

*A social history of Loweswater -  
through three periods of change.*

**A talk given to Lorton & Derwent Fells Local History Society, by Dr Derek Denman,  
on 13 June 2019**

Speaking text.

**Slide 1**

Good evening, and thank you for coming. My subject is Loweswater, and I have called it a social history because I would like to cover the people and the changes in their lives through recorded history.

This is a one-off talk, and so the slides tend to include some of my notes, to help me along. Firstly, I should say that this is not all my own work, though there is original research here. I must acknowledge the works of Angus Winchester, particularly in the medieval period, and of course Roz Southey for her sketches of Loweswater life. And the various studies which have been done by society members, particularly by Roger Asquith, whose work you will find in our Journals online.

**Slide 2**

What I hope to do is to take three historical periods, and to look at, effectively, the emancipation for the people of Loweswater, from feudal peasants to property owners with control of their lives. Unfortunately, I will not have time to cover people other than the property owners. I will stop 100 years ago, since when little has changed.

**Slide 3**

What basic factors have determined the nature of the lives of Loweswater's people? Firstly, the economic aspects of their lives were dependent of sheep. The crops and the cattle were primarily for subsistence, but the flocks of sheep on the vast fells provided the wool and cloth for trading. This was always the case and still is, with a little income from tourism.

**Slide 4**

The second factor affecting their political lives, or fighting rather than working, was the border with Scotland.

In 800 there was no border and therefore no real difference in ethnicity or culture north and south of the future border. In around 900 there was the peaceful Norse-Irish settlement from the west, following their expulsion from Dublin. The Norman border was a new separation.

**Slide 5**

William the Conqueror did not take Cumbria, which remained part of Strathclyde until 1092. so Loweswater is not in the Domesday Book. Also, while Northumberland rebelled in 1069/70 and was subject to the terrible harrowing of the North, Loweswater continued peacefully.

**Slide 6**

Cumberland's turn to join Norman England came in 1092, when William Rufus took Carlisle, built Carlisle castle and created the border. He imported many southern peasants to settle the area, but I think that would be around Carlisle, and the hamlets such as Loweswater would not be affected.

**Slide 7**

After Cumberland joined Norman England, the baronies were created. Initially there were two baronies in West Cumberland, divided by the Derwent., to the South was given to a Norman, William le Meschin, while Allerdale was retained by Waldeof a native Anglo-Scot, seated at Papcastle.

Around 1100 the Five Towns and Derwentfells were transferred to Waldeof and the Cocker became a significant boundary. This unified the control of the Derwent Valley under a native lord. Loweswater and Thackthwaite remained in the barony of Egremont. Angus Winchester will be covering this in more detail in October.

**Slide 8.**

Coming to my first Loweswater person, Ranulph de Lindesay, who gave Loweswater Chapel to the Priory of St Bega – which I will call St Bees. He was part of the family which created Crawford Castle, and part of the retinue of David I of Scotland. I said the Cumberland joined Norman England in 1092, but it reverted to Scotland again during the anarchy, or the civil war between Stephen and Matilda. From 1139 Cumberland was ceded to David, who moved his seat to Carlisle Castle. David was mostly responsible for the feudalisation and monastic creations in Southern Scotland. My guess is that David's control was not unwelcome to the lord of Allerdale, who was now Alan, son of Wadeof, and that this area escaped the worst of the unpleasantness meted out to the areas which contained those imported southern peasants.

We know that Ranulph de Lindesay was with David and Alan at Lamplugh in about 1140, and that Ranulph gained some local property by his marriage to Alan's sister. How Ranulph acquired Loweswater, we do not know, but he gave to St Bees the chapel at Loweswater – which clearly already existed – together with enough land for a peasant holding, which became the Kirkstile.

#### **Slide 9**

Which is why this image was used for the poster for the publicity. Two buildings on the same sites and in common ownership until the dissolution of the monasteries.

The Kirkstile would have two functions, as accommodation for a priest as needed, and as a grange to manage the Priory's growing agricultural interest in Loweswater.

#### **Slide 10**

When the Baron of Egremont, Richard de Lucy, died in 1213 he left a widow and two young daughters, Alice and Amabel who were about six and seven. They became wards of the King until they came of age at fourteen, and Thomas de Multon purchased that wardship from the King. He then consolidated his family position by marrying the widow, and then further by marrying his two sons by his previous marriage to Amabel and Alice.

In 1230 his first son Lambert and Amabel, acquired the Barony of Egremont, but because the sisters were equal heiresses, part of the barony had to be given to Alice and her husband Alan. That part became the manor of Loweswater, and was held directly of the King.

Alan de Multon and his son Thomas held Loweswater, though Thomas took the Lucy name from his mother. His son Anthony became Lord of Cokermouth around 1323, and that confirmed Loweswater's feudal relationship with Cokermouth, rather than Egremont.

#### **Slide 11**

We can reconstruct the part of the barony of Egremont which went to Alice and Alan in 1230. Here the full barony is bounded in a black dashed line, while the part of it going to Alice and Alan is bounded in red. You can see that it contained the hamlets of Loweswater, Thackthwaite, Mockerkin and Sosgill. This seems to be the origin of the curious ecclesiastical parish of Loweswater that we know today, created in 1230 because a man had two daughters and no son. I should say that Thackthwaite at this time was already granted to a freeholder within the barony, and Alan de Multon became the superior lord of the free tenant. Mosser was separate, which soon led to territorial disputes.

Alice and Alan had other property, including Caldbeck for example, but primarily they held Derwentfells as the superior lord. The places I have shown in red were some that they held, including Lorton, and also part of Whinfell in Five Towns. It would seem that the new manor was carved out in that position to join with Derwentfells across the Cocker valley, and to point to Cokermouth rather than Egremont.

You can see that the new manor contained about ten thousand acres, and had value for keeping sheep and for hunting.

#### **Slide 12**

This plan is rather speculative, but it tries to show the likely extent of the hamlet of Loweswater in the thirteenth century – which was a period of great growth, before the depopulation of the fourteenth Century. The light colour represents the enclosed lands, with the farmsteads strung along the road, apart from the Kirkstile. The natural boundaries are the manor boundaries at the Cocker and Crabtreebeck, and the beck connecting the two

lakes. The reason for this location is the pre-Norman open arable and meadow land shown on the flat fertile land there. The corn mill is not recorded, but will have been there at that time. After Alan de Mutton became Lord, in 1230, he created the deer park by a new enclosure to the south. His son, Thomas de Lucy, was more active. He extended the Park, and gave a large pasture called the Shepegate to the Monks of St Bees.

There is another part of Loweswater to the west of the lake. The name suggests that the Waterend and the Places area was once a sheeling or scales on the common. How much land was enclosed there by 1290, I have no idea.

Lastly, Thomas de Lucy created a building called Bal-nes, on the promontory into Crummock. The manor was sometimes called Bal-nes.

### **Slide 13**

There are no remains of the building, and its moat may be prehistoric. The short period of its records suggests that it may have been defensive during the first Scottish war of independence. The forces of Robert the Bruce came this way in 1322, and that may have been the end of Bal-nes. In 1323 Anthony de Lucy was granted Cockermouth Castle and later the Park was let to tenants.

This does point up that the inhabitants were vassals who had to both work on land which belonged to the lord, and had to fight for the lord in the service of the King against the Scots, though in the case of Edward I this was not to defend the Norman border, but to invade and conquer Scotland.

### **Slide 14**

We know that there was a chapel at Loweswater in the twelfth century, but not which people it served. In the thirteenth century there was an intention to raise it to the status of a parochial chapel, with a burial ground and a chaplain. A licence was given to the Priory to do this in 1281, when Tomas de Lucy was lord. But this did not happen until 1403, under the Earls of Northumberland. From some point in time, the chapel served the traditional four quarters, Thackthwaite quarter, Low quarter, which was Mockerkin and Sosgill, Park quarter and Middle quarter. I imagine these are long gone. By the way, Thackthwaite was not just the small hamlet, in 1545 Thackthwaite started at Foulisyke.

### **Slide 15**

The border dominated the lives of the Loweswater peasants as fighters, but sheep dominated their lives as workers. This slide just reminds us that the manor had about ten thousand acres of commons, mainly for farming sheep. The sheep are not to scale.

### **Slide 16**

Just how many sheep were there? Thomas Denton noted the sheep in Lorton, but his comments are more appropriate to Loweswater, where arable land is very limited. In 1839, there were 7000 sheep in Loweswater tithe accounts, or about twenty per inhabitant.

There was conflict over the ownership and use of this valuable resource, particularly with Mosser.

### **Slide 17**

The inhabitants also had a cuckoo in the nest in the shape of St Bees Priory and its rights to keep sheep, exercised through its grange at the Kirkstile. The income of the monasteries was based on the export of fleeces and cloth. In Loweswater their Shepegate presumably allowed them to overwinter large numbers of sheep.

As well as their own flock they also help the valuable tithes of lambs and wool, so that every tenth lamb and every tenth fleece belonging to the other inhabitants, had to be delivered to the monk's farmer at the Kirkstile.

St Bees was dissolved in 1539, and the property and rights were sold.

### **Slide 18**

Just to finish with sheep, I will jump ahead to the mid fifteenth century and the full development of the monastic business in Loweswater. This slide shows the Shepegate as I believe it was, and the Park let to tenants.

In 1437-8 land was allocated for a second fulling mill, belonging to John Richardson at Thursbank. A fulling mill is used to treat woollen cloth, and so it appears that there would be extensive cloth production in Loweswater, both for domestic use and for sale. The inhabitants would be engaged in spinning and weaving, both for themselves and presumably for St Bees. That second fulling mill appears to be Bargate, just outside of the shepegate. There is some evidence that the first was on an extension of the leet from the corn mill.

Work by Roger Asquith on wills shows that larger scale weaving and fulling in Loweswater is not evident in the seventeenth century, and it may be that the dissolution of St Bees in 1539 contributed to that.

The corn mill was also ceased in the later eighteenth century, while Lorton continued fulling well into the nineteenth century, and grinding corn for much longer.

### **Slide 19**

So, in 1300, Loweswater was truly feudal, and the tenants of property were the vassals of the de Lucies. There were three lines of authority for those who controlled Loweswater. The Church, including St Bees in this case, the Lord of the Manor, and the state as represented by the king. The power of the state was exercised through the lordship. The thickness of the lines is intended to illustrate the importance. This will change.

## **Part 2**

### **Slide 20**

In part 2 I will consider the changes for the people of Loweswater in early modern Tudor and Stuart England, which were considerable. I will just follow the main themes of peasants becoming landowners and of religious freedom.

During the 1400s the manor and the people were effectively the property of the Percys, the Earls of Northumberland. They were generally on the losing side in the wars of the roses, but under Henry VII from 1485, Henry Percy the 4<sup>th</sup> Earl was restored and was loyal to the crown, securing the border with Scotland.

Under Henry VII the direct control of the state was increased and the power of lordship was reduced. For example, barons such as the feuding Percys and Nevilles were no longer allowed to pay large numbers of retainers as private armies. The Council of the North and the appointment of a Lord-Lieutenant date from this period. Secondly, the system of Justices of the Peace was established, which took much of law enforcement away from the manor courts.

### **Slide 21**

So, looking at pre-reformation Loweswater, the manor and the chapelry were coherent, in that they both included Loweswater, Thackthwaite, Mockerkin and Sosgill, consistent with the creation in 1230, but having gained some land from Mosser.

Also, by 1500, I think it was the Percys who took Birkness as demesne grazing and combined it with Gatesgarth, and that possibly Scales Stinted pasture was also granted to the Loweswater inhabitants, perhaps as a compensation.

I am not going into the detail of the farm properties that existed pre-reformation.

### **Slide 22**

I will address this section through the activities of Richard Robynson of Loweswater, who died in 1549 in London. He left an extensive will, the first we have for a Loweswater person, which has been transcribed by Roger Asquith, and is available here.

He was clearly of Loweswater, and had no family because he was a priest, though curiously he made provision for the three children of a person in Ennerdale. There is a long list of bequests to Loweswater people, including his sister and cousin.

From the manorial records we know that he was Chaplain of Loweswater in 1508, and engaged also in farming. He appears for disputing the decisions of the manor authorities, and for cutting trees, and I assume he was resident at the Priory's property of the Kirkstile.

He next appears in 1832 as the priest at the Chantry of St Michael, at Brigham Church, where he was ejected on the orders of the sixth Earl, Henry Percy, for not fulfilling the role, which was basically to pray full-time for the souls of the Percys in purgatory. His reinstatement was ordered by the King, with the involvement of Thomas Cromwell, and Robynson was restored

in 1533. He clearly had powerful connections, possibly being one of Cromwell's agents. Henry Percy is best remembered for being betrothed to Anne Boleyn and later for collapsing at her trial. In 1531 Henry Percy had given or sold his Cumberland properties to Henry VIII, and so the King's intervention on the chantry would be justified. The better control of the barons in the north was clearly on the agenda, and Robynson seems to be the King's man, and not the Earl's.

### **Slide 23**

In 1531 Henry Percy gave or sold his Cumberland estates to the King, including Loweswater, but intending that they would later go to his nephew. However, the Percys were Catholic and the reformation caused them to revolt in 1536 in support of the monasteries, an event called the Pilgrimage of Grace. The Percy lands were considered forfeit, and Henry VIII felt able to sell some of them. Richard Robynson was allowed to purchase the manors of Loweswater and Thackthwaite in 1545, including the extensive commons. He did not receive Mockerkin and Sosgill, which eventually reverted to the Earls of Northumberland.

### **Slide 24**

Here is the image of Henry VIII from the grant of Loweswater to Robynson, from the Whitehaven archives.

### **Slide 25**

St Bees Priory was dissolved in 1539. Loweswater chapel and the valuable tithes of sheep and wool had belonged to the Priory and were been granted to Thomas Legh for 21 years. Robynson bought those rights for the people of Loweswater, so that for a while they could appoint their own priest and fund his living through the tithes. This grant expired and the rights to St Bees Parish eventually came to our good friends the Lowthers.

Who was Thomas Legh? His family held the manor of Frizzington. He was notorious, together with Richard Layton as the 'visitors' of the northern monasteries in 1535, creating the damning reports which justified their dissolution.

The other monastic property, that is the Kirkstile and the Shepegate, was granted by Edward VI to Lord Grey of Wilton in 1549. Lord Grey was a soldier who was rewarded for his defeat of the Scots at Musselborough, in what was called the rough wooing. This was the failed English campaign to have Edward married to Mary of Scotland, by force if necessary, thus uniting the two kingdoms.

The grant to Lord Grey contained a number of items clearly destined for Robynson, which would complete his ownership of Loweswater – except for Mockerkin and Sosgill.

It seems quite likely to me that Robynson was a local part of the Protestant reformation.

### **Slide 26**

Robynson died later in 1549, leaving his property to John Robynson, the 15 year old son of a Loweswater yeoman, clearly intending to establish an independent and Protestant Loweswater, owned by a benevolent dynasty of Robynsons.

The executor of the will was Thomas Stanley, who was to be responsible for the upbringing and training of John Robynson in his new responsibilities. The Robynson dynasty lasted only until 1562, when John Robynson sold all to Thomas Stanley.

Stanley was from Cumberland, of the Dalegarth Stanleys, but was also a goldsmith and master of the mint. He was responsible for Henry VIII's debasing of the currency, and for the new currency under Elizabeth.

### **Slide 27**

Here is an image of Thomas Stanley.

### **Slide 28**

During the Robynson period it seems that the newly acquired monastic property, that is the Kirkstile farm and the shepegate, were let to manorial tenants on the old basis at low fixed rents. The shepegate became the new Kirk Head farm, which was later held by the Hudsons, probably from the Buttermere Hudsons. Part of the shepegate became Bargate farm, based on the fulling mill.

Additionally, land seems to have been enclosed from the common. We know that Richard Robynson was first to try to enclose the Holmes for his own use in the 1540s. That is now the

lower part of Holme Wood next to the Lake. The people who objected to this were the tenants of Mockerkin and Sosgill, who were no longer part of the Loweswater Manor but had rights on the common. They were still under the control of the Percys, whose lands Robynson had acquired.

Robynson treated Loweswater and Thackthwaite favourably and new enclosures appear to have been made and let to tenants a low manorial rents. Part of Bargate, Steel Bank and High Nook. In orange on the slide.

Kirkhead is interesting because one customary acre was kept as freehold and became the manor house, possibly for John and Martha Robinson, but definitely for Henry Patrickson in the seventeenth century.

### **Slide 29**

Just to show you Kirkhead, which was developed from the manor house built on freehold land called the Hall Acre

### **Slide 30**

The two Robynsons were lords of the manor for about seventeen years, and for that time effectively Loweswater ran itself. It was probably during that time that the Loweswater tenants became independently minded and resistant to outside authority. Perhaps even after 1562, Thomas Stanley made little change as lord of the manor, and when he died in 1571, his daughter Mary inherited. She was the wife of Sir Edward Herbert, second son of the Earl of Pembroke, who became lord of the manor until 1592.

The second half of the century was a time of inflation when prices doubled. This was no trouble for the Loweswater tenants because they were self-sufficient and on fixed low rents. They would benefit from the higher prices for sheep and wool, and the values of their farms increased while their rents were fixed.

### **Slide 31.**

It was the sale of the manor in that year to Anthony Patrickson of Ennerdale, that would shake up the cosy arrangements, as Patrickson needed to take more income from the manor. He increased entry fines, which were payments made when there was a change of tenant or lord. These were arbitrary and could be related to the current economic value. He challenged their rights to wood, and denied their tenantry, that is their ability to pass their property to their heirs, which was linked to serving her majesty on the borders.

What is significant was that by now the tenants had access to legal remedies, and the ability and funds to be able to defend their tenantry at law, at the Court of Chancery. In 1597 they obtained a judgment under Elizabeth which confirmed their tenantry and customs, and set entry fines at a maximum of ten years ancient rent. Patrickson had enclosed the Holme and was allowed to keep most of it, and he regained the corn mill.

When James I came to the throne, after the union of the crowns, he decreed that tenantry had ceased with the settled border and required that the border tenants should be leasehold. In this environment the Patricksons tried to improve on the 1597 agreement. Needing cash, they offered the tenants the right to buy improved rights, including nominal entry fines. This was not a freehold, but close to it. Most of the tenants of Loweswater and all those of Thackthwaite purchased these rights, and they had a great deal of control. This process effectively confirmed the tenants as small owners, rather than leaseholders with no ownership. This important agreement was made in 1619, four hundred years ago. There is a copy here.

### **Slide 32**

The other subject I would like to address is religious diversity and toleration and the Quakers. There is a strip of land to the west of the Cocker which became a focus for Quakerism after 1653, when George Fox preached here. This stretched from Pardshaw, through Whinfell and Mosser, and to the Waterend area of Loweswater, though the most famous Quaker from Loweswater, John Burnyeat, came from Crabtreebeck.

The Quakers appeared in the commonwealth period, when the Church of England was abolished, and when various forms of Protestantism were allowed to develop. Quakers did not

accept the need for churches or priest but believed that they could have a direct relationship with their god. John Burnyeat disputed with priests in the Chapel, and suffered from it., and suffered for it.

### **Slide 33**

With the restoration of the monarchy the church of England was re-established and Quaker meetings became illegal. They sought out of the way places such as Loweswater and Mosser where they could purchase properties and create communities to practice their beliefs. After the glorious revolution, under William and Mary, various varieties of dissenting Protestants were tolerated. Quakers could not hold an office because they would not swear an oath. They would not pay their church dues or tithes. To some extent their community was separate, based on the Pardshaw meeting. Quakers married Quakers, did business with other Quakers, such as using Quaker mills, and sold their properties to Quakers. But overall the two communities co-existed and the Quakers prospered in Loweswater, particularly at Water End.

### **Slide 34**

To sum up the position in 1689 in a simple way, my lines of authority are shown as all equal. I should say that the equivalent functions of the modern civil parish were exercised through vestry meetings of the church of England.

## **Part 3**

### **Slide 35**

In this final part I would like to discuss Loweswater in the modern era, which in historical terms starts in 1688. This includes the industrial revolution, which did not touch Loweswater directly, in the way it did Cockermouth or even Lorton. Rather, Loweswater became the territory of romanticism and preservation.

### **Slide 36**

Gentry tourism of the Lakes started in the 1770s, but the tourists seldom crossed Scale Bridge, and Loweswater Lake was not on the circuit – though the popular Scale Force is in Loweswater. The carriage trade frequented the Inn at Scale Hill in Brackenthwaite, and not the Kirkstile, which was for locals and the more commercial trade.

Thomas Malthus, before he became famous as a population theorist, failed to find Loweswater Lake, and noted *'I found myself at dinner without having seen Loweswater, but I comforted myself with the reflection, that I should certainly not have missed it in so extraordinary a manner, if it had not been very small & not worth seeing.'*

### **Slide 37**

Wordsworth was well acquainted with Loweswater. In November 1799 Wordsworth took Coleridge on his first tour of the lakes. They also did not cross Scale Bridge, but Coleridge noted in his diary:

*We pass the Inn at Scale Hill, leaving it to our right & and to our right is Lowes Water which we see – tis a sweet Country that we see before us, Somersetshire Hills & many a neat scattered House with Trees round of the Estates Men. — the White Houses here beautiful & look at the river & its two arched Bridges –*

Coleridge and Wordsworth were concerned with the cultural landscape of the inhabitants, as well as the natural landscape.

### **Slide 38**

Wordsworth also included Loweswater in his first guide text, accompanying Wilkinson's Select Views published in 1810:-

*'... Nor will the most hasty Visitant fail to notice with pleasure, that community of attractive and substantial houses which are dispersed over the fertile inclosures at the foot of those rugged Mountains, and form a most impressive contrast with the humble and rude dwellings which are usually found at the head of these far-winding Dales.'*

So Loweswater was one of the more prosperous parts of the lakes.

### **Slide 39**

The later editions of Wordsworth's Guide did not include that text on Loweswater. One reason for may be that in 1807 the manor of Loweswater, was purchased by Joshua Lucock Bragg, of Lorton Hall, who was the grandson and heir of Joshua Lucock of Cockermouth. Joshua Lucock Bragg was a despoiler, and he immediately cut all the timber he could in Loweswater, raising five thousand pounds. Fortunately for Loweswater he died in 1809. His trustees put Loweswater up for sale in 1813.

### **Slide 40**

Wordsworth was acquainted with John Marshall, the wealthy flax spinner of Leeds, because Marshall had married Jane Pollard, the best friend of Dorothy Wordsworth. Wordsworth detested everything Marshall stood for. except that Marshall loved wild scenery, was purchasing property around Ullswater, and they shared an interest in planting wood.

### **Slide 41**

And just to illustrate the point here is the non-Wordsworthian cultural landscape created by Marshall of Leeds.

### **Slide 42**

Marshall purchased the manors of Loweswater, Thackthwaite and Brackenthwaite in 1813 for £10,500 – loose change for him. Marshall devised his plan for improving the appearance of Loweswater by planting wood, discussing these plans with Wordsworth in 1816 during a three-day stay at Scale Hill Inn. Marshall planted the Holme as a wood, which he could do because he owned it. We recently had an excellent talk on Holme Wood by John Macfarlane. Marshall had his manor surveyed, including the woodland, and had a plan drawn up in 1819, exactly two hundred years ago. This image is taken from that plan, and we have a graphics version of it on display today.

### **Slide 43**

Marshall thought he could gain the co-operation of the tenants who had bought their rights under the 1619 agreement, but he underestimated the capabilities of the tenants, and their long experience of difficult relations with lords of the manor. He wanted to acquire Watergate Farm, presumably to plant the rest of Loweswater Lake, but clearly John Harrison was not selling. In 1817 Marshall demanded an entry fine because Harrison had inherited under Bragg, and a mistake in the paperwork had admitted him only for the life of Bragg. Harrison would not pay this small amount because that was not the Loweswater custom. Marshall then pursued a vexatious legal attempt to eject Harrison. But Harrison held tight and kept Watergate.

### **Slide 44**

Having failed to gain Watergate, in 1823 Marshall bought the eleven acres of Nether Close from Henry Muncaster, for an unknown sum. Marshall used Nether Close as his centre of operations, for bailiffs of the manor, for forestry woodmen, and for managing the mining which he leased out. Henry Muncaster set himself up Muncaster House.

### **Slide 45**

Marshall's main plan for Crummock was to plant trees all along the west bank and Buttermere Dubs, to join with planned planting at Burtness behind Buttermere Lake. This was partly the common, but also a string of stinted pastures held by numerous Loweswater tenants. In 1824 Marshall and his solicitor met the tenants at Scale Hill Inn, which Marshall now owned, to propose that Loweswater commons should be enclosed in a particular way. Marshall would have the east side of Mellbreak, and the tenants would give up their stinted pastures next to Crummock, but the rest of the commons would become a stinted pasture owned by the tenants. The tenants would receive their freeholds in exchange. That scheme could have been very advantageous to the tenants, but they rejected it, and he got nowhere with planting Crummock. If the tenants had agreed, Crummock would look very different today.



All Marshall could do was to buy what was for sale. He rather gave up with Loweswater, and he refused to co-operate with later proposals made by the tenants. When they proposed to enclose and divide the commons in 1829 he withheld his consent. When they tried in the 1840s to commute their manorial dues to a rent charge, Marshall had a veto and refused. There were no developments until after his death in 1845. The commons were not enclosed and divided until the 1860s, and even then the tenants were not made freeholders of their farms.

The fact that Loweswater today is so little changed in appearance from Loweswater of 200 years ago, is largely down to the fact that the lord and the tenants generally maintained a stalemate until the preservationist movements took control. Many will consider that fortunate.

**Slide 46**

When the chapel was to be rebuilt in 1829, it is unlikely that Marshall, being a dissenter, contributed much. The Society is considering a project to study the detail of this church, and if you are interested please speak to Hugh Johnson.

**Slide 47**

Rather, Marshall's schools were his churches, and he paid for this one in Loweswater in 1839 – now the village hall. This is his monument.

**Slide 48**

If we go forward to the end date of the talk, one hundred years ago, we have a situation where lordship still exists in this manor, just, but it has little role in making the future of Loweswater. In time the National Trust and the National Park would become influential. Much of the social role of the Church had reduced through a raft of nineteenth century legislation. The poor law amendment act of 1866 led to the separation of civil and ecclesiastical roles and to the creation of Loweswater Parish Council, which is firmly part of the state.

**Slide 49**

In this talk I have noted important events 400 years ago, when the tenants purchased the rights to their land in 1619, and 200 years ago, when John Marshall drew his manor map, the first large scale map of Loweswater. It was 100 years ago in 1919 when the inhabitants of Loweswater commissioned this fitting brass memorial to the Loweswater men who were killed in World War One. On which I will end.

**Slide 50**