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Abstract

Angela Darlington

The period covered by this document extends over nearly 600 years from the Norman Conquest to the English Civil War. In focusing on the lot of the common people of Castleton and Hope, it provides a backdrop in terms of the land that they occupied, and some of the most important influences in their day-to-day lives. They raised their families in unpredictable circumstances affected by the vagaries of climate and disease. In what was already a difficult existence, they also had to contend with the constraints of forest rule and the onerous burden of taxation. The church and the lead-mining industry both played a central part in these two North Derbyshire communities.

The scene is set with William the Conqueror’s great Domesday survey and a discussion of the differences between the two villages in terms of land areas, taxable value and administration as described for 1066 and 1086. At the time of the Norman Conquest Hope was a larger and much more important settlement than Castleton, but within 20 years of the Conquest was apparently declining in economic status whilst Castleton was growing.

Hopedale within the Royal Forest of Peak was the home of Hope and Castleton villages and so Forest Law was central to the people that lived and worked there. The section on the Royal Forest describes the hierarchy that protected it and made rulings on apparently frequent misdemeanours including those of “vert and venison” that generated yet another source of income for the Crown.

Hope had a Saxon church and Castleton’s St Edmund’s Church dates from at least early Norman times. Both institutions played a very large part in the daily life of the community not least in the tithes that were collected over hundreds of years. The differences in the ways the two churches developed are discussed, pointing out their divergent jurisdiction from the second half of the 12th century, and the difficulties that faced parishioners during the Reformation and the Commonwealth.

Following on from the topic of church tithes, the many and varied forms of taxing subjects, from the early taxes such as “geld”, “heriot” and “scutage”, to Elizabethan Poor Law and Charles’s use of Ship Money to raise funds during the period when parliament was abolished are discussed. Each type of tax is thoroughly explained and placed into general context, and reference is made to certain very good records for Hope and Castleton that are available on e.g. the Poll taxes and the Exchequer Lay Subsidies. These provide insights into the incomes, occupations, and continuity of names over the 600-year period of the project.

Chapter 6 on Crime and Punishments specifically covers examples from the Derbyshire Eyres of 1281 and the Forest Rolls relating to Castleton and Hope, explaining concepts such as “frankpledge”, “englishry” and “murdram”. The earlier chapter on the Peak Forest provides the context for crimes concerning brewing and baking, and we see an important function of the village church as a place of sanctuary.

High rates of violent crime would have been part of everyday life for the common man. Apart from the taxes imposed to fund them, the impacts of war were intermittent. Chapter 7 describes in some detail the Scottish Wars of Edward II (in which the High Peak was required
to raise 300 archers), musters for a possible Spanish invasion under Elizabeth I and events during the Civil War, with reference to some important local characters.

Land transactions are some of the most widely surviving documents from our period of research and provide us with significant information on the fortunes of local families, including their social rankings, where they lived and what lands they held. The section on Hope focuses on three historic properties including for example King’s Hague which has links to the Eyres, a family prominent in the area for more than 700 years. A few original land transfer documents dating from the early 1300s are held at local archives, others came from a variety of immensely valuable transcripts compiled by antiquarians in the 19th/20th century. As well as family names we found evidence of place names that are still in use today; in particular records of field names have value in providing evidence of the medieval open fields of both Castleton and Hope.

The history of both villages is inextricably linked to the industry of lead mining, as well as to agriculture. A detailed account of the mines, the life of the miners who worked them and the gentry that exploited them has been compiled. Mining in the Hope Valley is thought to go back to Saxon times; Odin Mine beneath Mam Tor was the earliest named mine in the area for which we have records (1280). The laws relating to mining are described in some depth.

A few prominent local surnames are discussed, with a thorough treatment of the Woodroffe family of Hope. Many of our local names originated from occupations, and only became hereditary in the 1300s. Occupations in the Castleton area as listed in the 1381 poll tax and Court Rolls, and the laws governing brewers, bakers and butchers are discussed.

Finally the document concludes with an analysis of wills and inventories from 1547 for Castleton and from 1620 for Hope, up until 1650. Whilst these do not strictly span the medieval period they make the link to early modern times in the Hope Valley and tell us a great deal about the social history of the ordinary people who lived and died there.
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1. Introduction

Di Curtis

This report is the result of the documentary research conducted as part of Castleton and Hope Historical Societies’ Lives of the Medieval Common People Project. Members of the project documentary research group undertook research between February 2012 and April 2013 with the aim of identifying evidence for the lives of the more ordinary residents of the two parishes for the period between the Norman Conquest in 1066 and the English Civil War of 1642-51.

The group searched documents in Derbyshire Record Office, Lichfield Archives, Sheffield Archives and the National Archives, as well as printed transcripts of court rolls in the University of Sheffield. Types of documents included wills and inventories, land deeds, historical maps, close, fine and patent rolls, inquisitions and other court and ecclesiastical records. The study area was the modern parishes of Castleton and Hope, though Hope was a much larger area during the medieval period and it is difficult to identify references to the modern parish rather than the wider area.

The following chapters are the result of this monumental task, undertaken in less than 18 months. The report is ordered into chapters which seem best to convey the results of the research and help to give insights into how the ordinary people of Hope and Castleton lived in Medieval society.

The Archive consists of all documents retrieved, with details of source, reference number, brief extract of content, and the type of record made (either digital or photocopy) which has been stored for future consultation as an Excel file. A file of paper “slips” recording this information was also kept because not everyone has access to a computer or is able to work with online material. All digital images are stored in a separate archive which is available for consultation, by request through the societies’ web sites. Many of the photocopied documents have been digitised, a task which we hope to complete over the next year, when they will be available for consultation by request through the societies’ web sites. The final documentary report was written by the named individuals and expertly put together under the general editorship of Bill Bevan.

The project and this report are funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund.
Figure 1. Location of Castleton and Hope.
2. Domesday

Bill Bevan

"While spending the Christmas time of 1085 in Gloucester, William had deep speech with his counsellors and sent men all over England to each shire to find out what or how much each landholder had in land and livestock, and what it was worth".  

_Anglo-Saxon Chronicle._

As with many parishes in the Midlands, the first documentary record of Castleton and Hope is the AD 1086 Domesday (Morgan 1978). Domesday was a survey of much of England, mostly the Midlands and south, and of parts of Wales undertaken under the orders of King William I (The Conqueror) to identify what his financial assets were. The survey recorded who the landowners were, what was the value of their land, what livestock they held and what taxes they had paid to Edward the Confessor. Often, we see changes in landowner and land value between the time of Edward’s death in 1066 and 1086.

A group of royal officers visited most shires where they held a public inquiry, probably in the shire court, where each township in the shire was represented. Despite Derbyshire being a shire long before Domesday, it was combined with Nottinghamshire and was served by the shire court in Nottingham until AD 1256 (David Hey pers. comm.). The survey was undertaken by the Hundred, or Wapentake in Norse-dominated areas, which was an administrative subdivision of the shire. Six Saxon and Six Norman jurors swore to the accuracy of the return for each Hundred. The judgement was final and there was no right of appeal. Within a century, the survey was known by the English as The Domesday— _The Day of Judgement._

Castleton’s entry in Domesday, where it is known as _Pechesers_ (Peak’s Arse) - referring to Peak’s Cavern.

**County:** Derbyshire.  
**Hundred:** Blackwell.  
**Total population:** 3 households.  
**Total tax assessed:** 2 geld units.  
**Taxable units:** Taxable value 2 geld units.  
**Value:** Value to lord in 1066 £2. Value to lord in 1086 £2.5.  
**Households:** 3 villagers.  
**Ploughland:** 2 ploughlands [land for use by two ploughs]. 4 lord's plough teams. 1 men's plough teams.  
**Other resources:** Meadow 8 acres.  
**Lords in 1066:** Arnbiorn of Castleton; Hunding of Castleton.  
**Lord in 1086:** William Peverel.  
**Tenant-in-chief in 1086:** William Peverel.

Hope’s entry in Domesday.

Hope parish at this time was a massive area that included Aston, Edale, Muchedeswelle, Offerton, Shatton, Stoke and Tideswell all by name in Domesday. Chapel-en-le-Frith was also part of Hope that this time. Where we refer to Hope in this section we mean this much larger parish. Interestingly Aston and Bradwell were listed separately.
County: Derbyshire.
Hundred: Blackwell.
Total population: 4.4 households.
Total tax assessed: 1.3 geld units.
Head of manor: Bakewell I.
Taxable units: Taxable value 10 geld units.
Value: Value to lord in 1066 £30. Value to lord in 1086 £10.3.
Households: 30 villagers. 4 smallholders. 1 priest.
Ploughland: 10 ploughlands [land for use by ten ploughs]. 6 men's plough teams.
Other resources: Meadow - 30 acres. Woodland - 4 leagues & 2 furlongs. 2
   leagues mixed measures. 1 mill, value 0.26. 1 church. 1.0 church lands.
Lord in 1066: King Edward.
Lord in 1086: King William.
Tenant-in-chief in 1086: King William.

Each entry gives a snapshot of land use and numbers of households living in each
parish. On the face of it, there are small populations in both, though there is some
inconsistency to query the survey's accuracy; 30 villagers and 4 smallholders are
recorded for the 4.4 households in Hope. Villagers were the peasants with most land,
smallholders were middling peasants with less land than villagers. Only the heads of
households were recorded, therefore the surveyed population was larger than that set
down on parchment. It is highly likely that the actual number of households in each
parish was also much greater than recorded. Thirty-four heads of household across the
huge Domesday Hope parish would barely be a viable population.

In Castleton, the peasants’ lord had changed from two Anglo-Saxon earls to William
Peverel, a son of William the Conqueror, who was granted numerous lands by his
father including the township of Peak’s Arse. William the Conqueror ordered the
castle to be built and was made the administrator of the King’s Royal Forest of the
Peak. The Domesday Hope formed a significant part of the Forest, which the King
kept direct lordship over the township, as had Edward the Confessor (see 2. Peak
Forest).

Land use in both parishes includes arable land and meadow, certainly underestimated
in extent for at least Hope, indicating that the peasants lived from mixed farming
rather than solely being pastoralists. No direct reference to pastoral farming is made,
but this is clearly due to it not being recorded given the vast areas of moorland pasture
in the region. Hope also has extensive woodlands, measured as a distance rather than
an area – four leagues being approximately 6 miles. This is likely to be another under-
estimate.

The ploughland was an area that could nominally be ploughed by a plough team of
eight oxen in a single agricultural year (Finberg 1951). It appears that Castleton has
more plough teams than arable land for them to plough, while Hope could
accommodate four more plough teams. The “men’s plough teams” would be those of
the villagers while William Peverel appears to have four of his own plough teams to
work his own landholding there – presumably three of them were employed in his
estates elsewhere.
Interestingly, the only mill and church in 1086 are recorded in Hope, with a priest and lands going with the church. Hope’s church is the only one recorded in northern Derbyshire in Domesday, north of Bakewell – and the one feature in Hope’s Domesday entry we can be certain was in the township of Hope itself (see 3. Castleton and Hope Parish Churches 1066 – 1650). This shows how important Hope had been as the centre of an Anglo-Saxon Royal estate, one of four the Peak District was divided into during the early medieval period along with centres at Ashford, Bradbourne and Wirksworth (Barrett 2006). These estates have been interpreted as being the hundred of Hamenstan and possibly the main territory of the Pecsaetan (Roffe 1986; Sidebottom 1999). Notably, all four centres are recorded in Domesday with a church and priest, and have surviving early medieval stone crosses. The mill was most likely for grinding arable crops into flour, though there is the slight possibility that it was a fulling mill for washing wool.

The difference in Castleton and Hope’s land values to the Lord and taxable geld units are clearly the product of the huge difference in land sizes. What is interesting is the difference in the changes in land values between 1066 and 1086, which hint at the social changes forced on England due to the Norman Conquest.

Castleton was worth £2 to the Anglo-Saxon earls in 1066 and Hope was worth £30 to Edward the Confessor. By the time of Domesday, Castleton had been improved in value by a nominal 25% under William Peverel. This suggests a continuity of agricultural land use under the change of landownership. Meanwhile, Hope had devalued by approximately 75% in twenty years. Was this a result of a lack of land management under the new King, because the creation of the Royal Forest changed land use compared to the Anglo-Saxon lordship, or because the parish lost some of its population during the Conquest?

The geld was a periodic tax, first raised by the Anglo-Saxons to pay for wars against the Norse and was calculated at a number of pence per hide or carucate. A carucate was a measure of land in the Danelaw, often recognized as being 120 acres, which could be ploughed by a single plough team in a year. Both township’s geld units neatly equivocate with their number of ploughlands – two in Castleton and 10 in Hope (See Chapter 4, Taxation). Of all the ambiguities in Domesday, one thing is certain, the whatever the true population of the parishes knew how much tax they had to pay their new king.
3. Peak Forest

Di Curtis

Introduction

The villages of Hope and Castleton lie within an area administered in medieval times as the Royal Forest of the High Peak (Peak Forest). This area, sometimes referred to as the Alto Pecco in early documents, was derived from large Anglo-Saxon royal estates centered on Ashford and Hope (Sidebottom 1999).

After the Norman Conquest in 1066 the land was kept as royal demesne. From this time, all England was ruled by a rigid social hierarchy called the feudal system with an additional layer of management within the Royal Forests, largely imposed through Forest Laws, to maintain land fit for the King’s pleasure and the King’s purse.

William Peverel was granted much of this land after the conquest in recognition of services rendered and in c.1080 began to build his castle in what is now known as Castleton. The administration of this area, also known as the Honour of Peverel, was carried out from the castle which also provided for the custody of prisoners.

In the 12th century the Peak Forest comprised most of the North West corner of Derbyshire. It was divided into 3 divisions known as:-

Longdendale to the North and North West. At Domesday “all Longdendale is waste; woodland, unpastured, fit for hunting” (Morgan 1978) and comprised 32 sq mls of forest (Kerry 1893) with 12 small settlements of Thornset, Ludworth, Charlesworth, Chisworth, Chunal, Hadfield, Padfield, Dinting, Glossop, Whitfield, Hayfield and Kinder; whilst the whole parish of Glossop was added in the time of Henry I.

Hopedale to the East comprised the villages of Castleton and Hope. A century earlier at Domesday, Hope was the centre of a very large manor which included the seven settlements of Edale, Aston, Shatton, half of Offerton, Tideswell, Stoke, Muchedeswelle (now unknown). Castleton was very small, called Peaksarse and “held the land of William Peverel’s castle”, but by the 12th century, Castleton was a thriving medieval village with the Castle at its centre. Hopedale contained eight and a half sq mls of forest (Kerry 1893).

Campana, the open limestone country to the South & South West, between the river Goyt and Castleton. At Domesday, Wormhill had 20 acres of meadow, a small amount of under-wood and no recorded inhabitants. Other settlements in this area, including Bowden, Chinley and Tunsted, are not mentioned in Domesday.

The Seat of Justice for Peak Forest was originally Wormhill but later moved to an extra-parochial place equidistant from Castleton, Tideswell and Bowden where a forest residency and chapel was constructed; known as “Camera in foresta regia Pecci” or “Camera in Campana”. By 1225 the Justice seat moved again to Bowden, later called Chapel-en-le-Frith, where the foresters had petitioned for a new chapel due to increase in population.

In later centuries the Forest is best described as comprising the Ecclesiastical Parishes of Hope and Castleton (Hopedale), Glossop (Longdendale), and Chapel-en-le-Frith.
At no time in its history, does the boundary of Peak Forest correspond exactly with the early Saxon/Danelaw, Norman manorial or Ecclesiastical boundaries.

**Boundaries of Peak Forest**

The boundaries of Peak Forest were set in place in 1281 at the Forest Pleas of 13 Edw I and despite disputes remained largely in place until 1600.

Metes and bounds of the Forest of Peak, beginning on the eastern part to the new wood of Goyt, and so by the waters of Goyt to the water of the Etherow, and so by the water of Etherow to Landcroft at Longdenehead, and so by Longdenhead by certain service to the head of Derwent, and by the head of Derwent to a place called Mytham Bridge, and from Mytham Bridge to the rivulet of Bradwell, and from the river of Bradwell to a certain place called Hucklow, and from Hucklow to the great dell of Haselbach, and from that dell to the Park of Hocklowe, and from Hocklowe to the river of Tideswell and so to the water of Wye, and from Wye ascending to Belston and so to the new place of Goyt (Yeatman 1886, p303).

Other descriptions are given, usually when disputes occurred (Yeatman 1886, p303).

**Administration**

The administration of Peak Forest was always in the hands of the aristocracy as the gift of the King. In Peak Forest the chief administrator was usually also the **Bailliff** of the Castle and held Courts of Justice (eyres) for all major infringements of Forest Law. Under the Bailiff came the **Verderers** who were directly responsible to the crown, with the duty of implementing all offences of Vert and Venison and required
to take major responsibility at the smaller courts or Swainmotes for lesser offences. Verderers were men of position and usually Knights of the realm. **Regarders** were appointed by the King, to make regular three yearly collective inspections of the state of the forest; they too were knights of the realm and appear to have functioned as an inspectorate of the Forest on the King’s behalf.

At the lower levels of administration, local people were employed in the forest to guard the King’s property. They took office by letters patent as **Foresters** sworn to protect Vert and Venison within their own locality and to manage all animal husbandry within the forest. Since they were “of the people”, this created conflicts of interest, some of which have been recorded in the Court Rolls and Court proceedings of the medieval period. In Peak Forest the Foresters may be “**Foresters in Fee**” who paid to the Crown a Fee farm rent for the hereditary office. Nonfee foresters were also appointed and Foresters in Fees might appoint assistants and substitutes to carry out their office (Kerry 1893). **Agistors** were appointed by letters patent to take rents for grazing (agistment) of the animals in the King’s forest.

In 1372 the castle and Peak Forest were transferred into the administration of the Duchy of Lancaster, but much of the land, within a century, reverted to direct administration by the crown where much of it remained until Pleas for deforestation prior to the Commonwealth.

**Offences of Vert**

Fines for damage to timber. The woods were an important source of revenue for the King, in particular an inexhaustible supply of large oak trees would have been needed for all building purposes including ships, wagons, carts for both transport and warfare as well as both domestic and official buildings. The King gave gifts and rewards of trees and allowances of wood (Estovers e.g. “Husbote, Hedgebote and Ploughbote”) to tenants. Wastes were created when woods were damaged.

Fines for enclosure of Forest. Assarts (enclosure) were usually small in area, a fine was paid and then a rent charged. It was against the law because such areas were fenced against deer, which were thus prevented from ranging freely through the forest. Fines for “Preprestures” refer to fines for an enclosure with some type of building within the assart. Fines specifically for house building also occur.

All Offences of Vert could happen with or without the permission of the Bailiff and in all cases resulted in fines (amercements), providing income for the King.

**Concerning the King's woods in the Forest of the High Peak**

In the early days of the reign of Edward I, (Pleas of Forest; 13 Edward I 1285) a survey of all the woods of Peak Forest was reported; this appears to be the only full survey of woods reported in the Forest Rolls. The following extracts both describe the woods within Hopedale and the value of trees. They also describe the sale for treasury funds and the unlawful use of timber even by the Bailiffs charged with managing the King’s estate. (Yeatman 1886, p266-269).

The woods of Ockes and Horewhyt (Oak and Birch) were wasted since the last pleas of underwood and branches to the damage of 30s. by the inhabitants of Bowden and its hamlets 100 oaks are destroyed. (Kelly 1893).
The wood of Hope, which is common to the inhabitants of Hope as well as to the King's men and others of the same vill, has suffered to the amount of 1 mark. It is decided that the wood is in the old waste formerly made by the same villagers. It is commanded that of the remainder they take nothing except their estovers upon view and permission of the foresters, but without any waste.

The wood of Pindale has been injured since the last pleas by the vill of Bradwell to the amount of (?); of the vill of Bradwell, for old waste at Noneleye, half a marc; of the vill of Thornhill and Aston for old waste of those woods, half a marc.

The woods of Derwent and Ashop have been injured since the last Pleas of the Forest by certain Abbots of Welbeck who are dead, as well as by the present Abbot, and he is fined £20 (for the whole waste). The woods of Derwent and Ashop are also deteriorated by the villa of Hope, Aston, Thornhill, Derwent and Ashop to the value of 40s.

The King’s wood of Derwent was also wasted by Thomas de Normanville by the sale of wood by the King’s warrant £20. The King gave power to Thomas de Normanville, senr., to sell wood by lot in all the Royal Forests in his bailiwick to raise the sum of £1,000; besides this 100 oaks were destroyed, 20 of which were out of Derwent and Ashop. (Yeatman 1886, p270).

The wood of Eydale has been injured to the value of 40s. by the Bailiffs residing in the Castle of the Peak since the time of the last Iter. The vill of Castleton 2s. injury; Bradwell 20s.—10 oaks were taken. The King’s wood of Kynder has been injured to the value of 10s. by the vill of Hayfield (fined 4s.), with the hamlets appertaining 300 oaks have been converted into pales.

**Offences of Venison**

All animals within the Forest belonged to the King; these included deer, sheep, cattle, pigs and other wild creatures such as otters (important source of fur?).

Venison was taken to stock the King’s larder and given as gifts to employees but was also taken illegally by villagers and others.

**Specific Offences Relating to Hopedale**

These are taken from the Forest Rolls as transcribed by Yeatman (1886).

1. **Henry III** 1216-1272

Many offences of Vert within the Kings demesnes were reported during the court proceedings of this reign (Yeatman 1886, p233).

Four out of a long list of approx 64 names can be identified as probably within Hopedale

**WM. PROPOSITUS DE HOPE.**

**ROGER FOLJAMBE,** for many transgressions, 20m.

**LESSING DE VILL CASTLE OF PECCO.**

**HEIRS OF PHILIP DE STRELLY.** The price of vert which his father had in demesne.

All the undermentioned Agistors were summoned for not producing their rolls according to the customs and assize of the forest. (Yeatman 1886, p236).
There follows a list of Agistators and Regarders fined, from 2s to 1m, for not doing their jobs; one out 26 possibly from Hopedale.

PETER DEL HURST, Regarder of the Forest of Pec, because he did not present assarts and purprestures in his rolls 10s.

Fines for the illegal enclosure of land (Assarts) within Peak Forest. The King through his Bailiff was paid a fine for the offence and then demanded a yearly rent for the land, which continued to be paid by the offender’s heirs henceforward. For example In Villa de Castra de Pecco:

WALTER PIRROC assarted in the King’s demesne (2 Henry III), 3 acres in the Vill of the Castle, by the license of the Earl of Derby then Bailiff of the Peak, and Simon son of Mathew (dead) now holds it at the rent of the King, paying 4d per year for each acre, and the said Walter gave to the Earl for each acre 12d. for a fine and for rent (?) for which the heirs of the said Earl are answerable, and be it known that he shall pay the rent each year for his lands, and the same Simon is attached by Reyner de Hope and William de Scerde.

The following assarts were made and fines noted (Yeatman 1886, p242-243). These 9 names from Hopedale from a list of approximately 40 names.

- ADAM DE HOPEGATE assarted. 1 acre.
- EUSTACE DE HOPE, 4acre., 6s.
- WILL HENDY, 5acre., bail Robert of Aston and William son of Henry de Hope.
- ELIAS OF THORNHILL (dead), 6a. Robert his son now holds it.
- SIWARD OF THORNHILL, 6a
- ROBERT SON OF WILLIAM. of ASTON, 5a.
- WILLIAM. FIL ALDUS, 7a., bail. Wm. Nigel de Hope and Wm. Albn de Hassop.
- JOHN LE HARE, 2a. bail. Peter fil Robert de Hassop and Wm. de Aldus.
- ROBERT DE BALGY 1a.

In another sequence of fines for assarts which covers the whole period of the Kings reign, many are noted for other areas eg six at Bradwell 14 at Bowden, 20 at Combes, 22 at Buggesworth, 23 at Hayfield, 8 at Whitehall with only approximately three within Hopedale. (Yeatman 1886, p252 – 265).

WILLIAM FIL RICHARD DE SCERDE holds 4acres. in the Vill of Peak of the Liberty of William the Earl, Senior, at 4d. per annum to the King, and for fine to the Earl 4s.

Reyner de Hope 4a.

RICHARD LE HORE (dead) 3a. Peter his son now holds it.

Fines (Purprestures) were enforced for houses built both within and without the demesne lands and with and without the permission of the Bailiff. Houses were built at Bowden, Hassop, Buggesworth, Hayfield, Tunsted, Wormhill, Chelmorden, Taddington but apparently not in Hopedale. (Yeatman 1886, p249-250).

2. Edward I 1272-1307

*The Rights of the Foresters in Fee*

The rights and privileges of the Foresters in Fee in all divisions of Peak Forest which they or their ancestors possessed were clearly laid out in 1285 (Yeatman 1886, p269; Kerry 1893 for a better transcript). The document describes how much land they held, what their duties entailed and whether they could employ assistance to aid them in their duties. The post could be inherited or sold on.
The earliest copy of this information appears in the Forest Rolls of 36 Hy. III and is repeated in this 1285 version and at later dates when inheriting the position of Forester in Fee and as a general “inspeximus” in 1439 (Great Britain 1907c, p354).

For Hopedale (for full details see the original transcriptions):-

**William Hally.** A Forester in Fee who holds two bovates of land for the custody of his bailiwick, worth 6s per annum. His ancestors held 4 bovates of land, of which two were alienated in times past. He has all the above written rights enjoyed by the foresters of Campana and Longdendale, except that he has no man or servant or representative under him. He does nothing else for his office except his service and rent. It was asked whether he had appropriated anything and the jury said he had not.

**Peter de Shatton** A forester in Fee who holds two bovates of land in Shatton worth 6s per annum for keeping his bailiwick. His ancestors held four, of which two were alienated by them in past times. He does nothing except his service and rent. He has all rights as the same William Hally.

**William Le Heyr (Eyre).** A Forester in Fee whose ancestors held 6 bovates of land; but 5 were alienated and let out at a yearly rent. He now holds one for the keeping of his bailiwick. He ought to provide a man to reap for one day in autumn at Peak Castle and have a meal there once in the day. And likewise he ought to perform one ploughing for the castle in Lent; and he has the same rights as the said William (Hally). He has fully performed his duties at the castle and has appropriated nothing to his office. A later William le Eyre in 1345 had a grant enabling him to appoint a deputy to perform his duty. (Great Britain 1903, p23)

**Robert Balguy.** A Forester in Fee, holds 4 bovates of land in Hope for the custody of his bailiwick worth 4s per annum. He does service at the castle as aforesaid, and has all the same rights as William (Hally). He has fully performed his service at the castle, and has not appropriated anything.

**Roger Woodrove.** A Forester in Fee, holds 2 bovates for his bailiwick worth 6s per annum. He duly performs his service at the castle.

**Peter le Hore.** A Forester in Fee, holds one bovate for his office worth 3s per annum. He duly performs his service at the castle, and enjoys all the same rights as others.

**Robert de Hausted.** A Forester in Fee, holds a bovate and a half of land for keeping his bailiwick, worth 4s 6d. His ancestors alienated half a bovate which was let for 18d. He performs his duties and enjoys all his rights as aforesaid, but has a license by Letters Patent to appoint a deputy. (Kerry 1893).

Pleas of Venison and Vert (Yeatman 1886, p275 – 285).

Pleas at the courts during Edward’s reign produced records that are largely concerned with the taking of venison and other animals.

The names of the Foresters in Fee in Hopedale are named as above.

The Foresters of Hopedale are named as THOMAS LE RAGGED DE BERDE, JO DE MELNER, JAMES DE MAYNWARING, and ROGER FIL ROBERT DE MILNER, DEPUTY of MATILDE DE WITEFIELD.

In many pages of recorded wrongdoing there are few which relate to the known inhabitants of Hopedale:-

JOHN GOORYNG OF TWYCHILL was consenter to the crimes of JOHN DE OKE AND PETER DE OSPRING, who took one doe; bail. Roger le Ragged of Castleton, Adam fil Thomas. of Castleton, Elias de Bradwell, etc

JOHN LE HOR of Hope took one doe.
In a court held by ROBERT BOZOON, Bailiff of the Peak, the following are names from Hopedale (Yeatman 1886, p289).

Thomas le Ragged, Peter Rowland, Roger le Ragged de Rowworth and Richard de Hatteman, who attended as Verderers of the Forest, and 30 men were sworn upon oath to form the Jury. There are three names from Hopedale:-

Ranulf de Ashope, Simon del Ospital, Adam son of Thomas de Castleton,

A series of Rolls (Yeatman, 1886, p291-302) contain Pleas of Vert, Assarts and Perprestures of which there is no mention of Hopedale.

Horses were kept in the forest and considered to be damaging the forest (Yeatman, 1886, p305).

“The Queen consort of the King had a horse-fold in Compana, with 115 mares and young, to the great hurt of the forest, and it is found that many had horses and mares in the same Compana, under cover of the aforesaid equitium, who when required to answer say that they are the Queen's”.

The names of men probably from Hope who employed this tactic follow:-

PETER DE SHATTON, Forester of Fee, had for one year, some horses and mares feeding in Compana, whose pasturage is assessed at 2s, therefore he is in mercy, and he must answer, and the said averta must be removed. Others were also caught and fined; Robert Balgy, Forester, had 9, Richard le Archer, 7, Roger le Ragged of Villa Castle, 4, Robert Bozin, 2 mares with young, Thomas le Archer, Forester, 6 horses and mares, Thomas son of Thomas Foljambe, 3, William Hally, 8, Peter le Hore 11 (of which 3 were John Martin's), William le Eyr, 8, Roger Woodrove, 6, Roger le Ragged, of Castleton, 4.

An important series of Rolls detailing Fines, Redemptions, Amercements, Judgments of the Forest of Peak in the County of Derby, before Roger Lestrange and his associates took place in the 13th year of Edward.I which resulted in many names from Hopedale being fined (Yeatman 1886, p307-313).

The following were fined for offences of Vert.
The Vill of Castle for vert in Eydale,
Wm. Hally and his companions, Foresters of Hopedale, for the price of a certain horse,
Wm. le Fox of Castleton for building a house to the injury of the forest
Luca de Foresta de Peak, Rich. Hally.
Wm Vicar of Hope, Peter le Hore dead, Robt. le Hore of Hope, Thos. Yrpe de Hope, Robt. Sutore de Hope, Roger Woodrofe de Hope, Wm. Blanshard de Hope, Wm. le Brewester of Hope, Robt. Balgy, Jo. fil Moll de Hope, Wm. fil Milicent de Hope,Herbert fil Roger de Hope.
A visitation of the Regarders took place with some interesting results (Yeatman 1886, p318-320). Various persons were fined for injury to the woods, including the Forester in charge, who was in consequence fined ½m.

ROBERT LE MELNER, Forester, was fined £10, bail. Roger le Ragged de Roworth, Roger le Ragged of Castleton, Roger Woodrove, et al.

Hv. DE MEDWE, James Mainwaring, Robt. Balgy, Ad, Oumfrey, Peter de Shatton, Peter le Hore, Roger Wodrove, Wm. le Eyre, Thomas de Gretton, all foresters, were fined in the same way.

The heirs of Thomas Foljambe, already fined several times, were again fined.

The heirs of Wm. de Horsenden, whilst Bailiff, were fined £10, and for two forges for iron, 4½m.

THOS. DE GRETON, Wm. Foljambe, Hy. de Medwe, Peter Shatton, Robt. de Hausted, Robt. Balgy, Robt. Bozon, Thos. le Archer, Henry Medwe (again), Thos. fil Thos. Foljambe, Wm. Hally, Peter le Hore, Wm. le Eyre, Roger Wodrove, Nich. de Babingly. Thos. de Gretton, Thos. le Ragged de Ferneley, Cecilia Foljambe, were all fined for abusing their rights of pasturage.

Mathew de Kintwich, Robt. de Melner, Matilde de Whitefield, for cropping the land.

Ralf de Corner and Gilbert de Lizors and others were fined for taking fines improperly.

“That these fines were realities and had to be paid is evidenced by the fact that so many of the misdemeanants were practically bankrupt, no doubt ruined through the imposition. There is a statement occasionally in the rolls of certain persons being pardoned or excused payment, as, for instance, in 1340, John de la Hide, Wm. his brother, Peter de Wetenehale, Rich. de Broonhall, Robert de Ashton, and John de Pickford were severally pardoned by the King in consideration of their good services beyond the seas, and no doubt amongst the favoured ones many escaped punishment, but this long roll of fines is a sad story of wrong doing and retribution” (Yeatman, 1886, p319).

Records of some visits by the King ROLL V (Yeatman 1886, p285).

In 1274 the King hunted in Compana which appears to have attracted others to illegally take Venison (Yeatman 1886, p287). Noblemen of the court also hunted in the forest, killing many deer, some of which may have provided meat for the King’s larder (Yeatman 1886, p288).
3. Edward II 1307-1327 (Yeatman 1886, p320).

List of the Officials of the Forest.

Walter Waldeshelf, Chief Steward.

Foresters of Hope Dale.
Wm. Halley, Peter de Shatton, Robt. de Heire, Nicolas Baggeshawe

Verderers.
Philip ac Stredleigh, Wm. de Gratton, Robt. le Ragged, Wm. del Hage.

Regarders (Yeatman 1886, p321).
Richard de Paddeleghe, John de Smaleleghes, Robt. del Clough, Robt. de Wardelow, Rich. de Buckstones, Alan del Halle, Benedict de Shalcross, John Browne, Robt. de Bagshawe, Ralf fil Nicolas.
Wm. de Stafford, Hugh de Bredbury, Rich. del Clough, Wm. le Ragged of Rouworth, Richard de Baggeshaughe, Geoffrey Smithson, Wm. at the Churchyard, Robt. le Taillour, John fil Tele, John de Chinley, Nicolas de la Ford. Thos. Martyn.

Forest of the High Peak in the hands of Queen Isabella
In April 1313 the king gave to his Queen Consort Isabella the manor and castle of High Peak (de Alto Pecco) with its members of the forest park together with the knight’s fees, Advowsons of Churches and all other things appertaining to the castle, manor and forest (Great Britain 1898a, p38).
The rights and privileges she enjoyed are noted in other documents (Great Britain 1898a, p276); (Great Britain 1898a, p490-491). Reminders are sent out to officials that for alleged trespasses of vert and venison in the Forest of High Peak, all fines and ransoms which shall be taken from transgressors convicted before them shall be taken for the use of the Queen (Great Britain 1898a, p281).

4. Edward III 1327-1377
There is no account of the forest courts in Yeardley for the time of Edward III.

Forest of the High Peak in the hands of Queen Phillipa
In October 1333 Edward III announced that he had “lately granted the castle and the honour of High Peak to Queen Philippa for life, together with the knights fees, advowsons, forests chases etc, pertaining thereto, and he does not wish injury to be done to the Queen in the respect” (Great Britain 1898b, p142). The Queen paid for the warden of the hospital of St Mary, Castleton in High Peak, out of this income (Great Britain 1902, p58). Queen Philippa awarded favours by granting the bailiwick of the chief forestership of the forest of the Peak to various individuals for their lifetime (Great Britain 1902, p116; Great Britain 1909a, p492; Great Britain 1911b, p303). The Queen reminded overseers of the rights of the foresters who:-
“ought to have ‘housebot’ and ‘heibot’ of the king’s woods for repairing the houses in which they dwell with oak and other houses of that serjeanty, with birch and alder.....and that they ought to have their pigs nourished in that serjeanty quit of pannage in the forest and also pasture for their cattle, ...the foresters there ought to have a pig of their choice” (Great Britain 1905a, p115) and orders “to seek out evildoers and who
had been committing offences against Queen Philippa’s free chase of High Peak at Castleton, Hope and elsewhere”. There is a list of misdemeanours and it is obvious that the queen’s profits were suffering (Great Britain 1909a, p448).

5. Richard II 1377-1399
Records of a court held at Tyddeswall (22 Richard II. 1398) (Yeatman 1886, p323).
Jury
Foresters (Yeatman, 1886, p324).
By the oath of Robt Heyre, Robt. Wodrove, Wm. Woderowe, Wm. de Abney, Thos. del Clough, Wm. del Halle, John del Hall, John Lavoc, Jo. de Hegham, Wm, de Bagshawe, Robt. de Millur, Jo. del Bower, John del Hall, Thos. de Hollyngworth.
Rich. del Ferne, Wm. Woodward, and Hy. Joys, present that—
John fil Win. de Castleton and Thos. fil Alice of Padley, took a stag.
Arthur de Carrington took a stag at Eydale.

Venison Trespassers
John de Castleton (Yeatman 1886, p325).

6. Henry IV 1399-1413 (Yeatman 1886, p326; transcribed by Carrington)
This document is not a Forest Court report. It apparently contains a list of Crown Rents, the amounts generally are small sums (according to Mr. Carrington) and is useful in that it gives a list of names and in some cases mentions houses or estates which are described as Land transactions or under Family names. The full document is in Appendix 2 with only the most relevant retained in this Peak Forest report.
Woodlands (Absorbed into Hope Parish in modern time) (Yeatman 1886, p328-333).
John Smyth of Houpe, for Peyddarhagge, 10s.
Robert Haigh and Willam Hall, for Byrchynley, £6; (Birchinley or Birchfield)
Demeyne of Castleton.
Savage, £4.

Intakes at Castleton.
William Trykett de cast. Capellanus Hospital de Spetill, Wilm Trickett de Hope, for the House of the Blessed Mary at Castleton, Villa de Castelton, p. turbary, Henr Hall Demeyn, 40s., George Savage, prest, 40s.
Houpe.
John Eyr for King's haigh, Tota villa for Weyfeleys, Tota villa for liberties.
Tota villa for Weyfeleys, Tota villa for increments.
Ashoppe, Thornehull, Aston.
For all three; Tota Villa for Weyfeleys, Idem Villa for turbary Idem Villa for liberties.

7. Henry VI 1422-1461
1438 (17th H.V. VI) Five courts were held for petty misdemeanours at Castleton (Yeatman 1886, p337-340).
A plea of debt inquiry between Nicolas Stanreng and John Cok, of Hope, for stallage.
Ditto between Thos Newton and Wm. Hatfield, of Eydale, for mowing.
John fil Robt. Balgy acknowledged that he owed Jo. Forneys 2s. 6d. on the bond of Nich. Balgy,
Rad Payn acknowledged that he owed Thos. Fetcher two lode dish of ore,
Robt. Ralgy, butcher, for selling corrupt meat, fined 12d.
John Molte, tailor, fil Rd. Molte, who carried away goods seized by Wm. Watkin,
Frank. Pledge. of Hope, of the goods of Margaret Dutton
Four other courts were held at which nothing identified as happening in Hopedale was identified
1439 (18th HENRY VI). Three courts were held for petty misdemeanours at Castleton
Thos. Newton 16d. for mowing.
John Fox of Castleton, fine.
It was accounted by the Bailiff, that when he seized the carcasses of Robt. Balgy in execution for 8d. to be levied upon him to the use of Nich. Stanreng, the same Robt. without license carried away and sold the said flesh, therefore he is fined 40d.
1440 (19th HY. VI). Two courts were held for petty misdemeanours at Castleton
Many names and the heirs of many names were summoned to before the Court of Castleton, according to the custom of the Manor, and they did not appear, therefore each of them is in mercy.

View of Frank Pledge (Yeatman 1886, p343).
Thornhill and Shatton.
Present George Halley, for shooting two arrows at Jo. Shater, intending to kill him.

Castleton.
Present, Thos. Clough and Roger Gerveys.
11 other districts outside Hopedale mentioned
1441 (20th H.V. VI). View of Frank Pledge (Yeatman 1886, p345- 346).
Thornhill and Shatton.

Castleton.
Xpofer Balgy, Roger Jernysson, Thos. dough, and Henry Shaw, Frank pledge.
Thos. Woodruff made an affray in the open Court of Castleton, fined 4d. upon, Oliver Halley. Kobj. Aleyyn and John Thornhil sold ale.

6 other districts outside Hopedale mentioned (Yeatman 1886, p349).

1444 (23 HY. VI). A WAPPENTAKE held at Longston
4 hearings for assarts heard, none of them in Hopedale

1451 (30 HY. VI). VIEW OF FRANK PLEDGE held at TIDESWELL (Yeatman 1886, p350).  

Thornhill and Schatton.

Castleton.

Hope and Aston.

**Conclusion**
The records for Peak Forest in the 13th Century support the view that the Forest was an important source of revenue to King Henry III. It appears the King was always hard up. Thus in 1236, Henry appeals to his subjects as follows; “To the good men to the Peak, the King, by the common counsel, his lieges, has taken into his hands all his manors and demesnes, to stock them and make his profit of them. And he requests them to give him such an aid of their oxen, cows and sheep to stock the said manor as John Gobaud, Constable of the Peak, as will give him cause to commend them and merit his gratitude.” (Great Britain 1906a, p147).

The King used Peak Forest as an important place to conduct affairs of state as when, in 1257, he received the submission of Malcolm of Scotland.

Another visit was in 1263 (48 Hy.III) when King Henry III lodged at the Castle of Peak. This event appears to have been the occasion for misbehavior by his servants and retinue. During this visit THOMAS DE FURNIVAL, Lord of Sheffield, together with his servants, IVO DE HERIG, RAD BARRY, RALF DE ECCLESHALL, and a certain Knight, ESTOUT DE STUTVILLE, ROBT. BERNARD BALISTER, MICHAEL DE BONTELAND AND ROBERT his brother, separately and of his own will entered the Forest of Peak and did much damage in the same, and hunted in the forest to the hurt of the same 12 beasts. Thomas was imprisoned. The same Thomas imprisoned SAMPSON DE HASELBROOK, bailiff under JOHN DE BOWDEN, and took from him £10. Furthermore, THOMAS HANCELYN, STEPHEN RYBAND, servants of the said Thomas, went from the castle in the present pare into Hopedale and took one doe in Pindale (Yeatman 1886, p286). For the common people, the reports suggest considerable settlement of land through enclosure and clearance of forest. As a result this increases the revenue of the King probably without harm to the forest since the assarts are small in size. The increasing
settlement is a sign of population pressure also recorded by the grant to the foresters of Bowden to build a new Chapel for administrative purposes.

There are very few records for Hopedale or its population in the Forest Rolls suggesting an established agricultural population with little need to gain land or hunt for meat. Castleton is well established as a town supporting the Castle.

The government documents describe exchanges of small pieces of land and are useful in providing names of villagers, which usually designate where the individual came from, and occasionally refer to specific named fields. Thus in 1216 Ralph Talebot makes a Grant of a half acre of land in Hope near Thornawe to Henry de Grengel. Witness: Elias de Thornhill, Peter de Shatton, Elias and Robert, brothers of Aston, Elyas son of Elyas of Thornhill. (Jeayes 1906, #1422, p175).(Land use is fully discussed elsewhere).

During the reign of Edward I the Forest is continuing to provide the King with income and sport and he visits in person. At the end of the 13th century the inhabitants of Hopedale are named for offences of Vert (Yeatman 1886, p307-313). Other documents from this period concern land transfers between Foresters, hinting at the building of estates. Land parcels are named and position in or near to open field cultivation given. Horses are mentioned for the first time and records suggest there is whole scale illegal keeping of horses within what may have been woodland. Again this suggests a thriving economy practiced by the foresters as the raising of horses must have been a very necessary part of the economy. There is mention of a forge, presumably the use of wood for the forge would be at conflict with a continuing policy of preservation of Forest. Villagers are named for misdemeanours of agricultural practices rather than forestry.

During the reigns of Edward II and III, the forest is in the hands of the Queen consorts. Although there is substantial evidence that they pursued their legitimate income from the forest with diligence through the government Rolls; there are no records of visitations for any reason and Forest Pleas are not recorded by Yeatman.

Towards the end of the 14th C under King Richard II, little is recorded until the 22nd year of his reign when a court returns a few reports for offences against deer. Throughout the 14th Century there is substantial reorganization of land holding recorded for Hopedale and it is tempting to speculate that, in the absence of direct inspection of Peak Forest, those with the means to do so were busy organizing their own futures.

During the 15th C under Henry IV and VI the work of the Courts appears to change. The Forest Rolls give only land rents for Henry IV and do not add to the picture of life in Peak Forest. Most of the relevant information is to be found within the Government Rolls of the periods which record land exchange and acquisition of small parcels of land including references to the beginning of enclosure.

During the time of Henry VI the courts appear to be held frequently but the summons are for assault and trespass and other misdemeanors of village life etc rather than fines against the Kings property.
During this period, the major business described in the Government Rolls concerns land grants and inheritance of estates.

I have seen no Forestry Rolls for the 16th C and most accounts consider there was progressively less and less use of Forest Law during the 16th and 17th centuries when the forest formed part of the extensive territories of the Duchy of Lancaster. Deer continued to roam the forest until the early 17th century, when they were largely cleared. The process of disafforestation, begun formally around 1626, was delayed by the Civil War and following the Restoration, delayed by a legal wrangle between two members of the Eyre family and opposition to enclosure by commoners and tenants of Peak Forest. Some of the earliest to agree a settlement were the petitioners of Chapel-en-le-Frith in 1712; the agreement for Hope and Castleton did not finally come until a century later (Somerville 1977).

**Appendix 1**  
**Full list of Crown Rents from King Henry IV 1399-1413**
(Yeatman 1886, p326; transcribed by Carrington)

*In-tackes at Castleton.*

*Houpe.*
A note on sources

The sources for this research are based on studies of John Pym Yeatman, G.R.Sitwell and Lord Hawkesbury in The Feudal History of the County of Derby (Chiefly during the 11th, 12th and 13th Centuries). These transcriptions of the Pleas of the Forest of Peak are invaluable. The original source of the documents, as recorded by Yeatman is given as follows:-

1. HENRY III 1216-1272 (Yeatman 1886, p230)
Rolls of the Forest of Peak VOL. III. SECTION VI.CHAPTER IX. (Yeatman 1886, p266).
Duchy of Lancaster Records now 1/5 (late F. Nos. 50 & 51, P.R.O.) The Pleas of the Forest of Peak. Craft of St. Michaelmas 13 Edward I.

2. EDWARD I 1272-1307 (Yeatman 1886, p307)
Rolls of the Forest of Peak VOL. III. SECTION VI CHAPTER XI.
ROLL OF FINES &c. 13 ED. I. 1/11(Formerly Chapter House Forest Rolls, Box VI, No. 4, Ed. I, now Duchy of Lancaster Forest Rolls.)

3. EDWARD II 1307-1327. (Yeatman 1886, p320)
Formerly F 55 (6) now 1/13 Duchy of Lancaster.

4. EDWARD III 1327-1377 No records

5. RICHARD II 1377-1399 (Yeatman 1886, p323)
CHAPTER XIII.THE PLEAS OF THE FOREST OF PEAK. Duchy of Lancaster Court Rolls, No. 1914, B 128, P.R 0.

6. HENRY IV 1399-1413 (Yeatman 1886, p326)

7. HENRY VI. 1422-1461 (Yeatman 1886, p337)
CHAPTER XVI. the COURT ROLLS of the DUCHY OF LANCASTER Now in the Muniment Room of His Grace the Duke of Rutland at Belvoir Castle (Extracted by Mr. W. A. Carrington, Curator of the Muniments).
4. Castleton and Hope Parish Churches 1066 – 1650

Ann Price

Introduction
The church in early medieval times was the focus of the religious and social life of the village. It was an age when the church teachings and customs held sway over people's lives to a very great degree. The church buildings themselves would probably have been the only structure of any size or permanence in the village and thus became important not only for church services, but for business transactions and the day to day life of the community.

At this time services were held daily, people standing in the nave and listening to the service in (perhaps to them incomprehensible) Latin. Many churches had paintings on the walls depicting biblical scenes and teachings as the congregation would for the most part have been illiterate. The south porch was often used for business dealings. Marriages might be carried out there and part of the baptism service as well as discussion of parish affairs (Smith, Cooke & Hutton 1976, p68-70).

It was also an age of superstitious beliefs and a great fear of the devil. Many churches had doom paintings giving a graphic illustration of what sinners could expect if they died without confessing their sins. The North door and north side of the church yard were also associated in people's minds with the devil. This door would be left open during a baptism to allow any evil spirits to leave the child and then the door closed quickly to prevent them returning. The north side of the churchyard was used only for burial of the outcasts of society (Clarke 2009, p38). At this time only the very wealthy would have a memorial within the church and there were no gravestones in the churchyards.

The church also provided much of the fun and celebrations for the villagers. There were over forty feast and holydays on which people could take a break from the daily grind of labour on the land for their lord or on their own plots. At a time when there were no clocks or watches lives would have been regulated by the church bell ringing out the hours for waking, working, sleeping, attendance at mass and curfew (literally, “coevre feu”, for safety in their thatched houses) (Smith, Cook & Hutton 1976, p70).

Churchwardens (instituted in 1192) raised and administered the funds which would care for the church fabric and services, prosecuted offenders for non-attendance at church, collected rents on church lands, farmed the church stock of sheep and cattle and sold wool and cheese.

Even the church yard could be used to provide a place of safety for animals in times of danger.

From Tudor times onwards the church went through great upheavals. Henry VIII closed the religious houses and seized their wealth for himself. He declared himself head of the church rather than the Pope and instituted a new form of worship with the use of Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer, so that, perhaps for the first time, the parishioners would understand the words of the service. The Protestant form of worship continued in Edward's reign, but when Mary came to the throne she tried to restore the Catholic faith. Then under Elizabeth protestantism was again the official
religion but as long as people outwardly conformed she did not enquire too closely into their privately held beliefs.

James I steered a middle ground between Catholicism and Puritanism, tolerant of both. It was during his reign that the Bible was first translated into English, a huge advance for ordinary people at last able to understand what was read to them in services.

Charles I’s time was also troubled by religious matters and a split between High Church practices – termed “popery”- which he favoured and the puritanism of many in Parliament was one of the contributory factors in the Civil War.

It was a deeply unsettling time for priest and people alike.

History
The histories of Castleton and Hope parish churches vary a great deal considering that only a mile and a half separate the two villages.

In the Domesday survey of 1086 Hope is described as having “a priest with a church to which there belongs 1 caracute of land”. William Peveril had charge of these manors which included Bakewell and Ashford.

Figure 3. St Peter’s Church, Hope is probably on the site of the original Saxon church.
Photo: David Price.

In Saxon times the church of St Peter's at Hope lay at the centre of a very large royal hunting estate. The ecclesiastical parish included, besides the chapelry of Tideswell to the south, other chapelries at Fairfield, Chapel-en-le-Frith and Fernilee in the west. Hope Woodlands lay to the north and to the east were Abney, Stoke and Hignlow. In between came Hope township, Aston, Brough and Shatton, Thornhill, Grindlow, Great Hucklow, Little Hucklow, Hazelbadge, Bradwell and part of Wardlow. The size of the parish has given rise to the theory that Hope was a “ministeria” or missionary church in Saxon times. There are the remains of a Saxon Cross in the churchyard (Turbutt 1999, p311).
Castleton's church is not mentioned in the Domesday survey, but the church is dedicated to Edmund, a Saxon saint so there may have been a church at that time. William Peveril, whose estates included the old Royal hunting forest of the Peak, established his castle on the hill and is thought to have built a new church in about 1100 in the town which nestled at its foot. There is a Norman arch between the nave and chancel and a Norman font, as well as a piscina in the south wall of the nave, all evidence of the present church's early origin. There are also the remains of an early cross in the churchyard (Parkin, Harrison & Fowler [n.d.]).

Figure 4. St Edmund’s Church, Castleton with its 14th Century tower. Photo: Alan Darlington.

The advowson (the appointment of a priest) as well as tithes and other benefits of both Hope and Castleton churches were held by William Peveril of Castleton for the king. However in 1153 William Peveril's son, also William, is alleged to have poisoned the king's favourite, the Earl of Chester and his vast estates were forfeit to King Henry II. William retired to Lenton Priory, which he had founded, but was eventually forced to flee the country. In 1163 Henry gave the Peveril estates to his son, John, Earl of Mortain (Cox 1877, p257) At this point the history of the two churches diverges.

Hope
During the reign of Richard I in 1192, Prince John gave the church of Hope, with its chapelry at Tideswell to Hugh Nonant, Bishop of Coventry hoping for his support in his plots against his brother Richard I. This grant was ratified when John became king (Jeayes 1906, #1419, p174). In 1219 Bishop William de Cornhill gave all the rights in the church at Hope and its chapellries to the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield. The vicarage of Hope was formally ordained between 1224 and 1238 during the episcopate of Alexander de Savensby. Tideswell became a separate parish in 1254, but the rest of the villages within the original Saxon “ministeria” remained as part of Hope parish until the 19thC. The Dean and Chapter continued to hold the advowson of the parish until 1549 when the rights to the tithes of the rectory manor were given to Ralph Gell of Hopton (Cox 1877, p257-268). The Dean and Chapter of Lichfield are still involved in the appointment of a priest to the parish.
Castleton

Castleton church fared differently. It remained under the jurisdiction of the king, with all rights held by the custodian of Peveril castle, until 1269 when Henry III gave the advowson of the church to his son, Prince Edward. As part of the foundation charter of the Cistercian Abbey of Dernhall in Cheshire Edward gifted to it the advowson of the “church of the castle of the Peak” in thanks for his safe return after a dangerous sea voyage from a crusade to the Holy Land. (Cox 1877, p127)

The Taxation Roll of Nicholas IV (1291) valued the church at £12 per annum as an “ecclesia”. In 1297, Edward, now king, transferred the Abbey of Dernhall to the Abbey of Vale Royal in the same county. The rectorial tithes as well as the advowson were subsequently appropriated to the Vale Royal and a vicarage formally endowed (Cox 1877, p128).

At the time of the dissolution of the monasteries around 1536 Henry VIII gave the tithes and advowson of Castleton church to the Bishop of Chester (Clarke 2009, p36).

Castleton parish also included Edale. Until 1633 there was no chapel there and bodies were carried over the hill via Hollins Cross for burial in the churchyard in Castleton. The remains of this “Coffin Route” can be found today in Cross Street where a narrow passageway between two shops leads to the north door of the church. A toll would have been paid and the window where the money was collected can still be seen. To remedy this state of affairs a group of interested parties paid to have a chapel built in Edale and provided a parcel of land for a burial ground. The chapel was consecrated by the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry as the Chapel of the Holy and Undivided Trinity in 1634 (Cox 1877, p135).

Buildings

The churches were built by the people of the villages and in an age of deep religious belief it was important to them that the church should reflect the best that the village could provide.

In Hope there is no sign of the Saxon building. The church was rebuilt in the 14thC in a period of prosperity due to the importance of the wool trade, when many new churches were built. A piscina and sedilia from this time were incorporated into the chancel when it was rebuilt in the 19thC. There is an early piscina in what was once St Nicholas' quire, (now the vestry) and the church has a Norman font. Two 13thC grave slabs with depictions of forest insignia were found under the chancel floor when it was rebuilt in 1858. The south porch has a room above, known as the parwise, which may have provided accommodation for the priest and is traditionally believed to be the first schoolroom, before a building was erected for that purpose in 1632 (Smith Porter 1923, p4).

Castleton's church originally consisted of a nave and chancel dating to the early 1100s but in the 14thC a tower was built at the west end. The earliest identifiable grave is dated 1571 (Parkin, Harrison & Fowler [n.d.]).

Both churches have since been much altered both in the 18th and 19thC and many early features have disappeared.
**Income**
Neither Castleton nor Hope were wealthy parishes and in the early days incomes for the vicars would have been small. An early chartulary of the Lichfield Chapter shows that the vicar held the Easter dues, the greater and lesser oblations, the mortuary, marriage and purification fees, the dominical pence and certain lesser tithes, such as those on pigs, poultry and calves, giving him a total income of £9. 10s. (Cox 1877, p258).

Tithes were a tenth of all produce and earnings and were collected as a tax to pay for clergy and services. Hope and Castleton both have a building near their respective churches which is reputed to be a tythe barn used to store corn, wool and other items of produce gathered from the local people. The greater tithes from our villages would be sent to either Lichfield or Vale Royal, the lesser tithes would belong to the vicars.

Arguments arose over entitlement to tithes. In 1329 The Abbott of Vale Royal complained to Queen Isabella, who was lord of High Peak, that the Priory at Lenton were selling beasts from Edale, claiming that they were entitled to do so as William Peveril had given the tithes to Lenton Priory at its foundation. Queen Isabella's bailiff was asked to look into the matter and he found in favour of Vale Royal (Clarke 2009, p34).

Even in death the church took its share. A Receipt roll dated 1339 lists the mortuary fees of the Peak received by the Dean & Chapter of Lichfield who were entitled to the second best beast, always provided that there were at least three beasts all told. If not, other items were taken. Of the five entries for Hope three were for women which yielded tunics sold for 6d, 12d and 10d respectively, the cheapest one being described as “worn”. The other two entries, also for women yielded a heifer sold for 6s and an oxen sold for 8s. (Cox 1889, p156).

In 1538 at the time of the Dissolution the “Valour Ecclesiasticus” was drawn up from which Henry VIII assessed the value of all religious properties. This gives the value of the vicarage at Hope as £13.13s.4d. Castleton was valued at £6.7s.6d including 9s for tithes of lead.

An inventory of the possessions of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield taken at the same date, gives the rectorial tithes of corn, hay and minerals at Hope as £21.4s.6d.; the tithes of wool and lambs of Bakewell, Hope and Tideswell are given in the aggregate sum of £105; and the site of the rectory at Hope, with glebe and lands, at £5.0s.0d. (Cox 1877, p258 ).

The Easter dues traditionally belonged to the vicar. In 1658 in Hope it was the custom to pay 2d for each cow, and 1d on each calf and sheep. Fifty four householders are listed in the village yielding a total for the vicar of £2.14s.6d. (Cox 1889a, p15-30).
Priests and Vicars

Early priests may have been bright young men promoted by their own parish priest to train in a nearby monastery or religious house. They would have worked the glebe lands alongside their parishioners. Castleton had about 20 fields attributed to the Vicar in 1819, perhaps a continuation of this medieval glebe. Hope’s holding was much smaller – only 3 fields on the Tythe Map of 1847. Up until the 13thC priests might well have had wives and families until celibacy was ordered by Rome. Both Hope and Castleton have details of some of these early priests but the lists are incomplete and there is no way of knowing whether they were local people or not. Once a vicarage was established in the parishes the living was held by an appointee (vicariously) on behalf of either Vale Royal or Lichfield.

Sometimes the vicars held property of their own and would lease it out to parishioners.
In 1372 William Ruley, vicar of Castleton, leases “a messuage and outbuildings and adjoining curtilage land to John Mayoth and his wife to hold of the lord of the fee according to the service and customs.” (Anon, 1372).

In such stirring times it is not surprising that vicars got caught up in the general violence. Sir Thomas Wendesley and John Dean, vicar of Hope in 1403 “and many other of their bad associates” were accused of breaking into the house of Godfrey Rowland, kidnapping him and holding him for six days in the castle at Castleton, cutting off his right hand before releasing him. Rowland petitioned the king for restitution of this barbarous deed (Smith Porter 1923, p28).

Violence even took place within the church. In 1530 Robert Elott of Bradwell struck his kinsman Edmund Elott on the nose, spilling blood on the altar in St Nicholas’s chapel. The church had to be closed and reconsecrated and Robert was subjected to a public whipping as punishment for his misdeed (Smith Porter 1923, p6).

In 1602 an entry in the Parish Registers records that Edmund Eyre, “Vicar of Hope, was buried the xvth Aprill, without service or bell, in ye night”. What story lies behind that intriguing entry?
The period of the Reformation was a difficult one for vicars as they had to acknowledge the sovereign as head of the church, rather than the Pope, and use Archbishop Cranmer’s new form of service. The changes of emphasis during the reigns of Edward, Mary and Elizabeth would have affected priest and people alike. Nor was it easier during the Commonwealth when vicars were required to follow strict protestantism. In 1650 Cromwell's Parliamentary Commissioners reported that Rev Samuel Cryer was the incumbent of Castleton,”having conformed”. Following the restoration of the monarchy he was re-instated as vicar of Castleton, managing to keep his living despite so many religious “about-turns” (Clarke 2009, p129).

A similar story is told of Thomas Bocking of Hope. In the same Parliamentary Commission he is described as “the present incumbent, formerly in armes against the Parliament and reputed scandalous.” A pulpit with his name and the description “teacher” is still in use today (Smith Porter 1923, p29).

Nor was it an easy time for their parishioners. Everyone was expected to attend church and to follow services from Cranmer's new Book of Common Prayer. Those with religious scruples who wished to continue to follow the “Old Faith” might well be fined or even excommunicated for non-attendance at their church.

An entry in Hope's Parish Register for August 14th 1635 has a list of fifty three persons “excommunicated at the Visitacon of the Ld. Archibishoppe His Grace of Canterburie.” There is no record of this in the Lichfield Chapter records, so we do not know why they were excommunicated (Smith Porter, p59).

The following is an extract from a list of presentiments by local village constables of wrong doers in their parishes.

“Alto recto the present(m)ent of Robert Thomason Cunstable Con Derbie of Hope p'sented at day(?) – 23 of Aprill 1639

First hee p'senteth for absence ffrom the Church ffor 3 saboth dayes last past James How Humfree Smithe Mary Yellot francis Yellot Margaret Slacke.”

(In the same peti

ion “hee p’senteth ffor bruing without Licence Thomas Ashton of Castleton Henry Barmhead And further hee cannot p'sent. Robert Thomason.” (Anon, 1639)

In 1538 Parliament decreed that all baptisms, marriages and burials should be recorded and the records kept in a “sure coffer” with two locks and keys, one for the vicar and one for the wardens, the start perhaps of the use of the Parish Chest. From 1598 it was ordered that the records were to be kept in “great books of parchment”. Hope’s earliest register dates from 1598-9. The Woodroffes held the office of parish clerk almost continuously from 1620 for several generations when they had guardianship of the Registers. The early register is now in an extremely dilapidated condition, with beer stains and practice signatures scribbled in it by members of the Woodrffe family when they were publicans. Besides baptisms, marriages and burials other items are recorded in this register, one of them being the names of the 39 tithe payers and the amounts they paid in 1605.
Another records that in the “yeare of Our Lord God one thousand six hundred and thirtie six, beganne the great death of many children and others by a contagious disease called the children pocke: & Purple Pocke: & whyte hives with blisters.” (Smith Porter 1923, p60).

Castleton's parish registers do not begin until 1663. No parish records were kept during the Commonwealth so this may be why Castleton's records are later in starting.

Records for ordinary people are few and far between in Hope and Castleton and we can only catch a glimpse of the importance of religion and the church in their daily lives through these occasional references.

**Castleton’s Hospital of St. Mary in the Peak**

Angela Darlington

Nearly 500 hospitals and almshouses were founded in England before 1300, many of them for the poor and infirm of the parish, as was likely for Castleton’s Hospital of St. Mary in the Peak. Given its position on the way across the High Peak from Yorkshire to Cheshire, Castleton’s hospital may have also admitted poor wayfarers (Orme & Webster 1995). The sick poor in small rural hospitals such as Castleton’s were probably mainly provided with food, shelter and a bed; medical care, if any, would have been rudimentary. The care of the soul was at least as important as the care of the body, and hospital inmates would have been required to participate in the daily round of religious services and prayers, many dedicated to the soul of the founder. For this purpose early hospitals had chapels annexed to the infirmary, as confirmed for the Hospital of St Mary in a document relating the Augmentations (1548) when a grant to Thomas Babynington mentions that following its dissolution the hospital included a “mansion” with a “little chapel annexed to that house” (Great Britain 1924, p69).

Castleton’s hospital was reputedly founded by the wife of one of the William Peverels (putting its foundation before 1153), as reported by the traveller and writer William of Worcester in the 15th century (Harvey 1969).

The hospital is known to have had a succession of wardens who administered to the daily running of the institution, and chaplains who were responsible for celebrating mass in the chapel. Hospital wardens were supported by lay brothers and sisters, who would have provided most of the caring duties for the inmates. An early document (sometime between 1237 and 1243) refers to “fratres hospital de villa castra”, these “fratres” probably being lay brothers of the hospital, in connection with “assart” i.e. cultivation of the King’s land (Yeatman 1886, p243).

Place name evidence supports the general location of the hospital on the outskirts of the village between Castleton and Hope (e.g. Spital Bridge, Spital Field), and a Parliamentary Survey of 1654 describes boundaries of the lands of the Hospital of the High Peake that indicate its location in or close to the current Spital Field, i.e.,

“bounded on the South by the Peakes Arse River, East by a Comon feild knowne by the name of Over Maston, north by the Highway that leadeth to Hope and west partly by the said River, and partly by the said highway....”.

28
It continued as a hospital or spyttelhowse until 1535 or soon after when it was valued at 40s in the survey of the finances of the church ordered by Henry VIII, the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* (Anon. 1907). Medieval hospitals were frequently associated with larger religious houses or monasteries but Castleton’s hospital had no known mother institution. At the time of the Dissolution there may have been no inmates to consider and according to Victoria County History (1907) the warden by then was non-resident. However Brooksbank (1925) refers to “pensioners” apparently of the hospital as mentioned in a late 17th/early 18th century document “receiving the Royal Bounty in lieu of a home”.

The supposed site of The Hospital of the Peak was scheduled in February 1999 (NMR No. 29938). The scheduled monument contains the obvious surface features to the south of Castleton road and opposite Losehill Hall lodge, and the NMR report cites evidence from a 1920 lecture given by the Reverend Brooksbank that describes the position of the hospital.
5. Taxation Between 1066 and 1650

Ann Price

Introduction
The documents concerned with taxation in Hope and Castleton appear in several guises. The two villages are usually listed under Alto Pecco (High Peak) Hundred or Wapentake and may be featured as separate vills. More often both villages appear on the same list and can include the whole of the large Hope ecclesiastical parish with references to Aston, Abney, Bradwell, Brough, Hazelbadge, Shatton, Thornhill etc. It is not therefore possible to draw any idea of population in each village from this data. Indeed disentangling the separate villages is often extremely difficult.

Most of the taxes imposed upon the populace in the early years were levied in order to pay for whichever war the current King and his nobles were waging in France or Scotland. The majority of them would not have affected ordinary people – only those above certain levels of income would have had to pay. It is still interesting to see how taxation might have affected the population of our villages throughout the period.

Domesday
Taxation didn't just start with the Normans. The Domesday survey of 1086 provided William I with information about the value of most towns and villages in the country. The assessment was in geld units, and that was originally an occasional tax levied by the Anglo Saxons to pay for wars against the Norse and was calculated as a number of pence per hide or caracute. Before the Conquest Hope had paid taxes to King Edward as the township was part of royal lands whilst Castleton's were paid to its Saxon overlords.

In the Domesday survey Castleton was assessed as being worth two geld units. The value to the lord in 1066 was £2.00 and in 1086 was £2.5s, an increase in taxable value of 25% payable to King William

Hope's taxable value was assessed as 10 geld units. The value to the lord in 1066 was £30 but in 1086 it was only £10.3s, a drop in valuation by 75% in twenty years (See Chapter 1, Domesday).

Information on taxation in the 12th century appear in the Pipe Rolls which are a record of accounts presented to the Exchequer by sheriffs and other local officials and which still followed the system in use in Anglo Saxon times.

The Geld continued to be levied on all landowners and free men until 1162. Serfs and slaves were exempt.

Other forms of taxation were usually associated with the necessity of keeping a well equipped army for the frequent foreign and local wars. The Heriot was a tax whereby a lord who had paid to equip a fighting man in his service could on his death claim back the horse, arms and equipment. When knights as a class emerged and were later able to buy their own arms and horses the lord continued to lay claim to property upon death and this claim sometimes extended to everyone under his control. By the 13C the payment was made either in money or in kind by handing over the best beast or chattel of the tenant on death. With the church claiming the second best
beast or chattel as a mortuary tax (See Chapter 3, *Castleton and Hope Parish Churches 1066 – 1650*) death duties could also prove an expensive business for our medieval counterpart.

**Scutage** was a tax paid on knights’ fees – usually money paid by a feudal landowner in place of personal service in the wars. A grant assessment and List of Knights fees of 1428 which we found does not include Hope or Castleton because presumably they were not military fiefs.

These feudal taxes were discontinued in the mid eleven hundreds.

**Exchequer Lay Subsidies**

From 1188 onwards a new form of taxation was imposed to help pay for the Crusades in the Holy Land. Known as the Saladin tythe, this was a tax on “moveables” and varied from a fortieth to a fourth of the value of personal goods. The latter was exceptional and was imposed to raise money to ransom King Richard in 1193. This form of taxation became known as an Exchequer Lay Subsidy because the clergy were generally assessed separately.

Moveables were taxable items over and above normal daily needs and covered cattle, sheep and crops in the country and money and stock in trade in the boroughs. Certain people were exempt. Those whose surplus goods amounted to less than 5s in value were not taxed. In the counties armour, riding horses, the jewels and clothes of knights and their wives and of their esquires, together with any vessels of gold, silver and brass were exempt. In the boroughs and market towns a suit of clothes for every man and another for his wife, a bed, a ring and a buckle of gold or silver, a girdle of silk for ordinary use and a drinking cup were free of tax. These were expensive possessions and it is doubtful whether many people in our villages would have had such items. Most of them would have been exempt from tax (Cox 1908).

The method of assessing and collecting the tax is interesting because it continued in use from the time of Henry II until the Tudors. A writ was issued for each county appointing two knights as Commissioners who did not belong to the county. The commissioners selected two or four freemen as assessors in each township. These men took an oath to faithfully assess all goods in field and house and to enroll the same in an indenture delivered to the commissioners. The assessment varied but usually consisted of a sworn declaration of value by the owner of his own stock and of his two nearest neighbours with an assessment by a jury in case of a dispute. How much neighbourly collusion was there in this, one wonders?

The rate of tax varied. It was a fortieth in 1201, imposed by King John to fund a crusade.

Whilst taxation did not directly affect the common people, as most of them would have been exempt, the means whereby the king received consent to levy a tax lead indirectly to the establishment of Parliament.

In 1232 Henry III and his government sought consent from the nobles for the imposition of a tax on moveables.

In 1254 the nobles advised the king to summon the knights from each shire to help advise on a consent to a new tax. In the 1260's men from towns were included in the
consent process thus forming the beginning of the Houses of Parliament with representatives from the nobility, the counties and the boroughs

In Edward I reign there were many levies to help pay for wars in France and Wales. The tax rate varied from one fifteenth in 1275 and 1276 but in this year there was no collection from those whose goods were valued at less than 15s. It was one twentieth in 1277 to fund the Welsh Wars. In 1283 the tax was levied at one thirteenth from all who had over 6s 8d worth of chattels. From then on the tax seems to have been levied at two separate rates, one for rural areas and one for towns and “ancient desmesnes”. In 1294 it was one tenth and one sixteenth, in 1296 one eleventh and one seventh and in 1297 one eighth and one fifth.

A Lay Subsidy Roll of 1327/8 exists for Derbyshire taken during Edward II's reign. The returns are arranged under hundreds and those for High Peak appear on three membranes, the first of which is illegible so that the amount levied has been arrived at by deduction at £65 5s 9d 3/4. Neither Hope nor Castleton appear on the legible part of the High Peak Hundred list – but were perhaps on the unreadable portion! The villages appear on Lay Subsidy Rolls six years later so are unlikely to have been missed out. Over seventy occupations are listed in 1328 (Cox 1908).

By 1334 it was realised that the system of collecting tax on moveables was open to abuse so a new system was introduced. Edward III needed more funds to continue his wars in Scotland and France. The government ceased to concern itself directly with the wealth of individuals and instructed the chief taxers to negotiate and reach agreement with local people on how much each community should pay, as long as it was no less than that paid in 1332. If the sum could not be decided by negotiation then the chief taxers and their clerk were to carry out an assessment on the old lines.

The rate levied in 1332 became the norm, namely one fifteenth in rural areas and one tenth in boroughs or ancient desmesne. The new tax collection system showed how much each vill or township had produced in the past and they were expected to meet this sum from amongst themselves (Glasscock 1975, pxiv-xv).

In the list of taxes from the Wapentake of High Peak in 1334 Castleton and Bradwell were joined together for taxation purposes and £3. 13s 4d was levied at a rate of one fifteenth for a rural area.

Hope was joined to Shatton and the tax was assessed in two parts. That part of Hope and Shatton which was designated “an ancient desmesne” was taxed at the levy of one tenth, and the yield was 5s. 6d – the equivalent of £123 today. The rest of the joint townships were charged at one fifteenth and raised £4.0s 0d (£1,790) (Glasscock 1975, p47).

An “ancient desmesne” was usually a rural manor which had been listed under the heading Terra Regis or Kings Land in the Domesday Book, as was Hope.

**Poll Tax**

In 1348 Black Death (Bubonic plague) decimated the population, with further outbreaks in the 1360's and 70's. Because labour was scarce as a result people could demand higher wages. Tax on wool exports was a staple means of raising revenue,
but by 1377 there was a disruption in the wool trade because of a dispute with Flanders. In order to fund the continuing war against France Parliament levied a poll tax which affected almost 60% of the population. There were three separate levies – in 1377, 1379 and 1381. In 1377 every lay person over the age of fourteen who was not a beggar had to pay a groat (4d) to the crown. In 1379 the lower age changed to fifteen.

The 1381 levy was particularly unpopular as each person over fifteen was, in theory, required to pay one shilling which was then a large amount. Unrest about this tax and concerns that the ruling classes were attempting to restore feudal conditions in rural areas led to the Peasants Revolt, led by Wat Tyler. The peasants demanded the end of serfdom and a moderation of rents. Sadly we do not know whether any local people were involved in the stirring times in London when the young king, Richard II, met the rebels and promised that their grievances would be answered. Once they had dispersed he reneged on his promise and the ringleaders were hunted down and killed.

We do know however who had to pay in Alto Pecco. Only thirteen vills are listed in the Wapentake compared with twenty nine in 1334. The list headed “Castulton” has 335 names in all and appears to include people in Abney, Aston, Bamford, Bradwell, Brough, Hucklow, Thornhill, and Wetton.

There are also familiar Hope and Castleton names on the list, Balguy, Eyre, Woodrowe, Pedder, Burdekin, Bagshaw and “Walter, frater, vicar de Hope” so maybe several vills were amalgamated for this particular levy. The list also includes some peoples’ occupations – farmer, glover, tailor, carpenter, smith are a few (Anon. 1334) (See Chapter 11, Occupations in Castleton and Hope). After this a poll tax was not introduced again until 1635 in the time of Charles I.

The poll tax record shows that not everyone paid one shilling, with the amounts people paid in the Castleton area varying from 4d to 40d (3s 6d).

![Distribution of taxation levels in the 1381 poll tax](Angela Darlington).

**Figure 6.** The distribution of taxation levels in the 1381 poll tax (Angela Darlington).

*Later Exchequer Lay Subsidies*
Exchequer Lay subsidies continued to be levied under the same system into Tudor times. In a series of lists gathered together we find that in 1431 in the reign of Henry VI Nicholas Eyre of Hope, gent. paid 40s and William Abney of Hope, yeoman, paid 13s 4d. One hundred years later in 1535 Henry VIII assessors collected amounts ranging from ten shillings to eleven shillings and threepence from six people with familiar village names – two Eyres, two Marshalls, a Middleton and a Hague.

From then on the lists contain many known names from both villages. In 1546 George Woodrow headed a list with 40s to pay (over £400 today). Of the other names listed there were five Eyres, four Barbers, two Savages and two Hagues. Balguy, Staley, Hall and Middleton also feature and there are four women included on a list of twenty-eight names. Many were charged 3s 4d (£33.42) and the smallest amount was 4d.

Two subsidies of Edward's reign in 1551 and 1552 are smaller, but still contain the Balguy, Eyre, Barber, Hague, Staley and Savage names with levies of between sixteen shillings and ten shillings in both lists.

In Elizabeth's reign the pattern of names and amounts remains the same. In 1571 fifteen people appear on the list for Hope (Daniel Thyssen 1570/71).

What is interesting is that the system set up to collect taxes in 1188 under Henry II was still in use in Queen Elizabeth's reign. A document in the Derbyshire Record Office dated 1581 records the collection of a subsidy payment in Alto Pecco “granted unto our Sovereigne Ladye Elizabeth” under the charge of The Earl of Shrewsbury with Anthony Gell and John Manners as the Commissioners. John Parker was the Right Collector for the Hundred and he in turn employed Francis Barker as the Sub Collector. Under the entry for Hope, the names are those that appear continually about this time and include Barbour, Savage and Staley from Castleton and Eyre, Balguy and Marshall from Hope. There are fifteen names in all and the amounts they paid range from £5. 6s 8d from Thomas Balguy to £3.3s from Edward Barbour and four others (Anon. 1581). Here is the noble in charge, two local gentry as Commissioners and two local people to collect the tax just as was laid down in 1188.

**Poor Law**

In the early sixteenth century there was a dramatic rise in population and the economy of the time could not provide sufficient employment for everyone. Until now the monasteries and hospitals had provided alms and relief for the poor but in 1537 the dissolution of the monasteries had a devastating effect on the poor. We do not know how badly local people were affected when the Hospital of St Mary at Castleton was closed. The Vagabonds Act of 1495 had provided harsh punishments for anyone considered a beggar – the threat of branding, ear piercing and slavery being some of the deterrents. Several acts of Parliament during Edward and Elizabeth's reigns gradually differentiated between the “deserving poor” - young orphans, the elderly and infirm, physically and mentally handicapped, and the unemployed who were genuinely looking for work - and the “undeserving” - “tinkers, beggars, pedlars, workmen on strike, fortune tellers and minstrels.” It was hoped that members of the community could be persuaded to contribute voluntarily to Poor Relief, but eventually Justices of the Peace and then later church officials were charged with the office of collecting what became in effect another tax.
The Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 lasted unaltered until 1834. It made each parish responsible for supporting the legitimately needy in their parish. Wealthier citizens were taxed to provide basic shelter, food and clothing for their own needy, but not necessarily for people from other areas. Parish Constables were charged with seeing that indigent claimants from other parishes were returned to their home area.

An Assessment for the Relief of the Poor of the parish of Hope for the year 16?? (the last two figures are missing) is stored at the Derbyshire Record Office. The Churchwardens are named as John Shalcross, Esq., Robt. Eyre, Esq., and Henry Balgie, gent. The Overseers are Thomas Eyre, gent., Joseph Eyre, gent., and Ottiwell Bocking, gent. Each of the villages within the ecclesiastical parish of Hope are named together with their collectors – Hope, Bradwell, Woodlands, Aston, Thornhill, Brough, Shatton, Offerton, Stoke and Padley, Abney Grange, Great Hucklow, Little Hucklow, Greenlow, Wardlow and Hazelbadge. The list for Hope has one hundred and one names. These include well known names from Castleton, - Staley, Savage, Barbour – so perhaps the two villages were once again combined. Nine “widdows” are listed, suggesting that the tax applied to each household. Included at the end of the list for Hope are “Tythe for Corn £1. 2s 0d” and “Tythe of Wool and Lamb 3s 0d.” so it seems the church was expected to contribute to the relief of the poor (Anon. 16??).

There is a tradition that one of the cottages on Edale Road in Hope was for use by the overseer of the poor. Local charity boards in Hope church also bequeath sums of money to the poor of the village, and later there were private charitable initiatives leaving help for apprentices and poor widows.

**Ship Money**

A Poll tax always seems to cause trouble for those who try to impose it and for Charles I it was no exception. Ship money was a non parliamentary tax first levied in medieval times by the English crown on coastal cities and counties for naval defence in times of war. It required those being taxed to furnish a certain number of warships or to pay the ship's equivalent in money. In 1629 Charles dismissed Parliament and began eleven years of personal rule. During this time, deprived of Parliamentary sources of revenue, he was forced to use Ship Money as a financial expedient. He extended the basis of the tax to include the possibility of war, rather than a national emergency, and in 1635 included inland towns. It was evident that the king intended ship money to become a permanent and general form of taxation (Chisholm 1911).

Derbyshire in 1635 was “to provide one ship of 350 tons manned with 140 men and double equipage, with munitions, wages and victuals” (Kerry 1897). There seems to be no record of whether this ship was actually built.

In a tax list of that year, John Gell is in charge of collecting this tax from twenty five people in the Hope area. Names include people from Hope and Castleton and from Crookhill, Ashop and Rowlee in Hope Woodlands. The largest amount by far is from Rowland Morewood who pays seven shillings and fourpence, seven people pay three shillings, eleven pay two shillings and five pay one shilling (£4.46 today). The total amounted to fifty eight shillings and fourpence (Anon. 1635a).
The imposition of this tax aroused a great deal of discontent and John Hampden, a Buckinghamshire landowner refused to pay. The case was heard by all the judges of the Court of the Exchequer and Hampden lost by seven to five. However the closeness of the result meant that many others refused to pay and by 1639 only 20% of the tax was being collected. The Long Parliament in 1641 declared ship money to be illegal, but its imposition was one of the causes of the English Civil War.

**Lead Taxes**

In an area where lead mining was such an important activity any increase in the tax that had to be paid meant hardship for the miners. For full details see *Lead Mining 1066 – 1642*.

**Church Tythes**

Most of the taxes imposed by the government only affected the better off members of the two villages. However the tythes imposed by the church would affect every member of the community. They were imposed on earnings and produce and the Lesser Tythe paid the vicar’s stipend and for the upkeep of the church and the services held there, whilst the Greater Tythe was paid to the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield in the case of Hope and to Vale Royal Abbey for Castleton. Then there were mortuary fees, marriage fees and other payments for the organisation of the church collected by the church wardens. For more details see Chapter 3, *Castleton and Hope Parish Churches 1066 – 1650*.

The tithe was a tenth share annually and we get a good idea of how this worked in practice from a list of the Easter dues for Hope in 1658 which traditionally belonged to the vicar. However throughout the Peak jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter it had always been the custom for these to be collected by an official and paid directly to Lichfield. These Easter offerings differed widely in amount and character from parish to parish. They were personal tithes and were usually 2d for an adult (over sixteen) and a halfpenny for children and servants. In the Peak parishes a high rate of Easter offering was maintained and the lowest amount was sixpence which was probably the offering for a single adult.

In Hope it was the custom to pay 2d on each cow 1d on each calf and a penny from every keeper of sheep. Beekeepers paid 2d. This would be separate from the tithes on honey and wax which were part of the vicars tithe – he could also claim every tenth swarm. Plough Alms were also recorded, whereby a penny was paid for every plough-land which was unusual.

The list for Hope township includes seventy eight households. Thomas Burdekin paid one shilling and fourpence for ploughland, two cows, two calves, his sheep and his bees - £5.12s today. Even Anthony Ashton, described as a pauper had to pay tenpence. The smallest amount was sixpence and the total collected from Hope was £2.14s 6d. Young people under the age of sixteen made an offering at the chancel gates of £1. 17s.

The completeness of this roll for the larger parish of Hope is proof that ecclesiastical dues were rigidly enforced during the Commonwealth, though used for other purposes. The sum total of the roll was £35.3s (Cox 1889b).
We have not looked in detail at taxation returns in the National Archives and there is more information available from that source.

Much of the information for this report has come from local Record Offices, particularly Matlock, where many of Hope's records were deposited in the 1960's. This has meant a rather lopsided look at who paid taxes in our two villages as, apart from the Poll Tax of 1381, which listed the taxation centre as Castleton, most lists apply either to the High Peak Wapentake or to Hope, usually including the wider ecclesiastical parish. Research by Rev J.C. Cox and Rev Daniel Thyssen in the nineteenth century have been centred on Hope, using records in the Lichfield Dean and Chapter's archives and William Smith Porter added to this with “Notes from a Peakland Parish” in 1923.

The Civil War
Sir John Gell held the county for Parliament. Papers held at the county archive at Matlock are records of the Constable of Hope during this period. The first of these letters from the Derbyshire Committee for Safety is dated October 1644 when the war was into its second year. During the upheavals of the times it seems that taxes were not being collected. The letter starts:

“Whereas his Majesties, the Queenes and the Princes Revenews have since the beginninge of theise unhappy distracions either not been collected at all or misimployed to their Majesties and the Kingdomes prejudice” (Fisher 1950).

It goes on to describe the future method of taxation. Parliament had instituted a Committee to appoint Receivers to collect taxes and “arrearages”. The officers had authority to examine books and accounts in order to make an assessment of tax owed. They were also empowered to punish by fine or imprisonment any farmer or tenant who delayed or refused payment, the fine not to exceed £20 and they could call upon the “trayned Bands, Voluntiers, Constables and Headboroughs” to enforce the ordinance. An exact account was to be kept of all moneys levied with special accounts for any sequestered estates.

The letter then proceeds to the more particular concerns of Hope.

“Theise are therefore to require you not only to collect by Distress or otherwise all such Rents, debts and arrears as any of the Townes within your Constablery have or do stand charged with either for Palfrey silver, Turbary or Pinfield Herbages Wayseleyes increase or Common silver Liberties or any other Rent duties and customs whatsoever, and pay the same unto me or my lawful deputy upon Thursday next by eight of the clock in the forenoone at the house of George Milner in Hayfield.”

It ends with a dire warning that all farmers and tenants and those whose estates had been sequestered “fayle not to make payment...... as they will incur the danger of being proceeded against according to the several Ordinances of the Parliament. Fayle not of your due execucon thereof at your utmost perill.”

It was signed by John Bretland the Receiver. The Bill was
“Hope, for palfrey money turbaries wayseleyes and liberties for two yeares last past in arrear £1 10 10
Aston in arrear 11 4
Offerton in arrear 2 6
Thornhill in arrear 6 4

Palfrey money was a fee payable by custom from tenants who held their land directly from the king, Turbaries were the right to cut peat, Wayseleyes were way leaves over land and Liberties were king's lands passed on to a lord to administer.

The next letter orders that everybody possessed of lands, stocks of money or other goods appear before the Receivers in Chappell in le Frythe to compound with them for a fifth part of their yearly revenue and a twentieth part of their personal estates. Tenants on sequesterd estates were to pay their rents direct to the Receivers. The twentieth and the fifth reflect earlier taxation levies.

A Warrant dated December 28th appoints two tax assessors for each of the townships of Hope, Woodland, Edale, Offerton, Brough and Shatton, Aston, Thornhill, Bradwell and Castleton.
The assessors in Castleton would no doubt have to deal with the sequestration of the Savage family's estate.

The letters make excessive demands on the Constable who was usually an honorary officer for the village and it is obvious that he does not always comply with the demands made upon him. Having waited in vain at Chapel for rents and arrears from Hope to be paid, John Bretland, the Receiver fires off a warning letter to Mr Staley, the Constable.

“I have stayed till friday in the afternoon at Chappell expecting the execucon of your last warrant. Let this letter be delivered to Mr Balgue. I fear I shall be enforced to make you a precedent, for your father's sake I desire not.”

From this small extract of the letters held at Matlock it seems that the role of Constable during the Civil War was an unenviable one (Fisher 1950).
6. Crime and Punishment

Angela Darlington

Two texts, the 1281 Derbyshire Eyres (Hopkinson 2000) and extracts from Rolls of the Forest of the Peak (Yeatman 1886) contain a number of interesting examples of crimes and their punishments during medieval times in the High Peak. The following examples specifically relate to Castleton and Hope, with some interpretation of terms and context.

Records of felons in Castleton and Hope as recorded at the Derbyshire Eyre of 1281

The system of “general” eyres was at its height in the middle of the 13th century – they dealt with “common pleas”, so distinguishing these courts from e.g. the sessions of justices for forest pleas (or forest eyres). These constituted Crown pleas and Civil pleas that were dealt with by royal justices who as part of a wider circuit made occasional visits to an English county to hear all sorts of pleas belonging to the king’s jurisdiction; in some respects they simply held a special session of the county courts. Until 1256 Derbyshire was unique amongst English counties in not having a county court of its own; up until this time all the eyres relating to Derbyshire were held at Nottingham; after 1256 separate Derbyshire eyres were held at Derby. The 1281 Derbyshire eyre was part of a northern eyre circuit headed by John de Vaux as chief justice for which he received 50 marks annually (£33 13s. 4d.). He was accompanied by a team of four junior justices and a chief clerk and record keeper. For the Crown pleas each wapentake or administrative sub-division was represented by a jury that had to take an oath and then make written answers to a total of 143 questions about crime and royal rights (although in practise they may only have answered a fraction of these). The jurors appear to have been knights or substantial freeholders (Hopkinson 2000).

The cases reported here considered by the eyre included murder and other homicides, deaths by misadventure, burglary and theft. Pleas of particular interest to the crown were those concerned with violent death, because the crown was entitled to the chattels of the deceased and fines (amercements) from individuals or communities associated with defaults in their handling of the investigation or suspects. The cases relating to Castleton and Hope that follow are all interesting as they illustrate a number of features associated with the justice system in the 13th century. In the first example, the assailant sought sanctuary in Hope Church:

“Alan le Seriant of Hope killed Richard son of Abusa with a knife and immediately after put himself in Hope Church, admitted the deed and abjured the realm before the coroner. His chattels 10s., for which the sheriff is to answer. He was in the frankpledge of Geoffrey son of Brun de Hope which does not have him now, so it is in mercy. Agnes widow of Richard, the first finder, has not come, nor is she suspected. She was attached by Simon de Hokelow and Geoffrey son of Brun who do not have her now, so they are in mercy. The vills of Asseford, Schacton, Hope and Bradewell valued the chattels falsely before the coroner so they are in mercy.” (Hopkinson 2000, entry 412, p109)
Abjuration was an agreement to leave England for ever in return for one’s life. The chattels of the person abjuring the realm were forfeit to the crown. The example above illustrates the wide system of fines in place at the time. Henry de Bracton, an important 13\textsuperscript{th} century jurist, described the concept of “frankpledge” as follows: “every (male) who has reached the age of 12 years must take an oath at the view of frank-pledge that he does not intend to be a thief nor a party to thieving. All who hold land and house, who are called householders, ought to be in frank-pledge” (Corèdon & Williams 2004). This was based upon the concept that members of a community were responsible for each other’s actions (were members of a tithing, or the 10 householders of a frankpledge). Women and boys under 12 could not be outlawed because they were not within a frankpledge. In practise this meant that villagers could be amerced for allowing a felon to escape, or as in this example, for valuing his chattels incorrectly. Amercement for concealing or under-valuing chattels was fairly common.

The second example is interesting as early evidence of there being a mill in Castleton; it is also one of many examples in the roll where the assailant fled and was outlawed.

“Ellis le Cupere, miller of Castleton, killed Roger Colt of Castleton, fled at once and is suspected, so he is to be exacted and outlawed. His chattels 8p, for which the sheriff is to answer. He was in the frankpledge of William Hall of Castleton which does not have him, so is in mercy. The vills of Aston and Thrnovere did not attend the inquest, so they are in mercy. The vill of Castleton is in mercy because it did not arrest him.” (Hopkinson 2000, entry 422, p112)

The chattels of Ellis le Cupere were apparently very few at 8p; he was one out of only 20 felons from all 143 mentioned in the rolls who had chattels of less than 1 shilling. The value is amongst the very lowest recorded in the rolls of this eyre, and it seems surprising given Ellis’s description as a miller. According to the roll of fines (estreatments) William Hall (also described as William de Aula) was fined 6s 8d, the standard for frankpledge, and in addition the vill of Castleton was fined £2 for false valuation (vill of Thornovere 10s for the same).

The vill of “Thornovere/Thrnovere” may be an earlier name for Thornhill; “over” derives from the Old English for “place at the ridge or slope” (Mills 2003).

The surname le Cupere may reflect Ellis having an occupation as maker or repairer of wooden casks (Reaney & Wilson 2005) as well as being a miller.

\textit{“Englishry” and the concept of “murder”} \textit{\small

“Murder” had a special meaning in medieval times. After the conquest, William I had ruled that any murder victim who could not be proved to be English should be assumed a Norman, in which case the hundred in which the crime was committed was to pay a fine or “murdrum”. In this context, the coroner at his inquest might cause one or more of the deceased’s kinsmen on the side of either parent to appear before him to prove “Englishry”. In 1281, 200 years after the Norman conquest this system was still in existence, probably maintained as a convenient method of raising money for the crown, but in 1340 “murdrum” was abolished by statute reflecting the fact that the idea of a distinction between Englishmen and Normans had become obsolete. In the

following case, 4 villages of Hope Parish including Hope itself were held responsible for not pursuing the murderer:

“The jurors present that Robert son of Geoffrey de Bradewell killed William son of William Hally of Schackton (Shatton) in the vill of Schackton, fled at once and is suspected, so he is to be exacted and outlawed. He had no chattels. The first finder has died. No Englishry. Judgement: murder on the wapentake. The jurors did not mention the first finder on their presentment, so they are in mercy. Robert son of Geoffrey was in the frankpledge of Robert Pole of Schacton which does not have him now, so it is in mercy. The vills of Schacton, Bradewell, Hope and Aston did not pursue him, so they are in mercy.” (Hopkinson 2000, entry 404, p108)

The High Peak wapentake was fined a murdrum of £10, Robert Pole the standard frankpledge fine of 6s 8d and the vills of Shatton, Bradwell, Hope and Aston for allowing the murderer to escape each fined sums between 13s 4d and £1 6s 8d.

The term “in mercy” (at the mercy of the King) applied to anyone required to pay monies to the Crown by way of a fine or amercement.

**Peak Castle as a prison**

The Rolls of the 1281 Derbyshire Eyre shows that Derbyshire prisoners were normally taken to the sheriff’s prison in Nottingham. However as in the example below, Peak Castle of Castleton was also used as a prison. When as in this example the prisoner escaped, the person or community held to be responsible, in this case Roger le Estrange who was then Bailiff of the Honour of the Peak, was fined a standard (and rather harsh) amercement of £8.

“Adam, former sergeant of Richard le Ragged, wounded Henry son of Henry le Stanton Leghes in the shin with a sword in the vill of Stanton, so that he died three weeks later. Adam was immediately arrested by Llewellyn, constable of Peak Castle under Rodger le Estrange, and imprisoned in that castle, from which he later escaped. So to judgement on Roger le Estrange, keeper of the castle for the king.” (Hopkinson 2000, entry 407, p108)

Roger le Estrange was probably able to afford his fine – he held a number of other high status positions during his life including Sheriff of Yorkshire, was Commander of a force to quell a Welsh rebellion in 1288, King’s Messenger at the Court of Rome in 1291-2 and eventually became Lord Strange (Richardson 2011).

**The incidence of violent crime**

In the roll of the 1281 Derbyshire eyre, 22 deaths that today would be described as murder were recorded for the High Peak wapentake, and about 105 across Derbyshire. All these crimes had presumably been committed since the previous eyre in 1269; was this a high crime rate?

Using published calculations for Derbyshire and England in 1290 (Broadberry et al. 2011) and numbers for 2010 (Derbyshire County Council 2013), the 1290 populations were approximately one-tenth of their current size (Figure 1).
In 2010/11, there were 600 recorded murders in the UK (Guardian 2011) with a population of 52,234,000. Derbyshire’s population in 2010 at 763,700 was approximately 1.5% of UK population. Assuming a constant murder rate per head of population across the UK, in Derbyshire in 2010 there were a calculated 8.8 murders. In the 12 years between 1269 and 1281 there were 105 killings in Derbyshire recorded in the rolls of the eyre – this also (coincidentally) works out at 8.8 per year. However, given the difference in population sizes in the county, the violent death rate in 1281 was about ten times higher than in modern times. There were of course some distinctive differences in the methods used in medieval times; out of 46 deaths where the method was recorded, the axe was most used (14), followed by knife (13), staff (5), sword (3), arrow (3), strangulation (2 cases – in one case a child and the other a woman), and the remaining cases involved gimlet, stake, spade, and beating. Other types of crimes were recorded in the 1281 Derbyshire eyre, but not in Hope or Castleton; most commonly these were burglary and theft but also included e.g. wounding and battery, mayhem and burning houses.

**Punishments and pardons**

In 1281, as shown in the example above, where the felon had fled the normal punishment was forfeit of chattels, exactment and outlaw. However, thieves captured in flight whilst in possession of stolen goods could be immediately beheaded by the pursuer, whilst hanging was the sentence for a number of crimes including deaths, and grand larceny.

Pardons for killings were regularly recorded, and some on the face of it were not necessarily well-deserved. For example, Geoffrey Lolle of Micheldevere (Micheldever, a village in Hampshire) was pardoned for the death Walter Hotte of Hope, who was killed before the 26th November 1347. He was also pardoned for earlier crimes so may have been a frequent offender (Great Britain 1903, p219).

In 1393, Thomas, son of Thomas de Castleton (vicar of Wirksworth) was responsible for the death of Henry Smyth of Matlock, killed at “Stepul alias Stepullgrenes” (possibly Steeple Grange) in the parish of Wirksworth. He had friends in high places, probably on account of his father’s status, to appeal on his behalf as he was pardoned following the “supplication” of the king’s cousin the earl of Rutland (Great Britain 1905b, p324).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Derbyshire</th>
<th>England/UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>16,249</td>
<td>1,706,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>84,852</td>
<td>4,751,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>43,912</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>69,791</td>
<td>4,114,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>763,700</td>
<td>52,234,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extracts from Court Rolls 1439-1509
The Court Rolls provide some interesting examples of how law and order operated over several centuries in Derbyshire, some later examples of which (specifically relating to Hope and Castleton parishes) are given below. The rolls also contain valuable information about occupations in the villages, and apart from excerpts dealing with obvious crimes (e.g. Robert Balgy the butcher, below) these are dealt with under “Occupations”. Most of these cases were dealt with at the Castleton Court, probably held at the castle of the Peak.

1. Plea of debt for services rendered but not paid for:
In 1439, on the Wednesday after the Epiphany, pleas of debt were judged between Nicolas Stanreng and John Cok, of Hope, for stallage and between Thomas Newton and William Hatfield, of Edale, for mowing (Yeatman 1886, p337).

2. Fined for selling bad meat
On 21st September 1439, Robert Balgy, a butcher of Castleton or Hope, was fined 12d for selling corrupt meat (Yeatman 1886, p338). At another court shortly afterwards (Wednesday after the Feast of the Epiphany, 1440), the Bailiff reported that when he seized carcasses of meat belonging to Robert Balgy levied on him as part of his fine, Robert “carried away and sold the said flesh”. As a result he was landed with a bigger fine of 40d.

3. Affray in the open Court of Castleton
In 1442 Thomas Woodruff “made an affray” in the open Court of Castleton, and was fined 4d. (Yeatman 1886, p347).

4. Thefts of livestock in Castleton and Hope
These cases were heard at a court in Glossop on the Feast of St Lawrence in 1463. Arnold Barbur, late of Glossop, and Edward Tymme late of Castleton, both stole horses of Robert Townrowe at Castleton, one worth 13s. 4d, and the other 10s. Also Edward Barber stole the horse of Richard Smyth, worth 10s. at Hope (Yeatman 1886, p360). It is notable that both Arnold Barbur and Edward Tymme were “late”; perhaps they were killed by pursuers trying to retrieve the stolen horses?

In 1472 it was recorded that Christopher Hall, a vagabond of Castleton, stole a cow worth 10s. from Nicolas Bird at Castleton (Yeatman 1886, p363). The specific reference to “vagabond” is interesting; the first major vagrancy law was passed in 1349 to increase the workforce following the Black Death by making "idleness" (unemployment) an offence. By the 1500s the statutes were mainly used as a means of controlling criminals (Wikipedia 2013a)

5. Miscellany of penalties from Castleton Court in the time of Henry VII
At a Castleton court on 23rd April 1509, a few offences were tried (Yeatman 1886, p388), interesting in that they give insights into the responsibilities of tenants and traders in late medieval times, and possible penalties if these were not properly observed.
The village of Hope was fined 40d, for not presenting the brewers and bakers from Pentecost; this relates to the license requirement for those traders to present themselves at court.

The tenants of Castleton were charged “to make hedges”; and the tenants of Bradwall also charged to “keep the common lands within the fields separate till Autumn (till harvest)”.

Finally, Christopher Staley, constable of Hope was fined 6s. 8d. “that he should make the stoks fit in all things”. Stocks, pillories and cucking stools were used as physical punishments for e.g. brewing or baking misdemeanours (Halsall 1998). According to the “Judgement of the pillory”, if a baker or a brewer was convicted because he had not observed the Assize of Bread and Beer, for up to 3 “non-grievous” offences he would be fined, but “if the offence be grievous and often, and will not be corrected”, then he would be physically punished, by pillory, tumbrel, or “some other correction”. Similar in concept to the stocks, the pillory was a device of wood or metal framework erected on a post with holes for securing the head and hands (Wikipedia 2013b). Cucking-stools or ducking-stools were alternative forms of punishment by public humiliation and used for punishment of disorderly women, scolds and dishonest tradesmen (Wikipedia 2013c). We can be sure that Hope had at least one form of punishment in a set of stocks!
7. Wars and Rumours of War

Ann Price

Introduction
Throughout the earlier part of the medieval period English kings had waged war against France, Ireland, Wales and Scotland as well as taking part in Crusades to the Holy Land. Little is known of local involvement in these activities until the reign of Edward II when we get a glimpse from public documents of the participation of people in the High Peak in the King's battles with the Scots and with his own barons.

Edward II, Rebels and Scots
Robert the Bruce had gradually rid Scottish castles of their English garrisons and eventually defeated Edward II's army at the battle of Bannockburn. The Scots continued to raid deep into English territory and at the same time Edward was having problems with a group of rebel barons who objected to his choice of favourites, such as Piers Gaveston and Hugh Despenser.

In March 1322 Thomas de Fournival the younger was directed to go against the King's rebels and to levy the forces of the Peak in Derbyshire (Great Britain 1904b, p79). The barons were defeated at the battle of Boroughbridge later that month and in April the king ordered many castles including that of High Peak to "remove a munition of men that the king lately caused to be put therein by reason of the late disturbances in the realm." However the castle was to be kept in a state of readiness and any victuals that would not keep were to be sold and replaced at the castle keeper's own risk (Great Britain 1895, p137).

Having defeated the rebel barons King Edward could now turn his attention to the incursions of the Scots. On September 15th Commissioners were appointed "to array all able men between sixteen and sixty," Oliver de Ingham being responsible for "the parts of the Peck in the county of Derby". There was a mandate for the respective sheriffs to assist and cause men to appear before the commissioners. However the commissioners were afterwards ordered to hasten the business as the Scots had invaded the realm (Great Britain 1904b, p208-9).

This document gives a list of arms and accoutrements for each class of fighter, depending on how much land he held. Every man with £20 worth of land was to have a horse worth 100s, a haketon, (a padded jacket to go under armour), a habergeon, (a sleeveless coat of mail), a basinet with nosepiece, which was a light steel helmet with a visor, gauntlets of steel, a sword, a lance and a knife. Every man with land worth £10 was to have a horse worth 40s and the same arms. If your land or goods were only worth 40s you would receive the padded jacket (haketon), rounded steel plates to protect your armpits (palets), gauntlets, sword, lance and knife. (Wikipedia 2013d)

Anyone worth less was to have a sword, bow and arrows or a lance. The document states that "Views of arms are to be held every Sunday in each parish". Did the men of Hope and Castleton parade each Sunday with their arms?

How many of them were part of the force that was defeated by the Scots under Robert the Bruce at Byland in Yorkshire in October we do not know, nor even if they were present.
Edward continued to keep his troops in readiness for further battles with the Scots. He appointed Walter de Waldeshef as his Commissioner for the High Peak. Walter had been the king's butler and no doubt Edward would be anxious to have a loyal man in charge of mustering troops in the High Peak area. He certainly kept them moving.

On 10th December 1322 Walter de Waldeshef for the High Peak and other commissioners for Lancashire and Cheshire were ordered to have their levies at Lancaster on the fifth day after the Purification (Great Britain 1904b, p226-7).

In February 1323 Walter de Waldeshef was, with other commissioners of array, ordered "to be at Chesterfield with their levies by next Thursday to proceed against the Scots who were proposing to enter the county of Lancaster." (Great Britain 1904b, p247).

By March 3rd 1323 the king was at Knaresborough from where he ordered his commissioners, amongst them Walter de Waldeshef of the High Peak "to array all fencible men so as to be ready by Palm Sunday or sooner, after three days notice to march against the Scots, who are preparing to invade the realm." (Great Britain 1904b, p261). On March 9th Walter was specifically commissioned "to levy 300 archers in the Peak and to lead them to the king at Newcastle upon Tyne by the octave of John the Baptist, to set forth thence at the king's wages against the Scots." (Great Britain 1904b, p264). Two days later Walter has orders "to array all fencible men and to muster the forces at Lancaster at once so as to be able to join the king when required wherever he may be." (Great Britain 1904b, p264).

The next glimpse we have of these events is a note appended to the Calendar of Patent Rolls of 9th March which states "Afterwards, 2nd June, the king being at Thorpe by York and a truce made with the Scots until thirteen years after 12th June following the commissioners should surcease the execution of the premises." Even before the truce was signed the treasurers, barons and chamberlains of the exchequer were on 5th May ordered to pay the wages of the "following footmen, archers and other armed men whom the king has ordered to be chosen in the following counties and ordered to be brought to him for the Scotch war" Amongst these were "from the High Peak in co. Derby, 300 archers" (Great Britain 1895, p645).

The High Peak seems to have been treated as a separate area from the rest of Derbyshire when it came to raising a levy of arms. This was certainly the case during the Scottish wars. That there was at that time a 300 strong company of archers has associations with a tradition that almost one hundred years later, a company of archers from the High Peak fought at Agincourt, under the command of Nicholas Eyre of Hope. The evidence for this is scanty as the Agincourt Rolls which originally contained all the names of those who fought at that historic battle are incomplete. (Smith Porter 1923, p141) There is a field called Abney Butts marked on the 1847 Hope Tythe map. Is that where the archers practiced?

Elizabethan Musters
There are however records of the musters for the very real threat of a Spanish invasion in the reign of Elizabeth, preserved at Belvoir castle and published in the Derbyshire Archaeological Journal in January 1895 (reproduced in Smith Porter
There were two musters, one in 1585 and one in 1587. The first record written from Derby gives "the names of all such parsons as are appointed to be in readiness in the Heighe Peake by John Manners and Robert Eyre esquire at a muster taken at Backewell the viith day of November in the xxviith reign of Our Soveraigne Ladie Queene Elizabeth. And a particular note with all of such armor and weapons as every Township has in readiness for the furnishinge and settinge forthe of the same."

Robert Eyre of Edall, one of the two men appointed to make the levy, contributed 20 shillings towards providing horses and furnishing one petronell (a kind of large pistol or carbine).

Under Hope, the names recorded were Thomas Slacke, Ralph Glover, Richard Slake, Edward Halle, Thurston Hall, Renolde Purslove, Richard Needham, Robte Arnefeelde, Gilbart Marshall, Robte Marshall of Thornell. Some of these names are familiar from wills and other documentary evidence and apply to people from Castleton as well as Hope. The arms they bore were three caliver and three arquebus, both firearms, two corselets (defensive armour) and two bills, a weapon like a billhook with spikes at the top and back.

"From a muster Booke of all the selected men appointed for trayned soldiers made the seconde of November in the xxixth year of Or. Soveraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth 1587". In the Hundred of Highe Peake from Hope towneshippe the following are listed with their arms. Robte Halle; Victor Morten; George Needham, calivers; Willm Morten, arquebus; Thomas Hall, muskett; Gilbart Marshall, arquebus; Reignolde Purslove; Charles Hatfield; Willm Stevenson; Robte f furnesse corselets. A note at the foot of the page states that they "all trained in May 1588."

The cost of this muster is also recorded.
"firste of May 1588
Received towards the charge of the trayning of 200 men 3 dayes at Bakewell, vizt for every man 5s
Disbursed as followeth
Soldiers paye for 3 dayes having 12d a day £30.
ffor 145 lb of powder at 16d the pounde 14s.
ffor 12 lbs of matches at 6d the pounde 6s.
to the leuetennant 40s.
to 4 Serjants £4.
Clarks 40s.
2 Corporalls 20s.
2 Auncyents (ensigns) 15s.
2 Drumers 15d.

Sum £50.

(Smith Porter 1923)

The Civil War
During the Civil War Sir John Gell held the county for Parliament. A series of letters to the constable of Hope (in a fragile condition) are stored in the Derbyshire Record Office. They give an insight into Parliamentary procedures for collecting taxes (see
"Taxation.") and also what each township was expected to do to support the war effort. A warrant dated 26th February 1644 repeats a demand for fourteen strikes of oats to be delivered weekly to the Quartermaster at John Ward's house in St James' Lane, Derby. This was a large consignment and it appears that the request was ignored. A more moderate demand required only four loads of hay and four strikes of oats to be delivered to Quartermaster Henshaw at Mr Fisher's house by the Jail Side (Fisher 1950).

One letter signed by three local members of the Derbyshire Committee for Safety based at Chappell was written in November 1644.

"To the Constable and Inhabitants of Hope
Whereas Thomas Needham of Castleton has had a fatt cow taken from him and employed in the service of the Parliament: These are therefore to command and charge you to make an equal assessment within your township of the sum of four pounds and pay it unto Thos. Needham for his cow that were employed in the Parliament service. And hereof faile not.
H. Wigfall, Robt. Eyre, Jo Wigley."

Each township had to answer for the maintenance of a specified number of trained soldiers. We don't know how many soldiers Hope had to support, but a series of letters are concerned with this issue. A notice of June 10th 1645 threatens to distrain for arrears of £61 being the assessment of 21 shillings per week for every trained soldier. Five days later the Constable has to collect 16 shillings for every chargeable soldier to pay for mowing and making hay. It seems the demands of the agricultural year take precedence over civil war. The war in Ireland had to be paid for also and in October of 1645 the constable received a summons for 38 shillings for every trained soldier in the township towards an assessment of £29.3s.4d on Derbyshire for twelve months maintenance of the army in Ireland.

Very little time was given for the Constable to respond to request for aid. Will Spencer, writing from Tidsall (Tideswell) in May 1645 makes the following demand

"To the Constable and Inhabitants of Hope
These are to charge you and command you forthwith upon sight hereof to provide within your Constabulary two sufficient horses Mares or Geldings with Bridles, Saddles, Brestplates & Cruppers for ye use of Lord Fairfax his Regmt of horse, and that the charge may be more easy you are to levie an equal assessment in yr Constabulary to make satisfaction for the said horses and furniture etc., each man to be charged according to his abilities and the said horses with furniture you are to send to my quarters in Tidsall on Tuesday next by 9 a clock in the morning. Faile not herein or you will answer the contraray at yr utmost peril.
PS In regard of our march to Stoney Middleton you are to send horses and furniture thither tomorrow."

We know that not every one in Hope was a Parliamentarian. Thomas Bocking, the vicar of Hope, had fought in the war on the Royalist side, and was deemed "scandalous" during the Commonwealth. In Castleton the Savage family had their estates sequestered for supporting the king. Loyalties in the valley would have been divided.
8. Land Transactions and Land Use

**Castleton Land Transactions**  Kay Harrison

Through Documentary Research it has been possible to identify many different land transactions taking place in Castleton within the medieval period. However, they have given us much more information than simply a land transaction taking place. We have been able to identify, from searching documents, the “common” people who lived and worked in Castleton at this time.

**Family Names**

Many of the old and familiar “Castleton” family names can be seen running through the documents down the years. These include Hall, Savage, Gardner, Eyre, Tym, Torr, Dakin, Barber, Staley and many others. The land transactions have shown us what status these people were, and their occupations. The Staleys and Savages were mainly gentlemen; a gentleman may be defined as a man of breeding or higher class. The Eyres of Castleton were mainly referred to as “esquire” meaning a male member of the gentry ranking below a knight. The Halls, Gardners, Tymes, Halloms, Rowlands, Laughtons, Dronfields, Needhams and Barbers, however, were our “common” people; yeomen and husbandmen. A husbandman is defined as a farmer, one who raised crops or tended animals. A yeoman was one who farmed his own land; a commoner of good standing, a freeholder. Other occupations include a chaplain who was a member of the clergy officially assigned to an institution, group or private chapel. Also there was a reeve who was a local official such as a bailiff or a steward, and a mercer who was a merchant dealing in textiles and fabrics (Wiktionary 2013).

The transactions have also given us references of genealogy such as the name of a spouse, a son or a widow.


In 1336:

“Grant from John, son and heir of Robert Balgy, jun. to William, his son, and Joan, daughter of John del Halle of Castilton, of all the messuages, etc, which were formerly Robert Balgy’s in Le Castilton, with the lands which William Trayhot sometime held, and the land which Cecily, widow of Walter Pygot, holds as dower, and which, on her death, revert to the said John Balgy” (Jeayes 1906, #554, p72).

“Joan, daughter of Gereminius Pygot of Villa Castri (Castleton) of the Peak, in her pure virginity and full dominion, to Hugh Whitlocky of the same, for a certain sum of money. One burgage in Castleton between the burgages of Robert, son of John, son of Roger, reeve of Castleton, on the south” (Anon, late 1200s).

We have learnt the names of some of our common people and identified what they did for their living. What these records do not show is why land transactions occurred, only that the buying and selling of plots of land did occur during the
How Land was Exchanged
Our research has shown us how lands and property were exchanged; by Charter, Grant, Lease, Feoffment, Gift, Bargain and Sale, and for the price paid.

A Charter was a document conferring rights and privileges on a person. By Grant meant whereby land was given over, made conveyance of, given possession or title of, usually in answer to petition. A Lease referred to land being let, or rented. Feoffment; this was a gift or conveyance in fee, the grant of a feud or fee, the instrument or deed of conveyance. Fee; this was an inheritable estate in land held of a feudal lord on condition of the performing of certain services. A feud may be defined as an estate granted to a vassal (one who keeps land of a superior to whom he vows fidelity and homage) by a feudal lord for service. By gift, this would have been land or property exchanging hands as a donation or a present. Bargain; defined as an agreement between parties concerning the sale of property (Wiktionary 2013).

Geography of Transactions
As well as showing how lands changed hands, the transactions show us where people may have lived in the village such as “Ellis Barber of Mam”.

“Ellis Barber of Mam in the Parish of Castleton, yeoman, to Richard Torr of Castleton, yeoman. Barn or Buildings called Astons barn in the Knowles in Castleton, and several closes called Ashtons ground. For £80” (Anon. 1637a).

The area of Mam refers to the hill called Mam Tor and the fields and farms that lie below it, located to the north west of Castleton.

“John Hall the elder of Goose Hill, yeoman, Anne his wife, and John, his son, to Roland Morewood of le Okes, gentleman, and Robert Hall of Loosehill, yeoman. All their messuages, cottages, lands etc in Castleton. To the uses expressed in a deed of even date” (Anon 1637b).

The area referred to as Goosehill lies to the west within Castleton village. It is located up the steeply rising road after the little bridge, called Goosehill Bridge.

“Grant from Thomas Savage de le Spytell, in Castleton, to Elizeus Staley of Redseats, of a piece of meadow described as “oon outfall of medoe,” with four acres and three roods of meadow in Castleton. Dat 6 Mar.,2 Edw. VI (1548)” (Jeayes 1906, #567,568, p74).

The remains of the Spytell (Hospital of the Blessed St. Mary) are believed to be located to the east of Castleton. Grassy mounds can be seen in the field on the right once you’ve passed over Spital Bridge, on the Castleton Road travelling towards Hope. Redseats is located to the south east of Castleton; all that can be seen now is a barn down in the fields to the left when you’ve left the village going along the Pindale Road towards Hope.
The documents have shown us where a piece of land was located in the village, often with boundaries given, who’s land was to the north, south, east and west. Sometimes a feature is given such as” Peaks Arse Stream”, the “Town Ditch”, the “High Road”, or curiously, land lying “between two large stones.”

“Roger Barber of Ashoppe, yeoman, to Francis Barber of Castleton, clarke. A messuage and burgage with an adjoining croft in Castleton near the stream called Peaksarse (boundaries described). For £20” (Anon. 1635b).

“Roger Bradwall to John Tym, son of Thomas Tym of Castleton the younger. A burgage in Castleton between the Mill and lands of Richard Cademan west and east and the ditch of the town and 2 large stones south and north to hold of the lord of the fee according to the customs and services and paying annually to Roger a rent of 2d” (Anon. 1455).

In 1486:
“Grant from William Orme to Nicholas Eyere of a burgage in Castleton lying between the water-mill and the high road” (Jeayes 1906, #560, p73).

“Thomas Hall of Eydall, yeoman, to James Koc, chaplain, Nicholas Smythe, John Tyme and Robert Bradbery of Mame. A burgage in Castleton lying between the stream of Peeke Herse and Castell Clyff. To the use of Thomas, and then to the uses of his Will.” (Anon. 1532).

Many place and field names in the village, such as Goosehill, Redseats and Sypyll, can still be easily identified today. Also “Slippery Stones”; this is the small road leading away to the right from the top of the Market Place down towards Goosehill Bridge. “Foxhill” is an area lying to the north of the river (Peaks Hole Water) and the short lane running between the main car park and Back Street. Also “Robinlands”; these fields lie north east of Castleton along the
track called Robinlands Lane that turns off to the right from the Hollowford Road. Others place names remain a mystery; the locations of “Salford Yard”, the exact location of Peak’s Arse Yard, or a field named “Kytlowgreves”, for example, remain intriguingly elusive.

In 1547:
“Exemplification of plea brought by Elizeus Staley against William Nedham, son and heir of Otvel Nedham in Castleton and other lands called Rydyings, Foxhill, and Salford Yard, in the same place” (Jeayes 1906).

“Nicholas Laughton of Castleton, yeoman to William Glossop of Offerton. Cottage called Slippery Stones and crofts etc, named in Castleton. For £20” (Anon. 1628).

In 1495:
“Grant from Edmund Wodrofe, son of Oliver Wodrofe, to Nicholas Eyre, of a parcel of land called Le Redsettes, in Castleton, lying between the king’s land called Kytlowgreves and Castelton field” (Jeayes 1906, #561, p 74).

“The documents can help us to try to identify the location where land and buildings, known to have been present in the village, may have stood, such as the Hospital of the Blessed St Mary. These two examples give us a fascinating glimpse of how the village may have looked to our “common people” in times gone by.

“Grant of the mansion of the late hospital called Le Spytle of Castleton in Castleton Parish, Derbyshire in tenure of Thomas Savage, a little chapel annexed to that house, 2 little crofts of land (1 ac) on the south side of the said mansion, 2 crofts (7 ac) of land and meadow on the south side of said mansion, 2 crofts of arable land and 6 roods of land containing together 10 ac, in Bierdalfelde in Castleton, a cottage and 3 crofts (12 ac) of land and marsh at the west end below Mametorr of Castleton. Except bells and lead of the said “Spittle” of Castleton” (Anon. 1548-49).

“Thomas Dronfield of Castleton, Derbyshire, husbandman, of the first part, and Henry Garnett als. Stoke of Castleton, Derbyshire, yeoman of the second part. One barn in Castleton with a certain parcel of land adjoining, being about the breadth of the said barn, and in length from the east end to the west end of the said barn, with freedom to carry by carriage, hay, corn, or anything else necessary to the door in the north side of the barn, with a ladder steed round about the same for repair. Sixth part of a fold adjoining the barn on the west, which said fold is to continue to be undivided, and to be jointly used by Thomas Dronfield, Henry Garnett als. Stoke and Robert Dakin of Castleton. For £11 13/4, and to be held of the chief lord of the fee” (Anon. 1641).

Many different names for the lands and property are mentioned such as crofts, fields, gardens, meadows, folds, yards, messuages, barns and burgages. A croft
may be defined as a fenced piece of land. A field refers to an open or cultivated piece of land. A garden may be described as an outdoor area to the front or back of a house where plants may be grown for food. A meadow is a field or pasture; a piece of land covered or cultivated with grass usually intended to be mown for hay. A fold refers to an enclosure for livestock; an enclosed space or yard. A yard itself may be described as a small, usually uncultivated area adjoining within the precincts of a house or other buildings. A messuage refers to plot of land as a site for a house, outbuildings and assigned land. A barn is described as a building, often found on a farm, used for storing or keeping animals such as cattle. A burgage refers to a medieval tenure (a right to hold land under the feudal system) in socage (a system whereby a tenant would pay a rent or do some agricultural work for the landlord) under which property in England was held under the king or lord of a town, maintained for a yearly rent or for rendering a service such as watching or warding (Wiktionary 2013).

**Measuring Land**

We can see how large a piece of land may have been; in acres, roods and perches, also “one day work with the plough” as a reference to size.

“Stephen Staley of Readseats in the parish of Castleton (co. Derby) gentleman, Nicholas Staley and John Staley of Castleton, to Martin Halom of Bradwell in the parish of Hope, yeoman. One messuage, fold, barn, croft etc and two gardens adjoining, in Castleton, late Robert Foules” (Anon. 1620),

“Elize Gardner the elder of Castleton, yeoman, and Thomas Gardner his son and heir, to Elize Hall of Castleton, yeoman. A parcel of ground containing one day work with the plough called Howsitch Tongue and one rood on a furlong called Robin lands, for 40 years at a rent of one penny. For £10 and other good causes” (Anon. 1638a).

“John Kyng of Holmesfylde, yeoman to Roger Barbure of Asshop, yeoman. A messuage with 13 roods of land and the whole of a burgage in Castylton now or formerly in the occupation of Roger Cocke, Hugh Smyth and Robert B……….. to hold of the lord of the fee” (Anon. 1553).

**Buildings**

Often property and buildings are listed as standing on the land that is being exchanged; these may be non-specific such as a stable; defined as a building or dependency set apart and adapted for lodging or feeding animals with hooves, or a cottage; a small house, cot or hut. Appurtenances refer to minor properties, such as outhouses, that pass with the main property when it is sold (Wiktionary 2013).

“Richard Barber took from the hands of the King a cottage and parcel of land called Knowles under Mam Torr (of which his father Ed. Barber died seized) by copy of court roll, to the use of Richard and his Heirs” (Anon. 1647).

“Thomas Eyre, esquire, complainant(?), and Stephen Staley and Creature, his wife and John Staley, deforceants. Four messuages, four cottages, forty acres of land etc in Castleton and Hope” (Anon. 1626).
But sometimes buildings are also named specifically such as the “Castleton Mill” and “The Spittle”.

“William Trigg of the parish of Ealing, Middlesex, to John Hall of Castleton yeoman. Moiety of a mill called Castleton Mill with the profits of the same and a messuage with stables, gardens, etc, the osier hoppes, the meares, mildams, watercourses etc belonging to the mill, tolls, mulets, customs, privileges, profits to the mill belonging fully freely and in such ample form as King Charles gave by his letters patent of the Duchy of Lancaster on 17th May to Edward Ferrars, deceased, and the said William Trigg. Rent of 15s 10d to the crown” (Anon. 1638b).

“Edward Ferrers of London, mercer, and Francis Phelips of London, gentleman, to John Hall of Castleton, yeoman. Moiety of Castleton Mill with all its buildings, appurtenances, rights etc to hold of the king in the manor of Enfellde (in the county of Middlesex) at an annual rent of 15s 10d” (Anon. 1609).

“Thomas Savage of Castleton gentleman, and Robert Hall of the same, yeoman, agree that the said Thomas will obtain from the Duchy of Lancaster a lease of land in the fields of Castleton called Castell Flatts, with the meadow appertaining, and of a water mill called Castleton Mill for a term of 21 years. The said Robert to occupy the lands, and a moiety of the Mill, for a year and then the lands to be divided” (Anon. 1546).

“Grant of the mansion of the late hospital called Le Spytle of Castleton, in Castleton parish” (Anon. 1548-49).

**Discussion**

In conclusion our Documentary Research has shown us that many land transactions took place during the medieval period. We have identified who the common people were that lived and worked in Castleton at this time. We have seen how the lands and properties were exchanged and how they passed between family members and from one family into the hands of another, but not why. Named locations in the village have shown us where people lived, and where their land was situated; many of these place names are still identifiable to us today. Many different types of land and property were being exchanged; the description of these can show us what the village may have looked like to the common people, the yeomen and the husbandmen, during the medieval period.

**Hope Land Transactions**

*Kingshague, Birchfield and Twitchill*  
*Di Curtis*

These three properties are found in the Northeast of the modern parish. All three sites were farms until about the middle of the 19th century when Kingshague and Birchfield became part of small gentry estates. The earliest references to Kingshague are described in detail below and tie the occupation of this parcel of land from 1284–5 when William Eyre was forester in fee in Hopedale, through the Eyres of Hope and the Eyres of Haddon Hall to the 19th century when the Eyre Family represented by the Earl of Newburgh was the principle land owner of a large part of Hope Parish.
Figure 9. Locations of Birchfield, Eccles House, Kings Haigh and Twitchill Farm.
Map with text: Alan Darlington.

Birchfield is mentioned in 1497:
“Thus in 1497 Elize Ward of Nether Asshop in the Parish of Hope, yeoman, to Thomas Rowland of Lawsellhall (Loosehill Hall?) Alias Wooseates in the parish of Castleton, yeoman. One sixth part, and a half sixth part and a quarter of a sixth part of all his messuages and lands called Abney Hall. Byrchfeilds, and Nychohayes” (Anon. 1497).

Twitchell is recorded in 1566:
“Also in 1566 Roger Barbar, Yeoman of Ashop and Robert Ward, Yeoman of Twychell being joint tenants of land purchased of Godfrey Shaw of Barnebye(?) and in the tenure of named tenants in Hope and Castleton. The two parties agree concerning inheritance of the property” (Anon. 1566).
Kingshague  Jeannette Holmes

Kingshague is situated 60m above Hope, north east of the village and on the edge of the parishes of Hope and Aston. (OS ref 181 841). It is accessed by a track going north from the corner where Aston Lane turns east to Aston and is now a private residence. Hague meant an enclosure and so Kingshague means the Kings enclosure and would have been on the edge of the High Peak Forest.

The earliest trace of the name is in a Quitclaim in 1300 which states Robert Le Hore and Alice his wife were given all right and title to all the land called Kinggeshaig in Hope, by the usual services one rose on St John Baptist’s day (Anon. 1300).

Before this, although Kingshague isn’t named, there is information about land in Hope and named foresters. An Inquisition was taken in 1288 at Hope of Peter le Hore of the Peak. He was the king’s forester of fee in the Peak and held of the King in chief a messuage (this means a dwelling house with outbuildings and land), and one bovate of land (as much as one ox could plough in a year varying from 10 to 18 acres) in the town of Hope by service of keeping the king’s forest, and also two assarts containing
2 acres of land. John le Hore his son aged 30 and more is his next heir (Great Britain 1906b, p405).

In 1299 the lands of the deceased William Le Heyr of Hope, tenant in chief, were taken into the King's hands (Great Britain 1911a, p424). An inquisition in February 1300 of William le Eyr alias le Heyr of Hope showed he held a bovate of land in Hope of the King, keeping the king's forest of High Peak in Hopedale in person. Robert his son aged 30 is his next heir (Great Britain 1906b, p436). There is in June 1300 an order to deliver to Robert, son and heir of William le Heyr of Hope, tenant in chief, the lands late of his said father, he having done homage (Great Britain 1911a, p428).

Letters patent from Queen Philippa in 1345 notify that she has granted to her clerk Stephen le Eyr, king’s clerk, tenant for life of lands and tenements in Hope. He may appoint in his place an attorney as long as the attorney “make oath in full swainmote to be faithful in the office. The like of like letters patent also in favour of her clerk, William le Eyr, king’s clerk, forester in the said forest.” (Great Britain 1903, p23)

By order of the escheator in 1363 in the County of Derby the lands of the late William le Eyr of Hope are to be delivered to his heir Nicholas le Eyr as the King has taken his homage and fealty (Great Britain 1923, p243).

The parish of Hope Deeds shows a Grant of land on 2nd February 1387 by Nicholas, son of William Eyre to William Clerk, chaplain and names all lands and tenements, lying between the town of Aston on one part and Birchefeld on the other part. Although not named, Kingshague is in this area (Anon. 1387).

On the 10th November 1409 in the Hope Parish Deeds, John Eyr of Hope grants to Robert Hally of Schatton and Nicholas, son of William Eyr of Hope all his lands, goods, chattels etc. in the county of Derby (Anon 1409).

John Eyr of Kingshaghe, on 3rd May 1488, grants to Hugh Eyr of Eyham, Nicholas Eyr of Hope, Ralph Hethcote clerk and William Hethcote all messuages, lands, and rents etc. in the parishes of Hope and Castleton (Anon. 1488).

There is a Grant to Uses dated 17th April 1495, given at Hope, from Stephen Eyr of Hope to Ralph Hethcote, rector of Bangover, Hugh Eyr of Eyham and Nicholas Eyr of Hope. Stephen grants his messuages, tenements, rents etc. in the parishes of Hope and Castleton to the use of John Eyr of Kyngshagh, father of Stephen (Anon. 1495).

Details of a lease in the Parish of Hope Deeds, dated 27th September 1547, shows Nicholas Eyr of Hope, gentleman, and Edward Eyr his son and heir leasing lands, tenements and meadows in the fields of Hope to William Eyr of Kyngshaughe, yeoman, and George Eyr, his son and heir. The lands were between a place called Duglacse and a place called Fulwood field. (From the field names on the 1847 Tythe map this appears to be from the boundary between Hope and Aston below Kyngshague going in a north-westerly direction towards the Brinks.) (Anon. 1547)

In 1567 George Eyr gentleman and Ellen his mother leased to John Eyr of the Kingshawe, of Hope, yeoman, lands and meadows in Hope called the Ferney Furlong.
The Will and Probate of George Eyre of Kyngeshayghe in the parish of Hope, yeoman, dated 19\textsuperscript{th} June 1572 has no signature, only his mark (Anon. 1572).

A land dispute of 1577 details a complaint between Robert Eyre, esquire, and the defendant William Eyre. There are no details given of where Robert or William reside. The dispute is about two messuages (dwelling houses with outbuildings and land), two gardens, two orchards, thirty acres of land, twenty acres of meadow, forty acres of pasture, six acres of wood, two hundred acres of heath land with appurtenances in Hope and Kyngeshagh (Anon. 1577).

The Levy of a Fine (Inheritance) in 1590 paid from Robert Eyre of Edall, esquire, to Gilbert Earl of Shrewsbury, Knight of the Garter, concerns a capital messuage called Kynesgshagh in Hope with lands and appurtenances plus all other lands and messuages in Hope and Aston. This is for the use of Robert and Jane his wife for life, then to the Earl and his issue, in default of which to the right heirs of Robert (Anon. 1590).

Gilbert Earl of Shrewsbury, Knight of the garter, made a Land Grant in 1592 to Leonard Bamforthe of Graies Inne (co Middlesex), gentleman. The grant names a capital messuage called Kingeshaghe in Hope with its appurtenances in Hope and all his lands in Hope and Aston which were formerly the lands of Robert Eyre, esquire (Anon. 1592).

There were Indentures of a Fine in April 1629 between Thomas Eyre junior, plaintiff, and William Eyre, defendant, concerning a messuage, garden, ten acres of meadow and twenty acres of pasture in Kingshage and Hope (Anon. 1629).

The last mention before 1650 is of a Bargain and Sale on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} March 1633 between William Eyre of Kingshaughe in the parish of Hope, yeoman, to Thomas Eyre of Hassop, esquire, of land. Ferne Furlong is again mentioned (Anon. 1633).

Linking the Quitclaim of 1300 with the Calendar of Inquisition of 1288 and the Calendar of Fines 1299 it would appear that the dwelling and land of Kingshague was possibly in existence in 1288 and before that time. The house and land was held from the King by tenants, in their role as King’s Foresters, and the tenancy passed from father to son. There are indications that the later tenants were yeoman farmers. Going beyond 1650, on the 4\textsuperscript{th} May 1719 a lease for 21 years was given to William Ibbotson of Kings Hague, in the parish of Hope, webster, by Thomas Eyre of Eastwell (co Leicester), gentleman. The lease was for a messuage or farm called Kings Hague consisting of a dwelling house, two barns and a workhouse or shop (Anon. 1719).

The 1847 Tythe Map shows Kingshague and the fields all around, adjoining the house, to belong to the Earl of Newburgh and tenanted by John Marsden. (The Scottish title Earl of Newburgh, came to the Eyres of Hassop through the marriage of Francis Eyre to Lady Mary Radclyffe, the title being inherited by their son Francis through his mother in 1814). The 1851 Census lists John Marsden as the head of the household (a wheelwright and farmer of 22 acres), with his sister Sarah Aston and her two sons John and Henry (both wheelwrights) and a daughter Emma.
Traditionally Nether Hall in Hope was the ancestral home of the Eyre family who were descended from William le Eyr who came to the area with William Peveril and was a warden for the Royal hunting forest. His family remained in the Hope valley and there were many branches (Smith Porter 1923).

At the end of the 16thC Nether Hall is described as a mansion with houses, gardens, closes, commons etc and a water mill called the Nether Hall mill with the sook of all tenants. (The “sook” or “suit” is the right of all tenants to have their corn ground at that mill.) There were eighty acres of land, twenty acres of meadow and twenty acres of pasture. The house probably stood at the entrance to the village on the right of the road on high ground above the bridge over the River Noe which still bears its name. Opposite is a field called Nether Hall Yard.

Thomas Eyare, gentleman, of Turnedych, owned the property in 1570. He let the land to Anthony Gell esquire, of Hopton, George Eyare, yeoman, of Abney, William Nedham of Wormhill and John Hill, yeoman, of Hill, but his mother Elene Eyare had the tenure and may have lived in the house (Anon. 1570).

In an assignment of lease written in 1600 it is recorded that in March 1586/7 Humphrey Savage took over the tenancy of the whole property from Thomas Eyre for twenty one years at a yearly rent of forty shillings (Anon. 1600). The Savage family had land in Castleton.

In 1598 Thomas Eyre of Turndytch and his son John sold Nether Hall to Richard Slack of Clements Inn. The tenant at that time was Jane Savage, widow (Anon. 1598). This sale did not include the mill which was sold two years later by John Eyre to Adam Slack of Tydeswell, yeoman, along with other properties in the surrounding villages for £1000 (Anon. 1602).

In 1600 Jane Savage and Edward Barber of Rowlee assigned the lease on the land to Thomas Yeaveley the elder of Chappel in le Frith, for £80 for the remainder of the 21 year term. The property was described as a manor house with houses, gardens, closes, commons etc. (but not crabtrees and ashes) and the water mill. What custom lay behind the withholding of crabtrees and ashes? (Anon. 1600)

Thomas Eyre of Hassop was a big landowner locally who was always on the lookout for more property. Thomas Yeaveley the younger assigned the lease of Netherhall to him in 1604 (Anon. 1604). Jervase Eyre, one of the Hassop Eyres, must have sub-let the property to William Hall because in 1607 William sued John Slacke, Robert Furness and James Hopwood for trespass and ejectment on the whole of the property including the mill. The defendants were found guilty and fined £12.13s.4d (Anon. 1607).
In 1613 Thomas Eyre of Hassop bought the whole of the Netherhall estate in Hope from the Slack family together with other land and property in the valley (Anon. 1613). It remained as part of the Hassop estate under the Earls of Newburgh until 1911, when the estate was broken up and sold.

The following is an extract from a diary of the Rev. William Bagshaw of Bannercross, one of the Ford Hall family: “Friday Jan 18th 1793 – visited the ruins of a house near Hope, formerly the residence of Nicholas Eyre who had 12 sons, many of whom became heads of considerable families” (Smith Porter 1923, p22).

It seems that the hall was a ruin by the end of the 18thC. The land and the mill were the important part of the estate for agricultural purposes. The present owner has found no evidence of the exact whereabouts of the hall on his land. It may be part of the current house. The building has large corner stones rather grander than one would expect from a domestic farm house. The mill however continued to function as a corn mill until 1968, when it was converted into a private dwelling (Eyre 1988, p129).

The documents in the Bagshaw Collection only give us the names of landed people who leased or bought the estate, but if we look behind the written agreements there would have been farm labourers working on the land and a corn miller and men working in the mill. Others would have manned the carts that carried the corn to and fro. There would have been a wheelwright and blacksmith to service these activities. The common man is not lost – with just a little imagination he becomes part of the landscape.
Evidence for large open fields

In an Archaeological Assessment Report of Castleton (Stroud 2002) the following description was made:

“The medieval town had open fields and meadows lying in the valley to the west, north and east, with commons and waste on the higher ground to the south and above the fields. There were at least two open arable fields, Mamsitch Field to the north-west, referred to in 1378, and Spittlefield to the north-east, documented in c. 1300 (Cameron 1959). Evidence of these survives in the form of earthwork ridge and furrow and in the fossilisation of strips by later field walls.”

Evidence for more of these large open fields can be found in a comparison of field names from medieval land transactions with those in the relatively recent 1819 township map and index of Castleton and 1847 tithe map and index of Hope.

In Castleton, there are several examples of large open fields; as described above by Stroud (2002) Spittlefield was mentioned in a number of early 14th century documents (PHC206; Hall 1946, p1); on the tithe map there are 28 "Spittle" fields variously named Great Spittle, Little Spittle, Spittle Pingle, etc. There is evidence of medieval ridge and furrow in many of these fields.

An early 14th century land-charter (Hall 1946, p1) mentions “le Middil Furlong” in the territory of Castleton. From its described position this is one of 23 "furlong"-named fields on the 1819 map, all together and adjacent to and to south of Peaks Hole Water and Spital Field. The fields are still commonly known to locals as The Furlongs; they have the characteristic S-shape reputedly resulting from medieval ploughing with teams of oxen.

“All the forestry of Trayokes” was granted by William de Trayokes to John son of Robert Balgy in a document of around 1305 (Hall 1946, p1); in 1819 there were 14 fields including the term “Treak” all around the current Treak Cliff, including 5 fields named Treak Meadow.

Le Flodurs was named in a 1455 charter (Hall 1946, p5) in which one rood of land in le Flodurs was granted by Thomas Tyme to his son. According to Cameron (1959) the name may have derived from the local dialect “flothers” meaning marshy place or swamp. There are 12 “flodders” such as Far Flodders and Near Flodders on the 1819 map, all between Dunscar Farm and the south-west side of Dirty Lane.

The same charter described one rood of land in le Mamsechefylde; on the 1819 map there are no fewer than 39 "mamsitch" fields, all adjacent to each other and to the south and east of Dunscar Farm.

From making the same sort of comparison between field names in medieval documents and the township map of 1819, other larger fields in Castleton were Ronrydyngfelde and le Kylnelondes in land transactions from 1455 and 1456-7 (Hall 1946, p5-6). Kylnelondes (Kilnlands) is discussed further below.
Field names providing clues to their use or origins

There are fields named possibly for the agricultural use of the time; for example in Castleton the land named Ryecroft in 1455 (Hall 1946, p5) and 1310 (Cameron 1959), suggesting that rye was grown there, and le Wetefurlonge and Wetecerr Hurst, suggesting wheat cultivation, both from documents of 1456-7 (Hall 1946, p6).

In Hope the field Demryding was recorded in 1404; Cameron (1959) suggests that this meant “dam clearing” and is possibly the field named as Dome Riding in the 1847 Hope Tithe map (Anon. 1848). Apilore Furlong was mentioned in a 1341 document (Bag C/1460); this may have been the Appletree Furlong recorded in 1638 (Cameron 1959), the latter appearing in the index for the 1847 Tithe map of Hope; perhaps this was originally the site of an orchard?

The Spittle field must have been owned by Castleton’s medieval hospital of the Blessed Virgin of the High Peak, and was perhaps where the hospital was located.

The name Kynnelandes in a 1456 document (Hall 1946, p5-6) relating to Castleton suggests an area where kilns were used, probably for processing lime for building but mainly for agricultural use. In 1819 there were 13 fields including the term “kiln lands” or “kiln” and most of these are together in what was probably a large open field on the east of Hollowford Road (on the coffin route) and close to Trickett Gate. However two of the “kiln” fields were north of this field and directly adjacent to two farms.

In Hope there are 18 fields with Eccles in the name, all around the current Eccles Lane which is a road linking Hope with the neighbouring village of Bradwell. One of the fields is named “Under Eccles”, which may be the same area of land referred to as “sub Okelis” in a grant of 1306 (Jeayes 1906, #1430, p176). According to Mills (2003) Eccles means “Romano-British Christian Church”.

In Castleton close to the parish boundary with Hope and just north of the current main road there is a field named Gautry Thorn in the 1819 township index. “Galtrethorne” also appears in a 1455 land transaction (Hall 1946, p5). According to Cameron (1959) the name translates as “Gallow’s Tree thorn bush”, suggesting that this might have been a place of execution. Gallows were often placed on crossroads or on parish boundaries (Gallagher; Herbert et al. 2001) and whilst the historic significance of the current road is contentious, the name and location of this field is tantalising.

Another 1455 document (Hall 1946, p5) mentions a piece of land in Castleton named Mylne holme. “Holme” derives from the old Scandinavian word for “island/dry ground in a marsh /water meadow” therefore Mylne holme suggests an area fitting this description by a mill. The 1891 map names 3 fields on either side of the meanders of Peaks Hole Water and close to the corn mill and mill pond all named “Holme”; this land is still marshy and is evidence for the location of the 1455 mill at the same site.
Field names derived from their owners

Presumed examples are Shirley Yard and Emmacroft (Anon. 1625) in Hope, both appearing on the 1847 Tithe map. Also in Hope, Peyddarhagge mentioned in a document of between 1399 and 1413 (Yeatman 1886, p327), Pedderflatt (1520, Jeayes 1906, #564, p74) and later Pedder Rydding (Anon. 1613b); Nicholas le Pedder and Johannes Pedder were both recorded in the 1381 poll tax (Fenwick 1998) and a John Pedeler (possibly the same Johannes Pedder of the poll tax) was named as a witness in a 1400 land transaction (Jeayes 1906, # 1437,1438,1439, p177). Pedderflatt probably persisted in 1847 in the field named Pedlar Flatt.

In Castleton, Perkynmedo, probably Perkin’s Meadow, was mentioned in a charter of 1455 (Hall 1946, p5) but there is no sign of a similar field name in the 1819 township map index.

Locations of many of the fields mentioned above are given in Figure 11.

![Figure 11. Field names from the 1819 Castleton township map. Map with text: Alan Darlington.](image-url)
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Evidence from Map and Landscape Survey  
One piece of evidence for the presence of a medieval agricultural landscape lies in field shape where narrow selion strips are preserved by later hedged or walled fields and in the remnants of ridge and furrow made by ox-drawn plough lines operating up and down the strips of land.

Figure 12. Locations of ridge and furrow in Hope parish marked with directional arrows. Area A the Marshes; Area B strip fields; Area 4a. The Riddings and Area 4b New Hall; areas mentioned in 1691. Map with text Alan Darlington

Members of Hope Historical Society sought to record ridge and furrow within the modern fields before they vanish completely under current land management. There was no parish map marking ridge and furrow comparable with one such for Castleton. We found that what remains is fragmentary and does not give a picture of how large open fields might have been managed. One local farmer recounted how he had personally ploughed out ridge and furrow in the post-war period when modern
ploughs could not be effective over well marked ridge and furrow (the late Mr R. Priestley pers comm).

Figure 13. Ridge and furrow reveals the arable strips of the Medieval common fields behind Hope Valley College. Photo: Ann Price.

We made some serious attempts to measure the width of ridge and furrow when it appeared to be strongly marked (data not shown) which only demonstrated how ephemeral and strongly dependant on advantageous lighting Hope’s ridge and furrow had become. The selion fields are well preserved in some areas of the parish and well marked Croft and Toft land ownership still exists along Edale Road.

Figure 12 shows the position of the ridge and furrow we observed; we did not cover the entire parish, which awaits further work.
A series of Maps of the Wastes and Commons were made prior to disaforestation; the latest of this series in 1691 shows the area currently known as the Marshes as part of the Waste & Commons (Area A on Figure 12) and some areas occupied as strips in fields (Area B Figure 12 Anon. 1691).

Figure 14. Strip fields in Castleton. Photo: Di Curtis
Evidence from Documentary research

There are no early maps of Hope since Hopedale, which included the villages of Hope and Castleton, belonged to the King; therefore there are no early manorial or ducal surveys to take stock of land holding. The King ruled largely through Forest Law, which principally used appointed overseers such as the Verderers, Regarders and Foresters, to protect the King’s property. However, part of the property, namely that pertaining to the Church (tithes, advowson of the Church and other benefits, which must have included some land) came into the hands of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield in 1219. The Dean and Chapter of Lichfield sold the “Rights to the Tithes of the Rectory Manor” to Ralph Gell of Hopton in 1549 (Cox 1877).

The papers known as the Bagshaw Collection in Sheffield Record Office, provide a running commentary on land exchange up to the modern day. Similarly, Jeayes Derbyshire Charters (1906), helpfully translated from the Latin by Victorian antiquarians, provide some glimpses of the early exchange of land which can sometimes be identified within the present Parish of Hope.

1. The Fields of Hope
The phrase “in the fields of Hope” together with “bovate of land” implies the operation of an open agricultural field system around the village of Hope.

The Eyre deeds from the Bagshaw collection in Sheffield Record Office include numerous mentions of bovates of land in the town and fields with some in the ownership of the Dean and Chapter; dated 1318-1399 and thus:-

Quitclaim No 1458; to two half bovates of land).
Grant No 1461; of all lands and tenements in the Township of Hope
Grant No 1447; of one messuage and one bovate of land in Hope
Grant No 1448; All lands and tenements which ….in the town and fields of Hope
Copy Surrender No 1449; Manor of Hope. Court of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield. One messuage and one bovate of land.

This usage continues over the next two centuries with deeds dated as late as 1637 and which still refer to land that appears to be managed in strips, thus:-

Conveyance No 1526; A rood of land in the fields of Hope on the Fulwood Furlong.
This may refer to Area B as mentioned earlier

2. The Fields of Eccles
It is probable that 5 acres of meadow lying in the Field of Hope can be identified to the area known as Eccles (see Figure 9). This document also identifies some of the land belonging to one of the named Foresters, Peter of Schatton, although he clearly does not hold it for any length of time. The history of this parcel of land continues for nearly a century as follows.

In 1306 a piece of Meadow in Hope lying “sub Okelis” is granted to William, son of Peter of Schatton, forester, by William le Mareschalman de Burgo. This grant is witnessed by some well known names from Hope including Robert Balgy, Elias de Thornehulle, William Halby, Robert le Eyr, and Robert Wodereue. (Jeayes 1906, #1430, p176).
This parcel of land is mentioned again in 1359 and defined as five acres of land (Jeayes 1906, #1433, p176).

In 1361 a grant of this land is made to John le Vikersson (Jeayes 1906, #1434 p176) and in 1376 from John Vikersson to Richard de Wetton, John his brother, and Helen, wife of the said John de Wetton of five acres of land in Eckeler in the field of Hope (Jeayes 1906, #1435 #1436, p177).

In a marriage settlement In 1347, Roger of Hokelow grants all his land and tenements on the north side of the river (Pekesarse) in the township of Hope, to Cicely his daughter and William Oteson of Hope and their issue (Anon 1347). Thirty years later, in 1376, land described as one acre and a half in the Old Field in Hope lies between the messuage of Nicholas of Hokelowe and William the Hyrdman.

3. The Ryddings and Hall Croft (See Figure 12)
The word Rydding is usually construed as a clearing in the forest (Assart) and as such subject to Forest Laws. Several documents refer to this parcel of land and include some interesting names in the history of Hope.

In a document dated between 1403 – 1499, a Grant for life of a parcel of land called “le Dom Rydyng”, seventeen swathes in “le Ox(m)edo and two roods of land (Anon 1499).

In 1404 Power of attorney from Richard de Rouworth of Hope to John Wele, chaplain, and Richard Bockyn to give seisin to Anabilla his sister of a piece of land under Minley called Demryding (in Hope). Witness: m Clerk, chaplain, Roger Bockyng, John le Herdeman (Jeayes 1906 #1437,#1438,#1439, p177).

In 1411 a Grant from William Horderon and Annabella his wife to John de Staffelay of a piece of arable land called “Le Damrydyng” lying between “Le Grenesyde” and “Le Nonneley” in Hope (Jeayes 1906, #1442, p177).

Lease dated 10 May 1544, for 40 years, from Henry Wyllyams, Dean, and the Chapter of Lichfield to Rauf Hethcote of Hope and William his son, of a croft called Hallcroft in Hope, with houses etc., enclosed with “hays and dýches on bothe sydes Pekesarse”, and land called “the Ruddyng” abutting upon the “water of Pekeserse”(Jeayes 1906, #1451,#1452, p178).

Followed in 1544 by a Lease by Dean and Chapter of Lichfield to Rauf Hethcote of Hope and his son William of Hall Croft at Hope with 2 houses and a barn on it with hedges and ditches on both sides of Pekesarse, and the land called the Rydding, for 40 years at 31s 8d annual rent and the Rydding at Hope (Anon. 1544a).
A bond dated 1544, in £60 by William Heathcote to Dean and Chapter of Lichfield for lease of Hallcroft with houses and barn and the Rydding at Hope (Anon. 1544b). The fields named The Ridings are located on the Tythe map of 1847 as are the Hall Croft fields on the north side of the river.

These fields, lying north and south of the politely named Peakswater, are depicted in a series of rough estate plans drawn up in 1709; thus this parcel of land appears to be an
early enclosure with specific field names dating back to the medieval period. (Anon1709).

Figure 15. Sketch derived from “The rough estate plans of Hope”. Redrawn: Di Curtis

In the Bagshaw series of documents, No 1493 contains the last use of the phrase “town and fields” which I have implied means open arable fields. And No 1495 employs the first use of “Close” implying enclosure. For example Copy Admittance. No 1495 Dated 1579/80 for the Manor of Hope. “Admitted to a messuage and one bovate of land, and two closes called Dame Ruddyngge and Pedder Ruddyngge”.

From this date onwards, deeds usually refer to close or field by name, many of these names remain in use on the Enclosure Plan and Index of 1819 and thus the deeds refer to transactions which can be identified in the landscape.
10. Lead Mining 1066—1642

Patricia Miles

Introduction
It is generally thought that the Romans must have mined lead in the High Peak ore field, including the Castleton area. A large pig of Roman lead has even been found near Brough within what was the Medieval parish of Hope but it is difficult to find physical evidence from the mines since most of them have been reworked over the succeeding centuries. There is more tangible evidence that the Anglo-Saxons also mined lead. Many of the customs and laws associated with lead mining in the High Peak are thought to have originated with the Saxons, as have several of the terms and words peculiar to their activities. The Barmote Court, which still exists today probably evolved in Anglo-Saxon times and came to oversee the administration of the mines. The document Quo Warranto of 1288 is evidence of the Saxon influence and mentions the Court of the Barmasters (Barnatt 1999; Rieuwerts 1978, p13-17).

However, more identifiable evidence of lead mining in the High Peak begins to emerge with the coming of the Normans with their passion for organization and record keeping such as the Domesday Book.

The lives of the miners
In the medieval period inhabitants of Castleton and Hope would have primarily been tenant farmers. Mining would be a sideline, which had to fit in with the cycle of the farming year usually between April and July. Men who mined are usually referred to, in documents, as ‘cultor’ or farmer not miner, which does make it more difficult to research the individual miners in a community. In the early medieval period the inhabitants would have been subject to the lord of the manor: in Castleton’s case the Crown and whoever had control of the castle. Their position as serfs gave them little freedom and the small amount of land of which they had tenure would be poor quality. As a miner however, with the right of free mining, the peasant would theoretically be free from the control of the lord of the manor, provided he paid the dues of lot and cope and the tithe to the Church which was 1/10th of all produce from the land. He probably made little money out of the lead, but in this aspect of his work he was independent and the extra money was significant. (See below Lot and Cope and Free Mining).

Domesday and the Normans
The record of lead production in the Domesday Survey of 1086 for Hope is for the combined manors of Hope, Bakewell, and Ashford but it covers the years 1042-1066, during the reign of Edward the Confessor, before William the Conqueror defeated Harold and not for the year 1086 when the survey was made. From the amount paid to the Crown in duty in these years we might deduce that as much as 250 tons of lead ore were mined within the parishes of Hope, Bakewell and Ashford each year from 1042-1066. According to the Survey the royal manor of Hope together with Bakewell and Ashford supplied five wagon loads of lead annually to the King (Eales 2006; Reiuwerts and Ford 1993; Victoria County History 1907).

The choice of the site for Peveril Castle by William Peverel might well be explained by the ample supply of lead to be found in the limestone enclosing the head of the
valley as well as its defensive position and proximity to good hunting ground, which, after Henry II reclaimed the castle, became the Royal Forest of the Peak. Lead was in great demand for roofs and flashings of the Norman stone buildings, The Crown regained control of the castle from the Peverels in 1155.

In 1250, during the reign of Henry III, the constable at the castle was ordered to buy 50 fathers of lead (father = approximately one ton) for the royal castle at Winchester. Moreover in the years 1250-2 the castle was considerably refurbished and the bailiff was instructed to reroof the two gateways with lead. It is clear that lead mining was already an important contribution to the livelihood of the inhabitants of Castleton and Hope parishes (liberties) from the early part of the eleventh century onwards and that the lead was transported considerable distances (Eales 2006).

Figure 16. Odin Mine has been worked since at least the Medieval period. Photo: Ann Price.

**Medieval period 1100-1500**

Little is known about individual mines in this early period since only the duties from each liberty were recorded and few records still exist. By 1372 we know that the records were supervised by the Barmaster of the Barmote court, who was appointed by the Duchy of Lancaster. The earliest reference to an actual mine in the Castleton Liberty is that of Odin Mine about 1280. It was referred to when a fugitive was detained in the Royal Forest of the Peak accused of poaching in the wood at the entrance to Odin (Brooksbank 1925; Rieuwerts 2007; see also Chapter 5, Crime and Punishment). We have to rely on what archaeological evidence exists at the mines themselves to estimate when they were worked, and much of that has been obscured by later workings.
Hope itself is situated on the gritstone but is very close to the limestone where numerous rich lead veins occur. There are several ancient trackways which lead directly to the mines. One via Eccles House to Smalldale in the Bradwell Liberty whose mines are now for the most part obliterated by the cement works and on to Hazlebadge, and another to the mines of Pindale and Dirtlow Rake which are mainly in the Castleton liberty. Black Rabbit lane also leads beyond Pindale to Castleton while Winnats Pass leads to the mines of Peak Forest liberty. Odin mine below Mam Tor was also accessible from the track to Chapel en le Frith and Edale. Ancient trackways, therefore afforded the inhabitants easy access to an alternative source of income. Rieuwerts thinks that the scar to the left of the entrance to Peak Cavern, marking a surface outcrop of lead ore, was an easy and obvious source of lead for the early miners. We know that miners were prepared to walk considerable distances to work a mine.

Liberties were the administrative areas for lead mining, which usually corresponded to the Parish boundaries. The laws and customs of lead mining evolved in Anglo Saxon times. The Crown owned the minerals beneath the ground and exacted royalties from the lead miners. It encouraged lead mining as a good source of revenue for itself. The Derbyshire lead field was divided into two areas of jurisdiction, the High and Low Peak, both were within the Kings field (or Queens field) which is an area administered for the Crown by the Duchy of Lancaster which was set up with a grant of land by Henry III for his son Edmund in 1265 and later confirmed as The Duchy of Lancaster in 1399. Outside of the Kings field there were some areas of land where a noble had been granted the mineral rights as a favour by the King and the dues were then payable to that noble. The Liberties of Hope and Castleton and Bradwell were for the most part within the Kings field. There was, however, one private Liberty, that of Hazlebadge, south of Bradwell, owned after 1421 by the Vernons where the usual laws of the Kingsfield did not apply. It is estimated that the mines of Castleton, Bradwell and Hucklow yielded 700-1000 loads (four loads = one ton approx.) each year between 1236 and 1249 (Rieuwerts 1994).

The northwest area of the High Peak, which includes Castleton and Hope, is referred to by Blanchard as the “outer zone or reaches” (Blanchard 1971). Between 1270 and 1310 he reckons that the Derbyshire lead ore field “reigned supreme” and that the outer reaches were the most productive during this time. He thinks that Derbyshire was the “premier lead mining centre” in the country.

Rieuwerts has used the same figures as Blanchard from the Public Record Office for the High Peak, which might well have included some of the mines of Castleton and Bradwell Liberties to construct a table of ore production in the High Peak (Rieuwerts 1994). He reckons that the amount paid by the ‘farmers,’ in the High Peak for the right to collect the ‘lot’ duty from the miner in 1236-7 was £6-18-2 and went down to £4.00 in 1248-1249 indicating a fall in the price of lead. An approximate idea of the value can be formed from the National Archives currency conversion tables. In 1270 £6-18-6 would be worth £3,680.21 in 2005’s money not an insubstantial amount in those days. The farmers or lessees were often lead merchants and could have a very tight control of production, prices, smelting and sale as we see from the Vernon accounts of 1423 and 1442-43 which are discussed later.
**Free mining 1100-1500**

In 1288 an Inquisition was held at Ashbourne when the ancient rights of Derbyshire miners, which went back to Saxon times, were laid out in a document called Quo Warranto, which still survives (Rieuwerts 1978). That an inquisition was held and gave some order and authority to the ancient rights peculiar to the lead miners in Derbyshire is indicative of the importance and proliferation of lead mines in the 1200s.

A miner could search for lead ore without hindrance from the landlord provided it was not in a garden, orchard, churchyard, burial ground, place of worship, dwelling house or highway. If he found lead he then had to free his mine by registering it with the Barmaster, the administrator for the liberty, by paying a freeing dish of lead ore, usually about 65 lbs. to the Crown or its lessee. This gave the miner the right to mine for two meers length to whatever depth or width he liked depending on the vein. A meer in the High Peak was about 29m or 32 yds. After this he mined the Lord’s meer which meant all the ore mined here went to the Lord of the field or, if he wished, the miner could buy back the ore he had mined once it was valued. From then on he could mine as many taker meers as he wished provided he freed each one with a dish of ore (Rieuwerts 1978).

This right must have seemed very liberating to the men of the medieval period when their serfdom to their lord meant they were little short of slaves to him. Even though they had to pay duties they were free to mine where they chose which is why the right of free mining was held to be of primary importance to the miner and was defended so fiercely whenever it was threatened by the nobility. However, it would be surprising if sometimes the owner of the land which the miner farmed, did not covet the cash that the miner received for his lead ore and take it into account when he set the tenurial rate. For the poll tax of 1379 in districts where miners are known to have worked they are categorised as ‘cultor’ (farmer). Mining, it seems, was still seen as a sideline (Blanchard 1971, p100).

**Lot and cope**

Once the mine was freed the miner then had to pay a duty to the mineral lord, the King or Queen or his/her lessee or ‘farmer,’ which was called ‘lot’. This usually amounted to $\frac{1}{13}$ of the dressed ore mined. The lot payment was for the miner’s privilege of free access to his mine and also access to wood and water. It was usual for the right to collect the duty of lot to be ‘farmed’ out or leased to individuals, initially the gentry, but later such people as lead merchants.

In addition the miner or the lead merchant had to pay the duty of ‘cope’ of 4d per load which was payment in lieu of the Crown or its lessee having the first right to purchase the lead ore (Rieuwerts 1978).

The laws were complicated and quite costly for the miner but this right to free-mining gave everyone a chance to speculate and hopefully have another source of income. It led to many individuals or groups of two or three miners opening up several small mines along a vein. Hence a proliferation of small mines in the earlier period which eventually amalgamated into the larger mines. Mining and the chance of hitting on a rich vein has always been a lottery. Consequently in poor areas such as
Hope and Castleton the miners were forced almost always to combine mining with subsistence farming, fitting it into the farming annual cycle.

‘Farming’ the lead and the role of the gentry
It seems that once the Crown regained control of Peveril Castle in 1173 the administration was entrusted to an experienced official to act as constable and bailiff for the castle. He would probably have fulfilled the function of the lessee, or ‘farmer,’ of the lead from the mines of the parishes of Hope and Castleton until the control of the castle was handed over to John of Gaunt in 1373.

The ‘farmers’ appointed by the Duchy of Lancaster would have had an important influence on the lives of the actual miners. To farm the duties would have been a coveted right for several aspiring landed families. By the 15th century the Vernons, Eyres and Foljambes were playing an important part in the exploitation of lead in the High Peak including Hope and Castleton. As Rieuwerts points out a lead farmer could earn as much as £3680 in one year for collecting the lot and cope even as early as 1248-9 (Rieuwerts 1994).

The Vernon family (later Manners) acquired an estate in Castleton in 1421 and appear from the Belvoir documents, discussed later, to have acquired the right to ‘farm’ the lead; an indication of the family’s determination to extend their grip on the lead miners, even in the Kings field. In 1421 the Vernons in addition to their Nether Haddon estate had not only acquired the Strelley estates in Castleton but their land in Brough and the Private Liberty of Hazlebadge over which they had jurisdiction. They clearly had aspirations to control the local lead industry, which led to many legal battles and even riots. In 1630 John Manners from Haddon took all ore sales on his manor of Hazelbadge into his own hands and set the price at 9s per load instead of the market price of 22s leading to renewed conflict (Evans 1912; Wood 1999).

The Eyre family who held lands in the Hope Valley as far back as the 1200s was another family who together with the Foljambes disputed the freeminers guaranteed rights in return for payment of dues and tried to gain direct control over their estates. William Le Heyr (Eyre) was Forester of the Peak in the 1250 and was allowed a ‘bovate’ (between 15/20 acre) of land at Hope. His granddaughter Catherine married Sir Thomas Foljambe 1265-97 whose manor and principal residence was Hassop Hall, which the Eyres then came to own. One of the early mines in Pindale was Eyre Grove, In the reign of Henry VI a court was held at Castleton in 1472 when Nicholas Eyre acknowledged that he owed ‘one lode (load) of ore and five dishes’ to Nicholas Howe and Richard Slack de Burgh (Brough) ‘attached Nicholas Eyre in plea of three lodes of lead ore.’ This Nicholas Eyre could well be one of the sons of Sir Nicholas Eyre of Hope and is evidence of the Eyre’s early interest in lead. In 1483 Nicholas Eyre is mentioned as being of Redseats Castleton. Blanchard has discovered from accounts found in the Public Record Office, that Robert Eyre II of Padley and his offspring were farming the lead from the High Peak between 1475-1481 and 1486-1527. The mines from the Hope and Castleton Liberties would probably have been included in these accounts but how much lead the mines produced is very difficult to estimate. At least the gentry thought it was profitable to bid for the right to farm the Lot and cope (Blanchard 2005, p1373; Evans 1912).
Blanchard concludes from documents at Lichfield Record office that Thustan del Boure of Tideswell paid £36 to be lessee or farmer for 1391-2 for the part of the High Peak he terms the outer zone which would have included Hope and Castleton. This sum presupposes that about 702 loads (175.5 tons approx.) would have been mined for the year and suggests that Thurstan del Boure must have felt confident that his investment was worthwhile and that the mines in the area were productive. It was customary for the right to farm to be granted for no more than six years at a time, which means that Thurstan may have had the right to collect the duty for more than one year (Blanchard 2005, p1373).

**Smelting before 1570**

To render the lead ore into a usable form and enable it to be transported more easily the lead had to be smelted. Much of the ore first extracted was pure galena or ‘bing ore’ and was smelted in a bole furnace. A small amount of poorer quality ore (‘boose’) was taken to washing sites for cleaning along the courses of streams or rivers. The bole furnace was usually situated on the tops of west facing hills or escarpment to utilize the prevailing wind. They are first recorded in Derbyshire in the 12th century. Medieval boles were about three feet in diameter and later increased to about 20 feet in diameter. They were not very efficient and in the 16th century were superseded by ore-hearth furnaces, which enabled the boose ore, which had previously been discarded, to be smelted.

There are several hills today called ‘Bole Hill’ indicating where the smelters worked. The hill flanked on either side by the Hathersage and Grindleford roads to Sheffield is known as Bole Hill. It is in an ideal position on the route from the Hope Valley to Sheffield or Chesterfield and then onto Bawtry. The hill near Highlow Hall close to Abney (home of Robert Eyre II (1658) who had interests in lead) was known as Smelter’s Hill. Winhill is the nearest gritstone hill to Castleton and Hope where it has been established, from the lead deposits, that it was used for smelting, although Bradwell edge may well have been used as well. Depending upon where the lead was destined, the lead ore could be taken quite a distance even to the Tideswell smelters probably on Tideslow or as far as the outskirts of Sheffield.

The owners of the smelters were often lead merchants such as Thurstan del Boure and they became agents for the mine owners as well. They were the entrepreneurs of their day who frequently made the real profit from lead mining as Thurstan del Boure’s wealth bears witness. We gather too from the Baslow Court Rolls that Thurstan paid ‘the sum of xij per annum for having and burning boles’ and on his death owned a considerable amount of property. There appears to be a group of smelters from Tideswell since Baslow Court Rolls record that a licence for having boles was granted to Thomas son of Henry de Litton, Richard Litton, Roger de Wormhill and Ralph le Barker “all from Tideswell and its immediate vicinity.” Will of Hucklow was fined for having a bole without a licence (Kerry 1900).

**Derbyshire miners sent to Royal mines in Devon 1295-1360**

Clearly mining was well established in the Peak by the thirteenth century as in 1295 the King sends instructions to “William de Wymundham and the bailiffs of the Peak to seek out all the miners of those parts so as to take them to the king’s mine in Co. Devon, there to stay at the King’s expense. The King also caused money to be
It seems the first group of miners elected by the officials and the barmaster’ were taken to Coombe Martin mine, owned by the Crown. The mine’s records even list the names of some of the men who were sent who seem to have been from Wardlow and Monsall, However Blanchard (2005, p1627) maintains that the liberty from which the miners came can be identified from the list of names of those in the mining camp in Devon in 1297 and thinks Castleton miners were among them. The surnames, in those days related closely to the area in which they lived and Castleton was one such area. Castleton was a Royal manor and the mines belonged to the Crown so it is likely that some Castleton miners were elected to go to Devon. This demonstrates not just the power of the Crown to conscript men and transport them to Devon, but it also shows how much the expertise of Derbyshire miners was valued. The initial journey took ten days, which must have been quite an experience and the miners were allowed 2d per day for expenses. The Crown officials clearly anticipated that the mines would be very profitable (Blanchard 2005, p1627).

In 1295 The Crown officials opened up a new mine in Devon called Beer Ferrers, which was thought to hold great riches of silver and lead ore. A document in the Public Record Office reveals that a much larger and skilled labour force was needed, so officials were dispatched to the Peak District of Derbyshire to recruit more miners

In 1360 yet more miners were impressed at Coombe Martin. Peter Claughton explains in his excellent article that the Black Death (1348-50) had caused such a decline in lead mining, that Derbyshire alone had had sufficient skilled men to satisfy the needs of the Devon mines (Claughton 1991). He points out that for the Derbyshire miners conditions would have been very different in Devon from those of the Kings field without their right to free mining. “As servants of the Crown on fixed wages, their independence was gone. Privileges such as an exemption from local taxes were given, but the opportunity to abscond was clearly taken.” There was a warrant for the arrest of twelve Derbyshire miners in June 1360 “until they shall find security for returning to Devonshire” (Claughton 1991).

**Derbyshire lead in demand for prestigious buildings**

Apart from references to lead tithes in various documents and, in 1250, the order for lead to be sent to Winchester, the three following references from 1351 are the first actual mention of the use of lead we have found relating specifically to Hope and Castleton. They indicate that lead has certainly become an important commodity, which the Crown, the owner of the castle, controls and sees fit to exploit as the officials did in Devon.

“Writ of aid, for one year for Thomas del Clough, keeper of the castle and honour of High Peak, now in the hands of Queen Philippa, charged by her to hire workmen for working a lead mine for her use (135i)” (Great Britain 1907a).

This next reference helps to corroborate the one above indicating that Castleton lead was in demand in 1351 for building work in London
“Protection for one year for John Fuitz, Henry Fuitz, Simon de Monyasse who has undertaken to find lead from time to time as required by the King and Queen Philippa for their works at London, and elsewhere in those parts, and for his ships with his men and mariners bringing the lead from the Peak to London” (Great Britain 1907a).

The Black Death lasted from 1348-51 so these references help to confirm that the Hope and Castleton miners may not have been as badly affected as other parts of the country and the local lead industry may have profited from this. Queen Philippa was the wife of Edward III and had been given charge of the castle by her husband. The lead could have been for any of a number of works in which she became involved.

From 1304-1311 Derbyshire was the leading export trader to foreign countries and sent 35% of its output abroad. The lead was usually taken to Hull either, via Chesterfield and then to the port at Dunham (now a Toll Bridge over the Trent on the A57) to be shipped via the Trent to the Humber, or it was transported overland to Bawtry and then by ship to Hull. The favourite route from the Hope Valley seems to have been via Bawtry (Blanchard 2005, p1408).

The following reference indicates that the importance of Hull as a distribution centre for lead continues: “Sept 1351 protection with clause nolumus, for one year, for Richard Lever, the King’s purveyor of lead for his works, in buying lead in High Peak and carrying the same to Kingston upon Hull and other ports” (Great Britain 1907a).

High Peak lead was used for prestigious buildings including Windsor Castle, Westminster Hall, and Winchester Palace as well as the Abbey of Clairvaux in France (Rieuwerts 2000).

This evidence of the demand for High Peak lead is corroborated by the fact that Thurstan del Boure from Tideswell, a wealthy lead smelter and merchant, was asked to provide 100 tons of lead for the roof of Westminster Hall in London (Victoria County History 1907).

Blanchard uses the value of the lead tithes to indicate for this period how much lead was being produced and what price it was fetching. The tithe was one of the many taxes the miners had to pay but this tax was to the Church. It amounted to 1/10th of what was produced. In Hope, Bakewell and Tideswell the value of the tithe paid to the diocese of Lichfield had fallen by a third in 1356 to £10-13s-4d from 1342 prices but then increased to £20 in 1403. Blanchard argues that 1403 value was still less than 1342 in spite of lead doubling in price, but since the decline was just after the Black Death (1348-51) when the population fell so dramatically, it does not seem surprising that the output might be less. However the amount paid by Thurstan del Boure in 1391-2 to farm the lot and cope for the High Peak would mean that 720 loads were mined which is much more than 450 loads in 1310 before the Black Death (Blanchard 2005, p1373).

**The first half of the Fifteenth Century**

Whether or not the output of lead declined in the fourteenth century some historians think that there was a real decline in lead output in Derbyshire in the 15th century, which coincided with a decline in agriculture. The land in the two parishes was poor and given over, for the main part, to sheep. The decline in lead output is difficult to
verify for Hope and Castleton since there are so few records available. The number of wars in which the nobility became embroiled would presumably have led to an increased demand for lead ore for warfare and also for men for military service. Wood has a telling contemporary quote ‘old (lead) wurcks had ben in old tyme’ but were now ‘quite overgrown wth grasse’ and thinks that the High Peak was “virtually moribund.”

We do, however, have some interesting records from Belvoir Castle which help to illustrate how the lead industry was controlled in the first half of the 15th century.

**Accounts for Sir Richard Vernon of Haddon Hall 1423-1443**
The following accounts of Sir Richard Vernon give us some insight into the workings of the lot and cope, how much lead was being produced from Hope and Castleton mines in the fifteenth century and the money the miners would ultimately receive.

By the 15th century many entrepreneurs were becoming smelters and even tried to own the mines themselves to avoid having to pay the free miners for their ore. The miner then became a wage owner. In the following accounts from the Vernon papers, Robert Mornsall was not only the receiver and buyer of lead but organised the smelting on behalf of Sir Richard Vernon.

**Belvoir castle Documents’ Account No 1025 (1423)**
1423 - Robert Mornsall receiver and buyer of lead for Sir Richard Vernon.
Received from the Kings field 316 loads 6 dishes.
This amount would presumably be from free miners but we only have the names of the miners and not the location of their mines. It is not clear whether the sums would be what they owed for duty of Lot or the amount bought.

**1442-1443 – Robert Mornsall Purchase of ore**
Robert Platts of Castleton 12 loads
Thomas Tym of Castleton 2 loads
John Tym 3 loads – 18/-
Richard Triket of Hope 3 loads
John Burton 5 loads – 30/-
William Fornes 4 loads at 6/8d – 26/8d
Richard Howe of Bradwell 18 loads at 6/ - £5-8-0
Nicholas Halle 7+1 half loads at 6/- 45/-
William Bradshawe of Hope 4 loads at 6/- 24/-
Roger Slacke of Hope 3 loads at 6/-
Ralph Heye 1+ 1 half loads – 9/-
Richard Bown 14 loads 2+1 half dishes He received £4-15-0
Richard Bown 4 loads at 6/8d Bermaister dishes
Total not including Platts 12 loads = 69 loads
Sum of ore 69 loads 3 dishes
allocated to the same 33/4d (BUT 69 loads at 4d per load cope; 69 x4/12 = 23/-23/- + 5/4d = 28/4d not 33/4d)

It is difficult to understand the reckonings because the Latin is not clear. Perhaps something else has to be taken into account to make sense of them.
Another Belvoir Account (no. 1095) of 1442 to Michælmas 1443 does not explain why Robert Platts is not included in the final total, but some of the miners were not paid immediately and had to wait until the lead was smelted and then sold on, at which time Mornsall himself would receive the money from the Vernons to settle the debts. The miners might have to wait some time to receive their pay. Certainly in this document some appear not to have been paid. Blanchard thinks this is an example of how the Vernons operated: that the miners and the suppliers of tallow and rope for the miners were the last in the chain to get their money. Mornsall’s own pay was only £1-6s-8d.

Since Robert Mornsall is listed as purchaser of ore, he would be liable to pay the duty of cope. The miners already should have paid the barmaster their duty of ‘lot’ in appropriate dishes. Was Richard Bown paying money owed for barmaster dishes? It is interesting that Robert Mornsall seems to have kept his position for at least 20 years.

**Account Michælmas 1442**

Richard Bowne features again in a special account for the previous year as owing 24 loads 2 burdens 1 dish from mines in arrears, followed by a list of miners’ names. Who possibly mined the ore. Was Richard Bowne Barmaster or did he collect money for the Barmaster? The miners’ names are interesting. The fact that Robert Platts is not included in the addition of the previous list may be because he still owed money.

Robert Marshall of Hope  
Robert Platts  
Nicholas Burton of Bradwell  
John Cole  
Robert Elat of Aston and a William T—whose name is indecipherable

It seems here that Sir Richard Vernon must be the lessee or farmer for the Duchy of Lancaster, since Hope and Castleton are in the Kings field. However the Vernons had just acquired the Strelley estate in Castleton and at Hazlebadge in 1421 and would be a major landowner in the area. He seems to be exercising his prerogative of preempting the ore. By rights these men mentioned above should all be free miners (Evans 1912).

It would be wrong to assume that the sums paid to the miners would be all profit. The larger sums probably represented the work of at least two or three miners, apart from the other workers needed to dress the ore and transport it to the smelters. Moreover the miners would have incurred expenses for their specialist tools etc. From present day evidence it appears that much of the mining, prior to 1600, in Dirtlow Rake and Odin mine was large open cast workings to a depth of about 40 feet. The almost pure galena, which was initially mined, was called ‘Bing’. This needed little dressing.

If the miners had removed all the surface lead and were involved in digging shafts and levels they would need their specialist tools, many candles, possibly powder to blast the rock (gun powder began to replace fire-setting from the mid 1600s), wooden props etc. and a windlass to lift the ore. It appears that levels were being driven under the shale by at least the early 1600s at Odin. If a financier owned the mine then the
miners could bill him for their expenses. It is difficult to establish from this document from Belvoir (Haddon) who actually owned the mines at this time but we can be sure the Vernon family and the smelter made the most profit.

The ‘boose’ (mixture of ore and surrounding minerals etc.) had to be ‘dressed’ by a bucker to extract the ore, and then someone had to put it through a sieve and wash it before it was sold and transported to the smelters. It would be interesting to know how many days’ work a load equalled. The returns quoted in the Vernon document appear to be for a year, so the miners did not make great fortune.

At 2005 rates £5-8-0 which Richard Howe was paid for 18 loads would equal in 1440 £2,534.49 and 18/-paid to John Tym would equal £422.4. Four loads equalled roughly one ton so Howe was paid for four and a half tons, probably for the work of several men.

**Developments in the second half of the fifteenth century**

Most miners must have faced a problem in the second half of the 15th century and continuing into the sixteenth century. Most of the galena, good quality lead ore, which could be extracted from the surface had been exhausted and it became necessary to dig deeper, sink shafts and tunnel out levels from which to extract the lead ore.

At the end of the fifteenth century at Odin mine the first attempts appear to have been made to drive a tunnel beneath the shale. All this work needed new expertise and much more financial investment. So it was that the owners were forced to look for shareholders to provide the finance and many merchants and gentry began to seize the opportunity to invest in the mines. Another problem, which confronted the miners, was that of draining the mines once their workings were below the water table, forcing them to drive levels or soughs for drainage channels.

There was no shortage of gentry and aspiring yeomen willing to invest in the mines of the High Peak and as a result there appears to be an upturn in the second half of the 16th century. Moreover there is more documentation for this period and the country was at peace, after the War of the Roses was finally settled at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485. Before the battle of Bosworth, however there was another development, which implies that the Derbyshire lead trade was still vibrant in spite of the numerous battles and that the proceeds from its lead was highly prized by the Crown. The creation of a Staple at York in 1485 specifically for Derbyshire lead seems to indicate that towards the end of the fifteenth century at least there was an expectation of a worthwhile output of lead for export.

**A Staple at York**

In April 1485 Richard III, shortly before he was killed by the army of the Tudor pretender Henry VII, set up two Staples for the export of metal by royal charter, one at Southampton for various metals and the other at York specifically for lead from Derbyshire. A Staple was a designated market for export goods run by a mayor and various merchants which was responsible for collecting the duty due to the Crown for lead ore and usually wool and tin from the exporters. These new Staples were to have the same powers as the one at Calais, which was still in English hands. All lead and metal exports had to pass through one or other staple. Previously all exports had gone through Calais. It seems that Richard III wanted to prevent the exporters of lead and
other metals from avoiding this tax and “to obviate the evils arising from the non-
observance of the said provision.” It also seems that although Calais still remained in
English hands he did not trust the loyalty of the officials. The lead from the High
Peak, destined for the continent from then on had to pass through York and from there
by boat to the Humber and Hull. The output of Derbyshire lead must have increased
and the amount of exported been quite substantial for the Crown to set up a special
Staple for Derbyshire. Was it set up for the merchants convenience or because they
were adept at avoiding paying the export dues? It suggests that the value of the tax to
the Crown must have been considerable (Great Britain 1914).

**Free mining in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century**
An industry that Wood describes as ‘moribund’ was given a new lease of life about
1569. William Humphrey introduced an ore hearth mill for smelting which helped to
revolutionise the output of the smelting industry. It meant that the smelters were no
longer constrained by the seasons and the weather and much smaller pieces of lead
could be smelted and poorer ore deposits and waste heaps could be utilized. To quote
Kiernan “a high quality product mainly for the domestic market was transform
ed into
a major overseas trade” (Kiernan 1989, ch6).

In the second half of the sixteenth century the most valuable commodity as far as
private estates in Derbyshire were concerned was lead; Europe at that time depended
on the supplies from English lead fields and over half the national production came
from Derbyshire. Lead was in demand for roofing, pipes and pewter as well as
supplies for the large European standing armies. In the 1540s Derbyshire miners
produced an annual amount of 3,000 loads of ore but by 1600 this had increased to
34,000 loads of ore (Dias 1981; Wood 1999, p73).

The late sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century were the
boom years for many of the ambitious yeomen and gentry who invested in the mines
in the High Peak, whereas a free miner who worked underground would be dependent
on a small workforce, often three from his own family. The miner himself would
extract the ore from the lead vein, a carrier would take the ore to the foot of the shaft,
up which it was wound to the surface and the winder, often the wife, would also dress
and sieve the ore.

The work underground was hard and dangerous. One of the earliest confirmations that
the Derbyshire miners were tunnelling at depth is the evidence they gave to the
Exchequer Commission in 1581 where they maintained they were digging to a depth
of 40 to 60 fathoms. The miner had to timber the level (tunnel) as he went, to prevent
falling stone. He drove levels underground with only candles for light sometimes
advancing less than 3 inches per shift. The process of fire setting to loosen the rock
could fill the galleries with smoke, until the use of gunpowder was developed later in
the century. He could be overcome by lack of oxygen or a concentration of methane.
There were many fatalities (Wood 1999).

It is important not to underestimate the skill and knowledge of the miners themselves,
which led to the development of the mines in the first half of the seventeenth century.
One cannot but admire the fortitude and persistence of the men who not only
constructed passageways underground with minimum tools, but understood enough
about the geology to know where to dig and how to cope with the various rock
formations and types of ore they encountered. Even though they were not always successful, they were prepared to risk their lives.

The miners themselves made their case when they gave evidence to an Exchequer Commission as early as 1581. They complained that the new system of smelting known as Humphrey's ore hearth mill which allowed for much smaller pieces of ore to be smelted, gave the cavers an advantage. All the cavers had to do was to dig over the waste hillocks left from the earlier workings and then sift the ore with one of Humphrey's sieves. Cavers were often semi-vagrant poor people, sometimes women, who scavenged for the small bits of lead ore in the waste heaps (hillocks). The ore hearth-smelting mill opened up a new source of income for the poorest. The Miners on the other hand had to “sink a pytt” up to three fathoms in stone to find ore and then down to 40 or even 60 fathoms to extract the ore at great risk to their lives (Wood 1999, p82).

As the depth of the mine and the cost of mining increased, miners had to raise money for investment, consolidate smaller mines into bigger concerns or sell out to larger consortia often headed by successful mine owners or merchants. The free miners of Castleton remained ‘socially significant’ but their importance was challenged by the need for greater investment and capitalisation of the industry. Between 1638-41 Wood reckons that 41-50% of the total population was dependent on mining in Castleton and Hope.

Attached to the list of miners names in the Miners’ Petition to the Long Parliament in 1641/2 are the numbers of the poorer workers in individual liberties of the Derbyshire minefield, which demonstrates the abyss between those higher up the production chain, such as shareholders of consolidated mines or owners of smelting mills and merchants and the large number of cavers and hirelings dependent on mining for their livelihood (Anon. 1641-2).

In addition to the actual miners names in the Petition, the number of cavers and hirelings is listed. There were as many as 85 cavers in Hope and Castleton in 1641. Apart from the cavers, hirelings were the lowest class of society. As their name suggests they were for hire, for a minimal wage, often in gangs, at any mine where work was needed. Cavers and hirelings made up a quarter of the work force in the lead field.

**Ancillary workers**

The Derbyshire miners’ Petition to the Long Parliament also provides a useful list of ancillary workers for the mining industry in Derbyshire in the years 1641/2, which shows how important the lead industry had become at this time as a means of employment.

*Smelters (the workers) and families* 1000  
*Jaggers and families (who carry ore from the mines to the smelting mills)* 2020  
*Carriers of lead from the mills* 2000  
*Woodcutters (for Fuel)* 500  
*Horse masters* 150  
*Woodcutters for cross timber* 600  
*Chandlers* 300  
*Carriers of courses and cross timbers* 100
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According to Wood the miners of the parish of Hope in the first half of the seventeenth century were among the poorest in the High Peak and this is borne out by the figures from the 1641 document which says:

“more poore hirelings and cavers with their children have their liveinges on the mynes. In Hope and Castleton there were 85 hirelings.” (Anon. 1641-2).

Wood concludes that the miners were for the most part wage dependent and landless (Wood 1999). However by the mid 1660s the effects of the civil war and exhaustion of the ore from above the water table in many mines and the near monopoly of the profits by the gentry meant that the free miner was reduced to near poverty or to being a dependent wage earner.

By contrast Henry Kniveton a lawyer who lived in Castleton had made several million pounds, in today’s money, from his shares in Odin mine by 1673 when his daughter Elizabeth married John Wright of Eyam Hall with a dowry of shares for Odin mine worth £1,500 equivalent to £124,000,000 in 2005 money. (Anon 1672)

Wills and Inventories
Some of the wills and inventories in Lichfield Record Office from Hope and Castleton of this period refer to small amounts of unsmelted lead ore (dishes) and some to lead already smelted into ‘pigs’, fodders or ‘pieces.’ The wills were written shortly before the Miners Petition of 1641. The impression is that lead is available at a price (see Ch. 12 Wills and Inventories).

The inventory of the estate of Thomas Bockinge of Castleton in 1615 includes a long list of people who owed him money and five who owed him lead. He in turn owed one man two fodders of lead priced at £22 (the 2005 equivalent of £22 in 1620 is £2,112.00) (Bockinge 1615). He does not seem to have been a lead miner since there are no miners tools in his inventory, nor would he have been fit enough at the end of his life but it could be that he was buying and selling lead: a bit of a wheeler dealer. Certainly, Bockinge’s household effects point to a man who seems better off than many of the other villagers and he owns land setting him apart from most of the villagers and classing him probably as a yeoman. The surname Bocking(e) occurs fairly regularly in mining history, from this period and through the next two centuries, and especially in Bradwell, where there were Bocking Titles on the hill above Hazlebadge which were most probably active in this period since the miners of Hazlebadge were in dispute with the Vernons in 1629 over the regulation of the mines.

The small amounts of lead (pieces) owned or owed does make one wonder how much the ‘black market’ operated at this time. The Castle was now defunct so there was no local Crown official to oversee the payment of duties. It would have been up to the vigilance of the Barmaster or the ‘farmer’ of the duties to do so. The Vernons may well have been the lessees or farmers. It is easy to imagine that small amounts of lead ore could be smuggled home, though a ton is not so easily disguised. If the lead had been legally smelted then duties would have been paid. It is commonly alleged that Castleton Miners were prone to evading the Barmasters records and the necessary
duties. Even Richard Torre, in 1654 admits to neglecting to free eight meers in Odin and in consequence lost four of them to Eyre and partners (Rieuwerts 2007, p31).

Richard Needham’s inventory (1617) raises some questions. From the estimated value, £43 9s 0d, of the goods he left, he does not seem as comfortably off as some of the other deceased. However he was owed £11.65s plus two pigs of lead. A pig of lead is ore which has been smelted and poured into a long large dish to form a bar or ingot. What did a Shoemaker need with 2 pigs of lead? In the 1641 petition listing the names of the miners who supported it, there were six different Needhams listed and at least four of the men owing Richard Needham money were also miners who put their mark on the petition list. Moreover, a century later, in the 1750s we have a record of a mine called Needham Grove on Dirtlow Rake (Barnatt 1999).

John Mellor, yeoman who died in 1632 appears to own land (Mellor 1632). He owed or was owed money or lead by several of the men listed in the petition.

Thomas Townsend, who died 1637, owed Ottiwell Smith for a fother of lead, a lot of money, and other ‘bonds of money’ amounting to twenty seven pounds while Bockinge in turn owed him £24. 10s 0d for what we do not know (Townsend 1637). Who was Ottiwell who was owed so much? He does not appear on the petition list unless he is in the damaged section but there are other Smiths. Was he also dealing in lead?

The picture we get from these inventories is lead being bought and sold among the locals for what could have been work on houses or farms. Although the value of the lead was high, it does not seem that any of these men had enough to be fully-fledged merchants. The rate for a fother (almost a ton) of lead appears to be about £11. The 1632 equivalent of this in 2005 would be £980.76.

**Derbyshire Miners’ Petition to the Long Parliament 1641**

In 1635 the miners encountered yet another threat to their income which eventually led the miners to organize a petition to King Charles which they presented shortly before the Civil War, when the King was keen to enrol as many as possible for the Royalist cause. Most of the miners eventually sided with the Parliamentarians.

King Charles had doubled the duties taken by the Exchequer on the export of smelted lead to forty-eight shillings per foder or ton (2100-2300lbs). Lead prices were already beginning to fall and the miners realized that the increase of lead duties would have a knock on effect and would in effect reduce yet further the price they would get for their lead. This would also affect the other people whose jobs were dependent on the lead industry.

There were over 1.912 signatories to the petition of miners from Derbyshire to the Long Parliament asking for the duty to be reduced to twenty-eight shillings. The petition is significant since the signatories were not the gentry but the actual miners themselves. They included 30 legible signatories from Hope and Castleton and 163 who made their mark beside their name, presumably illiterate. The document included the number of all their dependents, which amounted to 276. Some areas of the list are damaged. Unnamed but listed were the numbers of cavers (85) Ancillary workers for the whole of the Derbyshire ore field were also listed as 7,620. The document reckons
that 424 people in the two liberties of Hope and Castleton were immediately dependent on lead mining for their livelihood. Only two families had a servant, which indicates the poor status of most of the miners (Anon. 1641-2).

The petition begins-
*The humble petition of twenty thousand myners whose names are hereunto annexed inhabitants of Derbishire on behalf of themselves and divers others*

*Humbly sheweth that the myners of Derbishire have for many ages past gotten by their own labour and indus(torn) great quantities of lead oare which milled into leade and part thereof transported beyond the seas hath (torn) profit and comoditye to the whole comonaltye besides the continuall mayntinance and daily employment of many thousands in and about those mines that the duties paid out of the mines were only lott and cope and tythe the lott being the thirteenth dish or measure and the coope being in some manor sixpence and in some foure pence for every load of oare mine dish or making a----- and both theise are payd to the Kinge or lord of the manor. The tythe is paid to the Churche and when the myners have paid the foresaid duties all the rest of the lead oare is theire owne bot by lawe and tht custome of the mynes.they are discharged of all other payments for the same…*

Here they explain that 20 shillings more had been added to the 28 shillings imposed by Queen Elizabeth on a fodder or tonne of lead, bringing it to 48 shillings. They argued that in Queen Elizabeth’s reign lead was £17 a fodder, whereas it was currently only £10 a fodder.

*Your petitioners most humbly pray that they have some reliife as by the taking of theis late illegall ymposicions or otherwyse they must bee forced to give over the mynes to the utter undoing of them and their wyves and children and to the great losse and prejudice of the Commonwealthe (Anon. 1641-2).*

The petition was successful and in July 1641 the tithe duty was reduced by a Commons committee. The number of the petitioners is an indication of how important lead mining was to the local economy and that the miners could see themselves as a political force, independent of the gentry, yet able to organize themselves into an effective opposition.

*Disputes over the paying of Tithes*

The lead tithe had always been a costly duty for the miner and was very much resented. The Medieval church, especially the monasteries and abbeys, had long held the right to demand tithes of 1/10th of all agricultural production. Somehow lead came into this category. Perhaps it was seen as a product of the land. Apparently some even believed the lead grew in the veins. The Tithe was a very heavy tax for the poor but such was the power of the church that no one dared to refuse to pay it. After the dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII the right to collect tithes was sold by the Crown to various nobles and members of the gentry along with church land and property.

The story of the lead tithes payable to Lenton Priory illustrate how the gentry tried to use the tithes to buttress their finances and how the Bakewell, Hope and Tideswell miners doggedly resisted the tax. A list of tithes produced in the Court of Chancery
in 1619 by John Gell when he was seeking an injunction against the miners shows that the tithes for Bakewell, Hope and Tideswell were originally granted to Lenton priory in the 12th century by William Peveril and a third had been sold to Lichfield Cathedral in the fourteenth century, presumably after 1347 (Slack 1996; Anon [n.d.]).

In 1347 we learn that by letters patent the King lately granted licence for the Prior and Convent of Lenton to demise their manor of Dunston at farm and sell a portion of their tithe sheaves in the High Peak ……for a time ….praying that whereas they have a portion of a tithe of lead in the High Peak of some value but cannot sell this….they may have licence to sell or lease the same for sixteen years….to William of Amyas. The king has granted the licence prayed for (Great Britain 1914). Clearly these tithes were valuable,

This permission from the King to sell off or lease the tithes to William of Amyas, an eminent business man and successful lead merchant from Nottingham, shows just how valuable the tithes were and what a heavy tax it was for the miners to pay. Moreover William was clearly a rich man who could afford to finance a chantry for himself and yet he saw the tithes as a good financial investment. No wonder the miners resented this tax, since it had ceased to be a way of funding the true work of the church, its original purpose (Cameron 1971).

After the Priory was dissolved in 1539 a third of the lease of the tithes for lead ore in the parishes of Bakewell, Hope and Tideswell had been bought by John Gell’s grandfather in 1549 from the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield Cathedral and two thirds went to the Earls of Shrewsbury (later the Cavendishes) (Slack 1996).

The gentry continued to try to extract the lead tithes from the miners but the miners refused. In 1613 Sir Francis Leake of Sutton acquired two thirds of the lease from Shrewsbury and conspired with John Gell of Hopton ‘to raise the lead tithes upon the miners.’ Resistance was organized by the miners. Leake and Gell took court action in 1619, demanding the recovery of the documentation proving their right to the lease of the tithes, which the miners had stolen. They then sued in Chancery and Exchequer for the recovery of the tithe itself. The miners simply hid their ore or assaulted the men trying to recover the tithe.

After 1615 the miners met at Barmote meetings and collected money for fighting funds and to appoint legal advisers and attorneys. Legal proceedings continued between Gell and the miners until 1642 and the beginning of the Civil war but the vigour and organization with which the miners of Bakewell, Hope and Tideswell pursued their case against the payment of tithes and the expense for the lessees of litigation persuaded the lessees to desist from pressing their claims too strongly. The miners appear to have built up a considerable fighting fund.

‘They made or gathered a purse, or a great some (sum) or anie some or somes of money for the mainteyning of suites against the sd John Gell’” (Newton 1966; Slack 1996; Wood 1999; Anon [n.d.]); Anon [n.d.]).

The Hope, Bakewell and Tideswell miners also won a Pyrrhic victory on the matter of the tithe duty as Derbyshire began to collapse into civil war. On the 15th of August 1642 King Charles published an appeal to the miners in which he offered to exempt them from the duties of lot and cope if they joined the army at Nottingham. Twenty-
eight of the High Peak miners from Hope, Bakewell and Tideswell signed a petition agreeing to form a regiment if, instead of exempting them of the duty of lot and cope, he lifted the oppression of the lead tithes. Charles agreed. By early September about 400 miners had joined the King’s army. At last they had turned the tables on the much-hated Sir John Gell who had been ruthless in collecting the tithes and was the miners’ main opponent in their opposition to the tithes. It was a short-lived victory however since they lost the privilege at the Restoration when the Dukes of Devonshire gained the right to collect the tithes (Wood 1999).

**Challenges to Free mining 1606-1657**

At the same time as the miners were battling with the land owners and lessees about the rights of the tithe payment, disputes arose as to whether an area was within the Kings field or not. As with the tithes, various members of the nobility or gentry had acquired parcels of land, which they insisted, did not have the rights of free mining. If the mine was not within the Kings field then the right of free mining did not exist and moreover the owners could insist on buying the lead at a reduced rate from the established miners (pre-emption). This coincided with an appreciable rise in the price of lead and an increased demand for its use in buildings, which the gentry wanted to exploit. There were ongoing battles, even violent skirmishes, at times between the High Peak miners and the Manners of Haddon Hall over the right to freemining. The miners of Haddon were frequently supported by miners from the adjoining Kings field of the High Peak (Wood 1999).

The powerful gentry families such as the Manners of Haddon and the Cavendishes of Chatsworth and lesser nobility such as the Eyres and Foljambes were opposed to free mining on what they considered their land. The manors of Castleton and High Peak, which included the parish of Hope, had been administered by the Duchy of Lancaster since 1155, when Henry II removed them from the Peveril lordship. They were therefore in the Kings field and so the miners thought they had a right to free mining. However sections of these manors had later been leased to the Earls of Shrewsbury and the Manners family. On the death of Gilbert Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury in 1616 the land went to Bess of Hardwick’s offspring, the Cavendishes. Both the Manners and Cavendishes were initially opposed to free mining. The miners of the High Peak led by Ralph Oldfield of Litton and his son-in-law William Bagshaw of Hucklow began to lead the miners in their assertion of their free mining rights with legal actions from about 1606 to 1657. Both ended up in prison in 1634 but were released a year later. They were both relatively wealthy and were of the upper yeomanry class. Both favoured the protestant Parliamentarian cause.

As the price of lead ore rose from the beginning of the 1600s the lords tried to impose a pre-emption of ore sales within the Kings field of the High Peak at a rate lower than the market price. The Manners remained implacable against the free miners protests, The Cavendishes eventually were more amenable to the miners but the Eyres of Hassop, who had a reputation for corruption and were hated by rich and poor alike, sided with whichever family best suited their interests. It does seem that most of the miners within the Kings field of Hope and Castleton were eventually able to establish their rights, though conflicts and disputes continued between miners and those landowners who maintained they owned the mineral rights to their land, especially the Manners of Haddon Hall. In 1630 John Manners from Haddon took all ore sales on his manor of Hazelbadge, a private liberty, into his own hands and set the price at 9s
per load instead of the market price of 22s leading to renewed conflict (Wood 1999, p120).

It would appear that the Manners family provided the lessees or farmers for the Duchy of Lancaster of Hope and Castleton for 1442-3 and almost certainly for longer and, according to Blanchard, one of the many Robert Eyres and his successors farmed from 1475-1485 and then again from 1497-1504 followed by Arthur Eyre 1506-1527. We have no indication who had this right by the later 1600s but many of the mines by the 1700s were owned by the landed gentry, consortiums of people who were prepared to risk their money as shareholders or the lead merchants and smelters, the equivalent of modern day entrepreneurs. However if the mine was within the Kings field the owners still had to pay their dues, although how well the payments were policed depended on the efficiency of the Barmote officials who were initially appointed by the Duchy. From the early 1500s evasion of payment was becoming a problem (Blanchard 1971).

**The Mines of Hope and Castleton**

It is difficult to be too specific about the medieval Odin mine and those of Dirtlow Rake and Pindale, since the evidence of the old workings has inevitably been destroyed by later workings. It is also difficult to say which was being worked at any one time. Written evidence and records of the mines are almost non-existent since most of the miners would be illiterate and we do not even have the Barmote court records until the seventeenth century. Only those records in the Public Record Office give us any information and many were lost as a result of the destruction of the Duchy of Lancaster’s archive in 1381 during the Peasants Revolt. Subsequently during the following century Duchy officials seemed to rely on oral estimates. Most of what we can deduce is from archaeological evidence and from documents such as the Domesday report, which is clear evidence that lead was being mined in the area in the 11th century. It seems reasonable to suppose that the workings were either at Odin and, or Pindale or Dirtlow, each of which has evidence of Medieval workings (Barnatt 2002; Blanchard 2005, p1372; Heathcote 2001).

**Odin Mine**

Although it is likely the Odin (or Odin) mine was being worked in the twelfth century, if not before, the first evidence of its existence is approximately 1280.) We know from the laws and customs compiled between 1288 and 1525 that the basic geology of the lead veins was understood by the miners: the concept of a vertical or sloping vein containing a rib of ore (galena) bounded by walls of stone or other mineral. The Miners would have understood that the galena would be found associated with limestone, but it was not until the mid sixteenth century that the miners realised that the ore bearing limestone continued below a shale covering (Rieuwerts 2007).

The Odin vein or rake, which outcrops at the base of Mam Tor at the northern end of Treakcliff was rich in ore. Here there is a limited but spectacular surface appearance of the vein which has been much drawn, painted and photographed since the late eighteenth century. Initially the mining would have been open cut. The open works extend for four meers to Gank Mouth. From there the vein disappears beneath the shale of Mam Tor, which was only exploited from the early seventeenth century. By 1638 nine meers had been worked below the shale and already they had been troubled
by water. According to Rieuwerts’ research, in 1638 Deep Shaft Meer, the second meer southwest from Gank hole was the only part of Odin mine then at work presumably because of the drainage problem. Robert Dakin, a sixty-year-old Castleton miner, deposed in 1669 that “about thirty one years ago the meers of ground in Odin were troubled by abundance of water and want of wind” (ventilation) Richard Torre mined Odin Grove and came into conflict with the Eyre Partnership because he had not freed his meers correctly (Rieuwerts 2007.)

The drainage problem was typical of so many mines, once shafts were dug and levels driven beneath the water table and it led to a huge expenditure on the construction of soughs (drainage channels) in an attempt to drain them. However the money, that the Kniveton family is reputed to have made from Odin mine by 1670, is indicative of the amount of good quality ore that must have been mined.

The record of lead mined from 1042-1066 and 1236-1249 and then in 1295 testifies to the fact that the Castleton mines would have been active from a very early period and most probably even before the building of Peveril Castle.

Mines in Dirtlow Rake and Pindale
Unfortunately written evidence for the mines on Dirtlow Rake before the 1700s is scarce. The first known reference to Dirtlow Rake is in 1538. However, it seems that the extensive open cuts must have begun at a very early date.

The principal later mines on the northeastern end of the rake were Nether Dirtlow mine originally known as Ashton or Eyre’s Grove, Pindale (Ashton’s) Mine, Pindale End Mine, and Siggate Head Mine. The old name of ‘Ashton’ leads one to speculate that the Ashton family may have owned the mine. There are four miners named Ashton from Hope who were signatories to the 1641/2 petition, The Eyres of Aston, Hope and subsequently of Padley Hall and Hassop Hall were also heavily involved in lead mining even before the 1500s. There were Eyres living in Hope who likewise signed the petition in 1641 (Anon. 1641-2; Bates 2007).

The Pindale mines
Chris Heathcote has researched the Pindale mines and particularly draws attention to three mines, Pindale Side Vein, Kytle End Vein and Fire Scrin. Chris is a well-respected local mine historian. His findings help to confirm that these mines were active in the medieval period.

Pindale Side Vein or Lawyer Vein “The surface features at Pindale Side Vein together with Kytle End Vein and Fire Scrin have recently been given Scheduled Ancient Monument status which highlights the importance of the area. The open cast stopes (vertical fissures) on Pindale Side vein contain sweeping pick marks almost covering the walls. These may date from medieval times” (Heathcote 2001).

Fire Scrin “It is possible to enter with care the opencut at its open end – at this point large baulks of timber have been placed across the width of the vein walls--- Closer inspection reveals that originally, possibly in the 17th or 18th century, large timbers spanned the whole height of the opencut.-- The walls of the opencut are completely covered by pickwork seen in nearby Pindale Side Vein” (Heathcote 2001). This again seems to indicate early working.
Unfortunately the earliest records that can be located for the mines only date from 1727 onwards. The impressive handpicked stopes of Pindale Side Vein and Fire Scrin probably pre-date these records, possibly dating from pre-1600. Both veins were worked from 1727-1894 but only produced approximately 2400 loads of ore suggesting the earlier miners had taken the rich ribs of ore from the workings.

It is also worth noting that the entire side of Pindale below the Pindale Side Vein and Fire Scrin is covered in large hillocks of waste material testifying to the considerable amount of mining that has been undertaken in this vicinity.

![Fig 17 Mining waste at Pindale; Photo by Robin Blake during Landscape Survey](image)

Although Barnatt has found no firm evidence of Dirtlow Rake being mined before 1538 he thinks that the whole of the rake northeast from ‘Dirtlo Rake Hed’ had been worked by 1538 and agrees with Heathcote and Rieuwerts that it is to the north east in the sides of Pindale where the workings are likely to have been medieval or even Roman (Barnatt pers comm).

**Hazlebadge Mines and the Bradwell Liberty**

Much of the early evidence of the mines in the Bradwell Liberty has been obscured by later workings, especially those of Smalldale whose veins ran parallel with Pindale. However the the mines of Hazlebadge Liberty reveal some evidence for the medieval period and could well have been worked by men from Hope or Castleton.

The Hazlebadge mines were in a private liberty owned by the Vernons since 1421 and, after the marriage of Dorothy Vernon to John Manners, by the Manners family of Haddon hall and eventually the Duke of Rutland. As early as 1292 the annual value of the lot ore was 10s suggesting a yearly output of 100 loads (Evans 1912).

Little is known about the working of the mines themselves prior to 1600 but in 1630 “twenty eight articles regulating the working of the mines in the Liberty were written down at a Barmote Court held at Hazlebadge.” This may have been a result of trouble in 1629-30 when a group of miners took possession of “fower score several meers” in various mines which the miners claimed had been abandoned. They argued that they had the right to take possession by the laws of the Barmote Court provided they fulfilled certain conditions. The case was heard at the Barmote Court at Hazlebadge but Hazlebadge was a private liberty and the Vernons/ Manners could dictate their own terms. The case led to seven named miners and others armed with many weapons.
and dogs meeting in a rebellious manner at the said mines. At this time there was great resentment against the gentry especially the Manners and Gells, both owning considerable estates in the mining areas and both were challenging the rights of the free miners in order to exploit the riches of the mines. In 1630 John Manners from Haddon took all ore sales on his manor of Hazelbadge into his own hands and set the price at 9s per load instead of the market price of 22s leading to renewed conflict (Rieuwerts personal archive, now deposited at Derbyshire Record Office).

The Hazelbadge Liberty was extensive and included the Bocking titles. It is quite probable that some Hope or Castleton Miners worked there (Rieuwerts 2007, p64; Wood 1999, p120).

**Mining Language**

The geographical position of Castleton set at the far west end of the Hope Valley must have meant that the miners were relatively isolated so it is not surprising that they have developed their own terminology for special mining technicalities. Rieuwerts has listed some of the words peculiar to Odin mine found in a handwritten appendix to Mander’s Miners’ Glossary; Crooked Knerl used for a wide place in a vein, Jerranite applied to shale etc. From old plans Rieuwerts has found other terms whose meaning one can only guess, such as Gin Swafe, Slatter Bullock, the Brass Castle (Rieuwerts 2007).

Wood points out that even though most miners of the period before the Civil War would have been illiterate, their culture and the technical nature of their work gave an importance and authority to the spoken word. Terminology was necessary ‘for tools, types of deposit, mining operations, legal processes and the huge variety of lead ores.’ It is thought that many of the terms were of Saxon origin. Their trade dialect had to be exact and functional and Manlove writing in 1653 says ”The miners’ Terms are like to heathen Greek, Both strange and uncouth” (Wood 1999).

**Discussion**

The Domesday Survey and the granting of lead tithes to Lenton Priory by William Peveril in the 12th century indicate that some of the mines in Hope and Castleton were active at least by the eleventh and twelfth century and continued to be so through to the seventeenth century and onwards. Lead was a valuable commodity, which the Crown and the gentry were anxious to control and exploit. High Peak miners contributed lead for some of the most prestigious buildings of the Middle Ages, not just in England, but in Europe too.

The miners of Castleton and Hope always struggled hard to make a living from the Norman period onwards while most of the profit from the mines went to the landed gentry, as the lessees or ‘farmers’ of the lead, and to the merchants who could control the prices. The miner was primarily a farmer of the land and much of his livelihood came from farming.

By the seventeenth century the feudal system had broken down and we see from some of the wills and inventories that some of the inhabitants owned their own land. The demand for lead was high so there should have been more scope to earn money from the lead industry. However the number of hirelings and cavers listed in the 1641
petition shows that there was still real poverty and most of the profit went to the shareholders, merchants or smelters.

The miners’ opposition in early seventeenth century to the various monetary duties, especially the tithes, which the powerful gentry tried to exact, indicates that by then the miners had learnt to organise themselves into a political force, raise funds for litigation and so develop their own identity as miners of the High Peak. Instead of resorting to violence, as the miners had against the Vernons/Manners at Haddon and Hazlebadge, they sought to exhaust their opponents by drawn out legal action and forming alliances. However there was a much greater need for investment, mines were amalgamated and the free miner inevitably became subject to the shareholders.

Wood believes that in the early seventeenth century the miners of the parish of Hope (which included Castleton) were among the “poorer sort. The social structures of the parish were built upon deep poverty, heavy wage dependency and extreme landlessness.” (Wood 1999). The inhabitants of the other two parishes of the High Peak, Tideswell and Bakewell, were not as poor. The comparative poverty may always have been true. Even the churches of the three parishes reflect their relative wealth in the 1400s and it seems no coincidence that Tideswell had at least three benefactors at that time who derived much of their wealth from lead, smelting, ‘farming’ it or as merchants: Sir John and Edward Foljambe, Sir Sampson Meverill and Thurstan del Boure. How much, if any, of this wealth disseminated down to the free miners is not clear, but the miners would have had a ready market for their lead ore.

By contrast, once the castle was abandoned, the wealthier medieval families of Castleton and Hope, who exploited the miners’ work either migrated from the villages, as the Eyres and the Balguys did or, like the Vernons, never lived there. These families all, nevertheless, continued to prosper from the work of the miners in the seventeenth century. Wage dependency became more evident as the mines became owned by the wealthier families and their shareholders. This happened in Castleton. The statistics of the Hearth Tax of 1661 show it as one of the poorest villages in the county. Most of any wealth generated in Hope itself is thought to have come from wool (Cox 1907; Wood 1999, p89-93; Kerry 1901).

Many of the grand houses of the seventeenth century are adorned by lead from the High Peak among them Eyam Hall. Its exterior is graced by decorated hoppers and downpipes whose lead is most likely to have come from Odin Mine.

Very few of the actual miners of Castleton and Hope emerge from the shadows: Robert Dakin a mine owner gave evidence in 1669 when 60 years old about the problems that Odin mine had with flooding in 1639 and was also a signature to the Miners Petition of 1641 albeit with a cross (his mark) since he could not write; Unfortunately the picture of the actual miners is eclipsed by the wealth of evidence there is for the exploitation of the mines by the gentry, nobility and the Crown.

The success of the miners’ petition however proved to be but a ‘false dawn.’ After the Restoration (1660) the gentry continued to try to line their coffers from wealth earned by the miners. Richard Bagshaw of Castleton, as a shareholder in several mines, was one of the many in the Bagshaw family to profit from lead. He was
able to live in style in Goosehill Hall, Castleton, from the proceeds of Odin and other mines in the early 1700s and to become High Sheriff of Derbyshire in 1721 (Anon. 1721; Newton 1966).
11. Castleton and Hope; Names and a Notable Family

Di Curtis and Angela Darlington

*Castleton and Hope Surnames* | *Angela Darlington*
---|---
When researching land transactions, wills, taxation records and other documents over the medieval period relating to the parishes of Castleton and Hope, certain names crop up regularly, and some of these persist in the area today.

According to Professor David Hey each county has its own distinctive surnames that originated there in the Middle Ages (Hey 2003). Names were starting to become hereditary in the late 14th century, and their origins were variously derived from occupations, place-names, offices, pet-names, as well as derivatives of e.g. Scandinavian names. The 1381 poll tax (Fenwick 1998) is an excellent source of examples. Derivations from place-names are evident in e.g. “de Abbonay” (of Abney), “de Needham” (probably of Needham near Buxton (Needham 2002)) and “de Touneshend” or “of the Townend” as for William in a 1463 quitclaim from Hope Parish (Hall 1946). The numerous surnames that derive from occupations include Glover, Skynner and Webster. The unusual “Symkynman” in the 1381 poll tax for Castleton area may have been a pet name meaning “Little Simon” (Reaney & Wilson 2005).

Drawing on information from these key references, a few of the notable local names that turned up regularly in medieval documents are expanded on here. In his paper cited above, David Hey described how by mapping the distribution of surnames and combining the data with genealogical evidence it may be possible to pinpoint where surnames originally arose. He used an interactive CD-ROM of the 1881 census as a source of relatively recent data of surname distribution (*The British 19th Century Surname Atlas ver 1.10*, Archer Software 2003), and this piece of software has been used below to generate national distributions of the selected Hope Valley names in 1881.
1. Eyre

Figure 18. Incidence per head of population of the name “Eyre” in the 1881 census

The surname “Eyre” is well known as a local name in Castleton and Hope today, and it dates back to the 13th century. The name probably meant literally “the heir” (Reaney & Wilson 2005). William Eyre held an hereditary serjeanty of Hopedale in the Forest of the Peak in 1284 (Turbutt 1999) and in 1299, he was mentioned as the deceased tenant in chief in the context of an “escheat” (Great Britain 1911a, p424). Tenure of lands directly from the king as tenant in chief was a great honour, (Wikipedia 2013e). If the holder died without an heir or committed a felony, the lands reverted to the crown by way of the common law doctrine of escheat. However in William’s case, he did in fact have a son, Robert, to whom the lands reverted in the following year (Great Britain 1911a, p428).

A few years later in 1305 Robert le Heyr was a witness in a land charter involving land named Trayokes of Castleton (Hall 1946, p1) and in 1306 he was witness to a grant for land "sub Okelis" (probably meaning “under the Eccles”) in Hope (Jeayes 1906, #1430, p176). In the 1381 poll tax three “le Eyres” were recorded, Nicholaus, Johannes and Robertus, all taxed 2s 6d which was close to the highest tax band recorded. The numerous records of Eyres in land transfers indicate the high status held by the family in medieval times. In the 1881 census, Derbyshire had 168 Eyres per 100,000 head of population, by far the highest county density in Great Britain (Figure 1).

2. Savage

No Savages were listed in the 1381 poll tax for the Castleton area and the earliest record of this family that our documents have shown for Castleton/Hope area is of George Savage, chaplain (also named as “prest” or priest) in a rental roll, sometime
between 1412 and 1431 (Yeatman 1946, p331). Whilst there were a number of named wardens or masters, George Savage is unusual in being a named chaplain of Castleton’s Hospital of Blessed Mary of the Peak, or “Hospital de Spetill” as referred to in the rent roll transcript. Oddly, over a century later, another George Savage was one of the last wardens of the hospital (1532-1542) and in 1548 Thomas Savage was named “of the Spytell” in the Augmentations. The Savages built New Hall in Castleton and were an important family in the area until the Civil War. In the 1881 census the Savages were widely distributed across the counties of Great Britain with highest densities in the Lake District and Nottinghamshire.

3. Woodroffe
The local modern surname is Woodroffe (as in the Woodroffe Arms in Hope) but there are several variations on the spelling in early documents such as Woodrove, Woodrofe, Woderoue etc. According to Reaney and Wilson (2005) the name derives from the sweetly scented herb woodruff that was carried by women with their prayer books to church, and may have been an “ironical” nickname for someone that used perfumes. Our earliest record of the surname is from 1284-5, concerning Roger Woodroer of Hope (Yeatman 1886). Three “Woderoues” – Gervaisus, Johannes and Johanna – appeared in the 1381 poll tax for Castleton area, almost certainly including Hope, and a Gervase Woderove appeared as a witness in documents from 1359, 1361 and 1376 concerning transactions of land around the Eccles in Hope (Jeyes 1906, #1435, p177). The name persists in the area today but in the 1881 census had a fairly wide distribution with a higher concentration in other counties notably Wiltshire.

Figure 19. Incidence per head of population of the name “Woodroffe” in the 1881 census
4. Trickett
An interesting surname, as although it isn’t one of the commonest in historical documents, Castleton has Trickett Gate on Hollowford Road that leads to Edale at the northern side of village. The earliest record of this name found so far is in 1381, a poll tax entry (20d) for Willelmus Triket. A William Trickett of Hope was mentioned in the rent roll of 1412-1431 (Yeatman 1946) “for the House of the Blessed Mary at Castleton”. The name derives from Norman-Picard names Trichet or Trichot which themselves probably originate from the Norman-Picard word *Tricard* meaning “cheat” or “deceiver” (Cameron 1959). As the map shows, the name was common in the West Midlands including Derbyshire in the 1881 census.

![Trickett per 100,000 population map](image)

Figure 20. Incidence per head of population of the name “Trickett” in the 1881 census

5. Balguy
The Balguys were one of the hereditary forester families of Hopedale and the family were living at Aston in the 12th century. In 1285 Robert Balguy held (in sergeant) four bovates of land in Hope, and had to provide for a man to perform labour services at Peak Castle (Turbutt 1999, p575). This surname (variously Balgy, Balgi, Balge, etc.) also occurred in a number of early 14th century land transactions, when Robert Balgy of Castleton and his sons Robert and John were named as recipients of land for instance in Spitilfeld, Trayokes and Hopegate. Three Balgys, Thomas, William and Richard, were named in the 1381 poll tax (taxed 2s, 2s 6d and 6d respectively, therefore of mixed fortunes). In 1439, William le Eyr, Robert Balgy and Roger Woderove “whose ancestors were [made] foresters of old time by William Peverel” were all foresters in fee in the bailiwick of Hopedale (Great Britain 1907c, p354).
In the 1881 census there were only 10 Balguys in Great Britain (3 of these in Derbyshire), suggesting that the family had not flourished despite their apparent success in medieval times.

The Woodroffe Family of Hope  
Di Curtis

The History of the Woodroffe family of Hope is excellent example of the history of the common people searched for in this project. The Woodroffes are first mentioned in the 12thC, when a Woodroffe was appointed Forester of Fee, an early example of local government officer. Later Woodroffes of the 17th and 18thC, held the hereditary role of Parish Clerk. Many generations of the family thus held successful local office in Hopedale without ever accumulating sufficient land or wealth to become landed gentry. Whilst the main branch of the Woodroffe family died out in the 17thC, a descendant of the Hope Woodroffes, in the maternal line, still lives in Hope village.

The name Woodroffe, is that which is used in the village as the current name of the Inn, but the spelling appears in many forms in earlier documents. The meaning of the name may be from the Old English Wudu meaning wood and derived from the occupation of Forester as Wood Reeve or Wood Stewart (Smith Porter 1923).

Photo 21. Medieval grave slabs in Hope Church; the carving represents, swords, arrows and hunting horns suggesting the dead were Foresters in Peak Forest. 
Photo Ann Price

The name of Roger Woodrove first appeared during the reign of Edward I in 1284–5 when he was one of eight named foresters in fee in Hopedale, who held two bovates of land in Hope worth 6s a year. But the position held by this family dates right back to the days of William Peveril and is confirmed again in 1439 (Great Britain 1910a, p416; Great Britain 1907c, p354).
this document is the inspeximus of 1439 to the earlier document of 1284). The early history of this family is told in documents relating to the inheritance of this land held as a payment for services rendered to the King and in the Forest Courts held locally to hear offences relating to the Kings management of the Royal Forest of the Peak. Despite his position of Forester, Roger Woodereove was fined by the Forest Courts for keeping six horses in the forest and for offences of Vert and abusing his rights of pasturage (Yeatsman 1886).

By 1306 Robert Wodereue is named as a witness in a land transaction (Jeayes 1906, #1430, p176). Interestingly the Wooderoofes are not named as foresters in the Court Rolls of Edward II (Yeatsman 1886).

In January 1353, Thomas Woderoue of Hope, son of Nicholas, inherited a messuage and a bovate of land in Hope and the post of Forester in Fee in Hopedale in the forestry of the High Peak. It cost him 6s 8d, which he paid to the King, to be admitted to his inheritance (Great Britain 1907a, p382).
Thomas Woderoue died in about 1370, when it appears that he had increased the land he held to three bovates of land for his forestership and a bovate of land for service at the castle. His son and heir was only 7 years old and not entitled to inherit. John Woderoue was made a ward of the King who took back the land directly under his control (Great Britain 1938, p412). This matter was not resolved until 1387 when King Richard II ordered the escheator of Derbyshire, not to take the matter any further since it was resolved that John Wooderoue had (as had been rumoured in 1377) entered a monastery and the next rightful heir was William Woodereoue, Parson of the church of Spofford and brother of the deceased Thomas (Great Britain 1974, p178-179).

Meanwhile a Gervase Woderowe, who may be another branch of the family, is named as a witness in a number of land charters between 1359 to1376 (Jeayes 1906, #1433, 1434, 1435, p176-177).

In the Forest Court proceedings of Richard II (1377-1399), both Robert and William Woodereowe are named as Forresters (Yeatsman 1886).
Robert Woderoves appears as a witness to a land charter in 1394 (Jeayes 1906, #1437, p177); whilst in 1402, William Woderowe of Hope is arrested for threatening some of the king's tenants of Tadyngton, but we are not told why (Great Britain 1905c, p131). The consequence of the arrest did not affect his standing in the community as he appears as a witness in a land charter of 1409 (Jeayes 1906, #1440, p177).
However in 1411 both William and Robert Woderoue of Hope are in trouble again for failing to surrender an underage heir to the Queen. It appears that the child is the offspring of Emma and Nicholas Ketoun and the widowed Emma has remarried one of the Woodroffes (Great Britain 1932a, p143).This incident is important because it emphasizes the importance to the Crown of keeping control of inheritance at a time when childhood survival was limited and it is only one of several such matters which are reported for other families in the Court Records of this period.
William Woodrowe of Hope died in 1427 when a new coroner was elected to replace him (Great Britain 1932b, p309). This William Woodroffe must have been an old man at his death if this is the same William, brother of Thomas, first mentioned in the inheritance of 1353.

In the years between 1434 and the end of the century a Thomas Woderoffe and a Robert Woderoff of Windmill (near Hope) are named (Great Britain 1907b, p410-413). Thomas Wodroffe appears in the Forest Court proceedings when he paid rent for an intake, attended the court and was fined 4d when he made an affray in court (Yeatman 1886).

In 1495 a Land Grant of a parcel of land called Le Redsettes, in Castleton, is recorded by Edmund Wodrofe, to Nicholas Eyre (Jeayes 1906, #561, p73). This is the first of several concerning this parcel of land in Castleton and is referred to elsewhere.

During the Tudor period the Woodroffes were men of property and must have been of some importance in the High Peak as they were listed in the Herald’s visitation of 1569 and as landowners in the 1570 list for the High Peak. Their coat of arms, described as “a chevron between three crosses with the crest (a woodpecker russet) above” is painted on the North wall of the chancel of Hope church together with their motto “Quod transtuli, retuli” (Cox 1877).

The Subsidy rolls for the period list land value and tax paid as :-
1535 Nicholii Woodroffe qui het bona ad vall xxli, tax xs
1546 Georgio Woodrofe pr bonis xxxLI tax ls
1571 Nichus Woodruffe in terr lxs tax iiijs
1599 Edmund Woodrofe senior gent in land iiijl tax xiis (Kirk 1919).

However the 16th C wasn’t entirely without problems for the Woodroffes.

In 1559 there is an example of how difficult it was for the average man to pay the fines imposed by the courts when another Edmund Woodruff together with one Nicholas Ashton, shoemaker, were made outlaws for non-payment of a debt of £20. They were pardoned after surrendering themselves to the Fleet Prison (Great Britain 1986, p140).

Disasters also occur in the Woodroffe family, when in 1561, William Woodroffe was assaulted and died of his injuries, no details are given. Both his attackers, described as Husbandmen, were subsequently (Great Britain 1986, p140).

In 1579, Nicholas Woodtrove had a licence to alienate land (described) in Hope to Edward Woodtrove and his heirs and Nicholas Howe at a cost of 8s 10½d (Great Britain 1986, p242). This appears to be the beginning of a series of transactions between 1582 and 1599, when the Woodroffe family had interests in the manor of Great Hucklow and when the suffix “gent” is attached to their names (Anon. 1599a, 1599b).

By 1606 this tenure in Great Hucklow had passed to Thomas Woodrowe of Hope (Anon. 1606) and was subsequently sold out of the Woodroffe family by Ellis Woodroffe in 1616. (Kirk 1919).
Ellis Woodrofe, barrister-at-law in London, but buried in Hope in 1634, was the last male heir of the main branch of the family; although one branch of the Woodroffe family gave rise to the Woodroffes listed as Parish Clerks in the 18th C (Smith Porter 1923).
12. Occupations in Castleton and Hope

Angela Darlington

Evidence from the 1381 Poll Tax
The 1381 poll tax for “Villa de Castulton” (Fenwick 1998) has 225 entries for “Castleton” although from the names these are likely to cover other villages in the area. Only 31 out of the 225 entries have occupations and 4 are not legible. Definitions of the occupations for the remaining 27 entries (Fenwick 2005; Callum 2012) break down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carpen’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cult’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferrour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>smith (esp one working with iron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>maker or seller of gloves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dyer (or could be woodworker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheperd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s’eius</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serviens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>shearmen (of woollen cloth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skynn’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>skinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sout’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>shoe-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swynherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>swineherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22. Occupations as listed in the 1381 poll tax for “Villa de Castulton”.

Compared with Castleton, other villages in the High Peak Wapentake have a much higher percentage of occupations listed against names. The commonest is cult’ (farmer) followed by artifex (craftsman). For instance Villata de Baslow listed at least 20 cult’ and 17 artifex. Baslow also had 1 carnifex (butcher), 1 drapor (draper) and 4 chapmon or chapman (merchants); Baslow’s occupations suggest a growing community and thriving commerce. There are a number of other occupations mentioned in villages of the High Peak Wapentake however none of them are listed often. The only flecher (maker or seller of arrows) listed in the wapentake was from Eyam.

At around the time of the 1381 poll tax, surnames were starting to become hereditary (Hey 2003), however, returning to the entries for Castleton, some of the surnames reflect occupation; the ferrour is Robertus Smyth, the glover is Willelmus Skynner, and the heust is Willelmus Walker (surname derived from the work of the fuller who “walked” on his cloth).
Although the occupations are not given, there are other surnames that may indicate occupations in the Castleton entry for the 1381 poll tax. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>1st NAME</th>
<th>INFERRED OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le Pedder</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>pedlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagger</td>
<td>Ricardus</td>
<td>one who makes bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Margareta</td>
<td>fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Henricus</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le Herdeman</td>
<td>Willelmus</td>
<td>one who tends sheep, cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerke</td>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>cleric,clergyman, particularly common for one who had taken only minor orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herdeman</td>
<td>Willelmus</td>
<td>one who tends sheep, cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedder</td>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>pedlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Ricardus</td>
<td>merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Willelmus</td>
<td>fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>Robertus</td>
<td>smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>Henricus</td>
<td>glover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wryght</td>
<td>Robertus</td>
<td>carpenter or joiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le Warde</td>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>guard, watchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skynner</td>
<td>Willelmus</td>
<td>skinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Willelmus</td>
<td>guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Thomas filius Roberti</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Willelmus</td>
<td>Fisherman (however his occupation is given as sissor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le Milner</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le Ward</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>guard, watchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheperd</td>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Ricardus</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taleour</td>
<td>Robertus</td>
<td>tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thacher</td>
<td>Robertus</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23. Occupations inferred from the 1381 poll tax for “Villa de Castulton”.

Taken together with the first table of given occupations this creates a picture of a society significantly reliant on wool and cloth-making or production of skin goods. However the highest tax-payer out of all 225 Castleton tax-payers is Robertus de Needham who is the only “cult” or cultivator/farmer, at 40d.

The distribution of taxation levels in the 1381 poll tax is given below.
Evidence from Court Rolls

A series of Court Roll transcripts (Yeatman 1886) provide an insight into additional occupations, in particular for those brewing ale, baking bread and butchering. Some background to the information in the Court Rolls is given in Judith Bennett’s Ale, Beer and Brewsters in England (1996):

“In most communities, local officers (often called aletasters or aleconners) supervised commercial brewing and presented brewers at court sessions…. The Assisa (Assize) regulated the prices set for ale, which were to vary according to both the cost of grain and the place of sale. Brewers were to be amerced for their first three offences and punished physically thereafter. These limited statutory provisions changed in actual practise, with officers supervising not only the price of ale but also its quality and measurement. Brewers were therefore liable for punishment if they committed any of three offences: selling ale in false or illegal measures, selling ale of poor quality, or selling ale at excessive prices. Brewers could also incur punishment for trying to escape supervision by, for example, failing to summon the aletasters or selling without proper publicity. Yet as the scope of enforcement widened, the scope of punishment narrowed. Local courts infrequently punished brewers on the cucking-stool or by other public humiliations, preferring instead to profit from amercements”.

Commercial brewers, bakers and butchers were all required to be presented to the court and a number of names associated with Hope and Castleton are to be found in Court Rolls, examples below.

In 1438 at Castleton Court, Robert Balgy, butcher, was fined 12d for selling corrupt meat. At another court session a few months later, it was reported by the Bailiff “that when he seized the carcases of Robt. Balgy..., the same Robt. without license carried away and sold the said flesh, therefore he is fined 40d”.

In 1442 Margareta Thomasson and Margarita Bradwall were mentioned as selling ale in Bradwall and Haselbache. In Hope and Aston a number of brewers were mentioned.

In 1463 at Castleton, Resius Fumes was mentioned as a “common baker” and Rich. Wethe as a brewer. Ten years later in 1473 the Court Rolls recorded that “Rees Fumes, Thurston Dunn, Roger Marshall, Rd. Withey (probably the Rich. Wethe from 1463), Jo. Stanryn, Hy. Dunn, Thos. Glover, Katherine Balgy, are brewers and bakers”. At the same court, were present “John Slack and Robt. Barker, as butchers against the Assize”; this term indicating that they were being tried for offences.

One brewer, an Agnes Page, appears 8 times as presented at the local Castleton court, between 1507 and 1531. She appears to be a Castleton brewer, along with (but not always) other brewers Catherine Sykes, Isabella Howe and Thurstan Newton.

In April 1509, the vill of Hope incurred a penalty of 40d for “not presenting the brewers and bakers from Pentecost”. This apparently refers to the timing of a previous court, presumably from the previous year.

Nich. Smith and Jo. Trykett of Hope both presented several times at the court as brewers, and John Balgy of Hope as butcher, between 1515 and 1531.
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13. Wills and Inventories

John Talbot

Introduction
The wills and inventories of people in Castleton and Hope are stored for the most part in the Cathedral archive of Lichfield, with a few in the National Archives. They start in 1547 and tell us nothing about medieval life, although they do give a good insight into the early modern period in the Hope Valley.

Figure 25. Inventory of Thomas Tym who left little tables on his death. Listed below the tables are a land iron (to support wood in a fire) and a rackentail an (iron bar for hanging a pot over a fire). Photo: Bill Bevan, courtesy of Lichfield Record Office.

These documents were written during the most revolutionary period of English history, and it is interesting to map the change, or lack of it, in the attitudes and social habits of this rural community. They span the period of the ardent Protestantism of Edward VI, the equally ardent Catholicism of Mary I, into the 44 years of relative peace during Elizabeth I’s reign. With the accession of the Stuarts, at first riven with plots during James I’s reign, then during the disastrous conflict between Charles I and Parliament leading to the Civil War from 1642 to 1651, it might be expected that these documents would reflect the turmoil. By and large, however, none of these events impacted upon the papers reviewed here.

The parish of Castleton was under the administration of the Archdeacon of Lichfield, and that of Hope under the Dean and Chapter, qualifying the latter as a Peculiar. A peculiar parish is exempt from the jurisdiction of the archdeaconry, sometimes as here or on occasions under the local Lord of the Manor or some other jurisdiction such as an Archbishop or a monastery. This appears to have made a difference to this study because, while the documents from Castleton are available from 1547, they start in Hope in 1620 apart from those proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury and
now in the National Archives. Why this should be is unclear. Further and also inexplicably, people from Hope often died intestate and letters of administration of their estates were issued, which were invariably much less informative than wills. There are no surviving inventories from Hope before 1620, and only a few wills, so that comparisons between the two villages must be approached cautiously.

The Documents

The papers available from the Lichfield archive fall into three groups: wills, inventories and letters of administration of estates. Those from the National Archives are copied wills from the Canterbury Prerogative Court, without any inventories. It appears that testators could choose to have their wills proved there, or they owned property in more than one parish. On the whole the Canterbury documents are from relatively wealthy estates. There 3 from Castleton from this period in the National Archives, and 5 from Hope, 4 of which date from before 1620, the earliest of the Hope documents in Lichfield.

There are very many additional documents listed under the two parishes but from people not living in Hope or Castleton themselves, such as Edale or the many hamlets in Hope Woodlands. All of these have been excluded from this review.

There are 74 wills, 12 from Hope and 62 from Castleton. As noted, for unknown reasons, many Hope residents died intestate and letter of administration of their estates had to be issued.

There are 87 inventories in all, 17 from Hope and 70 from Castleton.

There are 17 estates with letters of administration from Hope but only 2 from Castleton. If the deceased died intestate, a person, sometimes a relative, was appointed to administer the estate. These documents followed an absolutely standard format, often word for word the same, and written in a catch-all way so that the deceased’s name and that of the appointed administrator could be written into the gaps of a pre-written document. They were issued in Bakewell, often under the authority of John Rowlandson, vicar of Bakewell, and written by the clerk Reginald Pynder. Occasionally, a similar format was used to ensure the education and care of children of the dead person, usually when he or she died intestate but sometimes also if the will had not provided sufficiently for them.

Wills

Form of wills

The wills followed a generic pattern. They started with a religious invocation, occasionally in Latin: “In the name of God Amen.” Then followed information about the testator and the date of the will. The latter often included reference to the year of reign (the regnal year) and this was occasionally the only indication of the date. There was always a statement that although the testator was “sicke in bodye” he or she was of good “remembrance” or “memorie”. Then followed variably pious bequests of the owners’ soul to God and, in the period 1553 –1558 to the Virgin Mary, although usually not thereafter. An exception was Martin Hall (1608 Castleton) who dangerously invoked “the felicite & blisse of heaven in the comunion of Sayntes and Angels”. A desire for the testator’s body to be buried in either Hope or Castleton followed, with the exception of William Hall (1605 Castleton) who
wanted to be interred in Sheffield. After this, the wills diverged as they dealt with the meat of the estates but ended by naming executors and, often, supervisors to see fair play. Finally, witnesses were named and often made their marks or signed the document. In this regard, there was a slight increase in literacy through the 100 years. Many wills had seals.

Some wills listed debts but these are considered with the inventories.

John Bramall (Castleton 1640), Mary Furnies (1630 Hope) and Ellis Stalley (1570 Hope) had wills that were nuncupative, that is written by witnesses when the person was in extremis and unable to write, or have written, a will.

**Status and occupation**

In a minority, the will, and occasionally the inventory, labelled the testator as to his status in society. Women were invariably described as widows, if anything. There were 12 husbandmen, 10 yeomen and two gentlemen (John Eyre of Hope 1567, and Rowland Mortwood of Castleton 1637). These documents are from people with goods and chattels, not the very poorest in the villages.

The few with identified occupations were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bocking</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Webster (weaver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Eyre</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Goldsmith</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hall</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hallam</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hallom</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Needham</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Savage</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Slack</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26. Occupations of testators.

This demonstrates that wills were written by most sectors of society although they do not include the very poorest. Nevertheless, this paper uses them and their inventories to interpret the lives of ordinary people at this time.

**Content of wills**

Wills, in general, are less informative about the lives of ordinary people than inventories. However, some do give insights that lists of goods cannot. They also provide valuable numbers of names that can help towards understanding the population of the two villages and enable the construction of family histories that can occasionally be cross-linked between testators.
As expected, bequests were made principally to immediate family, particularly wives and children. In 17 wills there was no evidence of children but it is impossible to say why this may have been. Notably, although he left no will, Thomas Savage (1590), who was vicar of Castleton, did have a son John, as mentioned in Humphrey Furniss’s will (1613 Castleton). Equally it is difficult to judge if the male testators were married as, if they had lost their wives, no mention was made of it, unlike the women who were stated to be widows.

Particular care was taken to ensure that under-age children would be properly fed, clothed, housed and educated; for instance Henry Berlowe (1640 Hope) left £20 specifically for this purpose until his children ended their minority at the age of 14.

The wills sometimes gave a glimpse of family relationships. Generally, husbands conveyed their respect for their wives, but this is less clear when it came to their children. Even so, Thomas Bocking (1615 Castleton) initially willed most of his estate to his wife but changed his mind immediately and an alteration to the will is written sideways in the margin reducing the bequest to a third. John Mellor (1632 Castleton) had 6 daughters and one under-age son. He carefully bequeathed the bulk of his estate to his fifth daughter Dorothy until his son became of age, and made her his executor. It is possible that he had made financial provision for his other children before death, but the will hints at the relative merits of Dorothy over the others. Henry Bocking (1608 Hope) left £20 to his nephew Ralph Bocking (he had no recorded children) provided that he gave up gaming within 4 years. Mary Furnies (1630 Castleton) made clear in her nuncupative will that her daughter should not have her best “apron, cuiffe and kerchief”, which she bequeathed to her daughter-in-law. She also left only 6 pence to her son, as his child’s portion.

It was common for surprisingly small amounts to be left to a testator’s children, in satisfaction of their “childes porcion”. As Hey points out, this may well have been because money had been settled on them at the time of the child’s marriage (Hey 2004, p 216).

In the minority, testators nominated their wives or even daughters as executors (executrices), even if there was a son or a brother alive. However, in common with the universal practice, all the supervisors were men (Erikson 1993, p161).

Sometimes the testator’s parents were still alive. In Richard Bridbury’s will (1620 Castleton) he made them special provision for housing, and ensured the onus was on his other legatees to provide for them. John Eyre (1567 Hope) left most of his estate to his mother, as his children, brothers and sisters were too young.

Testators sometimes insisted that families stayed together as a provision in the will and went to elaborate lengths as to how the bequests were to be rearranged should families split up, or members marry, or simply not get on with each other. Usually these were wives and children but Nicholas Hadfield (1636 Hope) declared that his wife Margret and nephew John should live together and took around a quarter of his long will to work out what should happen if they did not. Thomas Marshall (1649 Castleton) required his wife, son and daughter-in-law to live together but, if they did not, his wife was to have possession of the house and the goods were to be divided three ways.
Six bequeathed to their or, sometimes, other people’s servants. The amounts were usually small, with the exception of Ottiwell Smith (1638 Hope), who mentions neither a wife nor children in his will, and left £30 to Marie Gibson his servant but a sheep each to unnamed “servantmen”. Rowland Mortwood (1637 Castleton) left forty shillings each to an unspecified number of servants. Henry Bocking (1608 Hope) left a suit of clothes to his apprentice.

Very few of these people had a declared profession with tools that were passed on to the next generation. An exception was the Hallam (Hallom) family who were blacksmiths in Castleton, and whose inventories listed their smithy tools, which were bequeathed in their wills. The schoolmaster at Castleton, Richard Slack (1581), bequeathed his books to people who were not teachers.

Perhaps because most were relatively small estates, little was bequeathed for good works. Reflecting the custom of the times, Edmund Goldsmyth (1547), vicar of Castleton, donated 4 shillings to “Saynt chad Howsse in Lichfield”. Henry Bocking (1608 Hope) gave 20 shillings to Hope Church and Ottiwell Smith (1638 Hope) 40 shillings for the repair of the Free School chambers in Hope.

Four testators bequeathed small amounts to the poor of their villages, although Roger Harrison (1614 Castleton) left £1.18.4 each to the poor of both Hope and Castleton. Rowland Mortwood (Castleton 1637), gentleman, left £5 each to Castleton and Bradfield for the poor and fifty shillings each to Eyam and Middleton (presumably Stony Middleton) for the same purpose.

Disappointingly, in neither the wills nor the inventories from the two villages is it possible to get an idea of the layout of people’s homes. The single exception is Roger Harrison (1614 Castleton) whose inventory described goods in a parlour, a buttery and the room over the parlour. Martin Hall (1609 Castleton) left a house to his brother John “conteyning ffyve bayes or there abouts” that must have had a suite of rooms, frustratingly nowhere described.

Rarely, wills anticipated or covered legal problems. The only explicit case was that of Elizabeth Saunderson (1636 Hope) who left £10, with provision for more if needed, “to defend a sayle now depending in the honorable Cort of Chancery”. Although there was no will, there were instructions to an attorney in the case of Nicholas Jessop (1650 Castleton) by his brother and others to retrieve money that was owed to the estate. William Worrall (1604 Castleton) left money for the discharge of a debt to Thurstan Nall, as part of his duty as his executor. William Hethcote (1603 Hope) seemed to predict “strife” between his executors and children, ensuring that the supervisors of his will would act as intermediaries, although this may have been merely a more explicit way than usual of defining the role of the supervisors.

Inventories
Form of inventories
An inventory was only required if the estate was worth more than £5, although, as in 6 cases here, smaller estates could be evaluated too (Erikson 1993, p33). The inventories also followed a pattern, naming and dating the document, and listing the
appraisers ("praysers"), at least two local men who were appointed as a requirement of the church court (Hey 2004, p219). There followed a tabulated and valued list of what was considered necessary to include. In the early years of these documents, the testators’ livestock was always listed, along with his “purse and apparel”, and usually “husslements of house” or “houshold stuffe”. Only later were the latter broken down into useful listings of chattels. Undoubtedly, as the renaissance attitude to personal possessions, and their owners’ view of their status in the world, evolved and filtered into rural communities, so did the desire to list those possessions. For certain in most cases, even if goods and chattels were not listed, they did exist.

It is recognised that inventories valued only part of a person’s property, excluding his house and land, if he owned them (Hey 2004, p221). Further, confusion arose if his wife’s goods that she brought to the marriage were not valued with his own.

Small items were routinely excluded from inventories as being of insignificant value, even though they are of interest now. These might include many small wooden goods, rushlight holders, and much earthenware (Erikson 1993, p34). Here it is clear that inventories did not necessarily list all the chattels. There is a notable disparity, for instance, between the number of horses and the scarcity of horse gear such as saddles.

Debts were an important part of inventories. Those owed to the estate were regarded as an asset, but, equally, those owed by the estate were sometimes also carefully listed, occasionally resulting in a negative balance, although this was never acknowledged. Debts were sometimes included in the will and occasionally in both the will and the inventory, often with differences between them; in the latter case, those in the inventory are always taken as being most accurate.

The date of the inventory is taken as representing the date of death. Whilst it was the practice for the will to be written shortly before death, in this study it has been shown that this was not always the case. However, the inventory had to be drawn up close to the date of death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No of deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1547-1560</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-1570</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-1580</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1590</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-1600</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1610</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1630</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-1640</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1650</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27. Year of inventory for Castleton per decade.
Given the small sample, it is dangerous to draw many conclusions from this table, but the death rate in this segment of society in Castleton at least doubled in the period 1601-1620. Further, the death rate was remarkably stable in all other decades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No of deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1547-1560</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-1570</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-1580</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1590</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-1600</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1610</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-1620</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1630</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-1640</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1650</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28. Year of inventory for both villages per decade.

On combining the data for both villages, the variance is not so marked and the small number in earlier years must be discounted as there are so few documents from Hope in this period.

Month of inventory

Taking the month of the inventory as a proxy for the date of death, some hint as to the cause of death can be construed:

Figure 29. Months when inventories were written, taken as a proxy for month of death.

There were markedly more deaths in the winter and spring, as would be expected. This might be partly because of the prevailing climatic conditions affecting households where keeping warm was hard. There was a well-known cooling period that coincided with this period of study, known as the Little Ice Age. The first Frost Fair on the River Thames in London was in 1604. Food resources were lowest in the
spring before any harvesting could occur (the hungry gap). Infectious illnesses would have been more prevalent at that time of year, and would have been exacerbated by the cold. Certain knowledge of influenza epidemics is hard to obtain but there is agreement that there was a pandemic in 1580 (Potter 2001), not reflected in the figures here. Several episodes of plague were known to have broken out during these hundred years, notably in 1604, but there is no clustering of dates that tallies with the known data and, in any case, plague was less common in the colder months.

Taking March as the month in which there were most deaths, review of the valuations of the testators’ personal possessions in that month shows a range of £1.10.0 to £50.5.2, with a median of £17.18.10 (an average would be meaningless as these data derive from 100 years, during which inflation makes direct comparisons suspect). The median for all the inventories was £24.3.11. Whilst the people who died in March do not include the wealthiest and do include the poorest, there are 4 in this group whose estates were valued at more than £40.0.0.

On balance, the likely explanation is a combination of cold and starvation.

Content of inventories
Whilst there are 87 inventories among the documents, many are uninformative about the various categories of livestock and chattels discussed below. 75 could be analysed for livestock, 72 for household goods and only 50 for external goods such as tools and agricultural equipment.

Overall wealth
The valuation of items in the inventories allows an estimate of people’s wealth to be made. Sometimes this was displayed as a “Summa totalis” but often has to be calculated.

No-one was rich. Direct comparisons through the 100 years of this review must be read with caution because of inflation. In this analysis, account has been taken of an estate’s debts, allowing an insight not only into the value of a testator’s personal possessions but also their debt burden, resulting in some cases in a negative balance sheet.

The smallest total valuation of a person’s possessions was £1.10.0 (Thomas Furnice 1607, Castleton) and the largest £320.8.4 (Jane Savage 1604, Castleton). However, after taking debts into account, the smallest was that of Robert Hallam (1641 Castleton) at minus £261.17.0 because his debts were at least £400.0.0 even though his personal possessions amounted to £138.3.0. The median (the midpoint of a distribution curve of valuations) before taking debts into account was £24.3.11.

Some of those whose wills were listed in Canterbury were plainly richer than those analysed here but they had no inventories. The yeoman Ottiwell Smith (1638 Hope), for example, left cash bequests amounting to £452.0.0 on top of “All my Messuages, Cottages, lands, tenements and hereditaments”, and without any mention of debt.

Subsistence farming
Subsistence farming is defined as agricultural production that is only enough for the farmer’s and his family’s subsistence. Overton estimates that around 80% of English
farmers in 1520 were subsistence farmers (Overton 1996, p22). In this survey, it is not possible to establish the proportion of testators that were in this position, but, given the relatively impoverished inventory valuations, there is no reason to suggest that in the two villages there was any difference between North Derbyshire and the rest of the country.

Small scale farmers were vulnerable to changes in the market. Those with a large acreage were able to weather variances; in bad years, the value of grain rose even if the amount fell, and it can be shown that this could result in an increased income for the larger farmer, as he could sell at a time when prices were advantageous. The small farmer, unable to store reserves, was forced to buy dear and sell cheap (Overton 1996, p20). It is not possible to assess the acreage available to those surveyed here but the period of this review was a time of great deprivation and many, perhaps the majority, would have suffered badly.

**Inflation**

Inflation has made it hard to make direct longitudinal comparisons between testators’ wealth. Further, inflation was not evenly distributed across all commodities, although the rise in agricultural prices was predominant at the time:

![Figure 30. Rates of inflation 1530 – 1650. Drawn from Outhwaite 1982, p12](image)

The prices in the graph are relative to a base of 100 in 1451. It shows the rise in the price of a basket of foodstuffs throughout the period of study but which was particularly aggressive in the 1540s and 1590s, with an overall approximate 2.5 fold increase between 1550 and 1650. The rise of around 4- to 5-fold in the valuations of sheep, cattle and swine in this study, let alone that of horses of 13.7-fold, however, is well above that of other commodities.

The explanations for inflation at this period are wide-ranging. However, there were severe crop failures in the 1590’s, together with a rise in population. The latter, in particular, has been closely correlated with inflation (Outhwaite 1982, p60).
Livestock
All classes of people owned livestock. The vicar Edmund Goldsmyth (1547 Castleton) owned 4 oxen, 13 cattle, 43 sheep and 5 horses and his successor Thomas Savage (1590 Castleton) had 12 cattle, 2 horses and 2 pigs. Richard Slack (1581), the Castleton schoolmaster, had 2 oxen and 14 sheep. The Hallams (Halloms), the Castleton blacksmiths, owned sufficient cattle, sheep and horses to require both agricultural skills and time.

Cattle
Cattle were named in a variety of ways, partly to signify their age – calves, stirkes (yearling), twinters (two winters) and heifers (before calving), and finally the generic kyne and cows, “kyne” being the early English plural of “cow”.

Usually listed separately were oxen and sometimes bullocks. Both of these were probably castrated males, the bullocks being younger than the oxen (Overton 1996, p12). Again there are some listings suggesting ages of oxen, such as ox stirkes and twinters, and, in one case, oxen bullocks. No bulls were mentioned in any of these documents.

Oxen
Oxen were draught animals, used for heavy work. They were probably castrated to make them more tractable, although it is possible that some described as oxen were the missing bulls. Draught horses are 50% faster than oxen for lighter tasks such as ploughing, enabling a greater acreage to be worked in a day, and required a third less labour force (Overton 1996 p126). In some areas they started to replace oxen in the mediaeval period but, during the time surveyed here, and in these remote areas, it appears that oxen were still used for the plough, perhaps as well as horses.

Nevertheless for this agrarian community, it is surprising that oxen were relatively rare animals. Only 16 of the 74 (21.6%) inventories listed them, 10 listed bullocks, and 22 had either or both. The individual holding varied between 2 and 7 animals; the latter was the exception in that every other holding was of an even number, possibly relevant to the way in which draught animals were used in pairs.

In support of the hypothesis that the ox was an “old-fashioned” draught animal is a striking bias towards inclusion in earlier inventories. Whilst inventories from the 16th century form 25.5% of the whole, 63.6% of inventories with oxen and/or bullocks were from the 16th century, over 40% more than if the distribution of oxen had been uniform over time. However, as noted elsewhere, the ownership of horses also dropped during the same period, and the value of oxen rose above other measures of inflation. An alternative is that there was a shift away from arable to stock grazing in the 17th century although there is no other evidence in these documents that supports this suggestion.

The unit value of oxen ranged from £1.0.6 in 1547 to £5.0.0 in 1614, with a gradual rise in between, except in special circumstances such as the listing of 4 “runt oxen” valued at £2.0.0 each in 1631 (George Grant, Hope) or the 4 oxen bullocks at £2.10.0 apiece in 1629 (Richard Needham, Castleton). This represents is a 4.9 fold inflation, slightly higher than for other cattle, suggesting that there was no lack in demand for these beasts.
Other cattle
66 (88%) of the inventories listed cattle of one sort or another, apart from oxen. As these animals were often listed in groups, for the purposes of this study they have been considered together, with the exception of oxen.

Individual holdings of cattle were small. Only 10 had more than 10 cattle, whereas 16 had only one or two. The range was 1-16. This implies that most beasts were kept for domestic purposes, including milk and cheese, although one fully productive milking cow was likely to have produced more milk than a household could use, leaving some for sale. Only 3 owned cattle but no other animals; these were all women with only one cow each: Alice Godderd (1632 Hope), Elizabeth Saunderson (1636 Hope) and Katherine Shemett (1577 Castleton).

The average holding of cattle in the first half of the study (1547-1600) was the same as in the second (1601-1650), that is 5.5 and 5.4 respectively. The number of cattle varied through the year, with a maximum in February, presumably as a result of calving.

These beasts were of relatively high worth and in almost all cases were carefully valued. The range was £0.11.3 in 1547 to £3.10.0 in 1610. The unit values rose steadily but not smoothly through the 100 years of study, as exemplified by the anomalously high amount quoted here in 1610, whereas the average for the last decade of investigation (1640-1650) was £2.10.11. Using the latter figure, this is a 4.5 fold rise in value.

Sheep
62 of the inventories listed sheep, at 83% a lower proportion than that of cattle owners. They were classified as lambs, hoggs (from six months old until the first shearing) or sheep and “sharre” (shorn) sheep, sometimes specifying if they were ewes, although rams were never mentioned. They are all considered together in this study.

There was wide variation in the number of sheep owned by the testators, from 2 (Thomas Creswell 1624, Castleton) to 200 (Robert Hall 1555, Castleton) whose net worths were £32.6.2 and £52.64 respectively, both in the middle range of wealth for this group. Seven had no other animals listed in their inventories.

Sheep ownership was not as evenly distributed through the 100 years of study as that of cattle. The average holding of sheep was greater in the years 1547-1600 at 60.5 compared to 45.2 during 1601-1650, a 25% drop. The reason for this is unclear as, although Elizabeth’s government had taken steps to increase the wool trade in the 16th century, there is no suggestion that the trade dropped off in the next 50 years.

The unit value of sheep rose smoothly from £0.1.8 in 1558 to £0.7.0 in 1650 (with the exception of Roger Harrison’s sheep in 1614 which were valued at £0.7.3). This is a 4.1 fold increase in value.

13 inventories recorded wool. As might be expected, the largest holdings were in the inventories of those with the most sheep: Francis Barber (1650 Castleton) had 115 sheep and 15 stone of wool, Robert Hall (1555 Castleton) had 200 sheep and 13 stone...
and Nicholas Townrowe (1558 Castleton) had 20 stone and 160 sheep. However, 3 wool owners had no sheep at the time of death.

**Horses**

62 inventories recorded horses, with no-one owning more than 6, and 20 people owning a single animal. There was little indication of function; horses were sometimes only qualified as caples, mares, colts or foals (never stallions).

The value of a horse rose from £0.7.4 in 1547 to £5.0.0 in 1650, a 13.7 fold increase, far higher than the inflation in value of sheep and cattle.

Whilst horses were not labelled according to function, some clue can be obtained from the saddlery found in the documents. As noted elsewhere, there were 11 pack saddles, 4 cart saddles, 3 hackney saddles and one side saddle. The hackney and side saddles were for riding and the others for work but there is no suggestion for their use at the plough.

It might be expected that, as the number of oxen fell, the number of horses would rise, as it might have been predicted that horses were superseding oxen as draught animals. However, this is not the case. The average number of horses owned (excluding those that owned no horses) was 2.3 in the first 50 years of study, and only 1.6 in the second. Further, it might have been predicted that the number of horses would fall in the time of war, as the animals were diverted away from the land. Again, this is not so here as the average holding of horses increased back to 2.3 in the last decade of study, 1641-1650, during the Civil War.

**Swine**

Swine were occasional items in inventories, numbering 20 in all, and only in small numbers (1-3). Their value inflated from £0.3.0 in 1561 irregularly to around £0.12.6, with some anomalously high values in between, notably in Roger Harrison’s (1614 Castleton) inventory which generally had higher valuations than elsewhere. This increase of 4.2 fold tallies with that of sheep and cattle.

It is surprising that there were so few pigs listed in that, apart from giving leather, their only purpose was as a source of relatively cheap high calorie meat, through their fat content. Perhaps their scarcity was because they are sensitive to cold and wet.

**Poultry**

Poultry of one kind or another were listed in 19 inventories. These were mostly chickens but 6 included geese. Once again these were in small numbers, never more than 10.

**Bees**

The only other listed animals were bees. Honey and wax were important but mostly luxury items in this segment of society. Six inventories included bees and hives. Two hives were valued at £0.6.8 in 1623, but a stock of bees and a swarm were worth £1.0.0 in 1640. No bees were listed before 1623, but this does not imply that no bees were kept before that.
Other assets

Corn and hay
These important items were listed in 43 inventories, usually together. The precise meaning of both terms is unclear but it is assumed that corn means threshed grain and hay has its present meaning of cut and dried grass, used as fodder. The valuations ranged between £0.2.0 and £26.6.8. Unfortunately it was very rare for quantities to be specified and so it is not possible to achieve an idea of value per unit amount. Occasionally unthreshed grain was measured in thraves or 12 sheaves. Three listed straw. There is no suggestion from the date range of inventories with corn and hay that there was a shift to or from a more arable farming practice.

Two inventories, those of John Mellor (1632 Castleton) and Thomas Marshall (1649 Castleton) valued their corn and/or hay at 3 days’ work for £3.0.0.

Grain, meal and malt
Meal, which is ground grain, malt, which is dried germinated grain, usually barley, and grain itself were included in 15 inventories, again often together and therefore difficult to value. The usual unit of measurement was the bushel, hoop or strike, equalling 8 gallons of dry goods, or 4 pecks. Sometimes these assets were valued together with thraves of cereals, such as Roger Harrison’s (1614 Castleton): 120 thrave oats, 30 thrave barley, 40 strike oats at £22.0.0. At the other end of the scale, Alice Godderd (1632 Hope) had meal and groats at 6 shillings and a peck of barley at one shilling. Groats were hulled and crushed oats.

Fuel
Nine inventories listed fuel, rarely by itself and often combined with peat and manure in the valuation. This confirms that peat was not the only fuel and presumably wood played an important role as well. Two listed coal.

Peat
For an area that traditionally used peat for fuel, it is surprising that only 4 had it listed in their inventories. However, there were a further 4 with peat spades and 2 with peat carts. As noted, only one sled was mentioned.

Manure
Manure was not valuable in monetary terms but 12 appraisers, all in the 17th century, saw fit to list it. The range of values was only 12 pence to 10 shillings, presumably dependent on quantity, which was never specified. It must be assumed that manure heaps would have consisted of both animal and human waste: night-soil “which buried in garden, in trenches alowe, shall make very many things better to grow” (Tusser 1557 p58). It is also possible that the term included other soil conditioners such as wood ash and lime.

Lead
Five left quantities of lead and the owners probably dealt in lead, or were directly concerned with mining, although none was identified as a miner. Thomas Bocking’s (1615 Castleton) estate was owed a fooder (also foother or 19½ cwt, just under a ton) priced at £22 as well as 2 debts of “dishes” of “owre”. All the others owned, owed or
were owed pieces, piggs and spiggets of lead. See Chapter 9, *Lead Mining 1066 – 1642* for more information on lead in wills and inventories.

**Household goods**

*Furniture*

The range of furniture can be classified into bedding, seating, tables and storage, together with a number of other items.

*Beds and bedding*

57 inventories listed some form of bed or bedding. Beds ranged from featherbeds at the top of the range to bedstocks, merely bed frames. In between were chaff beds whose mattresses were presumably made of waste material, or possibly straw. There was one flock bed, whose mattress was made of pieces of wool.

16 had featherbeds and, not surprisingly, these were owned by the wealthier people. Roger Harrison (1614 Castleton), whose net worth was £300.15.2, had four. Featherbeds were valued at £1.0.0 to £1.13.4 but were often listed with mattresses, bolsters and blankets, making a precise valuation difficult. They consisted of a feather mattress, probably quite thin, which was laid over a straw under-mattress, then a canvas sheet in turn laid over bed slats, webbing or even rushes.

Chaff beds were listed in 12 estates, but, of these, only 3 were listed as the only form of bed. In all the rest, other beds, sometimes only bedstocks, were also listed. These three consist of two relatively small estates valued at £10.0.4 and £4.6.0. The third, however, is one of the most interesting in the canon, that of Elizabeth Saunderson (1636 Hope) whose estate was valued at £149.16.7, but whose personal possessions were only worth £19.18.8, and who is discussed in more detail elsewhere. Chaff beds also were rarely listed separately but were of low value, varying between 8 pence (1614) to 2s 8d (1649).

An important item in many inventories was a detailed list of bedding, consisting of mattresses, pillows, pillow beres (pillow cases), coverlets, bedhillings (bed coverings), bolsters, sheets and blankets, although they were usually listed together and individual valuations are difficult to find. From the list of bedding items, the commonest were coverlets (42), blankets (41) and sheets (40). The first is surprising but may be explained by the coverlet being both an important item for keeping warm but also sometimes decorated, particularly in the wealthier households. The rarest items were bedhillings (6).

*Storage furniture*

Storage was clearly given priority, even among the poorer households. Arks were found in 54 estates. These were chests with lids that could be lifted off and came in different sizes. Their principal use was for storing grain or meal.

Chests and cofferes were also common, numbering 16 and 34 respectively, and 50 in total. The terms appear interchangeable as in no case did both occur. Less common were aumbries (3), cupboards (11) and presses (1), probably also signifying the same thing. They were mainly for storage of clothes, cloth and other textiles. Crockery
and valuables were stored, or sometimes shown off, on shelves (4) and dishboards (12).

**Tables and chairs**

Tables were surprisingly unusual, occurring in 12 cases, but boards, supported by trestles, were commoner (26). Tables themselves tended to be listed in the wealthier households, although this was far from consistent, and the earliest was from 1613. It should be noted that either tables, boards or both were listed in a minority of households (35 of 72), less than items used for storage.

The table was sometimes covered by a boardcloth (13) or even a table carpet (1), in the latter case in one of the most luxurious homes in this series, that of Roger Harrison (1614 Castleton).

Chairs were found in 32, stools in 27 and forms (benches) in 20 inventories, frequently occurring together. In all, half of the households listed some form of seating. In only 2 cases were tables or boards listed without forms.

Cushions are considered here as they were presumably often associated with seating. Found in 29 inventories, these were plainly high status items, and it can be imagined that they were often made of relatively luxurious materials or embroidered. They were carefully listed and counted in many cases, and sometimes valued separately. Interestingly, they were never enumerated if there was only one cushion; the range was 2–28, the latter in the household of John Hall (1604 Castleton) whose net worth was £199.19.7.

**Lighting**

Lighting is generally reckoned to have been poor at this period. In impoverished households, such as many of these, either there was no light or light from the fire was exploited. Rush lights were used, as well as tallow candles, but the light from both was weak and lasted poorly, and the latter smelly. Beeswax candles were expensive. Here, candlesticks were listed in only 7 inventories and cressets, oil filled cups suspended on poles to burn for lighting, often outside, in three. Candles themselves were listed in one inventory, that of Thomas Godderd (1649 Castleton), whose net worth was only £21.1.10 yet he possessed 3 dozen.

**Professional household items**

There were 5 households with spinning wheels; in one case there were two (Roger Harrison 1614, Castleton). There were 2 weaving looms, 3 cards, 3 heckles and one wool wheel. Heckles and cards were wire combs for separating textile fibres. The looms belonged to a weaver, Edmund Eyre (1616 Castleton), and a widow, Ellen Howe (1630 Castleton). There is no inventory for the webster (weaver) Henry Bocking (1608 Hope) but his will does not mention any tools of his trade. Similarly the shoemaker Richard Needham (1617 Castleton), who left only an inventory, had no cobbling tools in the list of his possessions.

Only two owned books: Thurstan Hall (1650 Castleton) who owned just one, and Richard Slack who was schoolmaster in Castleton, dying in 1581. His will identifies: a Commentary on Ovid, a “vulgare boke”, “assorted horrace”, books by Vergil, another Ovid, a book on or by Augustine and one probably by Cicero.
A few inventories detailed quantities of cloth or yarn (11), although it is not possible to say whether these holdings were in a professional capacity. Woollen cloth was listed in 7, russet cloth in 3, green in 2 and linen cloth in three.

Four inventories listed hide, skins or white leather (2) which was horse hide cured with lime making a tough and hard product. Neither of the owners of the latter, both yeomen, had anything in their documents to suggest a professional need for this material.

**Luxury items**
The table carpet belonging to Roger Harrison is noted above. Also in that inventory, there was a prominent amount of pewter and brass, a Venice glass, a mirror, an hourglass, 2 pictures, 2 bottles of Aquavit but rather little silver (3 spoons). However, in no other case was there more than a few silver spoons and, rarely mentioned in wills, although never in inventories, rings and precious stones.

**Kitchen ware and containers**
A total of 37 items can be identified in these inventories as containers, cooking equipment (excluding tools such as spoons, skimmers, ladles and mortars), and plate for food consumption. Of all the 72 inventories with any listing of chattels, only one, that of the schoolmaster Richard Slack (1581 Castleton), declared no items in this category. In some others, very little was mentioned, often brass or pewter items, perhaps as they were the only articles thought worthy of inclusion.

A great deal of care was taken to list a very large range of containers, ranging from kimmels (12), loomes (20), barrels (4) tubs (6) and vats (6) at the top end of the size range, through kitts (9) to piggins (7). Some, such as vats and churns (11), had a specific use for brewing and butter making respectively, as did dations (dashens) (7) used for the preparation of oatmeal.

Pots (22) and pans (20) were often of brass, carefully enumerated and presumably used mostly for cooking, as were frying pans (10), skellets (skillets) (11) which were pans on three short legs with handles, and chafing dishes (5) for keeping food warm.

There were dishes (21), often listed if they were made from pewter, doublers or chargers (1), saucers (4) and trenchers (2), which were made from wood.

The relatively few drinking vessels included cans (9), noggins (2) and porringer (2). Only one listed glass. Liquids were contained or carried in bottles (2), costrels (4), and in one case a flagon.

In 2 inventories, Ticknall ware was mentioned. This was a coarse earthenware pottery, often with slip decoration, made in and around Ticknall in Derbyshire, although wares indistinguishable from those made in the county were manufactured elsewhere.

**External goods**
These items can be roughly divided into those concerned with transport, cultivation, tools, implements and ironwork for fires, goods associated with horses and other
professional goods such as smithy tools. As noted above, 50 inventories are available to analyse but there is some overlap in this category between household and external goods.

In every case, the value of goods identifiable for use outside the home was only a small fraction of the value of the household goods, mostly between around a half to a sixtieth. Considering this was an agricultural community, surprisingly few tools were recorded, perhaps because they had little value, even though those that were listed were in remarkable variety.

**Transport**
There were 31 with carts, which had 2 wheels, and 6 wains, which had four. Some indicated that carts had differing functions: dung carts or peat carts for instance. Wheels (30) were frequently separately listed, often, but not always, in pairs. Surprisingly given the number of sledways in the area, only one sled was listed (Henry Glossop Castleton, 1596), suggesting that this was, by this date, an archaic mode of transport.

**Cultivation**
There were 18 harrows but only 5 ploughs. The latter were not owned by the wealthiest in the group, with net valuations in the range of £2.2.0 to £74.12.6. Curiously, of the 15 estates that had oxen, only 2 also had ploughs. These two had 4 oxen each, which was the average holding of those with oxen across all the inventories. It must be supposed that ploughs were shared out in the community. Seven yokes and 3 teams, the harnesses for oxen or horses, were listed.
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Figure 31. A harrow, plough, irons and an axe are listed in Thomas Bockinge of Hope’s inventory in 1635. Photo: Bill Bevan, courtesy of Lichfield Record Office.

**Working tools**
There were 31 types of tool with a range of functions. Tools for cultivation included mattocks, pickaxes, crowbars, hoes, spades and shovels along with pitchforks, scythes, sickles and rakes. None of these occurred in any
number in the group. Slightly more common were axes which were listed 7 times. Spades came in many varieties with different functions from a straightforward delving spade to turf and peat spades. The function of a pricking spade is obscure, but possibly was used for pricking out seedlings. Also often listed were hand tools, the commonest of which was an auger (nogar) (6), but also hammers, mallets, chisels, saws and adzes. There were 4 inventories with ladders but only one wheelbarrow.

**Horse gear**
As noted above, horses were recorded in 59 inventories. It is surprising therefore that relatively little equipment relating to them was identified. Saddles were noted in 15 inventories: 3 saddles, 11 pack saddles, 4 cart saddles, 3 hackney saddles and one side saddle, with several sorts of saddles sometimes listed in the same inventory. The hackney horse was valued for riding at this time. The side saddle belonged to the wealthy Jane Savage (1604 Castleton). Also listed was a variety of equipment such as bridles, wantoos (ropes for attaching objects to the horse), garths and surcingles.

**Ironwork associated with fires and cooking**
Apart from the cooking tools and pots detailed above, there was a variety of ironwork associated with fires. Notably there were rackentails or rackentines (15) which were bars that hung from a gallows tree in the chimney from which to hang pots, brandreths or brandirons (14) which were gridirons or trivets for supporting pans in the fire, landirons for supporting wood in the fire and the similar but smaller cobert (1) which may have also been used for supporting a spit, 7 pot hooks and 7 spits. There were 21 inventories with tongs, although, from the context in the inventories in which tools were grouped together often with a function in common, it may be that tongs were used for other purposes as well as in the fire. Backstones or baking stones (6) were flat stone or iron plates on which to bake oatcakes.

**Professional tools**
There were few obviously professional tools other than the smithy tools belonging to Andrew and Richard Hallam or Hallom (1591 & 1599 respectively) whose family were blacksmiths in Castleton. They possessed smithy tools, a smithy hammer and an anvil or stythie.

Roger Harrison (see above) owned the only listed millstone.

**Leases**
The precise status of testators’ land holdings, or the type of leases held, is obscure in most cases. In the sixteenth century, most land was held in some form of customary tenure, of which there were several models, but of which copyhold leases, the holding of land according to local manorial custom, were the commonest (Overton 1996 p151). Practices varied but, in general, copyhold leases were held for a small annual rent but a large entry fine was imposed on, say, inheritance.

As noted above, inventories did not list property, that is land and houses, which were dealt with under common law. Leases were listed in 28 inventories and, as far as can be judged, were appraised on the basis of the length left to run. No leases were mentioned before 1590. The reason for this is unclear; it may be that it was just not the practice for assessors to include leases before this date.
They were often of considerable value, forming the bulk of the estate. The largest by far, “the Reversion of A Lease beinge the kings farme”, belonged to Jane Savage (1604 Castleton) with a valuation of £220.0.0 out of a total estate of £320.84. At the other end of the scale “one lease of towe (two) Landes in Marstons” by Thomas Morten (Hope) was valued at £1.0.0 in 1629, out of an estate with a net worth of £6.0.6.

In other cases it is often unclear as to whether testators actually owned the land listed, although it is suggestive that they did. As noted before, it was not the custom to list owned land in an inventory. Robert Mellor (1610 Castleton) owned “the Right & tytle of all suche grounds as he heyld”. John Needham’s inventory separately listed “ground” and the “Rendition of a lease” both worth £5.0.0. Thurstan Nall’s (1591 Castleton) inventory detailed his farms worth £13.6.8, without any mention of a lease. Thomas Creswell (1623 Castleton) was owed rent at death and John Eyre (1567 Hope), gentleman, owned land in 3 villages and received rent from 7 men.

In this group of documents there are only two mentions of a copyhold, and perhaps this old form of land tenure was becoming obsolete by this time. George Grant (1631 Hope) had in his inventory the “Reverssion of one coppie” at £1.10.0, as well as the reversion of a lease at £2.0.0. The wealthy Ottiwell Smith (1638 Hope) listed both copyholds and freeholds in his will. There is no mention in any will of the payment of a fine or heriot to the lord of the manor on the death of the copyholder.

Overall, these documents do not give an accurate image of the types of tenancies and land holding prevalent in North Derbyshire, although a mixture was usual in England at this time (Overton 1996, p 35).

Debts
Overall, 69% of inventories listed debts, either owed or owing to their estates, or both. In the large majority these debts were recorded as cash. In a very few instances, physical items, usually lead, were recorded as being owed, and sometimes not valued. The sums owed to and owed by estates are summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% with debts owed/owing</th>
<th>Owing to estate (£.s.d)</th>
<th>Owed by estate (£.s.d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
<td>129.17.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>0.6.8</td>
<td>113.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32 Table of Debts

Comparison between Hope and Castleton
It is difficult to make a safe comparison between the two villages because Hope’s inventories only start in 1620. In a better analysis, review of Castleton debts between 1620 and 1650 shows that, of 13 inventories, 92.3% had debts to or from the estates outstanding at death, compared to Hope’s 61.5%. The total amounts owed were also greater in Castleton. Other than suggesting that there was a more entrepreneurial spirit in Castleton than in Hope, there is no obvious explanation.
Banking

Some individuals were prominent money dealers, either or both lending or borrowing, and small-scale banking should be regarded as an occupation in some cases. Rates of interest were never recorded either in wills or inventories, although there are references to “interest” in a list of qualities of property in some wills. It can be assumed that interest was payable on the loans that feature so prominently in these documents. From 1571, the maximum rate of interest allowed was 10% per annum but this was reduced to 8% in 1624, although charging any interest at all was regarded as a matter of conscience and remained a moral issue.

There was no external source of cash in these communities. People relied on access to land mostly through leases, labour usually on their own account, and excess production and eventually cash, for borrowing and lending.

Seasonal variations in lending and borrowing

Both borrowing and lending were commoner in the winter and spring and less in the summer and autumn. This reflected the cash flow through the agricultural cycle with the need to buy seed in the spring and, perhaps, livestock, combined with the well recognised dearth of resources in the spring.

Large debts

Analysis of the 20 estates with either large debts (>£20) or large numbers of debtors or creditors (>10) shows that nearly 3 times more in this group both borrowed and lent money than the average for all estates. In other words, this is a particularly entrepreneurial subset of testators implying a positively adopted lifestyle, practice or even business.

Elizabeth Saunderson (1636 Hope) deserves particular mention as she lent £129.17.11 to a total of 46 people, without any recorded borrowing, by far the largest lender of all. Thomas Bockinge (1615 Castleton) was exceptional in lending £113.12.2 to 35 people, yet owed £268.98 to a further 23.

Estates in debt

As noted before, apparent indebtedness does not take into account the whole of a person’s estate as the inventory never valued the testator’s house or land. It is also likely that an estate’s outgoing debts were not listed in every case (Hey 2004, p221). However here, taken at face value, substantial outgoing debts meant that several inventories showed estates that were in overall debt at the testators’ death. Of all the inventories, 5 ended in that state with the addition of William Eyre (1597 Castleton), most of whose debts were to his son and, if that debt is discounted, his estate would not have been in the red. Of the rest, two estates were left in serious negative balance. Thomas Furnice (1620 Hope) left £42.0.0 of debt, with little in the way of personal possessions (£5.18.0). The outstandingly indebted estate was Robert Hallam’s (1641 Castleton), although there is limited information about this. He left an estate in overall negative balance of at least £261.17.0. One senses the frustration of his appraisers who were unable to quantify the extent of his debt; after a very detailed inventory it merely states: “And his debts are £400 and upwards.”
Women
There are hints that women had a positive role to play in family life at this time. They were clearly respected by their families, and in several cases were appointed executors, sometimes to the exclusion of male family members. In Castleton, there were 23 executrices, of which 18 were wives, and in Hope two. At 27%, by a large margin, compared with other national surveys, this is the lowest proportion of wives appointed either solely or jointly as executrices (Erikson 1993, p158). In Humphrey Furniss’s (1610 Castleton) and Edmund Joll’s (1559 Castleton) wills, both their wives and daughters were appointed and Richard Slack (1581 Castleton) appointed his mother as executrix.

Having noted this, however, there is no doubt that the law discriminated against women. On marriage, their property was forfeit to their new husbands by the Law of Coverture in which the husband and wife were, in effect, one person: the husband. Wives were unable to enter into legal contracts or keep a salary. In some of the documents here, the husband exercised his discretion in willing his wife’s property back to her although, provided she did not marry again, she was entitled to a third of her husband’s estate during her lifetime (Hey 2004, p 217). In contrast, however, a widower kept her whole dowry, his “curtesy”, provided there was a child from the marriage (Erikson 1993, p25). Women often inherited more than the law required, although their inheritance was usually just for their maintenance. There was a tendency for the proportion left to widows to decrease with the increasing wealth of their dead husbands (Erikson 1993, p19).

This review is mainly not concerned with the inheritance of land, very rarely mentioned in wills and never in inventories, other than the value of leases. Land was dealt with in common law through the principle of primogeniture, whereby it was inherited by the sons, and, only in their absence, by daughters.

Women were often strikingly depersonalised in these documents, sometimes referred to as the wife (or uxor) of a man, omitting her first name and, often, in a list of creditors and debtors, the women’s names came at the end.

There were 7 women in the two villages that had a recorded inventory, as well as one with only a will and another with only a letter of administration. All were widows except Katherine Shemett (1577 Castleton) for whom there is little information. As none of the married women owned property of any kind, they left no wills and there was no purpose for an inventory.

It is noteworthy that so few of these documents related to women’s estates. Presumably, roughly as many men as women died in this period although the death rate in and around childbirth was high. For those that survived to widowhood, they inherited a good part, if not most, of their husbands’ estates and died with significant estates themselves. In many cases the widows’ inheritances were entailed by their husbands’ wills after their deaths, and probably this is the reason for the dearth of documentation. There are tentative clues as to the origin of these women’s wealth in only 3 cases; they suggest that they had increased the value of their estates by the time of their own deaths, and reduced their inherited indebtedness.
The wealthiest estate of all the 87 with inventories was left by Jane Savage (1604 Castleton) and the third wealthiest by Elizabeth Saunderson (1636 Hope). Jane Savage’s wealth resided largely in the value of a single lease worth £220.0.0, whereas Elizabeth Saunderson’s wealth was in the value of the debts owed to her estate, £129.17.11 in 32 debts from 46 creditors. Overall, with the exception of the latter estate, fewer women than men had any debts.

**Discussion**

This review gives a good picture of the agrarian society of north-west Derbyshire of the period. It omits information about the poorest members of the community and gives only a hint of those on the lowest rung of the nobility, the gentlemen.

Strikingly, the documents convey a portrait of a very stable society in which little changed during one of the most turbulent centuries in our history. Not only is there little reference to the profound effects of the Reformation, but there is no hint of the Civil War at the end of the study period.

This study took in a period during which, on a national scale, there was as shift away from purely subsistence farming towards growing for the market, mostly because of the growth in the population, especially in the towns. However, here, it seems that the isolation of the area meant that the economy was still mainly concerned with self-sufficiency. Only 8 inventories showed no animals, although the majority of the rest had only small numbers of their own livestock, often ten or less cattle and as few as two sheep. A number of households had small numbers of poultry. Further, all classes of people owned at least one animal, including the vicars, the teacher and the blacksmiths.

Much could be sought to inform the historian of the economic upheavals of the time, but, again, there is not much to show for them. Nationally, there was serious and persistent inflation, severe deprivation caused by enclosures, disease and population growth. There were only hints of the shift away from arable to pastoral practice associated throughout the country with enclosure: fewer draught animals, few ploughs and harrows, and copyhold leases, which were vulnerable to landlords reclaiming land to enclose it, were rare. In this particular locality, with its extensive upland areas, notably the Upper Derwent Valley and Hope Woodlands, as well as valley-bottom fertile land, the picture is one of a mixed agrarian economy, which was slowly changing towards grazing animals in the hundred years of the review (Bevan 2004, p107 et seq.).

This is interesting given the small quantities of pottery found in the test pits in the two villages (Bevan and Curtis 2013). Approximately 5% of the total pottery excavated came from the centuries covered by the wills and inventories. This lack cannot be readily explained by a single factor such as sheer bad luck, middening strategies or later ground disturbance, though later disturbance and tarmacking has occurred over the historical core of Hope. Could the lack of ceramic vessels in the inventories suggest low levels of pottery use in households who favoured metal, wood, skins or other organic materials for cooking, storage and serving? Was pottery a relatively high status product or something so commonplace that it did not deserve mention in inventories? Given the other household goods listed, including chaff beds, sheets and
one instance of candles, it would seem strange that ceramic vessels were omitted from inventories where present.

Who were the people that populate these documents? Some feel tantalisingly close and even familiar: the hard-working and proud husbandmen ensuring their families’ future after their deaths, the entrepreneurs who put their estates at risk by borrowing and lending, the blacksmith and weaver, the schoolmaster and vicar, and the strong women who not only kept their families going after the deaths of their husbands but increased their prosperity.

There was a striking interconnectedness and mutual reliance demonstrated in these documents, both at a family level and through small-scale business.

These people did not include the lowest in society. The servants benefited from their masters’ generosity but did not make wills themselves. Where are the labourers in the fields? Most of these people were their own labourers, milked their own cattle, sheared their own sheep and ploughed their land, rented for the most part from the wealthy whose wills were not recorded in Lichfield.
14. Conclusion

Angela Darlington

Fifteen months of documentary research and analysis is encapsulated in this report on the lives of the common people of medieval Castleton and Hope. As will be evident from the diversity of writing styles, a number of researchers with different backgrounds and interests adopted specific topics to write up. The result is an impressive collection of historical fact and its analysis resulting from the exploration of a very large array of archive sources, published transcripts and academic literature.

This is the first product of a systematic attempt to catalogue the medieval history of Hope and Castleton as it might relate to the “common person”. While there are still huge holes in our knowledge, we have started to build a picture of how ordinary men and women lived their lives in this part of the Peak Forest, worked on the fields and in the mines, went to church, paid their taxes and tithes, fought their wars, committed crimes and paid penalties for them. Finally the chapter on wills and inventories allows some very personal glimpses into the usually simple and essential possessions of residents from two adjacent villages in the Hope Valley at the end of the medieval era.

It is hoped that the information contained here will be of interest and use to readers. We expect that the documentary archive will continue to grow and will in time generate further outputs as a result of on-going and future analysis.
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