Cultivating Kin in Lancashire: The Stansfields of Long Clough, Littleborough, 1697–1861

R. E. STANSFIELD

With its stone lintel inscribed with the year 1725 and its mullioned windows, the farmhouse at Long Clough, near Littleborough, Lancashire, remains a fine example of the eighteenth-century domestic architecture characteristic of the Lancashire Pennines; accordingly, it was granted Grade II listed status by English Heritage in 1986. In addition to the farmhouse itself, it appears that there were also a number of other buildings attached to the estate in earlier centuries. Whilst its architecture has received recognition, Long Clough and its residents have been largely omitted from both antiquarian and more recent accounts of the history of Littleborough and its local families.

Several families appear to have lived at Long Clough during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but one family in particular, the Stansfields, appear to have resided there continuously from at least 1697 until 1861. Such long-lasting residential attachment was relatively uncommon during this period, even in North-West England where mobility was less prevalent than elsewhere. It has been estimated that those who were geographically-immobile represented less than one-quarter of Lancashire’s population. Hence, the example of the Stansfields of Long Clough is pertinent to discussions on mobility and

migration, to kinship networks, and to the agrarian economy of the district.¹

The close correlation between agriculture and inheritance during this period means that in order to gain a greater understanding of the concerns of the Lancashire farmer or small-holder during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is necessary to focus on case-studies of individual communities or families, such as the Stansfields of Long Clough, Littleborough. Wills and inventories have been widely used in order to illuminate past lives, cultures, and societies, despite their acknowledged limitations; likewise, parish records have also been an essential element in genealogical and historical research, despite their recognised deficiencies.² The evidence of the wills and inventories that survive for the Stansfield family has been complemented by parish records and other sources, such as epigraphy and census returns. Collectively from this evidence, it has proved possible to reconstruct familial relationships and to explore the family’s agrarian and commercial concerns, which will be outlined against the broader background of Lancashire society during this era. First, however, it is necessary to delineate, depict, and describe the Stansfield family itself in further detail.

Affinity and Association

‘Consid[er]ing the uncertainty of this life’, John Stansfield I (d.1721) made his last will and testament on 23 November 1720 (see Appendix I). He was buried at the Parish Church of St Chad, Rochdale, on 14


April 1721, and his will was proved at Chester later that year. He appointed his wife, Mary (d.1731), and his eldest son, John II, as his executors. To his wife, he bequeathed all rights to which she was entitled (along with a bed and bedding). It appears that John I’s marriage to Mary is not recorded in the parish registers of Rochdale, Todmorden, Whitworth, or Heptonstall, but it is clear from his will that they had at least six children who survived to adulthood. The baptism of only one of these children – James on 28 October 1697 – was recorded in Rochdale’s registers (which entry also represents the first reference to this Stansfield family residing at Long Clough). In addition, the couple seems to have had two un-named children who died in infancy and were buried at Rochdale in January 1710. John I’s widow, Mary, might be identified as the Mary Stansfield who was buried at Rochdale in December 1731.

John I bequeathed to his daughter, Susan, the sum of £20 (which was to be paid by her brother James I). He also bequeathed to his daughter, Martha (d.1792), the sum of £20 (which was to be paid by her brother John II on her majority). He seems to have been concerned that the entitlements of his youngest daughter, Martha, might be overlooked by her siblings, so he made provision so that – in the event of his wife’s death (before Martha attained her majority) – Martha should receive an annuity of 20s. from the entire estate until she came of age. He gave only 5s. to his daughter, Mary (d.1771), the wife of Abel Dearden, because she had already received her portion of her inheritance: she had presumably received this at the time of her marriage, which Rochdale’s

6] Greater Manchester County Record Office, Manchester (hereafter GMRO), L48/1/1/8 (Registers of the Parish Church of St Chad, Rochdale), 1 Apr 1721; for John I’s will: Lancashire Record Office, Preston (hereafter LRO), WCW, John Stansfield, Long Clough, 1721 (see Appendix I).
7] For these parish registers, see: The Registers of the Parish Church of Rochdale, 1582–1616, ed. H. Fishwick (Rochdale, 1888); The Registers of the Parish Church of Rochdale, 1617–41, ed. H. Fishwick (Rochdale, 1889); The Registers of the Parish Church of Rochdale, 1642–1700, ed. H. Brierley, Lancashire Parish Register Society, 58 (1921); The Register of the Parish Church of St Mary, Todmorden, 1666–1780, ed. D. Wilson, Lancashire Parish Register Society, 117 (1978); Marriages at the Chapels of Heptonstall and Cross Stone in the Parish of Halifax, 1594–1837, ed. D. Wilson (Todmorden, 1995).
9] There are also further burial entries for unnamed children of John Stansfield in 1715 and 1719 which might be identified as relating to this family, but this remains speculative since no residence was recorded: GMRO, L48/1/1/7, 14 Jan 1710; L48/1/1/8, 29 Aug 1715, 5 Jan 1719.
10] GMRO, L48/1/1/9, 8 Dec 1731.
11] Martha may not have married and might be identified as the Martha Stansfield of Long Clough who was buried in 1792: GMRO, L48/1/2/3, 26 Mar 1792.
parish registers confirm as having taken place on 4 February 1720. 12

Whilst John I’s youngest son, Richard (d.1754), did not receive a bequest of any part of the Long Clough properties from his father, he was compensated in monetary terms by receiving £20 from both his brothers John II and James I on the attainment of his majority. It appears that Richard continued to reside at Long Clough, even after his marriage to Ellen Hill in 1730. 13 It was on Christmas Day, 1730, that Richard and Ellen’s first child, John, was baptised at the Parochial Chapel of the Holy Trinity, Littleborough. 14 Another son, James (1732), and a daughter, Mary (1734) soon followed, and they continued to reside at Long Clough; but by the time of the baptism of their fourth child, Richard, in January 1737, Richard and Ellen had removed from Long Clough and were residing at ‘Greenwells’ in Rochdale. 15

One of the witnesses to John I’s will was Thomas Stansfield. The only other reference to a Thomas Stansfield in connection with this family is the burial of Thomas Stansfield of Long Clough at Rochdale in December 1762. 16 Given the average life-expectancy during this era, it seems most likely that this Thomas might be identified as another of John I’s sons rather than his octogenarian brother. This may seem unlikely because Thomas is not mentioned in John I’s will, but if he had already received a fair portion of the estate – in either landed or monetary terms – then he might not have received any further legacies from his father.

Whilst each of their siblings appears to have received only monetary bequests from their father, what did John II and his brother James I inherit? John I bequeathed to his eldest son, John II (d.1745), one part of the messuage at Long Clough (including the great parlour, the chamber above it, the buttery (or cellar), and the great barn) along with

12] The Marriage Registers of the Parish Church of Rochdale, 1701–1801, ed. H. Brierley, Lancashire Parish Register Society, 62 (1924), p.34. The last will and testament of Abel Dearden (d.1759), yeoman, of Whitworth, Lancashire, was made on 7 January 1756, and was proved at Chester on 7 July 1759. He made bequests to his wife, Mary, to his three daughters Susan (wife of James Schofield of Tong End), Sarah (wife of James Clegg of Howarth), and Ann, and bequeathed the majority of his estate to his surviving son, John: LRO, WCW, Abel Dearden, Whitworth, 7 July 1759. Abel’s widow might be identified as the Mary Dearden who was buried in 1771: GMRO, L48/1/2/1, 27 Jan 1771.
15] GMRO, L48/1/1/9, 13 Aug 1732, 15 Sep 1734, 16 Jan 1737. Two further sons, George (bapt.1739) and Charles (bapt.1742), and a daughter, Susan (bapt.1745), were born before Ellen’s death at Moorgate and burial in 1747: GMRO, L48/1/1/9, 30 Mar 1739; L48/1/1/10, 1 Aug 1742, 16 Dec 1744, 18 Feb 1747. Richard might be identified as the Richard Stansfield of Sandhole buried in 1754: GMRO, L48/1/1/10, 10 Nov 1754.
16] GMRO, L48/1/2/1, 7 Dec 1762.
other lands and gardens. John I bequeathed to his second son, James I (1697–1760), the rest of the messuage at Long Clough (including the room called the ‘shop’ (or workshop), the little parlour, the chamber above it, the wash-house, and the little barn) and various lands. John I then directed that the rest and residue of the estate should be divided equally between each of his children. Whilst Richard Stansfield (d.1754) and his siblings presumably received their monetary bequests and at some later time removed from Long Clough, what happened to each of the portions of the estate that John II and James I inherited? John Stansfield I’s second son, James I (1697–1760), appears to have married Mary (fl.1728–35), though this marriage does not seem to have been recorded in the parish registers of any of the local churches (see Genealogy I). The baptisms of James I and Mary’s three sons were recorded in the registers of Littleborough: Charles (1728), Eli (1732), and James II (1735).\footnote{GMRO, L48/1/1/9, 13 Oct 1728, 9 Jan 1732, 19 Oct 1735.} Whilst there seems to be no record of Mary’s death and burial, it is clear from the monumental inscription preserved at Rochdale, that James I died in February 1760.\footnote{GMRO, L48/1/2/1, 16 Feb 1760. At St Chad’s Church, Rochdale, the monumental inscription records: ‘Here lies the body of James Stansfield of Long Clough, yeoman, who died on 13th [sic] February 1760 in his 63rd year’.} James I’s elder sons, Charles and Eli, may have not survived to adulthood, or may have married and removed from Long Clough and the surrounding district, since it is clear that James I’s heir and successor was his third son, James II (1735–90).

James II married Alice Holt on 2 October 1755, and it seems likely that they had a daughter, Elizabeth, who was born around 1756.\footnote{Marriage Registers of Rochdale, 1701–1801, p.120.} It appears that Alice may have died of complications arising from childbirth since it was on 4 December 1757 that Alice was buried, and her daughter Alice was baptised.\footnote{GMRO, L60/1/1/1 (Registers of the Parochial Chapel of the Holy Trinity, Littleborough), 5 Nov 1775.} It seems unlikely that James and Alice could have also had a son James during their short marriage, so it seems that it was James II himself who married for a second time to Mary Butterworth at Rochdale on 20 August 1787.\footnote{GMRO, L48/1/2/1, 4 Dec 1757. James II’s daughter, Alice, of Long Clough, appears to have married James Holt on 31 March 1777: Marriage Registers of Rochdale, 1701–1801, p.240.} James and Mary lived at Long Clough, and had two sons, John IV (1788–1817) and James IV...
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(1789–1813).\(^{22}\) However, a few months after the baptism of his younger son, James II was buried at Rochdale in May 1790.\(^{23}\) James II's last will and testament – if he made one – has not survived, but it was presumably his intention that his portion of the Long Clough estate should be divided equally between his two sons. However, tragedy was to alter this intention in that his younger son, James IV, died, aged 23, and was buried at Littleborough in May 1813.\(^ {24}\) Thus, James II's elder son, John IV (1788–1817) seems likely to have inherited the entirety of his father's portion of the Long Clough estate.

John IV appears to have married Mary Rigg at St Chad’s Church, Rochdale, in November 1810.\(^{25}\) He continued to reside at Long Clough, and was also employed as a stone mason. They appear to have had three children, James (1812–29), Elizabeth (1815–16), and John (bapt.1817); but, again, tragedy was to strike this family: one-year-old Elizabeth was buried at Littleborough in June 1816, and John IV himself, aged 29, was buried at Littleborough in October 1817.\(^ {26}\) It is to be presumed that John IV’s widow, Mary, and his surviving sons, James and John, continued to live at Long Clough. In August 1821, John’s widow, Mary, married the weaver Robert Howarth of Shore, Littleborough, at St Chad’s, Rochdale.\(^ {27}\) It seems likely that James and John would have inherited their father’s portion of the Long Clough estate in the event of attaining their majorities; however, James Stansfield of Croft, Long Clough, died, aged 17, and was buried at Littleborough in April 1829.\(^ {28}\) With James’s death, his brother John appears to have become the sole heir to this portion of the estate. However, it seems highly likely that the senior branch of the family would have purchased his portion of the Long Clough estate, and thereby united the properties and lands into a singular whole for the first time since 1721: but was this the case?

---

22] These baptisms both record James and Mary’s residence as ‘Stansfield’ not Long Clough, but it is clear from later evidence that these entries relate to the Stansfields of Long Clough, and the area called Stansfield might be deemed to include Long Clough itself: GMRO, L60/1/1, 25 Mar 1788, 12 Sep 1789. John (1788–1817) has been assigned the numeral IV in order to distinguish him from the senior branch of the family, and James (1789–1813) has been assigned the numeral IV to take account of his cousin James III (1785–1861) who also resided at Long Clough and will be discussed later (see below).

23] GMRO, L48/1/2, 26 May 1790.
24] GMRO, L60/1/3/1, 27 May 1813.
26] GMRO, L60/1/1/3, 5 Aug 1815; L60/1/3/1, 30 Jun 1816, 7 Oct 1817. For John’s baptism: The National Archives, Public Record Office, London (hereafter PRO), RG4/992 (Registers of the Wesleyan Chapel, Littleborough), 2 Sep 1817.
28] GMRO, L60/1/3/1, 26 Apr 1829.
John I's eldest son, John Stansfield II (d.1745), had received one part of the Long Clough estate after his father's death in 1721, so what had happened to this portion? On 23 October 1733, John II married Susan Stansfield (1704–87), the eldest daughter of John Stansfield (1683–1763) of Dean in Inchfield, Walsden (see Genealogy II). 29 It is possible that the Stansfields of Long Clough were related to the Stansfields of Inchfield, and their cadet branch residing at Handle Hall, Littleborough. The proximity of Long Clough and Inchfield is relatively close; and that between Handle Hall and Long Clough is even closer. It is possible that John Stansfield I (d.1721) of Long Clough was the youngest son of Abraham Stansfield (d.1678) of Dean in Inchfield, and brother of Abraham Stansfield (d.1721) of Dean in Inchfield and Anthony Stansfield (d.1692) of Handle Hall. Given the close proximity and the close generational correlation between these families this is a distinct possibility; but this conclusion remains mere conjecture, and, without further – more substantial – evidence, it remains difficult to be certain of the connection, if any, between these two Stansfield families. If the Stansfields of Inchfield and those of Long Clough were related in this way then this would have meant that John II and Susan were distant cousins. 30

The registers of Littleborough record the baptisms of John II and Susan's daughters: Mary (1734), Susan (1740), and Sarah (1744). 31 Whilst the baptism of John II's son, John III, was not recorded, it is clear that he was born in 1736. Their second daughter Susan appears to have died in infancy, and can be identified as the Susan who was buried at Rochdale in January 1741. 32 Less than a year after the baptism of Sarah, his third daughter, John II made his last will and testament on 5 February 1745 being 'weak of body but of perfect mind and memory' (see Appendix II). He was buried on 20 February 1745, and his will was proved at Chester on 13 October 1745. 33

30] For an examination of this family – descendants of Anthony and Elizabeth Stansfield who were married at St Chad's, Rochdale, on 26 April 1591: Stansfield, 'Family, Faith and Farming', pp.19–44: for the transaction by which Susan Stansfield's portion in the Inchfield property was sold to her brother-in-law, John Haigh (1703–72) of Pastureside, Inchfield, Walsden, in March 1765: West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield, DW: 1020. I am most grateful to Mrs D.M. Hargreaves for this reference, and for lending me a copy of this indenture, and also the website, created by D.M. Hargreaves and Linda Briggs, exploring the local history of Walsden and its environs: www.todmordenandwalsden.co.uk.
31] GMRO, L48/1/1/9, 17 Mar 1734, 12 Oct 1740; L48/1/1/10, 23 May 1744. Mary (bapt.1734) had an illegitimate daughter, Alice (bapt.1753), by Charles Hill: GMRO, L48/1/1/10, 16 Sep 1753.
32] GMRO, L48/1/1/9, 16 Jan 1741.
33] GMRO, L48/1/1/10, 20 Feb 1745; for John II’s will: LRO, WCW, INFRA, John Stansfield, Longworth [sic: Long Clough], 1745 (see Appendix II).
John II appointed his wife, Susan, and his sister, Susan, as the executrixes of his will, whilst his brother James I was amongst those to compile the inventory of his estate. To his ‘dearly beloved wife’ he bequeathed one third of his estate for her lifetime, and to his only son, John III, he bequeathed the rest of the estate at Long Clough. He directed that John should pay both his sisters, Mary and Sarah, the sum of £20 when they reached their respective majorities, and also declared that the whole of his personal estate was to be divided between his two daughters. Therefore, whilst John III appears to have inherited two thirds of his father’s interests in the properties and lands at Long Clough on his majority in around 1757, it may have been some thirty years later that he finally obtained his mother’s one-third portion of the estate. John II’s widow, Susan, might be identified as the Susan Stansfield who was buried in July 1787.34

It was on 11 May 1760 that John III (1736–1826) married Betty Holt (d.1766) at St Chad’s Church, Rochdale.35 They had four sons: Thomas (bapt.1760), John (bapt.1761), James (bapt.1763), and Abraham (1766–1842); but one month after Abraham’s baptism, Betty Stansfield was buried at Rochdale in February 1766.36 It appears from the baptismal entries that John III must have married for a second time, and his second wife was also called Betty: indeed, the Rochdale registers record the marriage of John Stansfield and Betty Cryer on 17 November 1767.37 John and Betty’s eight children were all baptised at Littleborough: Hannah (1768), Elizabeth (1769), Charles (d.1771), Mary (1774), Martha (1774); Sarah (1776); Benjamin (1779–1842), and Fanny (1781).38 John III’s second wife, Betty, was buried at

34] GMRO, L48/1/2/3, 9 Jul 1787.
36] GMRO, L60/1/1/1, 14 Sep 1760, 20 Dec 1761, 2 Oct 1763, 9 Jan 1766; L48/1/2/1, 22 Feb 1766. Abraham (1766–1842) might be identified as the Abraham Stansfield of Whiteles who was buried in 1842: GMRO, L60/1/3/2, 19 Aug 1842.
38] GMRO, L60/1/1/1, 14 Aug 1768, 17 Dec 1769, 10 Jul 1774, 5 Apr 1776, 17 Jan 1779, 4 Feb 1781; L48/1/2/1, 9 Sep 1771. Mary Stansfield (bapt.1774) married Henry Wood of Whitefield on 29 April 1798; Marriage Registers of Rochdale, 1701–1801, p.407. Fanny Stansfield (bapt.1781) married John Butterworth: L48/1/4/10, 1 Apr 1804. Benjamin (1779–1842) married Mary Holt (1785–1851), and was buried in 1842: GMRO, L48/1/4/11, 18 Aug 1812; L60/1/3/2, 31 Mar 1842. A monumental inscription preserved in the churchyard at Littleborough records ‘Benjamin Stansfield of Featherstall who died March 28th 1842, aged 63 years. Also of Mary, his wife, who died Nov 27th 1851, aged 66 years. Also of Thomas Cockcroft, late of Featherstall, who died August 5th 1884 in his 64th year. Also of Mary, his wife, who died Dec 12th 1858, aged 36 years. Also of Alice, their daughter, who died Jan 20th 1843, aged 11 months. Also of Walter, their son, who died Nov 7th 1858, aged 5 months. Also of Robert Henry, son of Thomas and Ann Cockcroft, who died May 18th 1865, aged 4 months’. 
Littleborough in January 1802.\textsuperscript{39} John III seems to have survived for a further twenty-four years: he died, aged 89, and was buried at Littleborough in January 1826.\textsuperscript{40} Whilst the marriage of John III’s eldest son, Thomas Stansfield (bapt. 1760), to Sarah Halliwell of Long Clough on 12 November 1781 is recorded at St Chad’s Church, Rochdale, there appear to be no extant baptismal records for Thomas and Sarah’s children at Rochdale or Littleborough.\textsuperscript{41} However, it is evident that they had at least one son, James III, who was born in around 1785, before Sarah was buried at Rochdale in October 1792.\textsuperscript{42}

Thomas’s son, James III (1785–1861), seems to have married Ann Casson (1790–1861) at the parish church of Rochdale, in December 1814.\textsuperscript{43} They appear to have had five children: Elizabeth (1815–42), John (1818–38), Martha (1820–39), James (1823–38), and Sarah (1830–). However, tragedy was to affect this family profoundly: James and Ann’s eldest son, John was buried, aged 20, in March 1838; and seven months later, their second son, James, was buried, aged 15, in October 1838.\textsuperscript{44} One year later, their second daughter, Martha, was buried, aged 18, in November 1839; and their eldest daughter, Elizabeth, was buried, aged 27, in September 1842.\textsuperscript{45} The family which had once numbered seven, now numbered three, and this family unit is recorded as residing at Long Clough in the censuses of 1841, 1851, and 1861.\textsuperscript{46} By this time, it seems that James III had purchased the remaining portion of the estate from his cousin: in the 1851 census, James described himself as a ‘farmer and enumerator’ and as a freeholder of 13 acres (which was entirely his responsibility since he

\textsuperscript{39} GMRO, L60/1/1/2, 7 Jan 1802.
\textsuperscript{40} GMRO, L60/1/1/3, 10 Jan 1826. The letters of administration for John III’s estate were granted in February 1826: LRO, WCW, John Stansfield, Long Clough, Feb 1826. A monumental inscription in the churchyard at Littleborough records ‘In Memory of John Stansfield of Longclough [sic], yeoman, who died January 5th 1826 in the 90th year of his age. Also, of John, the son of James and Ann Stansfield, who died on the 25th day of March 1838, a[g]e[d] 20 y[ea]rs. Also, of James, their son, who died Oct[ober] 11th 1838 in the 16th year of his age. Also, of Martha, their daughter, who died Oct[ober] 30th 1839 in the 19th year of her age. Also, of Elizabeth, their daughter, who died on the 8th of Sep[tember] 1843, aged 27 years. Also, the abovenamed [sic], James Stansfield, who died May 24th 1861, aged 76. Also, the said Ann, his wife, who died July 6th 1861, aged 71 y[ea]rs.

\textsuperscript{41} Marriage Registers of Rochdale, 1701–1801, p.273.

\textsuperscript{42} GMRO, L48/1/2/3, 31 Oct 1792. James (1785–1861) has been assigned the numeral III in order to distinguish him from his great-grandfather’s brother James I (1697–1760) and his descendants.

\textsuperscript{43} GMRO, L48/1/4/12, 12 Dec 1814.
\textsuperscript{44} GMRO, L60/1/3/1, 29 Mar 1838; L60/1/3/2, 22 Oct 1838.
\textsuperscript{45} GMRO, L60/1/3/2, 5 Nov 1839, 12 Sep 1842.
\textsuperscript{46} PRO, HO107/550/37. I am indebted to Miss Laura A. Watkins for her assistance in identifying this and subsequent census references.
employed no agricultural labourers to work his land).\textsuperscript{47} By the time of the 1861 census, his wife, Ann, had been suffering from blindness for seven years, and the family employed a domestic servant.\textsuperscript{48} It was later that same year that James III died, aged 76, and was buried at Littleborough in May 1861; his widow, Ann, survived for a further few weeks before she died, aged 71, and was buried in July 1861.\textsuperscript{49} Thus, the sole surviving Stansfield of Long Clough was their thirty-one-year-old unmarried daughter, Sarah, who sold the property shortly afterwards.\textsuperscript{50} Thus, the untimely deaths of James and Ann’s other children had deprived Long Clough of its future custodians. Therefore, the deaths of James and Ann, and Sarah’s sale of the estate itself, represented the close of an age: the conclusion of an era during which the Stansfields had enjoyed continuous possession of Long Clough for over one hundred and sixty years.

Analysis of wills can create a distorted depiction of family life: many testators’ emphasis on providing for their lineal relatives – such as their children and grandchildren – means that they tended to omit lateral relationships – including their siblings and cousins.\textsuperscript{51} Indeed, analysis of these two Stansfield wills – in isolation from other evidence – permits the construction of an image of family relationships that is limited in its extent. Little mention is made of lateral relatives, such as brothers and sisters, even though it is clear that they were residing within close proximity. Hence it is necessary to be aware of the way in which the use of wills evidence can tend to minimise the importance and relevance of the wider network of familial connections. Kinship networks were formed, forged, and framed by bonds of duty and empathy, and by ties of responsibility and understanding: it would be within an expanded community of reciprocal aid and assistance that the work of the home and the toil of the farm would become a collective undertaking.\textsuperscript{52} Whilst interactions between some relatives may have been affable, those between other relations may have been acrimonious. Nevertheless, it appears that

\textsuperscript{47} PRO, HO107/2247/8/5.
\textsuperscript{48} PRO, RG9/3048/8/2.
\textsuperscript{49} GMRO, L60/1/3/3, 29 May 1861, 10 Jul 1861.
\textsuperscript{50} PRO, RG10/4129/171/3.
the strength and significance of family feeling was such that several generations of an extended family survived and subsisted in close proximity at Long Clough from the early eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century. By 1826, when the link between the two Stansfield families recalled the division of lands a century earlier by a great-great-grandfather, it might be assumed that kinship ties and a sense of familial solidarity may have weakened to some degree.

The wider community of friends and neighbours within a locality also sustained individuals within a supportive framework of reciprocal assistance. This is illustrated by the part that usury played as an accepted and acceptable aspect of the agrarian economy. John I's activities as a money-lender appear to have been on a very small scale in comparison with others. He was owed sums of money by his son John (13s.), and also by various friends and neighbours, such as Joseph Lord (£1 13s.), John Butterworth (3s. 8d.), and James Holt (5s. 6d.). It seems evident that the bonds of affinity and association were of some pertinence to the Stansfields, and were perhaps of no less importance amongst eighteenth- and nineteenth-century farming families in general. Irrespective of social echelon and affluence, perhaps the importance of kinship ties might be appreciated as an aspect that has been universal to individuals and families throughout the centuries.

Cultivation and Commerce

Inventories offer a wealth of evidence with which to reconstruct the agricultural patterns and local history of a district or region; yet these valuations have serious limitations as an indicator of individuals' prosperity because of local and seasonal variations in agrarian conditions. However, in a society in which income and occupation were essential criteria in the establishment of social distinction, these valuations enable an approximation of social status to be made. Monetary divisions between husbandry and yeomanry were imprecise; for instance, the average probate valuation for a yeoman was between £104 and £229,

and that for a husbandman was between £22 and £83.\textsuperscript{56} Yet social standing was often defined in local communities by the common esteem in which an individual was held by his neighbours. In his will of 1720, John I regarded himself as a ‘yeoman’ even though his estate was valued, at the level of a husbandman, at £89 17s. Likewise, John II regarded himself as a yeoman, even though his estate was valued at even less than his father’s estate, at £33 19s.

Literacy was also a mark of social distinction, but in terms of ascertaining the Stansfields’ level of literacy it remains difficult to formulate firm conclusions. Both John I and John II were able to mark their wills with their signatures; however, this – in itself – need not signify any great level of literacy. Likewise, even though no books were recorded amongst their possessions, the appraisers may have included books within a particular room under the generally-descriptive phrase ‘remainder of [the] goods’. Similarly, the comparable language employed in the two wills might indicate that one will was used as a source of reference or a guide or model for the second, thereby perhaps indicating a limited level of literacy. But does such similarity of phrasing merely suggest John II’s familiarity with his father’s will, and perhaps represent his wish to emulate – with filial affection – the form of an important familial document? Similarly, it is also possible that the same scribe or clerk was employed to draft and prepare both documents, and such phrases may merely reflect one clerk’s personal phraseology. Such possibilities, as well as the employment of formal legal formulae, plague the effective evaluation of the Stansfields’ literacy.\textsuperscript{57} If it is not possible to ascertain their literacy from the evidence of their wills, it is certainly possible to learn more about their landed and commercial concerns from their inventories.

The agrarian economy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries dictated that farmers, especially those of a lower socio-economic status, had to embrace diversification by supporting both animal husbandry as well as arable cultivation. It was a pastoral pays that predominated in the majority of Lancashire in terms of agricultural regions, although arable land featured prominently in many areas of the shire. To the east of the county, the principal focus seems to have been cattle-rearing for domestic consumption; whilst those lands designated as tillage would


have yielded grain crops, such as oats. In addition, the close proximity of several urban markets (which would be available for the sale of meat and dairy products) may have assisted in the development of a well-formed pastoral farm economy. As might have been expected, animal husbandry appears to have been a key concern for the Stansfields: in 1721, John I owned six cows and two horses; whilst, in 1745, John II owned five cows and one calf. In addition, it is clear that the Stansfields cultivated arable crops on Long Clough’s collective thirteen acres: the inventory of John I in May 1721 valued his ‘se[e]ding’, and the inventory of his son in February 1745, included corn valued at 1s. as well as hay. Moreover, John II’s inventory lists his ‘huslements’, which probably refers to his husbandry and horticultural implements.

It would have been practical for any surplus yields from arable harvests or livestock to have been sold at local markets. References to the part of the house known as the ‘buttery’ indicate that the family utilised their cows’ milk to make butter (and also perhaps cheese) for their own consumption. Whilst being an important domestic activity, this endeavour may have also been extended – in some small way – to create produce for general sale within the wider district, especially in a prime-dairying region such as eastern Lancashire with numerous local markets. However, the sale of such produce as well as the sale of surplus crops would depend entirely on the quality of harvests, the incidence of bovine maladies, and market prices, during an era in which subsistence crises were not uncommon, particularly in north-western England. Even though the Stansfields may not have needed to use local common lands for the grazing of their livestock, such lands and nearby moors (such as Inchfield Moor) may have proved an important resource for providing nutritional supplements (such as nuts and berries), domestic materials (such as peat and wood), as well as stone for building.

The household production of cloth was a supplementary activity, which provided a welcome additional income for many agricultural families. The homes of the eastern-Lancashire uplands specialised in the working of coarse low-grade cloth, which they might then sell at


local markets.\textsuperscript{61} The Stansfields seem to have been engaged in this cottage-based textile-working industry: John I's inventory makes reference to the two 'paires of loombs' in the 'shopp' (workshop). Whilst John I bequeathed this workshop to his second son, James I, it seems likely that one pair of handlooms might have been inherited by James I and one pair by John II. In John II's inventory of 1745, it is clear that he also owned 'looms' valued at 5s. It was common for elder children, younger siblings, and elderly relatives to assist with the spinning, winding, and warping, whilst the men would undertake the weaving of the cloth. Evidently, the Stansfields' activities were not confined merely to tillage and grazing but also extended to textile manufacture: their case study might therefore be regarded as a representative example of the interests of the Pennine small-holder during this era.

\textit{Conclusions}

Just as the economy and society of North-West England altered profoundly between 1697 and 1861, so did the Stansfields' agricultural and commercial affairs. Their income from crop-cultivation, dairying, and cattle-rearing seems to have been supplemented by the proceeds of cloth-production. However, changes in modes of production – from cottage industry to industrial manufacturing – depleted farmers' supplementary incomes, and seduced many family members to seek permanent employment in cloth-production. The growth of urban markets boosted demands for farm produce, yet the expansion of transport infrastructures, such as railways in the nineteenth century, also spurred alterations in agricultural patterns. It appears that the Stansfields provide one example amongst many Pennine families with comparable economic interests in a region in which pastoral farming and textile production were particularly prominent.\textsuperscript{62}

Whilst inventories can be used to illuminate some aspects of a family's agricultural and commercial interests, they allow the extrapolation of only incomplete conclusions. Similarly, the evidence of wills for the reconstitution of family relationships and inheritance patterns can also prove to be an imperfect source because of their excessive emphasis on the nuclear household and lineal relatives. Nevertheless, such evidence can be utilised alongside other evidence from parish records and epigraphy to reconstruct a fuller account of kinship networks. Since the inter-relationship between inheritance and agricul-


tural patterns means that it is difficult to disentangle familial and socio-economic spheres, it is only by examining both aspects that it is possible to gain a broader understanding of the worlds of a yeomanry family in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Lancashire.

Not only are the Stansfields an illustration of the typical Pennine farmer-weaver of the era, they are also an example of the remarkable continuity of a geographically-immobile family who lived at the same residence for at least 164 years. The division of lands between elder sons (as John I specified in 1721) appears to have been a common local practice in eastern Lancashire (and also in other regions), with other families choosing to partition their landholdings in a similar way, such as the Stansfields of Inchfield, Walsden.63 Such patterns of inheritance would have reinforced existing ties of kinship and ensured that the extended family acted as a structure of reciprocal support to supplement the wider assistance offered by neighbours and friends within the local community. A case study such as the Stansfields of Long Clough illustrates the inheritance patterns of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Lancashire, but also enables us to chart a family’s adaptation to the complex developments of the modern era and to acquire a greater insight into the lives, interests, and inspirations of one of Lancashire’s farming families – one of its cultivating kin.

Appendix I: The Will of John Stansfield, Long Clough, 1721
LRO, WCW, John Stansfield, Long Clough, 1721

In the name of God, Amen. The twenty-third day of November Anno Domini 1720 and in the seventh yeare of the reigne of our most gracious soveraign lord George, by the grace of God, of Great Britain, Franchise, a[nd] Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc. I, John Stansfield of Long Clough within Middle [H]undersfield in the p[arish] of Rochdale a[nd] county of Lancast[er], yeoman, cons[ider]ing the uncertainty of this life do mak[e] this my last will a[nd] testament in man[n]er a[nd] forme following and touching the disposition of my Istate real a[nd] p[er]sonal I do give, order, direct, a[nd] appoint as ffoloweth. Item, I give to Mary my wife all rights to her belonging, a[nd] also one bed with bed[ding] thereunto belonging. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath to my son John Stansfield, his heirs and assigns, all that one parte or [...] of that one messuage or tenem[en]t where I now dwell called Long Clough and also one p[ar]te of the housing or building com[m]only called as Kenson by the name or names as ffoloweth. In primis, the body of the house where I now live, the great parlour a[nd] chamber over them, a[nd] the buttery or sell[ar], and also the great barne, a[nd] one stable adjoyning to the house, Lower Stoneyroyd, a[nd] the green Hill Holme, a[nd] Holmebank, a[nd] the bank called the Hanging Bank, the clough a[nd] all the waist [sic] upward, New Earth, Calfeecroft, a[nd] great garden, all which said ten[em]lants, messuages, a[nd] lands pr[e]misises are in the tenure, holding, or occ[c]up[a]tion of me, the testator, or my assigns, to hold a[nd] com[m]only to have and to hold the s[a]id one p[ar]te or [...] of all the said messuage or tenem[en]ts a[nd] also one parte or [...] of all said housing or buildings, the body of the house, the great parlour and chambers ov[e]r them, also the buttery or seller, and also the great barne a[nd] one stable adjoyning to the little barne, and the great meadow under the house, Lower Stoneyroyd, a[nd] great Hill Holme, a[nd] Holme Bank, and the bank called the Hanging Bank, the clough, a[nd] all the waste upward, New Earth, Calfeecroft, and great garden togeth[e]r with all and singu[lar] houses, outhouses, barns, buildings, lands, grounds, closes, hereditaments, and pr[e]misises with their and ev[e]ry of their appurtenances unto my son John, his heirs and assigns, forever. Also chargeable neverthel[ess] with the payment of twenty pounds of good British money to my son, Richard Stansfield, and also with the payment of twenty pounds of good British money to my daught[e]r, Martha Stansfield, in man[n]er a[nd] forme as shall be hereafter[e] declared. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath unto my son James Stansfield, his heirs and assigns, all the rev[er]cion or remaining p[ar]te of all my afores[a]id messuages, lands,
tene[men]ts a[nd] buildings whatsoever which I have note heretofore disposed of. In pr[imis] one roome called the shop also little parlour, chamber over it, a washouse, and the little barne, and also the bent me[a]dow, a[nd] carr, the High Stoneyroyd, Highfield, a flaugh, also the great bank, little bank, a[nd] old garden [...] all which remaining parte of all my lands, messuages, and tenements or my assigns or und[er]tenants to have a[nd] to hold the said reverc[j]on a[nd] rev[er]c[i]ons, remaind[er] a[nd] the remaining parts of all my said messuages, lands, tenem[en]ts, or buildings, the aforesaid shop, little parlour, cham[be]r ov[e]r it, a[nd] washouse, and the little barne, also the bent meadow a[nd] carr, High Stoneyroyd, Highfield, a[nd] flaugh, also the great bank, little bank, a[nd] old garden, together with all and singul[a]r houses, outhouses, barns, buildings, lands, grounds, closes, hereditaments, a[nd] pr[e]mises with their and ev[e]ry of their appurtenances unto my son James, his heirs and assigns, forever. Also chargeable nevertheless with the payment of twenty pounds of good British money to my son Richard Stansfield, a[nd] also the further sum of twenty pounds to my daught[e]r Susan Stansfield as shall hereaft[e]r be specified a[nd] declared. Item, I give to my son Richard Stansfield the sume of fourty pounds of good British money to be paid as ffoloweth (viz) twenty pound parte thereof when he comes to his respective age of twenty a[nd] one years and the remaind[er] twenty pounds to be paid at the end of one whole yeare aft[e]r a[nd] the same to be paid as afores[ai]d by my son[s] John a[nd] James. And if my son Richard chance to die before he come to his respective age of twenty a[nd] one years then it is my will and mind that that afores[ai]d sume of fourty pounds shall be divided equally among so many of my children as shall be then living. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath to my daught[e]r Susan Stansfield the sum of twenty pounds of good British money to be paid as afores[ai]d. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath unto my daught[e]r Mary, the now wife of Abel Dearden, the sume of five shillings having in my lifetime paid her a competent port[i]on according to my oth[e]r daught[e]rs. Item, I give to my daught[e]r Martha Stansfield the sume of twenty pounds of good British money to be paid at her respective age of twenty one years or within one whole year after the same to be paid as afores[ai]d. And further provided by me a[nd] it is my will and mind that if my daught[e]r Martha chance to dye before she attain to her respective age of twenty one years that the afores[ai]d twenty pounds shall be divided equally among so many of my children as shall be then living as afores[ai]d. And further provided by me a[nd] it is my will a[nd] mind that if Mary my wife chance to dye before my daught[e]r Martha come to her respective age of twenty a[nd] one years then I do give to my daught[e]r Martha the sume of twenty shillings a
yeare out of all my messuages, lands, a[nd] tene[en]ts afores[ai]d a[nd] to be paid by my son[s] John a[nd] James equally betwixt them till she come to her full age of twenty one years, and all the rest, residue, a[nd] remaind[e]r of all my p[er]sonal estate after my debts to be paid, and ffun[er]al expenses discharges a[nd] the charges of the probat[i]on of this my last will a[nd] testament be discharged, I do give to all my children as shall then be living equally to be divided amongst them. And, lastly, I do nominate a[nd] appoint Mary, my wife, a[nd] my son John, joint execut[o]rs of this my p[re]sent last will a[nd] testament hoping they will truly p[er]forme the trust I have reposed in them.

In witness whereof, I, John Stansfield, the testator, have to this my last will a[nd] testament put my hand a[nd] seal the day a[nd] yeare first above written.

Sealed, signed, published, and declared by the within-named John Stansfield, t[he] testator, for his last will, in t[he] p[re]sence of us: Robert Holte, Thomas Stansfield.

The Inventory of John Stansfield, Long Clough, 1721

A trew and just inventory of all t[he] goods and chattles and credits of J[oh]n Stansfield of Long Clough in Hundersfield in t[he] p[ar]ish of Roachdale and county of Lancaster, late deceased, taken and apprised May t[he] 3: 1721.

In primis  li  s  d
purse and apparel 2  5
Goods in t[he] house
one fire iorn a[nd] other materials 1
remainder of t[he] goods in t[he] house 4  2  4
Goods in t[he] parlor
one coberd and one table 1  7
remainder of t[he] goods in t[he] parlor 1 12
Goods in t[he] chambers
4 beds and bedding 7
remainder of t[he] goods in t[he] chambers 6
Goods in t[he] buttery
pewter and brass 3
remainder of t[he] goods in t[he] buttery 2
Goods in t[he] shopp
2 pairs of loombs 2
remainder of t[he] goods in t[he] shop 5 15  4
Goods in the barn
6 cowes and 2 horses 26 17
remainder of the goods in the barne  4  16  2
Tilth and seding  7
Good and bad debts
  owing by J[oh]n Stansfield, his soon  13
  owing by Joseph Lord  1  13
  owing by J[oh]n Butterworth  3  8
  owing by James Holt  5  6
  89 17

Apprised by us: Abel Dearden
Appendix II: The Will of John Stansfield, Long Clough, 1745
LRO, WCW, INFRA, John Stansfield,
Longworth [sic: Long Clough], 1745

In the name of God, Amen. The fifth day of February one thousand seven hundred and forty-five. I, John Stansfield of Long Clough within Mid[dle] Hundersfield in the parish of Rochdale and county of Lancaster, yeoman, being weak of body but of perfect mind and memory, God be thanked, do constitute this my last will and testament in manner and form following and making the disposition of my estate real and personal I do give, order, direct, and appoint as followeth. In prims, I give to Susan, my dearly beloved wife, for term of life, the third of my land and tenement. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath to my son John Stansfield, his heirs and assigns, all my estate, messuage, or tenement, where I now dwell called Long Clough[h]. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath to my daughter Mary Stansfield, the sum of twenty pounds of good British money to be paid by my son John Stansfield when he comes to his respective age of twenty-one years. Item, I give, devise, and bequeath to my daughter Sarah Stansfield the sum of twenty pounds of good British money to be paid by my son John to be paid at her respective age of twenty-one years. And if my son John chance to die before he come to his respective age of twenty and one years then it is my will and mind that aforesaid estate of land be divided equally between my two daughters or if either of my daughters chance to die before the age abovementioned it is my will and mind the twenty pounds to be divided equally between the two living. All my whole personal estate, it is my will and mind, to be divided equally between my two daughters Mary and Sarah. In case either of my daughters chance to die before they come to the respective age of twenty and one years it is my will and mind that the personal estate be divided equally between the two survivors. I do give to my two daughters Mary and Sarah all the rest, residue, and remainder of all my personal estate aforesaid, my debts paid, and funeral expenses discharges, and the charges of the probate of this my last will and testament be discharged. And, lastly, I do nominate and appoint Susan, my wife, and my sister, Susan Stansfield, joint executrices of this my present last will and testament hoping they will truly perform the trust I have reposed in them.

In witness whereof, I, John Stansfield, the testator, have to this my last will and testament put my hand and seal the day and yeare first above written.

Sealed, signed, published, ad declared, by the within-named John Stansfield, the testator for his last will and testament, in the presence of us: Ralph Taylor, Mary Stansfield, John Lord.
The Inventory of John Stansfield, Long Clough, 1745

The inventory of the goods and chattels of John Stansfield of Long Clough in the county of Lancaster in the parish of Rochdale, lately deceased, yeoman, as followeth:

In primis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purse and apparel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goods in the house

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clock</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spice cupboard (2s.) a[nd] trest (6d.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 chaires (1s.), and mettle iron things (1s.6d.)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three iron potts (3s.) and 3 pans a[nd]</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brass pott (14s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goods in the parlour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>couch chair (5s.) a[nd] table (2s.6d.)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cupboard (12s.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pewter (20s.) and kist (1s.6d.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wooden vessels (5s.) a[nd] nings a[nd]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pots (2s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

House chamber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ark a[nd] meal (£2 10s.) a[nd] long kist (4s.6d.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one bed a[nd] bedding (5s.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chamber over parlour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed a[nd] bedding (2s.6d.) a[nd] looms (5s.)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a[nd] kist a[nd] desk ([1]s.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cows a[nd] calf (£12 1s.) a[nd] hay (£2 6s.)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ark (10s.) a[nd] corn (1s.) a[nd] huslements (£5 4½d.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


19th October 1745, this inventory was exhibited by Susan Stansfield and Susan Stansfield, joint ex[ecu]tors names in the last will a[nd] testam[ent] of the said deceased for a full a[nd] true one.