

BOROUGHS
in the Chester County Pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

MIDDLEWICH

Middlewich lay in Northwich hundred, but never sent townshipmen to present at the hundred court, presumably because of its borough status. Nevertheless, most houses in Middlewich mentioned in these pleas were not described as burgages.

In 1281 Robert de Tansley brought a suit against Richard son of Geoffrey and Matthew de Cranage, afterwards described as ‘men of Middlewich’ for imprisonment.

2:3: 16 December 1281

m'ia

Rob's de Tamesleg' op se u^s Ric'm fil' Galfr'i & Matheu' de Crawenach' de pl'ito in p'samenti & p'd'ci Galfr's²⁷⁰ & Matheus no' ven' & p'cept' fuit vic' q'd distr' eos p om's t'ras &c' & vic' testificauit q'd p'd'cu^s Ric's manucepit p'd'cm Matheu' & q'd p'd'cs Matheus manucepit p'd'cm Ric'm Id'o v'l'q' in m'ia. Et p'cept' est vic' q'd distr' eos p om's t'ras &c' Et q'd h'eat eos ad px' Com'

2:83: 27 January 1282

Rob' de Taunsey po. lo. suo in plac' int' ip'm & ho'ies de Med' Wyco de plac' de t^ansgr'. Rog' de Burton. u'l Hug' de Halweston'

2:124: 10 March 1282

Rob' de Tannisleg' .u^s. Ric'm fil' Galfr' & pcenar' suos de pl'o de t^ansgr' p Ademet del Bothes
p'mo

Middlewich borough seems to have been accepted as existing from time immemorial, but a challenge was made in 1305 as to by what warrant a guild was held there.

16:50: 27 April 1305

Dies datus est co'itati de medio Wico q'd [ven' ad] px' Com' auditur' iud'm suu' de hoc q'd ip'i [clan'] habere gildam inf^a vill' medii Wici absq' aliquo war' sp'iali p continuac'one seis' a tempe quo no' extat memor' [ho'im]

16:110: 1 June 1305

p' sine esson'

Prec' est vic' q'd distr' co'itatem de medio Wico p om's terr' & cat' &c'. Et q'd de exit' &c'. Ita q'd eam h'eat ad px'm Com' auditur' iud'm suu' de hoc q'd ip'i clam' h're gildam inf^a vill' medii Wici absq' aliquo war' sp'iali p continuac'om seis' a tempe quo no' extat memoria —

²⁷⁰ sic

BOROUGHES
in the Chester County Pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

In September 1306, it was presented that Roger Strongitharm had killed Adam son of Dogge²⁷¹ of Middlewich. Adam's widow Margery, claiming that her husband had been killed in her arms²⁷² appealed Strongitharm for murder: having been exacted five times and failed to appear, Strongitharm was outlawed. Unfortunately the beginning of the first entry is missing, the roll being torn and tattered: of immediate interest is whether the person reporting the murder to the court was, for instance, the bailiff of the town of Middlewich (see Bailiffs).

17:674: 27 September 1306

.....le de Medio Wyco q'd Rog's Strongitharm int'fecit Ad' filiu' Dogge de Medio Wyco
Medio Wyco
.....

17:684: 27 September 1306

Appell'

Marg'ia que fuit vx' Ad' fil' Doge sequit' & apellat Rog'm Strongitharm de morte d'ci Ad' viri sui int'fecti int' brachia sua ppleg' de ps' Thom' & R'us fr'es ei's d'm Marg'ie

18:60a: 29 November 1306

exact'. ij^o

Rog's Strongitharm exact^s ad hu'c Com' s'cdo ad sectam Marg'ie que fuit vx' Ade fil' Doge de Medio Wyco no' ven'. I'o exigit' t'cio.

18:115: 20 December 1306

Exact^s iij^o

Rog' strong in ye arm exact^s ad hu'c Com' t'c'o ad sectam M'rger' que fuit vx' Ade fil' Dogesone de medio Wyco no' venit I'o exigit' quarto

18:200: 28 February 1307

Exact^s qu^arto

Rog'us Strongynthearm exact' ad hunc Com' q^arto qd sectam M'rger' que fuit vx' Ade fil' Doogesone de med' Wico de morte p'd'ci Ade viri sui que' int'fec' no' ven', id'o exigit' quinto

18:281: 4 April 1307

Vtlagatus

Rog' strong in the arm exact^s ad hu'c Com' quinto ad secta' M'rger' que fuit vx' Ade fil' Doge de med' Wico de morte p'd'ci Ade viri sui int' brachia sua int'fecti no' ven', id'o vtlag^r

²⁷¹ probably pronounced 'dodge', a hypocorostic form of Roger

²⁷² a conventional term in such cases, not to be taken literally