textiles declined from east to west within Rossendale, with agriculture declining from west to east. Only in the township of Haslingden with its concentration of trades and crafts was this pattern disturbed.

Data for the period 1716 to 1780 continues to be heavily based on probate inventories and occupational listings in chapelry registers. Unfortunately, these sources still do not give a complete coverage. The probate inventories are only found in number down to 1750, whereas the occupational listings are restricted to the chapelry of Haslingden and even then are restricted to the period down to 1760. For the period from 1760-1780, alternative sources have to be used, primarily the evidence of apprenticeship indentures in the chapelry of Newchurch. The limitations of inventories and occupational listings were considered during the discussion on 1650-1715 and in Appendix I, and thus do not require repeating here.

Having overcome the danger of double counting entries, the occupational listings provide a general indication of the economic framework of all parts of Rossendale other than the chapelry of Newchurch.

However, any analysis of the Haslingden registers is complicated by the use of the general term "labourer" to describe many individuals in the listings. The number of men so classified is sufficient to have undermined the use of a structural breakdown attempt. Fortunately, this
problem is not insuperable. There is evidence available to suggest that many, if not the majority of men categorised as "labourers", were engaged also in textile manufacture. As local agriculture was primarily pastoral in nature, it would not have been labour intensive. In addition, most farms in Rossendale were small, and as such would require little labour outside that available from within the family. On both these grounds it is unlikely that agriculture could have absorbed the relatively larger number of "labourers" listed. The only large scale alternative capable of absorbing the required numbers in most of Rossendale was the textile industry. The registers themselves contain more direct, if less comprehensive, evidence to the same effect. Many of the individuals listed as "labourers" were subsequently recorded under a different occupational description. In drawing up a list of such cases, care has been taken to ensure the omission of cases where two or more men with the same christian and surname may have been active. This has been done by including only those cases where the address of the "labourer" was unchanged and in the case of baptisms where intervals of not less than ten months elapsed between listings. Once such steps have been taken the following structure emerges:

### Alternative Occupations of Labourers in Haslingden Chapelry Registers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Textiles</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures show that around ten per cent of "labourers" were subsequently listed under an alternative occupational classification within the following five years of the starting date of the sample. Of the labourers so recorded, a large majority, over eighty per cent in each of the periods, were listed on the subsequent occasion as a textile worker. Though the numbers involved are small, the stability of this figure of eighty per cent suggests this may have reflected the position amongst all labourers.

If this percentage is accepted as a reasonable approximation, it permits the occupational structure of the western Rossendale to be analysed in detail. It is on this basis that the table on the following page has been constructed.

The situation indicated by these figures is clear and applied to all three sub areas that the importance of textiles grew markedly in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. This growth was at the expense of all other occupational groups, but in particular, agriculture, where the decline appears to have not been merely relative to textiles, also in absolute terms. This rapid change in structure remains clear even if the eighty per cent of labourers are not included in the textile figure, though in that event the textile figure for all three areas falls from sixty four to forty one per cent by 1760.

Yet this shift only brought these areas of Rossendale into line with those found in Newchurch chapelry before the beginning of this period. The experience of the Newchurch area in the period down to 1760 is difficult to ascertain with any precision, though given the growth in textile penetration in all other parts of Rossendale, it too probably experiences a further increase in textile penetration. This likelihood is strengthened by the experience of the nearby Saddleworth area. Saddleworth was physically similar to Newchurch, being on the
## Adjusted Occupational Structure in Rossendale 1716-1760

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1705-6</th>
<th>1722-5</th>
<th>1741-5</th>
<th>1755-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listings</td>
<td>Listings</td>
<td>Listings</td>
<td>Listings</td>
<td>Listings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paupers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Occupational Listings</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Haslingden Chapelry | Textiles       | 7      | 22     | 47     | 50     | 22      | 67     | 41      | 65     |
|                     | Agriculture     | 17     | 53     | 24     | 26     | 5       | 15     | 11      | 17     |
|                     | Trades & Crafts | 5      | 16     | 6      | 6      | 4       | 12     | 5       | 8      |
|                     | Labourers       | -      | -      | 7      | 7      | 2       | 6      | 6       | 10     |
|                     | Paupers         | 2      | 6      | 6      | 6      | -       | -      | -       | -      |
| Others              | 1      | 3      | 3      | 3      | -       | -      | -       | -      |
| Total of Occupational Listings | 32     | 100    | 93     | 100    | 33      | 100    | 63      | 100 |
### Adjusted Occupational Structure in Rossendale 1716-1760 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1755-6</th>
<th>1755-6</th>
<th>1741-5</th>
<th>1741-5</th>
<th>1722-6</th>
<th>1722-6</th>
<th>1755-6</th>
<th>1755-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>No of Listings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paupers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Occupational Listings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
edge of the Pennines as well as being economically similar as an out-
lying part of the Rochdale woollen area. At the beginning of this period it was like Newchurch already heavily committed to textiles.

In 1720, textiles accounted for seventy six per cent of occupational listings in Saddleworth, whilst in 1760 this figure had risen to eighty eight per cent and by 1780 to eighty nine per cent.\(^1\) This magnitude of penetration appears to have been present in Newchurch Chapelry between 1760 and 1780. In those years, of forty eight apprentices indentured by the parochial authorities, thirty seven (seventy seven per cent) were apprenticed to textile workers of various types with only two (four per cent) going into agriculture and six (under thirteen per cent) into trades and crafts.\(^2\) This compares with fifty six per cent devoted to textiles in the occupational listing in the Newchurch chapelry register for 1705-1700. On this basis, it appears likely that the penetration of textiles in Newchurch increased in this period, but as textiles started from a high base before 1716, this increased penetration was probably less dramatic than in other parts of Rossendale.

As was found before 1716, the presence of dual employment in the locality means that occupational listings only provide an outline guide to economic activity within the area. The only way available to look beyond occupational labels is by inventories. Though the preceding section indicated a stretching of local wealth distribution pyramid most of this stretching probably occurred after 1750, therefore the inventories which begin to run out after 1750 can still be of value

\(^1\) W. Wild, "The Saddleworth Parish Registers As A Source for the History of the West Riding Textiles Industry During the Eighteenth Century," 1964.  
\(^2\) RRL/Rc331-55 Rossendale MSS, Miscellaneous, Apprenticeship Indentures of the Chapelry of Newchurch in Rossendale 1759-1774.
for the present purpose, particularly for assessing the relative importance of textile and agricultural activity.

The one hundred extant inventories for Rossendale from 1716-1762 suggest that both textiles and agriculture were practised by a large proportion of the local population, with seventy one per cent of inventories showing evidence of textile activity, and a massive ninety four per cent showing agricultural activity. These figures appear to have remained remarkably stable after 1716:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Textiles and Agriculture in Rossendale Inventories 1716-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period (w of Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the textile figure is higher than the pre 1715 figure, the general pattern is surprising given the trends in the occupational listings. However, these figures do not indicate the importance of these activities to the individuals concerned. The nature of the inventory evidence makes it difficult to obtain an indication of the relative importance of textiles and agriculture to the individual. In particular the period after 1715 saw a rise in the importance of credit to the average inventory value and though much of this credit was probably tied up in textiles, an unknown proportion could be tied up in other activities. To overcome this, credit provision has been omitted from all calculations, even though this probably results in an under estimation of the importance of textiles. Probably the clearest impression of the changing relative importance of agriculture and textiles is to compare the average value of each in inventories.
Relative Value of Textiles and Agriculture in Rossendale Inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Agriculture as % of combined Value</th>
<th>Textiles as % of Combined Value</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1711-20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731-40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate a clear and steady change in emphasis away from agriculture in favour of textiles. Thus the change in the local economic framework would appear to have been more subtle than is indicated simply from an analysis of the occupational listing from chapelry registers. Despite the occupational listings many men retained an interest in both agriculture and textiles, the change was one of emphasis as they increasingly placed more reliance on their textile activities.

Yet before this view can be confirmed, some attention must be given to the likely experience of the poorest elements of the local community. It has already been noted that there was probably a steadily widening gap in the level of per capita wealth within the local community. In consequence, inventories cannot be taken as reflecting the experience of the total community. Direct evidence relating to these groups is difficult to obtain. In 1719, the poor law overseers of Haslingden chapelry sold the goods of two paupers, John Townsend of Lower Newhallhey and Charles Haworth of Newchurch in Rossendale. In addition to a range of basic domestic goods, both men owned a pair of looms and spinning wheels, but no other visible means of support. The
absence of all reference to agricultural goods suggests that even at this date, full time textile workers were resident in Rossendale. To ascertain the extent of the full time textile labour force more indirect methods must be utilised.

Given the local occupational structure, most dual employment concerned farming and textiles. The township surveys of the 1750's are of value here. They indicate that the only large concentration of cottages was in the town of Haslingden which would rule out agricultural by-employment for many. In other areas, cottages appear to have been clustered in small groups rarely exceeding three or four around local farms.\(^{(1)}\) Land deeds suggest that such cottages rarely had more than a small garden attached. This, plus the limited labour demands of pastoral farming, meant that these cottage dwellers may have become almost totally dependent on textile activity for their income. These cottage clusters may have represented an attempt by manufacturers to increase the degree of supervision over his workers.\(^{(2)}\) Alternatively, given the contemporary labour shortage the provision of a cottage may have provided a means of attracting labour to a manufacturer.

Overall it appears that a substantial full time labour force emerged and at the same time textiles were playing a more important role amongst the traditional

---

\(^{(1)}\) R.P.L./Ac35 ROS. Valuation Book for Part of Rossendale 1754. (covers part of Haslingden Chapelry). Stevens and R Hawkin, ed, op cit, passim (Haslingden Township)
L.R.O./Q.S.P./2858 Newchurch in Rossendale Poor Law Assessment 1757-8 (Newchurch Chapelry)

\(^{(2)}\) W.B.Crump and G.Ghorbal, History of the Huddersfield Woollen Industry, 1935, p 59-60, 66 and 87 - suggests a similar phenomena was present in the late eighteenth century Huddersfield woollen industry.
farming elements of Rossendale, though this increased role remained in the context of dual employment.
Prior to 1716 the only trading centre of any significance in Rossendale appears to have been the town of Haslingden. This was the location of the only market and fair in the area, and the place of residence for most local tradesmen and craftsmen.

The data of occupational listings from chapelry registers indicate that Haslingden retained its position as the only significant trading centre in Rossendale during this period. An extended coverage down to 1780 is possible here as the Haslingden baptism and burial register lists the occupations of trades and craftsmen, though not general workers from 1781-1785.

### Distribution of Tradesmen and Craftsmen 1716-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Haslingden Township</th>
<th>All Other Parts of Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705-8</td>
<td>22 69</td>
<td>10 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>34 81</td>
<td>8 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>46 79</td>
<td>12 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756-60</td>
<td>42 79</td>
<td>11 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>37 88</td>
<td>5 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The apprenticeship registers of Newchurch indicate few resident traders or craftsmen in that chapelry even at the end of this period.

(1) Bacup and Newchurch appear to have remained largely manufacturing centres.
In consequence, a study of trades and crafts in Rossendale from 1716-1780 again revolves around a study of trades and crafts in the township of Haslingden.

The overriding impression to derive from a study of the range of trades and crafts available within Haslingden from 1716-1780 is one of general stability. Though the number of trades and craftsmen listed grew\(^{(1)}\) from twenty two between 1705-1708 to forty two between 1755-1759, this figure marked a decline from thirty two per cent to seventeen per cent of all occupational listings between those dates. The number of crafts and trades present also appears to have stagnated during this period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of Trades and Crafts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1705-8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of trades and crafts available remained extremely basic supplying the relatively unsophisticated needs of the local population. For more sophisticated needs outside sources had to be utilised, even at the end of the period. In 1762, Richard Moon, a solicitor from Bradford was brought to Heap Clough, Haslingden to provide legal advice.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) See Table 1

\(^{(2)}\) RPR/Rc921/3/4
In 1765, Robert Halstead of Clough End, Haslingden had an account with a Rochdale hatter. In 1752, Laurence Eastham of Edenfield, innkeeper, was buying his meat from Haslingden, but his hops for brewing from Manchester.

Within the range of trades and crafts, considerable variation in financial standing appears to have been present. General retailers such as mercers and shopkeepers appear to have been at the top of the financial tree. In 1724, George Duckworth left £213 5s 8d in personal possessions, in 1725, Ralph Almond left £307 12s, in 1726 George Hargreaves left £361 7s 2d, whilst in 1743, James Schofield left £302 14s 8d. At the opposite end of the scale were shoemakers, masons and carpenters. In 1710 William Cranshaw, a shoemaker, left a mere £0 7s, in 1720, James Cunliffe, a carpenter, left £7 13s 8d and in 1741 John Lord, a mason, left only £36 7s 10d. Innkeepers appear to have ranged between the two groups. At one extreme was Richard Ainsworth, who in 1760 had a debt on his personal estate of £25 6s 7d, whilst at the other Giles Hoyle left a personal estate of £178 0s 10d. Between these extremes lay other innkeepers.

Inventories also provide some indication of the range of activities undertaken by some local traders. This is certainly true of those engaged in the distributive trades such as retailing. In 1724, George Duckworth of Haslingden, mercer, left the following wide range of goods:

"1 trunk and linen in it
kerseys and plains"

(1) RPL/Rc921/3/10
(2) LCO/Probate Inventory of Lawrence Eastham of Edenfield, 1752
Linen cloth and flannel
Blanket in Crepe and Stockings
Scotch cloth and socking in handkerchiefs
Sheep leather, Mohair, buttons, seeing glasses
Nutmegs, cinammon and other small goods
Book debts which we expect will be paid
Book debts which is desperate
Bodies, pitch, tar oil
Prunes, tobacco, brimstone
Cheese, candles, cards, nails and other odd things
Spices, brandy, waters"

This list indicates a wide range of consumer goods ranging from food and drink, to cloth and lighting equipment. A similar miscellaneous range of goods were present in the cellar of James Schofield, a Haslingden shopkeeper in 1743:

"100 p(oun)d est(imated) of treacle at 16d (per lb)
In lead 15s
In pitch 5s
Tar 2s
3 baking stones 3s
In pipes 4d
5 casks 6s
20 barrels at £1 10s
4 barrels at 10s
8 dozen of glass bottles at 12s
Whale bone £1 1s
Soap £2 5s
2 barrels of Civic Oil £5
The size of the establishments occupied by such men appears to have varied in size. Duckworth appears to have occupied a relatively small, probably two storied, premises, consisting simply of a parlour, house, shop and a single chamber over the parlour. In contrast, the premises of Schofield were probably a much more substantial three storied building, consisting of a shop, cellar, house, kitchen, dining room, parlour, kitchen chamber, house chamber and a stable.

Many innkeepers and hostelers occupied similarly large and well equipped premises. In 1717, Henry Ingham left an inn containing six rooms and a brew house, in 1723 Giles Hoyle left an inn of ten rooms, whilst in 1760 Richard Ainsworth left an inn of eight rooms and a brew house. (1)

These inns played an important role in local commercial life. Local inns often acted as meeting places to discuss questions of business, as in 1767 when the creditors of Henry Coupe, a bankrupt Haslingden clothier, agreed to meet at the Black Dog Inn in Haslingden to consider all claims of Coupe's estate. (2) Inns were also used to sell property by auction. The Black Dog Inn in Haslingden was used for this purpose in the 1750's. In December 1756, it was used to auction two tenements at Hutch Bank, Haslingden, and in August 1757 to auction a further three tenements in Haslingden. (3) Yet such auctions were not restricted to inns within the town; inns throughout Rossendale were used for the same purpose. (4) Yet the limited facilities of Haslingden

(1) Probate Inventories, passim
(2) Manchester Mercury, March 12th 1787
(3) Manchester Mercury, December 21st 1756, August 23rd 1757, February 7th 1758 and March 9th 1756
(4) Manchester Mercury, February 26th 1760, March 18th 1761, July 7th 1761.
inns and the town as a whole, is also indicated by such newspaper advertisements. When a fulling mill and dyehouse in Haslingden were auctioned in 1757, the auction was held in the larger textile centre of Rochdale with a Haslingden schoolmaster as the local agent. This link between inns and the wider aspects of the local economy often became more concrete. In 1755, John Tattersall, an innholder in Haslingden, also had a business as a woollen weaver and chapman at Edenfield. In 1765, John Duckworth of Haslingden, innkeeper had credit dealings with John Chetham, a Rochdale clothier. Inventories reveal that other local innkeepers also had a link with local textile and agricultural activities.

Both the innkeeping and general retailing trades appear to have often been rather unstable financially. The inventory wealth of local inventories varied markedly from as little as £15 to up to nearly £200. Many hit severe financial trouble. The inventory of Richard Ainsworth in 1760 indicates his personal estate was in debt to the sum of £25 6s. 8d. In 1757 John Tattersall another Haslingden innkeeper, was declared bankrupt. Other men were more fortunate and succeeded in building up considerable wealth. One such family was the Hoyle family which held the Hare and Hounds Inn in Haslingden for much of the eighteenth century. Advertisements in the Manchester Mercury indicate that the family had substantial interests in both the butchering and inn-keeping trades in Haslingden. In 1725, the first generation of this family, John Hoyle of Haslingden, butcher, left a substantial nine

(1) Manchester Mercury, May 4th 1757
(2) LROY/Q38/37/7
(3) LROY/Q38/31/14
(4) LROY/Probate Inventory of Henry Ingham of Haslingden, 1717
LROY/Probate Inventory of Giles Hoyle of Haslingden, 1723
LROY/Probate Inventory of Richard Ainsworth of Haslingden, 1760
roomed inn/butchers shop, but a personal estate valued at a modest £70 6s 8d.(1) The second generation of the family, again John Hoyle of Haslingden, butcher, successfully built on this base, leaving a personal estate valued at over £400 in 1750.(2) After 1750, a third John Hoyle of Haslingden, butcher, appears to have continued to build up the family fortunes by a series of property purchases of land close to the centre of the expanding town.(3) As a result, by the late eighteenth century, the Hoyle family amassed a considerable fortune and with it a considerable influence in the town.(4) This family does not appear to have been alone amongst local trading families in building up considerable wealth. George Hargreaves of Haslingden, variously described as a grocer or mercer, was probably a similar case. In 1722, he received £800 from Roger Kay of Fittleton, Wiltshire for his share in the Todd Hall estate.(5) In 1726, he left a substantial fourteen roomed house plus barns and stables and a considerable personal estate by local standards of £361 7s 2d.(6) His son, George Hargreaves II, appears to have built further on this base. In 1750, he bought the whole of the Todd Hall estate for the considerable sum of £1920.(7)

Despite the financial success of some local traders and the growth in the number of local trades and craftsmen, not all aspects of the town's marketing activities had such an experience. This is particularly true of the fair and market of the town.

---

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Hoyle of Haslingden, 1725
(2) LRO/Will of John Hoyle of Haslingden, 1750
(3) LRO/DDX/416/Box 1351
(4) C. Aspin, Historical Notes on Haslingden and Helmshore, 1963, p 69
(5) LRO/DD/3d/21/27–28
(6) LRO/Probate Inventory of George Hargreaves of Haslingden, 1726
(7) LRO/DD/3d/21/1–26
The only guide to the fortunes of the fair is probably as before 1716 its lease value along with the other nearby fairs at Colne, Burnley and Padiham:

**Lease Value of North East Lancashire Fairs 1716-1780**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lease Value per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1714-40</td>
<td>£16 0s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740-45</td>
<td>£11 0s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746-82</td>
<td>£ 9 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782-89</td>
<td>£ 7  7s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) These figures suggest a long term decline that probably ran throughout the period. This decline chronologically coincided with, and was probably caused by, the decline of the local pastoral sector of the local economy which reduced the town's scope as a livestock fair. The swing to dairy production would further intensify this reduction. (2) The fair may have responded to this change by laying more emphasis on the retailing of general consumer goods to the fast expanding local community. One sign of this pressure was the increase in the number of fairs held. The two original fairs of April 27th and September 21st were changed to May 8th and October 2nd, probably to take into account the change in the calendar in 1752. During the eighteenth century these were joined by two additional dates, February 2nd and July 4th and then by a further eight for the remaining months of the year on the second Tuesday of the month. (3)

(1) URIJ/DD/Ke/5/174-82
Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 81

(2) See Chapter XV, Section D

(3) Woodcock, Haslingden, A Topographical History, p 81
By such changes, the Haslingden fair continued to attract visitors from outside the immediate area. In 1742, Richard Kay, a Bury doctor, his two sisters, a cousin and an apprentice from Manchester, all attended the April and June fairs. In 1748, Kay along with a cousin and two vicars, again attended the April fair. Such people were more likely to have been visiting the fair for social reasons and/or to buy general consumer goods rather than to deal in livestock. (1)

The fortunes of the weekly market is even more clouded in uncertainty. Some time during the eighteenth century, the market day was changed from Wednesday to Saturday, perhaps a sign that it was struggling for survival. By 1700, it is possible that this too may have been in decline. Such decline may have been the result of the emergence in the early eighteenth century of a larger number of resident mercers and shopkeepers who could provide a daily, rather than a weekly service, and the increasing frequency of the fair, which reduced the scope of a market in the supply of more sophisticated items outside the range of local mercers and shopkeepers. In turn, the rise of resident men undoubtedly reflects the demographic and as will be discussed subsequently, the economic expansion of the area.

To conclude it may be seen that this period saw undoubted change in the trade and craft structure of Haslingden, though this settlement continued to be the only trade and craft centre of any significance in Rossendale.

The number and range of trades and crafts remained basic and limited, but within these limits the number of tradesmen and craftsmen grew. Probably of particular importance were the inns which acted as centres of local commercial life. Despite the growth in the numbers

(1) Brockbank and Kenworthy, The Diary of Richard Kay: A Lancashire Doctor 1716-1751, loc cit, p 49, 52 and 120
involved in these activities, the range in their personal wealth and commercial success varied widely. As in other aspects of the local economy, bankruptcies were common, but the successful became leading local citizens and property owners.

The detailed fate of both the fair and market are clouded, but in general terms they appear to have been in decline. In the case of the fair, this probably reflected changes in the role and structure of local agriculture and in the case of the market, the rise of resident retailers.
CHAPTER XV
AGRICULTURE 1716-1780

SECTION A - WASTE AND COMMON

Waste and common land appears to have remained quite widespread on the flanks of Rossendale, but in more centrally placed areas the amount of waste and common was substantially reduced.

In the township of Haslingden, the main area of waste lay on High Moor to the north west of the towns. In 1750, a single, though admittedly abnormally large estate included a total of over seventy acres of waste on High Moor. (1) Other land deeds reveal that at this date High Moor contained at least a hundred and fifty four acres of waste. (2) South eastern Rossendale contained an even greater area of common at Brandwood amounting to over two hundred and sixty one acres after 1800. (3) South western Rossendale also contained a substantial area of common at Horncliffe. (4) The extent of enclosure in these areas between 1716 and 1780 was probably negligible. In 1726, a farm at Carterplace, Haslingden, contained eight and a half acres of waste on High Moor, a figure which still remained with the farm in 1768. (5)

(1) LRO/DDX/118/8/27
(2) LRO/DDX/114/129; LRO/DDX/118/111/4; LRO/DDX/118/164 Will of James Ratcliffe of Haslingden, 1757
(3) LRO/DDX/118/107/2
(4) LRO/DDX/118/104/4; LRO/DDX/118/153/1-6
(5) E. Chadwick and J. Boardman, Report on the Estate of Sir Andrew Chadwick his Life and History, p 14-19, 92-3
Enclosure was certainly more rapid for waste land in the heart of Rossendale where human settlement was rapidly expanding. At the beginning of the period, common was to be found at Codhill Moss, Ring Fold and Mear Fold, all in the Wolfenden area of Newchurch. From 1730, references to waste and common in this area all but disappear, indicating only a modest waste and common acreage remaining. Indeed, a survey by the Newchurch poor law authorities in the 1750's indicates that by that date only one property owner in the Wolfenden area was holding waste land and even that appears to have been modest in extent.

Waste close to the centre of the growing settlement of Haslingden had a similar experience of steady enclosure after 1715. As in the sixteenth century, the enclosure was normally via small scale encroachments. However, unlike the sixteenth century, much of the initiative came from established local families engaging in property speculation/investment.

In 1752, the manorial court granted five hundred square yards on the south side of Haslingden school house to George Scholes of Haslingden. In 1760 a further grant was made of a piece of waste called Black Lane consisting of around one and a quarter roods, to John Hoyle of Haslingden. In 1763, Elizabeth Schofield was granted two hundred and forty square yards of waste at Sandpits on Flaxmoss waste. In 1764, a cottage and a customary acre of land recently enclosed from Flaxmoss waste was surrendered. The township authorities made use of township waste for public building as the town grew. In 1753, eight

(1) LRO/DDX/118/103/8, 9 and 10 Newbigging, Notebook for History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 89-97

(2) LRO/QSP/2858

(3) LRO/DDX/416/Box 1351

(4) LRO/DDX/118/114/15
hundred and eighty square yards of waste on Bull Green, Haslingden were granted to John Holmes, the curate of Haslingden.\(^{(1)}\) In 1776, a piece of waste was granted to Robert Halstead to partly provide an endowment of a proposed school, the rest to provide a site for the school.\(^{(2)}\) In 1781, the township authorities granted a further three quarters of an acre to trustees who were to sell the land to raise money to help finance the building of a work house and a new school house. The favourable location of this land close to the existing built up area of the town is reflected in the price obtained for it at £322 19s per acre.\(^{(3)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/DDX/114/15 and 16

\(^{(2)}\) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 70

\(^{(3)}\) ibid, p 71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Codhill Foss and part of Mean Fold</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Turbary</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/118/103/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 days of turf cutting</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/114/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Chadwick Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Codhill Foss and Ring Fold</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Turbary</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/118/103/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>White Hill</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Turbary and herbage</td>
<td>LRO/DD/8d/24/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>42-40</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Will of John Hargreaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1/3 of turbary on Rough Close</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/118/104/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Horncliffe</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/2 turf digging</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/114/129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>50.68</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>LRO/DD/8d/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>LRO/DD/8d/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.40 acres of common, pasture and turbary</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/118/111/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Will of George Haworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Will of James Ratcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Codhill Foss and part of Ring Fold</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LRO/DDX/118/103/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Waste and Common in Rossendale 1715-1780 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>LRQ/DDX/416/Box/351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>LRQ/DDX/416/Box 1351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>LRQ/DDX/118/164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pasture and turfary right</td>
<td>LRQ/DDX/114/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Brandwood</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Newbigging Notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Chadwick Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>LRQ/DDX/114/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B - FARMING UNITS

No source comparable with the mid seventeenth century manorial survey exists for the eighteenth century until the 1782 Land Tax return which provides an estimate of the number of land owners for all parts of Rossendale other than Lench, Yate and Pickup Bank, Wolfenden, Bacup and Henheads. For those parts of Rossendale covered by this survey it appears that the number of estates more than doubled to over five hundred and fifty from the 1650 figure. (1)

Most of this fragmentation particularly of the larger estates, occurred in the years after 1716 when the leading families of the area lost control over much of their property. (2)

(1) PRO/E317/Lancs 8 p 38-77
    LRO/QDL/3/3/26

(2) LRO/DD/Wo/1
    LRO/DD/Bd/24
    LRO/DD/Bd/27-52
    RPL/Stephenson MSS/P 83-4
The 1782 land tax return also permits some indication of the extent of owner/occupation to be obtained for the end of the period. Despite the fragmentation of land ownership, owner/occupation appears to have been a relatively limited phenomena in all parts of Rossendale.

**Extent of Owner/Occupation in Rossendale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Owner/Occupiers</th>
<th>Tenanted</th>
<th>Partially Tenanted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Rossendale</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>460</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land deeds and wills, particularly for the larger estates indicate that the tenanting of property was a widespread practice throughout the period after 1716. In consequence, the nature of this practice is extremely important for any understanding of local agriculture.

In the years immediately prior to 1716, the trend in leases had been to shorter and more fixed terms. This trend gradually continued after 1715.
### Rossendale Leases 1716-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Lease Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Ewood, Haslingden Township</td>
<td>500 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Rockcliffe, Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Ewood, Haslingden Township</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Ewood, Haslingden Township</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Rawtenstall, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Goodshaw, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>3 lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Henheads, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Wolfenden, Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Baxenden, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Baxenden, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Hutch Bank, Haslingden Township</td>
<td>17 years of lease left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Crawshawbooth, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Crawshawbooth, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Pilgrims, Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Wolfenden, Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Woodcock, Some Ewood Deeds, passim
Newbigging, Notebook for the History of the Forest of Rossendale p 91
LRC/Hic/Ha/41/3 and 50/1
LRC/BOX/41b/Box 351
LRC/BOX/110/120 and 129
Manchester Mercury, December 1756
Chatham Library, Raines MSS/237
RRL/RC/921/3/5
Bury PL/Hutchinson Papers/Box 1/2/2
RRL/RC 331.55
These figures overestimate the length of many leases. In the late 1760's, the estate of the Holdens of Holden Hall was tenanted out in a series of small farmsteads. The rentals of some of these farmsteads could change at frequent intervals:

Holden Rental 1766-1771

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenement</th>
<th>1766</th>
<th>1767</th>
<th>1768</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hudrake</td>
<td>£25 12s Od</td>
<td>£25 12s Od</td>
<td>£25 12s Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Swinard Low</td>
<td>£14 6s Od</td>
<td>£14 6s Od</td>
<td>£14 6s Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barns</td>
<td>£15 15s Od</td>
<td>£15 15s Od</td>
<td>£15 15s Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>£19 2s 6d</td>
<td>£19 2s 6d</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>£19 2s 6d</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinners</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£10 Os Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>£3 0s Od</td>
<td>£3 0s Od</td>
<td>£3 0s Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyfield</td>
<td>£48 4s Od</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenement</th>
<th>1769</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1771</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hudrake</td>
<td>£25 12s Od</td>
<td>£20 Os Od</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Swinard Low</td>
<td>£14 6s Od</td>
<td>£17 Os Od</td>
<td>£10 Os Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Swinard Low</td>
<td>£15 15s Od</td>
<td>£17 1s Od</td>
<td>£17 Os Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barns</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£23 Os Od</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£23 10s Od</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinners</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£21 Os Od</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>£3 5s Od</td>
<td>£3 5s Od</td>
<td>£3 5s Od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyfield</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£61 10s Od</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rental also carries the implication that some tenants may have subleased part or all of their farm to others. Thus, in 1770, James Hindle paid £23 rent for "Old Ro Holdan's farm near Holden Hall" (Barns Tenement) whilst Thomas Coupe paid £23 10s Od rent for
Christopher Tattersall's farm near Holden Hall and John Heys paid £21 for John Kenyon's farm near Holden Hall. (1)

The above Holden rental also suggests that during this period the rental value of local farms was increasing. Similar trends were observable elsewhere in Rossendale. In 1762, Higher Hugh Edge farm at Crawshawbooth in Haslingden Chapelry was leased for twenty one years at £15 2s 6d per annum rent. At the end of the lease in 1783, the farm was re-leased for another 21 years, but now at a rent of £24 per annum. (2)

Such upward trends were evident even earlier and in sale values as well as rental values. In 1728, a tenement consisting of nearly sixty four acres at Hudhey in the township of Haslingden was sold for £500. Within two years a half of the same tenement was re-sold for £270, suggesting a total tenement value of £540. (3) That land values were higher in this period than before 1716 is confirmed by taking the 'average value per acre of farms sold in Rossendale between 1716 and 1780. The fifteen cases available for such an exercise indicate an average value of £21 12s per acre compared with an average for the earlier period of under £5. Indeed in only two of the fifteen cases after 1715 was land sold at below the 1715 average level. (See Table next page)

Finally, attention must be devoted to the crucial question of the size of Rossendale farm units. In the period 1650-1715, this average was around twenty two acres. In the period after 1715, this trend was reversed, the average for 1716-45 being around twenty eight and a half acres rising to thirty three acres in the period 1746-80. This reversal of trend was largely concentrated on Newchurch chapelry and possibly south Rossendale.

(1) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 113-21
(2) Chetham Library/Raines MSS 237
(3) LR/118/111/1 and 2
### Rosendale Property Values 1715-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Value per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Pikelou</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£14 1s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Hudhuy</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£ 8 15s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Hudhuy</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£ 9 9s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>£25 0s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£ 7 4s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£87 15s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Parkhouse</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>£11 11s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Carterplace</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£14 5s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Pitthead</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£29 2s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£35 15s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£35 16s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£ 3 0s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Gambleside</td>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>£13 6s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Parkhouse</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>£ 8 19s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Church Post</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>£31 17s 00d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Sources: Woodcock, Haslingden, A Topographical History p 26-9

LRO/PUH/6/2
LRO/DDX/118/111/1 and 2
LRO/DDX/To/0/1/3
LRO/DDX/118/164
LRO/DDX/416/3ex 1351
LRO/CIV/15/1 and 4
LRO/DDX/118/129/5
LRO/DDX/114/17, 19 and 20
LRO/DD/8d/24/6
Rossendale Farm Sizes 1650-1715 and 1716-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>1650-1715</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>1716-1780</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The explanation for this upward trend of farm size at Newchurch is by no means clear. It may well be tied to the expansion of textile activity, encouraging inhabitants to turn to textiles on a full time basis and give up the land to those wishing to specialise in supplying the growing local market with foodstuffs. This specialisation by the latter would explain why land values and rents continued to grow despite men turning to full time textile activity.

(1) See Rossendale Farm Sizes 1716-1780 (4 cases)
The small size of the South Rossendale sample places that figure under some doubt.
SECTION C - THE STRUCTURE OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY

Probate inventories continue to offer by far the best guide to local agricultural activity for all but the final thirty years of this period. Though the widening of the local wealth range means that these inventories are probably not as representative of Rossendale society as they were in the seventeenth century, they still cover a relatively wide band of the local population. Between 1716 and 1780, eighty five out of the one hundred extant male probate inventories indicate the presence of some form of agricultural activity. Of the thirty "infra" inventories valued at under £40, twenty four or eighty per cent show evidence of farming activity. In contrast the equivalent figures for "supra" inventories valued at over £40 are sixty one out of seventy inventories (eighty seven per cent) with farming activity. Thus it would appear that agriculture was an economic activity amongst a very wide band of the local community. Though the figures are slightly lower than in the pre 1716 period, they are still sufficiently high to indicate that agricultural activity was the norm for a large proportion of the local population. Neither do these figures appear to have declined significantly over time. Of the fifty eight inventories extant for 1716-35, eighty six per cent showed evidence of agriculture whilst the figure had only fallen to eighty three per cent for the forty two inventories of 1736-62. Thus agriculture appears to have been a widespread activity throughout the entire period.

Subject to the limitations discussed in the section on the structure of agricultural activity in the period 1650-1715, inventories can be used to obtain an indication of the local balance between pastoral and arable activity. These inventories indicate the following pattern of activity.
Pastoral/Arable Balance in Rossendale 1715-1762

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
<th>Pastoral</th>
<th>Arable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Rossendale</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate clearly that despite the small size of the sample, pastoral farming continued to dominate local agriculture retaining its value ratio of around four to one against arable farming. The available figures also suggest that this dominance stayed relatively unchanged throughout the period down to 1760.

Fluctuations in Rossendale Agricultural Structure 1715-1762

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
<th>Pastoral</th>
<th>Arable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715-35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was indicated in Chapter XIII, this pattern took place against a background in which the value of agriculture as a proportion of total contemporary inventory values was in decline. At the same time, this was a period in which the local textile industry was expanding, supposedly creating pressure to switch to the less labour intensive pastoral sector. The explanation of this stable balance between arable and pastoral probably continued to be in the state of the Lancashire
transport system prior to 1760. The poor state of Lancashire roads in this period made bulk long distance transport of the type to replace local arable production uneconomic if not physically impossible.

After 1760, this situation was beginning to change as many of the trunk roads of Lancashire became turnpiked and later as canals were built. Yet the change was only slow. Speaking of the period prior to 1765, Samuel Bamford noted that in east Lancashire: "Farms were ... mostly cultivated for the production of milk, butter and cheese. Cots for the families consumption of meal ... would be looked after; and a small patch of potatoes when they come into general use, would probably be found on some favourable bank attached to each farm."

This is consistent with the structure observed in inventories prior to 1760. However, Bamford did acknowledge that the role of agriculture was now very much secondary to that of textiles even amongst farm occupants: "The farming was generally of the kind which was soonest and most easily performed ... If the rent was raised from the farm so much the better; if not the deficiencies were made up from the manufacturing profits."(2)

(1) See Chapter XI
(2) S. Bamford, Dialect of South Lancashire, 1850, p iv
SECTION D - PASTORAL FARMING 1716-1780

Within the pastoral sector cattle retained their dominating importance over all other forms of livestock, being found in over eighty per cent of all extant inventories and accounting for well over ninety per cent of all livestock by value. Such figures suggest there had been little change in the situation found in the period prior to 1716.

This was not so in terms of the absolute numbers of cattle kept on Rossendale farms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Total Head</th>
<th>Average Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Chapelry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>456</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate in all cases a fall from the levels recorded in the period before 1716. This was especially true in the chapelry of Haslingden. If the figures are broken down chronologically, they indicate that this fall was continuous throughout the period especially immediately after 1715. (See table next page).

Falls of the magnitude found here are surprising given the general increase in contemporary farm sizes and the continued dominance of cattle and pastoral activity in the local agricultural structure. The figures indicate that the number of stock carried per acre was in decline.
Rossendale Cattle Herd Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Total Head</th>
<th>Average Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710-19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720-29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740-49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An even greater shift occurred within the local livestock herd between beef and dairy cattle. In the period prior to 1715 beef probably had a slight numerical dominance within Rossendale. After 1715, this balance altered increasingly in favour of dairy cattle:

Rossendale Cattle Herd Dairy v Beef Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>No of Beef Head</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>No of Dairy Head</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715-29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This trend appears to have occurred to a similar degree in most parts of Rossendale except for the chapelry of Newchurch.

In all other parts of Rossendale, the dairy/beef balance moved towards a two to one ratio in favour of dairy, whilst in the chapelry of Newchurch, the proportion of beef cattle in the herd remained steady at around fifty per cent.

(1) The figures for 1650-1715 were beef - fifty five per cent, dairy - forty five per cent.
The general switch towards dairy cattle probably reflects a growing demand for milk and dairy goods from the growing and increasingly industrially based local population. The highly perishable nature of milk would prevent its importation over any distance even given the improvement in the regional transport facilities.

Though the rising local population would also probably increase the demand for beef, this product was less perishable if brought on the hoof from outside the area for slaughter locally. The presence of such a trade between east Lancashire and Yorkshire in the late eighteenth century has already been noted. This situation meant local farmers had a growing local market for both beef and milk, but opted increasingly for the latter, as this was less subject to outside competition than the former.

In contrast, the decline in herd size and the swing to dairy cattle appears to have had an insignificant impact on the range of cattle types found on local farms. Though as before, many of the poorer men were restricted to the odd milk cow, larger local herds continued to retain a full range from calves to cows and oxen. This is indicated by the random selection of cases shown in the table on the next page.

As before, the only types of stock missing on most local farms were bulls, which appear to have been scattered lightly throughout the area amongst the larger local herds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cattle Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Butterworth</td>
<td>Muxbury</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>2 calves, 1 twinter, 2 steers, 2 oxen and 6 kine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Lau</td>
<td>Helmcroft</td>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1 calf, 1 sterk, 1 cow, 4 oxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilos Hoyle</td>
<td>Haslingdon</td>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>3 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lord</td>
<td>Broadclough</td>
<td>Howchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>2 calves, 2 storks, 4 cows, 6 oxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hargreaves</td>
<td>Bridge End</td>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>2 twinters, 2 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Holt</td>
<td>Cribdenside</td>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1 calf, 1 sterk, 1 heifer, 1 twinter, 4 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Nuttall</td>
<td>Gambleside</td>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>2 storks, 2 twinters, 4 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Taylor</td>
<td>Constablee</td>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1 twinter, 1 why, 3 cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Schofield</td>
<td>Haslingdon</td>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1 cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Duxbury</td>
<td>Pickup Bank</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1 calf, 1 heifer, 2 storks, 4 cows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Bulls in Rossendale 1716-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of Bulls</th>
<th>Size of Total Herd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hargreaves</td>
<td>Balladen</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lord</td>
<td>Broadclough</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapel</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sherrock</td>
<td>Pickup Bank</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That such bulls were used by other local herds is confirmed by the case of Lawrence Eastham, an innkeeper/farmer of Edenfield. In 1752, Eastham paid Peter Warburton 1s for "the bulling" of two of his cows. The limited number of references to bulls in this period particularly after 1730 is perhaps a further reflection of the fall in local herd sizes, and the swing over to dairy cattle, though it is probably also particularly a reflection of the number of extant inventories available.

The decline of local beef production and with it, the end to cattle exports from the area via the spring and summer fairs of Haslingden would have had implications for seasonal changes in the average size of the Rossendale herd. In the period before 1716, the sale of cattle at Haslingden probably explains why herd sizes were at their low during the summer months. In the period after 1715, the seasonal average altered dramatically to give higher summer than winter figures.

As the spread of dairy farming would tend to stabilise seasonal fluctuations in demand, and as the pre 1716 figures show Rossendale to have been capable of supporting larger average herds than these, it appears that the spring jump in the figures must have been due to the
end of cattle sales to outside the area. From this spring peak, the number gradually fell during the rest of the year as stock were slaughtered for family consumption or for sale on the growing local market.

When considering the period down to 1716, it was noted that the importance of sheep in Rossendale stabilised from 1650-1715 because the waste and common acreage was maintained. As has already been shown the period from 1716-1730 saw a decline in the waste and common acreage particularly in areas near to expanding settlements. On this basis, it could be projected that this period should have seen a renewed fall in the importance of sheep within Rossendale.

The inventories indicate that such a trend was indeed operative. In the period down to 1716, sheep were present in eighteen per cent of the over two hundred and fifty extant inventories, whereas from 1716-1780 the equivalent figure fell to only five per cent of the one hundred extant inventories. In addition, the location of such sheep appears to have been even more closely geared to areas of known waste and common. Three of the five extant cases of sheep relate to the extensive waste in the vicinity of Coupe Lench and New Hall Hey. Thus it appears that during this period, sheep declined to almost insignificant importance to the overall local farming structure.

However, on those few farms on which sheep were kept, the average flock size appears to have held up well compared to the pre 1716 average of around eighteen head. The average for the small sample of five available also comes out at eighteen head per flock. A larger figure is suggested by the 1741 will of Henry Hoyle of Coupe which refers to thirty two sheep gates left on Coupe Height Common.(1)

---

(1) Will of Henry Hoyle of Coupe
Despite this stability, sheep continued to remain of purely supplementary importance compared with cattle.

Together, the experience of cattle and sheep make an interesting contrast. The decline in cattle was due to a fall in the size of the average herd rather than a decline in the frequency with which cattle were kept. In contrast, the decline in sheep was due to a decline in the frequency with which they were kept rather than a decline in average flock size. The decline in sheep was far more decisive than that of cattle perhaps because of the buoyancy of demand for cattle products, thus whilst the decline of both was absolute, sheep also declined in relative importance in comparison with cattle.

The role of swine and poultry also declined from there already insignificant position before 1716. The odd pig continued to be kept on local tenements, but even these appear to have disappeared from the mid 1720's. Occasional references to pork continue in local inventories indicating a possible continued policy of keeping the odd pig for family consumption.

The position of poultry is even more obscure. Inventories contain no references to the keeping of poultry in this period, but given their small value it may be that they were simply ignored by the inventory appraisers.

Horses continued to be kept widely but in small numbers. Given the general decline in local agriculture and the expansion of textile activity, horses probably progressively ceased to be part of the local agricultural sector, they were increasingly kept to transport textiles and general goods rather than for farming. In addition, the virtual absence of all references to foals in inventories indicates that the modest degree of horse breeding present before 1716 all but disappeared.
SECTION E - ARABLE FARMING

It has already been indicated that the decline in pastoral farming was not due to growth in the relative position of arable agriculture as the ratio between the two remained at around four to one throughout this period. Thus it would appear that the importance of local arable agriculture was also in decline.

Yet despite this overall decline, inventories indicate that grain production remained as widespread as in the years before 1716. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Inventories</th>
<th>No of Inventories with Corn Growing</th>
<th>% Growing Corn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700-15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716-35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such corn production retained its hold in all parts of Rossendale.

Corn Growing in Rossendale by Sub Area 1715-1720

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Total Inventories</th>
<th>No of Inventories with Corn Growing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Based on the criteria adopted for the inventory analysis of grain production for 1650-1715.
The value of corn production on Rossendale farms remained modest as the randomly selected extracts given on the following page indicate.

As for the period before 1716, it is difficult to obtain figures for the acreages devoted to arable farming on local farms. Scattered references only are available, particularly for the early part of the period. In 1722, the arable acreage of the Ewood estate in the township of Haslingden was put at fifty acres out of a total estate of two hundred and forty acres (twenty one per cent). As this area was exceptionally well favoured for arable farming, the figure of twenty one per cent probably over estimates the position of arable on the average Rossendale farm.

Perhaps more typical were the farms owned by Lawrence Ormerod in the 1730’s for which the arable area can be estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Farm</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pastoral Acreage</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Maximum Arable Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lum</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linceys</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whorelaw</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawclough</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking these two small samples it appears that at the beginning of the period anywhere up to twenty per cent of the total acreage may have been devoted to arable farming on the most favoured sites. On

(1) T. Woodcock, Some Ewood Deeds, p 16
(2) RFL/Rc/333.330 Su
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Nature and Value of Corn Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hargreaves</td>
<td>Goodshaw</td>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Hay and Corn £10, malt and wheat £17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Schofield</td>
<td>Mibusury</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Hay and Corn £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Culiffe</td>
<td>Daubenough</td>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Hay and Corn £40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Mountall</td>
<td>Gambleide</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Hay and Corn £1, meal £6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hawthorn</td>
<td>Horncliffe</td>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Hay and Corn £32, meal £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Whitaker</td>
<td>Bank Top</td>
<td>Haslingdon Chapelry</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Hay and Corn £15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holden</td>
<td>Husbury</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Corn £0, meal £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hayworth</td>
<td>Deardengate</td>
<td>Haslingdon Township</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Corn £25, one load of meal £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Duxbury</td>
<td>Pickup Bank</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Seed corn £10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


less well favoured sites the figure often fell below that, indeed on some farms there was no arable activity.

This absence of grain farming on some sites when taken against a background of an expanding local market for foodstuffs provides a clear indication that there must have been a massive increase in the level of grain imports into Rossendale during this period.

The likelihood of such large scale grain importation makes it difficult to assess the structure of local grain production from inventories with any degree of precision, as grain reference may relate to imports rather than local produce. However, where grain references were present in inventories, together with direct evidence of corn growing, as via the presence of ploughs and harrows, it is highly probable that at least a proportion of the grain concerned was grown locally. On this basis, inventories can still be of value as an indicator of the structure of local grain production.

As before 1716 the generic terms of "corn" and "meal" appear to have been used as a description of oats. In all the cases where the nature of the "corn" or "meal" is specified it is clear that oats were the grain in question. On this basis, it can be said that oats remained the dominant local grain throughout the area and throughout the period down to 1760. Wheat and barley usually in the form of malt remained the only other local grains of any significance, but even they showed no evidence of increasing their importance in relation to the basic crop of oats.

The modest role of arable activity after 1715 is further indicated by the experience of corn milling activity during the following years. From 1716-1780, the population of Rossendale grew around three fold, yet the available evidence from the eighteenth century surveys of most parts of the area indicate that the number of corn mills in
Rossendale remained static. Local corn mills as in the preceding period consisted of those at Holden and Ewood Bridge in Haslingden township, Dankenheadwood in Haslingden chapelry and Boothfold in Newchurch chapelry. This relative decline reflects two central factors. Rossendale grain output probably remained no more than stable. (1) Secondly, these mills only had a monopoly over corn grown within Rossendale, an increasing proportion of total local corn consumption was probably imported and this is not covered by the monopoly. The limitations of this monopoly were confirmed by the Duchy of Lancaster court as late as 1785. (2)

To a modest extent, the production of grain was supplemented by the growing of potatoes in the years from 1715. Even at that early date, potatoes were not new. The inventory of Mary Haworth of Wolfenden indicates the use of, if not growth of, potatoes in Rossendale as early as the mid seventeenth century. (3) Prior to 1716 such references were rare but from that time the frequency increased. In 1730, Charles Holt of Coupe left up to 15s of potatoes, whilst in 1743 Margaret Lord, a widow of Dedwenclough left a sack of potatoes. By 1746, potatoes were being sold commercially in the village of Newchurch. (4) By 1752, potatoes were clearly being grown on a commercial scale. In that year, Lawrence Eastham left £8 of "Potatoes in the ground". (5)

(1) This is indicated from the value structure of contemporary probate inventories.
(2) LRO/Probate Inventory of Mary Howarth of Wolfenden, 1664.
(3) Moffit, op cit, p 11
(4) LRO/Probate Inventory of Lawrence Eastham of Edenfield, 1752.
(5) LRO/Probate Inventory of Charles Holt of Coupe, 1730
LRO/Probate Inventory of Margaret Lord of Dedwenclough, 1743
half of the century the local popularity of the potato spread.\(^{(1)}\)

Potatoes appear to have been the only vegetable grown locally on any scale during the eighteenth century.

---

\(^{(1)}\) See Chapter XXII 1781-1795 Section B
Bamford's description of east Lancashire farming suggests that the priority given to textiles led to a neglect of the agricultural potential of the area.\(^{(1)}\) This view is confirmed by advertisements in the Manchester Mercury from 1752-1780 in which the untapped potential of local farms was stressed. In March 1756 a tenement of nearly thirty six acres at Grane, Haslingden was advertised as being "capable of great improvement".\(^{(2)}\) Three other tenements in the same township were advertised in similar fashion later in the same year. In 1758 a tenement at Edenfield on the Rossendale/Bury border was advertised in similar fashion.\(^{(3)}\) The validity of such advertisements is not easy to assess, the aim was to get the best deal possible, but whether this would encourage the advertiser to over estimate or under estimate the state of or potential of a local farm is debateable. Further confirmation comes via the fall in the number of stock kept per acre during the course of the eighteenth century.\(^{(4)}\)

Certainly some local farmers continued to show concern about the efficiency of their farming. Inventories suggest that prior to 1760 dung was widely used on local farms. Perhaps the clearest example of this came in the inventory of James Holden of Yate Bank in 1731 which valued at 10s:

"Leading muck to ye Corn and Spreading."\(^{(5)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) S.Bamford, Dialect of South Lancashire, p IV

\(^{(2)}\) Manchester Mercury, March 9th 1756

\(^{(3)}\) Manchester Mercury 1752-1780 passim

\(^{(4)}\) See Chapter XV, Section C

\(^{(5)}\) LR\A Probate Inventory of James Holden of Yate Bank 1731
In 1780 William Hutchinson gave his tenant on a Wolfenden farm the right to half the corn and hay on the farm so long as he left the manure in the dung hill when vacating the farm.\(^{(1)}\)

Lime used before 1715 continued in use as a fertiliser. In 1752 Lawrence Eastham of Edenfield valued "Lime lately set" at 12s whilst in 1766 a parcel of land was leased for a year in Crane, Haslingden for £13 subject to the lessee putting twenty loads of lime on the land during the year. Others made use of the expanding human settlement of the area to obtain new sources of fertiliser in the form of ashes and human excrement. One such man was Thomas Butterworth who obtained the right to all the dung and ash from a house built on his land in Flaxmoss, Haslingden in 1762.\(^{(2)}\)

By the end of the period some local land owners were using lease agreements to determine the land use and ensure that progressive methods were used on their farms. Two such farms were those at Spring Bank and New House in Haslingden. The meadow at Spring Bank was not to be ploughed up whilst the arable was to be ploughed one year and left stubble the next year. At New House the arable was not to be ploughed for more than two consecutive years.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Bury RL/Hutchinson Papers/Box 1/2/2/h
\(^{(2)}\) LRO/Probate Inventory of Lawrence Eastham of Edenfield, 1752
\(^{(3)}\) RRL/Rc921/3/11
SECTION G - OTHER PRIMARY PRODUCE

Down to 1716 the only local materials extracted in any quantity were coal, turfs and possibly stone. Iron smelting present in the sixteenth century and slate and lead mining attempted in the seventeenth century all appear to have ceased by this date. The evidence available indicates that turf and stone were all extracted for purely domestic consumption rather than for commercial sale, whereas the commercial production of coal was underway in both the township of Haslingden and the chapelry of Newchurch.

During the period 1716-1780 this position altered in several important respects. As early as 1736 commercially produced coal was being bought by the churchwardens of Haslingden. Inventories also suggest that the balance between coal and turf in local fuel consumption altered significantly in favour of coal. Such a switch is not surprising given the gradual decline in the area of waste from which turf could be obtained and the rapid growth in population and thus fuel demand that marked this period. Together this forced a move towards the consumption of coal at a time when bulk transport was still sufficiently poor to give local coal producers a virtual monopoly of the Rossendale market.

The favourable position facing local coal producers led to squabbles over coal mining rights. One such dispute blew up in 1753. By an indenture of 1737 it was claimed that the Lord of the Manor had leased to Jeremiah Hargreaves of Fullege, Burnley, all the lord's mines and coal beds in Wolfenden (Newchurch chapelry), from Lumm to Higher Clough Bottom, with the liberty to mine and dig coal for twenty one years and an annual rent of £10. However in 1753, George Hargreaves the heir of the said Jeremiah Hargreaves claimed that since June 1752 twenty eight local inhabitants had opened mines and dug coal for sale
from within the area covered by the lease.\(^{(1)}\) The coal thus mined and sold was valued by Hargreaves at over £500 which in less than a year indicates a considerable volume of production. The local copyholders and defendants in this case denied the charge on the grounds that as copyholders they had the right to dig and sell coal.\(^{(2)}\) Though the outcome of the case is unknown this example shows the growing interest in coal and the increase in the importance of the industry since the mid seventeenth century when the net profit of the coal mine at Haslingden was put at a mere £15 per annum.\(^{(3)}\)

The distribution of the defendants indicates that coal mining was common throughout Rossendale:

- Chapelry of Haslingden: 15 men
- Chapelry of Newchurch: 8 men
- Unspecified parts of Rossendale: 5 men \(^{(4)}\)

The Newchurch chapelry poor law assessment of 1751 indicates coal mines were in production at Tunstead, Wolfendenbooth, Bacup and Constablee.\(^{(5)}\) The sum total of these cases throw open to doubt Tupling's supposition that coal mining was of little importance in Rossendale before the steam age.\(^{(6)}\)

Despite this the size of individual mines was probably tiny. The method of mining in this period in the neighbouring and geologically similar area around Rochdale was described by Bamford. Coal

---

\(^{(1)}\) LRQ/DDX/118/130/3  
\(^{(2)}\) LRQ/DDX/118/130/2b  
\(^{(3)}\) RAL/E317/Lancs 8  
\(^{(4)}\) LRQ/DDX/118/130/2b  
\(^{(5)}\) LRQ/QSP/2858  
RAL/RC/352*ROS  
\(^{(6)}\) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 226
was said to be mined by tunnelling into the hillside. Where coal was
mined subterraneally, buckets and ropes were said to suffice. Horses
and gins were only used in the few larger pits. (1)

The rapid growth of the local population after 1715 appears to
have given a similar boost to local stone quarrying. The clash over
rights to local stone reserves also came to a head in 1753. In that
year the Lord of the Manor brought a claim against thirty five copy­
holders. (2) He alleged that together with persons unknown they had:

"lately set up diverse pretences and claims to dig, work and
get slate, flags and wall stones . . . and pretend they have a right
to do either as Copyholders or as Commoners on the Estovers or under
pretend of some other Title which they refused to discover and they
have actually since the 6th day of July 1749 . . . got won and worked
for sale severally great Quantities of Slate, flags and Wallstones and
have sold the same and thereby made and received great profits to the
(sum) of £500 and upwards for which they ought to come to Account . . .
and to pay . . . the balance of the clear gain made there by."

It was claimed by the lord of the manor that the right of the copy­
holder to extract stone was restricted to their own tenement and was
not for re-sale or use outside the tenement. (3)

(1) Bamford, Dialect of South Lancashire, p III and IV

(2) LRO/DDX/118/130/3. These men were resident in
    Haslingden Township - 17 men
    Haslingden Chapelry - 1 man
    Newchurch Chapelry - 3 men
    South Rossendale - 3 men
    Unspecified part of Rossendale - 4 men
    Spotland, Rochdale - 11 men
    Marsden, near Burnley - 1 man
    Burnley - 1 man
    Colne - 2 men
    Earby, Yorkshire - 1 man

(3) LRO/DDX/118/130/2q
Though the eventual outcome of the case is also uncertain, it again indicates a substantial degree of commercially based stone mining in the area at the time.\(^{(1)}\) By the mid 1750's stone quarries were also found at Coupe and Oakenheadwood.

The importance of local coal and stone mining probably continued to grow down to 1780. Certainly the main cause of their growth, population expansion continued. Indeed local masons came to occupy their own quarries which suggests that commercial quarrying was now becoming accepted. In 1771 Thomas Holden a mason of Flaxmoss, Haslingden had an annual lease on John Hey's stone quarry in the Holden Post of the town. This appears to have been an open abuse of the traditional manorial regulation that stone could only be extracted from copyhold for use within their own tenement.

Some indication of the relative importance of coal and turf in local fuel consumption may be gleaned from the expenditure of the Haslingden township poor law authorities on fuel between 1783 and 1786. During this period a total of over £14 was paid out for coal deliveries whilst only 11s was spent on two cart loads of turf.\(^{(2)}\)

The position of other extractive industries appears to have remained extremely marginal. There is no evidence to support Moffit's assertion that Rossendale was one of the two main iron smelting areas of Lancashire in the eighteenth century.\(^{(3)}\) In 1753, there was an attempt at lead mining on Hameldon Hill in the chapelry of Newchurch, but this appears to have soon collapsed due to the poor quality of lodes.\(^{(4)}\) In 1755 an attempt was made to revive lead mining at

\(^{(1)}\) RRL/RCO 52-1 ROS
\(^{(2)}\) LAG/MBH/5/1
\(^{(3)}\) Moffit, op cit, p 158
\(^{(4)}\) Anon, "Rawtenstall: Descriptive and Historical Notes," 1966, p 12
Thievley just beyond the eastern boundary but this also quickly failed with the bankruptcy of the mining company. (1)

SECTION H - CONCLUSIONS

The general decline in the position of agriculture within the local economy in these years was by no means a simple or clear cut process.

The extent of waste and common declined, particularly near expanding population centres such as Haslingden. This erosion as in the sixteenth century was done on a piecemeal basis but now the township authorities played a more direct role.

Land ownership also saw renewed fragmentation though this was not accompanied by any increase in the extent of owner/occupation. The eighty per cent of property occupied by tenancies were subject to an overall increase in rents and decline in the length of leases. From the land owner's point of view the period was characterised by an increase in land values.

Within agriculture, pasture retained its late seventeenth century dominance. Despite this, all branches of the pastoral sector experienced some decline. Only cattle remained of significance and even here, herd sizes fell, and there was a swing from beef to dairy production. The structure within the small arable sector remained more stable with oats continuing its traditional dominance.

This decline of agriculture was accompanied by a degree of complacency amongst some, though not all farmers. This complacency was probably a reflection of expansion in other parts of the local economy rather than a cause of the decline.

The major area of expansion in the primary sector was in coal mining and stone quarrying, though quantitatively they appear to have remained of limited importance.
Each of these changes can be seen as a response to the basic factors affecting the local economy, the demographic expansion, the textile expansion and the efficiency of local transport.
SECTION A - TYPES OF CLOTH PRODUCED

There is no doubt that woollen manufacture continued to dominate the Rossendale textile sector during the period, but as in the pre 1716 era other textiles continued to be produced albeit on a very modest and possibly intermittent basis.

This supplementary textile activity was based on a traditional fibre flax for linen manufacture and a new fibre, cotton. References to the manufacture of pure linen after 1715 are very fragmentary. In 1716 James Ramsbottom of Deardengate, Haslingden was described as a 'linning weaver' whilst much later in 1746 John Ramsbottom of Musbury was also described as a 'linnen weaver'.

'Checks' a fabric made of a linen warp and a cotton weft were made in Rossendale during the 1720's. In 1723, Edmund Ratcliffe of Priestentax on the western edge of Rossendale was listed as a check weaver, whilst in 1730 Thomas Morris of the neighbouring area of Grane left an inventory containing £1 10s Od of check pieces. The same period saw Robert Whittaker of Laneside, Haslingden active as a cotton weaver. From the end of the 1720's all reference to the production

---

(1) Haslingden Chapelry Register: Baptisms, December 24th 1716
Baptisms, November 30th 1746

(2) C. Aspin and S.D. Chapman, James Hargreaves and the Spinning Jenny, 1964, p 10

(3) Haslingden Chapelry Register: Baptisms, March 24th 1723
LRO/Probate Inventory of Thomas Morris of Grane, 1730

(4) Haslingden Chapelry Register: Baptisms, June 10th 1722
of any material containing a cotton fibre disappear. Thus the flirtation by western Rossendale with the cotton industry appears to have been both marginal and short lived.\(^1\) A similar and equally marginal and short lived attempt was made to establish a cotton industry in early eighteenth century Saddleworth south and east of Rossendale. The failure of these industries to become established perhaps reflects the buoyance of the contemporary east Lancashire woollen industry.\(^2\) Cotton only returned to the Rossendale area in the mid 1770's when muslin production appears to have begun in Bacup.\(^3\) On that occasion, the impact of cotton proved to be swift and dramatic in western Rossendale.

A more long lived but equally marginal offshoot of traditional textile activity was stocking weaving. As early as 1719 Edmund Metcalfe, a 'stockinger' was in gaol at Lancaster for debt.\(^4\) In 1741 Robert Chadwick of Haslingden was described as a stocking weaver as was Edmund Duckworth of Haslingden in 1749.\(^5\) In 1758 John Jaggar a 'knitter of stockins' from Rossendale was married.\(^6\) The same year saw two stocking frames with their ancillary equipment offered for sale at Edenfield on the southern boundary of Rossendale.\(^7\) The above references suggest that this

---

\(^1\) All of the above references relate to areas in or to the west of the town of Haslingden

\(^2\) Wild, loc cit, p224

\(^3\) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 217

\(^4\) LRO/QJB/7/35

\(^5\) Haslingden Chapelry Registers: Burials, December 20th 1741 and September 22nd 1745

Marriages: June 1749

\(^6\) Haslingden Chapelry Registers: Marriages, March 12th 1758

\(^7\) Manchester Mercury, February 7th 1758
industry too had its success mainly in the western half of Rossendale.

Despite the very marginal impact of linen, cotton, checks and stocking weaving in Rossendale before 1780, their tendency to have greatest penetration in the west of Rossendale probably indicates a less firm commitment to the woollen trade than was to be found in eastern Rossendale. This would not be surprising as western Rossendale lay adjacent to the growing fustian and cotton industry of the parish of Blackburn. Equally it was geographically remote from the main centres of the woollen trade which by this time all lay beyond the eastern edge of Rossendale. This more independent attitude could even be seen before 1716 when the Haslingden area already had commercial links with centres such as Manchester, which were even then withdrawing from many aspects of the woollen trade.

In 1716 the two main products of the Rossendale woollen industry had been bays and kersey.

Kersey appears to have retained its importance beyond this date. In 1724 Defoe commented that in and around Rochdale and Bury there was a large trade in kerseys and half thicks.\(^1\) As late as 1778 Rochdale retained a substantial market for kersey.\(^2\) However, within Rossendale itself, there is little evidence of widespread kersey production particularly in the later part of this period. In George Duckworth a mercer of Haslingden, recorded £22 10s 5d of kersey and plains amongst his textile stocks.\(^3\) Given the recent tradition of local kersey manufacture, this cloth may well

---

(2) H. Fishwick, *A History of the Parish of Rochdale*, p 57
(3) LRQ/Probate Inventory of George Duckworth of Haslingden
have been manufactured within the area. Indeed as Duckworth himself
possessed a pair of looms he may well have manufactured it himself.
For the later period, evidence of kersey production is even more
indirect. In 1769 James Anderton of Hutch Bank, Haslingden bought
"1 Pack more Noils" from John Vavasour of Rochdale. (1) Noils were
the short fibres remaining on comb teeth after combing. (2) The yarn
produced from such noils was generally used to produce coarse woollen
cloth which in Rossendale meant kersey. (3)

In contrast to a probable decline in local kersey production,
local bays output appears to have remained buoyant and growing. The
presence of bays cloth is noted in many local inventories. In the
1740's John Lord of Dedwenclough left seven pieces of bays, whilst
George Hindle of Laneside left two pieces of bays. (4) In 1765
Lawrence Ormerod of Whitewell Bottom was described as a bays maker. (5)
Earlier in 1746 Rossendale producers claimed that their area manu-
factured more bays cloth than any other area of similar size in
Lancashire. (6) Baines writing in 1824 went so far as to state that
little more than half a century ago, "the majority of local (Hasling-
den) textile workers had been employed in the making of bays and a
pure worsted, flannels". (7)

(1) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 187
(2) F. Atkinson, ed, Some Aspects of the Eighteenth Century Woollen
   and Worsted Trade in Halifax, p 70
(3) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 187
(4) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Lord of Dedwenclough 1741
LRO/Probate Inventory of George Hindle of Laneside, Haslingden,
   1743
(5) T.W. Hanson, "Royds of George Street, Halifax and of Bucklersbury,
   London", T.H.A.S., 1941, p 81
(6) C. Barnes, The Changing Industrial Pattern of Rossendale 1597-1850,
    1957, p 18
(7) E. Baines, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of
    Lancaster, Vol I, p 644
The reference to flannels indicates the local production of pure worsted, something not found in the area before 1716. Pure worsteds were being produced in the Halifax area in the 1710's and were in large scale production by the 1720's. By the 1720's pure worsted production had spread to Rossendale. The chapelry register of Haslingden shows that before 1726 two serge weavers were resident at Sunnyfield on the west side of Haslingden township, ie the area most remote from Halifax. (1) By 1733, calamanco had been added to the range of local worsteds when John Taylor, a weaver of Walls in Wolfenden, left five yards of black calamanco. (2) By 1746 George Hargreaves of Newchurch had added backing to the list of Rossendale worsteds when he left four pieces of backing valued at £20. (3) In June 1767 a dyehouse was advertised for sale at Hutchbank, Haslingden that offered a large screw press for pressing woollen cloth and shalloons as well as a full range of dyehouse equipment. (4) This implies a well established local shalloon industry. Taken as a whole these various types of worsted suggest that a new branch of the woollen industry had successfully penetrated Rossendale during the period after 1715. This impression is confirmed by the 1777 decision that the Rossendale worsted industry was of sufficient importance to justify it being allocated one of the nine Lancashire representatives on the Worsted Committee set up in that year. (5)

(1) H. Heaton, The Letter Books of Joseph Holroyd and Sam Hill, 1914, p 11
(2) Haslingden Chapelry Register Baptisms: July 28th 1722 and September 22nd 1722.
(3) LRO/Probate Inventory of George Hargreaves of Newchurch, 1746
(4) Manchester Mercury, June 2nd 1767
(5) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 184
The foregoing sections suggest that the nature of cloth production changed in the period 1716-1780 away from woollen kersey towards a range of worsteds but with bays continuing to play an important role.

This switch in the nature of cloth production was accompanied by a switch away from the narrow cloth that kersey production represented. Seventeenth century kersies were thought rarely to exceed a yard in width. A switch towards broader cloth was evident even before 1716. In 1712 Josiah Gartside of Rochdale introduced a new white broadcloth into the area which he claimed to have helped the prosperity of the industry. Broad pieces soon spread into Rossendale. In the 1720's Ralph Almond of Yate Bank possessed four broad pieces whilst George Ashworth of Fearns left two common broad pieces. By the 1760's broad pieces were in large scale production. In 1765 Lawrence Ormerod of Whitewell Bottom consigned a batch of broad bays valued at £162. The production of broad cloth was further affirmed during the legal disputes between John Kay and local manufacturers over his wheel shuttles in the 1730's and 1740's.

(1) Heaton, The Letter Books of Joseph Holroyd and Sam Hill, p 10
(3) LRO/Probate Inventory of Ralph Almond of Yate Bank, tradesman, 1724
LRO/Probate Inventory of George Ashworth of Fearns, yeoman, 1728
(4) Hanson, "Rovds of George Street, Halifax and Bucklersbury," London, loc cit, p 81
(5) See Chapter XVI, Section C
SECTION B - THE ORGANISATION OF PRODUCTION

Before 1716 the production of cloth had been organised on a pyramidal basis. A small number of clothiers backed by a much larger number of specialist weavers was the typical situation.

This pyramid was maintained between 1716 and 1780 though the gap between the top of the pyramid and the bottom appears to have widened considerably, which is perhaps a reflection of the local introduction of worsted manufacture.

The Haslingden chapelry registers can be used to plot the numerical balance between weavers and clothiers down to 1760 after which the occupational listings peter out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weaver</th>
<th>Clothier</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1705-9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The short lived jump in the number of clothiers by the early 1720's may well have been a response to the sudden growth in the impact of textiles on the economically more independent part of west Rossendale. The dominance of weavers was also retained to the east in the chapelry of Newchurch. This can be observed from the thirty seven extant apprenticeship indentures covering the period 1759 to 1774.

(1) Haslingden Chapelry: Baptism, Burial and Marriage Registers
Occupational Structure of Newchurch
Woollen Workers 1759-1774

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaver</th>
<th>Clothier</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total No of Cases</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though numerically of limited significance Rossendale clothiers played an important role in the local woollen industry as their putting out activities developed. In 1724, a Rossendale clothier had £200 of raw wool, combed wool and jersey yarn put out with spinners and weavers to be worked up. (2) In 1725 Ralph Almond of Yate Bank left:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In workmens Hands 25 warps</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warps In the Warehouse 10 and 5 up on Bobbins at 12 for</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 bundles Bundles Blue yarn 12 Spaad at 2 per</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White yarn 47 Bundles at 10 per Bundle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Winders Hands 3 Bundles yarn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow wool Up Stairs at</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White wool Up Stairs 270s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue weft Up Stairs 76s</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey weft Up Stairs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving weft in weavers Hands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool at Spinning 120s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yards 4 cam Broads 3 fine 2 spots</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Debts</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desperate Debts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Inventory Total 268 1 0) (3)

(1) RRL/Rc331.55 Apprenticeship Indentures of the Chapelry of Newchurch in Rossendale, 1759-1774

(2) LRO/Probate Inventory of Ralph Almond of Yate Bank 1725

(3) PRO/PL/7/129
This suggests a substantial undertaking under which material was put out for spinning, winding and weaving in three distinct and separate operations. Between each stage the material appears to have been returned to Almond's dwelling or his warehouse. This case also suggests the woollen putting out industry could operate successfully in the far west of Rossendale within the boundary of the parish of Blackburn with its emerging cotton fustian industry. Also on the far western boundary Daniel Sutcliffe of Duckworth Hall, clothier, was engaged in putting out in Rossendale on a modest scale by 1729. Further east George Law was also operating a putting out system in 1752. In that year the commissioners in bankruptcy of Law noted that he had for several years bought and sold considerable quantities of sheep's wool and had employed people to manufacture it into woollen cloth which he had sold. In addition he had bought woollen cloth at the neighbouring markets and sold them again. By such trade he had become indebted. This suggests that in addition to more traditional putting out functions, Law had unsuccessfully indulged in speculation in the nearby wool and cloth markets as a merchant. The debts and presumably the business of George Law had been substantial as he owed £100 to John Ormerod, an innkeeper of Newchurch, who was only one of a number of creditors. In 1748 James Heyworth of Haslingden also appears to have been operating a putting out business with:

(1) LRO/QJB/19/43
(2) LRO/DD/Bd/29/3
1 pair of looms in the Laneside with gears belonging £ 17 6
25 lb of Listern yarn and 4 stone of wool 3 1 5
\( \frac{1}{2} \) stone of greased wool and \( \frac{1}{2} \) stone of noils - 18 10
13 stone of wool 6 18 10
6 lb of listern yarn 113 11 1 1
5\( \frac{1}{2} \) lb of broken wools and 1 narrow list 3 14 6
5 lb of salvage worsted, 113 lb of combed wool 1 11 3
1 pack of noils and 1 stone of liv(...?) in wool 6 18 0
4 pieces in the hands of Henry Ormerod 11 1 6
2 pieces in the hands of Richard Hargreaves 5 19 7
2 pieces in the hands of James Pilkington 5 15 3
1 piece in the hands of Widow Heyworth 3 19 0
A bockin in the hands of John Piccop 4 11 7\( \frac{1}{2} \)
2 pieces in the hands of Henry Ainsworth 5 15 3
2 packs of wool at £8 and 4 packs of Combing wool at £10 56 2 0

(Textile Total 128 3 7\( \frac{1}{2} \)) (1)

This again appears to have been a quite substantial putting out business by local standards probably based on the manufacture of bays and worsted.

Though each of these men appears to have operated on a substantial scale they were quite modest compared to the largest of local producers. The business of these men appears to have been measurable in terms of hundreds of pounds. Larger men operated on perhaps ten times this scale. John Haworth of Fearn was such a man. In 1746 he left the following textile stocks:

---

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of James Heyworth of Haslingden, 1748
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wool with sheets and out of the sheets</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combed wool and worsted yarn</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lister's glue and butter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool and warps at making</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieces made and in the House</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 firkings of soap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Debts</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money at interest upon promissary notes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Textile Total 1 078 17 8) (1)

The activities of Lawrence Ormerod of Whitewell Bottom were probably on a similar scale in 1765 when he dispatched in a single consignment eighty-five pieces of cloth valued at over £300. (2)

Large scale putting out activity within Rossendale was also organised by outside producers. In 1723 John Parker, a clothier of Marsden just to the north east of Rossendale had two putting out depots in operation, one in Nelson itself, the other in Haslingden. It appears that wool was sorted at his workshop in Marsden and then put out for carding and spinning. After spinning it was brought back to the workshop before again being put out for weaving. (3) In 1771 Benjamin Walmesley of Rochdale left legacies to his 'helpers in putting out' in Haslingden and Goodshaw. (4) This suggests a business

(1) LRO/Probate Inventories of John Haworth of Fears, clothier 1746
Even these activities were tiny compared to the major clothiers based in Halifax where the turnover of one large clothier was estimated to have varied between £20,000 and £35,000 per annum during the 1740's - Atkinson, op cit, p 1

(2) Hanson, loc cit, p 81

(3) Bennett, The History of Burnley, p 83-5
Bennett, The History of Marsden and Colne, 1957, p 127

(4) A.P. Wadsworth, The History of the Rochdale Woollen Trade, 1957 p 127
using labour throughout west and central Rossendale. Manchester men also continued to put out in the area as late as 1765 when Richard Scholes of Manchester was operating with Rossendale labour.\(^{(1)}\)

Even some of the larger nominally independent Rossendale manufacturers had a very close business relationship with these non-local merchants and manufacturers. In 1759, Edward Dole, a Stockport merchant was the "Principal Creditor" of his brother Thomas Dole, a Haslingden clothier. This may have been a family business with Thomas responsible for manufacturing in Rossendale, with Edward responsible for sales from Stockport, the original family home.\(^{(2)}\) Even Lawrence Ormerod of Whitewell Bottom mentioned earlier was under an obligation in 1765 to send all his and all his father's production to market via Royds of Halifax for a period of twelve months, i.e. Royds had turned Ormerod's business into a tied house.\(^{(3)}\) Some local manufacturers appear to have voluntarily relinquished their independence in order to become manufacturers on commission for larger outside merchants. One such man in Haslingden advertised in 1769 that he was a "person of fortune and good character leaving off making bays or plain cloth for himself" but instead "to make by commission".\(^{(4)}\)

Writing of Haslingden around 1750 Aitken noted that "The people were . . . chiefly employed by monied men at Rochdale".\(^{(5)}\) Baines suggests that this was still the case in the 1770's noting that at that time "the manufacturing part of the population was

\(^{(1)}\) Manchester Mercury, January 10th 1765

\(^{(2)}\) Will of Thomas Dole of Haslingden, 1759

\(^{(3)}\) J.W. Hanson, loc cit. p 82

\(^{(4)}\) Manchester Mercury, April 18th 1769

\(^{(5)}\) A. Aitken, A Description of the Countryside for Thirty miles around Manchester, 1795, p 276-7
employed chiefly by the capitalists of Rochdale".\(^{(1)}\) As Haslingden was relatively remote from Rochdale and exhibited early signs of independence from it in other respects, it can be taken that the hold of Rochdale was at least as strong over central and eastern Rossendale. Though growing signs of independence in organisation were present, the role of neighbouring centres probably remained predominant down to the end of the period.

Larger scale organisation based on putting out that developed after 1715 appears to have been at the expense of the small family clothier. The only two inventory cases of clothiers in Rossendale after 1715 relate to John Schofield of Torside in 1723 and Henry Hargreaves of Newchurch in 1736.

In addition local sources suggest that\(^{(2)}\) independent specialist weavers remained active in the area after 1715. In 1727 James Hartley of Friarhill left two packs of wool, warp yarn, woollen weft, two pairs of looms and six pieces of cloth valued in total at £32 9s whilst in 1747 James Ashworth of Holden left a pair of looms plus gears and two pieces of cloth together valued at £4.\(^{(2)}\) The activities of local dyers also suggests the presence of small independent men organising manufacturing. In 1761 Richard Harrison a Bacup dyer was owed £1 16s 6d by John Haworth of Breckclough for dying, £1 8s by James Ormerod of Boothfold for goods sold and work done and 17s 7d by Edmund Ashworth of Edgeside for goods sold.\(^{(3)}\) In 1775 Lawrence

\(^{(1)}\) Baines, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of Lancaster, Vol I, p 644
\(^{(2)}\) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Schofield of Torside, Musbury 1723 LRO/Probate Inventory of Henry Hargreaves of Newchurch 1736 LRO/Probate Inventory of James Hartley of Friarhill, 1727 LRO/Probate Inventory of James Ashworth of Holden, 1747
\(^{(3)}\) LRO/QJB/35/20
Ashworth, a dyer of Burnley just to the north of Rossendale was owed £4 16s by John Woods of Haslingden and £1 18s by Robert Dearden of Haslingden both for goods sold. (1)

A second growth area within the woollen sector appears to have been amongst those in an employee status. Many employee weavers were found dependent on others to put out work to them. The rapid growth of this group is indicated by the rapid increase in the number of weavers recorded in Haslingden chapelry registers between 1710 and 1760. In this period their number rose from a mere fifteen in 1705-9 to one hundred and nine in 1755-9. (2) Typical of such men was John Ratcliffe of Priestentax on the west side of Haslingden who in 1736 left a pair of looms and warping woughs valued together at £1 5s. The absence of any reference to the ownership of wool, yarn or cloth appears to confirm their position in an employee status. Similar men could be found further east as in 1743 when Robert Cunliffe of Newchurch left a pair of looms and gears valued at 13s. (3) The rapid growth in the number of woollen weavers in eighteenth century Rossendale would have necessitated an even more rapid increase in the number of workers in the preparatory trades particularly given the technological advances that increased the productivity of local weavers. As the workers in such preparatory trades were traditionally women and children this growth in their numbers cannot be quantitatively observed from either chapelry registers or probate records. (4)

(1) LRO/QJB/43/30

(2) See opening page of this section. Though some may have been independent the majority were probably virtually of employee status.

(3) LRO/Probate Inventory of John Ratcliffe of Priestentax 1736
LRO/Probate Inventory of Robert Cunliffe of Newchurch, 1743
See Chapter XVI Section C

(4) This view should not be taken to extremes, Newchurch Apprenticeship Indentures show girls as well as boys being apprenticed to woollen weavers even in the mid eighteenth century.
However, inventories do indicate that the equipment for undertaking the preparatory processes in woollen manufacture remained widespread in Rossendale households particularly though not exclusively amongst those of low financial standing.

Probate inventories indicate that few individuals in any branch of the local woollen trade were entirely dependent on that trade for the whole of their income. Even the largest local clothiers such as John Haworth of Fears retained some direct agricultural interest. The inventories suggest this is also true of many of those of lower financial status such as George Dearden of Musbury who in 1744 left warping yarn, two woollen pieces and looms valued at £4 16s and three cows valued at £5 13s out of a total inventory value of £19 17s 3d. (1)

However, inventories under represent such groups and now probably ignored the poorest groups in local society. The rapid growth of population in Rossendale and the stability in local farm size must have created a situation in which local interest in agriculture was only of marginal economic significance for many people. This view is confirmed by local property deeds and contemporary property surveys which show the presence of concentrations of small cottages with little if any land attached, particularly but not exclusively near the growing town of Haslingden. (2)

Adult male inventories ignore two potentially important groups in the textile labour force namely women and children. Female inventories indicate that prior to 1750 women were largely restricted

(1) LAO/Probate Inventory of John Haworth of Fears, clothier, 1746 LAO/Probate Inventory of George Dearden of Musbury, woollen weaver, 1744

(2) Stevens and Hawkin, A Haslingden Churchwarden's List of 1753, passim LAO/QSP/2858 Newchurch Chapelry: Poor Law Assessment 1757–8
to the carding and spinning processes with virtually none engaged in weaving. This situation began to change after 1760. During the 1760's and 1770's six girls were apprenticed as woollen weavers by the poor law authorities of Newchurch alone. Such female weavers were probably relatively few. For example, during the 1760's and 1770's the figure of six female apprentice weavers was out of a total of thirty six.

These figures also indicate the widespread use of child labour via the apprenticeship system which was also widely used in other Rossendale townships. The nature of this eighteenth century apprenticeship system can be observed on the indenturing of Henry Jackson in 1747. Jackson was apprenticed to John Hindley of Todd Hall, Haslingden to learn woollen weaving until reaching the age of twenty one. For undertaking this responsibility, Hindley was paid 10s 6d by the overseers.

By the end of the period the traditional apprenticeship system was beginning to break down. In the late 1770's James Rawstron of Higher Booths learnt his trade of wool combing with his father, but until he was married he regarded himself as a journeyman rather than an apprentice. In 1778 nineteen year old Andrew Nuttall of Green Houses, Haslingden "went to learn" woollen weaving with John Pickup of Green Houses. Yet rather than paying for his apprenticeship, Nuttall was paid 6d per week plus meat, washing and lodging and was only contracted for one year.

(1) RRL/Rc331.55 Apprenticeship Indentures of the Chapelry of Newchurch in Rossendale 1759-1774
(2) LAQ/PR/2859/8
(3) MGRL/MF/561/A3/No 89
(4) LAQ/PR/2859/14
SECTION C - PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

Concern here is with the basic production processes of carding, combing, spinning and weaving.

Prior to 1780 the spinning method used in the east Lancashire woollen industry was described in the following terms:

"the spinner stood beside a large wheel to which, with one hand she gave motion whilst stepping back to the extent of her reach, she drew out the slubbing and having given it the necessary twist, wound it on the spindle and so continued until she had spun cops enough to make a warp". (1)

This description suggests that the traditional spinning wheel was still dominant in this field as they had been since at least the mid seventeenth century.

New spinning technology was adopted in the newly re-emergent Rossendale cotton industry of the 1770's. James Hargreaves of 'spinning jenny' fame actually resided on the western border of Rossendale but his jenny only spread into this area with the cotton era. The jenny was possibly in local use as early as the mid 1770's when a small cotton mill was opened at Laneside, Haslingden. (2) This site was not suitable for water power and the timing was too early for steam power, thus suggesting a hand operated jenny mill. By the late 1770's the jenny was certainly present as Haslingden by then possessed a jenny maker in William Cockerill who was later to make a fortune in the embryo European textile engineering industry. (3)

(1) Bamford, Dialect of South Lancashire, p V
(2) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 204
(3) T. Woodcock, William Cockerill and his Family, 1927, p 15
Domestic combing and carding was a technological simple operation. Cards consisted of two boards fitted with handles and covered with teeth. Wool was placed between the boards which were then brought together and moved in a circular motion to work the wool into a mass of inseparable fibres ready for spinning. Combs consisted of two boards containing rows of teeth of gradually reducing length. One comb would be attached to a post and the other used to pull the wool through the comb teeth in order to get the long fibres lying parallel and thus ready for spinning into worsted yarn.\(^1\)

It is argued that during the eighteenth century an improved stock card was introduced into Rossendale though the precise nature of the improvement is unknown.\(^2\) Revolutionary change did occur in the carding process at the very end of the period. The development of an improved cylindrical carding engine in the 1770's encouraged this to become the first branch of the local manufacturing process to adopt powered machinery and mill organisation.\(^3\)

The fundamental changes in the weaving sector are those associated with the 'wheel shuttle' or the 'flying shuttle' of the 1730's. Kay's 'shuttle' was basically an attempt to improve the existing broad loom. Rossendale was associated with Kay's shuttle from its commercial inception. The shuttles made for Kay's initial demonstration tour in September 1733 were made in Rossendale.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Heaton, *The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry*, p 333-4

\(^2\) Aspin and Chapman, *James Hargreaves and the Spinning Jenny*,

\(^3\) E. Baines, *History of the County Palatine and Duchy of Lancaster*, Vol I, p 116


\(^4\) PRO/CII/2452/15
The shuttle was soon in wide use in Rossendale and neighbouring areas which led to a series of disputes between 1735 and 1744.\(^{(1)}\) These disputes relate to several specific aspects of the shuttle. The new system of winding developed by Kay between 1733 and 1735 was the issue in the earliest disputes. This new winding mechanism wound the weft on a bobbin inside the shuttle thus preventing breakages and allowing a bigger bobbin to be used. In 1735 Kay acted against three men in eastern Rossendale, and three to the north of the area. The defendants admitted using the shuttle but denied using the Kay winding.\(^{(2)}\) In 1737 Kay acted against two further Rossendale men and fourteen from neighbouring areas after they had ignored hand bills warning them of the consequences placed in Newchurch church and at other places in the locality. On this occasion the weavers admitted using the winding system but claimed it was not new having been used in the West Riding worsted trade. In addition, they argued that Kay's patent of 1733 made no mention of Kay's winding system which he had developed after that date. They also admitted using a second feature of Kay's shuttle, the wheels on the shuttle. However, they argued that it was not new and that a Joseph Crowder of Spotland, between Rochdale and Rossendale had developed such a shuttle some thirty years earlier whilst the board on which the shuttle ran had been known for around fifteen years. They did accept Kay's claim to have invented a third feature, the wooden tenders with a cord which permitted one rather than two men to operate the broad loom. However, they claimed

\(^{(1)}\) Unfortunately, the legal results of these disputes are not known.

\(^{(2)}\) PRO/C11/2452/15
that this was not a success causing as many problems as it solved.\(^{(1)}\) In 1740 Kay brought a claim against another Rossendale weaver and eight men from neighbouring areas but little information is available on the details of the dispute.\(^{(2)}\) In 1743-4 Kay appears to have made a final and larger effort to get his patent enforced bringing an action against eight Rossendale men and twelve from neighbouring areas. On this occasion, the defendants re-iterated the claim that a wheel shuttle had been in use long before Kay's patent. In addition, they argued that the shuttle they used was heavier and larger than that in the Kay patent and consequently was not covered by that patent.\(^{(3)}\)

Regardless of the outcome of these cases, they all serve to show that the local industry was quick to respond to technological change when circumstances proved favourable. The pressure for change in local weaving continued after Kay. Some time after 1750 the 'wheel shuttle' is said to have been superceded within Rossendale by a derivative known as the 'bocking' shuttle usually accredited to John Maden of Bacup.\(^{(4)}\)

The expansion of the local woollen industry and even the associated technological change was facilitated by local textile machine and component makers. Reference has already been made to William Cockerill, a Haslingden jenny maker, at the end of the period. Similar men were present at a much earlier date. In 1725 John Birtwistle was resident as a card maker in Haslingden whilst in the 1730's and

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(1)} & \text{ PRO/C11/2456/21} \\
\text{(2)} & \text{ PRO/C11/1566/28, 29, 30} \\
& \text{ PRO/C11/1575/26} \\
\text{(3)} & \text{ PRO/C11/1591/24 and 25} \\
\text{(4)} & \text{ C. Barnes, op cit, p 17}
\end{align*}\]
and 1740's Charles Hardman was working as a slay and read maker in the same town. (1) In the late 1760's John Whittaker was active as a shuttlemaker at Crawshawbooth. (2) The role of local craftsmen in technological change can be seen in the adoption of the 'wheel' shuttle in the 1730's. Some of the shuttles for Kay's initial demonstration tour of 1733 were made by Abraham Tattersall, a shuttlemaker of Edgeside near Newchurch. In the 1737 dispute with Kay, several local weavers claimed to have obtained their shuttles from the same Abraham Tattersall. In the same case, two other local men, James Lord of Slack near Newchurch and Abraham Foster of Bacup were also said to be supplying the new equipment to local weavers. (3)

Taken as a whole it would appear that the pace of technological innovation in local textiles varied according to the process involved but where the technology was available and was applicable it was rapidly adopted by local industry. Prior to 1780 all these changes other than the carding engine could be operated within the existing domestic form of organisation.

Though remaining domestic, the development of the industry after 1715 coincided with the emergence of specialist manufacturing facilities. Prior to 1715 such facilities appear to have been exceedingly rare within Rossendale which is in line with the predominance of small scale family based clothier undertakings. The only possible example was in 1676 when Ralph Duckworth of Musbury left a  

(1) Haslingden Chapelry Baptism Register December 1725
    Haslingden Chapelry Marriage Register June 1731
    Haslingden Chapelry Burial Register February 1742

Reads or slays were comb like frames on the loom to beat the weft tight. The warp threads went between the teeth of the reed or slay. F, Atkinson, op cit, p 11

(2) Haslingden Chapelry Register

(3) PRO/C11/2456/21
shop that may have been a weaving shop. The development of the more
capitalistic putting out regimes after 1716 quickly changed this.
From the mid 1720's weaving shops became much more common. By 1751
at least seventeen such shops existed in Rossendale. Some were sub-
stantial establishments. In 1728 James Townend of New Hall Hey left
six pairs of looms and two presses suggesting a shop probably employ­
ing journeymen weavers on the premises. More typical was the shop
of James Pickup of Heightside which in 1727 contained a pair of looms,
warping woughs and rings. Yet it is often difficult to see such
'shops' or loom houses as fixed capital investment in the woollen
industry as in practice they appear to have often been used as a
general storage area. In 1727 the shop of George Crook of Pikelaw
contained, a pair of looms, with gears, two harrows, a plow and irons,
shovels, a cow yoke, a sack, ladders, three sleds, and rakes.

As the putting out sector of the local woollen industry grew
so did more specialist facilities such as warping chambers, wool
chambers and warehouses. In 1739, Christopher Hargreaves of Heap
Clough had a warping chamber, whilst in 1740 John Whittaker of Bank
Top had a wool chamber. Warehouses were also scattered throughout
the area. One existed near Haslingden in the early 1720's whilst

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of Ralph Duckworth of Musbury 1676
(2) LRO/Probate Inventory of James Townend of New Hall Hey, 1728
LRO/DDX/19
RRL/Rc/362.5 Ros Newchurch in Rossendale Poor Law Assessment 1751
(3) LRO/Probate Inventory of James Pickup of Heightside near New­
church 1727
LRO/Probate Inventory of George Crook of Pikelaw, Oakenheadwood,
clothier, 1727
Warping woughs - were the machines in which threads were arranged
two if not three were present in Dedwenclough, Tunstead and Wolfendenbooth in the 1750's. (1)

(1) Bennett, *A History of Marsden and Colne*, p 127
RL/RC 362.5 Ros Newchurch in Rossendale Poor Law Assessment 1751
LAQ/QSP/2858 Newchurch in Rossendale Poor Law Assessment 1758
SECTION D - FINISHING TRADES

Until 1713 no finishing facilities existed within Rossendale to meet the needs of the local woollen industry. However, from this date when a fulling mill came into operation at Brandwood, finishing trades became firmly established throughout Rossendale.

The initial finishing processes varied according to whether the cloth was woollen or worsted. Woollen cloth was treated, often with urine or dung, scoured and then fulled before being dried on tenters. In contrast, worsted was not fulled though it was scoured and dried. This distinction reflects the nature of the wool fibre which has a saw-toothed serrated edge. Thus, if the fibres are thrown out of parallel with one another they interlock, which in turn increases the strength of the material. This process of making the fibres interlock is achieved by felting during the fulling process. In worsted, a stronger yarn is used, and the strength of the cloth lies in the strength of its warp and weft, thus removing the need for felting and fulling.

After drying the cloth was generally cropped and sheared, which in 1716 was a hand labour process. A final stage was dyeing, although this was a process that could also be carried out as a preparatory process.

The growth of fulling and dyeing mills in western Rossendale was clearly evident by the mid 1720's when Abraham Fish was active as a clothier and miller at Church Hill, Haslingden. By the mid 1730's Elliot claims there were two dyehouses operating in the

(1) Atkinson, Some Aspects of the Eighteenth Century Woollen and Worsted Industry in Halifax, p ix
Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry, p 322-4

(2) ibid, p 260-1 and 342-4
Newchurch area at Tunstead and Waterfoot.\(^{(1)}\) By the mid 1740's these had been joined by a dyer resident in Crane and a clothmiller at Bridge End, both near Haslingden.\(^{(2)}\) From 1750, the rate of increase appears to have accelerated. In 1751 two mills were recorded at Tunstead-Wulfendenbooth and Bacup, one, possibly both being fulling mills.\(^{(3)}\) In 1753, Haslingden township had another fulling mill in Church Post, whilst in the following year, a cloth mill was operating at Constablee in central Rossendale. Three dyers were active in the Haslingden area in the late 1750's. By 1758, up to four mills were operating around Newchurch with a dyehouse at Bacup.\(^{(4)}\)

Pressure was brought on the traditional hand perching process by the adoption of the gig mill after 1715. In 1737, perchers and sheermens in and around Rochdale, Bury and Manchester sought to put down the gig mills on the grounds that they caused unemployment amongst hand perchers and damaged the quality of the cloth.\(^{(5)}\) The spread of the gig/perching mill with its need for water power would be beneficial to an area such as Rossendale with an abundance of such power.

After 1750 there appears to have been a trend towards conducting all three of these finishing processes within the same establishment giving a combined dyeing, fulling and perching mill. Probably the first such establishment was in operation in Holden Post, Haslingden by 1753, though by 1757 it had definitely been joined by

\(^{(1)}\) J.Elliott, *David Whitehead of Rossendale, 1790-1860*, p viii

\(^{(2)}\) Haslingden Chapelry Register, January 1745 and August 1745

\(^{(3)}\) RPL/Rc 365.5 Ros

\(^{(4)}\) Stevens and Hawkin, *op cit*, passim
RPL/Rc 352.1 Ros
LRO/Will of Henry Haworth of Constablee 1756

\(^{(5)}\) Preston Guardian November 10th 1877 - from Nicholas Grimshaw MSS.
a large newly built joint dyehouse, fulling and perching mill at Ravenshore on the border between Haslingden township and the parish of Bury. By 1770 a fulling mill and dyehouse was operating at Paghouse in Church Post, Haslingden. This may well have been the success of the fulling mill operating in Church Post in 1753. Similarly, in 1772 a joint fulling mill and dyehouse was operating at Huttocks in Henheads township.

These joint operations offered a wide range of finishing services to local woollen producers. The Ravenshore unit offered lease in 1757 was described as "A large new-built very commodious Fulling mill with implements for Frizing and perching cloths and also a dyehouse with Vessels therein ready fix'd and seven seams of tenters." In 1767 the Hutch Bank unit was offered for lease as "A Good accustomed Dye-House, completely fitted up with Fats and the usual Implements necessary for carrying on of the Dyeing Trade, together with a Perching Mill, A Frizing Mill and an Indigo Mill turned by Water and also a large Screw Press for the Purpose of Pressing Woollen Cloth and Shalloons." Paghouse mill and dyehouse in 1770 offered two fulling stocks, a perching mill, a frizing mill,

---

(1) LRQ/QSP/2858
Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/No 1727

(2) Stephens and Hawkins, op cit, passim
Manchester Mercury, May 3rd 1757
Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 114

(3) Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/No 1968

(4) Manchester Mercury, May 3rd 1757
Frizing - a cloth finishing to give a curled or knotted map
Atkinson, op cit, p 70

Tenters - frames on which drying cloth was stretched. Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries, p 343

(5) Manchester Mercury, June 2nd 1767
two vats, one boiler, seven seams of narrow tenter, a press and three pairs of shears. These examples suggest that in addition to the basic processes of fulling and dyeing, these establishments also provided frizing, perching, tentering and shearing facilities plus pressing facilities for local shalloon producers.

As stated earlier the dyeing process could be undertaken as a preparatory or as a final process after finishing. Both were methods used within Rossendale. In 1724, Ralph Almond of Yate Bank was having his wool dyed before weaving. His inventory records, twenty four bundles of blue yarn, forty seven bundles of white yarn, over £25 of yellow and blue wool and £18 of blue and grey weft. Much later in 1743, George Hindle of Laneside was in a similar position when he left a stone of blue listing. In contrast, James Anderton of Hutch Bank, Haslingden was obtaining both dyed wool from, and having finished pieces dyed by Benjamin Boothman of Haslingden in 1773. This is revealed by the following extract from their account:

"Mr James Anderton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 26 1773</td>
<td>to 12 pound of Listen Red</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to pleane Blu By thomas houldin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to 2 peecis Dide Red at</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 23</td>
<td>to one Blue frise and one green frise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21</td>
<td>to 4 pound of wool Black and Brown at</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to throms Black at</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>to 2 Blu frises at</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 2 3"  

(1) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p
(2) LRO/Probate Inventories of Ralph Almond of Yate Bank, 1724
LRO/Probate Inventories of George Hindle of Laneside, Haslingden, 1743
(3) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 187
Thrums are the waste ends of wool or yarn
Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/1968
The above case of a Rossendale cloth producer using Rossendale finishing facilities was probably the normal situation. However, this was not always the case. In 1756, James Haslam had an extensive putting out business in the area around Rochdale, including south eastern Rossendale. As Haslam also owned his own fulling mill it is likely that he took responsibility for the finishing of his cloth. (1)

Though not all cloth was finished locally, the Rossendale finishing trades appear to have been able to attract some business from outside the area. In 1761, Richard Harrison, a dyer of Bacup, was owed money from men in Brockclough, Boothfold and Edgeside all near Newchurch, and men from Tong, Farewell and Lower Turnstile all in Rochdale; Hawkern Head and Cross Bank in Bury as well as a man in Bolton le Moors. In each case, the debt was for work done by Harrison. (2)

Towards the end of the period the possibility of turning some of these facilities to new finishing functions was being acknowledged. In 1770 the joint fulling mill and dyehouse at Ravensshore was offered for lease with the recommendation that:-

"The above-mentioned premises has several good springs, in it, and is very suitable for either bleaching, printing of cottons, etc." (3)

However, there is no evidence of any such conversions prior to 1780.

---

(1) Chetham Libraries/Raines MSS/31
Manchester Mercury, October 5th 1756

(2) LRQ/QJB/35/20

(3) D.Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 10
SECTION E - RAW MATERIAL SUPPLIES

Before 1716 Rossendale was dependent on neighbouring centres especially Rochdale for its supplies of raw wool. Despite the general development of textile organisation within Rossendale from 1716, this dependence on neighbouring centres was maintained.

In 1752 one of the chief creditors of George Law, a piecemaker involved in the putting out at Stocksteads near Newchurch was an Anthony Moore, a Colne wool stapler. Later in 1772 Henry Duckworth, a merchant and chapman of Haslingden was dealing with William Fawcett, a Halifax wool stapler. Around 1770 James Anderton of Haslingden was receiving wool supplies from both Rochdale and Bury.

In September 1769 he bought:

- "1 Pack and 39 pd Sup" fine Wool £9 10s pk
- 1 Pack more Noils at

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{£} & \text{s} & \text{d} \\
11 & 0 & 10 \\
5 & 17 & 6 \\
16 & 18 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

This wool was purchased from John Vavasour, a Rochdale wool stapler.

In March 1770 he bought from the same man:

- "2 Packs Fine Wool at £9 5s
- 120 pd over weight
- 2 Packs more £7 10s
- 1 Pack more at
- 60 pound overweight

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{£} & \text{s} & \text{d} \\
19 & 10 & 0 \\
4 & 12 & 6 \\
15 & 0 & 0 \\
8 & 5 & 0 \\
2 & 1 & 3 \\
48 & 8 & 9 \\
\end{array}
\]

(1) LRD/DD/8d/29/3

(2) Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/1968
In February 1775 he was dealing with Roger Booth of Bury.

"1 Pack of Wool No 787648 at £9 2s 6d 19 5 0
1 No 78 160 lb at £11 11 0 0"

Resident wool dealers were also found but again they were dependent on supplies from larger men in neighbouring centres. In 1775 and 1776 George Dixon of Haslingden was receiving wool from Messrs Bracken and Rawson of Rochdale and in turn was supplying smaller men throughout north east Lancashire. Whilst in prison for debt in 1778, Robert Law of Bacup was selling wool in order to support his family.

Chapmen may also appear to have played an important role in the distribution of wool to smaller local producers. In 1728, John Rothwell of Haslingden and Robert Hardman of Rossendale owed £3 and £7 respectively to John Maude, a Rochdale chapman probably for wool supplied on credit. The same is also probable for James Leach, a chapman and dealer of Rochdale, for his dealings with three Rossendale men in 1746 and John Riley of Rochdale, another chapman and dealer, with links with Rossendale in 1761.

The wool used by the local industry probably originated as before 1715 from the agricultural counties of the Midlands. In 1755, James Haslam, a Rochdale clothier and chapman became bankrupt.

(1) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 182-3
(2) HRL/Ledger of Ann Dixon of Haslingden, 1775-1785, p69-70
(3) LRO/QJB/45/32
(4) LRO/QJB/10/11
(5) LRO/QJB/30/7
LRO/QJB/35/17
Haslam was the buyer of the cloth produced. Henry Lord, a clothier of Greens Bacup was also a wool distributor on a considerable scale having debts for wool not only in Rochdale but also in Batley, Halifax, Manchester and Youlgreave, Derbyshire. The Halifax debt of £203 was to John Kershaw, wool stapler who:

"saith he is also employed in selling Sheep's Wool by Commission by John Hanley of Newark, Co Notts Fellmonger and owing on this score (by James Haslam) £49 9s 0d

and was "also employed by Wm Southern of Grantham. Co Lincs Chapman in the sell of Sheeps Wool by Comp (James Haslam) ows" £33 4s 0d (1)

This case shows the complex mechanism by which wool supplies must have reached Rossendale. From producer to chapman or fellmonger to Halifax, then to Rochdale for putting out in such areas as Rossendale. However, it should also be remembered that the above cases also indicate that wool could have entered Rossendale from many other centres such as Colne, Bury and Manchester. Regardless of the centre used, there is no evidence of Rossendale men adopting a more independent role in this activity.

(1) Chetham Library/Raines MSS. Vol 13, p 472-6
SECTION F - MARKETING

As with the supply of raw materials, the marketing of Rossendale cloth prior to 1716 was dependent largely on the services of neighbouring marketing centres especially Rochdale. The paucity of data for this early period allowed only the barest of outlines to be established. Fortunately for this later period a more detailed picture can be drawn up.

Neighbouring market centres continued to play a vital role, but no longer a totally dominant one between 1716 and 1780. Rochdale in particular continued to play a major role. In 1732 Francis Lord of Rossendale was prominent amongst the creditors of Miles Lonsdale, a Rochdale textile merchant. In 1747 John Ormerod of Huttock, north of Bacup, was supplying cloth to Andrew Holden, another Rochdale merchant. By 1755, Henry Lord, a clothier of Greens to the south of Bacup was supplying James Haslam, a large Rochdale clothier, chapman and bays dealer. Two Rossendale clothiers were creditors of Samuel and Richard Bamford, merchants of Rochdale at the bankruptcy of the Bamfords in 1768. In 1774, James Clegg, a Rochdale bays maker, dealer and chapman was forced to assign his estate to Lawrence Ormerod of Greensnook, Bacup. All the above cases, serve to establish the strong marketing link with Rochdale throughout this period.

Despite this strong link the importance of Rochdale to the Rossendale industry probably did decline as new rival marketing centres emerged and with the switch away from public markets to private

---

(1) LRD/DD/WH/3/53
(2) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 190
(3) Chetham Library/Raines MSS/Vol 13, p 42-6
(4) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 190
(5) Halifax BL/Parker MSS/1977
agreements between larger producers and merchants. In addition, population growth in east Lancashire after 1715 would itself have provided a small but growing market for local output.

Such trends are indicated in the dealings of many local producers. From 1751 until 1754 John Lord of Nabb near Newchurch regularly sold cloth to a Leeds cloth merchant.\(^1\) In 1765 Edward Taylor, probably of Haslingden was supplying cloth directly to a Robert Scholes of Manchester.\(^2\) During this year the aforementioned Lawrence Ormerod of Whitewell Bottom was selling goods by private contract to a large Halifax merchant thus by passing not only the Rochdale market but public markets in general.\(^3\) In 1777 Henry Duckworth of Haslingden was forced to assign his estate partly to Halifax merchant which suggests Duckworth may also have been dealing directly with Halifax.\(^4\)

Most dramatic of all was the case of Hugh Duckworth of Haslingden who in 1766 sent a £50 order of bays and swan skins to a customer in Philadelphia.\(^5\) This marks the earliest known case of a local manufacturer exporting directly and of local cloth going to the American market. There is no evidence that Hugh Duckworth was in any way exceptional from other Rossendale merchants, thus it is possible that he was not alone in either exporting directly or dealing with the American colonies.

More modestly local cloth was also sold within Lancashire.

---

\(^1\) Leeds University/Bretherton Library/Lupton M.S.S., Vol 78.
\(^2\) Manchester Mercury, January 10th 1765.
\(^3\) T.W. Hanson, *loc cit*, p 81-2
\(^4\) Halifax Public Library/Parker M.S.S./1968a.
\(^5\) Wister M.S.S. 20th December 1766 - reference kindly supplied by Dr. S.D. Chapman.
In 1779 two Rossendale chapmen appear to have been supplying cloth to Joseph Aspinall, a chapman, latterly of Liverpool. (1)

This case of local men supplying the Liverpool market suggests that Rossendale itself may have been playing a more positive role in the marketing of its cloth. This was certainly attempted in the 1740's. In 1746, the bays makers of Newchurch declared that in future they would only market their goods at a local market in the village of Newchurch rather than as formerly at Rochdale. (2) This gesture appears to have failed for in 1792 Rossendale men were amongst those subscribing to the building of a cloth hall at Rochdale. (3) Despite this probable failure, this attempt reflects growing self-confidence on the part of the Rossendale industry. In the subsequent period, Rossendale men took responsibility for the marketing of cloth produced outside the area. In 1755, John Tattersall, described as an innholder of Haslingden and woollen weaver and chapman of Edenfield was selling goods for Thomas Crompton and George Walker of Radcliffe Bridge near Bury. (4) In 1765, Richard Ashworth, a chapman of Goodshaw owed a book debt to John Cheatham, a clothier of Rochdale. (5)

Local cloth was retailed in the surrounding areas by hawkers carrying hosiery, drapery and non textile goods on their backs. These hawkers were said to travel from town to town retailing from door to door in the street. (6)

(1) Manchester Mercury, March 29th 1779
(2) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 183
(3) Rochdale Public Library/MA4/F2
(4) LRO/QCB/31/14
(5) LRO/QCB/37/7
(6) S.Bamford, Early Days, 1859, p 17
Some cloth was sold locally by local shop keeping retailers. In 1724, George Duckworth of Haslingden held stocks of a range of cloth that could well have been made locally:

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{"Kerseys and planes"} & 22 & 10 & 5 \\
\text{Lin cloth cotton flanel} & \\
\text{blinket in Crape Stokins} & 13 & 16 & 10 \\
\text{Scotch Cloth and Sackin"} & (1)
\end{array} \]

The destination of much Rossendale cloth continued to be in London. In 1751, Bacup was described by Pococke as "a large village where they have a great manufacture of woollen clothes which they send white to London."(2) Though he fails to comment on any other Rossendale settlements, the same situation probably applied there too.

By the early 1720's Rossendale men were in direct contact with the London market. In 1724 Robert Schofield of Loveclough was disposing of his goods to two dealers in London without the assistance of a chapman.(3) Even earlier in 1717, Christopher Hartley of Laund in north western Rossendale left an inventory including a bill on London valued at £96 in addition to textile materials and equipment.(4) This again suggests a possible direct trading link between Rossendale and London. Much later in 1751, George Law of Newchurch, clothier, was owed a total of £250 by two London merchants for goods he had supplied to them.(5)

---

(1) LRO/Probate Inventory of George Duckworth of Haslingden, mercer, 1724
(2) Dr Pococke's Travels Through England, p 205
(3) PR/PL/7/129
(4) LRO/Probate Inventory of Christopher Hartley of Laund, 1717
(5) Hanson, loc cit, p 82
Yet these men were probably untypical, the majority of local producers continued to rely on neighbouring towns and intermediaries to market their cloth in distant areas. In 1765, Lawrence Ormerod was trading indirectly with London via Halifax and Hull. The cloth was evidently sent by pack horse to Halifax where it was baled in the warehouse of Messrs Royds before being sent by canal from Salterhebble to Hull and by ship to London. (1) A similar arrangement may well have been operating in 1764 when John Howarth of Edgend, Newchurch, clothier and James Ashworth of Pastures, Gambleside, clothier were major creditors in the bankruptcy of John Milne, a warehouseman of Rochdale and Thomas Scholes of the City of London. (2) It would appear likely that these two clothiers sent their cloth to Rochdale for baling before being sent to London, possibly by Halifax and Hull. Another example of this link came in 1773 when Edmund Smith a merchant of Underwood, Rochdale, was forced to assign his estate to George Diggles a warehouseman of the City of London, John Holt of Tod Lane, Rochdale, merchant, and Lawrence Ormerod of Greensnook, Bacup, clothier. (3) This also appears to be a case of Rossendale cloth reaching its London market via Rochdale. The above examples suggest that most Rossendale cloth left the area by way of Rochdale and/or Halifax. The extent of this trade by the end of this period is indicated by a description of Rochdale in 1777:

"This Town (Rochdale) is remarkable for its wealthy merchants, it has a large woollen market, the merchants from Halifax are

(1) T.W. Hanson, loc cit, p 82
(2) Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/1956
(3) Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/1775
repairing hither weekly; the neighbourhood abounds with clothiers."\(^{(1)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Fishwick, *A History of Rochdale*, p 58
SECTION G - FINANCE

Down to 1715 most local cloth had been marketed at neighbouring towns by small Rossendale producers, which meant the demands on the local credit system were relatively modest. After 1715, the emergence of larger producers using the putting out system and the tendency of some producers to retain cloth ownership until the cloth was marketed at more distant centres, meant growing pressure would be placed in local credit provision. In contrast, demands for fixed capital undoubtedly remained very modest other than for finishing.

Even in finishing, newspaper advertisements and property deeds indicate that the fixed capital investment in these facilities did not come from the operators who worked them purely on a lease basis. Thus in this as in the other branches those directly engaged in the textile trade could devote virtually the whole of their resources to working capital.

Local inventories suggest that the scale of Rossendale credit finance before 1716 never exceeded £100 and rarely exceeded £50. After this period, such sums were extremely modest by the new standards of the area. Three distinct levels of credit activity are discernable. At the bottom, some men, usually those engaged in the preparatory trades still had relatively modest credit dealings. In 1722, Abraham Hayworth of Wolfenden who was engaged in spinning and combing activities, left credits totalling £20 possibly from people to whom he had supplied yarn. Similarly in 1722, John Hoyle of Coupe engaged in carding and spinning left credits to the sum of £10. The next group, often those engaged as small clothiers, left sums of up to £250. Such a man was Lawrence Taylor of Constablee who, in 1740, left wool, cards, wheels, warping woughs and cloth pieces to the value of £55 13s plus £80 of credits "by way of his trade", and £40
on "security and lett money". Earlier in 1731, John Taylor of Newchurch left credits in the form of "Book Debts" of £194 1s 10\(\frac{1}{4}\)d in addition to shop goods valued at £165 13s 10\(\frac{1}{4}\)d. At the top of the scale with credit activity in excess of £500 were the larger clothiers probably those engaged in putting out. Thus in 1746, John Haworth, a clothier of Fearns, was owed "Book Debts of £607 5s in addition to woollen materials and equipment valued at £429 9s 8d."

Though Hargreave's inventory shows no sign of current textile activity his considerable involvement in the woollen trade is indicated by the fact that within his large house, one room was specifically allocated as a warping chamber.\(^{(1)}\)

This case suggests that during the eighteenth century, credit finance was essential to the operation at all levels of the local woollen industry. Indeed in 1764, Lawrence Hey, a chapman of Martinscroft in Church Post, Haslingden, claimed to have conducted his life's business on the basis of credit.\(^{(2)}\) The importance of such credit was indicated in 1757 by George Law a Newchurch clothier, who was owed money by two London merchants. Law noted that he had immediate need for the money to carry on his trade and business.\(^{(3)}\)

This case indicates two important points about contemporary credit provision. As in the seventeenth century, the provision of credit was a risky undertaking, but not for the first time, Rossendale men appear as suppliers of significant amounts of credit to other areas.

\(^{(1)}\) LRQ/Probate inventories, passim  
\(^{(2)}\) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 174  
\(^{(3)}\) Hanson, loc cit, p 82
Both trends are reflected in contemporary cases where the credit system broke down. In 1724 Robert Schofield of Loveclough was supplying credit to two merchants handling his cloth in London.\(^{(1)}\) As mentioned earlier, 1757 George Law of Newchurch was in a similar creditor position with two London merchants.\(^{(2)}\) The 1760's and 1770's saw other cases of Rossendale producers supplying on credit to their London merchants.\(^{(3)}\) Credit was also supplied by Rossendale producers operating in a more modest way. In 1761, seven men from the neighbouring parishes of Bolton, Bury and Rochdale, owed a total of £5 17s to Richard Harrison, a Bacup dyer, for goods sold and work, presumably dyeing, done.\(^{(4)}\) In 1776 Lawrence Stephenson, a chapman formerly of Burnley, later of Haslingden had advanced money for work done to George Hargreaves of Nottingham, whilst in 1779 two Rossendale chapmen were providing credit to Joseph Aspinall, a Liverpool chapman.\(^{(5)}\)

The extent to which neighbouring centres continued to provide credit for Rossendale producers is difficult to assess. Wool staplers continued to supply credit to local producers. Thus in 1752, Anthony Moore, a Colne wool stapler, was supplying credit to George Law, a piecemaker of Stacksteads.\(^{(6)}\) More uncertain is the position regarding credit provision in the sale of finished cloth of the larger Rossendale producers. As the above cases indicate,

---

(1) PRO/PL/6/63/30
(2) Hanson loc cit, p 82
(3) Halifax Public Library/Parker MSS/1956, 1975, 1977
(4) LRO/QJB/35/20
(5) LRO/QJB/43/59
Manchester Mercury, March 29th 1779
(6) LRO/DD/Bd/29/3
Rossendale producers were supplying credit to London merchants. Yet such men need not have had total financial independence from larger merchants. An interesting example of this relationship between the larger Rossendale clothier and neighbouring merchants comes in the 1760's with Lawrence Ormerod of Whitewell Bottom, Newchurch and Messrs Royds of Halifax and Bucklersbury, London. Here, Ormerod's cloth was sold by Royd's on a commission basis from their Bucklersbury warehouse. Ormerod retained ownership of the cloth and thus provided the credit and accepted the risk until the cloth had been sold. However, Royd's provided the organisation and the insurance cover for the transport of the cloth from Halifax to Hull and its shipment from Hull to London and used this to ensure Ormerod's future custom.\(^{(1)}\) Thus, both parties were making a financial commitment in the sale of the cloth. Unfortunately, it is unclear how typical such a relationship was in practice. Even where Rossendale merchants nominally financed the sale of their own cloth, larger merchants such as the Royds could be a financial asset in a quasi-banking function by facilitating the discounting of bills. Thus in 1757, the Royd's bought £250 of debts owed to George Law, the Newchurch clothier for £150.\(^{(2)}\)

Amongst smaller men, Rochdale and neighbouring areas continued to provide a source of credit for local woollen producers.

This was often by direct putting out of work to local producers as practiced by John Parker of Marsden in the 1720's and John Walmsley of Rochdale in the 1760's.\(^{(3)}\) In other cases, the relationship is

---

\(^{(1)}\) W. Hanson, loc cit, p 81-2  
\(^{(2)}\) ibid, p 82  
\(^{(3)}\) Bennett, A History of Marsden and Colne, p 127
less clear cut though credit was certainly supplied to Rossendale men. Between 1728 and 1765 in five separate cases, insolvent Rochdale chapmen and dealers claimed to have supplied credit to Rossendale producers. Many other cases must have operated where insolvency did not result. Other areas also supplied credit. In 1775, two Haslingden men owed £6 14s to a Burnley dyer for goods sold.\(^{(1)}\)

Much earlier in 1729, David Sutcliffe of Oswaldtwistle, clothier, was supplying credit to four Rossendale men.\(^{(2)}\)

Taken as a whole, it appears that though external sources of credit remained important, this period saw a substantial increase in the extent to which the local industry was self financing, particularly in terms of marketing. The increased role undertaken by leading local manufacturers, still of relatively modest financial status, almost certainly increased financial instability in the industry as locals now bore the full risk of trade. Thus cases of imprisonment for debt were common in the eighteenth century. Many of these failures are recorded in the Quarter Sessions' insolvency papers which show a steady flow of local business failures in this period.

The adoption of a more positive financial role in marketing, would have placed increased pressure on local financial resources.

Such finance was probably obtained via several mechanisms. Probably the most important source of long term finance were re-invested profits during a period of growth in the local industry.\(^{(3)}\)

A second alternative was the use of the mortgage mechanism. This is said to have been used to raise finance in Lancashire from

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/Q3B/43/30

\(^{(2)}\) LRO/Q3B/19/43

\(^{(3)}\) See Chapter XVI, Section H
the late seventeenth century. (1) It was certainly used in the Rossendale area from the 1690's and was common throughout the eighteenth century. (2) However, this should not lead to the assumption that this was a major source of business finance. Local wills suggest that by the mid eighteenth century few local specialists in textile manufacturing were property owners. Though many of them occupied farms, it was normally on the basis of tenancies rather than ownership. This would obviously preclude the use of the mortgage, indeed it may imply that the sale of land rather than its mortgaging was a source of business finance. Secondly even where the mortgage was used it is unclear how much the proceeds were used to finance business activity as distinct from higher personal consumption.

Inventories indicate that trade credit was a major source of working capital prior to 1780. Large merchants were using bills of exchange in dealings with their London distributors from the mid seventeenth century. (3) In contrast, the small Rossendale manufacturers used the less sophisticated promissory notes and even listed them as book debts down to 1750. By the 1770's the system had become rather more complex in east Lancashire as a whole:

"several considerable manufacturers (in Lancashire and Yorkshire) gave their makers notes for their work instead of cash, which they are able to pay to the badgers and shop keepers, till they amount to ten or fifteen pounds, when these notes will be accepted by the

(2) *Lancashire Wills and Land Deeds*, passim
drawers and discharged in London."(1)

This system of drawing bills on London was used in Rossendale by 1780 to obtain raw materials. In 1776, Henry Gearvies of Haslingden accepted such a bill from James Smith drawable on Richard Oswald of London.(2) In 1781 Lawrence Ormerod of Edgeside, Newchurch owed £10 by bill to his Burnley wool supplier, to be paid in two months and drawn on Messrs John Royds of London. In the same year, Ormerod had a similar bill debt to a James Roberts, payable in two months on William Hargreaves of London.(3) Bullcock's account book suggests that smaller debts continued to be based on promissary notes payable on demand.

(1) Manchester Mercury, October 10th 1778 - this system reflects the contemporary shortage of small coins.

(2) RRL/Rc 21/5/MSS.File

(3) MCRL/L1/30/11/1 Account Book of James Bullcock of Barrowford, wool dealer.
SECTION H - THE GROWTH OF THE INDUSTRY

The foregoing sections strongly indicate that the Rossendale woollen industry experienced a significant phase of growth in this period as a whole. The introduction of new types of cloth, the emergence of larger scale local producers, local production and finishing facilities, the adoption of more efficient techniques and the development of a more active marketing role, all lead towards this conclusion.

The extent of this growth is impossible to measure with any precision though the chapelry register data does facilitate a crude outline to be constructed. The Haslingden chapelry registers indicate the following occupational trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textile Labour Force 1716-1780</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each case, the occupational listing covers a large proportion of the total listings, thus the figure of sixty five to seventy per cent is probably a good reflection of the occupational classifications of all the local adult male population. Similar figures for Newchurch are only available for the period of 1705-1707,

(1) Haslingden Chapelry Register
The textile figures include those classes of labourers, most of whom have relied on textiles given the small size of local farms and their bias towards pastoral activity.
but the result here coincides well with sixty per cent of the one hundred occupational listings being in textiles. In the period after 1715, this figure probably grew to at least that found in Haslingden chapelry. Indeed in the absence of any significant trade and craft activity as found in Haslingden town, the Newchurch figure may well have been higher. It is not possible to estimate the amount of attention devoted to textiles in this dual employment economy but local probate inventory returns indicate that even amongst wealthier local families, textiles accounted for an increasing proportion of their personal estate after 1715. This may also reflect textiles accounting for an increasing proportion of activity. Such a trend would probably be even more acute amongst the poorer families who held little land/had little alternative employment in agriculture at a time of population growth. Thus, on balance it would be reasonable to assume that local families were devoting an increasing proportion of their efforts to textile manufacture. Changing production techniques probably had a similar impact in boosting local production, but again the impact of this is difficult to assess as the extent to which such improvements were adopted is uncertain. The flying shuttle and its derivatives, and the 'spinning jenny' both appear to have been in local use with a consequent impact on labour productivity. Against this must be set the oft stated claim that the middle and later eighteenth century saw a growing preference for leisure as opposed to work on the part of many workers. The impact of this was probably relatively marginal when set against the other factors.

(1) Newchurch Chapelry Register
In both cases double entries have been excluded.

(2) D. Bythell, The Hand Loom Weaver, p 115-117
If it is assumed that textile activity was the norm amongst around two thirds of the adult male Rossendale population, the growth of this population would suggest local output at roughly three times the 1716 level by 1780. Given the probability of increasing proportion of time being devoted to textiles by this population and improving production technology, the rate of increase was probably in excess of this figure. The figures for broad cloth milled in the neighbouring West Riding area show over a three fold increase in output between 1728 and 1780, a year of depressed output levels. These figures are usually accepted as a good minimum guide to local output levels. However, it is reasonable to assume that the Rossendale industry did rather better than the West Riding average. As we have seen the Rossendale industry was increasingly switching away from woollen to worsted or mixed woollen/Worsted production. This worsted sector is generally accepted to have experienced more rapid growth in the West Riding than the broad and narrow cloth woollen industry. As Rossendale was an offshoot of this industry it too is likely to have experienced this faster growth rate. If this is so, it would have resulted in Rossendale growing in relative importance compared to the West Riding area. This increased relative importance of Rossendale was reflected in 1777 when the Rossendale industry was deemed important enough to justify Richard Lord of Grane being appointed to the Worsted Committee established

(1) Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industry, p 276 and 278
The increase is nearly four fold if measured to the cyclical peaks of 1778 and 1783
Narrow cloth output also shows a considerable rise down to 1780

in that year. This compares with two representatives from the Rochdale area and six from Halifax. (1)

Thus, taken as a whole it appears reasonable to conclude that local output probably increased three fold and possibly four fold between 1716 and 1780.

The 1770's also provides a possible indication of the magnitude of local output. In 1772, the output of bays and other cloth in the Rochdale area was estimated by the usually reliable Wolrich at one hundred and twenty four thousand pieces valued at £310,000. As the figures for the Burnley and Colne area are given in separate totals, it appears that the figures given relate to the Rochdale and Rossendale areas. (2) If representation on the worsted committee of 1777 is any guide, it would suggest that Rossendale accounted for about a third of the total for the entire Rochdale area. This would give figures of around forty one thousand pieces valued at around £103,000 per annum for the Rossendale industry.

---

(1) J. James, History of the Worsted Manufacture in England, 1857 p 296
(2) ibid, p 283
SECTION I - CONCLUSIONS

This was undoubtedly a period of massive long term expansion for the local woollen industry in which output probably grew at least three fold. The expansion was such that the industry became the key to the economic prosperity of the area.

This expansion was associated with attempts around 1715 to extend the range of local cloth output. The attempt via cotton failed but that via pure worsted was more successful. This success was accompanied by the development of 'putting out' organisation in place of the traditional independent family clothier.

Though this new organisation was largely dependent on non residents, local men did emerge to play a more influential role, albeit on a modest scale.

The expansion of the industry provided employment for a growing proportion of the expanding local population, but even so severe strains emerged forcing the employment of female weavers, the undermining of the traditional apprenticeship system and the adoption of new labour saving technology.

The advance of the industry was further illustrated by the spread of finishing facilities so that by 1780 Rossendale was able to provide such services for neighbouring production areas.

The local success in marketing was less certain, the area remained substantially dependent directly or indirectly on the traditional marketing centres. This failure was even more acute in terms of raw material supplies.

Despite these limitations the general increase in significance of some local men increased the need for finance. This need was primarily for short term financing of production and some marketing. This need appears to have been substantially met from local sources.
SECTION IV

ROSSENDALE 1781-1795
In 1780 the population of the core areas of Rossendale covering the registers of Bacup, Goodshaw, Haslingden and Newchurch numbered around eleven and a half thousand. During the following fifteen years this figure grew substantially. By the time of the 1801 census the population of this core area had grown to over fourteen thousand. This figure compares with an estimated population of fifteen thousand derived for the same date from the chapelry register data and fourteen thousand in 1795. The chapelry register figures suggest that the rate of natural increase slowed substantially after 1781. The annual rate of increase fell from a high of 2.6% in the late 1770's to 1.2% in the 1780's and only 1.0% in the 1790's.

Both population estimates suggest that the bulk if not all of this increase was due to internal factors rather than net immigration. This is not to say the migration was not present. During this period it is probable that a distinctive north to south migration was underway. In the early nineteenth century it was stated that northwest Yorkshire had formerly supplied east Lancashire including the

---

(1) Based on population estimates from the chapelry registers and the Porteus Visitation of 1778.

(2) Abstract of Answers and Returns, Enumeration, Part I, England and Wales, p 163

(3) See Figure No I
Bacup and probably the Haslingden area with population. (1) At the same time there was an outflow of local people to areas further south. Haslingden burial register lists thirty five burials of Manchester residents with Rossendale surnames during the 1790's, whilst early nineteenth century pauper examinations indicate that many of these people had moved south for employment reasons. (2)

Though the net flow of population was undoubtedly from north to south many individuals showed a much more complex mobility pattern of frequent short distant movements often with no apparent direction. In 1775, John Pickup of Higher Booths township moved to Colne but within a year returned to Rossendale where he spent the next five years at four separate addresses. Around 1780 he moved to Blackburn returning to Rossendale in the early 1790's, after which he moved to Manchester. His frequent movement continued after 1795. John Hargreaves of Gambleside lived at thirteen separate locations in Rossendale until the age of forty two, after which he moved to Pendle Forest and then Manchester. Though these men were probably exceptional other poor law examinations reveal that others were also geographically mobile. (3)

The pattern of this movement especially that from north to south probably reflects earning and job opportunities. Yet as the case of Pickup and Hargreaves when examined in the 1820's indicate

(1) PR/1835/500/vol 35, 1st Annual Report of the Poor Law Commission Appendix B, No 11, p 185
By the late 1790's immigrants were coming from the Lancaster area
Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 212

(2) Haslingden Chapelry Burial Register
LRO/PR/2859/9

(3) LRO/PR/2859/14
these migrants often returned to their place of origin in old age whether via impoverishment and compulsion or via voluntary desire. Such a pattern appears to have been in operation by the mid 1790's when Eden noted of the town of Bury:

"many young married people . . . are tempted by the demand for employment to settle in and near the town, when they grow up, (they) return to their native parishes."(1)

Bury, lying just to the south of Rossendale, probably attracted migrants from there so that the quotation is probably applicable to the Rossendale area.

As in the period 1716 to 1780 the fifteen years from 1780 saw a substantial absolute increase in the population. Rossendale chapels both increased their population by around twenty per cent bringing the total in Haslingden to around six thousand and in Newchurch to just over eight thousand.

The gap between the local birth and death rates suggests that the rate of natural increase declined from the gaps of around twenty two per thousand recorded in the 1770's. This decline continued down to 1791 when the gap averaged only eleven per thousand. In the early 1790's something of a slight recovery appears to have set in though its duration is unclear as it lies outside the period under study. This general pattern occurred almost equally in both chapels, the difference between them never exceeding five per thousand.

Taking the area as a whole, both the birth and death rates appear to have contributed to this slow down. The birth rate fell from over thirty seven per thousand to a low of under thirty three

per thousand between 1781 and 1796 whilst the death rate rose from around nineteen per thousand in 1781 to a high of over twenty four per thousand in 1791.\(^{(1)}\)

Closer examination suggests that such a picture is an over-simplification. In Haslingden chapelry the main cause of the slowdown in natural population increase was the steady and substantial decline in the birth rate at a time when the death rate was stabilized. Newchurch, in contrast, experienced a rising death rate with a stable birth rate. As a result by the 1790's Newchurch had lost its position as the traditionally low death rate chapelry of Rossendale, whilst Haslingden ceased to be the high birth rate chapelry.\(^{(2)}\)

Part of the explanation for the fall in the Rossendale birth rate is revealed by the analysis of the local marriage rate. In 1776 this stood at nine and a half per thousand, but then entered sustained decline down to just over eight per thousand by 1796.\(^{(3)}\) This decline as would be expected, given the slump in its birth rate, was particularly marked in Haslingden chapelry. However, the fall in the marriage rate only provides a partial explanation, the trend of marital fertility also being of significance.

\(^{(1)}\) See Figure No II. The fall in the death rate from 1791-1796 accounts for the widening of the gap between burials and baptisms in those years.

\(^{(2)}\) See Figure No II

\(^{(3)}\) Marriage Rates 1776-1796

(Marriages per Thousand Population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Combined Chapelries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marital fertility in Rossendale increased steadily during the earlier eighteenth century to a peak of over five and a half in the period 1751-1770. From that date however, decline set in within both chapelries so that by 1781-1800 the figure was only a little over four.\(^{(1)}\) Though individual chapelry figures do not totally square with the idea of the sharpest decline in the Haslingden birth rate they do clearly show in both cases that decline was generally present. Indeed there is reason to doubt the individual chapelry figures. One of the main factors determining marital fertility was the interval between baptisms. These figures show a general widening of the interval particularly in Haslingden chapelry:

### Baptism Intervals 1781-1805

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapelry</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ave Monthly Interval</th>
<th>No of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801-5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801-5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801-5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) Marital Fertility 1751-1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>Combined Chapelries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1751-1770</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761-1780</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771-1790</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-1800</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is probable that the interval between birth and baptism increased in these years.\(^{(1)}\) Yet, the magnitude of the Haslingden increase is sufficient to indicate that there was almost certainly a real increase in birth spacings in the area during the final two decades of the eighteenth century. In turn though, this was by no means the only influence on marital fertility it does illustrate that the falling marriage rate was probably not the sole cause of the decline in the contemporary birth rate.

The local mortality pattern can be examined through periods of crisis mortality.\(^{(2)}\) Using the same definition of mortality crisis as for the periods 1650–1780 the years 1781, 1786 and 1789–1794 inclusive stand out as periods of excessive mortality.

Though this was a period of rising food prices there is no evidence that they were associated with these crisis periods. Indeed the periods of highest prices 1782–1785 and 1795 were notable as years of low mortality.\(^{(3)}\) High food prices certainly afflicted east Lancashire as much as the rest of the country. The price of flour and potatoes even led to rioting in August 1795.\(^{(4)}\) Indeed local wholesale prices at Blackburn show a doubling in the price of flour and oat meal during the first eight months of the year and a substantial increase in the prices of potatoes, oats and beans.\(^{(5)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) See Appendix No I

\(^{(2)}\) Burnett, *History of the Cost of Living*, p 138

\(^{(3)}\) See Chapter III, for definition of crisis mortality.

\(^{(4)}\) W. Robertson, *Rochdale Past and Present*, 1875, p 218

\(^{(5)}\) Blackburn Mail January to December 1795 — peaks for all food items reached in the issue of August 12th, the week of widespread unrest.
In contrast 1794 had been a year of low and generally stable prices. (1)

Nor can the mortality be associated with local trade depressions. The period from 1783 to 1795 which cover most of the crisis years was generally one of buoyant trade expansion. (2) Again, taking the 1794 crisis year, the price of weft in Blackburn rose steadily until September and though it subsequently fell, it was still higher at the end of the year than at the beginning. (3) Such a situation is not consistent with a trade depression of major magnitude sufficient to cause crisis mortality.

There is no evidence of climate playing any significant role. If the local climate had been particularly severe, some reference to the problem would be likely in the regional press, but they remain silent. Equally the impact of climate would probably be partly through disrupting transport and thus food and industrial supplies. As already noted, no such interruption is observable in the crisis years. Indeed, improvements in the regional transport system would have reduced Rossendale's vulnerability to climatic disruption. (4)

By such a process of elimination, suspicion must turn to epidemic acting as an independent variable. By their nature such outbreaks could be localised and thus not reported in the regional press. This is a particularly strong likelihood in the case of the 1786 crisis when nearly sixty per cent of the burials at Ebenezer

---

(1) Blackburn Mail January-December 1794
(2) See Chapters XVIII and XX for a fuller consideration
(3) Blackburn Mail January-December 1795
(4) See Chapter XVIII
Baptist chapel, Bacup related to children under the age of 5 compared with an average of forty two per cent from 1787 to 1794 inclusive. Similarly in 1789 fifty per cent of internments of individuals of known age related to people over the age of forty five compared with an average of twenty five per cent between 1786 and 1794. In addition, fifty per cent of 1786 burials occurred in the months of April to June whilst in 1794 fifty five per cent occurred in the months July to October. In 1789 nearly three quarters of all burials occurred in the six months from January to June. These deviations from the norm in both age and season distribution of burials indicate the possibility that epidemic may have been at work in 1786 and 1794 and possibly in 1789. Tentatively, therefore, it appears that epidemic acting as an independent variable was possibly becoming the most important factor in causing mortality fluctuations.

As in the period 1716 to 1790 the most obvious feature of this period was the massive and sustained increase in the size of the local population. Equally as before, this growth was virtually entirely due to natural increase.

Though the increase in the absolute size of the population was massive, chapelry registers suggest that the rate of increase was substantially below that down to 1780. This slow down appears to have been the product of a simultaneous fall in the birth rate particularly in Haslingden and a rise in the death rate particularly in Newchurch chapelry.

(1) LRD/MF/Ebeneezer Baptist Register Bacup Birth and Burial Register.
The figure of sixty per cent relates to the forty nine burials of individuals of known age. In addition, there were seven burials of individuals of unknown age.
The fall in the birth rate was the product of a fall in the marriage rate and in marital fertility. The decline in this marital fertility was at least in part due to a widening of the spacing between births. The causes of the increase in the death rate are more difficult to pinpoint. Neither food prices nor the state of local trade appear capable of providing an explanation. This turns suspicion to epidemic acting as an independent variable. This suspicion is strengthened by the distribution of interments both by age and season during several of the crisis mortality years.
CHAPTER XVIII

THE PATTERN OF TRANSPORT AND SETTLEMENT 1781-1795

As in the years before 1780 Rossendale remained essentially an area of dispersed population down to 1795. The movement towards larger units of settlement began before 1780 continued albeit on a modest scale.

Both Bacup and Haslingden continued to account for a slowly increasing proportion of the local population, the Bacup figure growing from ten to twelve per cent of the total and that for Haslingden from ten to eleven per cent. (1) The continued increase took place against a background of absolute growth in Rossendale as a whole. Using the methodology adopted for the years before 1780 this would suggest that both settlements experienced rapid absolute growth. (2)

Growth of Haslingden and Bacup 1781-1805

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Haslingden</th>
<th>Bacup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1781-5</td>
<td>1,000-1,100</td>
<td>700-750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-5</td>
<td>1,900-2,000</td>
<td>2,100-2,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The figures quoted are based on all local baptisms and burials with surnames initials A - E. These account for about twenty eight per cent of all chapelry baptisms and burials.

(2) See Chapter IV

(3) This pattern crudely squares with an estimated population of almost fifteen hundred in a survey of Bacup of 1798. T. Whittaker, History of the Ancient Parish of Whalley, p 320
These figures show a massive increase in both but particularly in Bacup which now began probably the largest settlement in Rossendale. This change is not surprising as Bacup had recorded the faster growth rate from the middle of the eighteenth century.

The scale of the increase in the population of both settlements was such as to ensure their continued physical expansion. In the mid 1790's Aitken noted of Haslingden that:

"The church stands on the brow of a hill, which was also the situation of the old part of the town, but the buildings have now extended into the valley beneath."(1)

These new buildings became the heart of the early nineteenth century town.

A similar movement may have been at work at Bacup where the nineteenth century heart of the town was still essentially rural in the late eighteenth century.(2)

In the nineteenth century this shift in the heart of the town was attributed to the need for more shelter and better access to communications.(3) Such views are open to extreme doubt. The need for shelter was not new in the late eighteenth century and thus fails to explain the timing of the movement. In the case of Haslingden, the move began with the sale of town waste for building purposes in the early 1780's, whilst transport improvements did not get underway until the late 1780's.(4)

---

(1) J. Aitken, A Description of the Countryside for Twenty to Thirty Miles Around Manchester, p 216
(2) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 200
(3) E. Baines, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of Lancaster, Vol I, p 644
(4) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 73-77
More probable is that the lower land being flatter offered more scope for building and better access to the emergent local mill sector. The development of turnpike routes through these new areas would serve to intensify these existing pressures.

The physical expansion was accompanied by extensive redevelopment of the central area with the continued replacing of the traditional semi rural cottages. Of Haslingden, Aitken noted:

"inns have (been) erected . . . for the entertainment of travelers, shops, and handsome houses for their own residence. A square is lately planned here, and some capital houses are already built in it." (1) Warehouses were built for the products of the textile trade. (2) Some of the already substantial buildings were further expanded. One such example was the Black Dog Inn in the early 1790's. (3) The turnpike route through Newchurch and Bacup in 1789 indicates that here too an urban terraced environment had been created. (4)

Expansion also occurred outside these major centres in the villages that emerged in the early eighteenth century. However their expansion remained modest compared with that of Bacup and Haslingden. Indeed in the cases of Deardengate and Laneside they had become virtually suburbs of Haslingden by 1795, whilst Tong became virtually a suburb of Bacup. Though others grew quickly and maintained their independence they remained relatively small. With the exception of Newchurch none had a population of over five hundred.

(1) Aitken, op cit, p 277
(2) LRO/DDX/118/131/1-3
(3) Blackburn Mail, July 3rd 1796
(4) HRL/Local Collection No 681
Despite the profound changes occurring in the contemporary economy, the distribution of population by altitude still remained relatively stable.

### Distribution of Population by Altitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude (in feet)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1781-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-99</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-99</td>
<td>76 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-99</td>
<td>93 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-99</td>
<td>180 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-99</td>
<td>133 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-99</td>
<td>53 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100-99</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200-99</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,300-99</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,400-99</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>568 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety four per cent of the population resident between the six and eleven hundred feet contours in 1801-5 compared with ninety three per cent in 1781-5. Thus by this period virtually all of the population was concentrated into the valley sides.

Though some of this increase was absorbed by reducing farm sizes, most was absorbed by the building of cottages. By the end of the period virtually every farm had at least one cottage attached. A sample based on every tenth entry in the Haslingden township survey of 1798 indicates that of fourteen farms, twelve had at least one cottage in addition to the farm house. Many had more than one cottage, thus

---

(1) Haslingden and Bacup figures excluded, if they are included in these percentages are boosted even further. See Maps No VII c and d

(2) See Chapter XXII Section A on average farm sizes
fourteen farms had a total of seventeen cottages attached. Many dwellings were built during this period, the most dramatic being Bentgate Farm which grew from an isolated farmhouse in 1785 to being surrounded by eight new dwellings by 1797. As in the Huddersfield area, clusters of cottages were also built along the newly turnpiked roads. In both types of cluster the drive behind such arrangements probably came earlier in the century, from local manufacturers seeking to attract labour or to subject the labour force to closer supervision.

The continued rapid demographic and economic expansion of Rossendale in the years after 1783 led to a rush towards road improvements in the late 1780's and early 1790's.

The forerunner of these came in 1787 when it was agreed to build a branch on the Burnley to Rochdale turnpike. This branch ran from Broadclough north of Bacup to Cliviger township probably via Lane Head thus providing a parallel route to the existing road. In 1789 two new turnpikes were constructed, one opening up western Rossendale, the other linking western and eastern Rossendale together. The former road ran north from Bury via Flaxmoss to Haslingden where it divided, one branch going north to Accrington and Whalley, the other west to Blackburn. The second road ran east from Haslingden via Newchurch and Bacup to Todmorden. In 1795 a north/south turnpike was constructed

(1) L.R.O./P.R./865 Haslingden Township Survey, 1798
(2) L.R.O./D.D.X./118/103/21 and 22
See also L.R.O./D.D.X./118/114/22 and 24
(3) Crump and Ghorbal, History of the Huddersfield Woollen Industry, p 62
(4) Rochdale P.L./RB214 Rochdale and Burnley Turnpike Road Minutes 1755 - 1791 - May 17th and June 21st 1787, August 28th, November 20th and September 3rd 1789
(5) H.P.L./Local Collection No 681
through Central Rossendale with the opening of the road from Burnley to Goodshaw and Rawtenstall to Edenfield where it joined the Bury/Haslingden turnpike. The previous year had seen the turnpiking of a road from Edenfield on the southern edge of Rossendale to Rochdale. These roads marked the end of this second stage of turnpiking in Rossendale.

The turnpike system was largely the result of the new economic pressures of the period. The continued demographic and economic growth of the area was intensified by the introduction of the cotton industry into the area. In particular, this re-stimulated the links between Rossendale and the areas to the south and south west. The growth of cotton encouraged local cotton manufacturers who looked to Manchester for raw materials and marketing facilities. At the same time, large producers from established cotton centres such as Bolton and Bury began to push northwards into Rossendale in their search for hand loom weavers. The expansion of local stone quarrying and coal mining provided a further supplementary pressure for improvements. Together these pressures appear to have created a critical mass that encouraged the area to partake in the widespread transport boom from the late 1780's. The list of trustees for the Bury, Haslingden, Whalley and Blackburn, and the Haslingden to Todmorden trusts gives some indication of the groups behind the schemes. Though not all the trustees can be positively identified, a sufficient number can to confirm the prominence of textile

(1) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 224
(2) ibid p 224
(3) The next era of turnpike activity opened with a second Haslingden to Blackburn road via Grane in 1810
(4) See the following for detailed consideration of these points - Chapter XXII Section D and Chapter XXIII Sections A, C,H and I
interests. Trustees of the former road included the Grundy family, prominent in the Bury woollen trade, members of the Peel families of Church and Bury, cotton manufacturers and two members of the Turner family prominent in the Church and later the Helmshore woollen trade. In addition, at least nine other local woollen manufacturers were involved. Trustees of the Haslingden to Todmorden road included the aforementioned Peel family, and the Royds and Walmesleys, two of the most prominent families in the Rochdale woollen trade, and at least fourteen other local woollen producers. Of the other groups that can be identified, three stand out, the clergy, local landowners and gentry country families such as the Towneley's of Burnley. Of these latter groups the clergy and the non resident county families almost certainly saw the roads as an investment in its own right rather than as a means of providing cheap transport for their other economic interests.\(^{(1)}\)

The turnpike system of 1789-1795 in the same way as the earlier Burnley to Rochdale road, essentially kept to the pre turnpike routes. This appears to be a reflection of contemporary population distribution and local geography which made major realignments unattractive. Adjustments were only made on a small scale and for major reasons. Thus the Bury to Whalley and Blackburn road was moved a few hundred yards to the east of the pre turnpike road to facilitate road widening.\(^{(2)}\)

In the early years at least these turnpiked roads were a substantial improvement over their predecessors.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) HAPL Local Collection No 681
\(\text{Bailey's British Directory, 1784}\)
\(\text{LGD/Land Deeds passim}\)
\(\text{LGD/PR/865}\)

\(^{(2)}\) Woodcock, \(\text{Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 86-7}\)

\(^{(3)}\) See Chapter XI for an account of the state of local roads in the early 1780's.
were engaged to build the road, for example, Metcalf was responsible for the Bury, Haslingden, Whalley and Blackburn road, whilst rather later MacAdam was employed on local roads. The 1787 extension of the Burnley/Rochdale road had a substantial width of twelve yards and the trustees appear to have been quite ready to pay compensation for damage its construction entailed. On this and other roads considerable sums were spent on widening and improving the road. Around £3,000 was spent on the short three mile stretch of road from Edenfield to Haslingden in 1789. From that date repairs to the road were regularly put out to tender. Where problems did arise the trustees were quick to act, in 1791 they acted "to fill up the cart ruts through the whole of the said road." In this the contractors were greatly aided by the availability of local stone.

In 1795, Aitken was able to describe the roads from Haslingden to Blackburn and Todmorden as being "kept in excellent condition", whilst that from Haslingden to Bury was also commended.

---

(1) Anon, The Life of John Metcalf, p 150
Ashmore, Industrial Archaeology of Lancashire, p 158

(2) Rochdale PL/RB214 June 21st 1879, August 28th and November 20th 1788 and September 3rd 1789.

(3) S.W. Partington, Toll Bars and Turnpike Roads of Bury and Rossendale, 1921, passim, p 7
LRO/TTA/1.

(4) LRO/TTA/1 July 5th 1791
Toll charges were also structured to favour wide wheeled carriages which did less damage to the road - Partington, op cit, p 2 and HRL/Local Collection No 681.

(5) ibid p 269
Rochdale PL/RB214 November 20th 1788 and September 3rd 1789

(6) Aitken, op cit, p 269 and 277.
The rapidity of construction and the evident desire to maintain the improved quality of these roads reflected the underlying expansion of the area in these years as well as the prominence of local manufacturers amongst the trustees of the road. (1)

Wilson argued that the trend of toll incomes from turnpikes can provide a useful indication of the level of economic activity in an area. (2) Using data from several West Riding roads he finds evidence for rapid expansion in the regional economy particularly from 1786. Unfortunately, as only Rossendale Road was turnpiked throughout this period local evidence on this subject is limited. Despite this its proximity to the West Riding would lead to the expectation of a similar pattern of expansion. This is indeed true. The toll lease value of the road increased steadily during this period though it is possible that the most rapid increase occurred prior to 1786. (3)

The increasing need for efficient transport in the 1780's and 1790's also led to the construction of a canal network in north western Lancashire.

(1) Local manufacturers such as Turner Brothers of Helmshore even built their own private roads to give themselves better access to the turnpikes - LAO/DDX/118/172/1


(3) Burnley To Rochdale Turnpike Toll Lease Values 1781-1791

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Habergham Eaves Gate</th>
<th>Toad Lane Gate</th>
<th>Combined Gates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>£122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>£132 0s Od</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£205</td>
<td>£356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>£166</td>
<td>£266</td>
<td>£422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>£170</td>
<td>£257</td>
<td>£427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£258</td>
<td>£458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>£178</td>
<td>£262</td>
<td>£440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>£180</td>
<td>£320</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As early as the 1760's Brindley had been employed to survey a route across the Pennines to bring a canal to Rochdale but little came of it. By the 1790's when interest in canals was revived the need was even more clear cut. It was noted that bulky goods bound for Haslingden had to be brought "by the Selby navigation into Yorkshire and thence hither by land carriage".  

(1)  In 1791, action was taken with the construction of the Manchester, Bolton and Bury canal which ran within a few miles of Rossendale.  

(2)  The earlier Leeds/Liverpool canal ran seven miles north of Rossendale.  

1794 saw parliamentary approval for a canal through Rossendale linking up both the aforementioned canals to the north and south. Yet this venture never materialised due to a mixture of geographic and technological problems. The idea of a canal through Rossendale appears to have been primarily backed by the Manchester, Bolton and Bury canal which eventually got its link to the Leeds/Liverpool canal via the Bridgewater canal which afforded an easier route.  

(3)  Indeed the entire Rossendale canal proposal may have been little more than a negotiating ploy by the canal. Any residue possibility of the scheme being realised were probably killed by the terms of the authorising act which only allowed the construction of locks with the approval of three quarters of the millers occupying local streams. In the absence of such approval the company

---

(1)  Aitken, op cit, p 277  
The Selby navigation terminated at Halifax.  

(2)  R.K Fleischman Jnr, Conditions of Life Among the Cotton Workers of South Eastern Lancashire During the Industrial Revolution 1780-1850, 1973, p 9  

(3)  Journal of the House of Commons January 24th 1794  
S.Hamilton, The Historical Geography of South Rossendale 1780-1900  
1974, p 62
was empowered to substitute "rollers, racks, inclined planes or any other works engines or machinery."(1) Such technology would probably have made the canal commercially unviable.

As a result, Rossendale remained totally dependent on land transport, a point which was to pose a problem for its economic future in the nineteenth century.(2)

To summarise, this was a period of substantial economic and demographic growth which had repercussions for both the settlement and transport pattern in Rossendale.

Though Rossendale remained predominantly an area of dispersed settlement, urbanisation continued to occur particularly in relation to the two largest centres. Bacup and Haslingden together increased their proportion of the local population from twenty to twenty three per cent between 1781-5 and 1801-5. The expansion of secondary urban settlements such as Newchurch was rather slower, indeed in some cases, these were absorbed as suburbs by the expansion of Bacup and Haslingden. This urban growth, as before 1780, was met by the physical expansion of the settlement, particularly towards lower land which gave better access to the new mills and to building land. Equally redevelopment of the existing urban area appears to have increased the density of housing as well as providing larger commercial facilities. In the rural areas expansion was also met as before 1780, with the construction of cottages attached to farms. By the end of the period such cottages were probably attached

(1) Journal of the House of Commons, January 24th 1794.

to virtually all farms. In addition, clusters of cottages were built on the sides of the major road routes.

Contemporary economic and demographic pressures particularly the spread of cotton from the west led to the turnpiking of the major road routes. By 1795, Rossendale had the major turnpikes providing improved access to all parts of the area. These new roads were probably of good quality as they were built by leading contractors and had considerable amounts of attention and money devoted to their building and maintenance. The period even saw a canal through Rossendale mooted, but this came to nothing probably due to problems of geography and technology.
CHAPTER XIX
PER CAPITA WEALTH 1781-1795

Despite the period of economic expansion prior to 1780 there is little evidence that the incomes and wealth of the mass of local residents saw any significant increase. At the same time, the extent of poverty appears to have begun to increase from the middle of the century.

With the increase in the number of landless full time textile workers in the period after 1780, the importance of wage incomes in determining the per capita income and wealth amongst the mass of the local population undoubtedly grew. Thus attention must be initially concentrated on the point. Unfortunately, the final decades of the eighteenth century lie before many of the records of the nineteenth century parliamentary enquiries begin. An additional complication is that the traditional woollen trade was now supplemented by cotton manufacturing whilst the traditional domestic organisation was supplemented with a mill sector. Thus the wage income picture became more complex at a time when the available data sources remain fragmentary.

In relation to the domestic outwork sector Bythell suggests that the piece rate system was the only possible method of payment. Whilst not disputing this it should be added that not all domestic workers were outworkers. Even small farmer/weavers often employed journeymen on a fixed wage basis. Cases of this type could be found in Rossendale

(1) See Chapter XX
(2) See Chapter XXIII, Sections A and B
(3) Q, Bythell, op cit, p 96
before, through and beyond the period under consideration here.\(^1\) Despite this, piece wages undoubtedly do provide a useful starting point for a study of earnings.

It is probable that in the late eighteenth century north east Lancashire acted as a single labour market. This was certainly true of the early nineteenth century when standard wage lists were agreed for this wider area in both the cotton and woollen industries.\(^2\) The presence of large cotton and woollen producers with putting out activities throughout the area in the 1790's would have given such men the ability to divert work from area to area according to which offered the most favourable return. Equally, the presence of small independent manufacturers in both industries selling relatively standardised productions in clearly defined market centres would help reduce long term variations in their relative piece earnings.\(^3\) This may not have been so in the short run where the emergence of the cotton industry with demands for handloom labour pushed up piece rates beyond those obtaining in the traditional woollen sector.\(^4\) Yet the rapid headway made by cotton in these years helps illustrate just how this differential could attract labour from one textile to another, thus indicating the presence of a single textile labour market. It is not therefore surprising that soon after the turn of the century when cotton had established its position, this differential disappeared.\(^5\) Thus in the long term, the trend of piece rates was probably

\(^1\) LRQ/PR/2859/14/passim
\(^2\) Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 11
\(^3\) See Chapter XXIII
\(^4\) Eden, op cit, vol II, p 294
\(^5\) Aspin, Haslingden 1800–1900, 1962, p 31
similar in both branches of textiles though until 1795 the absolute level was higher in the cotton sector.\(^{(1)}\)

The period from 1780 - 1795 was a period of rapid expansion in the textile trade which in itself may have led to buoyant piece rates. The disruption caused by the war probably brought this period of buoyancy to an end. Certainly local writers noted that piece rates had been in decline from long before the 1820's.\(^{(2)}\) Select Committee papers indicate that this decline was certainly present in the course calico sector, of which Rossendale was a part, from the beginning of the series in 1802.\(^{(3)}\) The documentary evidence for a rise prior to 1795 is even more fragmentary. During 1789-1790 labour was so short around Haslingden that Metcalfe found it difficult to attract workers for turnpike construction.\(^{(4)}\) In 1791, the woollen trade was reported as brisk, as it was in 1793.\(^{(5)}\) As late as 1795, labour was still sufficiently scarce around Haslingden to force a local flannel manufacturer to advertise for weavers.\(^{(6)}\) By this time, however, demands were being made for higher wages following disturbances around Rochdale.\(^{(7)}\) Though not in itself conclusive when judged against a background of textile expansion, these cases suggest that piece rates were probably buoyant down to 1795.

The limited evidence available on wages suggests a similar pattern.

\(^{(1)}\) Eden, op cit, Vol II, p 294
\(^{(2)}\) \(\ldots\), Vol 7, p 595 and 600
\(^{(3)}\) \(\ldots\), Vol 6, p 594
\(^{(4)}\) Anon, Life of John Metcalfe, p 150
\(^{(5)}\) A.Young, Annals of Agriculture, Vol 15, 1791, p 311 and Vol 20, 1793, p 184
\(^{(6)}\) Blackburn Mail, November 11th 1795
\(^{(7)}\) Blackburn Mail, August 12th 1795
In the 1770's one local adult male weaver was earning as little as 10d per week, another only 2s per week, both living in with their masters. (1) This would suggest earnings of up to 4s per week for those living at home. In contrast, by 1795, earnings may have reached up to 16s per week. (2)

Other factors were also at work which partly undermined the real earnings of weavers prior to 1795. Bamford argued that the position of such weavers was being undermined by the 1790's by the high level of rents. This was certainly true of Rossendale, where both farm and cottage rents rose. (3) Food prices also began to rise, especially in the 1790's and as by this date, even local farmers had to buy most of their food, this would be of obvious impact. Thus it is not surprising that Fleischman's indices of Lancashire weavers' wages in terms of their grain and meat purchasing power show a decline from the beginning of the indexes in the late 1790's. (4)

The position of wage earners in the mill sector may have been only slightly more favourable. In 1799, most spinners at Laund Mill Rawtenstall were able to earn around 10s per week. This was similar to the figure found in the weaving sector. Given their shortage, mill mechanics did rather better, all earning over 10s, many earning over £1 per week. (5)

In both sectors, a further influence on earnings was undoubtedly the presence of truck. This system had long been established in the

---

(1) LRQ/PR/2859/15
(2) Eden, op cit, Vol II, p 294
(3) See Chapter XXII, Section A
(4) Fleischman Jun, op cit, p 102 and 111
(5) RRL/Rc677 Ros Accounts of a Mill in Rossendale: Spinning and Mechanics Wages Books
domestic sector despite nineteenth century claims to the contrary. (1) With the development of mills, the system spread. By the early nineteenth century truck and credit sales were both widespread. (2) In the short run both may have had benefits for the local consumer but once real wages began a long term decline, it almost certainly posed an additional burden for the worker.

Many workers in the domestic sector also benefitted as before 1780, from the opportunities for fraud and embezzlement. The Committee of Worsted Manufacturers attempted to control, if not curb, such practices in the 1780’s. In September 1780, Priscilla Bayley of Newchurch, Oliver Ashworth of Newchurch, Susan Hartley of Bacup and John Clegg of Boothfold were each fined 5s for false reeling. In April 1781, Nancy Maden of Lower Booths township was also fined 5s for a similar offence. (3) By their very nature, such cases probably reflect only a tiny proportion of the true extent of such practices. These cases relate to the domestic woollen spinning sector, but there is no reason to doubt that equivalent practices could be found in domestic weaving and in the cotton trade.

If the conclusion of rising piece rates from 1783-1795 followed by the onset of a long term decline is valid, it would be logical to

---

(1) LRO/QSP/822/3  
(LRQ/380) 1842/ Vol 15, p 107

(2) Rossendale Free Press, July 12th 1941, Moses Heap: An Old Man’s Memories.  
(LRQ/380) 1842/ Vol 15, p 97  
RRL/Rc 67/7 RSS Account of a Mill in Rossendale: Spinning Wages Book  
RRL/Rc 658/15 Goo Account Book of Goodshawfold Mill and Shop 1812-3  
Elliot, op cit, pp 17, 24 and 29

(3) MCRQ/528.4 W/Committee of Worsted Manufacturers/An Account of Frauds and Offences committed by the Spinners and others Employed in the Worsted Manufacture.
expect the extent and burden of poverty to have followed a similar pattern.

As before 1780, local charities were of little importance in supporting the local poor, down to 1795. Thus, the extent of poverty will be indicated by the level of poor relief disbursements.

The evidence of poor relief expenditure shows an accelerating trend of disbursements from the late 1770's:

Poor Relief Expenditure 1776-1804
(Annual Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>1775-1778</th>
<th>1783-1785</th>
<th>1801-1804</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coupe Lench, New Hall</td>
<td>£ 53 8s 7d</td>
<td>£113 12s 3d</td>
<td>£216 6s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey and Hall Carr</td>
<td>£ 5 9s 1d</td>
<td>£ 5 5s 9d(b)</td>
<td>£ 37 2s 0d(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnockshaw</td>
<td>£224 10s 11d</td>
<td>£310 11s 4d</td>
<td>£934 13s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>£122 16s 6d</td>
<td>£149 6s 3d</td>
<td>£304 11s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henheads</td>
<td>£101 11s 7d</td>
<td>£132 3s 10d</td>
<td>£328 13s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Booths</td>
<td>£122 16s 6d</td>
<td>£149 6s 3d</td>
<td>£304 11s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Booths</td>
<td>£101 11s 7d</td>
<td>£132 3s 10d</td>
<td>£328 13s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td>£ 15 2s 2d</td>
<td>£ 34 9s 6d</td>
<td>£ 89 2s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td>£213 19s 3d(a)</td>
<td>£316 9s 5d</td>
<td>£946 2s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yate and Pickup Bank</td>
<td>£ 75 15s 4d(a)</td>
<td>£ 91 8s 0d</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The years from 1796 saw the rapid establishment of a number of Friendly Societies which by 1801, covered nearly twenty per cent of the population. To some extent, such organisations will lead to some extent to an underestimate of the extent of poverty in the area.

An abstract of the Returns made by the Overseers of the Separate Parishes, Townships, Places and Divisions separately maintaining their poor in the County Palatine of Lancaster 1804. Also HRL/Local Collection/942HAL Halstead MSS Notebook, p 34. HRL/Local Collection/No 163, Articles of the Union Society of Women.

(2) LRO/CTV/2/1
LRO/CTV/313
In all cases the figures are from Easter to Easter
(a) Figures for 1776 only
(b) Figures for 1802 only
These figures show that in the period as a whole there was a dramatic increase in the level of poor relief expenditure in every township. Excluding Yate and Pickup Bank, for which no figure is available for 1801-1804, the total level of expenditure rose from £711 in 1776 and 1778 to £1,077 in 1783-1785 and £2,862 in 1801-1804. This represents an annual increase of 7.3% in the seven years from 1777 rising to 11.3% in the twenty years from 1784.

These figures must be judged against a background of population growth and inflation. When population increase is taken into account, poor relief still continued to increase from 1s 4d per head in the late 1770's to 1s 7½d in the mid 1780's and 3s 8d by the early 1800's. Equally, the increase outstripped even the estimated doubling of prices in the period as a whole. Thus it is clear that the total real cost of poor relief grew substantially in this period. Prior to the mid 1780's, this increase appears to have been modest, probably in line with that recorded from the mid eighteenth century. Sometime after the mid 1780's, probably from when the French wars began to be of impact in the mid 1790's, the rate of this increase accelerated.

Attention in this chapter has been focused on two related issues, wage rates and earnings, and poor relief expenditure. Both suggest a similar pattern.

---

(1) Dunnockshaw and Henheads are retained in this calculation, despite the absence of expenditure figures for 1776 and 1778, as they account for such small sums. The figures for Yate and Pickup Bank for 1776 and 1778, and 1783-1785 suggests that their experience may have been similar to that of the rest of Rossendale in the period as a whole.

Throughout this period domestic wage rates and earnings were probably quite buoyant. This pattern was modified by earnings obtained from probable widespread embezzlement though this was offset by rising prices and rising cottage rents. Truck and credit sales were also widespread in both the domestic and mill sectors, possibly serving to further erode real wage levels in the long run. Poor law expenditure per head of population rose only slowly indeed, after inflation is taken into account it was relatively stable, certainly down to the mid 1780's and possibly until the mid 1790's.

In the late 1790's piece rates and purchasing power in the domestic sector both began to fall, whilst poor law expenditure per head even after inflation began to grow rapidly.
The period 1716-1780 saw a steady swing in the male occupational framework throughout Rossendale from agriculture to textiles. The only exception to this was in the town of Haslingden with its general market function. This change was reflected in the occupational listings in the chapelry registers, the agriculture/textile balance in probate inventories down to 1760 and the Newchurch apprentice registers.

The pattern in the fifteen years following 1780 cannot be established with any precision as none of the above sources are available for this purpose. In consequence, the pattern just beyond the turn of the century for which data is available must be used to compare with the situation prior to 1780. The 1810 militia list provides a comprehensive view of the adult male occupational structure for all parts of Rossendale other than Haslingden township. The chapelry registers again provide ample occupational listings from 1812. Given the comparability of these registers with the register data of the eighteenth century, they make the best starting point for analysis.

By 1812 entries in chapelry registers had become voluminous. To ease the practical problems involved with such a mass of entries, a sample has been used in which coverage has been restricted to all those entries with surnames beginning with the letters A - E inclusive. There appears no reason to feel that this leads to any bias as the total number of cases remains substantial and these surname letters cover old established Rossendale family names such as Ashworth and Barnes as well
as many new surnames.\(^{(1)}\) In all other respects the methodology used is identical to that utilised prior to 1780.\(^{(2)}\)

The figures resulting indicate that the domination of textiles was further increased in this period whilst agriculture was reduced to a negligible role. Trades and crafts also appear to have made some progress throughout the area so that Haslingden was no longer the only service centre:

**Rossendale Occupational Structure 1756–1815**

*from Chapelry Registers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>1756-59</th>
<th>1813-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No of Entries</td>
<td>% of Entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades and Crafts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapelry</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades and Crafts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapelry</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades and Crafts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades and Crafts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) This provides a twenty eight per cent sample of all contemporary entries.

\(^{(2)}\) For consideration of the limitations of these registers for occupational analyses see Chapter VI.

\(^{(3)}\) MCRL/ MF/PR124a and 127a. LRO/PR/2859/2, LRO/DRB/2/254/5 and 274. LRO/PR/3016/1/9.
The size of the samples for Haslingden chapelry and South Rossendale are small. Fortunately, these figures can be verified against the militia list. This list is not quite comparable with the registers, recording all males between eighteen and forty five rather than merely male heads of households involved in baptisms and burials. Even so it provides a useful checking device for both the above areas plus Newchurch chapelry.

**Rossendale Occupational Structure 1810; from the Militia List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listings</th>
<th>Haslingden Chapelry</th>
<th>Newchurch Chapelry</th>
<th>South Rossendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades and Crafts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures confirm the continued swing to textiles and spread of trades and crafts in Newchurch chapelry. Indeed they indicate that the bias towards textiles amongst male heads of households was lower than amongst adult males generally. This was probably also true of the commercial economic activity of females and children. Where unmarried mothers had children baptised, the occupational status given suggests that they were virtually always employed in textiles.

As dual employment was widespread prior to 1780 the aforementioned occupational data can only be of value if the extent of such dual employment after 1780 is appreciated. Unfortunately the absence of probate inventory data makes such analysis difficult.

(1) RRL/Rc 355.223 Rossendale Militia List, 1810
The emergence of urban settlement such as Haslingden and the construction of large numbers of terraces would preclude a growing proportion of the local population from such activity. Outside of such centres dual employment remained widespread. Beesley noted that:

"when textiles . . . were chiefly of domestic manufacture, this part of the country (north east Lancashire) was in a very flourishing state. A few acres of land on which a cottage and weaving shop had been erected, was looked upon (as) a prize to be obtained." (1)

Even as late as the 1820's loomshops were probably attached to most local farms. (2) Thus many of those classed as weavers in the militia list and chapelry registers would have still been men of this dual employed type. In consequence, the registers and the militia list in a sense over dramatise the decline of agriculture. (3)

Against this must be set that within dual employment, the balance was clearly switching further and further to textiles. From the early 1780's the main selling point of many local farms was their location in a manufacturing area rather than their intrinsic agricultural potential. (4)

By this time, the prime aim of east Lancashire farms was said to be to raise the accommodation rent for the family rather than their main source of income. Even in this objective textile earnings had to be used to supplement the farm income. (5) The mill sector was also closely integrated with agriculture, several fulling mills were actually part of a farm's buildings. In 1794 Rushbed farm in Higher Booths consisted of a

---

(2) eg Blackburn Mail, December 20th 1826
(3) See also Chapter XXIII, Section E.
(4) See the files of the Manchester Mercury, 1781-1795.
(5) S. Bamford, Dialect of South Lancashire, 1850, p IV-V
farm house, barn, fulling and perching mill and meadow land as did Edgeside fulling mill, Newchurch. (1) Even larger mills such as Hareholme Mill from 1798, owned and farmed land, not just for water rights but probably to provide grazing for mill horses and food for the workforce, though probably not for cloth drying ground. (2)

Thus it can be seen that the role of textiles in the occupational structure was further increased from its already dominant 1780 position by 1795. This is certainly true of male heads of household and probably even more so for other economically active members of the community. This increase was largely at the expense of agriculture which declined to negligible importance in the above terms. The service sector even replaced agriculture in importance. The expansion of this sector was particularly pronounced in Newchurch chapelry thus ending Haslingden's traditional position of the only significant service centre within Rossendale.

Occupational structure figures as at earlier dates are weakened because of the continued widespread presence of dual employment in the dispersed settlements within Rossendale. Here small scale farming/textile working continued to operate as it had for over a century. In the emerging urban areas of Rossendale the spread of high density terraced housing suggests that this form of employment was probably of negligible significance.

---

(1) LRO/CCR/1795/22 and 23 - See also /37
(2) RRL/Rc677 Ro8/Accounts of a Mill in Rossendale: General Accounts 1799
Prior to 1780, the only service centre of any significance was Haslingden which catered for western and central Rossendale. The east of Rossendale probably relied on outside centres such as Rochdale. All parts of Rossendale relied on such outside centres for anything other than the most basic trades and crafts.

This situation appears to have been little altered in the early 1780's. Bailey's directory of 1784, whilst far from comprehensive, clearly indicates that Haslingden remained the only market centre of any significance. As already noted, this had ceased to be the case soon after 1800 in relation to Bacup.

Although the chapelry registers of Haslingden for the early 1780's do not consistently record all occupations, they do appear to provide a constant listing of those engaged in trade and craft activity. Consequently, it is possible to obtain some indication of the range of such activities in the town at the beginning of this period. The range of activities indicated in these listings is consistent with the narrow and basic range observable in the period 1716-1780. The only significant increase in numbers was that of innkeepers, though Bailey's directory indicates that attorneys were also resident in the town by this date.

---

(1) Bailey's British Directory, 1784, p 539, 676-7
(2) LRO/DRB/2/252
(3) See Table No I
(4) Bailey, op cit, p 539
As indicated above, the period after 1780 saw a substantial increase in the number of inns particularly in the town of Haslingden. This increase is a reflection of the expansion of the local economy and the growing independence and sophistication of local society.

Newspaper advertisements suggest that much of this increase was associated with the traditional functions of local inns in relation to local agriculture and domestic industry. These functions were to act as foci for property auctions and for business dealings of local textile producers especially in the case of bankruptcy. Such transactions occurred in inns throughout the area whereas the rather more sophisticated auctions associated with new developments in the local economy were generally restricted to the urban inns of Haslingden and to a lesser extent Bacup. These new auctions often related to the sale or lease of local mills and the annual lease of turnpike tolls. In the case of toll leases of roads running through central Rossendale and thus away from Haslingden and Bacup, the auction of leases was usually held at neighbouring urban centres such as Burnley.

The inns of Haslingden and Bacup were also used for both the ordinary and extra-ordinary meetings of turnpike trustees. The use of local inns for such purposes was not new. Inns at Bacup and Boothfold were used for meetings of the trustees of the Burnley to Rochdale turnpike in the 1750's.

(1) Aspin, Historical Notes on Haslingden and Helmshere, p 76-81
(2) Eg. Blackburn Mail, September 25th and December 25th 1793.
(3) Eg. Blackburn Mail, April 6th and April 15th 1796.
(4) Eg. Blackburn Mail, June 28th 1797
(5) Rochdale RL/RB214 Rochdale to Burnley Turnpike Road: Minutes 1755-1791 – Meetings of February 2nd 1756 and March 12th 1756.
For the larger urban inns the general increase in road traffic associated with economic expansion provided an important additional source of business. These inns benefitted not only from local economic expansion, but from the economic expansion of north east Lancashire as a whole, as Rossendale lay across the main turnpike routes from the Colne, Burnley and Ribble Valley areas to Manchester. Haslingden in particular appears to have become a significant turnpike centre being described in 1796 as:

"The central Town of many new Turnpike Roads that lead to the most principal Towns in this Country, as well as those in East and West Ridings of Yorkshire." (2)

This central position led to an increase in the passenger traffic and in turn to the expansion of Haslingden inns. It was written of the Black Dog Inn in 1796 that:

"On Account of the great Thoroughfare, and Frequency of Travellers and Carriages passing through the Town, the new Buildings and additions 

... have been lately made ... for the better and more agreeable accommodation of Strangers and Travellers." (3)

This increase in the number of travellers had little to do with the coaching trade. Directories indicate that before 1800 there were no regular coaching services through Rossendale. (4) In contrast, such inns were probably used as termini for those engaged in the public carrying trade or by private travellers.

---

(1) The presence of the Leeds-Liverpool Canal meant that much of the goods traffic of these areas may have by-passed Rossendale.

(2) Blackburn Mail, August 3rd 1796.

(3) ibid

(4) Universal British Directory, Vol II, 1794
Dean & Co Manchester & Salford Directory, 1804
Dean's Manchester & Salford Directory for 1808 and 1809, 1809
The expansion of business meant that leading local inns became much larger and more sophisticated establishments. In the 1790's the Black Dog Inn was three storied measuring seventy five by thirty six yards incorporating a large purpose built room for public meetings, stabling for thirty horses and twenty acrea of meadow and pasture land.\(^{(1)}\)

Throughout this period many urban innkeepers remained dual employed even when running the larger inns. Generally this by-employment was complementary to innkeeping. The keeper of the Black Dog also operated as a dealer and chapwoman, whilst John Kenyan, another Haslingden innkeeper, was also active as a saddler.\(^{(2)}\)

As in the textile trade, credit was at the base of much of the general retail trade throughout Rossendale. Around 1780 an unnamed local shopkeeper was selling goods on credit to a number of people around Haslingden.\(^{(3)}\) Richard Emmot a Loveclough shopkeeper was operating on a similar basis in 1795.\(^{(4)}\) This retail credit system was rife into the nineteenth century.\(^{(5)}\) This system was found even amongst the middle class consumer and the larger retailer. In 1788, a leading Haslingden oil and butter merchant was seeking payment for goods supplied to a local "gentleman" several years earlier.\(^{(6)}\) This practice amongst the local middle class also remained into the early nineteenth century.\(^{(7)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Blackburn Mail, August 3rd 1796 and January 23rd 1799

\(^{(2)}\) Blackburn Mail, May 9th and July 4th 1798

\(^{(3)}\) LRD/DDX/28/249/48

\(^{(4)}\) RRL/RC 332.7 Rossendale Collection MSS, Miscellaneous File.

\(^{(5)}\) S. Bamford, Passages in the Life of a Radical, Vol I, 1849, p 60

\(^{(6)}\) RPL/Rc921/File I/4/3

\(^{(7)}\) LRD/QJB/55/53

RRL/Rc921/File I/7/11
Within Rossendale two levels of tradesmen operated, large men at least partially engaged in wholesaling and small scale retailers. Most of the former group were based in Haslingden where they supplied the smaller retailers both of that town and the rest of Rossendale. Soon after 1800, George Ingham, a Haslingden draper, was supplying goods on this basis to the itinerant grocery business of David Whitehead based near Newchurch. Some men operated as both wholesaler and retailer. Until 1801, James Hargreaves of Haslingden was operating as both a badger and shopkeeper.

By the late eighteenth century, some of the smaller retailers were engaged in their trade full time, though as in earlier times, many of dual employed men were often with textile by-employment. Though in some cases these activities may have been separate, they probably frequently overlapped in practice via the credit mechanism. Weavers often attempted to pay for groceries with pilfered weft rather than cash in the early nineteenth century. As such pilfering was rife prior to 1795 as was the credit system, this arrangement was probably not new.

Other factors also help explain the presence of dual employed retailer/textile manufacturers. As in the Whitehead case, such men would help larger retailers in Haslingden penetrate the growing semi rural market in other parts of Rossendale. The presence of the truck

(2) Blackburn Mail, March 4th 1803
By the nineteenth century, the term badger was being used locally to denote a wholesale grocer rather than a corn dealer - H.Cunliffe, A Glossary of Rochdale with Rossendale Words and Phrases, 1886, p 16.
(3) LRD/DDX/28/249/48
Blackburn Mail, December 28th 1803 and August 1st 1804.
(4) Elliot, op cit, p 17
system in parts of the mill sector may have intensified this by removing part of the independent market from these retailers. Perhaps the greatest pressure came from wartime inflation hitting local incomes and forcing local wholesalers to become more aggressive in their search for sales.

The decline of the traditional market and fair of Haslingden, underway well before 1780, appears to have accelerated from that date.

The market certainly remained in 1784 when Bailey indicates it was still operating on a Wednesday.\(^1\) Baines suggests the market remained in the 1820's but this must be open to doubt.\(^2\) Dickson's normally reliable survey of 1815 makes no reference to any market though he does acknowledge the continued presence of the fair.\(^3\) More conclusive is an enquiry in the Blackburn Gazette of 1829 which notes that Haslingden market:

"has long existed only in (historical) records, having almost since the recollection of the oldest inhabitants been in a state of perfect desuetude."\(^4\)

This essentially local account written at a time when an attempt was being unsuccessfully made to restore Haslingden market appears to have no obvious motive for bias. Thus, it is likely that Haslingden market was dead by the end of the eighteenth century.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Bailey's British Directory, p 539


\(^3\) R.W. Dickson, General View of the Agriculture of Lancashire, 1815, p 617.

\(^4\) Blackburn Gazette, September 9th 1829 - transcript in HPL.

\(^5\) An attempt to establish a flannel market at Haslingden in 1800 may reflect the last flicker of the traditional market though it could have been a totally separate enterprise Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 13
The reasons for this demise are not hard to see as the seeds of decline had long been present with the rise of full time resident craftsmen and tradesmen who were better able to supply everyday needs and the fair able to supply more sophisticated needs. The post 1780 development of turnpikes would accelerate this demise by giving better access to larger neighbouring markets. Baines indicates that Haslingden market day was switched from Wednesday to Saturday in a belated attempt to escape competition from Blackburn market.\(^1\)

Haslingden fair also experienced a continued though rather less dramatic decline along with other neighbouring fairs over the same period. The toll lease values of Haslingden, Colne and Burnley fairs fell steadily:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Annual Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1742-1782</td>
<td>£9 10s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782-1789</td>
<td>£7 7s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789-1835</td>
<td>£5 5s 0d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)

The frequency of Haslingden fairs also declined from six in the mid eighteenth century to three in 1784 where the number and dates remained in 1815.\(^3\) The range of commodities sold also remained largely unchanged with livestock supplemented by general pedlary and cloth.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Baines, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of Lancaster, Vol I, p 644.

\(^2\) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 81

\(^3\) Rochdale RL/MAL/F3 Diary and Account Book of an unnamed east Lancashire farmer for 1784

\(^4\) ibid, p 617
The failure to change explains much of the decline. The fair's traditional function of the disposal of locally raised livestock to outside markets was obsolete. Agriculture's role was now muted whilst dairying had virtually replaced beef and with it the need for a fair. The development of a more sophisticated range of resident tradesmen and craftsmen and the improvements to communications allowing outside competition would have restricted the fair's potential for developing into the sale of more sophisticated consumer goods.

In total, it can be said that the Rossendale service sector saw considerable change generally in favour of increased sophistication in these years.

Though Haslingden remained the most important, it ceased to be the only service centre in the area. In Haslingden, the innkeeping trade in particular saw expansion and moves towards greater sophistication due to the general economic and demographic development of north east Lancashire as a whole and the increasing needs of local business for commercial centres. Yet these developments should not be over estimated, the travelling custom probably came largely from public carriers and individuals travelling privately rather than regular commercial coaching services whilst many of the occupants of even the larger inns were dual employed.

The general commodity trade remained as before 1780 heavily based on the credit mechanism even for sales to the local gentry. The business operated at two levels with large wholesaler/retailers based in Haslingden supplying goods to small retailers scattered throughout Rossendale. This latter group were often dual employed with an interest in textiles which reflects the overlap between the credit system in both trades.
In the more traditional sectors occupied by the market and the fair decline was apparent. Indeed the market probably totally disappeared before 1800. The decline of both can be attributed to the rise of full time resident services and the opening up of the area via turnpikes to supplies from neighbouring centres. In the case of the fair these would be intensified by the decline of cattle rearing for export which had provided its traditional base.
CHAPTER XXII
AGRICULTURE 1781-1795

SECTION A - FARMING UNITS

The pattern of land ownership at the beginning of this period is indicated by the 1782 land tax return. The pattern by the end of this period can be established for western Rossendale via the township surveys of the 1790's which provide a similarly comprehensive and comparable source.

The figures in the table shown overleaf indicate that in the urbanising area around Haslingden, the fragmentation of landownership that proceeded 1780 was put into reverse after that date, whereas it continued unabated in the more rural outlying area of Musbury. Though it cannot be checked it is possible that a similar pattern was observable in the urbanising areas of Newchurch and Bacup and their surrounding rural areas.

The 1782 land tax return indicates that the bulk of the local estates were occupied by tenants rather than by owner occupiers. Certainly, in western Rossendale and probably further east as well, this general position was maintained throughout this period. In the township of Haslingden township, tenancies accounted for eightyfive per cent in 1798. In Musbury township the 1782 figure was sixty seven per cent which rose to sixty nine per cent in 1793-4. As a result

(1) LRO/QDL/3/3/28
(2) LRO/PR/865 Haslingden Township Survey 1798
LRO/DDX/118/166/Musbury Township Survey 1793-4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>1782</th>
<th>1792-3</th>
<th>1798</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Estates</td>
<td>Average Estate Size (in acres)</td>
<td>No of Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbury Township</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The figures for built up areas of Town Post, Haslingden are excluded as this was dominated by the emergent urban centre of Haslingden. To include such figures would undermine any attempt to consider the ownership of farm land. Thus the figures resulting tend to over estimate the township average estate size.
the questions of leases and rents remain of major concern in the
analysis of local farming.

The period down to 1780 saw a general decline in the length of
local leases, by that date the most typical leases appear to have been
for eleven or twenty one years.

Early nineteenth century writers indicate that soon
after 1800 leases around Haslingden average seven to eleven years and
around Bacup nine to eleven years. (1) In addition, it was noted that
some land was held on a year to year basis without a lease.

The examples of farm leases available for 1780-1795 suggest that
this decline in lease lengths did not get under way until after 1795:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Lease Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Hutch Bank</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>70 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Springwood</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>11 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Calf Hey</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>30 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Horncliffe</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>52 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Rushbed Bottom</td>
<td>Haslingden Chaaelry</td>
<td>11 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Edgeside</td>
<td>Newchurch Chapelry</td>
<td>21 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of such a reduction prior to 1795 implies that the
eventual fall may have been a product of wartime pressures.

(1) Dickson, op cit, p 139

(2) Manchester Mercury, November 1786
LAC/CCR/1789/1
RAL/Ross MSS Miscellaneous File/Duckworth Papers
LAC/DDX/118/103/1
LAC/CCR/1795/22
LAC/CCR/1795/23
This first recorded case of tenancies at will appears in 1797 -
Blackburn Mail, November 22nd 1797
Against this stability in lease lengths the size of local farms fell substantially between 1781 and 1795. In this period the average of twenty one farms was a mere nineteen acres compared to forty acres from 1745-1780. Though the 1781-1795 sample is small it suggests that the fall took place throughout the area. The township surveys of the 1790's permit this to be confirmed for western Rossendale and also enable the range of farm sizes to be estimated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>0-32 acres</th>
<th>33-65 acres</th>
<th>66-99 acres</th>
<th>100+ acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td>1793-1794</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Post</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grane Post</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden Post</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Post</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst confirming the general decline from the pre 1780 figure of forty acres, the data also suggests that the decline may have been most acute near emerging urban centres such as Haslingden. The two remotest areas Musbury and Grane Post had significantly larger percentages of farms of over thirty two acres than any of the three more centrally located posts.

The general decline in farm sizes undoubtedly reflects the expansion of the local population and the local textile trades. Textiles,

(1) See Table No II

(2) LRD/DDX/118/166/1
LRD/PR/865
in particular would have this effect through two main mechanisms both linked to the continuation of dual employment. The expansion of hand loom weaving would increase the demand for farms. Writing in the mid nineteenth century of this period, Beesley claimed that a small farm with an attached weaving shop was regarded as a valuable prize by weavers. At the same time, the expansion of textiles by offering a higher and more regular income than agriculture would have altered the balance within dual employment away from farming, thus encouraging the fragmentation of farms.\(^{(1)}\) This latter point should perhaps not be taken too far as local agriculture played only limited demands on time.

This pressure obviously had implications for the level of rents. In 1770 only one small five acre piece of land on the Holden estate was paying a rent in excess of 7s 6d per acre, out of a total of over five hundred acres for which the rent can be calculated.\(^{(2)}\) By the mid 1790's Holt was noting that even the barrenest of land was paying a rent of around 5s per acre with land near growing urban centres paying up to £5 per acre.\(^{(3)}\) The higher urban rents reflects the presence of a growing local market for dairy products.

---

(1) Beesley, op cit, p 6

(2) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 113-119 - these were not fossilised rents, many showing a small upward adjustment in the years around 1770

(3) J.Holt, General View of the Agriculture of the County of Lancaster, 1795, 1969 edition, p 22
SECTION B - STRUCTURE OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY

In 1780 as in 1650, Rossendale specialised in pastoral farming particularly cattle. In the eighteenth century this was increasingly for the growing local dairy market. Unfortunately, the period after 1785 possesses no primary source equivalent to the probate inventories used for the century 1650-1750, to provide a long run and comprehensive coverage of local farming activity.

Other sources are available which only partially overcome this deficiency. The 1798 survey of Haslingden township provides a description of the land being assessed. This reveals not surprisingly that the vast bulk of local land continued to be used for pastoral purposes. The extent of arable was by now totally insignificant and less than one per cent of the total acreage. Such a situation is not surprising in the long term influences favouring pastoral over arable in Rossendale were now strengthened by other pressures. The continued expansion of local population meant that an expanding local market for foodstuffs was present. In the case of arable production, this was offset by the steady improvement in communications which permitted the bulk importation of foodstuffs, so long as they were not rapidly perishable, from areas naturally much more favoured for their production than Rossendale.

Holt, writing in the year 1795, noted that the markets of east Lancashire were supplied from the arable areas around Warrington, Rufford and Scarisbrick in south west Lancashire. At the same time, Aitken noted that Rochdale which acted as a market centre for south east Rossendale received up to ninety five per cent of its

(1) LAQ/PR/865
(2) Holt, op cit, p 71
grain needs from Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire or from Wales and southern England. In addition, he noted that meal, fruit, vegetables and roots were supplied from Manchester and sheep and cattle for slaughtering from Skipton and Wakefield fairs.\(^{(1)}\) Goods from Hull and Liverpool were brought overland to the Rossendale area by canal. Writing of Haslingden, Aitken noted that: "Some bulky goods . . . are brought from London by Selby navigation into Yorkshire and thence hither by land carriage."\(^{(2)}\) By this time, the Leeds-Liverpool canal provided a canal link from Liverpool to within a few miles of the western borders of Rossendale. The Selby navigation was extended westwards towards the Halifax and the Lancashire border as early as the 1750's. This suggests that this switch to imported grain may even have got underway before 1780. The rapid spread of improvements in local transport after 1780 probably accelerated this process.

One further guide to the demise of local arable activity comes via the fate of local corn mills which had a monopoly over the grinding of corn grown within the locality. The presence of this traditional monopoly was reaffirmed by a Duchy court decision as late as 1785.\(^{(3)}\) In 1780, four such corn mills existed at Ewood Bridge and Holden in Haslingden township, Oakenheadwood in Haslingden chapelry and Boothfold in Newchurch chapelry. In 1786, Ewood Bridge mill was converted to calico printing, whilst by 1798 Holden Mill possessed an engine house for textile manufacture.\(^{(4)}\) By 1800 Boothfold mill

---

\(^{(1)}\) Aitken, op cit, p 246

\(^{(2)}\) ibid, p 277


\(^{(4)}\) J.Graham, *History of Printworks in Manchester and District*, 1760-1846, 1846, p 376

\(^{WAG/PR/865}\)
may have been converted to carding and fulling.\(^{(1)}\) Thus, by the end of the century, the system of corn mills in Rossendale was largely in decay. Yet it must be acknowledged that this change of function does not only reflect the decline of grain production in the locality, it equally reflects the growing demand of the local textile industry for mill sites.

Despite this possibility it is not surprising that in 1800 the incumbent of Haslingden Church reported to the Home Office that the town was:

"almost wholly dependent upon Yorkshire and Cheshire for meal, flour and potatoes.\(^{(2)}\)

In contrast, the pastoral sector, particularly dairying retained its importance. This was not true of meat, which as already noted was largely imported by the 1790's. By this time and possibly much earlier the east Lancashire market was being supplied by the Scottish droving trade.\(^{(3)}\) This discrepancy probably reflects the perishability of dairy products which meant despite improved communications, local dairy producers retained a monopoly of their rapidly growing market. The switch from arable to pasture as a whole was also encouraged by the expansion of hand loom weaving which placed a premium on time and the rise of factories which removed child and female labour from local farms. Together, these would increase the attractiveness of the less labour intensive pastoral sector.

---

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/Badgery Yorkshire MSS/174/2

\(^{(2)}\) PRO/HO/42/55

\(^{(3)}\) Bonser, The Drovers, p 135–6, 166
Within the pastoral sector the continued dominance of cattle and sheep was clearly indicated in the return from a livestock census of Blackburn Hundred of 1810:

**Livestock Population of Blackburn Hundred 1810**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock Type</th>
<th>Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>15,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Cattle and Colts</td>
<td>8,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep and Goats</td>
<td>18,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>2,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Horses</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught Horses</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rise in the number of horses probably reflects the replacement of oxen as draught animals on local farms, and the expansion of the general local economy which increased the need for horses outside the traditional agricultural structure.

The declining size of local farms and the growing attraction of textiles probably combined to give a reduction in the average number of livestock per farm. Limited supporting evidence is available for this. In 1789, the shippon of a farm near Bacup had space for only two cows. (2) During the 1790's Henry Riley and his father kept five cows on their farm in Higher Booths township, whilst in 1799, James Ashworth of the same township kept only one cow. (3)

Though much diminished, the local arable sector did not totally disappear. In 1795 an agreement relating to a farm in Haslingden

(1) J. Britton and E.W. Brayley, *Topographical and Historical Description of Lancashire*, 1810, p 48
(2) LRO/CCR/1789/30
(3) LRO/PR/2859/14
township noted that:

"Mr Turner to have the Corn growing in the Parrak at £3 15s
Daniel Gregory to have the potatoes at Getting up time" (1)

In addition, a number of local lease agreements made conscious attempts to regulate local arable activity which suggests that arable production was still at least a potential activity on local farms, some refer specifically to ploughed land in the terms of the lease. (2)

(1) LRD/DDX/115/164/5
(2) LRD/CCR/1795/22 and 23
SECTION C - AGRICULTURAL METHODS

The nature of local agricultural practice was a common subject or criticism amongst progressive agricultural writers by the end of the eighteenth century. Probably the most precise of these was John Holt in 1795.

Holt was critical of local farming in several specific spheres. One area concerned livestock, local sheep were described as "half starved creatures" whilst he claimed that the quality of local cattle had deteriorated since mid century. Arable methods came under criticism, oats being said to be grown together for years on end, the repetition being only occasionally broken by a crop of potatoes or wheat. Criticism was also made of the lack of investment in both drainage and watering systems. Writing slightly later, Dickson concurred with many of Holt's criticism.

Despite these wide ranging attacks which were generally extended to north east Lancashire as a whole, some signs of attentiveness were present. Even Holt acknowledges that some farmers in this general area were experimenting with bone dust, linseed oil and lime mixed with mould as new forms of fertilizer. One such man was Richard Townley of Bellfield near Rochdale, a member of a wealthy family with land in Dunnockshaw who was corresponding with Arthur Young in 1784 on improved agricultural methods.

Some landowners resident within Rossendale showed a positive

(1) Holt, op cit, p 51, 4140, 143 and 166
(2) Dickson, op cit, p 265, 295, 451 and 574
(3) Holt, op cit, p 129
Letter from Richard Townley to Arthur Young
interest in the farming methods adopted by their tenants. In 1786
John Hargreaves of Rawtenstall leased a farm in the neighbouring
manor of Tottington for fifteen years. Under the lease agreement,
the tenant was obliged to maintain the property in good repair, re­
stricted in the areas he was allowed to plough especially in the final
years of the lease and was obliged to put specified types and quan­
tities of fertilizer on the land in each year of the lease.¹ When
Springwood farm, Haslingden was leased in 1789 the tenant was obliged
to maintain the property in good repair and was forbidden to plough
any of the meadow land.² As before 1780 many took steps to ensure
adequate supplies of fertilizer for their land. In the early 1780's
the trustee of a Haslingden estate negotiated the purchase of one
hundred and ninety eight loads of lime for the estate, presumably
for fertilizer.³ By the end of the period, Rossendale could sup­
port at least two resident specialist lime carriers, one in Hasling­
den township and the other in Haslingden chapelry.⁴ Though some
of the lime may have been used in building, much must have gone into
agriculture. Landowners also continued to take advantage of local
urbanisation. When selling land for the building of a house on the
Haslingden to Rawtenstall road in 1795, the land owner retained the
right to the dung and ashes that would come from the house.⁵ By
the turn of the century, attempts were being made on some estates to
drain the land and provide walled fields.⁶

(1) LRO/DDX/187/25
(2) LRO/CCR/1789/1
(3) RAL/Rc921/3/11
(4) LRO/DDX/28/249/Affadavits at Clitheroe
(5) LRO/CCR/1795/27
(6) E.Lovat, Sketch of the Improvements on Sundry Farms 1804-1814

In consequence, though the state of local agricultural practice undoubtedly left much to be desired, some local landowners did have a positive approach to ensure reasonable if not progressive farming techniques. This general failure of local farming is clearly associated with the expansion of textiles and population in Rossendale. The growth of textiles and population increased the size of the local dairy market at a time when still relatively poor transport gave local growers a new monopoly of that market. The growth of textiles meant that farming increasingly played a subservient role in the income of many farming families which in turn may have encouraged the relative neglect of the land. The presence of relatively short leases and rising rents may have intensified this by reducing the incentive to undertake long term capital improvement in such things as drainage. Finally, the textile expansion probably attracted men and initiative away from farming where the potential was limited to industry where the potential was much greater.

Not all criticism should lie at the door of the tenant, as the leases noted earlier suggest the landowner had considerable potential power over agricultural methods and such tenancies covered the bulk of local agriculture. The failure of many landowners to rise to this challenge is probably also a reflection of textile and demographic expansion. The potential of textiles would have attracted enterprise and capital away from the land.\(^{(1)}\) The textile and demographic growth which pushed up rents provided land owners with a growing source of income without any need for initiative or capital investment.

\(^{(1)}\) Many landowners invested in mill building for lease to local manufacturers, this would attract capital away from the land. See Chapter XXIII, Section F
Thus on both sides, the textile and population growth probably encouraged complacency and a loss of capital and enterprise in local agriculture.
In the years after 1780 the two focal extractive industries of coal mining and stone quarrying were of growing importance. Though such activities had long been found in Rossendale and indeed had probably experienced some growth prior to 1780, this growth continued on a substantial scale after that date. Thus, in 1794, the area around Haslingden was described as possessing "many valuable mines of coal and quarries of stone, slate and flags." (1)

Soon after 1800, local builders acknowledged that this expansion was a product of the increase in local population creating a demand for stone for housing and industrial expansion creating a demand for stone for mill and warehouse construction. (2) Of these the former was almost certainly of the greater quantitative importance as early local mills were small often using converted as opposed to purpose built premises. (3)

Another potentially important use for local stone came via the construction of the local turnpike network. The Act of Parliament of 1789 which established the Bury, Haslingden, Whalley, Blackburn and the Haslingden, Bacup, Todmorden turnpikes authorised the surveyors of the road to take sand and gravel from local townships as and when needed. (4) The turnpike operators soon extended this to the taking of stone. In the 1795 the Bury to Haslingden stretch of road was described by Aitken as being "made with a coarse stone between flag and freestone". This description matches local stone

---

(1) Journal of the House of Commons, January 24th 1794
(2) LRQ/DDX/118/130/6
(3) See Chapter XXIII Section F
(4) HRL Local Collection No 681, p 24
resources. Aitken also noted that the Blackburn, Haslingden, Halifax turnpike was "kept in excellent condition, from the goodness of the materials everywhere at hand."(1)

In addition, local stone continued to be used on local farms for such things as dry stone walling. Indeed, the subdivision of local holdings and improvements via walling on some local farms may have meant this was a considerable source of demand.(2)

The absence of efficient local means of bulk transport probably meant that the potential market for local stone outside the area continued largely untapped.

Local quarries were probably small undertakings in 1780. In 1789, the quarry at Horncliffe including the ground covered with rubble consisted of a mere ten perches.(3) Those in the township of Haslingden in 1798 were rather larger. One example was the quarry at Hartley House consisting of a one acre and thirty four perches.(4)

Small quarries were now being forced into deeper workings, in 1796 a man was killed in a quarry at Haslingden due to a fall of earth, which suggests considerable excavation had taken place.(5)

The continued emphasis on a large number of small quarries is not surprising given the contemporary pressures facing the industry. The limitations of transport made it important to have a local source of stone close to the point of demand. The buoyancy of the domestic textile sector meant that this demand was not totally concentrated.

(1) Aitken, op cit, p 269 and 277
(2) Dickson, op cit, p 223
(3) LRD/DDX/118/115
(4) LRD/PR/865
(5) Blackburn Mail, November 6th 1796
in the towns and villages. The simple manual techniques used in mining meant that the industry was not capital intensive and therefore was open to small scale producers. Farmers probably also retained their old quarries to provide their immediate needs. This rapid growth in commercial demand for stone under manorial regulations designed to meet the subsistence needs of local farmers inevitably caused conflicts over quarrying rights. Such conflicts occurred as early as the mid eighteenth century and do not appear to have been solved prior to 1795 as even in the 1820's serious disputes still occurred. (1)

Unlike commercial quarrying which appears to have been concentrated in Haslingden township, commercial coal mining was concentrated in the central and eastern parts of Rossendale.

There was also an undoubted increase in the demand for coal from a number of sources. Until 1780 both turf and coal were used as sources of fuel in local homes. In the early 1780's both were still in use. During 1783 Haslingden township overseers had eight deliveries of coal valued at £1 3s 1d but only two of turf valued at only 10s 6d. From this date, turf deliveries ceased whilst coal deliveries amounted to £12 19s 4d down to 1786, when the account ceases. (2) Though possibly not typical this does suggest that coal was becoming the dominant form of fuel. This was only to be expected for the area of common and waste from which the turf was obtained was in steady decline. Thus the onus of supplying fuel for the growing local consumer market must have largely fallen on coal. The textile

(1) LRO/DDX/118/130/6
(2) LRO/MBH/5/1
industry also had a demand for coal but surprisingly most of this demand probably came from the domestic sector where coal fires were used for such purposes as warp dressing. In the mill sector, demand was nil, as there is no evidence of steam mills prior to 1795. Mills were waterpowered and candle lit. Thus the demand for coal was largely of a consumer rather than a producer form.

Despite the growth in demand, coal mining like stone quarrying was done on the basis of small units. In 1784 a mine at Hogshead on the Rossendale/Rochdale border was leased for forty two years at a mere £12 per annum plus a levy of 8d for every forty baskets of coal produced. In 1788 two small mines were operating on the hills east of Bacup and one near Goodshaw. As late as 1820 the seven coal mines of Brandwood only employed twenty one men. There is no reason to believe that any other local mines were significantly larger as mining technology remained very simple.

Such small units as in quarrying reflect the geographically scattered nature of settlement and thus demand as well as the problem of bulk transport on local roads. Contemporaries were probably aware of this transport problem, both local turnpikes started in 1789 specified that coal wagons were only to pay half tolls.

---

(1) See Chapter XXIII, Section D
(2) Rochdale RL/DB/12
(3) LRD/Yates Map of Lancashire 1788
(4) Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 226
(5) Blackburn Mail, July 22nd 1795
(6) HPL/Local Collection No 681, p 14
SECTION E - CONCLUSIONS

Agriculture though of declining significance in the total economy was not static during these years, changes occurred in many of its facets.

By this period owner/occupation was rare, most farms were worked on the basis of tenancies. Farm sizes fell substantially whilst simultaneously farm rents rose especially near the urban centres. In contrast, the length of leases probably remained generally stable down to the mid 1790’s when a marked decline set in.

Within the structure of farming itself the livestock sector probably increased its already dominant role due to the expansion of the local market, the loss of local arable monopoly associated with transport improvements in the nation as a whole and because livestock farming was less labour intensive than arable farming. As in the early eighteenth century cattle dominated the livestock structure. The importance of dairying growing from the early part of the century continued to increase as it was here that the local industry had its greatest comparative advantage.

Farming methods and facilities were judged harshly by contemporaries. Though this was not always justified it does appear valid in many cases. This general weakness undoubtedly reflects the impact of local economic and social trends on both the landowner and tenant. Complacency amongst the landowners was aided by the high demand for small farms which provided a rising income without the need for investment, and the possibility of high returns from the development of mill facilities which would have attracted capital. Complacency amongst tenants was encouraged by the presence of a virtually guaranteed dairy market, expanding textile employment and relatively short
leases at a time of rising rents. In addition, the growth of textiles
would attract men of enterprise away from agriculture.

In contrast with agriculture, the two major extractive industries, coal and stone, experienced growth. Both benefitted predomi-
nently from an expanding local population which in the case of coal
was further boosted by the expansion of domestic industry, whilst stone
benefitted from road turnpiking and agricultural changes. Though coal
mining was concentrated in the east and stone quarrying in the west of
the area both continued to meet this growing demand on the basis of
small reproduction units. In both cases, this reflects the scattered
nature of local demand, the problems of transport for high bulk/low
value goods even with turnpikes, the limited capital need and the
traditional right of local farmers extracting such resources from
their own area.
SECTION A - TYPES OF CLOTH PRODUCED

In 1780 the position of textiles especially woollen was crucial in the local economy. Within the woollen sector mixed woollen/worsted bays and pure worsted such as flannel dominated output. Further confirmation of the dominance of woollen comes in Bailey's British Directory of 1784 in which all listed Rossendale textile producers were engaged in the woollen trade. (1)

However, the seeds of radical change in this picture had already been sown by 1780. In the late 1770's cotton and fustian manufacture re-entered Rossendale. (2) Unlike earlier periods the cotton trade in particular now made rapid progress. By 1795 Aitken noted of Haslingden that the introduction of the cotton trade helped to explain the rapid growth of the town over the previous twenty years. (3) Even so, he suggests that cotton was still of secondary importance to the woollen trade. Though the cotton trade was also present in central and eastern Rossendale from the 1780's its success was more limited according to Newbigging. (4)

---

(1) Bailey's British Directory, op cit, p 539, 676-7 - a total of thirty four names engaged in woollen manufacture are given.

(2) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 217

(3) Aitken, op cit, p 276-7

(4) Newbigging, op cit, p 219
The essentially impressionistic nature of the comments of Aitken and Newbigging means a need for more quantifiable data. Though outside the period under review, the chapelry registers of the early nineteenth century can be of value here. Haslingden chapelry registers differentiate between cotton and woollen workers for the final two months of 1812. In this period all textile entries are so differentiated. Of the twenty four textile entries thirteen were attached to the cotton trade and eleven to woollen.\(^1\) Newchurch chapel register provides cotton/woollen differentiation throughout 1813. Of the fifty one textile entries, forty two were associated with woollen, two with cotton, with the remaining seven of uncertain affiliation.\(^2\) Though limited in size these two samples confirm the more impressionistic views of Aitken and Newbigging that in the late eighteenth century cotton made rapid headway in the west of Rossendale but not in the east.

Attention must now be turned to whether the penetration of cotton in western Rossendale meant a relative or absolute decline in the importance of woollen. The comment of Aitken in 1795 suggests that the decline was relative rather than absolute.

Between 1780 and 1812 woollen employment fell from around one hundred per cent to around fifty per cent of all textile employment in Haslingden and Goodshaw chapelries. In addition, total textile employment fell from around seventy to fifty five per cent of all adult male employment. Taken together, employment in woollen textiles probably fell from around seventy to only twenty per cent of all adult male employment between the two dates.\(^3\) Against these downward

---

\(^1\) LAD/DRB/2/254
\(^2\) LAD/DRB/2/274
\(^3\) See Chapter XX
pressures were other factors. Between 1780 and 1800 the population of western Rossendale grew by nearly five thousand. Assuming adult males as a roughly stable proportion of this population, it would suggest that the woollen labour force was roughly stable at around two thousand. Given the increased labour productivity in several sectors the per capita efficiency of labour probably grew over the same period. Taken together these two factors may have been sufficient to ensure that woollen output continued to grow despite the penetration of cotton. This would certainly be so for eastern Rossendale.

In 1780 the woollen output of Rossendale consisted largely of bays and flannels. This continued to be so down to 1795. However, within this general situation some internal specialisation was observable by the latter date. Aitken noted that the Haslingden area was specialising in flannel production, whereas Rochdale and eastern Rossendale produced a wide range of cloth, particularly bays, flannel, kersey and coatings.\(^1\)

Newbigging took this one stage further, claiming that eastern Rossendale specialised in bays and the related products of booking, super booking and mocks.\(^2\) Only the largest local firms such as Turner Brothers engaged in the production of both types of cloth.\(^3\)

The local cotton trade was at least partially engaged in the production of fine calico. This is indicated both by the presence of mule spinning capacity and the putting out activity of such firms as the Peels.\(^4\) All parts of Rossendale were engaged in the production

\(^{\text{(1)}}\) Aitken, op cit, p 248 and 277

\(^{\text{(2)}}\) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale
The Haslingden bias on flannel and that of Bacup on bays was further confirmed in 1824 - Baines, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of Lancaster, Vol I, p 646-49
Vol II, p 638-43


\(^{\text{(4)}}\) See Chapter XXIII Sections C and D.
of this cloth, though clearly the scale of production was greatest around Haslingden. (1)

(1) Dickson, op cit, p 625
Bythell, op cit, p 51
Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 219
SECTION B – THE EMERGENCE OF THE MILL SYSTEM

As this was the classical period for the emergence of the factory system, some attention must be given to the timing, nature and extent of the emergence of mills within Rossendale.

Rossendale was relatively late in developing a mill sector. As late as 1780 mills had made virtually no progress here, but from the early 1780's progress was rapid. Writing in 1795 Aitken noted that mills had been erected for both the cotton and woollen trade in Haslingden.\(^{(1)}\) By 1798 the township alone contained thirteen distinct and separate mills plus a print works.\(^{(2)}\) Neighbouring Musbury township had three mills as early as 1793.\(^{(3)}\) Mills were also developed in the other townships of Rossendale.

Prior to 1780 the only processes to have had mill organisation were the traditional finishing processes of fulling and dyeing. Such mills remained after 1780 and probably increased in number. By 1795 additional fulling mills had certainly been developed at Rushbed Higher Booths and Edgeside Wolfendenbooth.\(^{(4)}\) Some local manufacturers operated such mills outside Rossendale. In 1788 Sale Brothers of Haslingden had their own fulling mill at Whalley, whilst in 1793 another Haslingden manufacturer operated such a mill in Bury parish.\(^{(5)}\)

---

\(^{(1)}\) Aitken, op cit, p 276-7

\(^{(2)}\) LRQ/PR/865

\(^{(3)}\) LRQ/DDX/118/166/1

\(^{(4)}\) LRQ/CCR/1795/22 and 23

\(^{(5)}\) Sun Fire Records MSS Vol 355/551899
Sun Fire Records County Series MSS, Vol 1/648063

I am grateful to Dr S.J. Chapman for the above and for subsequent references to insurance valuations other than that relating to Turner Brothers.
This probably reflects the location of their hand loom weavers rather than growing pressure on the available water resources of Rossendale.

Competition for sites certainly came as the new cotton trade established its own finishing facilities. Cotton finishing firms often took over and converted existing facilities not merely because they had good water power sources but also because they probably had the best supplies of pure water. The first such mill to be converted was Ewood Bridge corn mill taken over for calico printing in 1786.(1) In 1790 what was to become the Loveclough Printing Company established its first works in Higher Booths.(2)

In contrast the carding and roving mills developed after 1780 required water power only. Such mills were developed in both the cotton and woollen trades. By the mid 1790's woollen carding mills were present at Rising Bridge, Higher Booths and Helmshore, Haslingden.(3) At least two similar mills were also operating in Newchurch township.(4)

There is no evidence that any local mills undertook woollen or worsted spinning prior to 1795. The first local worsted spinning mills were not built until 1798 when Hareholme and Laund mills both in Lower Booths were constructed. Until then the local industry had to rely on outsiders for mill produced yarn.(5) In contrast numerous spinning mills were developed in the cotton trade which often also covered the carding and roving processes. Paghouse mill, Haslingden, was operated

(1) Graham, op cit, p 376
    Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 10

(2) G. Turnbull and J.G. Turnbull, A History of the Calico Printing Industry of Britain, 1951, p 420

(3) Blackburn Mail, December 22nd 1796
    Aspin, The Turners of Helshore and Higher Mill, p 3

(4) Wheeler's Manchester Chronicle, October 3rd 1795
    LAC/CCR/1795/24

(5) LAC/CCR/1795/46
on such a basis whilst seven cotton mills in Bacup covered carding and spinning.\(^{(1)}\) The mill spinning of cotton was restricted to the warp, the domestic sector continued to provide the weft. \(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/PR/865
H. Stephenson, *Old Haslingden*, in Haslingden Borough Year Book 1903, np
Blackburn Mail, May 31st 1797
Newbigging, *History of the Forest of Rossendale*, p 217-8

\(^{(2)}\) Aitken, op cit, p 269 and 276-7
SECTION C - THE ORGANISATION OF PRODUCTION

Prior to 1780 both the putting out and handicraft forms of domestic organisation existed side by side in Rossendale, that is to say some manufacturers operated on the traditional independent weaver basis whilst others put out work to paid employees.

Though some of the larger manufacturers were resident within Rossendale, most were based in neighbouring towns, particularly Rochdale. The role of Rochdale men continued to be of major importance down to 1795. In 1782 Robert Leach a Rochdale manufacturer bought a piece of land in Haslingden on which he built a warehouse which he occupied down to the turn of the century. This warehouse almost certainly acted as his 'putting out' and 'taking in' centre for western Rossendale. In the same period, the Walmsley's, perhaps the leading Rochdale manufacturing family of the period were putting out work to the inmates of Haslingden workhouse. Rochdale men were prominent amongst the shareholders of the Haslingden to Todmorden turnpike with its link to Rochdale when the turnpike was established in 1789. This tends to confirm the continued widespread link between large Rochdale manufacturers and the Rossendale industry, as Rossendale cannot be seen as a route for transporting finished cloth from Rochdale to the final market.

Non resident putting out manufacturers were also active in the new cotton trade. However, in this case, the large manufacturers were not surprisingly based in the traditional cotton centres to the south and west of Rossendale. In 1792, the Cockshutts, a leading putting

(1) LRO/DDX/118/131/1-3
(2) LRO/MBH/5/1
out family in Bolton had an interest in a mill on the south western edge of Rossendale. (1) In 1796, they leased a substantial loomshop in the same area, thus increasing their local commitment. (2) The firm of Peel, Yates and Co of Bury may have also had an involvement. Certainly by 1803 they were operating a 'putting out' and 'taking in' warehouse in Haslingden. (3) In the case of cotton, the influence of these non resident manufacturers was concentrated if not exclusively restricted to western Rossendale and it was here that the cotton trade made greatest progress prior to 1793.

Despite the importance of non resident manufacturers in both major textile sectors, contemporary writers indicate that the role of resident manufacturers had greatly increased. In 1790 Aitken noted that in contrast to the predominance of Rochdale men in the 1750's "now the trade is supported by capitals acquired on the spot by the industry and enterprising spirit of the manufacturers." (4) The most dramatic example of this change were Turner brothers who began production at Helmshore in 1789. By 1795 the firm was already substantial in size and soon after the turn of the century was employing two thousand weavers. (5)

---


(2) LRG/DD/Bd/29/5


(4) Aitken, op cit, p 276-7


PR/1812/Vol III Minutes of Evidence on Petitions relating to the Orders in Council, p 209-10
Turner brothers were an exception as they combined mill carding and finishing with domestic spinning and weaving.\(^{(1)}\) Prior to 1795 there is no evidence of any other local mill operator employing domestic labour on a significant scale. As late as 1800 many local woollen manufacturers, including Peter Heyworth and Sons of Bacup, said to be the largest such firm in eastern Rossendale were buying in yarn from outside the firm. Newbigging suggests that it was common practice for local manufacturers to buy wool in its raw state and put it out the domestic employees for all the production processes other than carding.\(^{(2)}\)

The carding process was undertaken by independent specialists probably on a contract basis for manufacturers. Thus a Mr Warburton of Ballanden Brook mill was described as having "carded woollen for country people".\(^{(3)}\) This probably reflects the fact that most local manufacturers other than Turner brothers were still too small to justify their own carding facilities and/or were reluctant to enter new areas of production technology and organisation, wishing to concentrate their expansion within the traditional domestic sector.

\(^{(1)}\) Sun Fire Records/Country Series/Vol 32/703/32
\(^{(2)}\) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 211
\(^{(3)}\) Elliot, op cit, p 29
SECTION D - PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGY

In 1780, the technology in all branches of local textile manufacturing other than the finishing trades was based on simple manually powered wooden machinery. The final part of the eighteenth century is classically associated with the replacement of this traditional technology by new artificially powered machinery. Such change certainly did occur to some degree in Rossendale. Attention here will focus on the general process and nature of this change rather than on the technical features of the new technology which can be gleaned from a number of secondary sources.

The manufacture of textiles can be divided into four basic processes. Initially, the raw material must be prepared by carding and roving or in the case of worsted by combing. This is followed by spinning and in the case of warp thread by warping. The yarn is then woven before undergoing the final stage known collectively as finishing. This finishing stage includes dyeing, printing and stretching. In the case of woollen, the cloth is also fulled whilst in the case of cotton and fustian the cloth is bleached.

In 1780 carding was still done by hand, but as has already been observed carding mills were spreading rapidly by 1795. Carding engines had been developed prior to 1780 by such names as Hargreaves and Arkwright.\(^1\) By 1780 their use had spread to the very edge of Rossendale. In 1779 carding engines were attacked and destroyed at Peel's Altham mill just to the north of Henheads township.\(^2\) During the early 1780s they entered Rossendale proper in both the woollen

\(^1\) C. Aspin and S.D. Chapman, *James Hargreaves and the Spinning Jenny*, 1964, p 11-12
\(^2\) R.A. Buchanan, *Industrial Archaeology in Britain*, 1972, p 127

Aspin and Chapman, op cit, p 49
and cotton trades. During 1784 a mill site north of Haslingden was advertised as possessing sufficient power for either cotton or woollen carding engines. Combing provided a contrast with this. There is no evidence of any mill combing prior to 1795. Indeed the two major worsted spinning mills built in the late 1790's continued to rely on domestic combing even in the 1820's.

Roving and spinning were two essentially similar processes. The roving process converted carded fibres into twist ready for more finely based process of spinning into yarn. The roving frame dates from the 1770's. In the early 1780's the frame was technologically superceded by the roving or stubbing billy which combined the principles of the jenny and the mule to permit the production of higher quality rovings. Despite this Rossendale was restricted to using the frame. Local mills such as Flaxmoss and Paghouse near Haslingden were totally dependent on such frames in the mid 1790's. The earliest known case of the local use of the stubbing billy was at Slidings Mill in 1806.

In the spinning sector the key question concerns the relative progress of the three basic systems of Hargreaves, Arkwright and Crompton.

The number of cases in the mill sector where the technology is known is too small to permit any precise quantification, this only a general approximation can be established. The Colquhoun list of Arkwright type mills in 1788 indicates that no mills of that type

(1) Manchester Mercury, October 21st 1784
(2) RPL/Hareholme Mill Accounts: William Bradshaw's Combers Accounts May 1821-May 1822
Manchester Guardian, August 5th 1826
(3) Baines, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of Lancaster, p 116
(4) Aspin and Chapman, op cit, p 49
(5) LRO/DDX/118/8
were then present in Rossendale.\(^1\) In the mid 1790's Flash Mill, Haslingden was totally reliant on mule spindles.\(^2\) Yet by this later date nearby Paghouse mill was operating two water frames alongside twelve mules.\(^3\) The waterside location of local mills and the absence of any reference to jennies amongst the equipment of local mills indicates that the mule and water frame were the predominant forms of spinning technology. Of these two, the mule was probably of greatest prominence.

In the domestic spinning sector, the technology was totally different. Though the jenny was originally developed in the 1760's, there is no sign of its local application prior to 1780. There is no evidence that the jenny riots of 1779 which affected the areas to the north and west of Rossendale, had any effect on Rossendale itself.\(^4\) Soon after 1780 this position began to change. By 1791 William Cockerill of Haslingden was describing himself as a jenny maker which suggests that the use of jennies was quite widespread.\(^5\) Moses Heap, a local weaver in the early nineteenth century argued that the domestic jenny remained in widespread use until the 1830's.\(^6\)

On closer examination the spread of the jenny appears to have been restricted to the local cotton trade where it produced weft to

\(^{(1)}\) Colquhoun MSS - copy in possession of Dr S D Chapman.
\(^{(2)}\) Blackburn Mail, June 15th 1796
\(^{(3)}\) Blackburn Mail, May 31st 1797
\(^{(4)}\) Liverpool Public Library/Mayer Collection/Wedgwood letter to Thomas Bentley, October 3rd 1779
> Aspin and Chapman, op cit, p 49
\(^{(5)}\) T. Woodcock, William Cockerill and his Family, 1927, p 13
\(^{(6)}\) Moses Heap: An Old Man's Diary, Rossendale Free Press, July 12th 1941
complement the mule and water frame warp.\(^1\) In the woollen trade, the success of the jenny was long delayed. The early jennies of the 1760's were too small for use in the woollen trade. Machine spun woollen weft was rough and hairy and thus was more difficult to weave than hand produced weft, therefore when the jenny was used, it was in its small manually powered domestic form. Larger jennies for woollen in the form of the jack or billy only came into common use from the turn of the century.\(^2\)

Following spinning and warping, both the cotton and woollen warp had to be sized. Sizing was done domestically by a similar process in both branches of the textile trade.\(^3\) From this point, the process differed between them. Woollen warps were sized in the open air:

"Standing upon the slope of one of the hills, the spectator would have seen stretching along the edges of the highways and lanes, and skirting the fields on every side, long wavy wreaths varying in shade from hodden grey to almost snowy white. . . . These were the warps which the weavers had stretched out to dry after sizing; the yarn being made to rest on wooden stakes about four feet in length, each inserted in the crevices of the fence walls in a horizontal position, and supported at the other end by upright stakes or stainers as they were called".\(^4\)

---


\(^2\) Aspin and Chapman, op cit, p 44

\(^3\) Newbigging, *History of the Forest of Rossendale*, p 218 - gives a detailed description of the sizing process.

\(^4\) ibid p 210-211
In the cotton trade the process was done much more quickly on an indoor basis in which the warp was:

"stretched on a machined called a "Deeting frame", and a bar of iron which had been made red hot moved backwards and forwards over its surface. This rod or bar was named the "Deeting iron" and it required a dexterous and steady hand to use it so as to dry the warps quickly without injuring the yarn." (1)

The weaving process remained dominated by the hand loom from well before this period and for a further thirty years beyond it. Yet this does not mean that loom technology remained unchanged. At the end of the eighteenth century the loom was improved by the application of a false reed or slay. (2) In the mid 1790's William Cockerill the Haslingden jennymaker, experimented unsuccessfully to introduce the power loom to Rossendale. (3) This failure was probably attributable to a mixture of commercial conditions, technical problems and social hostility that hindered similar attempts in other parts of Lancashire. (4)

The printing trade was a new activity in Rossendale associated with the new cotton trade. Though cylinder printing was developed in the early 1780's there is no evidence of its adoption prior to 1795. (5) Indeed even a large new print works built at Sunnyside in

---

(1) ibid p 217
The reference to grey and white warps in both trades suggests that some but not all wares may have been bleached prior to spinning.

(2) J. James, History of the Worsted Manufacture in England, 1857 p 355-6
Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 13

(3) Anon, The Cockerills of Haslingden, 1925, np

(4) Bythell, op cit, p 76-82

(5) Turnbull and Turnbull, op cit, p 50-67
Higher Booths in 1804 was equipped for hand block printing only.\(^1\) The failure to adopt machine printing probably reflects three major factors. In its early days machine printing had considerable technical limitations, it involved heavy capital expenditure beyond that involved in other factory processes and it met with considerable labour hostility.\(^2\)

Similarly, little fundamental technological change occurred in the much longer established fulling and dyeing trades. This is indicated by the contents of two local fulling mills at the turn of the century.\(^3\) The contents of these mills was totally consistent to those of similar establishments prior to 1780. However such descriptive similarities do not rule out possible changes within existing technologies.

The adoption of new technology by much of the Rossendale industry was undoubtedly delayed by the skilled manpower necessary to maintain such technology, unless it was of a small wooden type. This area had no tradition of metal working which therefore had to be built up from scratch or imported from outside the area. This problem remained acute into the early nineteenth century, as the Whitehead Brothers were to find out in the early days of their firm.\(^3\)

The adoption of new factory based production technology involved the adoption of new artificial sources of power. Indeed, it was the abundance of local running water supplies that encouraged the expansion

\(^{(1)}\) Blackburn Mail, November 28th 1804

\(^{(2)}\) Turnbull and Turnbull, op cit, p 85 and 104 Graham, op cit, p 357 and 420

\(^{(3)}\) LRJ3/CCR/1799/51
Manchester Mercury, May 4th 1802

\(^{(4)}\) Elliot, op cit, p27
of both local textiles in this period. These water resources were undoubtedly the major determinant of mill location within Rossendale prior to 1795.

The power potential of the Rossendale area had been only marginally tapped by the development of fulling and dyeing facilities before 1780. Thus once the economic and technical climate became suitable, the exploitation of this potential went ahead rapidly.

The importance of local water supplies was demonstrated in newspaper advertisements from the beginning of this period. In 1784, land was auctioned at Haydocks, near Haslingden with the special recommendation that:

"a stream of water runs through the Premises, with sufficient fall to run a number of Carding Engines or other Machines used in the manufacturing Cottons, woollens, etc."\(^{(1)}\)

An advertisement of 1796 for Flash Mill, Haslingden was even more explicit about the importance of local water power resources:

"The above Factory is exceedingly well calculated either for the Woollen or Cotton Business, possessing superior advantages to most other Situations, owing to a plentiful supply of Water."\(^{(2)}\)

In 1795 the dominance of water power was probably total. The 1798 survey of Haslingden township probably provides a comprehensive list of all mills in the township at the time. All the mills so listed show evidence of water power via reference to wheels, sluices or lodges.\(^{(3)}\) The position is central and eastern Rossendale is more

\(^{(1)}\) Manchester Mercury, October 21st 1784

\(^{(2)}\) Blackburn Mail June 15th 1796

\(^{(3)}\) LAO/PR/865

See Table No IV
difficult to ascertain. Virtually all the known mills in these areas had a location on or near local streams consistent with the use of water power.

No Boulton and Watt engine appears to have operated in the area prior to 1800. However, the significance of this should not be overdone as their engines were generally restricted to larger firms and in total probably accounted for no more than one third of the steam engines operating in Lancashire in this period.

Owen Ashmore suggests that two mills may have had steam power before 1800, Cloughfold mill, Haslingden and Balladen mill near Rawtenstall. Both must be open to doubt. Haslingden has no area or mill called Cloughfold, the nearest alternative was Clough End mill. According to the township survey of 1798 this had a fall of water and twenty two perches of lodge, which clearly suggests water power. The evidence for Balladen mill suggests it was still water powered in the 1810's.

Though there is no evidence for the use of steam power, it is possible that it was used as a supplement to water power as it was in other parts of Lancashire.

The predominance of water power is not surprising given the abundant water power potential and bulk transport problems of the area for coal. This water power potential was stressed when Ewood Bridge print works was leased in 1802:

---

(3) Ashmore, The Industrial Archaeology of Lancashire, p 52
(4) L.R.O./PR/865/No 208
(5) Elliot, op cit, p 27
(6) Musson and Robinson, op cit, p 426
"an advantageous situation for a cotton spinner, who may avoid the heavy expenses of purchasing and maintaining a steam engine, and providing coal at its present enormous price by working his machines by means of this powerful river." (1)

(1) Manchester Mercury, August 10th 1802
SECTION E - THE LABOUR FORCE

In Chapter XX it was indicated that textiles remained the dominant occupational category in Rossendale. Given the rapidity of population growth the absolute size of this labour force was probably growing rapidly. Within textiles some re-allocation of labour from woollen to cotton occurred, especially around Haslingden, but despite this the absolute size of the woollen labour force continued to grow.

The period after 1780 also saw fundamental change in the functional structure of the labour force. The growth of factory based carding and cotton spinning with its high level of productivity probably released labour, especially female labour which could be absorbed by the expanding weaving sector. The importance of this switch was acknowledged by a Rossendale woollen manufacturer:

"cotton weaving . . . very soon after (the introduction of power cotton spinning) amongst the labouring classes . . . became a substitute . . . for carding as (well as) spinning; the loom was the general resource for employment and continues so."(1)

The expansion of this domestic hand loom labour force continued until beyond 1795.(2)

Attention must now be turned to the sources of this additional labour. Bythell suggests that domestic cotton weaving in north east Lancashire obtained additional labour from natural population growth, former fustian weavers, former farmers and other non textile workers, former domestic spinners and carders, former linen and woollen weavers,

(1) Anon, Observations on the Use of Power Looms, 1823
(2) S. D. Chapman, The Cotton Industry in the Industrial Revolution, 1972, p 60
Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 219
Tupling, An Economic History of Rossendale, p 210-211
migrants and the spread of textiles to new areas. These can provide a basis for a study of the problem in Rossendale. Several of the suggestions can be immediately excluded. Fustian and linen weaving had never been usual here and thus was of minor potential importance. Textiles had already penetrated throughout the area by 1780, thus minimising the potential scope of this factor. As concern is with both woollen and cotton, the role of woollen weavers is not applicable.

Of greater significance was the attraction of non textile labour. The main local alternatives to textiles in 1780 were agriculture and trades and crafts. With the continued growth of the area after 1780 the scope for attracting labour from trades and crafts would have been modest. In agriculture textiles was already generally present via dual employment. Within dual employment, the switch of emphasis is difficult to observe. However, there is evidence that many farmer/weavers were becoming full time weavers.

John Hargreaves born on a farm at Higher Booths in 1755 remained resident there until 1772 when he became a cottage hand loom weaver until after 1795. James Riley born in the late 1760's resident on a farm at Higher Booths until setting up as a cottage weaver in the mid 1790's. Pauper examinations of the 1820's reveal that this occupational trend was by no means restricted to these two men in the late eighteenth century. The growth of weaving in urban centres suggests that full time weavers were common by 1800. By the early nineteenth century, local woollen weavers were said to be virtually totally dependent on their textile employment. However, numerous

(1) Bythell, The Hand Loom Weavers, p 41-8
(2) See Chapter XX.
LRO/PR/2859/14
(3) RA/1812 Vol III, op cit, p 209-211 and 478
early nineteenth century sources indicate that dual employed farmer/weavers also remained common.\(^1\)

Migration was probably not a significant source of additional labour as immigration appears to have been offset by emigration and the vast bulk of the local population had traditional local surnames suggesting the key role of natural increase.

Of much greater importance was female labour in weaving. This trend, developing before 1780, was undoubtedly accelerated by the demise of domestic carding and by the relatively coarse nature of local cloth. Female labour may also have been prominent in early factories. Fifty nine per cent of the one hundred and twenty seven spinners employed at Laund Mill in 1799-1800 were female.\(^2\) Yet as this along with Hareholme Mill was the only worsted spinning mill, was by far the largest of all mills in Rossendale, and was only opened in 1798 its labour force may not have been typical of local mills prior to 1795.

Children also played an important though not new role in textile expansion. The pressure on the traditional apprenticeship system apparent before 1780 continued to erode it after that date. At the end of the period Henry West of High Riley in Higher Booths was apprenticed to Richard Town but was free to leave at any time.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Elliot, op cit, p 1-8 and 17
\(^2\) Blackburn Mail, December 20th 1825
\(^3\) Report of the Select Committee on Hand Loom Weavers Petitions, 1834
Around the same date Henry Riley of Bottomley Banks, Higher Booths was apprenticed to learn combing with a neighbour. Henry learnt in two months though aged only fifteen. Similarly around 1800 David Whitehead was apprenticed to four different types of weaver, as well as a painter and a cooper all within a few years. He usually left following a dispute with his master or due to boredom. Mills also used this debased form of apprenticeship. Around 1800 James Riley apprenticed two of his children for a year to a local mill.

However, in some cases, the traditional apprenticeship continued in use. In 1788, Haslingden overseers apprenticed Hugh Taylor to Thomas Hall of Brent near Bury, cotton manufacturer. Hall agreed to teach Taylor woollen weaving in return for a fee of £10 paid by the overseers. A similar step was taken as late as 1812.

Free child labour was also used especially in mills. In 1800 such children normally employed with their parents probably as a family unit accounted for a third of the total spinning labour force.

Though the majority of adult males were employed in domestic weaving some were employed in the mill sector particularly in spinning, printing and as mechanics/joiners. By 1800, adult men provided nearly a quarter of the spinners of Laund Mill. A Calico printing

(1) ibid
(2) Elliot, op cit, p 1-11
(3) LRQ/PR/2859/14
(4) LAN/COB/34 Bury Township Apprenticeship Indentures, 1675-1836 "True" apprenticeships may also have remained in the printing trades which remained a skilled activity until the nineteenth century.
(5) RPL/Rc 677 Accounts of a Mill in Rossendale: Spinning Wages Book
(6) ibid
was a skilled trade and was also heavy work, both features encouraging the presence of an adult male labour force. The same features also help explain the position of adult men in the related mill crafts of mechanic and joiner.

(1) Turnbull and Turnbull, op cit, p 107, 183 and 198
SECTION F - CAPITAL NEEDS AND STRUCTURE

Prior to 1780 the capital needs of the local textile industry were extremely modest, especially the need for fixed capital. Fixed capital in the production processes was negligible as production facilities were the farms and cottages of the local population and the necessary tools could be obtained for a few shillings. The only function requiring specialist fixed capital investment came via the finishing facilities of dyeing and fulling. Though there was a greater need for working capital this too was modest as the area contained no exceptionally large producers by outside standards. Much of the working capital needed appears to have been supplied by large merchants operating from nearby marketing centres such as Rochdale and Halifax.

The emergence of the local industry on a new scale and in part with a new form of organisation after 1780 meant that the need for capital was greatly increased. This was partly but by no means totally due to the emergence of the factory sector. The purpose of this section is to consider the development of this increased demand for capital.

The capital needs of industry can be best divided for the present purpose into fixed and working capital. It is on this basis that the following analysis is based.

Nominally the best source for the analysis of the capital structure of early factory industry comes via insurance records. In practice such sources have limitations most notably that they ignore capital circulating outside the factory, and the value of the land on which the mill stood.


Chapman, "The Transition to the Factory System in the Midlands Cotton-Spinning Industry," loc cit, p 540. - the water course leading to the water powered mills was also ignored.
Prior to 1800 only three mill insurance valuations are extant. (1) In 1796 two cotton carding and spinning mills at Bacup were insured for £300 each. (2) In both cases, all of the sum was tied up in fixed capital. Four years later the woollen carding mill of the large firm of Turner brothers was insured for £4,800, fifty four per cent of the total being working capital. (3) As Turner brothers were an exception­ally large firm the two Bacup mills are probably more typical of the local mills as a whole. The total absence of working capital is not surprising when it is remembered that the operators of many of these small mills were not manufacturers in their own right, but merely pro­viding a specialist service for local domestic cloth producers. (4) Despite this the central conclusion to be drawn is that in terms of both their fixed and working capital requirements, local mills were extremely modest undertakings. These views, given the size of the sample can only be tentative and must be tested against other albeit less comprehensive evidence.

Fixed capital can be broken down into three basic components, land, buildings and fittings such as machinery.

---

(1) Specialist fulling mills have been included with the domestic sector.
(2) Royal Exchange Fire Insurance Record Series XX/117/843 and 844
(3) Sun Fire Insurance Records/County Series/32/703132
(4) see Section C
In the mill sector the number of known mill site valuations is small. In 1789 Turner brothers paid £725 for the site of their future Helmshore mill. Yet most mills were much smaller than this though this need not have met a smaller and cheaper mill site.

Rather more useful is the mill land and building valuation provided by the Musbury and Haslingden township surveys of 1793-4 and 1798 respectively. These surveys indicate a combined total of nineteen mills, none of which had a value in excess of £50 per annum. Two basic groups were present, the specialised carding mills with an £10-£25 annual value and the combined carding and spinning mills with a £25-£50 annual value. Mills in central and eastern Rossendale were probably similar. Thus Brockclough carding mill in Wolfenden had an annual value of £13 in 1798. This suggests that local mills were tiny undertakings. This remained true of several mills even in the early nineteenth century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No of Stories</th>
<th>Dimensions (in sq feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Duckworth Clough</td>
<td>Haslingden Township</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Facit</td>
<td>South Rossendale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


(2) see Table No IV

(3) LRO/CCR/1799/27

(4) Blackburn Mail, January 5th 1814

These dimensions put the mills no larger than the leading local inns – see Chapter 21
Even Turners mill in 1800 was really a mill complex made up of a number of separately small buildings.\(^{(1)}\)

Thus it appears reasonable to conclude that during this period local mills were extremely small and modest affairs. However, the late 1790's saw the onset of a new period with the construction of large multi storied mills. Hareholme mill built in 1798, the first of the new generation, was said to have been the largest mill for miles around at the time of its construction.\(^{(2)}\)

The extent of investment in machinery was also modest. Most local spinning mills were probably based on mules by 1795. Dobson and Rothwell of Bolton, engineers, were supplying such mules to Rossendale and other firms at this time at prices from £50 to £69.\(^{(3)}\) This gives an indication of the value of new mules. In 1796, Flash mill, Haslingden had thirteen mules, similar in size to those sold by Dobson and Rothwell for £50. If these were new mules it suggests a total valuation of around £650. Flash also contained three carding engines, two roving frames, a drawing frame and three stretching frames. On a valuation of similar equipment in neighbouring areas, this equipment would probably be worth £100-£150 giving a total machinery valuation of £750-£800.\(^{(4)}\) Around the same date Paghouse mill had a similar stock of machinery suggesting a total value of around £700.\(^{(5)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Sun Fire Records/Country Series/32/703/22
\(^{(2)}\) James, op cit, p 355
\(^{(3)}\) French, *Life and Times of Samuel Crompton*, p 289
\(^{(4)}\) LRO/DD Sc/12/135
   Blackburn Mail, June 15th 1796
\(^{(5)}\) ibid, May 31st 1797
the specialised carding mills the sums were even smaller. Carding engines were often valued at around £20.\(^1\) On this basis, the five carding engines in Baxenden mill, Higher Booths in 1796 would have been valued at only around £100.\(^2\)

The evidence relating to each of these three forms of fixed capital in the mill sector confirms that overall fixed capital requirement of local mills was very modest. Equally it appears that the level of fixed capital was modest in all three components taken separately, especially for the land and building. The relative importance of machinery as opposed to building in terms of fixed capital is confirmed by the three extant insurance valuations. At Helmshore mill and one of the Bacup mills the machinery/building ratio was two to one with a ratio of one to one at the second Bacup mill.

It is possible that this ratio was not applicable to the calico print works where the building/machinery ratio was three to one in favour of building at Loveclough in 1810.\(^3\) Though well outside the period under study, printing technology based on hand block printing applied at both dates and with it the modest demand for fixed capital.

The concept of fixed capital has been regarded as an unrealistic one in relation to domestic forms of industrial organisation.\(^4\) Yet it still provides a useful vehicle around which the analysis of the capital demands of contemporary industry can be discussed, particularly in so far as it permits comparisons with the mill sector and with genuine working capital.

\(^1\) LRD/DD Sc/12/135

\(^2\) Blackburn Mail, December 16th 1796

\(^3\) Sun Fire Insurance Records/Country Series/Vol 88/840080

\(^4\) Kuznets quoted in F., Crouzet, ed, *Capital Formation and the Industrial Revolution*, 1972, p 34
As with the mill sector a handful of insurance valuations remain for firms that were fundamentally domestic in organisation though they generally had their own fulling facilities.\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Firm</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fixed Capital Valuation</th>
<th>Working Capital Valuation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale brothers</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>£200 (25%)</td>
<td>£600 (75%)</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Lawrence Hoyle</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£450 (26%)</td>
<td>£1,250 (74%)</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale brothers</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£250 (25%)</td>
<td>£750 (75%)</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Hoyle</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£550 (22%)</td>
<td>£1,900 (78%)</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hargreaves</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£400 (66%)</td>
<td>£200 (34%)</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hargreaves</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£500 (83%)</td>
<td>£100 (17%)</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hoyle</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£630 (26%)</td>
<td>£1,820 (74%)</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Ormerod</td>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>£130 (12%)</td>
<td>£1,050 (88%)</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly the ratio of fixed to working capital was heavily based in favour of the latter in this sector despite the fact that insurance valuations ignore possibly substantial sums circulating outside the premises. All but three cases show working capital to have been accounted for between seventy four and seventy eight percent of the total capital of the firm. The ratio of working capital would probably fall to a similar level if the value of the two warehouses and warehouse utensils could be estimated and transferred to fixed capital. Unfortunately, no explanation can be found to cover the two cases where fixed capital was dominant.

\(^1\) The cases are all for woollen manufacturing firms.

\(^2\) Sun Series Vol 350/551/899
Sun Series Vol 357/551/1898
Sun Series Vol 375/577941 Some utensils in warehouse included with working capital
Sun Country Series Vol 1/583214
Sun Country Series Vol 1/619120
Sun Country Series Vol 2/622775
Sun Country Series Vol 11/648063
Sun Country Series Vol 13/664701 Includes two warehouses with their utensils
The absolute volume of capital found per firm in the two sections is also worthy of note. As a whole the level of capital per firm was considerably higher in the small mill sample compared with the domestic sample. However, of the three mill cases the two Bacup mills with an insurance value of a mere £300 each are probably more typical of the average Rossendale mill than the mill of Turner brothers. If so, the average insurance valuation in the domestic sector at £1,347 10s 0d was clearly well in excess of the modest levels of most of the mill sector. The main element of this additional capital appears to have been almost entirely in the heavy commitment to working capital in the domestic sector.

Specialist building facilities in the domestic sector consisted of loomshops, warehouses and fulling and finishing facilities for the woollen trade. The volume of fixed capital tied up in some of these facilities is indicated by the insurance records. These show that both warehouses and fulling and finishing facilities tied up only modest amounts of capital, warehouses never exceeding £150 and fulling and finishing facilities never exceeding £400. This was particularly true of warehouses, the insurance valuation of which never exceeded that of even the most modest fulling and finishing facility. The position in the cotton trade is not revealed by these valuations. Fulling was not applicable to the cotton trade and finishing was a mill based process with little direct contact with the domestic sector. The evidence of warehouse valuations is limited. The warehouse of Peel, Yates & Co at Haslingden was insured for £300 in 1803 but this may have been an abnormally large warehouse and the sum may

---

(1) Loomshops only are excluded
partly cover stock valuation. In consequence, the true warehouse valuation of the typical local cotton mill was probably well below this and possibly on par with that in the woollen trade.

Loomshops are not covered in insurance valuations for Rossendale. However, the cost of building loomshops at Turton to the south west of Haslingden around 1800 indicates that despite wartime inflation they were rarely worth more than £50. As Turton, like western Rossendale, was a major rural cotton weaving area it is likely that these figures reflect the position certainly around Haslingden.

Working capital in both the domestic and factory sectors can be broken down into two basic areas, capital tied up in raw materials, work in progress and finished stocks in the warehouse, and capital tied up in credit provided to distributors or other sales outlets.

Some indication of the former may be gleaned from insurance records. Chapman argues that such terms of "stock and utensils" in these records are best interpreted as covering tools and other moveable utensils making up part of fixed capital. He feels that this is the most likely explanation on the grounds that the valuations given under such headings are too small to cover raw materials, work in progress and finished goods in the warehouse. Local insurance records indicate that this was not always the case in Rossendale. In 1790 Sale brothers, woollen manufacturers of Haslingden left:

"Utensils, stock in wool warehouse £100
Utensils, stock in piece warehouse £200"

(1) S.D. Chapman, "The Peels in the Early English Cotton Industry," loc cit, p 75
(4) Sun Fire Insurance Records 375/577941
Similarly in 1797 George Ormerod a woollen manufacturer of Rossendale left:

"Old warehouse, stock and utensils £230
New warehouse, stock, utensils and combing equipment £600"

Such substantial sums in warehouses is not consistent with fixed capital of which little would be needed in the warehouse. Indeed amongst domestic manufacturers in general the level of "stock and utensil" valuations was substantial, certainly too high to be accounted for as working tools. If this interpretation is valid of the domestic sector the term probably had a similar meaning in the mill sector. This was certainly true of some mills insured after 1795. \(^{(2)}\)

In the calico printing works of Rossendale the position was rather different, as exceptionally high stock valuations largely explain the high overall insurance valuation. At Loveclough print works in 1810 stock alone accounted for seventy five per cent of the total insurance value of the firm. \(^{(3)}\)

Thus it would appear that stock was an important component of capital in both the domestic and printing sectors but not in the mill sector in general.

Another important component of working capital came in credit provision to and from the manufacturer. Such credit finance is not covered by the insurance records so that alternative sources have to be considered. The Quarter Sessions insolvency papers can be of value here, as they provide an indication of the financial dealings of insolvent debtors. However, it is not clear that they provide an

---

\(^{(1)}\) Sun Fire Insurance Records Country Series 18/664701
\(^{(2)}\) RPL/Norwich Union Fire Insurance Policy of William Whitworth 1815
\(^{(3)}\) Sun Fire Insurance Records Country Series 88/840080
accurate guide particularly of the nature of the debts of the im-
prisoned debtor. Despite weaknesses they do provide a crude quanti-
fiable guide to the extent of credit in local textile trades.

In 1794 James Pickup a fustian manufacturer of Bacup was im-
prisoned for debt at a time when he was owed £222 0s 0d for goods he
had sold and delivered to five men.\(^1\) On a larger scale was Richard
Haworth, a Haslingden cotton spinner, who in the same year was impri-
soned for a £17 2s 0d debt at a time when he was owed £922 7s 0d for
goods he had sold and delivered.\(^2\)

Such figures suggest that amongst the larger domestic manufac-
turers and the mill producers, working capital devoted to providing
credit for customers was of greater significance than capital devoted
to raw material, work in progress and finished goods on the premises.
These two together probably constituted a sum in excess of that
devoted to fixed capital, as this figure for credit must be added to
the figure for stock in the insurance records to obtain an all over
indication of the level of working capital involved in the business.
In the domestic sector the level of working capital was substantially
in excess of that in fixed capital whilst in the mill sector there
was probably a rough balance between the two.

\(^1\) LRG/QJB/48/47
\(^2\) LRG/QJB/51/40
SECTION G - SOURCES OF FINANCE

Despite the small capital needs of local mills the expansion of domestic manufacturers meant that the local textile industry faced an unprecedented need for capital after 1780. Attention must therefore be devoted to how this need was met.

One way of reducing the need for fixed capital was to take a long term lease on land on which a mill could be built. Thus, in 1785 James Law leased two thirds of a land plot set out for building a fulling mill at Flaxmoss, Haslingden for nine hundred years to Henry Hargreaves, merchant, and James Hargreaves, both of Millend, Newchurch. In 1795 New Hall Hey estate with its water rights was leased for ninety six years with the recommendation that it was a "capital Situation for the Woollen or Cotton Manufactury".

The lease of land and water rights for textile manufacturing in itself involved no new capital formation. This was not always true of the mill constructed on this land. The financing of mill construction was tackled by two basic methods. Landowners often financed mill construction and possibly even the purchase of machinery in the mill. Thus the mill operator provided virtually none of the fixed capital. Flash mill, Haslingden, was one such case when it was leased by Thomas Wellwork to William Roe senior for twenty one years at some date before 1796. In 1790 Paghouse mill was leased by its owner to Robert Fell and George Maxwell for seven years. The township surveys of 1793-4 and 1798 indicate that ten of the eighteen mills in

---

(1) LAD/DDX/118/161/1
(2) Blackburn Mail, February 17th 1796
(3) Blackburn Mail, June 15th, 1796
(4) Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 10
Nusbury and Haslingden townships were occupied by tenants with another mill partly tenanted.\(^{(1)}\) The system was also used for the larger print works. In 1802 Messrs Prince of Sunnyside print works, Higher Booths gave up their nineteen year lease on the property.\(^{(2)}\) The newspaper lease advertisements indicate that the machinery as well as the mill buildings were leased, thus confirming that the mill operator often owned little or none of the fixed capital. The second basic method to raise the necessary finance faced the owner/occupiers of mills. Some producers, for example, Turner brothers at Helmshore built their own mill complexes from scratch. Given the small size of local mills the capital required for this would be modest and probably within the reach of quite small manufacturers. In calico printing and too some extent in carding and spinning too, converted premises were often used. Ewood Bridge mill was a long established corn mill prior to its conversion to printing in 1786.\(^{(3)}\) In 1798 the site was partly occupied by a spinning mill.\(^{(4)}\) Paghouse fulling mill, Haslingden was converted to cotton spinning prior to 1793.\(^{(5)}\) The motive for converting these mills need not have been to save capital, it should be remembered that such old established mills probably had the pick of water power sites.

As already noted investment in machinery could also be reduced by leasing equipment along with a mill. Another alternative was also available via the purchase of second hand equipment. As late as 1806

---

\(^{(1)}\) LND/PR/865

\(^{(2)}\) Blackburn Mail, July 7th 1802

\(^{(3)}\) Graham, op cit, p 376 and 394

\(^{(4)}\) LND/PR/865

\(^{(5)}\) H. Stephenson, Old Haslingden, np
John Haworth of Bacup was buying used cards from James and John Baldwin of Halifax. (1)

The presence of such a range of sources and mechanisms necessary to raise business capital meant that even mill production could be started from minimal financial resources. In 1795, four men, a Haslingden cotton spinner and three Bacup cotton dealers, formed a partnership to spin and rove cotton at Laneside mill, Haslingden with an initial capital of just £25 each. (2) Even in 1803 a Bacup cotton spinner and two Broadclough clothiers could form a partnership to card, rove, spin and manufacture cotton with an initial capital of only £100 each. (3)

Trade credit provided a vital source of short term working capital in this period just as before 1780. As late as 1811 Ralph and Samuel Taylor, wholesale grocers of Rochdale, were discounting the bills of Rochdale based manufacturers who used the proceeds to pay their weavers in the east of Rossendale. They also provided a similar service to Rossendale based firms. (4) Laund worsted mill built in 1798 sold its goods on a credit basis to both large and small manufacturers. (5) This suggests that the new large mills represented by Laund provided a new form of trade credit, mill manufacturers providing credit for the domestic sector. Such mills outside Rossendale may have provided a similar service to local firms prior to 1795.

---

(2) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 218-9
(3) ibid, p 219
(4) Robertson, Old and New Rochdale and its People, p 199-200
(5) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 218-9

RAW/Accounts of a Mill in Rossendale, 1799-1801
SECTION H - ENTERPRISE

It has been noted that resident manufacturers came to play a more important role in local textiles after 1780, but who were these manufacturers?

Bailey's Directory of 1784 provides a useful starting point in the attempt to answer the question. Bailey provides a name list of thirty two local manufacturers. (1) The surnames of the manufacturers indicate that most came from old established families resident in Rossendale from at least the mid seventeenth century. These surnames, Ashworth, Haworth, Holden, Hoyle, Lord, Maden, Ormerod, Rawsthorn, Riley and Taylor account for two thirds of the total. The Haworth name alone had five representatives, whilst four other surnames had three representatives each. Yet it should not be assumed that this meant the domination of the trade by a handful of tightly knit families. In each case, the surname was extremely common in Rossendale so that any family tie was often remote and tenuous.

Many of the other families on the list had moved to Rossendale during the first half of the eighteenth century. The first generation had frequently followed relatively modest occupations. The Wilkinson family were wheelwrights in 1705, the Wilsons weavers in 1722, and the Houghtons weavers in 1741. Manufacturers outside the Bailey list could

(1) Bailey's British Directory, p 539, 676-7
Rossendale - George Ashworth, James Ashworth, Richard Ashworth, Samuel Haworth, Henry Hoyle, John Ormerod, Lawrence Ormerod and Taylir and Riley.
trace their ancestry to similarly modest origins. However, their modest background should not be over exaggerated. By 1753 the Houghton, Lonsdale, Rawsthorn, Teasdale, Whalley, Wilkinson and Wilson families were each owners of tenements in Haslingden township.

During the final decades of the eighteenth century many of these families extended their activities outside the field of domestic woollen manufacturing. Some entered the newly resurgent field of cotton manufacturing. In 1794, John Hoyle and John Houghton were both active as cotton manufacturers. Even earlier in the late 1780's Henry Lord of Bacup was insuring a cotton mill in that area. Woollen manufacturers also extended their mill based activities beyond fulling into carding. In the mid 1790's both John Holden and the Turner Brothers were manufacturers with their own carding facilities. This was a trend also observable in the contemporary Huddersfield woollen area. However, most drew the line at that point, there is no evidence that any began mill based spinning of either cotton or woollen before 1795. Indeed, only a few made the change after that date.

The prominence of these families did not survive long beyond the

(1) Haslingden Chapelry: Burials
    July 9th 1705 Rachel wife of Henry Wilkinson wright of Sunnyfield
    June 12th 1722 Elizabeth daughter of Josh Wilson of Haddocks, woollen weaver.
    : Burials May 25th 1755 Alice daughter of James Lund, blacksmith.

(2) P. Stevens and R. Hawkin, ed. A Haslingden Churchwarden's List of 1753, passim.

(3) Scholes, Manchester and Salford Directory, 1794

(4) Royal Exchange Fire Insurance Record Series XX/117/843

(5) L.R.O./P.R./865/No 30 and 87

(6) W.B. Crump and G. Ghorbal, op cit, p 69, 71 and 90.
end of the century. By the 1820's the Bilsborrow family were in brewing, members of the Sale family were occupied as tea dealers and surgeons, the Lund family as ironmongers, blacksmiths and butchers. Several of the more successful such as Edward Houghton were styling themselves gentlemen. The two largest Bacup manufacturers in the 1790's were the businesses of Peter Heyworth and Lawrence Ormerod but by the 1820's both had ceased manufacturing, the former to act as a commission agent for foreign trade, the latter to operate as merchants. (1)

A few families remained in manufacturing, the most notable being Turner brothers of Helmshore. On a more modest scale, were the businesses of Richard Teasdale and Henry Hoyle of Newhall Hey. In all three cases the business was becoming more mill based though with some weaving activity associated. (2)

Mill ownership was usually in the hands of local land owners. Some of these men were textile manufacturers like John Houghton and John Lonsdale but most appear to have had little direct interest in the textile trade. (3) The operators of these mills were normally men of lower standing. Rushbed carding mill Higher Booths was operated by two small clothiers in 1795 whilst Flaxmoss mill was run by two chapmen from 1792-1796. A Bacup spinning firm set up in 1795 consisted of three small scale cotton dealers and a cotton spinner. (4) These were all men with a background in


(2) ibid, p 647-8
L.R.O./D.D.X./118/160/3
Aspin, The Turners of Helmshore and Higher Mill.

(3) L.R.O./P.R./865
L.R.O./C.C.R./1798/27

(4) L.R.O./C.C.R./1795/24
Blackburn Mail June 15th 1796
Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 218
the local textile trade. On occasions, men with other expertise were involved. In 1798, an engineer, Luke Hoyle, leased Snighole mill at Bridge End. Other engineers took similar steps in the early nineteenth century. (1)

It remained possible for men of extremely modest circumstances to begin mill production beyond this period. Whitehead brothers brought up by their widowed mother in the 1790's, set up on an initially modest basis after the turn of the century. (2)

Operators of larger mill complexes prior to 1800 invariably originated from outside Rossendale. The Turner business is perhaps the most noted of these, the brothers, two cousins and an uncle originating from Great Harwood and Blackburn. That they could pay over £700 merely for the land on which their premises were to stand suggests that they began from a much larger base than most local firms. (3) Laund and Hareholme worsted mills were on a much larger scale than other local mills when they were built in 1798. They were built and run respectively by Nathan Booth originally from Derby and William Dockray also a non local. (4) Similarly, the successive operators of Ewood Bridge printing works down to 1800 were outsiders as were the operators of Loveclough printing works and Sunny-side printing works when they were established in 1802 and 1809 respectively. (5) Thus it can be seen that the initiative for establishing large mill based production and finishing facilities in the late eighteenth century lay with outside rather than local enterprise.

(1) L.R.O./C.C.R./1798/26
L.R.O./D.O./F.0./41/14

(2) J.Elliot, ed, David Whitehead of Rossendale 1790-1860, p 1-38
H.I.Hunt, ed, David Whitehead of Rawtenstall, 1956, passim

(3) Aspin, The Turners of Halmshore and Higher Mill, p 3

(4) Anon, Crawshawbooth Meeting House, nd, p 11
P.Stevens, 100 Years of Catholicacy in Rossendale, np

(5) Blackburn Mail, August 20th 1794
Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 10
Graham, History of Printworks in Manchester and District, 1760-1846, p 402
SECTION I - MARKETING

As with supplies of raw material, Rossendale had relied heavily on neighbouring towns for marketing services prior to 1780. Local manufacturers usually sold to merchants in these towns who resold them on the London and provincial markets or exported them. This system was supplemented by some local producers selling to local shopkeepers or chapmen.

The importance of Halifax merchants and market declined after 1780 as did the merchants but not the market of Rochdale. Local cloth continued to be sold on the Rochdale market until well into the nineteenth century.\(^{(1)}\) However, Haslingden merchants began to make use of this market in competition with Rochdale men. The open air market gradually gave way to the use of inns for the exhibiting of goods for sale. Here "the merchants from surrounding towns, but chiefly from Manchester, Bradford, Leeds, Halifax, Bury and Haslingden visited ... to make purchases."\(^{(2)}\) After purchasing, manufacturers would send their cloth for fulling. Cloth left unsold was usually left with the publican until the following market day, although he was often empowered to sell it in the interim if a suitable offer was made.\(^{(3)}\) The active role of Haslingden men marks a further stage in the independence of the Rossendale woollen trade. Not surprisingly Turner brothers were one of the first local firms active at Rochdale market.\(^{(4)}\)

A simultaneous attempt by a number of manufacturers including

\(^{(1)}\) Manchester Guardian, March 7th, April 11th and May 2nd 1835

\(^{(2)}\) Robertson, *Old and New Rochdale and its People*, p 302-3

\(^{(3)}\) ibid, p 303-4

\(^{(4)}\) ibid, p 303
two from Rossendale to establish a cloth hall at Rochdale met with little success. On issue in 1792, cloth hall shares were valued at £21, but subsequent share sales never recouped more than three quarters of this price, and the hall was soon wound up as a commercial failure. (1)

This failure was not merely due to the growth of sales by private agreement nor to the rivalry of the inns but also to the expansion of other alternatives.

The rapid growth of local population and the growth of Haslingden as a market centre after 1780 continued to provide a growing market for cloth sales. By 1800, if not before, Haslingden had developed its own specialist flannel market. (2)

The woollen manufacturers of western Rossendale continued to use the woollen market provided by Manchester. By 1791 Turner brothers had one of the brothers as a resident agent there. (3) In 1788 James Whitworth, a Haslingden dyer, was a regular visitor to the Manchester market. (4)

Some manufacturers continued to deal with country retailers.

In 1801 one such Haslingden manufacturer was supplying goods to men at Bentham, Ingleton and Settle, all in north Yorkshire as well as Kendal. (5)

(1) Rochdale PL/Cloth Hall MSS
(2) Halstead, Annals of Haslingden, p 13
(3) C.D. Saggar, Social Identification, Attitudes and Relations in the 1780's of those cotton manufacturers of Manchester listed in Trades Directories of the period, 1973, p 493 - copy in LRO
(4) Lewis's Directory for the towns of Manchester and Salford, 1788, p 39-42
(5) LAO/QJB/51/57
There is no evidence that Rossendale men engaged in any direct export down to 1795. Newbigging claimed that at the time Bacup producers did all their trade "entirely with Rochdale, Yorkshire and London houses". Aitken noted that the eventual destination for much Rochdale area cloth was Holland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Russia and Germany. More specifically, a Rossendale manufacturer writing in 1812 noted that the area had formerly exported mainly to Germany and Prussia, but also to Spain and Portugal. Both these views suggest an exclusively European market for local cloth.

The major outlet for local cotton producers was the Manchester market. This market was used by local producers from the early days of the industry. By 1794 John Houghton and John Hoyle, both cotton manufacturers in Haslingden were regular visitors to the Manchester market. Both men displayed their products at the Griffin Inn in Long Mill Gate. This suggests a system similar to that at the Rochdale woollen market. Manchester was also used by east Rossendale manufacturers. In the same year, James Pickup of Bacup, fustian manufacturer appears to have been selling to larger men in Manchester. The use of public inns in Manchester as a centre for marketing continued throughout the period though the use of warehouses also came more to the fore. In 1804 five Rossendale firms were listed as regularly visiting Manchester market, four were manufacturers, the other

(1) Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 181
(2) Aitken, op cit, p 248
(3) PP, (1812) Vol III, p 211
LRO/Scholars Manchester and Salford Directory, 1794
(5) LRO/Q38/48/47
a combined spinner and manufacturer. Of the five, two operated at both inns and warehouses, the others at inns only. All five used the same inn the Manchester Arms on Long Mill Gate. This suggests a possible concentration of manufacturers on certain inns according to their place of origin. It certainly was not by product type as the local contingent consisted of both fustian and calico producers. (1)

The similarity with woollen marketing can also be seen in the system of local sales via mercers, drapers, chapmen and pedlars. Mercers and drapers handled sales in the main population centres with chapmen and pedlars handling sales in rural areas in and around Rossendale. The latter were generally independent men retailing cloth to isolated areas on a credit basis. (2)

(1) Dean & Co's *Manchester and Salford Directory*, p 202-10
(2) Tupling, *An Economic History of Rossendale*, p 209
SECTION J - CONCLUSIONS

Two trends dominate this period, the monopoly of woollen was challenged by the spread of cotton and the monopoly of domestic production was challenged by the emergence to a factory sector. Alone however, this represents a gross over simplification.

The spread of cotton was largely restricted to western Rossendale and even there it led only to the relative rather than absolute decline of woollen. Though a factory sector emerged in both cotton and woollen, it was restricted to cotton and woollen carding and cotton warp spinning. Despite this factory sector, the core of manufacturing remained domestic, though based to an increasing degree on resident manufacturers. Mills were often run by independent men supplying a service to local manufacturers much in the same way as finishing services had been supplied for generations.

Mills led to the adoption of new technologies in some processes but not in all, even if the technology was available as in cotton printing. Given the abundance of water power it is not surprising that all mill development was powered from this source.

The continued expansion of woollen and the introduction of cotton increased the demand for labour in the domestic sector. As in neighbouring areas this was met by natural population growth, the decline of dual employment, child and female labour and the continued erosion of the apprenticeship system.

The impact of these changes on the financial needs of the industry was modest. Even in the largest mills both fixed and working capital needs were modest. More significant was the domestic sector where the capital needs, particularly for working capital was often larger. Despite this limited need in the mill sector, numerous sources were available to enable small men to set up.
Much, but by no means all, of the expansion was based on local enterprise. Well established local families played an important role in the organisation of domestic manufacture. However, these men rarely became engaged in mill production beyond the carding stage. This mill sector was dominated by two groups. Local men of relatively modest means were active operators of the smaller mills whilst newcomers from outside Rossendale dominated the larger complexes.

The expansion of trade encouraged the local domestic manufacturers to play a much more positive role in the marketing of their produce though they continued to rely on neighbouring centres for their supply of both raw cotton and raw wool.
CHAPTER XXIV

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The most central feature to emerge from the foregoing chapters is the fundamental difference between the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries in terms of both the area's economic and demographic experience. In the former period relative stagnation was the norm whilst in the latter substantial long term growth was experienced.

This basic shift in the early eighteenth century was found in many other parts of east Lancashire. Saddleworth, like Rossendale, a production offshoot area of the Lancashire woollen trade experienced similar rapid economic and demographic expansion as did the Colne area to the north east of Rossendale. (1) The same period saw the onset of a long phase of economic and demographic growth in townships to the south of Rossendale such as Bury and Radcliffe. (2)

In the same approximate period similar phases of expansion occurred in other regions such as the nail making area of south Yorkshire from around 1720. (3) Slightly earlier from the 1690's the Trent Vale area of Nottinghamshire entered a phase of economic growth which Chambers argues was also experienced by many other areas until

Bennett, History of Marsden and Colne, p 134

(2) Marshall, Lancashire, p 50-1
Gray, The History of Bury Lancashire from 1660-1876, p 40

(3) D.G.Hey, "A Dual Economy in South Yorkshire," Agricultural History Review, Vol 17, 1969, Part II, p 118
being interrupted in the 1720’s and 1730’s.\(^1\)

Though the evidence is limited in quantity as well as reliability, there is a clear indication that at least in terms of per capita wealth Rossendale gained not merely in absolute terms but relatively to other areas during the eighteenth century. An indication of this comes in a comparison of average inventory values in Rossendale and Mid Essex over the best part of a century. In Rossendale average inventory values stagnated at a low absolute level in the late seventeenth century whereas those of mid Essex were much higher and steadily rising. In contrast whilst the Essex levels stagnated during the eighteenth century those of Rossendale rose rapidly. Thus whilst Rossendale inventory values were on average less than half those of mid Essex in the later seventeenth century, they had outstripped them by the mid eighteenth century.\(^2\)

Given the labour intensive nature of the contemporary economy in places such as Rossendale, it is unlikely that the strong coincidence of timing between the onset of economic and demographic expansion was entirely fortuitous. This possibility must be examined more thoroughly along with why the west of Rossendale improved both its economic and demographic performance relative to that of eastern Rossendale.

The onset of a phase of economic growth in the late seventeenth century against the background of a population that had been stable

---

\(^1\) J.D. Chambers, “The Vale of Trent 1670-1800: A Regional Study of Economic Change,” EHR, Supplement No 3, p 3-4

\(^2\) F. Steer, Farm and Cottage Inventories of Mid Essex, 1635-1749, 1969, passim
from the mid seventeenth century led to a situation in which labour might be short. One response was to look to new areas for additional labour. The textile industry appears to have adopted such a course in Nottinghamshire in this period. (1)

Rossendale was one such marginal area of the West Riding and Rochdale woollen areas. In the late seventeenth century woollen manufacture was found throughout the area but especially in the east which was closer to the traditional centres of the industry. (2) Western Rossendale remained essentially geared towards its traditional function of stock rearing for external markets. On this basis alone Rossendale would provide a prime target in any geographical expansion of the woollen industry. The area also possessed other advantages notably that farms were generally too small to support families adequately, whilst the pastoral nature of agriculture meant that labour was available for by-employment. Writing at the end of the century, Whittaker noted the importance of farm size thus:

"The great increase of population . . . over the whole chase of Rossendale is solely to be ascribed to the woollen manufactory, which appears to have been attracted hither by the smallness of the estates into which the country was distributed, not sufficient to support the owners or employ their dependents." (3)

(1) ibid p 13

(2) The presence of woollen in Rossendale by 1650 indicates that Chambers rather over exaggerates the impact of late seventeenth/early eighteenth century textile penetration.

(3) Whittaker, History of the Ancient Parish of Whalley, p 321
Thus the geographical expansion of the woollen trade would be mutually beneficial to both the traditional centres and the outlying marginal producers.

The relatively poor economic and demographic performance of western compared with eastern Rossendale from 1650-1700 can be largely explained by the former's position of the margin of woollen production. It was more heavily dependent on agriculture with less in the way of textile employment to fall back on in time of crisis. The general stagnation of the local woollen trade in these years would have precluded any major long term expansion into western Rossendale.

Inventories, occupational data and the development of finishing facilities all suggest that fundamental expansion in the local economy in the early eighteenth century. This initially appears to conflict with the experience of the West Riding woollen trade which saw stagnation from 1710-1730 which would suggest geographic contraction rather than expansion. However, this view is based on the experience of the woollen rather than the worsted trade. Part of this depression in the former may be attributable to the rapid spread of the latter in the Halifax-Rochdale area of which Rossendale was a part. Once established the area also had other attractions, soft running water for finishing and a responsiveness to new technology as indicated in the Kay patent disputes. This expansion clearly explains the spread of textiles into western Rossendale and thus why the demographic and economic experience of that area came

---

(2) ibid, p 55
into line with eastern Rossendale after 1715. Contrary to the Chambers' view this textile expansion was not associated with demographic expansion, merely by higher fertility but also by lower mortality.

The coincidence of timing between the rise of the birth rate and the fall in the death rate itself suggests an economic causation. This view is further strengthened when it is appreciated that this was an era of rising employment opportunities and a period of low food prices. Together these indicate that the long term level of mortality and thus potentially of demographic growth were strongly influenced by economic factors.

This is in line with the observed situation in the West Riding a hundred years earlier and thus suggests the continued significance of Malthusian forces in the wider region throughout the seventeenth century. (1)

Unlike many areas to the south where the increased demographic growth rate was cut short in the period 1720-1750 the Rossendale growth rate continued to be rapid as it did in several other parts of the north. (2)

(1) Whilst accepting this, Chambers denies that such views are also applicable to southern or urban parts of England - Chambers, Population, Economy and Society in Pre Industrial England, p 15


Northern continued growth areas included Saddleworth and parts of South Yorkshire.

See M.T. Wild, "The Saddleworth Parish Registers as a source for the History of the West Riding Textiles Industry During the Eighteenth Century," loc cit, p 221

D.G. Hey, "A Dual Economy in South Yorkshire," loc cit, p 118
In these more southern areas the demographic crisis is generally attributed to the return of epidemic supplemented in some cases by short term food shortages, which preceded the epidemic.\(^{(1)}\) Similar pressures were present in Rossendale in the two main crisis periods of the later 1720's and early 1740's but with only a limited impact on mortality and the natural rate of increase.

The high resistance found in Rossendale may be related to two factors. Retail food prices may have been less important here as the improved economic climate may have increased local per capita purchasing power, whilst the occupation of small farms and waste by much of the population would provide them with a degree of self-sufficiency in food not available elsewhere. The dispersed nature of local settlement may have been a major advantage in providing resistance to epidemic when it did break out. The dual employment nature of the system may have enabled families to keep themselves relatively isolated in periods of potential epidemic. Equally, the general remoteness of the area, an upland area at the geographical extreme of an economic unit may have kept the area as a whole relatively isolated.

This is not necessarily in conflict with the possibility that epidemic came to play a more important role towards the end of the century for by then food prices were rising, dual employment declining, farms were even smaller, settlements were becoming larger and improving communications were reducing the isolation of the area. At the same time, these were generally years of rapid economic expansion in which there is little evidence of severe economic hardship.

\(^{(1)}\) Eg. Chambers, Population, Economy and Society, p 62-3 and 93
for the mass of the population certainly prior to 1790. Given this background it is likely that the long term increase in mortality in these years can be attributed to the impact of epidemic. If so, Rossendale was now coming into line with the experience of more developed areas of the south and Midlands of England by the end of the eighteenth century.
APPENDIX I

PROBLEMS OF DEMOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT FROM CHAPELRY REGISTERS 1650-1795

The value of parish registers as a source for analysing demographic trends in this period is by no means clear cut. Therefore it is essential to examine and estimate the extent of the problems involved in the use of such sources for Rossendale.

In 1650 Rossendale was part of the vast parish of Whalley, which, given its immense size, was organised on the basis of chapelries. The vast bulk of Rossendale fell within three such chapelries, namely Goodshaw, Haslingden and Newchurch. Until 1753, Goodshaw kept no separate registers, its vital events being recorded with those of Haslingden. From 1753 it began to keep its own register of baptisms, from 1755 of burials, but not until 1794 did it begin a marriage register. In 1761, the Bacup area of Newchurch chapelry began to record its baptisms in the Goodshaw register though continuing to use Newchurch to register other vital events. This obviously over inflates the baptism total for Goodshaw and under records those for Newchurch. This problem eased in 1772 when Bacup began to keep its own register of baptism though retaining Newchurch for other events. From 1788 Bacup came into formal existence as a separate chapelry in its own right with its own set of registers, thus giving Rossendale a fourth chapelry by the end of the period. In consequence, it can


(2) MCRL/MF/PR127a
LRO/PR/2859/1
Blackburn Mail, October 29th 1794

(3) Burials and marriages
be seen that down to 1750 Rossendale events were recorded in two registers only, namely Haslingden and Newchurch, but from that date the situation progressively became more complex with the emergence of separate registers at Goodshaw and then Bacup. In order to reduce this complexity the combined Haslingden and Goodshaw data has been totalled together under the heading Haslingden chapelry, whilst that of Newchurch and Bacup have been added under the heading of Newchurch chapelry for the entire period down to 1795. This leaves only the problem of recording of Bacup baptisms in the Goodshaw register from 1761-1772. Ninety per cent of the baptisms in this register in these years relate to the Bacup area, in consequence, these figures have been added to the Newchurch rather than the Haslingden chapelry totals. Though this creates a bias in favour of Newchurch, it is of a small size and of limited duration and thus of negligible long term impact.

Together these registers provide virtually a complete coverage for the period and for those few years where the original registers are not available the "Bishop's Transcripts" have proved a useful substitute.

Attention can now be turned to the weakness of such registers for the Rossendale area.

One central weakness of such registers is normally seen as their failure to record the vital events for sects outside the established church. (1)

At no time throughout this period was Roman Catholicism of any other than negligible numerical significance and therefore it poses little threat for the registers. This is certainly the view

from contemporary parochial surveys on such topics.\(^{(1)}\)

A potentially more serious problem is posed by the various protestant non conformist sects. In the 1660's the Quakers were probably the most prominent of these sects but even these numbered no more than twenty in the chapelry of Haslingden.\(^{(2)}\) The burial register of the sect suggests that they never grew to be of great importance. At their peak in the 1690's Quaker burials only averaged 2.3 per year.\(^{(3)}\) In 1715 their number was estimated at only ten families suggesting no more than fifty people, all in the chapelry of Haslingden.\(^{(4)}\) By 1778, the sect was of negligible numerical significance though it continued to run its Meeting House.\(^{(5)}\)

The relative decline of the Quaker sect was more than offset by the rise of Anabaptism particularly in eastern Rossendale. This sect entered the area in the late seventeenth century.\(^{(6)}\) From 1698 until 1703 Anabaptist baptisms and burials were recorded separately in the Newchurch Register where they accounted for six per cent of all baptisms and burials.\(^{(7)}\) By 1717 they were estimated at twenty

---

\(^{(1)}\) H. Fishwick, *History of the Parish of Rochdale*, p 250
\(^{(2)}\) Anon, "Notitia Cestriensis", *C.S.*, p 332
\(^{(3)}\) Cheshire RO/EDV/7/1/238 and 240
\(^{(4)}\) See also Censuses of Great Britain, 1851, Religious Worship: Reports and Tables, 1853, p 96 - copy in LRO/Preston.
\(^{(5)}\) Whittaker, *History of the Ancient Parish of Whalley*, p 221
\(^{(7)}\) Anon, "Notitia Cestriensis", loc cit, p 332
\(^{(1)}\) LRO/DP/372/1
five per cent of the chapelry population.\(\text{(1)}\) In Haslingden chapelry
the progress of the sect was much more modest. In 1717 only five
per cent of its families were estimated to be non conformist of any
type.\(\text{(2)}\) At this date, Anabaptists accounted for all local non con-
formity outside of the small Quaker sect. Down to 1778 non conform-
ity made little further headway. At that date the extent of non con-
formity in Newchurch was still estimated at twenty five per cent of
the population, whilst that of Haslingden had fallen to a mere one
per cent. The Porteous visitation of 1778 noted that the number of
Anabaptists had been static for some years past.\(\text{(3)}\) Though a stable
proportion of the population the rapid growth of that population bet-
 tween 1717 and 1778 suggests that in absolute terms the number of non
conformists grew. This growth was not via the Anabaptists where the
number of chapels increased but little.\(\text{(4)}\) Instead the growth cer-
tainly from the 1740's was associated with the introduction of
Methodism.\(\text{(5)}\) Yet even this sect may have temporarily run out of
growth steam by 1778.\(\text{(6)}\) In the period from 1778 Newchurch non con-
formity in proportionate terms grew only modestly to around thirty
per cent of the population in the 1820's. In contrast, the growth in

\(\text{(1)}\) Anon, "Notitia Cestriensis", \textit{loc cit}, p 332
\(\text{(2)}\) \textit{ibid}, p 332
\(\text{(3)}\) Cheshire RO\text{/EDV/7/1/238 and 240}
\(\text{(4)}\) P. Stevens, \textit{A Few notes having some bearing on the History of the
Borough of Rawtenstall}, 1923, p 125
\textit{LRQ/QSP/1614/6}
\textit{A. Buckley, History of Providence Chapel, Lumb, 1928, p 14-15}
\textit{Farrer and Brownbill, op cit, Vol II, p 75}
\(\text{(5)}\) Newbigging, \textit{History of the Forest of Rossendale}, p 151
\textit{F. Baker, William Grimshaw 1708-1763}, 1963, p 95 and 105
\(\text{(6)}\) Cheshire RO\text{/EDV/7/1/240}
Haslingden was dramatic being around twenty five per cent at the same
date.\(^{(1)}\) Much of this change probably occurred prior to 1795. In
1778 Haslingden chapelry contained two non conformist chapels, that
of the Quakers at Crawshawbooth and that of the Baptists at Goodshaw.
This soon changed with the building of a Methodist chapel in 1786
and an Independent chapel in 1787, both in the town of Haslingden.
The Methodist chapel was rebuilt in 1797 but there is no evidence
of any new or rebuilt Baptist chapels.\(^{(2)}\) In contrast, the number
of non conformist chapels in Newchurch chapelry remained unchanged
down to 1795.\(^{(3)}\)

Thus during the final century of this study non conformity was
widespread particularly in eastern Rossendale. Yet this need not
necessarily mean serious under recording of vital events in local
registers. As noted above, non conformist baptisms and burials were
recorded in the Newchurch register at the beginning of the eighteenth
century and possibly later. Certainly it was not unknown for members
of such sects to make use of the registers of the established church.
Quakers certainly made use of the Haslingden register during the
period.\(^{(4)}\) During the eighteenth century Methodists also made use of

---

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/QDV/9/81, 88, 97, 100, 104, 109-110
\(^{(2)}\) Farrer and Brownbill, op cit, vol 6, p 433
Baines, History of the County Palatine and Duchy of Lancaster,
Vol III, p 272
J. Fox, The History of Trinity Baptist Church, Haslingden 1811-1911,
1911, p 15-17
Anon, History of Methodism in Helmshore, nd, c 1930, np
W. Lee, The Late Blind Thomas Barnes, 1891, p 8
A. Buckley, History of Providence Chapel, Lumb, p 14
\(^{(3)}\) Farrer & Brownbill, op cit, Vol 2, p 75
F. Overend, History of Ebeneezer Baptist Church Bacup, 1912, p 60-63
Baines, History of the County Palatine and Duchy of Lancaster,
Vol III, p 278
Newbigging, History of the Forest of Rossendale, p 149-154
\(^{(4)}\) eg June 23rd 1699, February 10th 1733 - 4 cases, June 4th 1774.
the registers. (1) There is no evidence that any of these sects kept
their own registers prior to the second half of the eighteenth cen-
tury. Bacup Baptists began to regularly register births from 1773,
Haslingden Independents from 1786 and Bacup Wesleyans registered bap-
tims from the same year. Yet the number of registrations involved
was small in each case. Even by 1795 the combined total of all non
conformist birth and baptism registrations were fewer than fifty per
year.

Human error or carelessness may be a source of weakness in
registers particularly as it would not be a constant factor. (2) Such
dangers were probably most acute in times of stress either for the
incumbent personally or for the area as a whole. The extent of this
danger can to some extent be compensated for by comparing the trends
revealed in the registers with those from neighbouring chapelries and
parishes. (3) In general these show a high degree of consistency sug-
gestig that as a long term factor this is not a serious problem.

The extent to which illegitimate births were recorded in the

(1) eg, December 1st 1751, August 19th 1761, February 19th 1773,
October 9th 1778

(2) D.E.C.Eversley,"A Survey of Population in an area of Worcester-
shire from 1660-1850 on the basis of Parish Registers", loc cit, p 256

(3) A.Sparke, ed,"The Registers of the Parish Church of Bury in the
County of Lancaster 1647-1698", L.& C.P.R.S, Vol 24, 1905
H.Brierley, ed,"The Registers of the Parish Church of Altham in
the County of Lancaster 1596-1695", L.& C.P.R.S, Vol 36, 1909
J.Clayton ed,"The Registers of the Parish Church of Radcliffe
in the County of Lancaster 1660-1760", L.& C.P.R.S, Vol 60,
1922
Wild,"The Saddleworth Parish Registers as a source for the His-
tory for the West Riding Woollen Industry during the Eighteenth
Century", loc cit, passim.
registers is another highly variable potential factor. Though some illegitimate births were clearly recorded, there is no sure way of estimating the constancy of this recording. However, the probability of high mortality amongst such illegitimate births would considerably reduce their long term demographic significance. Though it would artificially depress both the local birth rate and death rate estimates, its effects on the trend of growth would be proportionately reduced. The degree of such mortality would vary with the economic climate and as this climate probably improved during much of the eighteenth century, it may have become a more important problem during this later period. Against this, an improved economic climate may have reduced marriage barriers thus reducing illegitimacy.\(^{(1)}\)

In a remote moorland area such as Rossendale, distance, terrain and climate were all potential deterrents to families making use of the facilities afforded for recording vital events. In reality this problem would not always have been severe. The Haslingden register for 1709-1722 shows that thirty babies were baptised at home in those years, nearly five per cent of all contemporary baptisms. In the majority of cases, these home baptisms involved babies from outlying parts of the chapelry thus indicating an awareness of the need for such a service. With the development of such facilities at Goodshaw and Bacup and the emergence of non conformist chapels during the eighteenth century, the problem posed by the area's natural features would have been gradually diminished. Thus during the course of the eighteenth century this was probably a factor of declining significance.

\(^{(1)}\) However, the extent of illegitimacy must also be seen as the product of social as well as economic forces.
The failure of births to be fully reflected in baptisms would probably peak where a new born infant died within a short period of birth before a baptism could take place. This would depress baptism totals and thus the estimated birth rate and total population size. Due to the high level of infant mortality in pre-industrial societies this would be a serious cause of under recording. A major factor influencing this problem would be the birth/baptism interval, the longer the interval the greater the potential under recording. For the second half of the seventeenth century it has been suggested that in the median parish three quarters of infants were baptised within two weeks of birth. However, this was based on a national sample and short distance variations were seen to be marked. In consequence more localised data is desirable.

The registers of the parish of Bury which incorporated part of southern Rossendale, namely the townships of Musbury and Coupe Lench, New Hall Hey and Hall Carr, recorded birth/baptism intervals in part of the late seventeenth century. Between 1662 and 1674 sixteen Rossendale infants were baptised here, six within one week, the rest within two weeks of birth. The pattern for the parish as a whole for which the sample is much larger confirms this picture. In 1660 eighty five per cent of baptisms occurred within two weeks of birth, a further ten per cent within three weeks. In 1690, ninety one per cent occurred within two weeks, the rest within three weeks.

For the early eighteenth century more albeit limited information relating directly to Rossendale is available. Between 1718 and 1726 the birth/baptism intervals are given for twenty seven entries


(2) Sparke, ed, 'The Registers of the Parish Church of Bury in the County of Lancaster 1596-1695, loc cit, passim
in the Haslingden register. This data suggests a lengthening of the
intervals with only fifty per cent of cases showing intervals of un­
der two weeks, seventy five per cent under four weeks with the figure
of ninety six per cent only being reached after two months. Unfor­
tunately, the value of this data is limited. As with that for Ros­
sendale 1662-1674 the size of the available sample is very small.
In addition, the 1718—1726 data only covers a relatively small per­
centage of all chapelry baptisms in those years. Even so, it is worth
noting that the available evidence despite its limitations, suggests
an increase in the interval, possibly dating from the 1680's from
below to above the Midi Berry and Schofield median.

The interval continued to increase during the rest of the eight­
eenth century according to the data from the Goodshaw and Haslingden
registers for soon after this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodshaw 1801-1804</th>
<th>Haslingden 1805-1806</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval in Weeks</td>
<td>0-4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Cases</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This trend may have been applicable to north west England as a
whole during the eighteenth century. In itself this widening of
the birth/baptism interval would mark an increase in the risk of
under recording vital events in local registers. However in the

(1) Midi Berry & Schofield, loc cit, p 456-9
eighteenth century this was at least partially offset by a decline in
the local death rate which would have reduced the impact of such widen­
ing intervals.

The above material indicates that some degree of under recording
was almost certainly present in local registers. Yet there is no rea­son to suppose that this problem significantly altered in scale over
time or significantly differed between the baptism and burial records.
If so, this would suggest that the crude annual totals of vital events
provide the best, albeit crude, indication of local population move­ments. This view is strengthened by the fact that the figures derived
from the parochial surveys of 1650, 1717 and 1778, and the figure from
the 1801 census generally coincides with the results obtained from
plotting trends from the crude annual totals of vital events as noted
above.
APPENDIX II

THE NATURE OF ROSENDALE CUSTOMARY MEASURE

In the mid seventeenth century the Rossendale area was surveyed twice in manorial rental surveys. The returns of these surveys give an indication of the size of local landed estates.

However the surveys measure the area in terms of customary rather than statute measure. It is probable that this customary measure was either the Cheshire acre of eight yards to the rod or the Lancashire acre of seven to seven and a half yards to the rod. Both units of measure were certainly in use in seventeenth and eighteenth century Rossendale. The best fit to the known local acreage comes when the Lancashire acre is used to convert land classed as 'old' hold and the Cheshire acre for land classes as 'new' hold. The surveys go on to state that copyhold tenants paid a rent of 4d per customary acre per year for 'old' hold and 6d per customary acre for 'new' hold. Thus by converting estate rentals into customary acres at the rate of 4d or 6d per acre and then converting the resulting customary acreage into a statute acreage by the use of the Lancashire and Cheshire acre, a good estimate can be obtained of the local estate sizes.

Within the township of Haslingden, a small amount of freehold was present and this was not covered by the above surveys. Woodcock's analysis of local land holdings via the extensive use of local court

(1) Farrer, Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, Vol III, p 420 PRD/E/179/250/4 p 65 sqq
(2) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 6-7
(3) Woodcock, "Some Ewood Deeds", loc cit, p 14
(4) Farrer, Court Rolls of the Honor of Clitheroe, Vol III, p 420
rolls enables the extent of these freehold areas to be clearly estimated. (1)

Together the converted figures of Rossendale copyhold and freehold yield a total estimate of twenty thousand, nine hundred and thirty eight statute acres. This is within 0.2% of mid nineteenth century estimates. This close proximity lends strength to the view that this is a reliable method of conversion.

In consequence the conversion rates have also been used on local land deeds to convert estate and farm sizes into statute acres for the entire period 1650-1795.

(1) Woodcock, Haslingden: A Topographical History, p 9
APPENDIX III

CHAPELRY REGISTERS AS A GUIDE TO THE SETTLEMENT PATTERN

Not all places of residence listed in the Rossendale registers can be identified as specific settlements on late eighteenth and early nineteenth century maps.\(^{(1)}\)

This failure can be explained by several factors. In a number of cases, the registers supply only the general area of residence rather than the precise location, for example, the registers of 1661-5, 1678-82 and 1701-9 give thirteen, sixteen and eighteen references respectively to the general area of Musbury, and sixteen, twenty two and twelve references respectively to the general area of Grane. Though such general locations account for the bulk of the problem, a small residue of settlements remain to which no reference is made on later maps. These cases may well reflect a change in the names of settlements or possibly the abandonment of a settlement.

Despite these problems the registers still provide a reasonably comprehensive coverage sufficient to indicate the general pattern of local settlement.

\(^{(1)}\) LRO/Yates Map of Lancashire 1788
J. Aitken, *A Description of the Countryside for Twenty to Thirty miles around Manchester*, 1795
LRO/Greenwoods Map of Lancashire, 1818
6" to 1 mile Ordnance Survey Map of Rossendale 1845
Other listings relate to settlements adjacent to Rossendale proper or provide no indication of settlement at all.
### Rossendale Settlement Listings 1661-1785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1661-65</th>
<th>1678-85&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1701-09</th>
<th>1721-25</th>
<th>1741-45</th>
<th>1755-59</th>
<th>1781-85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Listings</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>3,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Settlement Listings</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Listings giving Settlement</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(1)</sup> Haslingden data covers 1678-1682, the Newchurch data 1681-1685
Haslingden data covers 1705-1709, the Newchurch data 1701-1705
TABLE NO I
HASLINGDEN TRADES AND CRAFTS 1705-1785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1705-9</th>
<th>1722-6</th>
<th>1741-5</th>
<th>1755-9</th>
<th>1781-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building and Allied Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters and Joiners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaziers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater/Tiler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason/Joiner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and Drink Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victuallers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker/Butcher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apothecary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer/Mercer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwareman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clothing Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1705-9</td>
<td>1722-6</td>
<td>1741-5</td>
<td>1755-9</td>
<td>1781-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apothecary or Barber/Surgeon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metal Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leather Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers/Cordwinders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker/Carrier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitelimer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Statute Acreage</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Statute Acreage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Brecks</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Hudhey</td>
<td>28.3-31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Constablers</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Tunstead</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henheads</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coupe</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Lum</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincey's</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whorlaw</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Constablers</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Loveclough</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>25.8-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodshaw</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Loveclough</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Crewehouse</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swinyard Law</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Pithead</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodshaw</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Wormstall Holme</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Middlegate</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Dedwencloough</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Tunstead</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Henheads</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oakenheadwood</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Crewehouse</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horncliffe</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pithead</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Bacupbooth</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Gambleside</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Bacup</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oakenheadwood</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Goodshaw</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Hill House</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Tunstead</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Tunstead</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hile Farm</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ewood Hall</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Moor</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hargreaves</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Hile Houghe</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warth</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coup</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwood's</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dawson's</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heys</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunstead</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foe Edge</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfenden</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>9.5-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfendenbooth</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Flaxmoss</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Carterplace</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hudrake Head</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hudrake</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunnyfield</td>
<td>117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Hudhey</td>
<td>56.8-63.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swinehills</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clough Bottom</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Swinyard Law</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Parkhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Low Swinyard Law</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Low Swinyard</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Boothfold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Barne Tenement</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Stonefold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Fish Tenement</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Oakenheadwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Windy Harbour</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Horncliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Gilbert's</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Skinner's</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Loveclough</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Goodshaw</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Carterplace</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>9.5-10.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Old Meadows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Pickup Bank</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>New House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Wormstall Holme</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Bentgate</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Lane Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES:**

Woodcock, *Haslingden: A Topographical History*, passim

Woodcock, "Some *Ewood* Deeds", *passim*
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**TABLE III(A)**

*Poor Law Expenditure in Higher and Lower Booths Townships 1690-1742*

*Total Expenditure (in £ s d)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Higher Booths</th>
<th>Lower Booths</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Higher Booths</th>
<th>Lower Booths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>£26/14/-</td>
<td>£21/12/6</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>£47/-/-</td>
<td>£29/17/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>£41/12/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>£52/11/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£55/15/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>£28/18/9</td>
<td>£23/19/-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£26/7/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>£33/-/-</td>
<td>£23/5/8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£81/7/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>£34/-/-</td>
<td>£25/11/-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>£37/1/9</td>
<td>£27/19/11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£31/15/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>£73/18/7</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>£38/15/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£33/9/4</td>
<td>£27/6/11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£31/15/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>£41/1/7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£31/15/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>£20/5/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£31/15/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>£24/2/10½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£22/18/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>£21/17/8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£13/15/7½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>£15/12/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£18/1/2</td>
<td>£19/6/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>£24/15/5</td>
<td>£14/11/8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£29/17/4</td>
<td>£17/1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>£28/19/-</td>
<td>£17/-/-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£32/12/9</td>
<td>£30/2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>£42/10/10</td>
<td>£27/10/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20/1/11</td>
<td>£21/13/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>£34/8/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£18/5/9</td>
<td>£16/14/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£35/8/2</td>
<td>£28/4/4</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>£67/12/-</td>
<td>£60/4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>£31/4/10</td>
<td>£35/12/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>£71/18/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>£26/8/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£42/16/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£47/7/10</td>
<td>£45/14/2½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£26/17/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>£31/17/2</td>
<td>£28/17/-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£30/19/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>£48/15/10</td>
<td>£33/16/9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>£39/-/-5</td>
<td>£26/17/-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>£40/3/6½</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE IIIB**

**POOR LAW EXPENDITURE BY TOWNSHIP 1776-1805**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Booths (Higher)</th>
<th>Booths (Lower)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Dunnockshaw</th>
<th>Haslingden</th>
<th>Henheads</th>
<th>Musbury</th>
<th>Newchurch</th>
<th>Yate &amp; Pick-up Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>£144/-/-</td>
<td>£121/2/-</td>
<td>£55/3/8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£231/1/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£19/0/10</td>
<td>£126/0/9</td>
<td>£74/16/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>£156/-/-</td>
<td>£122/2/-</td>
<td>£110/11/-</td>
<td>£6/15/3</td>
<td>£348/-/-</td>
<td>£16/3/-</td>
<td>£33/6/5</td>
<td>£472/13/1</td>
<td>£84/2/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£151/18/11</td>
<td>£152/7/6</td>
<td>£110/11/-</td>
<td>£4/18/6</td>
<td>£303/16/9</td>
<td>£15/4/-</td>
<td>£33/6/5</td>
<td>£237/3/5</td>
<td>£124/7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>£144/-/-</td>
<td>£122/2/-</td>
<td>£119/14/8</td>
<td>£4/13/8</td>
<td>£230/19/0</td>
<td>£15/4/-</td>
<td>£38/1/8</td>
<td>£239/11/10</td>
<td>£65/17/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>£456/0/2</td>
<td>£426/9/10 3/2</td>
<td>£269/5/1 3/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£958/1/6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£105/5/2 3/2</td>
<td>£1484/10/5 3/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>£427/10/10</td>
<td>£418/19/4</td>
<td>£320/14/3 3/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£956/10/9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£76/17/5 3/2</td>
<td>£1138/0/7 3/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>£244/12/8</td>
<td>£276/6/11</td>
<td>£158/2/2 3/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£954/14/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£98/16/4</td>
<td>£766/9/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£228/3/7</td>
<td>£271/1/5</td>
<td>£157/7/11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£858/7/8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£76/4/5</td>
<td>£395/9/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>£166/11/4</td>
<td>£214/8/0 3/2</td>
<td>£176/1/5 3/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£945/13/6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£88/8/8</td>
<td>£780/4/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Coupe Lench, New Hall Hey and Hall Carr
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate No</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Occupier Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Annual Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Calf Hey</td>
<td>John Holding</td>
<td>Woollen carding and roving engine</td>
<td>£13 10s 0d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Broad Holden</td>
<td>George Wilkinson</td>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>£14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Hutch Bank</td>
<td>part by Thomas Wallwork</td>
<td>Cotton mill, old lodge, fall of water and other buildings</td>
<td>£22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hutch Bank Bottom</td>
<td>Hargreaves</td>
<td>Engine house, lodge and fall of water</td>
<td>£35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Weigh Mill Hutch Bank</td>
<td>Andrew Ashworth</td>
<td>Mill, lodge, fall of water and buildings</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Holden Mill</td>
<td>James Hargreaves</td>
<td>Engine house, lodges and falls of water</td>
<td>£22 6s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Cams Mill</td>
<td>James Law</td>
<td>Mill, falls of water, cottage and stable</td>
<td>£21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Helmshore</td>
<td>James Turner</td>
<td>Dry house, buildings and stable</td>
<td>£10 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stoving house and building</td>
<td>£2 2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mill, building, lodge</td>
<td>£38 4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£50 16s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Bridge End</td>
<td>Samuel Schofield</td>
<td>Mill, building, lodge and falls of water</td>
<td>£30 6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engine House</td>
<td>£7 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dyehouse building</td>
<td>£2 5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dryhouse building</td>
<td>£4 16s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£44 17s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bridge End Mill</td>
<td>John Riley</td>
<td>Mill, building, lodge falls of water</td>
<td>£27 2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dryhouse building</td>
<td>£4 4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dyehouse and stove house</td>
<td>£1 7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower mill and two warehouse rooms</td>
<td>£3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£35 13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate No</td>
<td>Estate Name</td>
<td>Occupier</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Annual Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ewood Old Mill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Printing shop</td>
<td>Empty and Unassessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dyehouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ewood Spinning Factory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty and Unassessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Holme Mill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mill engine house, lodge and fall of water</td>
<td>£37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dyehouse</td>
<td>£1 15s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two warehouse rooms</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£40 15s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Laneside</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Factory, building, lodge cottage, waste and a</td>
<td>£21 7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fall of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Clough End</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cotton factory, building, fall of water and</td>
<td>£20 3s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 perches of lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Paghouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Factory, building, fall of water and lodge</td>
<td>£31 4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Carr Mill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Building, lodge, fall of water and land</td>
<td>£23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New dyehouse</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parkhouse</td>
<td>Lawrence Duckworth</td>
<td>Carding Engine</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>James Birtwistle</td>
<td>Carding Engine</td>
<td>£13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Hargreaves</td>
<td>Carding Engine</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mid seventeenth century Rossendale was economically backward even by the contemporary standards of highland England. The rest of the century did little to improve the position of Rossendale as a whole. Within Rossendale, the experience was not uniform. The west, which experienced at best stable population and stable per capita wealth, remained economically committed to cattle rearing. The east, which experienced rising per capita wealth and population levels, became more orientated to woollen manufacturing. These differential experiences and trends are unlikely to have been merely fortuitous.

From c1715, a new phase of long term economic and demographic growth was entered, benefitting all parts of Rossendale. This growth, based on the woollen trade, was at the expense of the more traditional features of the local economy, notably agriculture and the market and fair of Haslingden.

Long term demographic and economic expansion continued down to the 1790's. Now, however, the economic base of expansion was widened particularly in western Rossendale by the growth of cotton manufacturing and factory production. Both developments were rapid, but neither were particularly new. Cotton manufacturing had been present earlier in the century, whilst the scale of early mills was usually as modest as in the old established domestic sector.

From the mid 1790's this long phase of expansion on a traditional domestic base was ended, most dramatically by the impact of the French wars, the building of large factories and the emergence of large scale business units.