

ART. I.—*Inglewood Forest*. Part III.—Some Stories of Deer-stealers. By F. H. M. PARKER, M.A.

Read at Carlisle, April 5th, 1906.

EVERYONE has read romantic accounts of the men who stole the king's deer. In so large and rich a forest as Inglewood it is only to be expected that there would be many such, and the story of Adam Bell, Clim of the Clough, and William of Cloudeslie needs no introduction. But for present purposes these heroes of ballad may be left out of the reckoning. All the persons mentioned here are authentic; the information about them is derived from a quite unromantic source, the official records of their convictions, in the reign of Edward the First. From them it is possible to glean many fragments of local history; and very curious is the insight given into the manners and customs of those old days.

One interesting point we shall observe is that these deer-stealing episodes involve no discredit. It is impossible to suppose that they were regarded as disgraceful when the persons charged include some of the great nobles. Conviction did not carry with it any legal disability, for Adam Turp, then lord of Edenhall, repeatedly broke the forest law, and yet was called upon to administer it afterwards in the capacity of verderer. Attention is drawn to this point because the reader, seeing sentences recorded against the bishop, the prior of Wetheral, an archdeacon, and several of the clergy, might form an entirely unjust conclusion as to the way in which the old ecclesiastics conducted themselves.

The relation of a deer-stealer to the Crown was mainly financial. Whatever may have happened in earlier periods, the principle at the time with which we are

B

dealing was this : the offender, on conviction, must be heavily ransomed. If he were not so ransomed, he was liable to be kept in prison for a year and a day ; if at the end of that time he could find no surety for the sum required, he was to abjure the kingdom. In such a case a poor man would be treated with special leniency. Indeed the whole practice of the law was infinitely more reasonable than the ballads would have us believe.

To make certain that a prisoner would appear before the justices, he was generally arrested as soon as his guilt was known, and kept in prison ; this was done as a safeguard, not by way of punishment ; and if the party in question could produce sureties for his appearance, he was released. It is not known whether any limit existed to the length of time during which a man might be detained under these circumstances, and this may seem to point to an injustice to a poor prisoner. But it was the common usage to treat such a man with particular consideration, while if he had been in gaol for a long time, the fact would be noticed by the justices when sentencing, in some cases even to the extent of discharging him. In short, the law was administered strictly, not harshly, and by no means vindictively.

Nor did a man become an outlaw, as the romances suggest, merely because he had killed a deer in one of the royal forests. Outlawry was a final step, only inflicted when there appeared to be no means of bringing the offender before the Court, as when he was out of the realm. In this case an order would be made that he be exacted or " put in exigent " by the County Court ; if he did not surrender, he was outlawed. Even then he might submit ; whereupon the law was administered in the usual way.

Our information is derived from the record of the Pleas begun at Carlisle on the Morrow of All Souls (November 3rd), 1285. They contain a great amount of material, for no Eyre had been held since that of Robert

de Nevill,* twenty-three years before. The roll† starts thus :—

PLEAS at Carlisle on Saturday the Morrow of All Souls in the thirteenth year of the reign of King Edward son of King Henry, before William de Vescy, Thomas de Normanvill and Richard de Creppynges, Justices in Eyre for the Pleas of the Forest at Carlisle, pleaded by the foresters and verderers named, that is to say

FORESTERS :—Alan de Kyrkeby, Forester ; Thomas de Hoton, Forester in fee of Plumpton Hay ; William de Boyvill, Forester in Fee of Allerdal ; William Gower, Hugh de Schupton (Skipton), Thomas de Rachton, Robert Scot, Henry de Aunay, Geoffrey de Beauchamp, Richard de Rachton, Adam de Hoton, John de Rachton and Adam Kelet, mounted foresters ; and by Philip de Lyndeseye, Thomas de Poer, John de Fadmor, William de Naulton, Thomas Stedman, William de Sutton and Ralph Buck, unmounted foresters in the lands of Plumpton, Morton, Braythweyt and Hescayth.

VERDERERS :—Adam de Hoton, Robert de Whyterig, Robert de Cropline, Thomas de Bello Campo, John de Crokedayk, Geoffrey son of Yvo, Robert de Rachton, Eudo de Skirwyth, William de Ulvesby, Thomas de Rybton, Peter de Eyncurt and Thomas de Malton.

Following this heading there is a chapter intituled “First Roll of Venison.” In each charge the complaint is said to be presented and proved by the verderers and foresters ; the facts are set out, and finally the steps taken to secure the payment of a penalty. In quoting, however, this latter portion is omitted for brevity, unless it contains matter of special interest, as is the case in the first entry. The exact offence the two men had committed was that of having venison in their possession :—

It is presented and proved by the foresters and verderers that Stephen the son of Gamel of Little Rachton and Adam the son of John Blom were found skinning the fawn of a hind that had been

* Particulars of the Forest Eyre of Robert de Nevill are given in the *Pipe Roll for Cumberland*, 51 Henry III.

† Forest Proceedings, Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt, 5. The extracts are quoted in the sequence in which they occur in the original, except where otherwise stated.

found by the foresters dead from hunger in the wood at Throskough on Thursday the Invention of the Holy Cross in the 47th year of King Henry. They were arrested and sent to Carlisle gaol.

And Adam does not appear, and it is proved by the foresters and verderers that he has been hanged. Therefore nothing from him at present. And the said Stephen does not appear; nor is it known where he is; nor will anyone be bail to produce him before the Justices. Therefore let him be exacted.

It is presented and proved that Stephen Howard and two others unknown killed a stag and two hinds in the land of Plumpton on Wednesday next before the feast of St Barnabas the Apostle, the same year; and were received in the house of Stephen.

This Stephen Howard was a member of a well-known poaching set whose names frequently occur. He was a Dalston man.

Odard de Devenes and Adam son of Arnald, both deceased, killed a hart near Thevesheued* in the same year, on Thursday before the Translation of St. Thomas.

Stephen Howard, Roger his brother, William their father and Henry son of Hamund killed a hind near Schauk on Thursday before St Edmund's day in the 47th year.

The next three entries are included simply in order to show the high social position of some of the persons charged. Many names well-known locally and elsewhere will be recognised.

Robert de Veteri Ponte, John de Morvill, the younger, Thomas de Hellebek, Thomas de Musegrave, Robert de Rypers, William de Wardecopp, Gilbert Engaine, Thomas de Hastings, John de Ormesheued, John of Whale (de Quale), serving man, Henry de Staveley, Michael de Hartecla, Nicholas de Musegrave, and Robert Bacun entered the forest in the land of Plumpton on their return from Carlisle just after Easter in the 48th year, and took deer without number.

Henry de Hastings, John de Vescy, Geoffrey de Lucy, Nicholas de Segrave, John de Eyvill, William de Marmiun, baron (*dives*), Robert de Hilton, Baldwin Wake, Adam de Noesmarche, Adam de

* Perhaps Thieves' Hill, between Petterill Green and the Carlisle road, beside which, a little further north, are "Thieves' Cottages."

Barton, Robert de Wolrington, Robert de Wyleghby, Thomas de Musegrave, Thomas de Hellebek, William de Wardecopp, Gilbert Engaine, Thomas de Joneby, Robert de Seton, and sundry others whose names are unknown, took many deer in the forest on their return from Carlisle in the same year. (m. 1d.)

Thomas de Multon of Gilleslaund the elder, John de Karleolo, Knight; Hugh his son, Thomas de Neweton, John de Bello Campo, John Hermer, Robert de Tyllol (Tilliol), Richard de Castelkeyrok, William de Furmery, Gilbert de la More, John del Gyl, clerk; Ralph de Lamplouch (Lamplugh), Adam de Derham, Walter Sauvage, Robert de Cambok, Robert Ayllurs, Alan de Joneby, and Adam de Vaus and many others whose names are unknown took three deer with a greyhound belonging to John de Karleolo on their way back from Kyrkosewald to Greystok in the 49th year of King Henry. And John Hermer shot one hind which was sent to the house of Robert Cambok and to John Hermer's house in Gillesland.

Thomas de Multon inherited the forestry or wardenship of Inglewood, but forfeited it for offences of the forest. John Denton says that he was deprived because he rose with Simon de Montfort; but whatever was the true reason, the former was the official one.*

The next entry has a tragic element about it :—

Adam de Totholes and Elyas le Feure killed a hart and a hind in Inglewood in the 49th year: and they do not appear, nor have they been attached before: but it is shown that Adam and Elyas have been hanged.

Stephen Howard, Adam Geytspald of Cumdivock and John, son of Diote were in the forest with the object of wrongdoing on Thursday next before the Feast of the Holy Trinity in the 49th year, with bows and arrows and a dog; and they were frequent evildoers, and took deer to a number unknown. And they were received at their own homes. And Adam has been twice arrested and imprisoned, once in the time when Roger de Lancastre was seneschal of the forest, and again in the time of Ralph de Poklinton. And John does

* *Pipe Roll*, 51 Henry III., contains this passage: "Eustace de Balliol (accounts) for the issues of the King's forest of Inglewood, which Thomas de Multon held of the King in fee, but which was taken into the King's hands for many trespasses committed in the said forest, from the twelfth day of May in the forty-seventh year (1263), as is contained in the Original of the same year."

not appear, and has not been attached; and he is living in the liberty of the Bishop of Carlisle. Hence the Bailiff of the Bishop's liberty is directed to bring his body from day to day, etc. (m. 2.)

This passage introduces us to a person who figures very prominently in these proceedings. It may be thought invidious to make comparisons between the numberless offenders against the forest law; but if it should be desired to select a typical example, we could hardly go wrong in choosing Adam Geytspald for the honour.

Few, if any, of the others can exceed the number of charges made against him; none can equal the length of his career, for he stole venison intermittenly for quite twenty years. In this particular year two more incidents of this kind are registered against him; no less than four in the next, and another five years later on. For some time after this he is not mentioned; whether he was in enforced retirement can only be conjectured. However, he was convicted of two trespasses in the year in which the pleas were held; the last occasion being exactly four weeks before the date on which they opened.

The next entry throws a curious light on the ways of the time. Several of the persons mentioned were habitual poachers, yet we find them taken in at Wetheral Priory:—

William Cockyn of Appleby, William Hayward of Wederhal, Garin of Wederhal, Thomas Langscast of Caldebek, Wadde the son of Susan of Caldebek, Roger the son of Avis, Simon of Cockermouth (de Cokermue), Adam son of Arnald of Laysingby and William Blackyrtel, the groom of Thomas de Newton, are evildoers in the forest as regards one hind. And William Cockyn, William Hayward and Garin were received at the Priory of Wederhal with that venison, in the time of Henry de Tuttebyr the Prior, who has died since.

Next we hear more of William Cockyn:—

William Cockyn of Appleby and Adam de Haulton, serving-men of Adam, parson of Louthre, killed a buck and a hind in the forest on Penrith Fells in the same year (the 49th) on the Vigil of St Cuthbert, and were received at the house of Adam the parson.

The entry next following seems something of a hard case. It serves to show that a man might find himself involved in a trespass of venison without the slightest idea of emulating the exploits of Robin Hood :—

Robert, the Lord Bishop of Carlisle took with his greyhounds a sorrel hart of one year and a hind in the land of Plumpton, while returning from the King's Court, and caused the venison to be carried with him to Rose. There were in his train William, his marshal, Reginald of Doncastre and Ralph de Poklington, on Wednesday in Whit week in the 50th year of King Henry.

Ralph Poklington was for some time undersheriff of Cumberland. A distinguished company was present as well, and so was one William Broket, the bishop's huntsman. Perhaps he was the person really in fault.

Adam Gaytspald of Cunduvoc, Stephen Howard, William son of Henry del Holm and Yvo his brother killed one hind near the land of Palmcastre on Wednesday before the Feast of St Cuthbert in the 50th year. (m. 2d.)

This notice is interesting, apart from the mention of four representative deerstealers, from its reference to Palmcastre, the mediæval name of Old Carlisle.*

Some of the charges made give a graphic account of what had taken place. Here is a typical one :—

A hart was taken in the fields at Langwathby outside the forest by Ralph son of Ralph of Langwathby, Thomas son of Agnes, Thomas son of Richer, and John del Drit in the 49th year; and they followed him across the water of the Eden and within the forest with bows, arrows and dogs; and the dogs choked that hart. Then the foresters appeared, and Ralph and the rest ran away, leaving one of the dogs behind. The flesh was sent to the Hospital of St Nicholas at Carlisle, the hide to the Canons of the Priory at Carlisle.

These two gifts require some explanation. The right to the hides of deer found dead in the forest was con-

* See the article on the subject by the Rev. James Wilson, in *The Antiquary*, November, 1905.

ferred upon the prior and convent, as they said, by King Henry, their founder; it was acted on without question; and afterwards Edward the First gave them a written confirmation of this and other privileges, to supplement the historic horn of ivory which had hitherto formed their only charter. The hospital benefitted under an old statute; this enacted that if any deer were found dead, the flesh should be sent to a spital house (*ad domum leprosi*); if there were no such house, it should be given to the poor and lame. (Statutes of the Realm, I. 244.)

The next entries include a conviction against Richard de Clifford, escheator beyond Trent; and a further offence by William Cokyn and two companions, John Madur and Jurdan de Brenkeburn. Of this precious trio none attended, as William Cokyn, who had foresworn the kingdom, was a fugitive, and John had been beheaded. No one volunteered to take responsibility for Jurdan, the third of the party, who is therefore to be declared an outlaw. Some Alston men are charged, namely Robert Blagate of Tyndale, Roger de Gildersdale of Alston, Simon the serjeant (*serviens*) of that town, and Nicholas Godbert of Tyndale, forester to Nicholas de Veteripont. One Alexander Stelrose of Lazonby had received them in his house.

The house of John, son of the shepherd, was searched by the verderers and foresters on Thursday next before the Translation of St Thomas the Martyr in the same year, whereupon there were found the skins of three hinds' fawns. As guilty in this, he was sent to Carlisle gaol: the skins were sent to the Canons. (m. 3.)

The next entry is a very tantalising one:—

Robert Scurel (otherwise Squirrel) and Hugh de Farlam were seized in the forest with bows and arrows for the purpose of evildoing in respect of the King's deer; and they were sent to Carlisle gaol and delivered to William (that is, William de Stokely, mentioned elsewhere as undersheriff of Carlisle). And William comes before the Justices and says that in the time of the war John de Eyvill seized the Castle by force from Eustace de Balliol, and released the

prisoners in his (William's) custody in the Castle; and he petitions that this may be verified by inquisition. And it is proved that this was the case.

This gives a glimpse of an exciting incident. The war referred to is, of course, the rising of Simon de Montfort, and this, very probably, told its tale in Cumberland. But it appears to be impossible to find anything further about this escapade of John de Eyvill. It is natural to suppose that the Pipe Rolls would tell us something, but here we are disappointed. In the Roll for the forty-sixth year there is a notice of twenty marks given to the citizens to fortify and strengthen the city, which promises well; still more so does a subsequent entry, where a sum of nearly £100 is paid to Master Gerard, the king's engineer, for constructing two great catapults (*blide*), conveying them from the city to the castle and covering them, a job carried out under the supervision of William "Aurifaber" and Jakeline Blund. But then the curtain comes down on the drama, and a gap follows in the local entries till the trouble was over.

There is an entry in the fifty-third year where Robert de Brus and his son James, nobles, who had slipped their greyhounds in Plumpton, appear to justify themselves. It is one of the few cases in which a defence is attempted, as in the pleas no questions of fact remained to be decided, the forest staff having thrashed them out already; so that the justices had only to sentence the person charged, or consider a defence on a point of law, or a plea attacking the validity of the presentation. In this case Robert de Brus appeared, and said that on the occasion of the complaint he was returning from the King's Court, which he had been commanded to attend; and pleaded an express provision of the Charter of the Forest, granting that a noble might take one or two deer when passing to or from the Court. Hence all the party were discharged. (m. 3d.) The Charter, as enacted in 25 Edward I., adds a proviso that when this privilege was

used, one should blow a horn if the foresters were not present, that it might not be supposed that the deer were being taken illegally. After another notice of Stephen Howard "of the Barony of Dalston" occurs this charge:—

John de Irreby and Patrick le Brun slipped their greyhounds to run at a hart in the fields at Kyrkland outside the forest on Wednesday, the Feast of St Denis, in the same, the 53rd year. They took that stag beyond the water of the Alne (the Ellen) within the metes of the forest. And John and Patrick entered the forest and dragged that hart out of the bounds of the forest at a horse's tail.

Another case, in which William Cokyn was caught with bows and arrows, accompanied by his father-in-law, William Marun of Appleby, records that they were taken by the justice of the forest, Roger de Leyburn, to Appleby Gaol. (m. 4.)

Some of the presentments give biographical, not to say domestic details:—

Hugh Tredgold and Adam son of Agnes de Langrigg killed a hind in Swalebymire on Thursday next after Michaelmas in the 52nd year, and carried it to the house of Adam; and it was eaten at his wedding feast.

Swalebymire was the more easterly of the marshes which met at the island of Holm Cultram, and is mentioned elsewhere in connection with Colemire. Both are described as being in the forest of Allerdale.

Clement, the serving man of the Prior of Wederhal, a constant evildoer of the venison, was found in the King's forest below Little Barrok, calling and whistling dogs, in the 54th year of King Henry, and he was received at the Priory of Wederhal with the Prior. (m. 4d.)

Robert son of Gilbert de Seburgham and Robert Boweman of Madresdale (Matterdale in Greystoke), were in the King's forest between Schauk and Caldew on Wednesday and Thursday after St Andrew's day in the same year with bows and arrows for the purpose of evildoing. And as they could get nothing they entered the park of the Bishop of Carlisle at Rose, and killed a hart (cervum

domesticum) and carried it to the house of Robert the son of Gilbert And it is testified that Robert son of Gilbert has been beheaded.

Richard Pulmer of Corkeby (Corby) and Nicholas Collok of Wederhal were taken at Wolfaykes (Wooloaks, near the modern Calthwaite Station) with bows and arrows for the purpose of evil-doing. One bow with three arrows was delivered to Alan de Brunfend Being asked where they were taken in, the verderers say that they were received at Wederhal Priory.

William son of Elyas de Grenrigg and Wadde, son of Susan of Caldebeck, were in the forest for the purpose of evil-doing towards the venison on Saturday the feast of St Luke the Evangelist in the same year. On seeing the foresters they took to flight, and left a russet mantle of the value of rod. The mantle was delivered to Gilbert de Kendal, who will answer for it.

This William, son of Elyas de Grenrigg, was another habitual deer-stealer. On this occasion he managed to escape, and again a second and yet a third time; but the fourth time, as we shall see presently, proved once too many.

Adam, the man of the Cellarer at Carlisle and Adam de Carleton were found in Scalescogh, the wood of the Prior of Carlisle, on Sunday the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle in the 55th year, carrying one buck. When the foresters came in sight they left the venison and fled.

The lord Robert de Mulcastre and the lord Thomas de Neweton with him and two esquires unknown were on their way along the road from Ulveton (Oulton) to Wyggeton (Wigton), on Saturday before the feast of the Purification in the 56th year, and a fallow greyhound followed them, and ran at a hind and took it. And it was taken in the town of Oulton. (m. 5.)

Robert, son of Gilbert son of Stephen de Seburcham and Gilbert de Redesdale, woodward of Sowerby, killed a great hart on St. Matthew's day in the same year, and carried it to the house of Michael of Foxglovehirst. And Robert and Gilbert at the same time killed two hinds near Welton And because the said Gilbert was woodward at the time of this evil-doing, the wood of Sowerby was seized into the King's hands.

This seizure was the recognized custom in such cases. The owner of a private wood within the forest had to have a woodward to protect the king's interests. In order to

ensure that trustworthy men were appointed, the owner was liable to have the wood taken from him if the woodward misbehaved himself, and would have to pay to recover it.

Robert Lamb of Sowerby took two fawns of a roe, and gave them to Avice, the wife of John de Swyneburn, who caused them to be carried into Northumberland. Afterwards he killed their dam, and carried it to his own house.

This story suggests that Avice de Swyneburn wanted those fawns for pets, and got Robert Lamb to steal them for her. His subsequent offence was evidently done on his own initiative.

The next entry is a graphic one, and gives a further insight into the manner in which the woodwards of Sowerby did their duty :—

John le Rydder and William Turpyn shot a great hart in the assart of Edmund le Turner in the wood of Soureby, and made Michael of Foxglovehirst and his grey mastiff hunt him as far as the Caldew below the house of William Unselman at the Feast of All Saints in the 56th year. Then came John de Werdhall, woodward of Soureby and struck him with two arrows and hunted him as far as Sebergham Bridge, and afterwards he was found in Rudestayngill dead. And he was carried by John son of Hamund Cully, John, son to the wife of John the woodward, and Hugh son of Michael of Foxglovehirst to the house of Hamund Cully. And Michael of Foxglovehirst and John the woodward had half of it at their houses. And it is testified that John de Werdhall is a fugitive because he slew John the son of Hamund. (m. 5d.)

Simon le Hargpur of Belhuses killed one great hart-a-grease in the same year at Biscopethweyt in Sowerby wood, and took part to the house of Gilbert de Seburcham, part to his own.

Robert de Hyndernese and Roger de Hyrton of Coupland and Nicholas de Brayton were in the forest below Warnhill on Thursday, the day of St. Edmund the King in the same years with bows and arrows and a brown dog; and they wounded a hart which escaped; and the foresters met the said evildoers, and they shot arrows at the foresters and the foresters raised hue and cry and went in pursuit till night came on.

Thomas le Rous of Penrith, Alexander de Capella, Alan son of Alan Capell, and John son of Gosceline of Penrith were in the land

of Plumpton on Sunday before the Feast of St. Margaret in the same year, with bows and arrows, and there they shot a hart about vespers at Stonecross opposite "Maydencaſtel" and another with two arrows at Ravenesgilfot.

The central figure in the next entries is Adam Turp of Edenhall, who enjoys a diſtinction unique in this roll, having no leſs than four consecutive charges devoted to him and his friends.

Adam Turp of Edenhall took a hart with a white ſtrakur and a greyhound in the foreſt on St. Stephen's day in the ſame (the 56th) year, and carried it to the houſe of Henry, parſon of Edenhall, who is dead. And there were with him for the purpoſe of evil-doing Richard Braſe and William Broket.

Adam Turp and William ſon of William de Edenhal, John of Sandwyk and Roger his companion took a buck in Edenhalscoch with the greyhounds of Robert Belle, and carried it to the houſe of the parſon aforeſaid, who received them.

Adam Turp, convicted for the third time, William, maſhal of the parſon of Edenhall, John his cook, William of Salkeld, ſon of William Clovenheued took a hart with three greyhounds in the King's foreſt on the vigil of Eaſter, and carried it to the houſe of the parſon aforeſaid, who received them.

Adam Turp, convicted for the fourth time was in the foreſt at Brunthweyt with bows and arrows and a fallow greyhound for the purpoſe of evil-doing. He was arreſted and handed over to Geoffrey de Nevill, Juſtice of the foreſt, along with the greyhounds as a common malefactor on Monday before the Feaſt of St. Katherine.

The notice cloſes with a reference to the fact that he had been ſubſequentially convicted, a point that had a ſpecial ſignificance, as ſome of his friends had become ſecurity for his future good behaviour. However, as has been already mentioned, he lived to hold office on the foreſt ſtaff as a verderer.

The name of Broket ſuggeſts connection with the biſhop's huntsman, who has occurred previously. Clovenheued is curious; a John Clovenheued was living near Plumpton about 1361. A poſſible explanation is that the word is intended to be read Clonenheued, a corruption of "At-lonnin-head," William of the lane head.

William Unselman and Ada his wife killed a hart-a-grease in the same year in their garden at Crokegilbank, and carried it to their house at Sowerby. (m. 6.)

Robert de Schupton, Clement his brother, Nicholas Collok, William son of Alot, groom of the Prior of Wetheral, William son of Henry Boweman, groom of the Prior, John Russel of Wetheral and three others unknown were in the forest at Quenwra with bows and arrows and a brown dog, and they were carrying the venison of three bucks; and they took a fourth at Castelewyn (Castle Hewen) on their way home on All Souls day in the same year; and they carried it to the Priory of Wetheral and were received there by Thomas de Wymundham, then Prior.

Adam, the cellarer's man, William Russel, formerly the man of Robert de Morvill, Stephen, son of Robert de Rossedowe and others unknown were in the forest in the first year of King Edward with bows and arrows for the purpose of evildoing, and carrying the flesh of one buck on Monday before the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle. On seeing the foresters they fled, and the foresters raised hue and cry as far as the town of Byrskawe (Brisco) and had no aid, nor could have had; yet they followed till night came on, leaving the venison. It was sent to the Hospital at Carlisle.

Robert Schupton, William son of Alot of Wederhal, Walter Scate of the same, William son of Henry Bouman, William Hogge of the brewhouse (de Bracino) at Wederhal, and Richard Belle of Braken-thweyt in Gilsland were in the forest with bows and arrows and a brown dog, below Barrok on Thursday before Lent in the same year. When they saw the foresters they fled to the Priory at Wederhal, where they were received; and they are constant evildoers.

The next entry gives an animated little account of what sometimes happened to persons who went out too frequently on deer-stealing expeditions. One William Bucke of Skelton was found with a bow and arrows with intent to kill venison. When he realised that the foresters had sighted him, he took a sporting chance of getting away. But he was not quite quick enough:—

One forester shot him in the thigh with an arrow as he fled, from which he has died.

He finds little sympathy; the charge coldly adds that he was an habitual evildoer. And so his knell is tolled.

In the second year it is recorded that a hind was found dead at Throskou in the forest. An inquisition being held to account for this, it was proved that the hind was wounded (*bersatus*) on Quinnefeld (Whinfell), outside the forest, and was mangled by dogs; that it then returned to the place mentioned, and died there. (m. 6d.)

The spot in question is on the Salkeld side of Penrith Fell; we read elsewhere of the men of the township of Salkeld making a waste there. There are other entries which suggest that the deer used commonly to cross the Eamont from the neighbourhood of Edenhall to Whinfell, probably by the low ground above Hornby. The word "returned" suggests that the hind was a native of Inglewood; a complaint was made about this time that Whinfell Park was a nuisance to the forest, as it offered counter-attractions to the deer.

Then we hear again of William, the son of Elyas de Grenrigg:—

William the son of Elyas de Grenrigg was in the forest on Thursday before the Epiphany in the same year with bows and arrows and one fallow mastiff. Seeing the foresters, he made his escape; and being again found with bows and arrows on Thursday in Whitweek for the purpose of evildoing he escaped again.

Once more he was detected, and tried to get away; what befell this time may be learnt from the Patent Roll for 1280:—

Pardon to Richard le Escot, one of the foresters of the Forest of Inglewood, for the death of William the son of Elyas de Grenrigg, upon testimony before the King that he slew him fleeing for trespass of venison, and refusing to be arrested.

The next entry concerns a very prominent person, Richard de Creppings himself. He had been given a buck, and when a man was given venison in this way, he was to take it himself. This is how Richard de Creppings proceeded to take his one buck. (m. 7):—

One buck was given to Richard de Creppings by Geoffrey de Nevill in the third year of King Edward; and Richard, under pretext of that buck, took a doe in Redmire at Hescayth on Wednesday next before the Ascension in that year, and carried it away with him; and he took one buck at Thevesheued on the same day.

Further it is presented that Richard, while he was sheriff of Cumberland had his archers with him, namely Thomas le Rous of Penrith and William Cutte and others unknown, on Penrith Fells on the Vigil of St. Nicholas in the same year, for the hunting of that buck.

In defence Richard objects that the charge is informal, and should not affect him, as it is not a true presentation, but rather a jealous accusation. As far as can be gathered from the scanty allusions to procedure, his point was that he was sent up for sentence on the strength of a piece of gossip, instead of properly proved facts. He petitions for an inquiry; whereupon the regarders and inquisitors say that the presentation was undoubtedly bad, but the verderers independently say that it is good, being presented by the foresters upon oath and in accordance with the assize of the forest. Hence the presentation is ambiguous.

The next charge concerns no less than thirteen persons. One sentence is worth quoting :—

William Fayreghe, William son of Stephen and John son of Edwin do commonly chase the deer beyond the Eden by moonlight, and there take them.

They were, as far as can be judged, all Salkeld men.

Among others who figured in these proceedings for offences in the third and fourth years are William de Harlawe, collector of the king's fifteenth, who took a doe at Bogge, near Morton, while on his way through the forest; Robert de Balliol, who took a doe at Whitewra in Plumpton Hay; and Hugh, "*Lardinarius*," of Wetheral, who with others had been in Plumpton Hay also. Adam Geytspald and Stephen Howard are again in evidence in 5 Edward I.

In this year an incident occurs which perpetuates a fact of interest, the name and date of an old rector of Great Salkeld. As is well known, this living was for centuries attached to the archdeaconry of Carlisle, but the earliest rector or archdeacon mentioned in the accounts of the parish * is Richard de Whyteby, who came later. The rector here referred to is called Eustace de Trewyk.

On St. Vincent's Day in the fifth year a hart, outside the forest crossed the Eden in the direction of the forest through the middle † of the town of Salkeld. A brown dog hunted him to the head of the town, and so he was driven back to the Eden; and there he was killed by John son of Nicholas le Sauser and carried to the house of Eustace de Trewyk, parson of Salkeld. John Mayman, reeve of Gamblesby, and Adam Bursi of the same place were at the taking of that hart. (m. 8d.)

On Wednesday, the feast of St. Margaret in the sixth year, a hart was found in the water of the Wampool. There was an inquisition by the verderers and foresters and the four nearest townships, Wigton, Waverton, Dundraw and Blencogo. This inquisition says that the hart came from the open ground outside the forest wounded by an arrow, so that it died there. The flesh was sent to the Hospital at Carlisle, and the hide to the Canons. (m. 9.)

How long that hart had been lying in the Wampool before the foresters found it is not stated.

Adam, son of Walle of Hutton, and Robert de Stokedale killed a hind in the wood at Soureby on Friday before the Nativity of St. John the Baptist in the same (sixth) year. And as they stood skinning it there came up Adam Weltheued, Ralph Scot and Adam Hower with bows and arrows, and took a part of that venison and carried it to their respective homes.

John son of Nicholas le Sauser, Patrick son of William of Merkanby (Maughanby?), Walter the man of William de Trewyk, and Adam Bursi of Gamelesby, John Page of Merkanby and Thomas de Kempeley took one doe with four greyhounds which belonged to *dominus* Eustace de Trewyk, parson of Salkeld at Todholgywath on Wednesday before the Purification in the same year, and took it to

* See *Great Salkeld: its Rectors and History*, by Rev. A. G. Loftie.

† *i.e.*, between Great and Little Salkeld, which lie on opposite sides of the river.

the house of the said parson. And they took* another doe at Todholgyl, but did not find it; but others found it and carried it away, namely Michael son of Hobbe of Hutton and Henry son of Robert of Eamont Bridge.

A presentation is made against Richard Siward for letting his greyhounds run at a doe at Hilderhead on his way through the forest. They are said to have escaped from his control, and did not do any damage. On appearing before the justices he stated that he was then about to set out to the assistance of the king in Wales, in pursuance of the royal mandate. Thereupon he was discharged.

Next is another charge against Adam Turpe and the parson of Edenhall :—

Henry, parson of Edenhall, Adam Turpe of Edenhall and one Wacherus, the man of Henry, took a doe in the town of Edenhall on Wednesday before All Saints day; and they took two harts above Brounhtwayt with greyhounds on Friday after the Purification in the same year, and were received at the house of the parson. And Adam Turpe took one hart on Thursday before Palm Sunday in that year at Thrangholm, and took it to the house of the parson.

A hart was taken below Carlisle wall in the King's socage on Saturday next before the feast of St. Peter ad vincula in the sixth year by the commonalty of the socage; and Michael Page, then undersheriff to John de Swyneburn the sheriff, carried the flesh and hide to the Castle. (m. 9d.)

In the seventh year a hart was found dead by the old bridge over Peyterel within the close of Plumpton. But the inquisition could tell nothing about it. In the next, Richard Bere, woodward to the Countess of Albemarle, killed a hart at Milnerbeck. The entry is interesting as giving the name of one of the dogs; he was called Gower.

* "Took" (*ceperunt*) is used in a specific sense. A hart was "taken," but crossed the Eden at Langwathby before it was pulled down. Here a deer was "taken," even though captors did not know where it had gone. To be able to strike or wound it would suit the sense; to have done this, or to have slipped dogs, would be enough to justify a conviction.

The succeeding charge gives a curious fragment of the family history of the Veteriponts :—

Michael del Gyl and two others unknown took a hart near Wigton on Sunday next before Lent in the 8th year with a strakur which belonged to Robert de Veteriponte the forester, and carried the flesh to a tower in Gamelesby outside the forest. (m. 10.)

And it is testified that Robert de Veteriponte lives at the King's Court, and has nothing in goods, and that the King feeds him of his charity (*pascit eum de elemosyna sua*).

An entry of the next year records the killing of a buck at Palmcastre by two men from Stainton in Wigton.

The following presentation clearly shows that the persons charged had no intention of committing an offence against the forest laws :—

Richard, the Porter, Stephen of the Cellar, and Walter the Cook of the priory at Carlisle, and William Gretheued allowed their greyhounds to course a hare, and the greyhounds bolted (*strakaverunt*) and throttled one fawn of a doe within the covert of the forest on St. Martin's day in the 9th year; and they left the venison, which was sent to the Hospital at Carlisle.

Afterwards it was asked of the verderers by what warrant Robert, then Prior, had his dogs and greyhounds to course hares within the King's forest. And they said they did not know by what warrant. (m. 10d.)

About this time Ralph Irton was raised to the See of Carlisle, and a surprising number of charges are made against his household servants. In the tenth year, Adam "le Harpur" of the Bishop—a constant offender—was poaching on the Morrow of St. John the Baptist; and on St. Mary Magdalen's Day his singing men (*Nonne homines*) were caught with greyhounds between Blaberithwaite (Burthwaite) and Mortonscoch, accompanied by Eudo de Clethun. On Sunday before St. Cuthbert's Day some of the bishop's men were in Croftonmire outside the forest, and wounded a hart; it entered the forest, and John, the bishop's forester, slipped two berselets and followed it as far as Hildekyrke (Ilekirk) and took it there, and carried

it to Rose. Moreover, John, the huntsman, slipped the bishop's dogs in Warnell, hunted a hind, and killed it below Sebergham Bridge; and later hunted a hart from Caldbeck Park to Langholm (in Sebergham), where it was killed—in each case carrying the venison to Rose. How far the bishop was informed of all this is not stated; he was held to be responsible, and the case was remitted to the king, because the justices could not deal with him as he was a baron. It was practically impossible for a master to show that he was not involved in such an affair when his servant was convicted.

Another entry mentions Hugh, kinsman of the prior of Wetheral, and James de Hoton. (m. 11.) The following is also curious:—

Thomas del Heued, Roger de Gressemer, Thomas son of Alan Carpenter, and Blacke Adecock of Soureby shot a hind by the Yve and carried the venison to Dacre, while William the chaplain, son of Roger del Cote, was celebrating his first mass there. (m. 11d.)

The chaplain had to find security for 40s. for his share in the proceedings. The other persons named deserve a few words of notice. Thomas and Roger were brothers; Black Adecock was a well-known offender, and Thomas, son of Alan, is described, when he first occurs, as Thomas, the son of Alan the Carpenter, woodward of Sowerby. Owing to the frequency of the presentations made against him, a shorter form was afterwards employed. It has been seen already that the woodwards of Sowerby had a rare knack of getting themselves into trouble. This Thomas fully maintained the tradition.

Richard de Wytton, parson of Soureby, William Hushald, his man, William del Gyl of Soureby and John de Hautecloch were in the King's forest at night for the purpose of evildoing on the vigil of Palm Sunday, and the foresters made a rush at them and they fled, leaving two mantles and a bay horse worth five shillings. For which Thomas de Hoton, forester of the land of Plumpton shall answer. (m. 12.)

The price put on the horse is a matter of some interest. Horses for ordinary use fetched various sums up to about 10s. One seized by the officials, when its owner was stealing an oak, was appraised at 1s. 6d., and the cart it was hauling at 6d. The Tanner of Tamworth, Edward the Fourth's friend in the Percy *Reliques*, rode a "mare of four shilling."

William Broket of Edenhall, John Gille, the parson's man, John, brother of the chaplain there, and Robert the proctor of the parson, shot a hart on Penrith Fells on Sunday before St. Martin's Day in the thirteenth year, and followed it over the Eamont and killed it within the forest of Quinefeld (Whinfell). Because it was wounded in the forest of Englefeld (*sic*) the flesh was sent to the Hospital at Carlisle. (m. 12d.)

Robert de Joneby, Adam le Harpur, Hugh Gouk, Walter Rostyng, William son of William de Joneby, Thomas Pickard and Thomas le Parker of Gilkamban were in the forest for the purpose of evildoing and shot at the foresters on the night of Saturday before the Ascension in that year below Randolfesete in Plumpton Park; and the foresters by a sudden onset took from them a fallow greyhound.

With the exception of this Thomas Parker, the whole party had been previously convicted.

Towards the end of the roll of venison are recorded several offences by the forest officers themselves, including Roger de Lancastre. Here are a few more miscellaneous charges:—

Ralph, cook to the Bishop, took a buck between the New and the Old Park and carried it to Rose in the 13th year of King Edward. (m. 13.)

Hugh, chaplain of Hoton, was in the forest with bow and arrows with the object of evildoing towards the King's venison in the same year. And the said Hugh was at Calvethweyt near Todholegile with bow and arrows and wounded a hart on Saturday on the morrow of All Souls in that year.

Adam Geytspald, already often convicted and imprisoned, Walter the son of Randolph of Conduvoc and three others unknown were in the King's forest at Whitewra on Saturday the morrow of St. Faith the Virgin, and there they took one doe with a brown mastiff, and carried it where they willed.

This was the seventh of October, 1285. Adam's last offence had occurred on the Vigil of St. Thomas' Day, the twentieth of the previous December. Another entry mentions Gerard Wyspens, rector of Greystoke. Yet another tells how John de Wigton, the hero of the Caerlaverock Roll, and Dyonisia, his wife, stole a hart and a hind and five hinds' fawns by night from Plumpton Hay, carrying them away to his house at Blackhall.

In the 11th year of this reign Thomas, the brother of Robert de Warthewyk, was poaching at Peytrellwra, accompanied by Adam of the Cellar, who has been mentioned elsewhere, with three greyhounds. The names of two of them are preserved, Kel and Arthurk; they were from the priory. The third is said to be "unknown." (m. 13d.)

There is also a late entry which shows that the justices were detained for several weeks at Carlisle, as they heard a matter which occurred in mid-December:—

It is presented and proved by the foresters and verderers that it has been presented by Hugh de Schupton and Adam Kelet, the foresters, that on Wednesday before the Feast of St. Lucy in the 14th year of King Edward (December 12th, 1285), a hart was taken by six greyhounds below the house of Bricius of Bramwra near the Eamont within the forest. There was an inquisition, etc., which says that while the Lady Idonea de Leyburn was travelling towards Brouham in her forest of Whynefeld, her men slipped their greyhounds to hunt that hart, and he, running in the direction of the King's forest, was taken at the place mentioned within it. But neither man nor dogs followed the hart within the forest, and the greyhounds returned of themselves.

The house of this Bricius was at Bramwra, later Bramery, above the Eamont. From the Pipe Rolls we learn that in about 1230 one Bricius the Cook obtained land there. About 1242 and 1252 Bricius of Penrith was a landowner at Bramwra. He died before 1260, for in the Pipe Roll for 45 Henry III., occurs a payment for tallage by those who had been the tenants of Bricius of Penrith. The

evolution of the designation of these individuals is curious. Bricius is at first a cook; when he gets to Bramwra, he is styled "of Penrith;" Bricius, firmly established in his estate, is "of Bramwra."

From the fact that the hart was found dead at this spot, it is probable that what happened was this—the hart was started near the dip in the road about four miles from Penrith, and headed for a point between St. Ninian's Church and Hornby Hall, about the best line he could have taken, no doubt in the attempt to reach Penrith Fell. The hounds gained on him over the low ground, turning him and forcing him to take the water too low, opposite the cliff where Honey-pot is now. The result was that he landed beside the Giant's Caves, a point from which escape was almost impossible, and the hounds ran into him before he could extricate himself.

An unusual distinction was paid to this hart. The venison was sent to the judges presiding over these Pleas, who no doubt did it full justice.

The rolls also supply information about the deer in Inglewood Forest. The royal forests were stocked with either red or fallow deer, rarely both, and some contained roe deer, though these were certainly scanty in the northern forests. Inglewood seems to have been exceptionally richly supplied, for not only were there red deer and fallow in abundance, but roes are mentioned several times.

The red deer were evidently the most plentiful and the most widely distributed, and by far the greatest number of convictions for taking deer relate to them. They were found both in Inglewood proper and Allerdale. Antlers of red deer often occur, many of them much larger than any of the present day.

The fallow deer seem to have been more local. In the grant by which Alan, the son of Waldeve, gave free chase to the king in Allerdale, they are not named. However, instances do occur of fallow deer killed in Allerdale. Probably the proper interpretation of the terms of the

grant is that it was intended to carry with it all the beasts of the forest; but that these deer were not expressly included, because it was not anticipated that they would be found there.

From the position of the places at which fallow deer were killed, it would appear that their special haunts were the north and easterly area of the forest. This is equivalent to saying that they kept within the woods and undergrowth, avoiding the more open land in the valley of the Petterill. When they came south, they usually found their way along the high ground on the east side of the Carlisle road, reaching Penrith Fell, and sometimes emerging at Great Salkeld and Edenhall. Still, a few are met with at Braithwaite and Morton, and one or two in Plumpton Hay.

The following instances of the capture of roe deer occur in the roll of the pleas :—

Robert Lamb of Sowerby, as we have seen, took two roe fawns, and afterwards their dam. (m. 5.)

William, the son of Maddok, killed one roe (m. 8d.)

William, the son of Maddok, and Adam, the son of John Little (Petit), the serving-man of Richard son of Richard de Soureby, killed a roe in Sowerby wood. (m. 9.)

Thomas de Crossethweyt, then forester, took a roe in Aykewand in this year (the 7th Edward I.), and carried it to his wife at his dwelling-place in Salkyld. (m. 9d.)

Walter de Lythbek, then forester, took a roe. (m. 10.)

Thomas, son of Alan, woodward of Sowerby, killed two does . . . and two roes. (m. 12.)

Two roes were killed, together with other deer, for the requirements of the Justices in Eyre. (m. 35d.)

In the first two and the last two instances, the form *capriolus* is used for *roe*, and in the others *cheverillus*. An exceptional use of the word *capra* for the dam of the fawns occurs in the first of them.

It may be noticed that in four of the five cases in which a clue is given to the district in which the roe was found, the offender was connected with Sowerby, though the

fact does not make it certain that this was their chief haunt. Aykewand, the other place referred to, is on Penrith Fell.

Two other forest terms used in this roll deserve a few words of comment—the *pricket*, denoting a red deer; and the *strakur*, a term used of a hound.

A pricket was properly a buck of the second year, though in the later part of the fourteenth century it was used of the hart also. Importance attaches to the fact that it is applied to the red deer at this period, because no instance of this usage earlier than the reign of Edward the Third was known, until those given below were observed by the present writer. The circumstances make it tolerably certain that the use of “pricket” to indicate a red deer originated in Inglewood, and was for some time peculiar to it. The first of the four instances given relates to the last months of the reign of Henry the Third.

Ralph de Pokelinton, deceased, who was Rector of the Church of Plumland, took a pricket hart (*unum prikietum cervi*) at Blaykthweyt, and carried it to his house at Plumland. (m. 5.)

On the same day of St. Peter (St. Peter in Cathedra, 6 Edward I., the day on which Richard Siward's hounds hunted a deer) a pricket hart (*unus prikietus cervi*) was found dead with an arrow in it. Nothing could be ascertained, because it was all devoured by foxes and birds. (m. 9.)

Ivo de Joneby, Walter son of William of the same, Thomas son of Sturgun and Adam le Carter took a pricket hart (*unum cervum prikiet*) with three greyhounds in Plumpton Park, on Friday before Trinity in the same year (9 Edward I.). (m. 10d.)

The last notice is by far the most valuable. The facts, put briefly, are as follows:—Robert de Brus, Lord Annandale, was authorised to take ten bucks. He and John de Seton, his knight, took three bucks and a doe, which is “a beast different from that contained in his warrant.” Afterwards, John de Seton and a servant took a sorrel hart (*sorellum cervi*).

Later, Robert and John appeared and brought the king's writ in these words:—

EDWARD by the grace of God, etc., to his Justices in Eyre for the Pleas of the Forest in the County of Cumberland Greeting.

Know ye that we have pardoned to our beloved and faithful Robert de Brus, Lord Annandale, and John de Seton, Knight of the said Robert, that trespass which they lately committed in our forest of Ingelwod, by taking therein in the thirteenth year of our reign, without our licence or will, a doe and a pricket hart (*unum priketurn de cervo*) in that forest, while hunting ten bucks which we had given to the said Robert in the aforesaid forest. (Here follows a formal authority to discharge them.)

Witness Myself, at Ford, the fifteenth day of December in the fourteenth year of our reign.

From this it seems that pricket and sorrel were used indifferently, at any rate in this locality.

But a slight difficulty still remains. What is the exact meaning of these terms? In the strict language of venery, a sorrel was a red deer in its third year. But earlier in this roll a "sorrel of one year" has been mentioned. A pricket, as was said before, denoted a buck of the second year. The inference is that the words are used of a red deer not exceeding the third year, and this seems fairly satisfactory, the words being used to indicate one of the younger deer. In default of further evidence, the interpretation may be left to stand provisionally.

There are a few more details which serve to show with some vividness how plentiful the deer were when Inglewood was in its glory. It is related that King Edward the First once killed two hundred bucks in a few days there. This story is well known, and is recounted in many local works. Readers of the printed Pipe Rolls for the reign of Henry the Third will notice that in two successive years there were taken in Inglewood two hundred harts and two hundred hinds. In a previous year two consignments of venison, each comprising over a hundred harts, were sent to Northampton. But this is nothing beside the great chase when Edward the First visited Inglewood in the eighth year of his reign. He hunted for

four days, and on the first there were killed *four hundred* harts and hinds.

The word *strakur* occurs about half a dozen times. As Mr. Turner gives no instance of this except from this very roll, it seems likely to have been a purely local usage. In various instances we read of black, white, grey, and fallow strakurs; in another of a greyhound strakur. Perhaps a clue to the meaning of the word is to be found in the phrase already quoted, *leporarii strakaverunt*.*

So many hard things have been said of the harshness of the forest law that a few examples showing it in a more favourable light will not be inappropriate. Here is one:—

On Saturday next before the Conversion of St. Paul in the 5th year of King Edward a hart came out of Colemire towards Dundraw, and fell on the ice, breaking its leg. And a mastiff followed and throttled it. The dog belonged to Gilbert son of William son of Geoffrey de Dundrawe, did not usually run at deer, nor was the said Gilbert previously charged with any trespass of venison. The hide was sent to the Canons and the flesh to the Hospital. Hence nothing (*i.e.*, no ransom) from this. (m. 8d.)

It is not absolutely certain on what ground this acquittal was reached; it may have been simply upon a broad principle of administering the law according to the spirit, not the letter, as the offence took place under exceptional circumstances. This view is supported by the testimony given of the hitherto clean record of both man and mastiff. Still, the decision may have been based on a useful old statute,† in which it was provided that “if any mastiff be found upon any deer, and shall be lawed, he whose mastiff he is shall be quit of that deed; but if he be not lawed, the owner of such mastiff shall be guilty as if he had given it him with his hand.”

The object of this statute was to compromise between two conflicting interests. In a forest, mastiffs would

* We may also notice *strákr* [Icel.] = vagrant, *strax* = forthwith.

† Statutes of the Realm, I. 244.

almost be a necessity for protection ; at the same time they would be a nuisance to the king's deer. The arrangement was a reasonable one ; the inhabitants were allowed their mastiffs, and were free from responsibility for any deer their animals might kill of their own accord, provided that they took the obvious means of preventing poaching by cutting their claws.

Richard, the son of Gilbert de Kendal carried a bow and arrows belonging to Gilbert his father in the forest on Monday before the Assumption in the eighth year with the object of evildoing in the matter of the venison. . . . And because it is testified that he did no wrong, there is nothing from him. (m. 10.)

To carry bow and arrows in the forest was forbidden for reasons that are self-evident. When a man was found doing so, the officials drew their own conclusions. But in this instance the presumption of evil intent was allowed to be rebutted by the most slender evidence. Probably Richard was only a boy, and a formal conviction would have been a needless act of hardship.

If a man desired to convey a bow through the forest, and his motives were honest, he would not be molested if he took the precaution of tying his arrows to the bow with the bowstring. This would effectively show that he was not intending to use it.

The hardest case in the roll is due, not to the character of the forest law, but to a flaw in the judicial system which was not peculiar to that epoch. Owing to the length of time between the Eyres, an offender might be kept in confinement for a considerable period ; and though these proceedings do not show many instances of this, there is one case that is somewhat striking. William Skalle, the son of "Mariota de Hibernia," had some venison in a chest, and five arrows were found in the bishop's vaccary at Normanloge, under circumstances which compromised William Skalle. He was therefore seized, and sent to Carlisle Gaol. When his case came before the justices,

it was pointed out that he had been there for three years. Why he had not managed to secure his release earlier is not explained, for the mere fact that he was poor hardly accounts for his long imprisonment. But whatever the reason may have been, the justices, on being informed of the facts, granted him a pardon "for the good of the king's soul" for this and a subsequent offence, on his finding two sureties for his future good behaviour. (m. 7d.)

The next quotations give two illustrations of the extent of a man's liability for the wrong-doing of his servant, one on each side of the line. If he could show that he absolutely stood aloof, he would be discharged.

Alexander de Chesewyk, of the Priory of Carlisle, Walter, cook of the same Priory (here is interlined, significantly, "formerly of the aforesaid Priory") with him, were in the forest on Friday next before the Translation of St. Thomas the Martyr in the first year of King Edward in the land of Ellerton (in Hesket). Seeing the foresters they fled, and left two greyhounds, of which one was white, and one partly brown and partly white. One was the greyhound of the lord Robert, then Prior of Carlisle, the other Robert de Stayvelawe's, the valet of the Prior. The Prior knew nothing of this, for he was not in the district. And as soon as he was informed, he dismissed Walter and the others from his service. (m. 6.)

Here the prior was discharged, and so was his valet.

Thomas the son of Henry Pyrrok took two greyhounds from the house of Master Richard de Whiteby, parson of Salkeld Regis on Easter day in the tenth year, and took a hind in the forest and carried it to the house of the said Richard. And the said Richard knew nothing of this, and as soon as he learnt from it, he dismissed him from his service.

So far the chance of an acquittal for the rector seem excellent, but

It is asked of the verderers whether he retained the venison after removing Thomas from his service. And they say that he retained it, and that one William, the proctor of the parson, retained it. (m. 11.)

And the rector had to pay 40s. and William 10s.

In the next instance one of the offenders seems to have been treated not merely with mercy, but with absolute sympathy, for there is nothing else to account for the lenience shown to one of the brothers involved.

Hugh Cutpyntel and John his brother killed a hind in Harescoch on St. Nicholas day in the 9th year. And Hugh and John did not appear, nor have they been attached; but it is testified that they dwell in Hoton in the Forest. Hence the Sheriff is directed to produce them here, etc. But it is testified that the said Hugh by mischance has broken his leg. Therefore he is respited till he recovers. Afterwards came the said John and made a fine for 20s. and found twelve sureties . . . and the said Hugh came and made a fine for forty pence. (m. 10d.)

So the victim of the accident escaped with a penalty one-sixth of that paid by his companion.

In this roll, at any rate, there is nothing to suggest that the penalties for killing deer were regarded with alarm. They may have added a certain excitement to the vetoed sport, but the impression left on the mind is that the risks were treated with a sublime indifference, unless the foresters came in sight at an awkward moment, in which event the culprits generally tried to make a run for it before they were recognised.

But there are several other points on which we could wish to be informed; whether, for instance, the number of charges bore any relation to political disturbance in the country. Probably it depended largely on the energy shown by the forest officers. And it would also be interesting to know how much venison was stolen without the knowledge of the foresters. It is a pity that we have to rely on the dispassionate statements of the Pleas. Could we only have a version of the same facts from the point of view of, say, Adam Geytspald, or had the woodwards of Sowerby left their memoirs, the record would have been exceedingly instructive, and certainly would not have afforded dull reading.