

ART. VIII – *Buying Off Robert Bruce: An Account of Monies paid to the Scots by Cumberland Communities in 1313–14*
By COLM McNAMEE

IN the spring of 1314 Edward Bruce, brother of Robert King of Scots, led a savage mounted attack on Cumberland. He crossed into England by way of Carlisle, and made for the Bishop of Carlisle's manor of Rose, where he stayed for three days. The Lanercost Chronicler takes up the story –

He sent a strong detachment of his army to burn the southern and western districts during those three days. They burnt many towns and two churches, taking men and women prisoners, and collected a great number of cattle in Inglewood Forest and elsewhere, driving them off with them on the Friday; they killed few men except those who made determined resistance; but they made attack upon the city of Carlisle because of the knights and country people who were assembled there.¹

The chronicler goes on to explain why this calamity occurred:

The Scots did all these wrongs at that time because the men of that march had not paid them the tribute which they had pledged themselves to pay on certain days.²

The document printed below is the final membrane of an audited account of money collected in Cumberland for buying off the Scots.³ It is remarkable in two respects. It provides a rare insight into this turbulent period of border history, when Robert Bruce held in thrall northern England as far south as the Tees. It is also a striking illustration of the weakness of the local gentry, and indeed of Edward II King of England, in the face of Scottish aggression. This introduction is intended to set the document in the context of the Anglo-Scottish wars of the fourteenth century; to describe its content; to compare it with the lay subsidy roll of 1332; and to compare it with other evidence for the payment of money to the Scots.

In 1311 Robert Bruce mounted two swift attacks on northern England, one in August and another in September. The first was said to have lasted eight days, the second fifteen; but in neither case did Bruce inflict serious loss of life. Rather, the objects of these invasions were to plunder and to extract ransoms. In the wake of these raids, the men of Northumberland and of the “County of Dunbar” in Scotland sent messengers to Bruce, offering him cash to desist from further attacks. Northumberland is said to have paid £2,000 for peace until 2 February 1312, that is, for about six months.⁴

In August 1312 Bruce struck again. He burnt the towns of Hexham and Corbridge; sent an expeditionary force as far south as Durham; and spent three days plundering the western marches from a base at Lanercost Priory.⁵ This expedition brought in a second series of blackmail payments. The bishopric of Durham purchased a truce to last from 16 August until 24 June 1313, apparently for 900 marks.⁶ Northumberland bought a second

truce, again for £2,000. The figure of £2,000 may be intended simply to represent a large sum of money, but it is not in itself an improbable sum; the poorer Western March was blackmailed into paying £1,466 in 1313–14.⁷ But August 1312 was the first time the people of the western marches paid up.

The people of Westmorland, Copeland and Cumberland redeemed themselves in a similar way; and as they had not so much money in hand as would pay them, they paid a part, and gave for the rest as hostages the sons of the chief lords of the country.⁸

How much was demanded on this occasion is not known. The facts that the western march could not pay at once, and that hostages had to be given as surety, underlines the relative poverty of the region. The hostages taken were almost certainly those named in the document below, the heirs of Walter de Kirkbride, Richard de Kirkbride and Alexander de Bassenthwaite.⁹

A third wave of blackmail payments was made in response, not to an actual attack, but to a threat. Although the truce purchased in 1312 was to last until Midsummer 1313, the Scots threatened to invade on the eastern march that spring. In March 1313 the Bishop of Durham was excused attendance at parliament,¹⁰ and in a letter dated 2 April Edward II exhorted the men of Northumberland to defend their county.¹¹ From this it seems that Northumberland was having difficulty meeting their demand. Cumberland was probably in the same position. In April Henry de Malton had been dispatched to the king, Edward II, to represent the plight of the western marches and to request protection, but the king was on his way to Aquitaine, and merely replied that he would give the matter attention on his return.¹² That summer, there was another invasion scare. It was reported in June that the Scots were ready to invade in three places on the march; and in August the Bishop of Durham wrote to the king that Robert Bruce had assembled a great host.¹³ The northern communities, including Cumberland, paid again for peace, to last from 15 August 1313 until 29 September 1314.¹⁴ Most likely the money was to be paid in moieties, as arranged in the case of the Durham truce of 1312. The Scots raided Cumberland both at Christmas 1313 and at the following Easter, perhaps as a reminder that moieties were due.¹⁵

The document printed below relates to this third truce. It is an audited account of money paid to Robert Bruce, by communities in Cumberland, during 1313 and 1314. The audit was ordered on 4 October 1314, after the truce had broken down. In the Patent Rolls it is recorded that Robert de Tilliol, Andrew de Harclay and Robert de Barton were commissioned “to audit accounts of divers sums which William de Mulcaster, Richard de Kirkbride and Alexander de Bassenthwaite levied from the commonalty of county Cumberland for use of the king’s Scottish enemies, for certain truces made between that commonalty and the Scots.” The auditors were to certify how much was levied, how much was paid to the Scots, whether any balance remained, and if so in whose possession it was.¹⁶ Payment of this truce put the western march under tremendous financial strain. Collection of a lay subsidy, the tenth and a fifteenth granted in December 1313, had to be abandoned, “because of the *sufferancia* between the said Scots and the men of the said county.”¹⁷ It looks as though the county had failed to pay the first moiety, for the Scots raided the county around Christmas 1313, causing many of the people to flee.¹⁸ A further default, at Easter, brought on the raid by Edward Bruce.

A few details can be added to the narrative of Edward Bruce's incursion. Some disagreement exists among the sources as to the actual date of the raid, but all agree that it took place shortly after Easter.¹⁹ A copy of an indenture dated 19 April is preserved in the register of the Bishop of Carlisle, wherein the bishop agrees with Edward Bruce to release two Scottish prisoners, the brothers Lindsay, in return for his sparing the bishop's manors at Rose and Linstock.²⁰ The account printed below shows that Philip de Lindsey, a Scot who held lands in Lincolnshire (and possibly a relative of the prisoners) participated in the truce negotiations.²¹ It looks very much as though he had organized this agreement between Edward Bruce and the bishop. But the deal did not come off, and Philip de Lindsey defected to the Scots soon afterwards. His English lands had been taken into the hands of the crown by August 1316.²² It is not possible from manorial accounts to distinguish the ravages of Edward Bruce from preceding and subsequent devastations of the Scots. But the *compotus* of the keeper of Penrith and Sowerby records that Penrith was burnt on 17 April.²³ A fall in assized rents at Sowerby is attributed to destruction of tenements by Scots, who entered the vill after Easter (7 April). These were almost certainly Edward Bruce's men.²⁴

By this time the King of England had at last gathered the support of his vassals for a great invasion of Scotland. But at Midsummer in 1314 his invasion force was roundly defeated by Robert Bruce at the battle of Bannockburn. The reign of terror which Cumberland and other border counties had experienced then spread throughout the north of England as far as York and Preston. It continued, with intermittent and uneasy truces, until the English conceded independence to the Scots at the Shameful Peace of 1328.

Of the 1313-14 account, only the final membrane has survived. It begins with details of the money contributed to the truce from local communities and from clergymen in Allerdale, one of the four wards of Cumberland. At the head of the membrane are the words *ad hoc de Allerdale*, revealing that the first portion of the Allerdale section is missing. This, and the assessments of the other wards, must have appeared on the missing membranes. Seventeen entities are listed, and opposite each are three figures: the amount at which it was assessed; the amount paid; and the amount outstanding. Following the Allerdale section are franchises and areas not included in the wards. These are: Alston Moor, the Liberties of Penrith, of the Bishop and of the Prior of Carlisle, and finally the *Communitas* of Sowerby. Totals only are given for these lesser districts; their component villas and hamlets are not listed.

Although details of payments survive from only part of one ward, we are fortunate in having on this membrane a summary of the total income. The total of the assessment is given as 2,202 marks 11s. 5½d. The total actually collected is given as 1,540 marks 11s. 2¾d., so about 70 per cent of the sum assessed had been raised. The auditors point out that the total of the assessments exceeds the sum actually conceded to Robert Bruce by 2 marks 11s. 5¾d. From this we infer that the sum demanded was 2,200 marks (£1,466. 13s. 4d.). Now it is possible that Bruce had settled for a round sum of 2,000 marks; the Lanercost Chronicle and other sources generally cite Scottish demands as round sums.²⁵

If it was the case that only 2,000 marks had been demanded, the additional 200 marks may have been intended to cover costs. But this is not what the evidence of the document would lead one to conclude. It is implied that 2,200 marks was conceded to Robert Bruce; and it is clearly stated that the assessment exceeds the Scottish demand by

only 2 marks 11s. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. The auditors' statement appears to be critical of the organization of the levy, in that no provision for error, loss or collection expenses had been made.

The third section of the account deals with the disbursements of cash from the common fund. These were as follows:

Sent to Bruce (1,290 marks)	£860. 0. 0.
Incidental bribes to Bruce and to Brother Robert de Morton	£ 32.16. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$.
Maintenance of hostages in Scotland	£ 90. 0. 0.
Expenses of collection	£ 40.13. 2.
Other expenses	£ 10. 3. 4.
Total	£1,033.13. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$.

The most striking aspect of this is that of 1,540 marks collected, only 1,290 marks were delivered to Robert Bruce in payment of the truce. Receipt of this much had been acknowledged by Bruce in four letters which had been returned to the men of the county by Brother Robert de Morton, who is described as the "attorney" of Robert Bruce. This is only a little over half of what Bruce had demanded. The rest of the money was absorbed by costs or by casual bribes. Firstly, there were *douceurs* paid to the Scots: oaten flour worth £20; £12 in cash, a salmon and two measures of wine given to Robert de Morton; and money spent on firewood for Robert's servants. More cash was paid out by Andrew Harclay, the sheriff of Cumberland. He paid £12 from the fund to compensate one William de Herieville, a Scot whose goods had been plundered by the English during the truce. A wise move, and one intended to keep the Scots happy; but such compensation should surely have been paid by whoever was responsible for the violation. Given Harclay's record as the leader of forays against the Scots, he or his retinue may well have been responsible.²⁶

The keeping of hostages in Scotland, the three heirs of leading Cumberland knights, was the largest item of expense. Thirty pounds was spent on each,²⁷ for a period of captivity which cannot have exceeded two years. This seems a lot, even for a young squire. Either their Scottish "hosts" were demanding exorbitant sums for hospitality; or their fathers, the Cumberland knights, were claiming the extra on expenses. There is a striking contrast between the sums spent on maintaining these young squires in Scotland, and the neglect of hostages shown by other English communities. Hostages of Ripon and Durham were surrendered to the Scots and simply forgotten about;²⁸ the Cumberland heirs – who must have been known to and identified by the Scots – were fortunate in that their fathers controlled the means of their redemption.²⁹

Expenses of collection include parchment and writing materials; and also the travelling expenses of Philip de Lindsey, of Adam de Skelton and of lesser messengers, going to Scotland and elsewhere, to save the cost of carrying the money by packhorse "to the water" (probably to Solway, a traditional point of contact between the kingdoms).³⁰ More substantial were the sums paid to Richard de Kirkbride, Alexander de Bassenthwaite, and William de Mulcaster for staying at Carlisle to supervise the collection.

Kirkbride and Bassenthwaite each received £9 for sixty days of this duty, and Mulcaster £5 for intermittent service. At three shillings per day, they paid themselves well out of the common fund. For military service in the royal army, a knight was paid only 2s. per day.³¹ It appears that the collection was initially conducted by three serjeants, who went about the country from the feast of the Assumption (15 August 1313) until Easter (7 April 1314). These were undoubtedly “serjeants of the peace”, law officers peculiar to the western marches, appointed by the lords of Egremont and Cockermouth in their respective lordships and by the crown elsewhere in the county.³² They had extensive arbitrary powers and were notorious for abuse of their authority, ideal agents for collection of this heavy imposition. At an unspecified stage (probably just after Easter) the pace of collection heated up, as the gentry despaired of raising enough money in time to ward off the Scots. Kirkbride, Bassenthwaite and Mulcaster, accompanied by Philip de Boyvill and others, both horse and foot, went around the country in a desperate *chevauchée*, trying to levy money, for six days. At this point the patience of the King of Scots gave out, and his impetuous brother was dispatched to remind the Cumbrians of their debt.

What of the assessment itself? Most of the Allerdale localities mentioned in the audit are all situated on rising ground to the north and west of Skiddaw. Most were villis or hamlets; some localities have only seigneurial or customary significance; indeed, some items on the account were only revenues. There was, then, no uniform unit of assessment. Castlerig and Talentire, both the property of John de Derwentwater, are assessed jointly;³³ Issaby was a tenement held by Carlisle Priory;³⁴ and revenues from the grange and tithes of Kirkland were the property of the rector of the parish.³⁵ The seventeen listed entities include both rural communities and the benefices of individual clergymen. This is surprising; ecclesiastical incomes usually received separate treatment for taxation purposes. Altogether the units listed were intended to pay 35 per cent of the levy on the ward. In fact they supplied about 40 per cent of the money received, suggesting that they were better payers than other districts in Allerdale. In some cases the lords of particular villis and hamlets may have seen to it that the inhabitants paid up. Alexander de Bassenthwaite must have had considerable influence in Bassenthwaite itself, which paid in full. Torpenhow and Bewaldeth were both held by William de Mulcaster, and again both these localities paid their assessment in full.³⁶

Where did the assessments come from? The incomes of clergymen may have been assessed specially for this levy. They bear little relationship to the standard assessment of benefices given in the *Taxatio* of Pope Nicholas IV.³⁷ The assessments of lay communities, however, seem to have been derived from the records of previous lay subsidies, assessed on movable wealth. Eight of the lay communities listed here appear in the earliest surviving Cumberland subsidy roll, that of 1332.³⁸ Comparing the assessments, one discovers that in 1314 and 1332 each of the lay communities bore a roughly similar share of the imposition on the ward. This seems to indicate that the 1314 assessments are of movable wealth, and are based on a pre-existing assessment for the levy of a lay subsidy.

In view of the intervening years of war and natural catastrophe, one might expect that assessments on the 1332 lay subsidy should be substantially lower than those for the levy of 1313–14. As it happens, the later assessments are invariably a little higher. There is no significant alteration in the distribution of the financial burden. For this levy of 1313–14,

Allerdale was due to supply 20 per cent of the county assessment; for the 1332 lay subsidy, Allerdale was intended to supply 22 per cent. So Allerdale paid roughly the same proportion to both levies.³⁹ This fact is open to a number of interpretations. Perhaps it indicates that other wards bore the brunt of Scottish attacks, and that Allerdale suffered no worse than the rest of the county. It could mean that Allerdale recovered rapidly from war damage. There is always the possibility that the taxation of 1332 was so closely based on the records of previous subsidies that it bears no relation whatsoever to changing economic circumstances. But some of the variation in assessments does correspond with what is known of the effects of war on the western march. The share of the levy borne in 1313 by the liberty of the Prior of Carlisle had been halved in the later assessment. This probably indicates a decline in prosperity due to warfare. Alston Moor was assessed in 1313 at only £20. This tract of seasonally occupied moorland paid nothing towards the truce. Generally revenues from the upland districts do not show serious decline during the war years;⁴⁰ they were well off the routes frequented by the Scots, and in any case there was little to be destroyed. In the case of Alston Moor however, failure to pay probably reflects the removal southwards of flocks and herds from manors exposed to Scottish marauding in the vicinity of the South Tyne.⁴¹ But we have to look to other sources to provide the proof of serious social and economic disruption as a result of war. For example, at Broughton demesne in the Honour of Cocker mouth, this takes the form of falling rental income, falls in sales of produce, and the demising of demesne lands at low rates.⁴²

This is the best example of an organized levy to buy off the Scots that has yet come to light. Previously it was thought that Cumberland was not sufficiently united or coherent to impose such a levy.⁴³ But this is more comprehensive than anything that survives for Northumberland or Durham. There are similarities with evidence of payment of *tributa* from other counties. Firstly, the profiteering by intermediaries, noted by Jean Scammell with respect to the Durham truces, is much in evidence.⁴⁴ The monk, Robert de Morton, received lavish bribes for acting as a broker between Bruce and the English communities. Clearly he was the go-between who transmitted cash to Bruce. Judging from the bribes he was a figure of influence at the Scottish court and a man to be placated. Nothing further is known of him. He does not appear as testator in any of Bruce's *actae*. Secondly, like the Durham truces, this levy is dominated by prominent local knights – the Kirkbrides, Mulcaster and Bassenthwaite.⁴⁵ It was the English who had sued for peace, and probably it was these individuals who had supplied the initiative. The method of collection might be interpreted as reflecting gentry interests. Whereas in Durham and Northumberland the laity contributed to these levies through assessment on manors,⁴⁶ in Cumberland the assessment was on movables and revenues. Thirdly, these Cumberland knights are seen as acting under the same auspices as the collectors of the Durham levies. The money was paid *per communitatem* and *ex parte communitatis*. Is one justified in translating *communitas* as “the county”? One could argue either way. On the one hand, the account is apparently comprehensive. The extant portion covers one of the four wards and areas outside the wards, the franchises. The other three wards were surely included on the lost membranes. In the auditors' commission it is stated that the levy was on the “commonalty” of the county.⁴⁷ Against this however, there was a tradition of separatism in the Honours of Cocker mouth and Copeland.⁴⁸ Separate lordships are said to have negotiated independently with the Scots. One chronicle lists

Gilsland, Allerdale, Cumberland and Copeland as the paying entities on the west march in 1312; Lanercost states that Copeland paid separately in 1312–13, and that it alone paid a ransom in August 1314.⁴⁹ Some of the Cumberland gentry are conspicuously absent from the levy of 1314, in particular the Lucys of Cockermouth. Lordships then, could make their own independent deals with the Scottish raiders. The present author considers that this document is suggestive of a levy on the whole county, based on a previous lay subsidy. The county was functioning at least as a unit of taxation, in spite of the social dislocation wrought by the war. Fourthly, the co-incidence of failure to pay royal taxes, and payments instead to buy off the Scots, is another theme in relations between northern communities and the Scots. Bassenthwaite, who assisted Richard de Kirkbride as receiver, had been a collector of the abandoned lay subsidy.⁵⁰ It seems highly likely that Bassenthwaite's records were used in the collection of the levy for the Scots, and that money was also diverted from the subsidy directly into the hands of Robert Bruce. If so, it was not for the last time. In 1315 Richard fitz Marmaduke seized £240, earmarked for payment of a clerical subsidy, from the precincts of Durham Cathedral to buy off the Scots.⁵¹ On two occasions at least then, taxation levied by the King of England went straight into the coffers of Robert Bruce.

Originally the practice of buying off the "rebel" Scots had been a device intended to buy time,⁵² resorted to in the belief that it was only a matter of time before the wrath of the King of England was exerted to quell Bruce's revolt. But by 1311 there was no longer any alternative but to pay up. Refugees from Scotland were streaming over the border, bearing tales of atrocities.⁵³ In particular, Edward Bruce's merciless campaign in Galloway in 1308 must have had a sobering impact on the people of Cumberland.⁵⁴ The *posses* of northern English counties were active in Scotland during the locust years of 1306–11, rendering unpaid military service, and they may already have been depleted and demoralized.⁵⁵ Royal indifference to defence of the marches was bitterly resented.⁵⁶ The Scottish threat happened to coincide with a time when the western march had been deprived by natural wastage of its natural leaders: the de Multon family of Gilsland had become extinct in 1313; the Forz lands were in the hands of the Crown; and the Wake barony of Liddel was in minority.⁵⁷ Most significant of all perhaps was the absence of Robert Clifford's extensive knightly retinue from the western march during much of this time. Clifford, the greatest magnate of the western march, was preoccupied with the pursuit of Piers Gaveston.⁵⁸ Even after the defeat of Edward II's invasion at Bannockburn in June 1314, the border communities continued to buy off the Scots for as long as they were able.⁵⁹ There was no other means of staving off destruction.

The payment of blackmail continued until the counties were financially exhausted and militarily overrun. The Scots were demanding a ruinous tribute; ruinous, at any rate, when compared to taxation. In 1296 Northumberland paid about £1,000 to Edward I for the heavy subsidy of that year.⁶⁰ If the Lanercost author is correct (and there seems no reason to doubt him) Bruce was demanding £2,000 in two successive years. Cumberland paid £538 to the king for the tenth and fifteenth of 1332;⁶¹ Bruce was demanding nearly three times that within the space of nine months. The failure of the truce of 1313/14 shows the western march was incapable of sustaining the burden. The exactions of Robert Bruce, coupled with the devastations which followed, mark a real watershed in the history of the north. Since the eleventh century devastations of the north by William the Conqueror and Malcolm Canmore, the northern economy had been slowly picking

up.⁶² Settlement had expanded, more land had been brought under the plough. The following document illustrates part of a desperate and ultimately futile attempt to save the labours of centuries.

Notes and References

I have used the following abbreviations:

<i>CDS</i>	<i>Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland</i> , vols. i–iv ed. J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1881–8); vol. v (Supplementary) ed. G.G. Simpson and J.D. Galbraith (Scottish Record Office, 1988).
<i>CPR</i>	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls</i>
<i>DCD</i>	Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Durham.
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i> .
<i>Lanercost</i>	<i>Chronicon de Lanercost</i> , ed. J. Stevenson (Maitland Club, Edinburgh, 1839).
<i>NH</i>	<i>Northern History</i> .
<i>PRO</i>	Public Record Office.
<i>Rot. Scot.</i>	<i>Rotuli Scotiae</i> , i (1814).
<i>RPD</i>	<i>Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense</i> , ed. T.D. Hardy, (R.S., 4 vols., 1873–8).
Scammell, “Robert I”	J. Scammell, “Robert I and the North of England”, <i>EHR</i> lxxiii (1958), 385–403.

¹ *Lanercost*, 224.

² *Ibid.*

³ *PRO* E101/331/25, printed below, [Cross reference to page 20–23.]

⁴ *Lanercost*, 216–7. These raids and the truces which followed have been discussed in the following works: E. Miller, *War in the North*, (University of Hull Lecture, 1960); Scammell, “Robert I”; C. McNamee, “The Effects of the Scottish War on Northern England, 1296–1328”, (Oxford University, Unpublished D.Phil Thesis, 1989), 65–7, 283–87; and I. Hall, “The Lords and Lordships of the English West March” (Durham University Ph.D. Thesis, 1986), 291–361.

⁵ *Lanercost*, 220.

⁶ *Ibid.*; *RPD* i, 204, 208; *DCD* Miscellaneous Charters, 4941; McNamee, *op. cit.*, 289.

⁷ See below, [Cross reference to location indicated on p. 6.]

⁸ *Lanercost*, 220.

⁹ See below, [Cross reference to location indicated on pp. 7–8.]

¹⁰ *Lanercost*, 222; *DCD* Bursar’s Roll 1313–14 (A); Scammell, “Robert I”, 386; *RPD* i, 301.

¹¹ *CPR* 1307–13, 559.

¹² *CPR* 1307–13, 591.

¹³ *CDS* v, nos. 581, 583; *RPD* i, 386.

¹⁴ *Lanercost*, 222.

¹⁵ The Christmas raid is described in *PRO* E159/100, m. 110d. and E143/8/4, no. 10/2. Many took flight from Cumberland, but Andrew Harclay rallied those remaining to the defence of the march.

¹⁶ *CPR* 1313–17, 240–1.

¹⁷ *PRO* E143/8/4, no. 10/1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 10/2.

¹⁹ *Lanercost*, 224 places it on the Tuesday after the Octave of Easter, i.e. on 16 April, while the taxor’s account *PRO* E159/110, m. 110d places it on the morrow of the Close of Easter, i.e. 18 May.

²⁰ *Registrum Johannis de Halton*, ed. W.N. Thompson (Canterbury and York Society xii and xiii, 1913) i, 96–7.

²¹ See document printed below [Cross reference to location indicated on p. 2].

²² The brothers Lindsey were still in captivity in November 1314, *Rot. Scot.* i, 134. For Philip de Lindsay, see *The Knights of Edward I*, (Harleian Society lxxxii, 1930) iii, 91–2; Lord Lindsay, *The Lives of the Lindsays* (London, 1858), i, 64–6.

²³ *PRO* E372/166, m. 32, Wednesday after the Octave of Easter.

- ²⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵ E.g., *Lanercost*, 216–7, 217, 219, 220, 229–30; and the Durham truces listed in McNamee, *op. cit.*, p. 287. It was not always the case that round sums were demanded. See *Ancient Petitions Relating to Northumberland*, ed. C.M. Fraser, (Surtees Society clxxvi, 1966), 22; *Rotuli Parliamentorum* i, 293; and payments in kind were also made.
- ²⁶ *Lanercost*, 230–2; PRO E101/14/31, ff. 9d, 10; CDS iii, nos. 458, 515, 697; *The Bruce* iii, 399. For Harclay generally, the best account is now to be found in Hall, *op. cit.*, 291–361.
- ²⁷ See document printed below, [Cross reference to location indicated on p. 23].
- ²⁸ Ripon: PRO KB27/250, m. 88d; *CIM* ii, no. 452; CDS iii, nos. 707, 858. Durham: C.M. Fraser, *Northern Petitions* (Surtees Society cxci, 1981), no. 128.
- ²⁹ William de Mulcaster later obtained a safe conduct for travelling to Scotland to redeem his son, *Rot. Scot.* i, 151.
- ³⁰ G.W.S. Barrow, “The Anglo-Scottish Border”, *NH* i (1966), 24–30.
- ³¹ Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance*, 41, 160; J. Morris, *The Welsh Wars of Edward I.* (Oxford, 1901), 49.
- ³² G.W.S. Barrow, “Northern English Society in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries”, *NH* iv (1969), 22–3; H. Summerson, “Crime and Society in Medieval Cumberland”, *CW2*, lxxii, 112.
- ³³ Nicolson & Burn, ii, 90; Hutchinson, ii, 22.
- ³⁴ Nicolson & Burn, ii, 128; A.M. Armstrong, A. Mawer, F.M. Stenton, and B. Dickins, *The Place Names of Cumberland* (English Place Name Society xxi, 1943–44) ii, 300.
- ³⁵ Nicolson & Burn, ii, 122–3, 125–6.
- ³⁶ For Bassenthwaite, see Nicolson & Burn, ii, 93–4, 96; for Mulcaster, see T.H.B. Graham, “The Family of Mulcaster”, *CW2*, xvii, 111–16; Nicolson & Burn, ii, 125–6; Hutchinson, i, 356.
- ³⁷ *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae Auctoritate P. Nicholai IV circa A.D. 1291*, ed. J. Topham, (Record Commission, 1802), 318–20.
- ³⁸ J.P. Steel, *Cumberland Lay Subsidy: being an account of a fifteenth and tenth collected 6th Edward III* (Kendal, 1912); discussed in C.M. Fraser, “The Cumberland and Westmorland Lay Subsidies for 1332”, *CW2*, lxvi, 131–58.
- ³⁹ In the account of 1313–14, edited below, the total sum demanded of the county is 2,200 marks, and Allerdale is assessed at 457 marks. In the lay subsidy of 1332, the total assessment of the county is £538, and Allerdale’s assessment is £120, Steel, *op. cit.*, 42–51, 71.
- ⁴⁰ See for example the flourishing Buttermere and Inglewood revenues 1316–18, PRO SC6/824/18; and the Mallerstang vaccaries, 1323–24, PRO SC6/1044/6.
- ⁴¹ *Lanercost*, 209; *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa*, ed. E.A. Bond (Rolls Series, 1868) iii, 333. V.H. Galbraith, “Extracts from the Historia Aurea and a French Brut”, *EHR* xliii (1928), 209; *Rotuli Parliamentorum* i, 293.
- ⁴² PRO SC6/824/18; see also E143/8/4, no. 10/2, “a great part of the men of the county fled for fear of the Scots” on the occasion of the raid at Christmas 1313. Depopulation is mentioned in most narrative sources.
- ⁴³ Scammell, “Robert I”, 389.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 399–401. See also H. Offer, “Murder on Framwellgate Bridge”, *AA5* xv (1988), 198–203.
- ⁴⁵ For the leading role of these knights in local affairs see the following: T.H.B. Graham, “The Kirkbrides of Kirkbride”, *CW2*, xv, 63–75 and “The Family of Mulcaster”, *CW2*, xvii, 110–25.
- ⁴⁶ Scammell, “Robert I”, 396–7; McNamee, *op. cit.*, 289–90; G.T. Lapsley, *The County Palatine of Durham*, (Cambridge Mass., 1900), 119; *RPD* iv, 273–277.
- ⁴⁷ *CPR* 1313–17, 240–1.
- ⁴⁸ T.H.B. Graham, “Allerdale”, *CW2*, xxxii, 28–33; Hall, *op. cit.*, 140–6.
- ⁴⁹ *Chronicle of St. Mary’s York*, ed. H.H.E. Craster and M.E. Thornton (Surtees Society cxlviii, 1934), 54; *Lanercost*, 229.
- ⁵⁰ PRO E159/100, m. 110d; E143/8/4, nos. 10/1, 2; *CPR* 1313–17, 51.
- ⁵¹ Scammell, “Robert I”, 399; PRO E159/96, m. 112d. J.F. Willard, “The Scotch Raids and the Fourteenth Century Taxation of Northern England”, *University of Colorado Studies* V, no. 4 (1908), 237–42.
- ⁵² *Rot. Scot.* i, 79; *Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, ed. H. Rothwell (Camden 3rd Ser. lxxxix, 1957), 384.
- ⁵³ CDS iii, nos. 11, 14; PRO Just3/53/2, mm. 7, 8.
- ⁵⁴ Barrow, G.W.S., *Robert Bruce*, (London, 3rd edn., 1988), 181–2.
- ⁵⁵ *Rot. Scot.* i, 57–8; CDS ii, no. 1751.
- ⁵⁶ See for example the letter of Maurice de Berkley, commander of Berwick, to the king in 1316, CDS iii, no. 477; also *Lanercost*, 222, 242.

⁵⁷ Hall, *op. cit.*, 288.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 285–88.

⁵⁹ *Lanercost*, 229–30.

⁶⁰ *The Northumberland Lay Subsidy Roll of 1296*, ed. C.M. Fraser (Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, Record Series i, 1968).

⁶¹ Steel *op. cit.*, 71.

⁶² E. Miller, *War in the North*, (University of Hull Lecture, 1960); “Farming in Northern England During the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries”, *NH* xi (1976 for 1975), 1–16.

APPENDIX

The Document

The document, Public Record Office E101/331/25, is written on a parchment roll, consisting of a single membrane, measuring about 24 × 71 cm. A strip of repairing material about 3 cm wide covers the top edge of the roll. No stitching is visible. On this strip is written in pencil “5–12 Ed II”, “5–10 Ed II” and two references: “Pat 8 Ed II Pt 17d” (written in ink) and “Bain iii, p. 95”.

Note on Transcription

This transcript has been prepared largely in accordance with the practice recommended by R.F. Hunnisett, *Editing Records for Publication*, (British Records Association, Archives and the User No. 4, 1977). Abbreviated words have been extended wherever possible; punctuation and capitalization have been modernized. The letters “c” and “t” have been transcribed as in the original. For the sake of clarity in the transcription of figures, the final “j” has been retained, and the capital “L” has been used for “50” when standing first or alone.

Ad hoc de Allerdale

Tenentes de Isakeby	xlvj s. vj s. viij d. ¹	Inde solvit xxvj s. viij d. Et debet xx s.
Alta Ireby	Lxvj s. viij d.	Inde solvit xxxv s. Et debet xxxj s. viij d.
Conchorheþayt	iiij li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Inde solvit Lxiiij s. vj d. Et debet xxviiij s. x d.
Rector de Yreby	Cvj s. viij d.	Et solvit totum.
Torpenhow	vj li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Et solvit totum.
Kyrkeland cum grangia et decimis	viiij li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Inde solvit cvj s. viij d. Et debet Lxvj s. viij d.
Vicar de Torpenhow	iiij li.	Et solvit Lxiiij s. iiij d. Et debet xvj s. vj d.

Skolitelgarth	xl s.	Et debet totum.
Ulvedale	x li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Inde solvit x li. Et debet xiiij s. iiij d.
Allerthwayt	xlviij s. viij d.	Et solvit totum.
Bouwaldef	Lxviiij s. j d. ob.	Et solvit totum.
Caldebek	xviij li.	Inde solvit xiiij li. ix s. Et debet Lj s.
Rector eiusdem	iiij li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Inde solvit xxx s. vij d. Et debet Liiij s. ix d. ²
Rector de Ulvedale	iiij li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Inde solvit Lx s. Et debet xxxiiij s. iiij d.
Bastinthwayt	viiij li. xiiij s. iiij d.	Et solvit totum.
Rector eiusdem	xx s.	Et solvit totum.
Castelrig et Talentire	xiiij li.	Inde solvit x li. viij s. ob. Et debet Lxxj s. xj d. ob.
. . . de Crossethway ³	iiij li. vj s. viij d.	Et solvit totum.
Vicar Crosseth	xl s.	Et solvit totum.
Summa assessionis huius wardae		CCCClvij marc xvij d. ob.
Summa recepti		CCCxxiv marc iij s. vj d.
Summa debites		Cxxxij marc xj s. iij d. ob.

Mors de Aldesto assita est ad xx li. Et debit totum.

Summa assessionis xx li. Summa debet xx li.

Libertas de Penereth CC li. Inde solvit lxxx li. xlvij s. xj d. Et debet Cxvij li. xij s. j d.

Summa assessionis CC li. Summa recepti lxxx li. xlvij s. [xi d.]⁴

Summa debet Cxvij li. xij s. j d.

Libertas Episcopi ad xlvj li. xiiij s. iiij d. Inde solvit xxxviiij li. iij s. xj d. Et debet viij li. ix s. v d.

Summa assessionis xlvj li. xiiij s. iiij d. Summa recepti xxxviiij li. iij s. xj d. Summa debet viij li. ix s. v d.

Libertas Prioris Liiij li. vj s. viij d. Et solvit totum. Summa patet.

Communitas de Soureby ad C s. Et debet totum. Summa patet.

Summa totalis assessionis MMCCij marc xj s. v d. ob. Et sic excedit summa assessionis summam duarum milium ducentarum marcarum Roberto de Bruys concessarum per ij marc xj s. v d. ob.

Summa totalis recepti MDxl marc xij s. ij d. ob. qu.

Summa totalis debit⁵ DCIxi marc xij s. vj d. ob. qu. Pro ut patet in extractis liberatis⁶ vicecomitis Cumberlandiae. Et sic excedit summis libat et expens summus recepti per ix marc vij s. vj d. ob. qu.⁷ ut patebit inferimus per liberationes et expensas factas.

Ad huc summa totalis recepti MDxl marc xij s. ij d. ob. qu. Inde videlicet:

In liberatione facta fratri Roberto de Morton, attornato Roberti de Bruys per quattuor litterae quietancie dicti fratris Roberti ostentae super comptum ad opus dicti Roberti de Bruys
MCCiiij^{xxx} marc.

Item liberatione facta Henrico de Malton pro viginti celdris farinae avenae datae de dono predicto Roberto de Bruys per communitatem propter quam⁸ cum eodem Roberto facto
xx l. viij s. iij d. ob.

Item in liberatione facta domino Andreas de Harcla vicomites Cumberlandiae pro catallis Willelmi de Herieville depredati in Scotia infra treugam
x li.

Item in liberatione facta Roberto de Morton de bono ex parte communitatis
xij li.

Item in uno salmono et duabus lagenis vini emptis et eidem fratri Roberto missis
v s. iiij d.

Item in liberatione garconibus fratris Roberti pro focularibus⁹ per tres vices
iiij s.

Item in liberatione domino Philippo de Lindesey eunti in Scotia circa treuga per duas vices
viij li.

Item Adae de Skelton pro eodem
xl s.

Item in liberationis tribus servientibus euntibus per patriam circa denarios levandos per diversas vices a festo Assumptionis Beati Mariae usque ad Pascham
iiij li. xij d.

Item in liberatione pro parcameno et canabo emptis per polectis¹⁰ ad denarios
iiij s. iiij d.

Item in liberationis diversis nunciis euntibus tam in Scotia quam in patria circa negocia et ne equis conductis pro denariis cariandis ad aquam
viij s. ij d.

Item in liberatione Ricardo de Kyrckebriid commoranti apud Karliolum circa receptioni pecuniis summis per sexaginta dies capienti per diem iii s.
ix li.

Item Alexandro de Bastinth per eodem comoranti per idem tempum circa eandem
ix li.

Item in liberatione Willelmo de Mulcastr venienti circa eandem per vices
C s.

Item in liberatione expensis Willelmi de Mulcastr, Alexandri de Bastenth et Walteri de Kirckebriid, Philipi de Boyvill et aliorum, tam peditum quam equitum euntium per patriam circa denarios levandos per sex dies
Lxiiij s.

Item in liberationes factas predictas Waltero et Ricardo et Alexandro ad opus filiorum suorum obsidii in manibus
iiij^{xxx} li.

Summa totalis liberationum et expensorum
MDI marc vj s. v d. ob.

Summa totalis recepti
MDxl marc xij s. ij d. ob. qu.

Et sic excedet liberationes et expensi summas recepti per
ix marc vij s. vj. ob. qu.

Textual Notes

- ¹ Repetition of *vj s.* is a scribal error. Recte *xlvi s. viij d.*
² The sums do not add up; either a scribal error or some figures are obscured.
³ First word illegible.
⁴ *xi d.* erased.
⁵ MS; rectius *debet*.
⁶ MS; rectius *libris*, “books”.
⁷ Calculation repeated at the end of the document.
⁸ Uncertain: *praeter quam* would just mean an extra payment, for no specified reason.

Glossary

- ⁹ MS. Possibly from *focalia*, firewood, J.F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leyden, 1976), 438.
¹⁰ MS; possibly a form of *pollegium* or *pollecticum*, meaning a tax roll or a roll of revenues, *Ibid.*, 811.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Public Record Office, Chancery Lane for permission to publish this document; Dr Judith Green who read the paper in proof; and also Dr Brian Scott and Mr Gerard McNamee for assistance with Latin terms. Responsibility for errors is mine alone.

