

ART. XVIII.—*The Feoffees of the Cliffords, from 1283 to 1482.* By the REV. FREDERICK W. RAGG, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Communicated at Carlisle, September 12th, 1907.

I.—INTRODUCTION TO THE FEODARY OF THE FREEHOLDERS UNDER THOMAS LORD CLIFFORD.

THE feodary here transcribed seems to have been little noticed. It is part of the contents of vol. 40 of Agarde's Indexes in the Public Record Office. Possibly its occurring in an index volume while it itself was not an index may have caused it to be passed by. Possibly also its curious mistakes and omissions may have raised a prejudice against it, causing others to think as I did at first, that it was simply a late faulty copy of an original return, the defects of which made it of little value. But it is better not to be too ready to look on things as common or unclean, and a close perusal of the document brought that lesson home. The writing shows itself after all as of the time of Edward IV., which towards the end of the feodary we find professing to be its date. But from its own statement this was a revision of a feodary belonging to some thirty years before. And the feodary of thirty years before had chances also of error in it if it was put together from rough notes such as would be likely to be taken in making the investigation. Rough full notes first, then fair copy. Thus there are three chances of errors and sets of errors, especially if at any one of these steps there was taking down by word of mouth by one who was not versed in names of men and places. It would seem too that the compiler or compilers found difficulty in reading documents of two hundred years earlier. The names at any rate in some cases were grievously misread. But such as it is, and incomplete as

it is, it seems to be a genuine return of the fiefs and feoffees of the Clifford barony of "Westmerland," founded on an investigation made for the Thomas Lord Clifford, who was slain at St. Albans on May 22nd, 1454; the services of feoffees at the time of compilation being compared with older "evidences" and proofs.

At first it is not easy to feel sure whether the list of names of existing feoffees given belongs to 31 Henry VI. (1452), or to 22 Edward IV. (1482), and no easier to see to what period the "quondam" so often occurring refers. But both difficulties vanish on investigation, as I think the following argument will show. If we take for instance the case of "Hertha" (*i.e.* Harcla or Hartley) and "Longton"—the fourth entry—we find that Michael "Hertha" (Harcla) once (quondam) held these. Now Michael Harcla the father, evidently, of the ill-fated Andrew, Earl of Carlisle, occurs as Sheriff of Westmorland in 1275, of Cumberland 1285 to 1298. In 1308 Andrew appears in the Assize Rolls and Michael passes away: there was a Michael, apparently brother of Andrew, but he comes on a little later.* We get from this the wide limits of a period from about 1275 to about 1308 as the period of the "quondam"—the "once." We can narrow these limits down by the entry concerning Overton and "Waterby" (Watby). A moiety of each of these is stated to have been once (quondam) held by "Ranulfus nuper dominus de Dacre." Two Ranulfs there were amongst the earlier barons of Dacre; one who was in possession of his barony between 12 Edward II., and 13 Edward III. (1318-1339), but we want a still earlier Ranulf if we are to have one contemporary with that Michael Harcla used for hypothesis above. Ranulf, Lord of Dacre, between 52 Henry III., and 14 Edward I. (1268-1286), will do quite well, and from this Ranulf we get the later limit as 1286, the earlier as 1268. Then

* After Andrew's fall Hartley passed out of "Harcla" into Musgrave hands.

if we turn to "Meuburne Mald" (Meaburne Maud) we find Richard le Fraunceys given under the most curious of mistakes as "Ricardus leigh Fraunceys" as "once" holding that manor. Richard le Fraunceys succeeded his father Gilbert le Fraunceys (who died before March 7th, 1278) in the ownership of Meaburne Maud, after the inquisition held on June 29th, 1283, he having reached his twenty-first year on May 19th, preceding that. We thus get a great shrinkage in the limits to the period, viz., 1283-1286. Now at the Inquisitio post mortem of Roger de Clifford held in January, 1283, the jury say that the knights' fees (military fees) and tenancies have not been yet apportioned to Isabel, widow of Roger de Clifford, and to Idonea, wife of Roger de Leyburne, though Roger held part of the cornage and had the shrievalty at his death. We may, therefore, fairly imagine that the first "evidences" spoken of in the heading to the feodary were then only being put into shape, as well the Clifford as the Leyburn evidences for those fiefs to which the Cliffords afterwards became heirs. The apportionment was complete by April 28th, 1289, and probably some time before, for we find from the Inquisitio post mortem of William, son of Thomas (de Greystock), given in our feodary as "once" holding Dufton, that he held it of the Lady Idonea de Leyburne. Between 1283 and 1286 may be safely assumed to be the date referred to in "quondam"; and I think we cannot be wrong in settling 1283. Incidental evidence in other documents corroborates. For instance, in the Assize Roll of 16 Edward I. (1287-8) we find that Thomas de Musgrave, who "once" according to the feodary held several manors, is already dead and has been succeeded by Richard de Musgrave; that Thomas, son of Gilbert, is in possession of the Curwen holdings instead of Gilbert, son of Patrick, of the feodary; and in the next year's Assize Roll (1288-9) that Hugh, son of Geoffrey de Louthier, and Inetta his wife are apparently in possession of Louthier,

and not John Copeland, Adam Everington (=Haverington =Harrington) and Simon "Bowney" (of him later on) of the feodary; and that Robert de Morville given as "once" holding "Helton Flethan" (Helton Flechan) must be dead, for there was an action brought by William, son of Walter de Wessington, against Robert L'Engleys and Idonea his wife, apparently in a dispute about their share in Robert de Morville's lands. If each of these items would not be strong enough taken by itself as proof, the agreement of the testimony of all must surely be enough for evidence. Other witnesses could be produced, but I do not think they are needed.

Now let us see what we can make of the period of the feoffees given as existing. Henry Vernon, we are told, holds Meaburne Maud. Henry Vernon also held Had-don—as we know from other evidence—in Derbyshire. He succeeded his father William Vernon in 1467. Humphrey Lord Dacre holds the moieties of Overton and Watby. This Lord Dacre was nominally heir to his brother Ranulf, killed at Towton in 1461, and came into actual possession after the attainder was reversed, but was not summoned to Parliament as Lord Dacre before 22 Edward IV. (March 4th, 1482), and 22 Edward IV. is the date which occurs in the heading of the second part of the feodary. I do not think we need search further. The feoffees given as existing cannot be those of 1452, but those of 1482.

I have not given all the compiler's slips from past tense into present (tenet for tenuit—debet for debuit); the contraction for the present tense was shorter, and he did not trouble apparently if he thought his meaning clear enough; nor have I given his curious separations of single Latin words into two—these things would have entailed a troublesome, and I think to the reader, irritating set of notes. What the document was intended to tell is what concerns us. Any error at all of moment I have kept and commented upon.

Having got the feodary into such form that we can begin to understand it, we can turn our attention to its contents and to the tenures which it describes. Can we conjecture why or in what circumstances it was compiled? I think we can. At the ending of the whole is a copy of the Patent Roll of 21 Richard II. (1398) granting to Ralph Nevill, Earl of Westmorland, for life, the Clifford rights in the fiefs. Ralph Nevill to whom this grant was made lived on till October 21st, 1425. His contemporary John Lord Clifford, who was thus disinherited by the King, was hardly ten years old at the time of the grant to Ralph Nevill. His father had done good service for his King. The grant looks like a specimen of King Richard's method of rewarding, if it was not as well a specimen of a Nevill's grasping. John Lord Clifford, however, was killed at the siege of Meaux, March 13th, 1422, leaving his eldest son Thomas (born in August, 1414) still a child, and of course Ralph Nevill still was in possession of the heritage of which he had been deprived. Thomas could not claim anything when Ralph died, nor for nearly ten years afterwards, August, 1435, when he became of age. This is the Thomas Lord Clifford for whom the feodary was made; and one can easily understand that he might well have need for investigation and for appeal to the "evidences" and "views" of his ancestors, all the way up to the beginning of the Clifford inheritance in the barony. An alienation to Ralph Nevill, lasting from 1398 to 1425, followed by a wardship of the heir and his estates—which of itself not seldom could be a cause of fleecing—for ten years till 1435, might easily find room for thickets of uncertainty to grow and for wastes by trespass and encroachment in the heir's paternal heritage. But why so long an interval—1435 to 1452—before the compilation, if this be supposed as cause or as one contributing cause of it? Encroachments might not be discovered all at once; investigation takes long and evidences take time to collect and search through, to say

S

nothing of disputes taking time for settlement. Not till all is done would come the time for tabulating all. This suggestion of the reason for compiling is, however, only suggestion of a possibility.*

Now the Letter Patent might be thought to rehearse in the actual words the grant of King John to which it refers. But this is not the case. It tells very much the same tale in words not quite the same, and adds particulars of the rights granted which may be implied in King John's charter, but are not mentioned. But these concern us little; the limits of the grant are what concern us, and not even in these do the original charter and the Patent Letter tally completely. King John granted to Robert de Veteripont and his heirs the services of all that held of him in the county of Westmorland who did not hold "per servicium militare," so the charter says; the Letter Patent says 'except the services of those that held of him "per servicium militare."' It comes to the same thing no doubt, but "servicium militare" in both deeds in describing the limits of the grant could only mean "by knight service." There is no difficulty in that, but the Letter Patent goes on to say "coronagium . . . quod est in effectu *servicium militare*," and the heading of our feodary states the holdings enumerated in its first part to be those held "per coronagium *quod est servicium militare*." And more, the feodary implies that cornage gives, and the Letter Patent states that cornage gives and always did give (dat . . . et a toto tempore dedit) "custodia," "maritagium," and "relevium"—the right of having the wardship of heir or heiress under age, and of the estates (custodia)—wardship; the right of disposing in marriage of the heir or heiress if left by a father's death under age

* A possibility that is dawn light, not day light. For from the Inquisitio p. mortem of Thomas Lord Clifford, 28th September, 1454, we learn that on August 5th, 1444, he had placed all his Westmorland estates in the hands of interim feoffees (trustees) of whom a John Wharton was one; and that the estates so remained till after his death. Was it these feoffees who needed exact particulars and sought them?

(maritagium)—“marriage”: the right to the relief (relevium), a sort of death duty to be paid, when the heir or heiress after proof of being of age was put in, before entrance into possession. These three—“custodia,” “maritagium,” and “relevium”—were, as Pollock and Maitland in their magnificent *History of English Law* show, rights attached to “servicium militare,” rights the feudal lord had over his feoffees holding by that tenure. There can then be no doubt about the cornage tenure. It was “servicium militare.” And all the Clifford feoffees except those who held in socage, to which we shall come hereafter, were holding by this tenure, nor is there any reason to suppose the tenures altered after the grant was made to Robert de Veteripont except possibly in the case of the few drengs.

It seems to be the case, we shall conclude, that “servicium militare” is used in these documents in two different senses, and that it was somewhat vague, a term of wide embrace. It has been somewhat too exclusively thought of as being only knights’ service—the service done and due for a knight’s fee usually called “feodum militis,” to which several might contribute; for there are plenty of instances of men holding by service of a fractional part of a knight’s fee. But this does not apply to cornage.* The knight and his fee are not divided up into aliquot parts in any document that I know of to describe the cornage holding. And, indeed, we have Maitland in his illuminating way suggesting that all were not knights who held by military tenure, and that even some of those who were knights, were only a sort of yeomen. If we look at the instances of free tenures of Appleby and Nether Burgh in the tabulations I give for illustration, we can easily see that very poorly harnessed and caparisoned would be the

* In the *Inquisitio post mortem* of Isabel de Clifford, (Esch. Inq., series 1, file 1, 20 Edward I, 1292), her share of the fiefs is given under the headings of “Feoda Militum” and “Alba Firma.” Which these were is shown in the tabulations. Feoda militum could hardly in this instance be knights’ fees, but must be military fees.

“miles” (knight) which such holdings could equip. And then again we find that the payment of cornage and therefore tenure by cornage can go at least two deep. Assize Roll, No. 979 (40 Henry III.), has a case in which Thomas de Hellebek was summoned to answer why he did not perform the services he owed to Alan de Cabergh for land he held of Alan in Wardecop, part of these services being the payment of $3\frac{1}{2}$ d. “ad cornagium”—the very term which our feodary uses over and over again. We must not take this to be equivalent to a rent paid by Thomas to Alan to help Alan to pay his cornagium, because the addition of the words “ad cornagium” only apply to that particular sort of due for a holding held by military service. Alan de Cabergh himself turns up in our feodary, but nowhere as holding lands in Wardecop, so that unless he was one of the small holders there who are lumped together as “tenentes ad voluntatem”—“tenants at will”—at the end of the cornage tenants, he might probably be holding, by cornage, land in Wardecop himself under the owner of the moiety of Warcop, which was held by cornage. We should then have cornage tenants three deep;* and however far it went down, tenure by cornage would carry, as Richard’s Letter Patent says it does and always did—wardship, marriage, and relief. We can see through the dark more easily if we take it that “servicium militare” is used in the vague width of meaning which can include higher and lower ranks, the service of the officer, the service of the rank and file—the service of the knight, the service of the men whom the knight led. Since they knew what they meant they did not see the need of separating out another term, “servicium equitum,” and leaving “servicium militare” to be “servicium militum”—that of the private soldier only. Taking things in this way, we can get a good grip on the

* I imagine that the boundary line between the lower or lowest tenant by cornage, and the tenants holding by the famous tenant right was vague and probably disappeared.

exceptions made by King John, and find the limits of the grant.

The county of Westmorland at the time of the grant included, as the Pipe Rolls show, and had included for some years, the whole of what we now call Westmorland. Richard I. had granted to Gilbert fitz Roger fitz Reinfred the barony of Kendal, which seems to have reached on the west to the bounds of Yanwath, including Hartsop, Patterdale, Barton, and Sockbridge; and to have had an outlier islanded inside the barony of Appleby—Morland and its manors,* except Maud's Meaburne and Bolton. King's Meaburne seems to have been separate from either barony, and yet it is set down in the *Inquisitio post mortem* of 24 Edward III., 1351, of Robert le Botiller as being a Clifford manor and in the King's hands only by reason of the non-age of the Clifford heir. Temple Sowerby is the remaining fief not in Clifford hands, but was not likely to have been included in the exceptions of John's grant.† Gilbert fitz Reinfred was let off pretty easily. For the larger half of Westmorland he not only was allowed the cornage, but he had to find simply two knights. Kendal was to be a fee of two knights; Veteriponts and Cliffords had four to find; Gilbert's feoffees by cornage would be in the same position as the feoffees by cornage of the Cliffords.

A little awkward in this military service, when one tenant held by that service under different lords, would matters sometimes be. It was all very well when all that the feoffee had was under one lord; but when, for instances, the Dacres, and the Curwens of Workington and the Vernons of Haddon happened to leave heir or heiress under age, holding as they did under different lords, the adjustment between all superior lords as to the marriage

* Of these, however, Melkinthorpe was feudally within the barony of Appleby under the service of a mewed sparrow hawk yearly due from the owner of the Kendal barony, as appears below among the socage entries (fee farm).

† It must be this that occurs once and apparently only once in the *Inquisition*—that of Isabel de Clifford, 1292, in the fee farm (socage) list.

would mean impoverishing the estates; and it is not a matter of wonderment that the tenant by military service sought so often to betroth his child while still an infant in order to stave off a worse fate for the possessions and the heir.

A matter in our feodary which needed some thought to settle was that throughout it "wardum" occurs and not "warda." Warda is guardianship, equivalent to "custodia"; "wardum" is usually taken to mean castle-guard, or payment for castle-guard. The reasons why one feels compelled to take "wardum" in this document as being wardship of an heir and not castle-guard are first that something is wanted, added to "maritagium" and "relevium," to answer to "custodia" so that we may have the two series in identity—custodia maritagium, relevium—and "wardum" fills the post, wardum, maritagium, relevium; then again "si contingebat" is attached to it "if it occurred" words which would not be needed for a yearly tax for repairing and maintaining the castles of the barony which were aids in the King's defence of his realm; and next that in the Inquisitiones post mortem which give the valuation of the dues to the barony *custodia* which was one of them is not given but *wardum* and the sum total is set down as *summa wardorum* distinctly, not *wardarum*. Yet one of these Inquisitions has a further puzzle the solution of which I am not yet prepared to give; to some of the items "valet wardum" such and such a sum is attached; to others "valet warda de wardo" such and such a sum. What the warda of the wardum was, will take some further investigation. But a last reason for taking wardum to be wardship is the amount given as the value. As a tax I think it would be something more than excessive. Heavy enough would be the cornage dues together with the obligation of military service which would mean fitting yourself with arms and armour and serving without pay, providing for your own necessities, except in so far as the inadequate

payment made by the King went—if any were made. And if such a heavy tax as that at which the wardum was valued were added on to these, no man could live. I take the valuation to be the amount which the estates in each case could produce yearly as its lord's profits. This would be what the man who agreed to give a lump sum for the wardship would wish to know: and this would be the valuation of that, "when it occurred" to the baron whose feoffee's estate had to find it. Of this I have something to say later on.

The grant to Robert de Veteripont was for the service of four knights; that is, the barony of Appleby or "Westmerland" was four knights' fees. But what one notices is that the obligation thus imposed on the Veteriponts and their heirs to find four knights did not exempt their free tenants from having to serve in a greater number than four if any of them had land enough or rental high enough for knighthood. When the Veteripont or the Clifford had found his four, he had done all that was required and no more could be claimed of him, so that he had nothing to say upon the matter. But the Assize Roll of 40 Henry III. tells us that the Valletti (officials of the Assize Court of some sort) who were to report on the numbers of men who possessed enough to make them of standing to be knights stated that William de Lindesey, William de Greystoke, Thomas de Hastings, Thomas de Musgrave, William de Kyrketon, Alexander Mauchil, Henry de Trekkeld, Gilbert de Engayne* and Henry de Stanell were of age, had sufficient estate for whole knights' fees and had not taken up knighthood. Nothing is said of those who had complied with the King's orders, but here are nine who had not; and the whole that the two baronies of the county were to supply was six. This is a little like exaction on the King's part although one knows the statute existed which required knighthood in those of certain standings. These might have been holders in

* Gilbert Engayne as will appear later was a dreng.

other counties besides Westmorland, but the point is that they were reported for not taking up knighthood for what they held in Westmorland.

We may now turn to the second part of the feodary, the feodi firma (fee farm) or alba firma (white farm), *i.e.*, the tenure which renders its dues in money payments, "white money" (alba),—silver that is,—which includes lesser coin. These the heading of the second part tells us held in socagio—in socage; and here again we are helped by Maitland's clear thought and realizing grasp. He defines socage as a tenure that is free but is not spiritual nor military nor serviential—this last is special service of some particular sort. The socage tenants held under various terms: they discharged their dues, some by a nominal rent—so we may term it—a rose given on a certain day, a pair of spurs or other small "gift," specified usually in family arrangements and settlements, some by a smaller or larger rent, and some by a rent and also by doing certain sorts of labour on the lord's land: dues of socage could be dues in money and dues in kind, and toil. This socage tenancy Maitland believes was a relic of older days; it was that form of tenure into which drengage (if, I suggest, drengage did not *begin* with that), and tenure by military service, and in fact all other tenures were gradually changed. In fact it was a forerunner of modern tenancies without their limit of a fixed number of years. In the Westmorland tenancies we find sometimes a mixture; for instance the tenant or feoffee of Orton besides his cornage has a serjeanty; he held his lord's stirrup, (see the entry in the text): thus his tenure was military tenure and serviential tenure: Johanna de Mallerstang (as the *Inquisitio post mortem* of Thomas Lord Clifford, who died 18th August, 1391, tells us) besides paying cornage provided a cradle * whenever

* Unam cunã; for unam cunabulam. This service is recorded in only one of the Inquisitions. At least if it is mentioned in any of the others it is in the part which is illegible. The Lady was of course the wife of the Baron of Westmorland. See the tabulation, Nether Burgh, 1392.

the Lady had a child. But on the whole the socage tenures are distinct, though it was quite possible for a feoffee to hold one tenure by cornage and another by socage. Cases of this sort appear under "Rukby" and Milneburne.

But how many were the original drengs? And what became of the drengage tenancies, we are wanting to ask, and in what way did drengage differ from other tenures? Of the tenure itself I would rather write at some future date, when I hope to know more about it. But what about the numbers? According to the Oblata Roll of 2 John 1200-1201, where the names also are given, 17 drengs paid a sum agreed on (a "fine") that they might not have to cross the sea in the King's service; by the next year according to the Pipe Roll one more must have joined the 17, for the payments of 18 are accounted for. We cannot be sure therefore that there were not more. But by means of some of the names given in the Oblata Roll we can discover with probability, I venture to think, into what form of tenure these were lapsing.

The names given are:—

		LATER TENURE.	MERGED INTO
Walter de Harcla	Hartley*		cornage
Walter fitz Durand	(not identified)		
Robert fitz Roberti de Suleby	Soulby	a Musgrave tenure	cornage
William de Askeby	Askby Wynander- waith (moiety)	an Askby tenure	cornage
John Tailbois	Cliburn, Askham, Bampton, &c.	Tailbois	cornage
William Mauchal	Crakanthorpe	Mauchael	cornage
Henry de Cundal	Bampton	Cundal	cornage
Alan Pincerna (le Botiller)	King's Meaburne and elsewhere	le Botiller	
Nicholaus fitz Roberti	(not identified)		

* These place-names are not given in either Roll, but are names of places in which from other sources we find these families held land in the 13th century.

		LATER TENURE.	MERGED INTO
Ricardus Anglicus (L'Engleys)	Askby Parva	L'Engleys	cornage
Hugh de Cotesford	Askby Wynander- wath (moiety)	Cotesford	cornage
Richard fitz Acher (?)	(not identified)		
Reginald fitz William	(not identified)		
William de Clifton	Clifton	Engayne	castle service and cornage.
Gilbert de Broham	Brougham	Brougham	cornage
William de Tirneby	Thrimby		
John de Morville	Helton Flechan	L'Engleys	cornage

The drengs left in 8 Edward II., 1314, were :—

Gilbert Engayne	Clifton	cornage
Adam de Coupland	Louther	cornage
The heir of Geoffrey or (? Walter) fitz Hervey	Cliburne	socage and cornage?
William de Ty[] (Tylia)	Cliburne	socage and cornage?
Robert de Soureby	Cliburne	socage and cornage?
Hugh	(?)	

These are all the names that are legible; from the space in the Inquisitio I do not think there were more, but they are stated to hold diverse tenements in Cliburn, Clifton, Louther, and Melkinthorpe per “servicium drengorum.”

A large proportion of those which can be traced with probability it would seem were changed into cornage. It was evidently the passing away of old things and the coming of new.

The third part of the feodary either was not made out or it has been lost. It is referred to in the entry about Clifton as “servicia castri de Burgham,” services connected with Brougham Castle. This may have been serjeanty.

One note about the Westmorland socage tenants. From claims brought forward in some of the Assize Rolls, as for instance in Roll 979 (40 Henry III.), one made by Constance, widow of Nicholas de Crakanthorp, against

Alexander Mauchal, it is clear that the wardship in these cases of both heir and land of the husband was in law the right of the widow and not of the feudal lord. This we learn from Maitland was the general, not the universal rule.

I now turn to the entries in the feodary. If I give here the formula of one of the cornage entries in full translated, and hints as to the variations in those which are not given in full I think we may save much space needed for notes and avoid repeating over and over again, to little purpose for intelligent readers, the same terms. Any variations which differ from the common formula I can explain as they occur.

That formula in full is this:—"A.B. once held as freehold the manor of X with its appurtenances as *m* carucates of land, and paid for cornage yearly at Easter and Michaelmas *y* shillings. He owed wardship marriage and relief and suit (sectam) to the county of Westmorland from month to month.* And wardship, when it occurred that there was any, was worth yearly *x* marks (at 13s. 4d.) (or *z* pounds); relief was paid 'per finem'—*i.e.*, by agreement, and marriage (dues) when they were to be had. And now C.D. holds the aforesaid manor by the same services and pays yearly for cornage *y* shillings."

In order to save himself repetition instead of writing after wardum "ut contingebat" (as it occurred) the compiler writes "&c.," in subsequent entries, and instead of repeating "maritagium prout habendi" (when it was to be had) and "relevium per finem"—he writes "de maritagio et relevio ut supra," or "ut prius," "as stated above."

Of the socage entries it is better to give the gist, each as it occurs. It is interesting to find that with very rare

* That is, his lord could claim from his estate the rights of wardship and its profits, the right of giving his heir or heiress (under age) in marriage (and make profit by so doing), and the "succession duty" (relevium); and required his attendance from month to month at the county court (not then merely a court of debt). The hereditary shrievalty made the county court of Westmorland the Clifford's baronial court.

exceptions the holdings subject to cornage are described as of three carucates or multiples or subdivisions of three; and that the cornage payments—payments per head of cattle—seem to have no relation to the carucates, which were plough-land. This makes one surmise that the cornage was due on cattle for feeding and cattle for work, part only of the cattle which the grass would feed being needed for the plough. The carucate is clearly an assessment dating from the times before such records of the Kings' courts as remain begin, and into this land of the silent and into the true connexion between this assessment and the cornage assessment we can only hope to enter by means of such charters and muniments of those times as remain and are accessible. The cornage payment reminds one of the swine dues of the South of England, in spite of the difference which exists between them. The dues per head of swine are I think nowhere set down as entailing "servicium militare."

II.—FEODARY OF THE FREEHOLDERS UNDER THOMAS LORD CLIFFORD.

Feodarium Serviciorum et liberorum tenementorum reddituum omnium militum armigerorum et aliorum liberorum tenentium quorumcunque infra Comitatum Westmerlande qui tenent libere de domino Thoma domino de Clifford et de Westmerlanda ut de baronia de Westmerlanda per coronagium quod est servicium militare, renovatum per Johannem Wharton auditorem dicti domini et alios de consilio suo, inspectis prius visis et examinatis antiquis feodariis et aliis evidenciis antecessorum dicti domini, ut pro uno anno, finiente ad festum S. Michaelis Archangeli Anno

Feodary of services and rents of free tenements of all knights gentlemen and other freeholders whatsoever within the County of Westmorland who have freehold under Lord Thomas, lord of Clifford and of Westmoreland, by cornage which is military service; renewed by John Wharton auditor for the said Lord Thomas and by others of his council, after looking into surveys and examining ancient feodaries and other evidences belonging to the ancestors of the said Lord Thomas: the return being of one year's services ending at Michaelmas in the 31st year of Henry VI. (and

regnorum Henrici Sexti xxxi
Edwardi quarti [22*].

again renewed) in the (22*) year
of Edward IV.

* The number of the year is not given here, but it occurs in the second part
"The Alba Firma" as 22.

CORONAGIUM WESTMERLANDE.

Hellebek.

Thomas Helbek quondam
tenuit libere manerium de Hel-
bek cum pertinentiis pro iij
carucatis terre et reddidit ad
terminos Pasche et Michaelis
6s. Et debuit wardum mari-
tagium et relevium ac sectam
Comitatui Westmerlande de
mensi in mensem. Et valebat
wardum cum contingebat an-
nuatim 20 merkes, relevium per
finem, et maritagium prout
habendi potuit. Et modo
Thomas Blenkinsopp tenet pre-
dictum manerium per eadem
servicia, et reddit per annum
ad coronagium 6s

* Thomas de Hellebek, besides holding these manors directly, held land in
Warcop under Alan de Cabergh. His wife was Amicia, daughter of Thomas de
Musgrave.

Ascom.

Idem Thomas Helbek quon-
dam tenuit libere manerium de
Ascom pro iij carucatis terre,
et reddidit annuatim ad coro-
nagium terminis predictis 50s 9d:
et debuit wardum maritagium
et relevium. Et solebat valere
wardum cum contingebat £20.
Et de relevio et maritagio ut
supra. Ac debuit sectam Comi-
tatui ut supra. Et modo Thomas
Sandford tenet dictum maner-
ium per eadem servicia et
reddit per annum ad corona-
gium terminis predictis 50s 9d

Helbeck.

Thomas Helbek* once held
this for 3 carucates. Cornage
paid was 6s. Wardship was
worth 20 marks yearly. Thomas
Blenkensopp holds it now by
the same services, and pays for
cornage 6s.

Askham.

The same Thomas Helbek
once held this for 3 carucates.
Cornage paid was 50s. 9d.
Wardship was worth £20 yearly.
Thomas Sandford holds it now
by the same services, and pays
for cornage 50s. 9d.

Cabergh.

Alanus Cabergh quondam tenuit libere manerium de Cabergh cum pertinentis pro iij carucatis terre, et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 17^s 8^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium &c ut supra. Et solebat valere wardum cum contingebat £20. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et debuit sectam ut supra. Et modo Alanus Fulthrope tenet idem manerium per servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis, ultra 6^s 8^d de alba firma ejusdem ut patet postea intra 'Albam Firmam Westmerlande' 17^s 8^d.

* Alan de Cabergh had a wife Alice. They held lands also in Lowther. Alan was son of Hugh de Cabergh, and had an elder brother Robert, who died s.p.—Assize Roll, 979, 40 Henry III.

Hertha Langton.

Michaell Hertha quondam tenuit libere manerium de Hertha Nun* Langton cum pertinentiis pro vi carucatis terre et reddidit pro utroque ad festa predicta ad coronagium 7^s 4^d. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim &c £40. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et nunc Ricardus Musgrave tenet dictum manerium de Hertha per omnia servicia predicta et reddit annuatim ad coronagium terminis predictis []. Et dictum manerium de Langton est in manu domini. Et sic eorum magis inde annuatim debitum, set 12^s 4^d per annum est extinctum 12^s 4^d.

* What the "nun" is intended for I do not understand. If it were not so plainly *nun*, one might be satisfied with 'cum' Langton. Langton seems to have been an escheat to the Cliffords later on. † The amount is not given. ‡ I think this is an error.

Kaber.

Alan Cabergh* once held this for 3 carucates. Cornage paid was 17s. 8d. Wardship was worth £20 yearly. Alan Fulthrope holds it now by the same services, and pays for cornage 17s. 8d—besides 6s. 8d. from the 'alba firma' (fee farm) there, as appears under 'Feodi firma Westmerlande' hereafter
17s. 8d.

Hartley and Langton.

Michael Hertha once held Hertha, now (?) Langton, for 6 carucates. Cornage paid was 7s. 4d. Wardship was worth £40 yearly. Richard Musgrave holds Hertha now by the same services, and pays for cornage [†] And the said manor of Langton is in the hands of the lord. And so more is owed from them yearly, ‡ but 12s. 4d. is 'extinct.'

Musgrave Magna.

Thomas Musgrave quondam libere tenuit Magnam Musgrave pro iij carucatis terre, et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 4^s 2^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Solebat wardum valere annuatim cum contingebat []. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et modo Ricardus Musgrave tenet idem manerium 4^s 2^d

* The amount is not given.

Morton.

Idem Thomas Musgrave quondam tenuit libere Moreton pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum terminis predictis ad coronagium predictum 6^s. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere annuatim &c []. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et nunc predictus Ricardus Musgrave tenet idem manerium per servicia predicta &c 6^s

* The amount is not given.

Souleby.

Predictus Thomas Musgrave quondam tenuit Souleby pro iij carucatis terre, exceptis tenementis quondam Thome Benet nunc Hugonis Louthre et tenementis quondam Ricardi Sandford nunc Thome Wharton pro parte. Et reddidit ad coronagium per annum terminis predictis 13^s 8^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium. Et solebat valere wardum cum

Great Musgrave.

Thomas Musgrave once held this for 3 carucates. Cornage was 4s. 2d. Wardship was worth [*] yearly. Richard Musgrave holds it now 4s. 2d.

Murton.

The same Thomas Musgrave once held this for 3 carucates. Cornage was 6s. Wardship was worth [*] yearly. Richard Musgrave holds it now by the same services 6s.

Soulby.

The aforesaid Thomas Musgrave once held this for 3 carucates except the tenements then held by Thomas Benet, now by Hugh Louthre and those held then by Richard Sandford, now by Thomas Wharton in part. Cornage was 13s. 8d. The aforesaid Richard Musgrave now holds Souleby the above excepted tenements excepted, and pays for cornage 13s. 8d.

contingit (?) £30. De maritaggio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc predictus Ricardus Musgrave tenet dictum manerium de Souleby per omnia servicia predicta exceptis terris predictis superius exceptis, et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 13^s 8^d

Warcopp et Wateby medietas.

Ricardus Warcopp* quondam libere tenuit Warcopp et medietatem de Wateby Agnes pro iij carucatis et dimidiis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 17^s 8^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim cum continebat £30. Et nunc dictus dominus Latymer tenet (manerium) de Warcopp per servicia predicta et reddit ad coronagium per annum 13^s 9^d ultra 13^d solutos per Robertum Warcopp ut patet intra 'Albam Firmam Westmerlande,' ac ultra 12^d solutos Collectori (?) de Burgh per annum. Et eciam Thomas Breauchamp tenet dictam medietatem de 'Waterby' (et) reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 17^s 8^d

[Note in margin has 'Waterby per annum ad coronagium 14^s 10^d']

Warcop and Waitby Agnes moiety.

Richard Warcopp once held Warcopp and a moiety of Wateby Agnes for 3 carucates. Cornage paid was 17s. 8d. Wardship was worth £30 yearly. 'The said lord Latymer' now holds Warcopp by the same services and pays for cornage 13s. 9d. besides 13d. paid by Robert Warcopp as appears in 'Alba Firma' (feodi 'firma' below) and besides 12d. paid yearly to the Collector (Collectors?) of Burgh. Thomas 'Breauchamp' also holds the said moiety of 'Waterby' and pays for cornage 14. 10d. 17s. 8d.

* Richard de Wardecopp was a defendant in a suit in 1277 (Assize Roll No. 980). He seems to have been a son of Alan de Wardecopp (Lowther Muni-ments) and to have had an elder brother William. The 'Agnes' seems to be the name of an old owner: whether its curious spelling is for Agnes, or is a doubling of the 'n' I cannot be sure. I have found it elsewhere. The name being attached to both moieties seems to point to another Waitby as existing in the county somewhere once. Breauchamp is a mistake for Beauchamp.

Overton Watby medietas.

Ranulphus nuper dominus de Dacre quondam libere tenuit medietatem de Overton 5^s 1^d et medietatem de Waterby Angnes predicta pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit annuatim ad coronagium terminis predictis 12^s 6^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium set non sectam Comitatus. Et valebat annuatim wardum &c £40. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et nunc Humfridus dominus de Dacre tenet dictam medietatem de Overton per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 6^s 1^d. Et Johannes Louthre tenet dictam medietatem de Waterby et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis []. Et reddit per annum ad coronagium pro Overton 5^s 1^d et Wateby 7^s 5^d

12^s 6^d

* The amount is not given, it would be a sum settled on by agreement between him and the Lord of Dacre.

Crosby Gerard. Overton medietas. Parva Musgrave.

Robertus de Souleby* quondam libere tenuit Crosby Gerard pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit ad coronagium 10^s 2^d, et Parvam Musgrave pro i carucata terre et reddidit annuatim ad coronagium terminis predictis 12^s 2^d, et medietatem de Overton pro i carucata et dimidia terre et reddidit ad coronagium terminis

Orton and Waitby Agnes (moieties.)

Ranulf late Lord of Dacre once held a moiety of Overton (5s. 1d.) and a moiety of Waterby Angnes for 3 carucates. Cornage paid was 12s. 6d. Wardship was worth £40 yearly. Humphrey lord Dacre holds it now by the same services and pays for cornage 6s. 1d.; and John Louthre holds the moiety of Waterby and pays for cornage [*]. He (Lord Dacre) pays for cornage for Overton 5s. 1d. : for Wateby 7s. 5d
12s. 6d.

Crosby Garret, Orton moiety, and Little Musgrave.

Robert de Souleby once held Crosby Gerard for 3 carucates. Cornage paid was 10s. 2d. : and Little Musgrave for 1 carucate. Cornage 12s. 2d.; and a moiety of Overton for 1 carucate and a half; cornage 5s. 1d. Wardship from Crosby and Little Musgrave was worth £34 yearly; from Overton £30. Thomas

T

predictis 5^s 1^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium. Et wardum de Crosby et parva Musgrave solebat valere per annum &c £34 et wardum de Overton £30 annuatim. Et debuit maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et nunc Thomas Laton de Sexhowe † in Cleveland tenet dictam medietatem de Overton et reddit ad coronagium annuatim 5^s 1^d, et omnia servicia predicta. Et Ricardus Musgrave tenet tres partes, et Prior de Watton tenet quartam partem de Crosby et reddunt ad coronagium annuatim 10^s 2^d et omnia servicia predicta, et idem Ricardus Musgrave nunc tenet dictam Parvam Musgrave et reddit ad coronagium terminis predictis 11^s 2^d et omnia servicia predicta. Et qui nunc tenet dict(am) carucat(am) terre in Appulby ‡ ignoro et tamen suppono quod est in manu domini per antiquam acquisitionem inde factam quia nunc nihil reddit ad coronagium. Et nunc reddit pro coronagio de Crosby 8^s 2^d Musgrave 12^s 2^d et medietate de Overton ut patet hic superius. Summa in toto &c 24^s 9^d

Laton of Sexhowe in Cleveland holds the moiety now and pays for cornage 5s. 1d. yearly. The same services. And Richard Musgrave holds 3 parts and the Prior of Watton the 4th part of Crosby, and they pay for cornage 10s. 2d. Services the same. And the same Richard Musgrave now holds Little Musgrave and pays for cornage 11s. 2d. 'And who holds the said carucate of land in Appulby I do not know, but I suppose it is in the hands of the lord by an old resumption, because it pays no cornage.' Cornage now for Crosby is 8s. 2d.; for Musgrave 12s. 2d. for the moiety of Overton as above. Total 24s. 9d.

* Robert de Souleby, Kt., was a witness to a deed of arrangement between Robert le Engleys, Kt., and Robert de Crosby Gerard, after a dispute about pasture in Crosby Gerard (Lowther Muniments). † Sexhow is in the parish of Rudby in Yorkshire, North Riding. ‡ This carucate in Appleby is not mentioned elsewhere. I have so far found nothing which explains the difficulty.

Sandford. Burton.

Ricardus Sandford quondam libere tenuit Sandford et Burton pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit

Sandford and Burton.

Richard Sandford once held Sandford and Burton for 3 carucates. Cornage was 19s. 7d.

per annum terminis predictis ad coronagium 10^s 7^d. Et deb(uit) wardum de Sandford et Burton annuatim 100^s. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Thomas Warcop* de Colby filius Thome Warcop nuper Vicarii de Kirkeby Stephan ut de jure Katrine uxoris ejusdem Vicarii; et Christopher Bardsay et Margareta uxor ejus ut de jure ejusdem Margarete filiarum et coheredum Roberti Sandford armigeri tenent Sandford per omnia servicia predicta et reddunt ad coronagium per annum 3^s 4^d. Et debent sectam Comitatus. Et Christopher Helton de Burton tenet Burton per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium 13^s 4^d
Summa in toto per annum 16^s 8^d

Wardship from Sandford and Burton was 100s. yearly. Sandford now is held by Thomas Warcop of Colby, son of Thomas Warcop, lately Vicar of Kirkby Stephan, in right of Katrine, wife of the same Vicar; and by Christopher Bardsay and Margaret, his wife, as Margaret's right. These two were daughters and coheirs of Robert Sandford, Esquire. Services the same. Cornage 3s. 4d. Christopher Helton of Burton, holds Burton. Services the same. He pays for cornage '13s. 4d.
Total 16s. 8d.

* Thomas de Warthecopp and Katrina his wife, and also Christopher Bardsey and his wife Margaret, are given in the Inquisition of 1442 (see tabulations) as owners, by right of the wives. It is from the feodary that we learn that Thomas de Warthecopp was of Colby and was a Vicar. The whole of the land of Sandford owed suit, and when it was divided it seems that both owners owed it. Burton seems to have gone quite separately from Sandford, from a time previous to 1314, remaining throughout the period in Helton possession.

Helton Bacon.

Thomas Ollerton* et Robertus Bacon quondam tenuerunt libere Helton Bacon pro ij carucatis terre et reddiderunt ad coronagium 13^s 8^d terminis predictis, et debuerunt wardum maritagio et relevium. Et ipse Thomas debuit sectam Comitatus. Et valebat wardum &c £13. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et nunc Ricardus Ristwald et Rogerus Helton tenent dictam villam per servitium militare et quisque eorum

Helton Bacon.

Thomas Ollerton and Robert Bacon once held this for 3 carucates, and paid for cornage 13s. 8d. Thomas owed suit to the court. Wardship was worth £13 yearly. Richard Ristwald, and Roger Helton hold it now by military service and each of them has the part (of the manor) for which Thomas aforesaid owed suit to the county. Cornage paid 13s. 8d.

habet partem (pro) qua (?) predictus Thomas debuit sectam Comitatus. Et reddunt per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis
13^s 8^d

* Ollerton is an error for Ellerton or Hellerton. Most curious is the way in which the names Bacon and Helton recur in the Inquisitions as possessors of a moiety of this fief. It would seem that suit to the county was not owed for all Hilton but only for that moiety which Thomas de Hellerton held; and since Richard Ristwald and Roger Helton each had part of that, suit was required from each.

Askby Wynandrawaith medietas.

Robertus Askby* quondam tenuit medietatem de Askby et Wynandrawaith pro iij carucates terre et una carucata in Winton (et) solebat reddere per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 19^s, et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et valebat wardum annuatim &c £40. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Christopher Moresby miles tenet dictam medietatem de Askby et Wynandrawaith ac unam carucatam terre in Winton per omnia servicia predicta et reddit ad coronagium per annum pro Askby
12^s

Asby Winderwath, a moiety of Asby.

Robert Askby once held a moiety of Askby and Wynandrawaith for 3 carucates and 1 carucate in Winton. Cornage was 19s. Wardship was worth £40. Christopher Moresby, Knight, holds these now and pays for cornage for Askby

12s.

* In 1277 (Assize Roll 980) a claim before the Assize was defended by Margaret, widow of Henry de Askby, her son Robert being under age and in ward. The claim was for a widow's dowry in Great Askby. I do not remember any other document in which Askby and Winanderwaith are given as separate places. It is probably an error, as is also the 12s. for 19s.

Askby altera medietas*

Peter Cotford quondam tenuit alteram medietatem de Askby pro [] carucatis terre et reddidit per annum terminis predictis 4^s 2^d; et debuit wardum annuatim. De relevio et

Asby, the other moiety.

Peter Cotford once held the other moiety of Askby for [†] carucates. Cornage was 4s. 2d. John Catesford (lately) ? held it by the same services, and paid for cornage
4s. 2d.

maritagio ut supra. Et Johannes Catesforde nuper tenuit (?) eandem medietatem per omnia servicia predicta et ad coronagium red(it) † per annum terminis predictis
4^s 2^d

* Askby Cotisford this is called in the 1397 Breve de Certiorari. Peter de Cottesford or Catesford was the owner of 1283. I find the name spelt in both these ways, sometimes with *o*, sometimes with *a*. also sometimes with one *t*, sometimes with two. † The number is not given. ‡ The word seems to be 'tenuit,' and this should imply 'reddidit,' but 'reddit' is given. I think it is the former which is wrong and that John Catesford was the existing feoffee.

Askby parva.

Robert Onglish* quondam tenuit Parvam Askby pro iij carucatis terre et ad coronagium reddidit per annum 2^s 10^d, terminis predictis; et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim £15. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Thomas Sandford tenet dictam villam per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis
2^s 10^d

* Just as in the case of Ollerton given for Ellerton the compiler here mistook E for O. Robert le Engleys is the right name. In 1277 (Assize Roll 980) Robert le Engleys of Little Askby had a claim brought against him by Robert son of Henry who was most probably Henry de Suleby (Soulby) under whom Robert le Engleys at that time held.

Crosby Ravnsiwaith medietas.

Nicholaus Hastings* quondam libere tenuit medietatem de Crosby Ravnsiwaith pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 14^s 7^d; et Nateby pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 13^s 7^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium relevium ac

Little Asby.

Robert Onglish once held this for 3 carucates. Cornage was 2s. 10d. Wardship was worth £15. Thomas Sandford holds it now by the same services and pays for cornage 2s. 10d.

Crosby Ravensworth.

Nicholas Hastings once held a moiety of Crosby Ravnsiwaith for 3 carucates. Cornage was 14s. 7d.: and Nateby for 3 carucates. Cornage was 13s. 7d. Wardship was worth £10 yearly. Now [Edward] † Hastings, Knt., holds them by the same services and pays for cornage 27s. 2d. And Lancelot Threkkeld holds

sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere &c £10 annuatim. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc [] Hastings miles tenet dictas Crosby et Nateby per eadem servicia et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 27^s 2^d (in) equis porcionibus. Et Lancelot Threkkeld tenet dictam Crosby et Thomas Wharton tenet dictam Nateby de eodem per omnia servicia predicta 27^s [2^d]

Crosby; and Thomas Wharton holds Nateby of him by the same services 27s. [2d].

* Nicholas de Hastings must have died before 1286, for there was a trial and a complaint against the King's Justices of which the final result is recorded in Assize Roll, 54 l.b. One of those attacks which were not unfrequent, as Assize Rolls show, had been made by a son of Richd. le Fraunceys, lord of Meaburne Mauld, and others, on the house of Thomas de Hastings in the manor of Crosby, and Nicholas his brother was killed in it. This must have been a son of the Nicholas of the text. A Nicholas, son presumably of Thomas was in possession in 1314. These attacks were usually made by men of position, and even women of position sometimes joined. † The Christian name of the Hastings of 1482 is not given, it was probably Edward, as I have given it in brackets. The 2d. (two pence) is omitted in the text but it belongs to the cornage.

Scapp Rosgill Bampton Patrik
Gnyp Patrik.

Gilbertus filius Patrecii * quondam tenuit Help que nunc dictus Schapp, et Rosgill (5^s 5^d) pro j carucata terre et dimidia (et) reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 10^s 10^d. Idem Gilbertus quondam tenuit Bampton Patrik pro j carucata terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 13^s 4^d. Idem Gilbertus quondam tenuit Gnyp patrik pro j carucata et dimidia terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 17^d; et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum de Scapp et Bampton et

Shap, Rosgill, Bampton Patrick
and Knipe Patrick.

Gilbert son of Patrack once held Help which is now called Schapp, and Rosgill (5s. 5d.) for 1 carucate and a half. Cornage was 10s. 10d. The same Gilbert also held Bampton Patrik for 1 carucate. Cornage was 13s. 4d. He also held Gnyp Patrik for 1 carucate and a half. Cornage was 17^d. Wardship from Scapp and Bampton and marriage from Bampton (Patrik) amounted to £42 : and from Gnype to £10.

maritagium [de Bampton] Pat-
rik valere per annum &c £42 et
[de] Gnyppe £10. De relevio
et maritagio ut prius. Et nunc
Abbas de Scapp et Thomas
Culwen miles tenent dictas
Scapp et Rosgill per servicia
predicta, et reddunt ad corona-
gium per annum terminis pre-
dictis 10^s 10^d. Et idem Thomas
Culwen et Johannes Clibborne
tenent dictam Bampton (13^s 3^d)
et Gnypp (17^d) per servicia
predicta, et reddunt per annum
ad coronagium terminis pre-
dictis 15^s 9^d

Unde summa in toto 26^s 7^d

The Abbot of Scapp and
Thomas Culwen Knt. now hold
Scapp and Rosgill by the same
services and pay for cornage
10s. 10. And the same Thomas
Culwen and John Clibborne
hold Bampton—13s. 3d.—and
Gnypp—17^d—by the same ser-
vices. Cornage 15s. 9d.

Total 26s. 7d.

* The feudal lords of these are sometimes in the Rolls called de Wirkington, at others Colwen, at others Corwen(ne). The family of Rosgill held under them and were of standing to be knights as also the Curwens were. A relationship of the Rosgills to the Curwens seems very probable from such evidences as I have seen. The Cliburn ownership of part of the manor of Bampton Patrick has been as yet unexplained.

Bampton Cundall, Gnypp.

Radulphus Cundall * quon-
dam tenuit Bampton Cundall et
Gnypp pro iij carucatis terre et
reddidit per annum ad corona-
gium terminis predictis 15^s 3^d.
Et debuit wardum maritagium
et relevium ac sectam Comitatus.
Et solebat wardum valere &c
annuatim 20 merkes. De mari-
tagio et relevio ut prius. Et
nunc [] (tenet) dictam
Helton per omnia servicia pre-
dicta et reddidit per annum ad
coronagium terminis predictis

15^s 3^d

* This was Ralf, son of William de Cundal, whose grandfather was also William and father Ralf (Lowther Muniments, Feet of Fines, 41 Henry III. and Assize Roll 980). Bampton Cundal came into possession of the Cliburn family through the marriage of Margaret, daughter of Roger, to Robert de Cliburne. Roger's deed of entail exists at Lowther. There is confusion at the end of this entry. The compiler mixed this and the next entry, and in such a way that it is not easy to realize what the error was.

Bampton and Knipe Cundal.

Ralph Cundall once held
Bampton Cundall and Gnypp
for 3 carucates. Cornage was
15s. 3d. Wardship was worth
20 marks.—[] holds the
said Helton by the same ser-
vices and pays for cornage

15s. 3d.

Helton Flethan.

Robertus Morbill* quondam tenuit Helton Flethan pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 17^d terminis predictis; et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere &c annuatim 20 merkes. De maritagio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc [] tenet dictam Helton per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 15^s 2^d

* Morbill is of course a mis-reading for Morvill. In 1277-8 (Assize Roll 980) a case brought against John de Morvill about land was defended by Robert de Morvill as his representative. Probably this is the Robert of the text. Robert's wife was named Alice. The confusion between the two entries continues. The cornage of Helton Flecket was not 15s. 2d., but 17d., as witness the tabulations.

Helton Flecket.

Robert Morbill once held Helton Flethan for 3 carucates. Cornage was 17d. Wardship was worth 20 marks yearly. Now [] holds the said Helton by the same services and pays for cornage 15s. 2d.

Clifton.

Henricus Engrane* quondam tenuit Clifton pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 16^s 4^d et debuit wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere &c annuatim 40 merkes. De maritagio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc Thomas Whibargh tenet eandem villam per omnia servicia predicta et per alia servicia et redditus que nominantur intra 'Servicia Castri de Burgham' † et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 16^s 4^d

* Engrane is a mis-reading for Engayne. Clifton was a dreng holding. Gilbert Engayne, as stated in the Introduction was reported in 40 Henry III., 1255-6, for not taking up Knighthood. Henry is witness to Lowther charters of 1294 and 1296, and was followed by another Gilbert before 1314. † The services to the Castle of Brougham are not given.

Clifton.

Henry Engrane once held this for 3 carucates. Cornage was 16s. 4d. Wardship was worth 40 marks yearly. Thomas Whibargh holds it now by the same services, and by other services and rents which are specified in the 'Servicia Castri de Burgham,' and pays for cornage 16s. 4d.

Burgham.*

Cristiana Burgham Willelmus Crakanthorp et Henricus Riddings tenuerunt quondam Burgham et reddiderunt ad coronagium per annum terminis predictis 13^s 6^d; et debuerunt wardum maritagium et releuium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum per annum 5 merkes. De releuio et maritagio ut prius. Et nunc Johannes Burgham Johannes Crakanthorp de Newbiging et Johannes Bird tenent dictam villam per omnia seruicia predicta et reddunt per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 13^s 6^d

* Like Lowther and Cliburn Hervey this had become partitioned amongst heirs or heiresses. This entry looks as if Cristiana were one of 3 sisters; she, so far, unmarried, the others married. But it is quite possible that she was married after this to John Godebird, given in the Inq. of 1314.

Yontwith, Belton, Brampton, Dutton.

Willelmus * filius Thome quondam tenuit Yontwith pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 3^s 6^d. Et Brampton pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 8^s 6^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et releuium ac sectam Comitatus. Et nunc Radulphus baro Grastoke tenet dictam villam et Duston per omnia seruicia predicta et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 25^s 6^d. Et Lancelot Threlkeld tenet dictam Yontwith [Et] [†] Ratclyf tenet dictam Delton. Et Thomas Lancaster tenet Brampton de dicta baronia per seruicia

Brougham.

Cristiana Burgham William Crakanthorp and Henry Riddings once held this. Cornage was 13s. 6d. Wardship was worth 5 marks yearly. Now John Burgham, John Crakanthorp of Newbiging and John Bird hold it by the same services, and pay for cornage 13s. 6d.

Yanwith, Bolton, Brampton and Duffton.

William, son of Thomas once held Yontwith for 3 carucates. Cornage was 3s. 6d.; and Brampton for 3 carucates. Cornage was 8s. 6d. And now Ralph, baron of Grastoke holds this and Duston by the same services, and pays for cornage 25s. 6d. And Lancelot Threlkeld holds Yontwith. And [Thomas] Ratclyf holds Delton. And Thomas Lancaster holds Brampton of the barony by the same services, and Duffton is in the 'hands of the barony'

predicta, et Dufton est manu
propria dicte baronie (?) &c †

* William de Greistok was holding this in 1255 (Assize Roll, 979). He is the William son of Thomas of the text. † The Christian name is not given, but it must be Thomas, see Mr. W. N. Thompson's paper in the *Transactions*, vol. iv., n.s. Thomas Lancaster as is already known, was one of the Sockbridge family. † One would expect 'in the hands of the baron' but the text seems to be that which I give. Delton and Belton are errors for Bolton as Duston is for Dufton. Yontwith is a most curious error.

Crakanthorp.

Johannes Mauchill* quondam
tenuit Crakanthorp pro []
carucatis terre et reddidit per
annum ad coronagium 6^s 10^d et
debut wardum maritagium et
relevium ac sectam Comitatus.
Et solebat valerè wardum 20
merkes. De maritagio et relevio
ut prius. Et nunc Johannes
Mauchill tenet eandem villam
per eadem servicia et reddit per
annum ad coronagium 6^s 10^d

* John Mauchill was son and successor of Alexander Mauchill, whose wife was Margaret. From this Alexander (Assize Roll 979) in 1255-6 Constance, widow of Nicholas de Crakanthorp, claimed wardship of her son and of his lands since they were held of Alexander in socage. † The number is not given.

Knok Salcok.

Robertus Bowell* quondam
libere tenuit Knok Salcok pro
iij carucatis terre et reddidit per
annum ad coronagium terminis
predictis 3^s 4^d et debut wardum
maritagium et relevium. Et
solebat wardum valere per an-
num &c 20 merkes. De relevio
et maritagio ut prius. Et nunc
Johannes Lancaster, ut de jure
uxoris sue filie et heredis Johan-
nis Rukeby, tenet dictam Knok
per omnia servicia predicta ac
per sectam Comitatus et reddit
per annum ad coronagium ter-
minis predictis 3^r 4^d

* Under this mis-reading we have to recognize Boyville. Robert de Boyville is the person meant.

Crackenthorp.

John Mauchill once held this
for [†] carucates. Cornage
was 6s. 10d. Wardship was
worth 20 marks. John Mauchill
holds it now by the same ser-
vices, and pays for cornage
6s. 10d.

Knok.

Robert Bowell once held this
for 3 carucates. Cornage was
3s. 4d. Wardship was worth
20 marks. It is now held by
John Lancaster by right of his
wife, daughter and heiress of
John Rukeby. The same ser-
vices. Cornage 3s. 4d.

Clibborne Tailbois.

Ricardus* Tailboys quondam tenuit medietatem de Clibborne vocatam Clibborne Tailbois pro i carucata [et dimidia] de terra et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 12^s 4½^d, et debuit wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et wardum solebat valere annuatim &c 20 merkes. De relevio et maritagio ut supra. Et nunc Johannes Clibborne tenet dictam medietatem per eadem servicia et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 12^s 4½^d

* This is an error for Robert. I have not discovered a Richard. There were two Roberts, father and son. The elder, son of an Ivo Tailbois, who married Elizabeth, daughter of William son of William, and widow of William Bardolf. She married after Ivo's death Nicholas de Farendon, but was called Tailbois in her Inq. p. mortem. Her son Robert gave to Robert son of Hugh le Franceys lands in Bampton and Askham with his daughter Elizabeth in marriage; and Margery, widow of Robert Tailbois, claimed (Rotulus Curie Regis 162) in 1259 her dowry of ⅓rd of these and of lands in Cliburn from Robert le Fraunceys, but her son Robert found her a dowry in his other possessions. It was not till after 1422 that the Cliburn family became feoffees of this manor immediately under the Cliffords.

Clibborne Hervy.

Walter de Tilia Johannes de Stabill* et Hugo Sourby quondam tenuerunt aliam medietatem de Clibborne vocatam Clibborne Hervy pro j carucata terre et dimidia et reddiderunt per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 7^s 8½^d. Et debuerunt wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum &c annuatim 10 merkes. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et [†] tenent eandem medietatem per eadem servicia et

Cliburn Tailbois.

Richard Tailboys once held the moiety of Clibborne called Clibborne Tailbois for 1 carucate and a half. Cornage was 12s. 4½d. Wardship was worth 20 marks yearly. John Clibborne now holds this by the same services, and pays for cornage 12s. 4½d.

Cliburn Hervey.

Walter de Tilia, John de Stabill and Hugh de Sourby once held the other moiety of Clibborne called Clibborne Hervy for 1 carucate and a half. Cornage was 7s. 8½d. Wardship was 10 marks yearly. And now [] hold this moiety by the same services, and pay for cornage 15s. 8d.

reddunt ad coronagium per annum terminis predictis 15^s 8^d

* John de Stabill is an error for John de Staffol: this family and the de Sourby family must have merged into the Tilia (de Tayl, de Teyl) family, the last owners of Cliburn Hervey before it came into the hands of Robert de Clibburne in 1392. Thomas son of John de Warthecopp and Margaret could have left no child. The heritage was hers and descended to her heir. † The name of the missing feoffee here should be John Cliburn.

Kirkbright.

Predictus Ricardus* Tailbois quondam tenuit Kirkbright in Appulby et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 2^s. Et de(buit) wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum &c annuatim 50^s. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Ricardus Ristwald tenet dictam Kirkbryght per servicia predicta et reddit per annum terminis predictis ad coronagium 2^s

* Robert, not Richard, as shown above.

Kirkbright.

The aforesaid Richard Tailbois once held this cornage was 2s. Wardship was 50s. yearly. Richard Ristwald holds it now by the same services, and pays for cornage 2s.

Colby.

Hugo de Bello Campo quondam tenuit Colby et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 6^s 10^d, et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim &c []. De maritagio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc Thomas Warcop* de Colby, filius Thome Warcop Vicarii de Kirkby Stephan tenet eandem villam per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 6^s 10^d

* This Thomas Warthecopp, Vicar of Kirkby Stephan, occurs also under the entry of Sandford. † The amount is not given.

Colby.

Hugh de Beauchamp once held this. Cornage was 6s. 10d. Wardship was worth [†] yearly. It is now held by Thomas Warcop of Colby, son of Thomas Warcop, Vicar of Kirkby Stephan, by the same services. He pays for cornage 6s. 10d.

Hoffe, Dribek.

Thomas de Multon quondam tenuit Hoffe et Dribek pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit ad coronagium annuatim 9^s 2^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus &c. Et nunc Humfridus dominus de Dacre tenet dictas Hoffe et Dribek per omnia servicia predicta et reddit ad coronagium per annum terminis predictis

9^s 2^d

Hoff and Drybeck.

Thomas de Multon once held these for 3 carucates. Cornage was 9s. 2d. Humphrey lord Dacre holds them now by the same services, and pays for cornage

9s. 2d.

Ormeshed.

Johannes Wasti* quondam tenuit Ormeshed Vasti pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit annuatim ad coronagium 13^s 6^d et debuit wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus necnon tenebat stirrop domini. Et nunc Thomas Ratclif tenebat (? tenet) medietatem 'dicte ville' per omnia servicia predicta et reddidit (? reddit) annuatim ad coronagium terminis predictis []. Et Johannes Barton tenet dictam Ormeshed de dicto Thoma per servicia predicta

13^s 6^d

Ormside.

John Wasti once held this for 3 carucates. Cornage was 13s. 6d. He used to hold the lord's stirrup. And now Thomas Ratclif holds a moiety of the said vill by all the aforesaid services, and pays for cornage [†]. And John Barton holds Ormeshed of the said Thomas by the aforesaid services

13s. 6d.

* This must be an error for Vesci, as the confusion between W and V may hint; there is often difficulty in deciding between c and t in mediæval documents and it seems there was the same difficulty in 1482. Hodgson says that the family of Vesci held Ormside in the time of Edward I., but if this feodary is right they began to be in possession earlier. † The amount is not given.

Newbigyng.

Robertus Newbyging quondam tenuit Newbyging et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 20^d et debuit wardum maritagium et rele-

Newbiggin.

Robert Newbyging once held this. Cornage was 20d. Wardship was worth 100s. yearly. John Crakanthorp of Newbiggin holds it now by the same ser-

vium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere annuatim &c 100^s. De maritagio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc Johannes Crakanthorp de Newbiging tenet eandem villam per servicia predicta et reddit annuatim ad coronagium terminis predictis 20^d

vices, and pays for cornage 20d.

Milneburne.

Thomas* Patric' quondam tenuit Milneburne pro j carucata terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 21^s 8^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim 20 merkes. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Johannes Crakanthorp de Holgill tenet dictam Milneburne per omnia servicia predicta ac per redd(itum) 6 merkes de Alba firma ejusdem ville. Inde domino debet hic in forisfactura [ut] intra 'Albam firmam Westmerlande' nominatur; et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 21^s 8^d

Milburn.

Thomas Patric' once held this for 1 carucate. Cornage was 21s. 8d. Wardship was worth 20 marks yearly. John Crakanthorp of Holgill holds it now by the same services, and by the rent of 6 marks from the fee farm (alba firma). From this he owes the lord in forfeit what is set down under the 'fee farm.' He pays for cornage 21s. 8d.

* This is an error for Comes Patricius (Earl Patrick)—the Earl of Dunbar—who appears as paying Isabel de Clifford's half of the dues in 1314.

Kirkby thorp.*

Gilbertus de Kirkbythorpe quondam tenuit tres partes de Kirkbythorp pro iij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 19^s 10^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium. Et solebat valere wardum &c annuatim []. De maritagio

Kirkbythore.

Gilbert de Kirkbythorpe once held 3 parts of Kirkbythorp for 3 carucates. Cornage was 19s. 10d. Wardship was worth [†] yearly. John Kirkby holds these three parts now by the same services, and pays an agreed sum for not attending the county court in spite of the fact that a

et relevio ut prius. Et nuuc Johannes Kirkby tenet easdem tres partes per omnia servicia predicta et facit finem pro secta Comitatu eo non obstante quod quidam dominus Westmerlande relaxavit cuidam antecessori suo hujusmodi sectam &c. Et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 19^s 10^d

Robertus Berforday quondam tenuit immediate quartam partem ejusdem ville de Kirkbythorp et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 12^s 8^d et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim &c []. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc [] Pudsey miles dominus de Berford super Teyes tenet immediate eandem quartam partem per servicia supradicta et reddit ad coronagium annuatim []. Et Johannes Wherton tenet dictam partem de dicto domino per omnia et eadem servicia supradicta 12^s 8^d

certain lord of Westmorland released a certain ancestor of his from the obligation. He pays for cornage 19s. 10d.

Robert Berforday once held directly under the lord the fourth part of Kirkbythorp. Cornage was 12s. 8d. Wardship was worth yearly []. [Ralph †] Pudsey, Knt., lord of Berford on Tees holds this now directly under the lord, and pays for cornage [§]. And John Wherton holds the said part of the said lord. The same services 12s. 8d.

* This is an error. Kirkby thore must be Thore's Kirkby. It is not easy to understand why there is such insistence on 'immediate' in the second part of the entry. Possibly there was a sort of claim made by the owners of the 3 parts to be lords over the owners of the 4th. The name Berforday must be an error for Berford. † The amount is not given. ‡ The Christian name, not given, I supply from Hodgson's Description, published about 1813. § The amount is not given.

Appulby.

Eudo de Ribbys* quondam tenuit 1 carucatam terre in Appulby vocatam Ribbesland et reddidit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 2^s. Et debuit wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatu.

Appleby.

Eudo de Ribbys once held 1 carucate in Appulby called Ribbesland. Cornage was 2s. Wardship was worth 20s. yearly. Richard Ristwald holds it now by the same services, and pays for cornage [†]

Et solebat valere wardum annuatim &c 20^s. De maritagio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc Ricardus Ristwald tenet dictam carucatum terre per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis []

Heredes Walteri Spencer † quondam tenuerunt viij acras terre in Appulby et reddiderunt per annum ad coronagium []; et debuerunt wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat valere wardum annuatim &c 5^s. Et nunc ut supra, dicte viij acre sunt in manu domini per antiquam acquisitionem inde factam per [] antecessorum suorum quare nunc nichill reddunt ad coronagium &c 2^s

* In 7-8 Edward II.. 1314, the Assize had to settle whether Johanna, daughter of Eudo Rybbes, had been disseised of her free tenement in Appleby, one messuage and 10 acres of land and 2 meadows; and it was shown that Elena, wife of Eudo, had put the defendants into possession. Robert de Bradewood was the chief of these defendants, and his name appears in the Inquisition of 1314 as in possession. † We find a John Spencer holding 2 bovates in Nether Burgh in 1392. See the tabulations. ‡ The amount is not given.

Rukby.

Thomas Musgrave quondam tenuit medietatem de Rukby pro [] carucat() terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 2^s 7^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium. Et solebat valere wardum &c annuatim 40^s. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Thomas Scays* tenet dictam medietatem per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis
2^s 7^d

The heirs of Walter Spencer once held 8 acres in Appulby and paid for cornage [†]. Wardship was worth 5s. yearly. These 8 acres are now, like other lands above, in the lord's hands by an old resumption, and they therefore pay no cornage 2s.

Rookby.

Thomas Musgrave once held a moiety for [†] carucate(s).? Cornage was 2s. 7d. Wardship was worth 40s. yearly. Thomas Scays holds this now by the same services, and pays for cornage 2s. 7d.

De 6^d de alba firma alterius medietatis ejusdem ville debitis per eundem Thomam Scayse nihil hic extenditur quia postea &c

About 6d. from the fee farm of the other moiety of this vill owed by the same Tho. Scays nothing is set down here. It is given below in 'fee farm.'

* The name Scays is an error. Scayfe or Scayffe occurs in the Inquisitions.
 † There is nothing to show whether this is one carucate or more.

Louthre Willius.
 Louthre John.*

Johannes Coupland, Adam Everington, † Simon Bowney et Prior de Watton quondam tenerunt Louthre Willelmus et Louthre Johannes pro [] carucatis terre et reddiderunt per annum ad coronagium 20^s 4^d. Et debuerunt wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus ad predictos terminos priores. Et solebat wardum valere annuatim &c cujuslibet 40^s. De relevio et maritagio ut prius. Et nunc tenentur dicte Louthres per servicia predicta et reddunt per annum ad coronagium []. Et Hugo Louthre tenet dictas Louthres de [] 20^s 4^d

Lowther William and Lowther John.

John Coupland, Adam Everington, Simon Bowney and the Prior of Watton once held Louthre William and Louthre John for [†] carucates. Cornage was 20s. 4d. Wardship from each was worth 40s. yearly. These 'Louthres' are now held by the same services, and pay for cornage [†] yearly; and Hugh Louthre holds them of [§] 20s. 4d.

* These two portions are given in the Inq p. m. of Isabel de Clifford, 1292, as Louthre Wyllame and Louthre Jon, † Everington is an error for Haverington (Harrington of later days), Bowney is a misreading for Dawney. Simon de Alne is the name given in Aug. 1314, and the name passes in documents through de Alneto to Dawney. Alne is in Yorkshire. All these owners seem to have held land in both Lowthers, for there is no separation. The complication in the history, and the regaining of possession by a Lowther as one of the original family is interesting enough but too long for a note. † The number and amount are not given. § The name is not given.

Meurburne Mald. Whale.

Richardus leigh Fraunceys* quondam tenuit in capite Meurburn Mald et Whale pro [] carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 33^s. Et de-

Meurburne Mauld and Whale.

Richard le(igh) Fraunceys once held Meurburn Mald and Whale in chief for [†] carucates. Cornage was 33s. Wardship was worth £40 yearly.

U

buit wardum maritagium relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere annuatim &c £40. De maritagio et relevio ut supra. Et nunc Henricus Vernon tenet in capite dictas Meuburn Mald et Whale per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum ad coronagium terminis predictis 33^s

* Richard le Fraunceys, son of Gilbert, He owned also amongst other manors one of the Haddon manors in Derbyshire. His great grand-daughter Isabel was married to Richard (?) Vernon owner of the other Haddon. Her son was William ancestor of the Lords Vernon. † The number is not given.

Smerdale.

Ricardus de Sandford et Thecwald* de Wateby quondam tenuerunt in capite Smerdale pro iij carucatis terre et reddiderunt per annum ad coronagium 13^s 8^d. Et debuerunt wardum maritagium et relevium. Et solebat wardum valere &c annuatim £10. De maritagio et relevio ut prius. Et nunc Reginaldus Warcop tenet dictam Smardale per omnia servicia predicta et reddit per annum &c 13^s 8^d

* Thecwald here must be an error for Theobald. At least I have found no Thecwald, but a Theobald de Wateby who held land under the mesne lord of Waitby in 1277 (Assize Roll 980). Theobald had as feoffee under him John de Cabergh, with whom arose a dispute about lands. John produced before the Assize a charter given by William son of Geoffrey, father of Theobald, to his grandfather Thomas de Cabergh, which settled the dispute.

Morton.

[] * [] quondam tenuit Morton pro [] carucatis terre et reddidit per annum ad coronagium 13^s 8^d. Et debuit wardum maritagium et relevium ac sectam Comitatus. Et solebat wardum valere

Henry Vernon now holds these in chief by the same services, and pays for cornage 33^s.

Smardale.

Richard de Sandford and Thecwald de Wateby once held Smerdale in capite for 3 carucates. Cornage was 13s. 8d. Wardship was worth £10. Reginald Warcop now holds this by the same services, and pays for cornage 13s. 8d.

Marton (Long).

[] once held Morton for [†] carucates Cornage was 13s. 8d. Wardship was worth [†] yearly. Thomas Salingr. Knt., holds it now by the same services, and pays for cornage 13s. 8d.

&c (annuatim) []. De
maritagio et relevio ut supra.
Et nunc Thomas Salinger †
miles tenet villam predictam
per eadem servicia et reddit per
annum ad coronagium predic-
tum 13^s 8^d

* The name is not given. † This must be Sir Tho. St. Leger, of a family also called Sellenger. Sir Thomas married Anne, sister of Edward IV. ‡ The number and amount are not given.

Tenentes domini ad volunta-
tem et alii liberi tenentes ibidem
reddunt annuatim domino ad
coronagium cum 12^d percipien-
dis in Warcop terminis predictis
10^s.

The lord's tenants-at-will and
other freeholders pay him yearly
for cornage including 12d. paid
in Warcop, 10s. in cornage.

Burgh.

Burgh.

Et predicti tenentes debent
wardum maritagium et rele-
vium quia tenent per servicium
militare &c

And the aforesaid tenants owe
wardship because they hold by
military service

Winton.

Winton.

Tenentes bovatarum dicti
domini in Winton ac alii liberi
tenentes ibidem reddunt domino
annuatim ad coronagium dictis
terminis Pasche et Michaelmas
&c 20^s 9^d

The tenants of the bovates of
the lord in Winton, and other
freeholders there pay him yearly
for cornage 20s. 9d.

Summa totalis []

Wanting

Two blank pages follow; then we find:—

Feodi firma sive alba firma
libreorum tenentium qui tenent
libere de domino Thoma domino
(de) Clifford et de Westmer-
landa in socagio, renovatum
secundum tenorem antiquorum

Fee farm or 'White farm' of
free tenants who have freehold
in socage under the lord Thomas
lord of Clifford and Westmor-
land; renewed according to the
tenor of ancient feodaries and

feodariorum et rentalium Antecessorum domini ibidem, ut pro uno anno finietur in crastino S. Michaelis Archangeli anno regnorum Henrici sexti 31^o, ac Edwardi quarti 22^o

rent-rolls of ancestors of the same lord, as for one year completed in the morrow of St. Michael the Archangel in the year of the reign of Henry VI., the 31st; and in the 22nd year of Edward IV.

Grangia Askby.

Abbas de Bella Landa quondam tenuit grangiam de Askby et reddidit per annum ad festa Pasche et Sti Michaelis pro omnibus sectis et serviciis 26^s 8^d. Et adhuc Abbas ibidem &c tenet dictam Grangiam in eadem forma et reddit per annum pro omnibus (serviciis), terminis predictis 26^s 8^d

Asby Grange.

The Abbot of Byland once held the grange of Askby, and paid yearly at Easter and Michaelmas in quittance of all suits and services 26s. 8d. The Abbot still holds it under the same terms, and pays
26s. 8d.

Brotherdall.

Idem Abbas quondam tenuit et adhuc tenet quandam pasturam vocatam Brotherdalle et adhuc reddit per annum ad dicta festa pro omnibus &c 5^s

Bretherdale.

The same Abbot once held a pasture called Brotherdalle, and paid at Easter and Michaelmas in the same way 5s.

Melkenthorp.

Margareta de Roos* quondam tenuit Melkenthorp et reddidit per annum termino Sti Martini tantum, pro omnibus, unum espervarium mutatum vel 5^s argenti. Et nunc Ricardus Musgrave et Thomas Lancaster tenent dictam Melkenthorp et reddunt per annum pro omnibus termino S. Martini tantum 5^s

Melkinthorpe.

Margaret de Roos once held Melkenthorp, and gave in quittance of all services yearly at the feast of St. Martin only one mewed sparrow hawk, or else 5s. in silver. And now Richard Musgrave and Thomas Lancaster hold it, and pay yearly at the feast of St. Martin 5s. for all services

* Margaret de Brus, wife of Robert de Ros, lady of the part of the barony of Kendal, afterwards called the marquis fee.

.Warcop.

Willelmus Warcop* quondam tenuit 2 carucatas terre in Warcop [et reddidit] per annum terminis predictis proxime 12^d pro omnibus serviciis; et nunc Robertus Warcop tenet easdem 2 carucatas terre et reddit per annum pro omnibus 12^d

Willelmus Morell † quondam tenuit 6 bovatas terre in Warcop et reddidit per annum termino Sti Laurentii tantum 1^d pro omnibus serviciis. Et nunc predictus Robertus Warcop tenet easdem bovatas &c 1^d

* William, son of Alan de Wardecopp, was before the Assize, 1255-6 (40 Henry iij), to answer to a claim of a debt for 2s. made by Beatrix, widow of Robert de Travers. As he called Robert, son of Robert de Travers, to vouch, it looks as if the claim was not valid, but also as if he had held his land (or had it transferred to him by them) of the family of de Travers. † This name should be Morville. The heir of William de Morville held in 1292.

Souleby. Warcop.

Thomas Bowet* quondam tenuit 4 bovatas terre in Souleby et 16 acras terre in Warcop et reddidit per annum termino Michaelis tantum pro omnibus 6^d. Et nunc Hugo Louthre tenet dictas bovatas et acras terre et reddit pro omnibus dicto termino Michaelis 6^d

* The name Bowet occurs later amongst the freeholders in Nether Burgh. See the tabulation.

Milneburn.

Bertumus* de Johneby et Robertus de Waile quondam tenuerunt 2 terras et tenementa in Winborrow Mylneburne et reddidit per annum termino Pasche et Michaelis £4 pro omnibus serviciis; et nunc

Warcop.

William Warcop once held 2 carucates of land in Warcop, and paid yearly at the terms just mentioned (Easter and Michaelmas) 12d. for all services. Robert Warcop holds them now and pays 12d.

William Morell once held 6 bovates of land in Warcop and paid, at the feast of St. Laurence only, 1d. for all services. The aforesaid Robert Warcop holds them now and pays 1d.

Soulby and Warcop.

Thomas Bowet once held 4 bovates of land in Souleby and 16 acres of land in Warcop, and paid yearly at Michaelmas only, for all services 6d. Hugh Louthre holds these now and pays at Michaelmas in the same way 6d.

Milburn.

'Bertum' de Johneby and Robert de Waile once held two lands and tenements in Winborrow Mylneburne, and paid at Easter and Michaelmas in quit-tance of all services £4. John Crakanthorp of Helgill holds

Johannes Crakanthorp de Helgill tenet dicta terras et tenementa et reddit per annum terminis predictis, ultra 21^s 8^d de cornagio ejusdem ville per annum (ut patet) antea intra 'Coronagium Westmerlande' &c

£4

these now and pays in the same way £4, besides 21s. 8d. for cornage from the same vill as appears above in the 'Cornagium Westmerlande'

* One would expect Bertram, but I cannot get this out of the manuscript. Bertram de Jeneneby occurs in Assize Roll 980, 1277-8. Possibly Robert de Waile is Robert de Whale. These must have really been sub-feoffees. Patrick, son of Earl Patrick, held this in 1292 (see tabulation). Helgill is an error for Holgil.

Rukby.

Robertus* filius Henrici de Askby quondam tenuit medietatem de Rukby et reddidit per annum termino Michaelis tantum pro omnibus serviciis 6^d. Et nunc Thomas Scase † tenet eandem medietateⁿ et reddit per annum eadem termino tantum pro omnibus, ultra 2^s 7^d de cornagio alterius medietatis ejusdem ville antea intra 'Cornagium &c'

6^d

Rookby.

Robert, son of Henry de Askby once held a moiety of Rukby, and paid at Michaelmas only, for all services 6d. Thomas Scase holds this now and pays in the same way 6d; besides 2s. 7d. for cornage from the other moiety, as appears above under 'Cornagium Westmerlande'

* This Robert, son of Henry de Askby, is the Robert of the entry concerning Askby Winderwath. † Scase is an error as before explained for Scayf.

Wharton.

Thomas Wharton tenet manerium de Wharton et reddit per annum pro omnibus serviciis termino Assumptionis Beate Marie tantum

6^d

Wharton.

Thomas Wharton holds the manor of Wharton and pays, in quittance of all services, at the feast of the Assumption only

6d.

Tibbey.

Thomas* Hastings quondam tenuit immediate Tibbey pro ij carucatis terre et reddidit per annum pro omnibus

5^s

Tebay.

Thomas Hastings once held Tibbey directly, for 2 (?) carucates of land, and paid yearly in quittance of all services 5s.

Rex Anglie, unus progenitorum nostrorum per literas suas patentes olim concessisset Roberto de Veteri Ponte Appleby et Burgh cum omnibus appendiciis et cum balliva et redditu Comitatus Westmerlande, et cum serviciis omnium hominum qui inde de eo tenuerunt, nisi illorum qui de dicto progenitore nostro tenuerunt per servicium militare, habenda et tenenda prefato Roberto et heredibus suis; Salva dicto progenitori nostro et heredibus suis omnimodorum regali dignitate; Virtute cujus concessionis dictus Robertus et heredes sui officium Vice-Comitis Comitatus predicti hucusque occupaverunt, ac eciam servicia omnium *liberorum tenentium* ejusdem Comitatus, qui de dicto progenitore tenuerunt per homagium et fidelitatem, et quendam certum redditum vocatum coronagium quod quidem coronagium dat custodiam maritagium et relevium et a toto tempore dedit, et quod est in effectu servicium militare; ac insuper occupaverunt wayfs strays blodwits et assisam panis et cerevisie, *que quidem officia, servicia, wayfs, strays, et blodwytes et assisam panis et cerevisie* dictus Robertus et heredes sui injuste et contra formam concessionis dicti progenitoris nostri occupaverunt, ut informamur: Nos de gratia nostra speciali concessimus dilecto et fideli nostro Radulpho de Nevill Comiti Westmerlande, in incremento

wit that since John once King of England one of our progenitors by his letters patent did grant to Robert de Veteripont Appleby and Burgh with all belongings and with the bailliwick and its rents of the county of Westmorland, and with the services of all who held land there of him of our said progenitor, except those who held of him by knights' service (per servicium militare): for the aforesaid Robert and his heirs to have and to hold; saving to our said progenitor and his heirs the regal rights of whatsoever kind; by virtue of which grant the said Robert and his heirs have hitherto held the office of Sheriff of the aforesaid County, and have held also the services of all freeholders of the same county who held of our progenitor by homage and fealty and a certain payment called cornage, which cornage carries with it (to the lord) the right of "wardship," "marriage," and "relief," and always did, and which is in actuality military service (servicium militare); and besides this (they) have held in possession (the right to) wayfs strays blodwits and the assise of bread and beer, which said duties services wayfs strays and bloodwytes and assise of bread and beer the said Robert and his heirs held in possession in unjust fashion and contrary to the terms of the grant of our said progenitor, as we are informed;

status sui comitis, quicquid ad nos pertinet de officiis et serviciis et franchesiis supradictis, Habendum eidem Radulpho ad terminum vite sue. In cuius rei testimonium has literas nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Teste (meipso) [R] (*per breve de privato sigillo.*)

Apud villam nostram Salop, quinto die Februarii anno regni nostri 21

We by our special grace have granted to our beloved and faithful Ralph de Nevill Earl of Westmorland, in augmentation of his estate of Earl, so far as they pertained to us, the offices and services and franchises aforesaid, for the same Ralph to hold for the term of his life. In witness of which we have issued these letters patents, (by brief under our private seal.)

At our town of Salop, Feby. 5th, in the 21st year of our reign.

* This is enrolled (Patent Roll, 21 Richard II., part 3, membrane 1). The parts underlined are omitted in the M.S. but are given from the Patent Roll.

Endorsement on next leaf upside down in different and later hand.

'for my lords case and Mertindale herres.'

This endorsement looks like the writing of late Tudor times.

III.—INTRODUCTION TO THE TABULATION.

The tabulation is compiled to illustrate the feodary, as well as to give the successive lists of the feoffees. It shows very fairly the descent of the manors held by those feoffees who held immediately or directly (in capite) under the Cliffords. It is arranged with the places in the order in which the feodary gives them, but with usual modern spelling. In the various inquisitions the order differs, though one can trace a general routine. The first list of feoffees is that given in the feodary, but with the spelling somewhat rectified; and this is followed by the lists given in the returns as the results of the several inquisitions post mortem which I have examined. It is perhaps as well to say that these were enquiries made by the king's command into the values of the estates of those

who held in chief (immediately, "in capite") under the Crown, for the purpose of what we should now call a succession duty. The King claimed this duty, his "relief," before he would allow the heir to take possession of his estates. The inquisitions given begin with that of Isabel de Clifford, daughter of the last Robert de Veteripont, who was co-heiress with her sister Idonea. It gives, of course, only her half; and in this it is interesting to notice that the partition must have been chiefly carried out by assigning one whole fief to one and another to the other of the sisters, though in a few instances, as in the case of Milnburne, the fief was divided between the two. I have not yet found Idonea's inquisition, which would be much later (1333), and after the two very full inquisitions of Robert de Clifford (1314). As these contain the full list possibly we should learn little from Idonea's. Isabel de Clifford's inquisition gives a great proportion of the fee farm list, valuable for comparison with that of the feodary and those of the later lists. These socage tenancies, as will be seen from the tabulations, instead of following the general order of things and absorbing the other tenancies, actually decreased in number in the interval 1282-1485, many of the smallest being absorbed into the tenancies by cornage (military service).* This gives a hint at the unsettled state of the borders. Why there were two inquisitions after the death of Robert de Clifford—one held on the Monday after St. Bartholomew, the other on the Sunday after St. Luke, both in 1314—it is not easy to say. I have given both. There are some interesting differences, and they illustrate one another—so far as each can be deciphered, but the August one is in great part so stained with oxgall as to be the colour of old oak, and this together with faded writing makes any deciphering a matter of considerable difficulty; and, in

* This seems to account for the increase of cornage dues in one or two instances—e.g., Cliburn Hervey.

truth, without the light I had gained from other documents, it would have been absolutely an impossibility. One of these inquisitions gives the total amount of the cornage dues (as does that of Isabel de Clifford of 1292); the other also shews the total value of the "wards." The August inquisition gives also, as does Isabel de Clifford's, the totals of the items given with the fee farm.

These summations were so valuable in helping to settle uncertain and faded numbers all through the lists that I have spent much time in making sure of them. It was no easy task, but I have satisfied myself that with the exception of very few I have got them right. Crosby and the earlier Musgrave fiefs were much trouble, and I have had to leave some difficulties not solved. These two inquisitions of 1314 give also the last lists of drengs. Six they were, and of five names I am fairly certain, of four I feel sure; there is one, the sixth, which is hopelessly gone—the other uncertain one is either Walter or Geoffrey, son of Hervey. On looking at the names in the columns (p. 266) we recognise these drengs as among those who paid cornage—*i.e.*, who held by military service. The grandfather, it must have been, of one (Gilbert Engayne) had, as already stated, been reported for being of standing to take up knighthood and not taking it. We can trace nothing in 1314 to separate these drengs from the other cornage or socage feoffees; there is no difference made in the dues, and no further services are mentioned. Dreng had evidently become a mere name, and that of a shadow. The October inquisition gives no separate list in the decipherable part, that I could find, of the socage tenancies, but some of these are entered with the others—those holding by cornage.

The next inquisition, of the Monday before St. Laurence (1362), is concerning the dowry of Isabel de Clifford, who died July 25th that year. She was widow of Robert (who had died in 1343) and mother of Roger, who had succeeded already to all the estate after his brother Robert's

death, except the fiefs enumerated in this inquisition as in his mother's dowry. In this we have a fresh valuation given, no longer that of the "wards." It gives the cornage dues and the statement that the fief extends to the value of so much yearly. This does not explain itself, but it is continued in the next inquisition also—that of Roger de Clifford (Monday after St. Peter ad vincula, 1388), which is a full inquisition, containing, as his mother's did not, all the fiefs. It is continued also in that of Thomas de Clifford, who died October 4th, 1391, held on the Monday after Epiphany, 1392, in which are given not only the fiefs of which he had possession, but those of which he had the reversion, that were held as dowry by his mother Matilda, whose inquisition does not come till the Thursday before Ascension Day, 1403. But the matter is explained by the list given in the *Partitio feodorum* Thome de Clifford (1392), which comes in between. This had been supposed to relate to the estates of the later Thomas Lord Clifford, killed at St. Albans in 1454, but I was able to point out that it was the Thomas who died in 1291 whose fiefs were thus partitioned; (the document is *Miscellaneous Rolls, Chancery Bundle 9, No. 37.*) Why the partition was made I have not a clear notion, but it excepts, of course, those fiefs which were then being held by Matilda, as will easily be noticed on comparing the two lists. The partition was in three, and I give only the Westmorland portion. It reveals the meaning of the "extension" to yearly value of the preceding inquisitions; this yearly value it gives and no cornage. The figures given are stated to show the yearly value of the services of the feoffees; this then was the amount paid out to the feudal lord, while the "wards" assessment was probably the estimate of the annual value to the feoffee. These yearly "extension" valuations are continued in some of the following inquisitions.

The list of 1397-8 is taken from the volume of printed *Indexes to Inquisitiones post mortem* issued by the Record

Commissioners. The document which it transcribes is now not to be found. It was a Breve de Certiorari, a king's letter requiring information about lands from which he supposed he was not receiving his dues—concealed lands. The names and not only those of the persons, but of some of the places seem in this index list to have been playing that part of the game of post which is called general post. I have given most of them as they are, misreadings included. It is possible to surmise what most of them were in the document itself. But the general impression that we get, apart from this, is an interesting impression that the exactions of Richard II. had caused, not so much the concealment of lands as the placing of them for the purposes of causing difficulty in carrying out exactions, in the hands of what perhaps I may be allowed to call interim feoffees—we should term them now trustees—a method of ensuring evasion which the Act of 27 Henry VIII. was intended to destroy, but failed to do so. "Interim" feoffees held for the use of the heir or ultimate feoffee, or in order that estates might be placed under some special entail, or in order to bar claims. They were, as I have not seldom found, clerics; and possibly many of those in the list of 1397-8 were such. This letter of enquiry gives, of course, no valuations.

The next inquisition (1403) I have already mentioned, Matilda's. There are two copies, but each in such a faded condition in parts that I found I could not make the list complete even by comparison of each with the other. Then follows the inquisition of John de Clifford, who was killed at the siege of Meaux. This was held on Monday before St. John the Baptist (1422), and contains a full list, including the valuations of those fiefs held in dowry by his mother, Elizabeth, whose inquisition follows (September 6, 1424), and by his grandmother—also Elizabeth—whose inquisition is the last (November 9th, 1435). This last had married after John de Clifford's death Ralph, Earl of Westmorland, grandson of the Ralph to

whom Richard II. had made the grant for life of the revenues of the county. A puzzle is left unexplained by the inquisition of 1422, which takes no notice of the grant to Ralph, Earl of Westmorland, but gives the particulars as if all were in Clifford hands. In fact, the only traces we have of the Nevills beyond Elizabeth's dowry (1435) are the tenure of the manor of Warcop in cornage by Ralph, Earl of Westmorland, in 1422, and afterwards by Lord Latimer, and the tenancy of two carucates of land in socage in Warcop also by Ralph, Earl of Westmorland, in 1424.

Some of the fiefs have an especially interesting history, as will be judged; and those particularly which were divided before the times of our feodary and within the period were again united, or which had several tenancies held under different tenures. For instance, Lowther we find already parted into two, the portions probably of descendants of co-heirs, but then already further parted between three, exclusive of the church lands, and later on all re-united by the family which took its name therefrom. Brougham has a history which wants still more unravelling. Warcop we find split up, yet over and over again yielding some scion of its owners who was able to find an heiress to marry and to hold her lands. Cliburn, like Lowther, begins as two; has two families at first not related who assumed the name of Cliburn, one of which died out leaving its heiress to be married to the other family, which persistently after it had started, and not intermittently like the other, called itself de Cliburne, and gradually brought all its small socage tenures, with one apparent and not real exception, into one. Bampton in its portions, and Rosgill and Soulby also have their own interesting histories. But I might enumerate all.

I had thought to give something of all this in notes upon the tabulations from particulars gathered from Curia Regis Rolls, de Banco Rolls, Assize Rolls, and other records in the Record Office completed by those afforded

by muniments; but I find practically that notes would be an unsatisfactory plan; and part of the most interesting matter could not serve as merely illustrating the tabulations or the feodary, though these make a very good basis for the rest. For the feodary and the inquisitions only tell, except very rarely, the feoffees who held immediately (in capite) or directly under the Cliffords, whereas there were feoffees of these feoffees who rose to be themselves feoffees in capite either in some other way or by marriage, and adopted the shields of the family into which they married. And there seem to have been tenants in capite who married the heiresses of the feoffees that held under them, and thus came into possession of the revenues as well as of the royalties, so to speak, of the demesnes, and quartered their shields.* I am therefore looking forward to following up the laying of this foundation by giving in future years and in a form more easily shaped out for following, the information I have gathered, and still hope to gather.

I have now only to record my thanks to my friends Mr. E. Salisbury of the Record Office and Mr. W. Boyd for help given in deciphering some of the worst portions of the public records examined, and to Prof. Collingwood for his kind management and arrangement in editing.

* The changes in the bearings of shields adopted in Elizabethan times and since perpetuated, in some instances certainly, though perhaps few, mislead as to the origin of the bearings, and obscure the far more interesting older forms.

CORNAGE. Tabulation I.	Carucates.	Feodary c. 1283.	Cornage.	Ward.	Isabel de Clifford June 1292.	Cornage.
Hilbeck	3	Tho. de Hellebek	6 ^s	20 ^m
Askham	3	Tho. de Hellebek	50/9	£20
Cabergh (Kaber) ..	3	Alan de Cabergh	17/8	£20	Alan de Caberg	.. 17/8
Hartley	6	Mich ^l de Harcla	7/4	£40	Mich ^l de Hartecla	.. 12/4
Langton		" "				
Great Musgrave ..	3	Tho. de Musgrave	4/2	
Murton	3	" "	6/-	
Soulby	3	" "	13/8	£30
		Tho. Benet Ric. de Sandford				
Warcop	3	Ric. de Warthecopp	17/8	£30
Waitby Agnes moiety	..	" "		
Orton moiety .. .	3	Ranulf de Dacre	5/1	£40	William de Dacre	} 6/3 †
Waitby Agnes moiety		" "				
Crosby Garrett ..	3	Rob ^t de Suleby	10/2	£34	Heir of Wm. de Suleby	} 22/8½
		" "			" "	
Little Musgrave ..	1	" "	12/2		" "	} 22/8½
Orton moiety .. .	1½	" "	5/1	£30	" "	
Sandford	3	Ric. de Sandford	19/7	100/-*
Burton	" "			John de Helton 1 ^m
Hilton Bacon .. .	3	Tho. de Hellerton	13/8	£13	Andrew de Hellerton	} 13/8
		Rob ^t Bacon			John de Helton	
Asby Winderwath moiety	3	Rob ^t de Askby	19/-	£40	Heirs of Rob ^t de Askby	} 19/-
Winton	1	" "			" "	
Asby Cotsford moiety	Peter de Cottesford	4/2
Little Asby	Rob ^t le Engleys	2/10	£15
Crosby Ravensworth ..	3	Nich ^s de Hastings	14/7	£10
Nateby	3	" "	13/7	

^m above a number=marks; £=pounds; ^s=shillings; ^d=pence. * This must be wrong. It is the "Ward" of Sandford without Burton. † For one-fourth of Orton and Waitby.

The rows of dots show where no information is given.

[] empty shows where information was given which is not now legible.

[] enclosing name or number shows information faded or wanting but certain or deducible.

Robert de Clifford Aug. 1314.	Cornage.	Robert de Clifford Oct. 1314.	Cornage.	Ward.	
Tho. de Hellebek	} 56/9	Ric. de Blenkanesopp	} 6 ^s	£8	
" "		Isabella de Slekburn		£4	
" "		Hen. de Warthcopp		40 ^s	
" "		Rob ^t de Swynburn ..		50/9	£20
Alan de Cabergh ..	17/8	Alan de Cabergh ..	17/8	£20	
Andrew de Harecla ..	[12/4]	Andrew de Harcla ..	[12/4]	£40	
....	
Tho. de Musgrave under age	} [4/2]	Tho. de Musgrave under age	} [4/2]	£42	
" "		[6/-]		" "	[6/-]
Tho. de Musgrave under age and in ward	} [13/8]	Tho. de Hellebek (moiety)	} ..	13/8	£30
Hen. de Warthcopp		17/8		Hen. de Warthcopp	17/8
" "	} 12/6	" "	} 12/6	£40	
William de Dacre		Wm. de Dacre ..		12/6	£40
" "	} 26/3	" "	} 26/3	£34	
Ric. de Musgrave		Ric. de Mosgrave		26/3	£34
" "	} [6/-]	" "	} [6/-]†	£30	
" "		" "		[6/-]†	£30
Tho. de Musgrave under age	.. [6/7]	Tho. de Musgrave under age	[100 ^s]	
Wm. de Helton ..	13/4	Wm. de Helton ..	13/4	£10	
Heirs of Andrew de Ellerton Robert Bacon	} 13/8	Heirs of Andrew de Hellerton Robert Bacon	} 13/8	£13	
Robt. de Askeby		19/-		Robt. de Askby	19/-
" "	} 4/2	" "	} 4/2	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d	
John de Cotesford ..		4/2		Joh. de Cotesford ..	4/2
Robert Lengleys ..	[2/10]	Robt. le Engleys ..	[2/10]	[£15]	
Nicholas de Hastings	} 27/2	Nicholas de Hastings	} 27/2	£40	
" "		" "		" "	" "

Tabulation I.

continued on pages

306 to 309.

† I do not feel certain about these numbers.

CORNAGE. Tabulation I. (continued).	Isabel de Clifford July 1362.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Roger de Clifford August 1388.	Cornage	Yearly value of services.
Hilbeck	Tho de Blenkinsopp } Willm. Lengleys }	6 ^s	5 ^m	Tho. de Blenkansopp } Nicholas de Harrington }	6/-	66/8
Askham	Wm. de Sandford ..	50/9	100 ^s
Cabergh (Kaber) ..	Alex. de Talentyre } Alan de Fulthrop }	17/8	£4	Wm. de Fulthrop }	17/8	£4
Hartley	Tho. de Musgrave ..	12/4	100 ^s
Langton
Great Musgrave	Tho. de Musgrave }	4/2	53/4
Murton	" "	6/-	£4
Soulby	Tho. de Musgrave } Wm. de Stirkeland } Wm. de Querton }	13/8	100 ^s
Warcop	Thos. son of Henry } de Warthcopp }	17/8	£6	Robt. de Thornburgh } and Isabel his wife, } her right }	17/8	£6
Waitby Agnes moiety	" "			" "		
Orton moiety	Joh. de Dacre, son of } Katrine de Quitfeld }	5/1	40 ^s	Wm. de Dacre ..	5/1	40 ^s
Waitby Agnes moiety	Adam Pakek, called } also Ad. Parnyng }	7/5	..	Wm. de Stirkeland ..	7/5	40 ^s
Crosby Garrett	Tho. de Musgrave } Prior of Watton }	10/2	£6 5 ^s
Little Musgrave	Thomas de Musgrave ..	11/2	40 ^s
Orton moiety	Robt. de Latone ..	5/1	40 ^s
Sandford	Robt. de Sandford ..	3/4	40 ^s
Burton	Wm. de Helton & Agnes } his wife, her right }	13/4	40 ^s
Hilton Bacon	Wm. de Whapelet and } Elena his wife, her right } § Ada[m] Bacon }	13/8	20 ^s
Asby Winderwath } moiety	Marg ^t de Moriceby }	19/-	£6 13 ^s 6 ^d	Christopher de Moresby }	19/-	£7
Winton	" "			" "		
Asby Cottesford moiety..	Joh. de Cottesford..	4/2	40 ^s	Stephen de Cottesford..	4/2	40 ^s
Little Asby	Joh. Lengleys ..	2/10	40 ^s	Tho. 'de' Ughtred and } Idonea his wife, her right }	2/10	60 ^s
Crosby Ravensworth	Ralph Hastyng(s) }	27/2	10 ^m
Nateby	" "		

* This must be for £6 13s. 4d.

Thomas de Clifford January 1392.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	1392.	Yearly value of services.	1397-8.
Tho. de Blenkansopp }	6/-	100 ^s	John de Aselby and others
Wm. de Sandford ..	50/9	100 ^s	Wm. de Sandford ..	100 ^s	Robt. de Swinburn
Wm. de Fulthrop }	17/8	£4	Roger de Fulthrop
Tho. de Musgrave Kt. . .	12/4	100 ^s	Tho. de Musgrave ..	100 ^s	Joh. de Kebergh and Peter Moglond
....
Tho. de Musgrave Kt. }	4/2	53/[4]	Tho. de Musgrave }	53/4	Peter Morlond
" " }	6/-	£4	" " }	£4	" "
Tho. de Musgrave Kt. }	13/8	100 ^s	Tho. de Musgrave }	100 ^s	Peter Morland and others
W ^m de Strikeland (cleric)			W ^m de Strikeland		
Wm. de Wherton [Robt] de Thornburgh and Isabel his wife }	17/8	£10	W. del Thwaites
" " }			—Parning & W. Thwait
Wm. de Dacre ..	5/1	40 ^s	Wm. de Dacre ..	40 ^s	John Dacre
Wm. de Stirkeland ..	7/5	40 ^s
Tho. de Musgrave Kt. }	10/2	£6 5 ^s	Tho. de Musgrave and }	£6 5 ^s	Peter Morland and others
Prior of Watton			Prior of Watton		
Tho. de Musgrave Kt. . .	12/2	40 ^s	Tho. de Musgrave ..	40 ^s	P. Morland and others
Robt. de Laton ..	5/1	40 ^s	Robt. de Laton ..	40 ^s	—Laton
Robt. de [Sandford] ..	3/4	40 ^s	Tho. de Sandford
Agnes de Helton ..	13/4	40 ^s	Agnes de Helton ..	40 ^s	Wm. de Helton
Wm. de Whapelode and Elena his wife }	13/8	20 ^s	Wm. Lenglis and others
§ Ada[m] Bacon					
Christopher de Moriceby }	19/-	£7 & 10 ^d	Christopher de Moriceby }	£7 & 10 ^d	Margaret Moriceby }
" " }			" " }		" " }
Stephen de Cotesford ..	4/2	40 ^s	Stephen de Cottesford ..	40 ^s	John Cotisford
Tho. Uchtrede and Idonea his wife }	2/10	60 ^s	Tho. Ughtret and Idonea his wife }	60 ^s	Robert Lenglys
Ralph Hastyngs }	27/2	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d	Ralph de Hastyng }	10 ^m	Richard Hastings
" " }			" " }		Peter, John, & Robert de Hastings

§ Though this reads as Adam I think it must be Ada. Two daughters could share the inheritance, not a son and a daughter.

CORNAGE. Tabulation I. (continued).	Matilda de Clifford 1403.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	John de Clifford June 1422.	Cornage.
Hilbeck	Tho. de Blenkinsopp ..	6/-	100 ^s	Willm. de Blenkinsopp	6/-
Askham	Rob ^t de Sandford ..	50/9
Cabergh (Kaber) ..	Willm. de Fulthorp } []	[]	£4	Wm. Fulthorp }	17/8
Hartley	Richd. de Musgrave ..	12/4
Langton
Great Musgrave	Richd. de Musgrave }	4/2
Murton }	6/-
Soulby	Richd. de Musgrave }	11/4
	Henry de Wherton }				
Warcop	Rob ^t de Thornburgh and Isabel his wife } []	[]	[]	Ralf, Earl of Westmor- land }	17/8
Waitby Agnes moiety }			
Orton moiety }	Tho. Dacre Kt. ..	10/2
Waitby Agnes moiety }	Wm. de Strikland ..	7/5	60 ^s	Wm. de Louther ..	7/5
Crosby Garrett..	Richd. de Musgrave ..	10/1
Little Musgrave	Richd. de Musgrave ..	11/2
Orton moiety
Sandford	[Robt. de Sandeford] ..	3/4	40 ^s	Tho. de Warthecopp and Katrina his wife Christopher Bardesey and Margaret his wife }	3/4
Burton	Willm. de Helton ..	13/4
Hilton Bacon	W ^m Whapelot and Elena his wife § Ada[m] Bacon ..	13/8	20 ^s	Richd. Ristwald }	13/8
				John Helton }	
Asby Winderwath moiety }	Christopher Moresby Kt. }	(19/-) †
Winton }	..
Asby Cotsford moiety..	4/2
Little Asby	Robt. de Sandford ..	10/2 ¶
Crosby Ravensworth	Richd. Hastyngge }	27/2
Nateby }	

|| Apparently doubled, which suggests that Thomas Dacre was holding the two moieties of Orton. No other feoffee for Orton occurs in the 1422 Inquisitio. ¶ These look like inversions 10^s 2^d for 2^s 10^d.

† This Inquisitio places Christopher Moresby to the wrong Asby, viz. : Asby Cotsford.

Elizabeth de Clifford Sept. 1424.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Elizabeth de Clifford Nov. 1435.	Cornage.	Feodary 1482.	Cornage.
....	Tho. Blenkinsopp	.. 6/-
Robt. de Sandford	.. 50/9	£4	Tho. Sandford	.. 50/9
....	Tho. Fulthorp	} 17/8	Alan Fulthrope	} 17/8
Rich ^d de Musgrave	Richd. Musgrave	.. [12/4]
....
Richd. de Musgrave	} 4/2	[]	Richd. Musgrave	} 4/2
" "	} 6/-	[]	" "	} 6/-
Richd. de Musgrave	} 13/8	100 ^s	Hugh Louthor Thomas Wharton	} 13/8
....	Lord Latimer	} 17/8
....	Richard Beauchamp	} ..
Tho. de Dacre Kt. ††	[]	[40 ^s]	Humphrey, lord Dacre	} 5/1
....	John Louthor	} 7/5
Richd. de Musgrave Prior of Watton	} 10/1	100 ^s †	Richd. Musgrave Prior of Watton	} 24/9**
....	Richd. Musgrave	} ..
Tho. de Laton ††	.. []	[60 ^s]	Tho. Laton of Sexhowe	} ..
....	Tho. Warcop of Colby son of Tho. & Katrina, Christopher Bardsay and Margaret	} 3/4
....	Willm. Hilton	.. 13/4	Christopher Helton of.. Burton	} 13/4
....	Richd. Ristwald	} 13/8
....	Roger Helton	} ..
....	Christopher Moresby Kt.	.. (19/-) †
....	" "	..
Stephen de Cottesford	.. 4/2	40 ^s	John Catesford	.. 4/2
....	Robt. de Sandford	¶ 10/2	Thomas Sandford	.. 2/10
....	Richd. Hastynges Kt.	27/2	[Edwd] Hastings Kt.	} 27/2
....	" "	..	" "	} ..

** This return is confused. Probably the missing carucate in Appleby mentioned in the text and not accounted for separately in the Inquisitions makes the difference.

†† These two are placed together in the Inquisition and the yearly value of the services of both given in one sum as 100^s which is puzzling. One would expect 80^s. See under 1388, p. 306.

‡ The feodary gives 12/- not 19/-, but the error seems to be that the cornage for Asby alone is given, and not for Asby and Winton together.

B

CORNAGE. Tabulation II.	Carucates.	Feodary 1283.	Cornage.	Ward.	Isabel de Clifford June 1292.	Cornage.
Shap (Heppe) ..	1½	Gilbert son of Patrick	5/5 *	£42
Rosgill			5/5 *	
Bampton Patrick	1	" "	13/4 *	
Knipe Patrick ..	1½	" "	17 ^d *	£10
Bampton Cundal	3	Ralf de Cundal	15/3	20 ^m	Ralf de Coundale	15/3
Knipe Cundal ..		" "			" "	
Helton Flecket ..	3	Rob ^t de Morville ..	17 ^d	10 ^m
Clifton	3	Henry Engayne.. ..	16/4	40 ^m	Henry Engayne.. ..	16/4
Brougham		Cristiana de Burgham Wm. de Crakanthorp Hen. de Ryddings	13/6	5 ^m
Yanwath	3	Willm. son of Thomas	3/6
Bolton		" "
Brampton	3	" "	8/6
Dufton		" "
Crackenthorpe ..		John Mauchell	6/10	20 ^m	John Mauchall	6/10
Knock Salcock ..	3	Joh. de Boyvile	3/4	20 ^m	Henry de Boyvile ..	3/4
Cliburn Tailbois ..	1½	Robt. Tailbois	12/4½	20 ^m	Lucas Tayleboys ..	12/4½
Cliburn Hervey ..	1½	Walter de Tyle (Tilia) Joh. de Staffol Hugh de Soureby	7/8½	10 ^m	Walter Tylle Rob ^t de Staffole Hugh de Soureby	15/5
Kirkbergh		Robt. Tailbois	2/-	50 ^s	Roger Bulle	2/-
Colby		Hugh de Beauchamp ..	6/10	..	John de Goldington ..	6/10
Hoff	3	Tho. de Multon	9/2	..	Thomas de Multon	9/2
Drybeck.. ..					" "	" "
Ormside Vesci		John de Vesci	13/6
Newbiggin		Robt. de Neubigging ..	20 ^d	100 ^s
Milburn		Earl Patrick	21/8	20 ^m	Earl Patrick (moiety) ..	10/10

* The sum total of these, 25/7, shows a discrepancy unaccounted for. As shown in the later columns the total was 26/7.

Robert de Clifford Aug. 1314.	Cornage.	Robert de Clifford Oct. 1314.	Cornage.	Ward.
Gilbert de Culwen	26/7	Gilbt de Culwen	26/7	£52
" "		" "		
" "		" "		
Henry de Cundal	15/3	Hen. de Cundal..	15/3	£13 6 ^s 8 ^d
" "		" "		
Robert Lengleys (moiety)	8½ ^d	Robt le Engleys..	8½ ^d	10 ^m
Walter de Wessington (moiety)	8½ ^d	Walt. de Wessington ..	8½ ^d	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d
Gilbert Engayne ..		16/4		
John Godebird Wm. de Crakanthorp Hen. de Riddings	13/6	John Godebird ..	13/6	66/8
		Wm. de Crakanthorp Hen. de Ryddings		
Ralf son of William	25/6	Ralf son of Willm.	25/6	100 ^m
" "		" "		
" "		" "		
" "		" "		
Tho. Mauchall ..	6/10	Tho. Mauchel ..	6/10	£13 6 ^s 8 ^d
John de Boyvil ..	3/4	Joh. de Boyvyle..	3/4	£13 6 ^s 8 ^d
Lucas Taliboy ..	12/4½	Lucas Tayleboys ..	12/4½	£13 6 ^s 8 ^d
William de Tylia John de Staffol .. Robt de Soureby	7/8½	Willm. du Teyle	7/8½	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d
		Joh. de Staffol .. Robt. de Soureby		
John de Harcla ..	2/-	Joh. de Hercla ..	2/-	50 ^s
Tho. de Colleby ..	6/10	Tho. de Colleby ..	6/10	£13 6 ^s 8 ^d
Heir of Tho. de Multon (under age)	9/2	Heir of Thos. de Multon of Gillesland	9/2	£30
" "		" "		
Joh. de Derwentwater	13/6	Joh. de Derwentwater ..	13/6	£10
Robt de Neubiggyng	20 ^d	Robt de Neubiging ..	20 ^d	£10
Earl Patrick	21/8	Earl Patrick ..	21/8	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d

Tabulation II.
continued on pages
312 to 315.

CORNAGE. Tabulation II. (continued).	Isabel de Clifford July 1362.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Roger de Clifford August 1388.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.
Shap (Heppe)	Robt. the Abbot of Heppe and Gilbert de Curwen	10/10	£8
Rosgill	" "	15/9	40 ^s
Bampton Patrick	Gilbert de Curwene and Robt. de Clibburne		
Knipe Patrick	" "	10/3	60 ^s
Bampton Cundal	Rog ^r de Cundal	15/3	60 ^s	Robt. de Clyburne and Margaret his wife, her right		
Knipe Cundal ..	" "			" "		
Helton Flecket ..	Tho. Lengleys ..	8½ ^d	£4	Tho. Ughtret and Idonea his wife, her right	17 ^d	£8
	W ^m de Wessington	8½ ^d	£4			
Clifton	Wm. Ferour and Alia- nora his wife, her right	16/4	66/8
Brougham	John de Tyndale Wm. de Crakenthorpe	13/6	40 ^s
Yanwath	Robt. de Greystoke Kt.	25/6	£18
Bolton	" "	6/10	60 ^s
Brampton	" "		
Dufton	" "		
Crackenthorpe..	John Mauchell	6/10	60 ^s
Knock Salcock..	Will. de Seuleby ..	3/4	60 ^s
Cliburn Tailbois	Walter Tailboys ..	12/4½	£4
Cliburn Hervey ..	diverse tenants ..	7/8½	10 ^s	Thomas son of John de.. Warthcopp and Marg- aret his wife, her right	15/5	20 ^s
Kirkbergh	[Walter Tailboys] ..	2 ^s †	†
Colby	Tho. de Mallerstang.. and Margaret his wife, her right	6/10	60 ^s
Hoff	Willm. de Dacre	9/2	£6
Drybeck..	" "		
Ormside Vesci	Joh de Derwentwater ..	13/6	60 ^s
Newbiggin	Wm. de Crakanthorp ..	20 ^d	40 ^s
Milburn	Wm. de Lancaster ..	21/8	100 ^s *

* I am not certain about these figures.

† The 2/- for Kirkbergh is in these Inquisitions included in the Cornage for Cliburn Tailbois, making it 14/4½. The £4 is the total of yearly services for both, Cliburn Tailbois and Kirkbergh.

Thomas de Clifford January 1392.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	1392.	Yearly value of services.	1397-8.
Abbot of Hepp and Gilbert de Curwen	[10 ^s 10 ^d]	£10	Abbot of Hepp
" "		
Gilbert de Curwen and Robert de Clibburn	15/9	40 ^s	Gilbert de Curwen and Rob ^t de Clibburn	40 ^s	Abbot of Hepp and others
" "			" "		Gilbert de Culwen
Robt. de Clibburn and Margaret his wife	15/3	60 ^s	Robt. de Clibburn and Margaret his wife	60 ^s	Abbot of Hepp and others
" "			" "		
Tho. Uctrede and Idonea his wife Wm. de Wassington	17 ^d	£8	Tho. 'de' Ughtret and Idonea his wife Wm. de Wessyngton	£8	Edmund de Sandford and others
Wm. Feror and Alia- nora his wife	16/4	66/8	Wm. Ferour and Alia- nora his wife	66/8	Tho. de Louther
John de Tyndale Joh de Crakanthorp	13/6	40 ^s	Joh. de Tyndale W ^m de Crakanthorp	40 ^s	John de Tindale and others
Ralf baron of Greystok	25/6	£20	Baron of Greistok
" "			" "
" "			" "
" "			" "
John Maunchell..	6/10	60 ^s	John Maunchell..	60 ^s	John Mauthell
Wm. de Souleby of.. Knok Salcok	3/4	60 ^s	Wm. de Souleby ..	60 ^s	John de Rukeby
Walter Tailboys ..	12/4½	£4	Walter Taylboys ..	£4	Walter Toile[boys]
Thomas son of John de Warthecopp and Marg ^t his wife	15/5	20 ^s	Tho. son of John de Warthecopp and Mar- garet his wife	20 ^s	Robert Cliburn
Walter Tailboys ..	[2 ^s] †	†	Walter Taylboys ..	†	W. LeEnglys
Margaret widow of Tho. de Mallerstang	6/10	60 ^s	M. de Colleby
Willm. de Dacre	10/2 *	£6	Willm. de Dacre	£6	Wm. de Dacre
" "			" "	..	" "
Joh. de Derwentwater ..	13/6	100 ^s	Joh. de Derwentwater
Joh. de Crakanthorp ..	20 ^d	40 ^s	Joh. de Crakenthorp ..	40 ^s	W. Crakanthorp
Wm. de Lancaster ..	21/8	100 ^s	Jo[n]by* and Robert } de Vallibus }

* Probably an error for " — Johnby " (see Nicolson & Burn, i., p. 386).

CORNAGE. Tabulation II. (continued).	Matilda de Clifford 1403.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	John de Clifford June 1422.	Cornage.		
Shap (Heppe) ..	Abbot of Hepp .. Gilbert de Curwen	10/10	£10	Abbot of Hepp .. Christofer de Curwen	10/10		
Rosgill						" "	" "
Bampton Patrick	Christofer de Curwen and John de Clyburn	15/9		
Knipe Patrick	" "	15/3		
Bampton Cundal	John de Clyburn			
Knipe Cundal	" "			
Helton Flecket..	Robert de Sandford ..	17 ^d		
Clifton	Willm. Wyber ..	16/4		
Brougham	Joh. de Lancaster and Katrina his wife Joh. de Crakanthorp	13/6		
Yanwath	Ralph, baron of Grey- stock	25/6	£20	John de Greystok Kt.	25/6		
Bolton						" "	" "
Brampton						" "	" "
Dufton						" "	" "
Crackenthorpe..	John Maychell ..	6/10		
Knock Salcock..	Tho. de Rokeby..	3/4		
Cliburn Tailbois	Walter Tailboys..	12/4½		
Cliburn Hervey	John de Clyburn	16/9		
Kirkbergh	Walter Tailboys	2/-		
Colby	Tho. son of William .. de Warthecopp and Margaret his wife, her right	Tho. de Warthecopp .. and Margaret his wife	6/10		
Hoff	Tho. de Dacre ..	9/2		
Drybeck	" "			
Ormside Vesci ..	[] de Derwentwater..	13/6	[]	Nicholas Radcliff and .. Elizab. his wife, her right	13/6		
Newbiggin	Joh. de Crakanthorp ..	20 ^d		
Milburn	John, son of William .. de Lancaster	21/8	100 ^s	John de Lancaster	21/8		

Elizabeth de Clifford Sept. 1424.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Elisabeth de Clifford Nov. 1435.	Cornage.	Feodary 1482.	Cornage.
....	Abbot of Scapp .. Tho ^s Culwen Kt.	} 10/10
....	" "	
....	Christopher Cur- wen and John Clibburne	} 15/9	Tho ^s Culwen .. John Clibborne ..	} 15/9
....	" "		" "	
....	John Clibburne	} 15/3	[]	} ..
....	" "		" "	
....	[]
Wm. de Wybargh	.. []	[]	Tho. Whibargh ..	16/4
....	Willm Thornburgh } Willm Crakanthorp }	} 13/6	John Burgham .. Joh. Crakanthorp of of Newbiging John Bird	} 13/6
....		} Under Greystok barony	
....	[] <i>Ratclyff</i>		
....	<i>Tho. Lancaster</i>		
....	Ralf, baron of Grey- stoke		
....	John Mauchale ..	6/10		John Mauchill ..
....	John Lancaster and his wife, d. & h. of John Rokeby	3/4
....	Walter Tailbose ..	[12 ^s 4 ¹ / ₂]	John Clibborne ..	12/4 ¹ / ₂
Tho. de Warthecopp of .. Sandford	16/9	40 ^s	[]	15/8 †
....	Walter Tailbose ..	[2/-]	Richd. Ristwald ..	2/-
....	Thomas Warcop of Colby, son of Thomas Warcop, Vicar of Ky. Stephen	6/10
....	Tho. de Dacre Kt. }	} 9/2	Humphrey lord Dacre	} 9/2
....	" "		" "	
....	Thomas Ratclif <i>Joh Barton</i>	13/6
....	Willm. Crakenhorpe	[]	John Crakanthorp of Newbiging	20 ^d
....	John Crakanthorp of Holgill	21/8

† This must be an error for 15/5. Sub-feoffees are printed in *Italic*.

CORNAGE. Tabulation III.	Carucates.	Feodary c. 1283.	Cornage.	Ward.	Isabel de Clifford June 1292.	Cornage.
Kirkby Thore 3 pts. } 1 pt. }	3	Gilb ^t de Kirkby Thore } Robert de Berford }	19/10 12/8
Ribbyslands (Appleby)	..	Eudo de Ribbys..	2/-	20 ^s
lands in Appleby	.. 8 ^{ac}	Heirs of Walt Spencer..
Rookby moiety	Tho. de Musgrave	2/7	40 ^s
Lowther William	John de Coupland	} 20/4	..	Henry de Wyteby	} 20/4
Lowther John	Alan de Haverington		Adam de Haverington		
		Simon de Alne		Hugh de Louthre		
		Prior of Watton		Prior of Watton		
Mauld's Meaburn	Ric. le Fraunceys	} 33/-	£40
Whale	" "		
Smardale 3	Ric. de Sandford } Theobald de Wateby }	13/8	£10	Mich ^l de Hartecla	.. 13/8
Murton	[13/8]
		Tenentes	ad	voluntatem		
Warcop
Burgh	10/8½
Winton	20/9
					Cornage Total (given) £13 8 ^s 9½ ^d	

* 13/8 must be an error ; the figures of the entry just preceding repeated.

Robert de Clifford Aug. 1314.	Cornage.	Robert de Clifford Oct. 1314.	Cornage.	Ward.
John de Kirkbythore } " " }	32/6	Joh. de Kirkbythore } " " }	32/6	£10
Heir of Eudo de Ribbys..	2 ^s	Robt. de Bradewode ..	2 ^s	20 ^s
Heir of Walter le Spencer	4 ^d	[]	[]
Tho de Musgrave † under age ..	[2/7]	Tho. de Musgrave † under age ..	[2/7]	..
Heir of Joh de Coupland } Henry de Haverington } Simon de Alne .. } Prior of Watton .. }	20/4	Adam de Coupland } Hen. de Haverington } Hugh de Louthre } Prior of Watton }	20/4	40 ^s 40 ^s 40 ^s
Ric. le Fraunceis } " " }	33/-	Ric. le Fraunceys } " " }	33/-	£40
Andr. de Harecla ..	[13,8]	And. de Harcla	[13/8]	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d
....
{ Cornage { Total (<i>given</i>) £27 15 ^s 9 ^d		Cornage Total (<i>given</i>) £27 15 ^s 6 ^d		
		Ward Total (<i>given</i>) £790 6 ^s 8 ^d		
....
....
....

Tabulation III.
continued on pages
318 to 321.

† Tho. de Musgrave paid 46^s 10^d for cornage, as total for all his holdings, whereas his cornage should have been 33^s. I cannot explain the discrepancy, but only with 46^s 10^d as given in the Inquisition does the sum total come right. Possibly Soulby was held under him and the cornage set down in error to him and the sub-feoffee both.

CORNAGE. Tabulation III. (continued).	Isabel de Clifford July 1362.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Roger de Clifford August 1388. .	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.
Kirkby Thore 3 pts. } 1 pt. }	Joh.de Kirkbythore } " " }	32/6	100 ^s	Joh. de Kirkeby.. } " " }	32/6	100 ^s
Ribbyslands (Appleby)	W ^m Lengleys Kt. ..	2/-	13/4	W ^m de Whapelot and .. Elena his wife, her right	2 ^s	13/4
lands in Appleby
Rookby moiety	Robert de Laton } Thomas Skayf .. }	2/7	10 ^s
Lowther William	Matilda, widow of Hugh de Louthre }	20/4	60 ^s
Lowther John	" " }		
Mauld's Meaburn ..	Ric. de Vernon Kt. }	33/-	10 ^m	Ric. de Vernon .. }	33/-	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d
Whale	" " }			" " }		
Smardale	Tho. son of John de .. Warthcopp : the right of Katrina his wife	13/8	40 ^s
Murton	Joh. de Holand Kt. ..	8/6	60 ^s
Warcop
Burgh
Winton

Thomas de Clifford January, 1392.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	1392.	Yearly value of services.	1397-8.
Joh. de Kyrkeby	} 32/6	100 ^s	John de Kirkby ..	} 100 ^s	Joh. le Kirkbythore
" "			" "	
Wm. de Whapelode ..	2 ^s	20 ^s	W. le Englys
....
Thomas Skayff ..	} 2/7	10 ^s	Tho. Scaiff ..	} 10 ^s	Robert de Laton Kt.
Matilda, widow of Hugh de Louther			} 20/4		60 ^s
" "	" "	" "		" "	
Ric. de Vernon ..	} 33/-	£6 13 ^s 4 ^d	Richd. Vernon ..	} £6 13 ^s 4 ^d	Ric. Vernon
" "			" "		" "
Tho. de Musgrave ..	13/8	40 ^s	Tho. de Musgrave ..	40 ^s	Peter Morland and others
....	Lord de Wake
....
....
....

* I suspect Margaret is error for Matilda, as most certainly Henry is for Hugh.

CORNAGE. Tabulation III. (continued).	Matilda de Clifford 1403.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	John de Clifford June 1422.	Cornage.
Kirkby Thore 3 pts. } 1 pt. }	Joh. de Kirkeby.. } " " }	32/6
Ribbyslands (Appleby)	Walter []	20 ^s	Richd. Ristwald.. ..	2/-
lands in Appleby
Rookby moiety	John Scayfe .. }	2/7
Lowther William	Robt. de Louthar Kt. }	20/4
Lowther John	" " }	
Mauld's Meaburn	Richd. Vernon .. }	33/-
Whale	" " }	
Smardale	W ^m de Crakanthorp ..	13/8
Murton	John de Gray Kt. and .. Margaret his wife, her right	8/6
Warcop
Burgh
Winton

Elizabeth de Clifford Sept. 1424.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Elisabeth de Clifford Nov. 1435.	Cornage.	Feodary 1482.	Cornage
....	Robt. Kirkeby and Johanna, widow of Gilbert Wher- ton	32/6	John Kirkby	19/10
....	" "		[Ralf] Pudsey Kt. ..	12/8
....	<i>John Wherton</i> Richd. Ristwald..	..
....	in the lord's hands	..
....	John Scayfe..	2/7	Thomas Scayfe ..	2/7
....	Hugh Louther	20/4	Hugh Louther ..	20/4
....	" "		under [] " "	
....	Richard Vernon	42/- *	Henry Vernon ..	33/-
....	" "		" "	
....	Reginald Warcop	13/8
....	John Gray Kt. and.. Margaret, his wife	8/6	Tho. 'Salingr' Kt. ..	† [13/8]
....
....
....

* For this discrepancy I cannot at present account. † This [13/8] as explained in the text is an error, and is the cornage of the entry just previous repeated. E

SOCAGE. Tabulation IV.	Extent of land.	Feodary 1283.	Rent.	Isabel de Clifford June 1292.	Rent.
Grange in Asby	Abbot of Byland ..	26/8	Abbot of Byland	} 9/8 ³
Bretherdale	" " ..	5/-	" "	
Melkinthorpe	Margaret de Roos ..	5/- †	Margaret de Ros ..	5/-
Warcop	2 ^{ca}	Willm. de Warthecopp..	12 ^d
Warcop	6 ^{bov}	Wm. de Morvill.. ..	1 ^d	Heirs of Wm. Morel ..	1 ^d
Warcop and	} 16 ^{ac}	Tho. Bowet	} 6 ^d	Thomas Bovet	} 6 ^d
Soulby		4 ^{bov}		" "	
Milburn	} 2 ^{terr}	' Bertum ' de Johneby	} £4 †	Patrick, son of the Earl [Patrick]	} 40 ^s
Wynborrow		2 ^{ten}		Robt. de ' Waile '	
Rookby moiety..	Robt. son of Henry de.. Askby	6 ^d	Robt. de Soureby ..	6 ^d
Wharton
Tebay	2 ^{ca}	Tho. de Hastings ..	5 ^s
Cliburn	1 ^{bov} † a	Geoffrey son of Hervy ..	1 ^d	Geoffrey, son of Hersy §	1 ^d
" [lands of Adam	son of Gilbert of Cliburn†]	Walter Tylle	6 ^d
"	1 ^{bov}	Joh. de Staffole	1 ^{pd} of cummin
"	4 ^{bov} †
"
Haile Grange
Colby	John de Galdington ..	6 ^d
Watby	9 ¹ / ₂ ^{ac} †
Mousegyl and Belowe..	pasture between	[Alan de Cabergh] § ..	6/8
Soureby	Tho. de Hellebek ..	13/4
				Total (given)	76 ^s 10 ³ / ₄ ^d
Drengs:—					
* [Clifton]
[Cliburn]
"
"
[Melkinthorpe ?]
[Louthur]

* These are the places given in the Inquisitions of 1314 as those where the drengs held, but each is not assigned to his place; this is easily done by collation. † Description of land given from Inq. of 1314. (a) It is clear from the tabulation that the lands of Geoffrey, son of Hervey, were not 'Judlands.' ^{terr}=lands. ^{ten}=tenements. For other abbreviations see page 328.

Robert de Clifford August 1314.	Rent.	Robert de Clifford October 1314.	Rent.	Isabel de Clifford July 1362.	Rent.	Yearly value services.
Abbot of Byland	} 31/8	Abbot of Byland	} 31/8	..
" "		" "	
[] de Ros ..	5/-
[Robt. ?] de Warthcop..	12 ^d	Tho. de Warthecopp	12 ^d	½ ^m
John Morel ..	1 ^d
Thos. Bowet ..	} 6 ^d
" "	
Tho. de Haltedden	} £4
Adam [Garret ?]..	
Robert de Askby..	6 ^d
Hen. de Querton ..	6 ^d ¶	Hugh de Querton ..	6 ^d	½ ^m
Heir of Tho. de Hastings	5 ^s
Geoffrey, son of Hervey	1 ^d	Geoffrey, son of	1 ^d
William de Tylia..	6 ^d	Hervey	6 ^d
John de Staffol ..	1 pound of	John de Staffol ..	1 pound of
Tenants of Reginald	cummin	[Robt. de Soureby ?]	cummin
[son ?] of []	1 ^d	William de Tylia ..	[1 ^d]
William de Tylia..	1 ^d
....
Tho. de Colleby ..	6 ^d
Thos. Bowet ..	1 ^d
Alan de Cabergh ..	6/8
....
Total (given) £6 17 ^s	4½ ^d **					
Gilbert Engayne	Gilbert Engayne
Heir of Geoffrey, son of..	..	Heir of Geoffrey,
Hervey	..	son of Hervey
William de T []	William de Ty[lie]..
Robt. de Soureby	..	Robt. de Soureby
Hugh de []	Hugh de []
Adam de Coupland	..	Adam de Coupland

Tabulation IV. continued on pages 324 to 327.

§ The names of these feoffees and the amounts are given in this Inq. but not the places, which are identified from the next Inq. (1314); Hersy must be an error for Hervey. ¶ Or 4 arrows.
¶ Payable at feast of Assumption. ** Evidently an entry of 5/- is obliterated; since the column as deciphered only gives £6 12s. 4½^d. † Or a mewed sparrow hawk.

SOCAGE. Tabulation IV. (continued).	Roger de Clifford August 1388.	Rent.	Yearly value of services.	Thomas de Clifford January 1392.	Rent.	Yearly value of services.
Grange in Asby ..	Abbot of Byland	} 31/8	£6	Abbot of Byland	} 31/8	£6
Bretherdale	" "			" "		
Melkinthorpe
Warcop	Hen. de Warthecopp ..	12 ^d	20 ^s	Hen. de Warthecopp ..	12 ^d	40 ^s
Warcop	Tho. de Warthecopp ..	1 ^d	12 ^s	Tho. de Warthecopp ..	1 ^d	12 ^s
Warcop and ..	} Willm. de Stirkeland	} 6 ^d	} 20 ^s	} Wm. de Stirkeland	} 6 ^d	} 20 ^s
Soulby						
Milburn	} Willm. de Lancastre	} []	} £4	} Willm. de Lancastre	} 20 ^s ?	} [£3 ?]
Wynborrow						
Rookby moiety ..	Robt. de Laton	6 ^d	10/-*	Robt. de Laton	6 ^d	2 ^s
Wharton	W ^m de Querton	6 ^d	½ ^m	Willm. de Wherton ..	6 ^d	[]
Tebay	} W ^m de Querton ..	} 5/-	} 20 ^s	} Willm. de Wherton	} 5/-	} 20 ^s
Cliburn	Tho. son of Joh. de War-	1 ^d	12 ^d	Tho. son of Joh. de War-	1 ^d	12 ^d
.. Adam's land ..	" "	6 ^d	10 ^s	" "	6 ^d	10 ^s
.. 1 bovate	" "	[]	3/-	" "	1 ^{pd} of	3 ^s
.. 4 bovates	cum.	..
.. Judland	William Jude	1 ^d	[12 ^d ?]	William Judd	[1 ^d]	12 ^d
Haile Grange ..	Abbot of Holm [Cultram]	13/4	20 ^s
Colby	Joh. de Colby	6 ^d	2/-	Margt. widow of Tho. ..	6 ^d	2 ^s
Watby	de Mallerstang
Mousegyl and Belowe..	William de Fulthorp ..	6/8	[]	Willm. de Fulthorp ..	6/8	[]
Soureby
Drengs						
[Clifton]
[Cliburn]
"
"
[Melkinthorpe ?]
[Louthur]

* There seems to be a confusion in this Inq. between the values of the two moieties of Rookby. The yearly value of the services from the moiety held by Cornage (Little Rookby) was 10^s. The yearly value of services due from that held by Socage was 2^s.

1392.	Yearly value of services.	1397-8.	Matilda de Clifford 1403.	Rent.	Yearly value of services.
Abbot of Byland ..	£6
" "					
....
Hen. de Warthecopp ..	40 ^s
Tho. de Warthecopp ..	12 ^s
Wm. de Strikland	20 ^s	William de Strikland ?	[]	[]
" "					
....	John, son of Wm. de Lancaster	[]	[]
....					
....	Robert de Laton ..	6 ^d	2/-
....
....	Willm de Wherton Rich. de Ristwald	[]	[]
Tho. son of Joh. de War- (thecopp)	12 ^d		
" "	10 ^s
" "	3 ^s
....
....	William Judde ..	1 ^d	[]
Abbot of Holme ..	20 ^s
Margt. widow of Tho. de Mallerstang	2/-
....
....	William Fulthorp ..	6/8	[]
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

SOCAGE. Tabulation IV. (continued).	John de Clifford June 1422.	Rent.	Elizabeth de Clifford Sept. 1424.	Rent.
Grange in Asby	Abbot of Byland	} 31/8
Bretherdale	" "	
Melkinthorpe
Warcop	Tho. de Warthecop ..	12 ^d	Ralf E. of Westmoreland	12 ^d
Warcop	Tho. de Warthecop ..	1 ^d
Warcop and	Willm. de Louther ..	6 ^d
Soulby	[Willm. de Strikland] ..	[2 ^d]
Milburn	John de Lancaster	} £4
Wynborrow	" "	
Rookby moiety	Tho. de Laton	6 ^d
Wharton
Tebay
Cliburn
.. Adam's land
.. 1 bovate
.. 4 bovates
.. Judland ..	William Judde	1 ^d
Haile Grange	Abbot of Holm	13/4
Colby
Watby
Mousegyl and Belowe ..	William Fulethorp ..	6/8
Soureby
Drengs				
[Clifton]
[Cliburn]
"
"
[Melkinthorpe ?]
[Louther]

NETHER BURGH. CORNAGE. Tabulation V. Inquisitio p.m. Thome de Clifford Jany. 1392.		Description of holding.	Rent.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.	Partitio feodorum Thome de Clifford 1392.	Description of holding.	Rent.	Cornage.	Yearly value of services.
25 freeholders at Whit-	} 25 ^s for all services.	suntide and St. Martin's also
Tho. de Derby			[2 bov. ?]	1 ^d	..	[]	John Dicconson	½ bov.	..	2/-
Joh. de Oxenthwayth ..	½ bov.	18 ^d	2 ^d	2/-	Joh. de Oxenthwayt ..	½ bov.	..	2/-		
Thos. de Derby	½ bov.	18 ^d	2 ^d	2/-	Thos. de Derby	½ bov.	..	2/-		
Joh. Bowet	½ bov.	18 ^d	2 ^d	2/-	John Bowet	½ bov.	..	2/-		
Joh. Spencer	2 bov.	2 ^d	8 ^d	8/-	John Spencer	2 bov.	..	8/-		
Johanna de Mallerstang ..	1 cradle value on occasion	2 ^d	[]	Johanna de Mallerstang }	6/-			
" " ..	4 ac.	½ ^d	(½lb. of cummin)	" " }			
" " (½ of 1 mess.) ..	8 ac.	20 ^d	2 ^d	2/-	" " }			
Willm. Smith do.	8 ac.	20 ^d	2 ^d	2/-	Willm. Smith	2/-		
Robert Douglas do.	8 ac.	20 ^d	2 ^d	2/-	Robert Douglas	1 car. ½ of 1 mess.	..	2/-		
Tho. Culverdowff, 1 mess.	2/-		
" " ..	2 bov.	..	8 ^d	[4/-]	Tho. Culverdowf	4/-		
" " ..	vaccaries 17 }	4/-		
Thos. Skayk * for le Redegetscliffe (farm) }	4/3½		
Constable's dues to :—										
Joh. de Crakanthorp (life interest) from Cabergh & Hellebek }	12 quarters of oats	=2/-		
Rikefilmer ' farm ' ..	6 bov.	2½ ^d		

These I could decipher only in these two documents. I believe returns of the sort are in the two
1314 Inquisitions decayed or hidden under stain.

Abbreviations used :—ca. = carucate ; bov. = bovates ; mess. = messuage ; ac. = acres.
vaccary = cow pasture (dairy farm). * Error for Skayfe. (?)

LAY SUBSIDY ROLL $1\frac{10}{32}$, WESTMORLAND.

29th Jany., 14 Henry vj. (1436).

(Owners of land worth 100^s and above in that year in the county).

	worth	subsidy due
Cristopher Moresby Kt. has lands and tenements	£60	30/-
Henry Wharton " " "	£25	12/6
Willm. Blenkinsopp " " "	£26	13/-
Willm. Crakenthorpp " " "	£15	7/6
Thos. Warcopp " " "	£13	6/6
Robert Warcopp " " "	£26	13/-
Thomas Warcopp of Sandford " " "	£10	5/-
John Barton " " "	£6	3/-
John Scayff " " "	£6	3/-
Richd. Blenkinsopp " " "	£10	5/-
Thos. Musgrave " " "	£10	5/-
Thos. Blenkinsopp jun ^r " " "	£6	3/-
John Langdale " " "	100 ^s	2/6
Thomas Strickland Kt. " " "	£86	43/-
Walter Strickland " " "	£13	6/6
Robert Leyburn Kt. " " "	£53	26/6
Robt. Belyngham " " "	£10	5/-
Tho. Midleton " " "	£20	10/-
Willm. Thornburgh " " "	£20	10/-
Nicholas Leyburn " " "	£13	6/6
Willm. Levyns " " "	100 ^s	2/6
John Roos " " "	£10	5/-
Hugh Ward " " "	£10	5/-
John del Chambre " " "	100 ^s	2/6
Roger Gnype " " "	£10	5/-
Richard Preston " " "	£21	10/6
Richard Doket sen ^r " " "	£20	10/-
Richard Doket jun ^r " " "	£6	3/-
Robert Dokwra " " "	£6	3/-
Richd. Roos " " "	£20	10/-
John Roos son of the aforesaid Richd. " " "	£6	3/-
Tho. Bayrose " " "	100 ^s	2/6
Robt. Garnet " " "	100 ^s	2/6
Joh de Weshyngton " " "	£6	3/-

G

	has lands and tenements worth	subsidy due
Johanna widow of Thomas Roos	100 ^s	2/6
Robt. Liester (?), clerk	100 ^s	2/6
Willm. Buggyngs, clerk	100 ^s	2/6
Richd. de Manser(gh)	100 ^s	2/6
John Bethome	100 ^s	2/6
Robt. Roche	100 ^s	2/6
Hugh Salkeld sen ^r	£46	23/-
Hugh Salkeld jun ^r	100 ^s	2/6
Willm. Lancaster of Hertsopp	£20	10/-
Henry Threlkeld Kt.	£80	40/-
Isabel widow of William Hoton	£20	10/-
Robert Lancastre	100 ^s	2/6
Robert Sandford	£40	20/-
John Clibbourn	£17	8/6
Isabel widow of John Helton	100 ^s	2/6
Nicholas Fallowefeld	£10	5/-
Gilbert Wherton	£10	5/-
Hugh Lowther of Ascome	£6	3/-

This includes the barony of Kendal, as well as the barony of Appleby, but it seems hardly worth while not to give the whole. It illustrates the scanty Inq. of 1435.
