

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England

Andy Wood

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

## Introduction

---

### **I The sons of Boaz and the daughters of Ruth**

Year after year, under burning summer sun or unseasonal rain, their backs breaking and their calloused hands sore, the gleaners carefully gathered the remnants of the harvest. Century after century, this was the lot of the poor of agrarian England: some were the wives and children of the men who reaped in the fields. Others were old folk without sufficient kin to support them in their declining years. A few were passing vagrants or wandering labourers, who, driven by hope and hunger, sought to blend in amongst the village poor, collect a bag of grain and move on.

God looked upon the gleaners and smiled. The Book of Ruth told them so. The Scriptures describe how divine revelation occurred in the humanized landscape of Bronze Age Palestine within a social structure defined by extremes of wealth and poverty. This was a world that the people of Tudor, Stuart and early Georgian England might have felt that they recognized. The Book of Ruth articulates the ideal social values of this settled, rural society. It tells of how, in a time of famine, the widow Ruth, accompanied by her sons, her aged mother-in-law Naomi and her sister-in-law, set off to the land of Moab, which God had blessed with a rich harvest. On their way, at the time of the barley harvest, they passed by Bethlehem. Naomi had a kinsman there called Boaz, 'a mighty man of wealth', and Ruth suggested to the others that they should glean in his fields. As the King James Bible told the story in 1611, 'Boaz came from Bethlehem, and said unto the reapers, The Lord bee with you; and they answered him, the Lord blesse thee.' Then came Ruth and asked permission to glean after the reapers; Boaz acceded to the request, adding that they could share the reapers' food and drink. Ruth asked him, 'Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldest take knowledge of me, seeing I am a stranger?' to which Boaz replied that he had learnt of her goodness, adding the prayer that 'The Lord recompense thy worke, and a full reward be given thee of the Lord God of Israel

2 Introduction

under whose wings thou art come to trust.’ Ruth kneeled gratefully before Boaz; ‘when she was risen up to glean, Boaz commanded his young men, saying, Let her glean even among the sheaves, & reproach her not and let fall also some of the handfuls of purpose for her, and leave them that she may glean them, and rebuke her not’. Ruth and her family stayed on in Bethlehem for the barley and wheat harvests. In the end, Boaz did well: at the conclusion of the story, Ruth married him and went on to bear Obed, the grandfather of King David.<sup>1</sup> If the Book of Ruth were insufficiently clear, then in Leviticus God underlined the point, telling Moses that he should instruct the Israelites as follows: ‘When ye reape the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make cleane riddance of the corners of the field, when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poore, and to the stranger.’<sup>2</sup> There were clear messages here for the propertied classes of early modern England: be kind to the poor, especially to widows; allow them food and drink and let them glean in your fields; encourage your labourers not to do their job so thoroughly that nothing is left for the poor. Then you too will be rewarded with their deference and prayers. Lodged within *Ruth* and *Leviticus* were fundamental, organizing ideas concerning social responsibility, reciprocity, charity and entitlement. That these ideals were imparted via a story about gleaning was perhaps unsurprising: that the claims of the poor to a share of the harvest required divine sanction suggests that, even in Old Testament times, it was a contentious practice.

In early modern England, gleaning formed a key component of a wider body of customary practices. From the point of view of the village poor, custom validated their claims to glean for grain after the harvest, to pasture an animal on the common or to collect firewood. Those claims were often contested by established, landed householders – men and women of middling status, many of them copyholders. To them, custom underwrote the terms of their copyhold leases, which amongst other things guaranteed them common rights. Here, too, there was potential conflict: with manorial lords, who perceived custom as sanctioning dues, rents and services from their copyholders and legitimizing the squeeze they were placing upon their estates. Custom, then, was a *discursive field*: a body of ideas that sanctioned claims to rights, office, space, land and resources. Most customs were built up, generation after generation, encoding social practices just as they became habitual. That only gleaning received explicit divine sanction was perhaps just

<sup>1</sup> *The Holy Bible* (London, 1611), Ruth 1–3.

<sup>2</sup> *The Holy Bible* (London, 1611), Leviticus 23:22.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England

Andy Wood

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## The sons of Boaz and the daughters of Ruth

3

as well; for, of all claims to customary entitlements, it was one of the most divisive.

Historians have shown that gleaning contributed a significant proportion of poor families' household income.<sup>3</sup> But, like the whole field of custom, gleaning was about more than the straightforward assertion of material need. As *Leviticus* and *Ruth* made clear, gleaning also invoked community, duty, morality, responsibility, reciprocity and godliness. Every year, as the gleaners arrived in the harvest fields, the social ideals of the Book of Ruth were made real. Notably, these ideals ran counter to the material interests of landholders to maximize the output from their fields. Boaz may have instructed his workforce to leave something to Ruth and her family, but in Tudor, Stuart and early Georgian England many farmers and gentry saw gleaners as near-criminal parasites.<sup>4</sup> Sometimes, elites needed to be reminded of their Christian duty: in 1665, a Lancashire gentleman who criticized his reapers for leaving too much grain behind them received the question, 'What shall we leave for the poor ones?'<sup>5</sup> Elsewhere, though, the authorities knew their responsibilities. When, in August 1612, the governors of Lincoln drew up regulations for the government of gleaning on the city's fields, they added that these rules had been laid down 'to the end that the poor may have and take the gleanings of the fields as fully as hath in ancient time been used, and as in charity and by the ancient custom of this Christian

<sup>3</sup> P. King, 'Customary Rights and Women's Earnings: The Importance of Gleaning to the Rural Labouring Poor, 1750–1850', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, 44 (3) (1991): 461–76; R. W. Bushaway, *By Rite: Custom, Ceremony and Community in England, 1700–1880* (London, 1982), pp. 138–48.

<sup>4</sup> It is significant that criticism of gleaning was often linked to the prosecution of poor people for collecting fuel. For examples, see NRO, T/QS/1, fol. 6r; S. Hindle, "'Not by Bread Only'? Common Right, Parish Relief and Endowed Charity in a Forest Economy, c.1600–1800', in S. King and A. Tomkins (eds.), *The Poor in England, 1700–1850: An Economy of Makeshifts* (Manchester, 2003), pp. 39–75, at p. 59. In sheep-rearing areas, gleaning was also linked to poor people's practice of gathering bits of wool left in fences by sheep or dropped by shearers. For examples, see E. W. C., 'Burton Agnes', in *Miscellanea, II*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, 74 (Wakefield, 1929), pp. 87, 88, 90. For the regulation of wool-gathering, see D. Woodward (ed.), *The Farming and Memorandum Books of Henry Best of Elmsewell, 1642*, British Academy Records of Social and Economic History, new series, 8 (Oxford, 1984). For the restriction of this practice, see A. Winchester, 'Upland Commons in Northern England', in M. De Moor, L. Shaw-Taylor and P. Warde (eds.), *The Management of Common Land in North-West Europe, c.1500–1850* (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 33–58, at p. 52; C. Brears, 'The Fen Laws of Common', *Lincolnshire Notes and Queries*, 20 (1928–9): 58–64, 74–7, at p. 64. In metal-mining areas, poor people who gathered to collect shards of tin or lead ore which, like the bits of wool collected from shearing, they could sell for a couple of pennies, were also compared to gleaners. For an example, see BL, Add. MS 6676, fols. 136v–60r.

<sup>5</sup> T. E. Gibson (ed.), *Crosby Records: A Cavalier's Notebook* (London, 1880), p. 136.

4 Introduction

kingdom they ought to have'.<sup>6</sup> It was not just in Lincoln where urban authorities felt a duty to protect gleaners' rights. In 1587, the court leet of Manchester ruled that as 'the Over Acres and Nether Acres had been usually kept open for the getting-in of the corn til Candlemas, to the great easement of the poor inhabitants; the jury crave the same may be used as it hath been accustomed.'<sup>7</sup> In a sense, gleaning gave the poor their place, one which some may have been happy to accept: gleaners in Methwold (Norfolk) in 1692 had no difficulty in identifying themselves as part of a crowd of 'poore women & girls' who were exercising their right.<sup>8</sup>

For all that the Lincoln authorities understood the gleaners' rights as sanctioned by Scripture and custom, they knew that they had a duty to crack down on what they called 'disordered gleaners'. Noting that the city's fields were subject to intrusion by gleaners before the harvest had been completed, the aldermen established rules for the government of the practice. Gleaning was limited only to those too poor to pay the lay subsidy. Gleaning was only to occur between eight o'clock in the morning and five o'clock in the evening. No one was to glean in any field until the corn had been led from it, or to put their gleanings into a sack but rather were to make the corn up into 'handfuls and bundles, as hath anciently been done'.<sup>9</sup>

Judicial, manorial and borough authorities across England knew that, unless strictly regulated, gleaning could become chaotic, as gleaners trespassed upon fields where the corn had not been reaped or dug about in corn stacks before the harvest had been led away. Desperate poor folk crowding onto freshly reaped fields could lead to trouble: in north Norfolk in 1659, it was noted that the village poor always made sure that their children were close to hand when gleaning commenced, in order to be sure of taking in the largest possible gathering.<sup>10</sup> The authors of manorial by-laws anxiously sought to regulate gleaning, trying to establish some kind of property rights over this most problematic of practices. Elsewhere, the county bench lent upon parochial authorities to impose order.<sup>11</sup> Even the greatest peers in the land were troubled by these matters: in 1580, the earl of Shrewsbury received a letter from

<sup>6</sup> HMC, 14th Report, VIII, Lincoln MSS, 87. For the biblical legitimation of gleaning, see GA, D354913/1/F4.

<sup>7</sup> J. Harland (ed.), *Court Leet Records of the Manor of Manchester, 1586–1602*, Chetham Society, 65 (Manchester, 1865), p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> TNA, E134/5Wm&Mar/Mich21.

<sup>9</sup> HMC, 14th Report, VIII, Lincoln MSS, 87.

<sup>10</sup> NRO, NQS C/S2/2, July 1659, Fakenham Sessions.

<sup>11</sup> For examples, see East Riding of Yorkshire Archives and Records Services, zDDX24/1/13; NRO, PD209/210.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England

Andy Wood

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## The sons of Boaz and the daughters of Ruth

5

his steward discussing the need to keep gleaners from the harvest until it had been reaped.<sup>12</sup>

In the eyes of both yeomen farmers and of their lords, gleaning was discretionary: it was a privilege allowed by them to the poor, which could be withdrawn as they saw fit. It was definitely *not* an entitlement. In contrast, the poor persisted in seeing gleaning as a right, guaranteed by custom.<sup>13</sup> The poor had a common interest in the defence of gleaning; but in its everyday assertion they sometimes fell to blows. In 1623, the poor folk of the neighbouring settlements of Ashill and Great Cressingham (Norfolk) fell to ‘blood-shed’ over gleaning rights in some recently enclosed fields.<sup>14</sup> If gleaning sometimes set one poor man or woman against another, so it could also generate some nasty struggles between rich and poor. In August 1606, Johanne Belgrave and Margery Hill were gleaning for corn in a field in Fulham (Middlesex) when Sir Henry Barker, the lessee of the parochial tithes, sent his servant John Stephens to ride into the field and beat Johanne with a cudgel. Challenging his masculine honour, Margery Hill (‘being a very aged woman’) shouted that ‘if he were a man he would not offer that great abuse unto her’. Stephens turned his horse about and rode over Margery Hill, beating her black and blue. When Sir Henry Barker was informed of the struggle, he deployed his powers as a magistrate, setting the women in the stocks in Hammersmith, where they were kept for two days.<sup>15</sup>

In crisis moments, the poor gleaner could even become, to her propertied neighbours, the bearer of levelling revolution: in 1649, the inhabitants of Ashwell (Hertfordshire) complained to the county bench that ‘divers evil and lewd persons of loose carriage’ were disturbing the peace of the neighbourhood. Not only were these people refusing to labour in the fields, ‘going of stout body and strong to labour’, but

the more to practise their wicked designs have agreed not to work with the said inhabitants in harvest but upon excessive wages, and out of wilfullnes and perverse humours are ready to lay hould upon any occasion to enter into tumult and disorder thereby to seek rappyne and pillage. And have further agreed out of contentious dispositions to enrich themselves under colour of gleaning in

<sup>12</sup> Sheffield Archives, BFM/2/44.

<sup>13</sup> For an example, see J. A. Sharpe, ‘Enforcing the Law in the Seventeenth-Century English Village’, in V. A. C. Gattrell, B. Lenman and G. Parker (eds.), *Crime and the Law: The Social History of Crime in Western Europe since 1500* (London, 1980), p. 106.

<sup>14</sup> N. Whyte, *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory, 1500–1800* (Oxford, 2009), p. 81.

<sup>15</sup> TNA, STAC8/8/4. Sir Henry Barker’s answer doesn’t dispute the facts of the case, only the slight which these poor women had set upon his honour. For a similar case, see TNA, STAC8/209/8.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the  
 Past in Early Modern England  
 Andy Wood  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

6 Introduction

harvest to carry away the grain from the owners thereof to their great wrong and damage if not timely prevented.<sup>16</sup>

Perturbed by this linkage between gleaning and wages, the Bench ordered the petty constables to search the houses of anyone suspected of gleaning and to bring all likely offenders before the magistracy.

Gleaning, then, was a sensitive subject, not least because it drew sharp lines within local society. *Ruth* and *Leviticus* were clear that the poor should be allowed to glean. But who were the poor? And what, when and how should they be allowed to glean? Given too much laxity, any kind of labouring person might start to assert claims over stacks of freshly reaped grain. The practice amongst East Riding farmers as noted by the yeoman Henry Best in 1642 was to allow the wives and children of workers to glean during the shearing of the corn, but not during the reaping. Best added the note that ‘Wee neaver suffer any such to gleane as wee finde able and unwilling to worke.’<sup>17</sup> Henry Best was not alone in seeing gleaning as the rightful entitlement of those unable to work: those members of the expanding rural proletariat who had the strength were to labour in the fields of their betters, not to glean the remains of the harvest.

Gleaning was a difficult issue not least because, for employers, it represented a dividing line within the ranks of the village poor, separating those who could labour from those that could not. Charity and labour relations were thereby intermingled. Certainly, gleaning was something which manor courts were anxious to regulate, specifying it sufficiently closely as to allow little space to its claimants. Orders passed by the manor court of Stretham (Cambridgeshire) in 1614 were clear enough: noting that ‘divers idle evill disposed persons under pretence and colour of glaying doe often times in time of Harvest’ take away the corn of the ‘inhabitants of Stretham’, it was laid down that only those who were aged under sixteen or over sixty, ‘or being otherwise sicklie’ may glean.<sup>18</sup> Undated by-laws established ‘for the good of the whole comonalty’ of Driffield (Yorkshire) included restrictions on gleaning until ‘men had led their corn away’ and their ‘due stubble’; the parish

<sup>16</sup> W. Le Hardy (ed.), *Calendar of the Sessions Books and Sessions Minute Books and Other Sessions Records of the County of Hertford, 1619 to 1657*, Hertford County Records, 10 vols. (Hertford, 1928), vol. V, p. 395.

<sup>17</sup> Woodward, *Farming and Memorandum Books*, p. 46.

<sup>18</sup> W. Cunningham (ed.), ‘Common Rights at Cottenham and Stretham in Cambridgeshire’, *Camden Miscellany*, 2nd series, 12 (1910): 267–71. See also M. Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 82.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England

Andy Wood

Excerpt

[More information](#)

The sons of Boaz and the daughters of Ruth

7

constable was instructed to search out ‘sheave stealers’ and those who ‘gleaned without right’.<sup>19</sup>

Proponents of an absolute right in property (whose voices grew ever more clamorous during the early modern period) saw in customary rights such as gleaning a fundamental threat to universal ideas of private property.<sup>20</sup> After all, in its practical form, gleaning hovered on the boundary between the legal and the illegal, as the Somerset blacksmith found who explained to the county bench that corn found in his house hadn’t been stolen but represented the fruit of his children’s assertion of the right to glean.<sup>21</sup> In every struggle over gleaning, what was at stake was more than the ability of a few poor folk to gather some bags of grain. At stake were fundamental organizing ideas about social relations, property, authority, entitlement and labour discipline. Gleaning rendered problematic the assumption – fundamental to any fully capitalist regime – that private property should be absolute and universal.<sup>22</sup> Gleaning implied the opposite: that property was a social construct, the product of the intermingling of habit, experience, compromise, struggle and long usage. For ordinary people, then, the right to glean may have been the most challenging political question in early modern England.

Repetition is an important element of any culture. *Year after year, under burning summer sun or unseasonal rain, their backs breaking and their calloused hands sore, the gleaners carefully gathered the remnants of the harvest.* As they faced down the insults of the farmers, or smiled at the strong reapers, the gleaners knew that they were labouring in fields in which, the previous year, and the year before that, they had scratched about for corn. Perhaps, for the established village poor, their ancestors had gleaned in those very fields too. How much of this did poor folk remember? It is often claimed that rural workers have an unusually strong social memory.<sup>23</sup> To what extent did poorer and middling people

<sup>19</sup> S. Harrison, *The History of Driffield: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000* (Pickering, 2002), p. 166.

<sup>20</sup> James C. Scott notes that in some rural communities, individual freehold failed to capture the complexity of land uses. J. C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, Conn., 1998), p. 38.

<sup>21</sup> E. H. Bates (ed.), *Quarter Sessions Records of the County of Somerset*, vol. III: *Commonwealth, 1646–1660*, Somerset Record Society, 28 (London, 1912), p. 286.

<sup>22</sup> For more on this, see Scott, *Seeing like a State*, p. 49.

<sup>23</sup> For the proposition (not empirically supported) that peasants have a strong social memory, see R. Schulte, *The Village in Court: Arson, Infanticide and Poaching in the Court Records of Upper Bavaria, 1848–1910* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 8; J. M. Neeson, *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700–1820* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 292; J. Thirsk, *Tudor Enclosures* (London, 1959), p. 7; P. Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 17. For a fuller discussion,

Cambridge University Press  
 978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the  
 Past in Early Modern England  
 Andy Wood  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

8 Introduction

have any coherent senses of the past, any way of situating themselves in historical time? To frame the question a different way, did ordinary people in early modern England possess a *social memory*? This book tries to provide some answers to that question.

**II At the deathbed of John Lorinch: custom, locality and popular memory**

Around about the accession of Queen Elizabeth, John Lorinch of the Gloucestershire village of Southam lay dying, his kin, friends and neighbours gathered about him.<sup>24</sup> Possibly, as a good father, he spoke to his son William and his daughter Anne of his love for them. Perhaps he shared happy memories with his neighbours. No doubt some of those neighbours gathered to swap stories or to settle quarrels: the early modern deathbed was a social place, and the passing away of an aged and respected member of the village community was a moment to be marked. One of the issues that, in his last hours, preoccupied John Lorinch was a matter of pressing interest to the village as a whole. He was concerned to unburden himself of important knowledge about the customs of the manor, especially as they bore upon a festering conflict between the people of Southam and those of the adjacent village of Bishop's Cleeve. The dispute concerned the right to an area of common land, called Cleeve Hills.

Because he had roots in both villages, being a tenant of both Bishop's Cleeve and Southam, John may have been saddened by the conflict between the communities. Alice Barne remembered John Lorinch's deathbed words clearly enough. 'Laying his hedd in [her] lappe nott passing one half hower before he died he then being in good memory', John commanded that his son William should not support any action by the inhabitants of Southam against Bishop's Cleeve concerning Cleeve Hills. His daughter Anne spoke to him, saying 'father you have comen uppon the said wast ground or co[mm]en', to which he answered, saying that indeed he had common rights on Cleeve Hills, but this was in his right as a tenant of Bishop's Cleeve, and not as one of Southam.<sup>25</sup> In Anne's hearing, her father provided William Lorinch with information

see F. Zonabend, *The Enduring Memory: Time and History in a French Village* (Manchester, 1984).

<sup>24</sup> The deathbed scene is evocatively described in K. Wrightson, *Ralph Taylor's Summer: A Scrivener, His City and the Plague* (New Haven, Conn., 2011), pp. 98–111. For attitudes to death, see R. Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion and the Family in England, 1480–1750* (Oxford, 1998).

<sup>25</sup> TNA, E134/6Eliz/Trin1.



that ‘There is variance about the hills you made not to care for you have comon in ev[er]y quarter ther which words were spoken wth a feynte voyce.’<sup>26</sup>

The exact nature of John Lorinch’s dying speech, then, was a subject of debate. That of the elders of Southam seemed more certain. John Carpenter remembered that he had gone to see William Kere, ‘being very syck uppon his dethe bedd’. They discussed the dispute over Cleeve Hills, and William ‘seid to his wief oh lett them have itt lett them have itt for they be in the right’. The dying man explained that the tenants of Southam ‘hathe in farther right of comen uppon the said downe then to a place called Castell dyche’. John Kere, William’s son, standing by the bed, then said to his brother Richard, ‘standing att the bedds feete Richard take you hede of this & there w[he]r[e]at my fathers seyde & take you hede of hitt’. Richard Kere remembered all of this well enough: in his account, he had been present at his father’s deathbed with his neighbours when his father told him ‘that he shuld nott make or meddle with the inhabitants of Southam in meyntheyning the sute agenst the inhabitants of cleve towching the comon downe or wast called cleve hills’.<sup>27</sup>

Communicating the customs of the manor and parish was one of the duties of old men and women, a duty that even intruded into the deathbed scene.<sup>28</sup> Passing on information or advice about local custom was not only the duty of common folk like John Lorinch. As he lay dying, sometime around 1623, Leonard Stavelie, the parish minister of Pettistree (Suffolk) also felt moved to offer directions concerning struggles over customary rights within his village. At the time, one of the parishioners, John Lane, was arguing with his neighbours over the tithing customs. As he lay dying, Stavelie said that Lane intended to overthrow the customs ‘if the town did not look into it’.<sup>29</sup> The issue of parochial tithes also disturbed the final hours of a dying Kentishman in 1554. William Weston explained how, following struggle between himself, as lessee of the tithe rights of the parish of Ightham and the minister of Wrotham over the produce of a field called Borne Croft, ‘he came unto William Tyrrie, beinge a man of the age of 60 years and upwards, being a paryshioner, and lyinge on his deathe bed sicke of a sickness, of the whiche he deceased’. Weston asked the old man’s advice concerning the struggle over Borne Croft,

<sup>26</sup> TNA, E134/7Eliz/East1.    <sup>27</sup> TNA, E134/6Eliz/Trin1.

<sup>28</sup> For other examples, see TNA, E134/3JasI/Mich30; TNA, E134/25&26Eliz/Mich22; TNA, DL4/24/5. For a vivid deathbed scene, see TNA, DL4/24/5.

<sup>29</sup> TNA, E134/20JasI/Mich7.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-0-521-89610-8 - The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the  
 Past in Early Modern England  
 Andy Wood  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

10 Introduction

to whom the sayde William Tyrrie made aunswere agayne and said, I am the more sorrie and you have the more wronge. And adding sayde, for that I am gods prysonor and lyke to go no more upon the yearthe, I praye you beare witnesse what I shall saye. Sixty years have I knowne this same paryshe and in thirty years in the same tyme I did carrie quietlie nine times the tithe corne of the same grounde unto the parsonage barne of Ightham. And I never knew or hard that ever the tythe of the same grounde was carried unto Wrotham.<sup>30</sup>

It was not only matters of tithe or manorial custom that imposed themselves on the dying thoughts of old men and women. Long-gone relationships in the village might also be invoked. That between servant and master preoccupied Richard Lightfoot of Dutton (Cheshire) as he lay dying in 1681. Richard had been a household servant to Lord and Lady Kilmory for twenty-eight years, mostly at Dutton Hall. On his deathbed, Richard called to his wife, Elizabeth, saying

in a very serious and concern[e]d manner, ... Love I am very much concern[e]d as to the Little Chancel belonging to Dutton ... that it should be lost, for it belongs to Dutton, and I leave thee to say, that it belongs to Dutton, for my old Lord and the Ladys who came in the coaches and the serv[ant]s when they came to Weverham Church used still to sit there.<sup>31</sup>

The parish church was a key site within which social relations were both mapped and enacted. In this, memory was critical, validating claims by individuals such as the lords of Dutton Hall to a prominent place in the chancel, and thereby to pre-eminence in the parish.

The local occupied a central place in popular culture: it was where identities were made, social relations performed and agency asserted. For subaltern groups across time, popular memory has often meant local memory: James C. Scott quotes a telling Javanese proverb: 'The capital has its order, the village its customs.'<sup>32</sup> Fundamental to this is a sense of the past. Studies of working-class politics and identities in the modern epoch have repeatedly emphasized the importance of a sense of the local, and the embeddedness of remembering in key sites, productive of a sense of remembered place that underwrites collectivities.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> E. Harrison, 'The Court Rolls and Other Records of the Manor of Ightham as a Contribution to Local History: Second and Final Part', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 49 (1936): 1–95, at p. 85.

<sup>31</sup> Cheshire Record Office, EDC5 (1701)7.

<sup>32</sup> Scott, *Seeing like a State*, p. 33.

<sup>33</sup> For memory and locality, see T. Blokland, 'Bricks, Mortar, Memories: Neighbourhood and Networks in Collective Acts of Remembering', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25 (2) (2001): 268–83. The importance of the local in the working-class culture of modern England was central to key studies of the 1950s: R. Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life* (London, 1957); M. Young and P. Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London* (London, 1957).