

Some Notes Extracted from the Pipe Rolls of King Henry the Second.

BY PYM YEATMAN.

FEW Scholars have taken the trouble to examine the Pipe Rolls thoroughly, and many are in absolute ignorance of their existence. Yet there is now established a society called the "Pipe Roll Society," the editorial department of which is conducted by earnest and able men, who are fully qualified to determine which of our series of public records is the most valuable, and who have selected these Rolls for their particular enterprise.

This society has many great patrons, some of whom, it is feared, only adorn it with their names. The Master of the Rolls is its especial patron, and the only wonder is that, since he has condescended to patronise it, he does not go a little further, and devote a portion of the funds at his disposal (some of which are sadly wasted) in developing this rich mine of antiquarian lore. Failing this recognition, it is to be hoped that those who love historical enquiry for its own sake will add their guinea to the society's funds, and help it upon its useful and honourable career. It is in this hope, chiefly, that this article is written, that those interested in genealogical studies may see the immense value of these rolls, and thus be induced to help on the movement.

It may be asked what are the Pipe Rolls? They are the national accounts, the budget of the year, nay more, the actual figures which go to make up the budget. The revenue of each county is accurately given, with the names of the payers or

receivers of each item of account, and the reasons for such payments. The regular income of the year arose principally from payments made by the great landowners, sometimes in respect of annual rents, at others for a kind of payment in lieu of succession duty on acquiring a property by purchase or inheritance. Other payments were made by way of fine or penalty for the infraction of some law, a rebellion perhaps, or for the permission for a widow to marry whom she choose, or alas, only too often, for a license for some mercenary ruffian to marry her. Large sums, too, were frequently paid for the King's good will. These accounts are most beautifully kept, and the earlier they are in point of date the more perfect is the arrangement and the legibility of the handwriting. They are called the Great Rolls, and well worthy are they of the name. They are of a very great antiquity—750 years or thereabouts is the date of the oldest, and there is a regular and perfect series from the year 1156, a wonderful collection of documents, the like of which no other nation in Europe can show a counterpart.

The credit of the invention of this system of accounting is generally given to one Nigel, who was afterwards created Bishop of Ely, and who is generally supposed to have been the nephew or son of a greater bishop—Roger of Salisbury, of the time of King Henry I..

Only five or six years of this vast period had been published before the Pipe Roll Society came into existence; they have printed about as many more years, and they only require funds to enable them to start the work in earnest.

Derbyshire historians have done but little in this direction. The writer, for his own work, has extracted all that relates to Derbyshire for the reigns of Henry II. and of several of his successors, a most laborious compilation; and it is not too much to say that the information which they produce is far greater than the whole amount of Derbyshire County History that has yet been published. It may be broadly laid down that there is no pedigree of true Derbyshire origin that is not here profusely illustrated.

Take for example the family of Heathcote, now honoured by

the chiefship of Lord Aveland. Who ever heard of this family earlier than the reign of Henry VIII., when they were generally in trade—merciers, butchers, braziers, and bell-founders—in Chesterfield? The Pipe Rolls show that one Godfrey Hethcote (the very christian name borne by many of the present family) was not exactly flourishing but existing in the 12th year of Henry II. So, too, the well known family of Bass is found here at the same, and even at an earlier period; the Foljambes, who are well known after the reign of Edward I., are frequently mentioned at this early period; so, too, are the Curzons, the Musards, the Chaworths, Britons, Byrons, Deincourts, Peverels, Ferrers, Marples (then called de Mapleton), Bardolfs, Stanleys, and indeed all the ancient names. We do not find the names of Gernon, Cavendish, and Vernon, and other names, some of which date from about the time of King John, but in his reign we find them replacing some of the oldest families in the county. The name of Francis, the patronymic of the present house of Vernon, occurs occasionally.

But it is not alone in tracing the origin of families that these rolls are valuable; they supply many most interesting particulars of history relating to events that are at present unknown, or only known partially. Take for instance the expenses attending the building and furnishing of the castles of the counties of Nottingham and Derby, for in these accounts they are grouped together. It would almost seem, from the immense sums then spent upon it, that the castle of Nottingham was rebuilt about the 17th Henry II. We find no particular entry relating to it before that year, but then we find the following large sums spent:—£40 13s. 3d., £38 14s., £274 12s. 9d., and some dozen other items making up another £100, altogether nearly £500 in a single year, an immense sum in those days. The following year £229 3s. 10d. was spent for the same end in one sum.

In 19 Henry II. we get an interesting item showing the wages of the period of the persons employed; 41 carpenters and one foreman cost 62s. 6d. for six days, making machines of war for the army at Leicester upon the occasion of the insurrection of

Prince Henry; £140 was further spent on the castle and gaol of Nottingham, and in furnishing it. No doubt it was now habitable, for 33 quarters of corn were laid in at a cost of 48s. 4d., 40 bacons at £4 5s. 6d., salt to the value of 50s. 7d., and 120 cheeses at 41s. 6d.; iron utensils were provided at 15s. 2d., seven manumols* at 10s., and charcoal at 3s. 7d.

In victualling the castle of Bolsover, 40 quarters of corn cost 53s. 4d., 20 bacons 53s., and 60 cheeses 19s. 8d.

In furnishing Peak Castle were consumed 20 measures of corn 50s. 6d., and 20 bacons 39s.

The cost of maintaining 20 knights for 20 days was only £20, of which £17 was charged to the county.

Operations upon the castles of Bolsover and Peak this year cost £100 os. 3d., and the knights and servants there £135 more.

The roll of 20 Henry II. shows that £17 18s. was spent in operations on Nottingham Castle, and 80 quarters of corn were laid in at a cost of 80s. 3d., 40 bacons costing 56s. 9d.; 7s. 8d. of salt, 12½ quarters of barley 12s. 3d., and 500 quartells 4s. 6d. (qy. breadstuffs, quartern loaves?). Besides this, 20 knights and 60 servants cost £25 for the three castles of Nottingham, Bolsover, and Peak.

In 21 Henry II. £46 was spent on the castle of Nottingham and the King's Treasury there.

In 22 Henry II. the works on the tower of Peak Castle cost £135; the following year £49 more was spent upon Peak Castle, and a sum of no less than £210 upon the King's house at Clipston and its fish ponds.

In 24 Henry II. £20 was spent upon the receiving hall and fish ponds at Clipston, £20 upon the chapel, and £36 upon the house.

The following year £65 was spent upon the castles of Nottingham and Clipston, £10 2s. 6d. on the park, £126 upon the fish pond, and £39 for the repairs of the gaol at Nottingham.

* *Manumola* was a late Latin term for *chiroteca*, or gloves, probably here gauntlets.—ED.

In 26 Henry II. the enclosing the park at Clipston cost £36, and the works on the king's chamber at the castle of Nottingham £20. The same year there was spent 21s. 6d. for the birds (*aves*) of the king and for one appenticium, and 12 great caldrons with tripods which cost £4 7s. od.

Ten marks were spent 27 Henry II. in repairing Nottingham bridge, and in 28 Henry II. the King's hall at Nottingham cost £80, the works on the gaol £15, and 7s. 7d. upon the burgesses' gaol at Nottingham: the whole expense thus given was £216 12s.

In 6 Richard I., on that king's return from captivity, £22 16s. 6d. was spent on the stables at the castle of Nottingham, upon the park, on the hall, on the buttery, on the high chamber (*lunariorum, lunarii*—serfs), on the windows of the hall, on the postern, in the moat.

We learn also the value of the goods and chattels of the period, especially in a return respecting the estate of William de Heriz, the lord of Winfield, who was a true Harcourt, and possibly in his family will be found the ancestors of the Harcourts who came into note in England about the time of King John. In 18 Henry II. the Sheriff accounted for £4 19s. 4d. for corn sold off the land of this William in the previous year, and £31 10s. for the present year; for 28 oxen and three affris, £4 14s.; for 400 sheep, £6 13s. 4d.; for 15 ruscis, 10s.; for five cows, 10s.; and for 20 scrophis and 3 verribus,* 15s. 4d. In 20 Henry II., William de Heriz was restored to his estates on paying a fine of 100 marks. He seems to have died childless before 28 Henry II.,

* *Affrus* was a coarsely-bred farm horse, as opposed to the *equus*, and was usually half the price of the latter.

Rusca, or *ruscha*, a term occasionally met with signifying *apiarium*, or bee-hive, or perhaps more correctly the swarm-hive.

Scropha and *Verres*, unusual terms of Norman-French origin, only met with in early chartularies or rolls, meaning respectively pig and boar.

With these agricultural prices of the twelfth century it is interesting to compare the prices of the next two centuries.

About 1292 the average cost of the affrus or stott was 12s., and of the ox 10s.; of cows, 8s.; of sheep, 1s. 3d.; of pigs, 3s. 3d.; of boars, 4s. A hive of bees were sold in 1281 for 1s. 6d., and in 1328 for 1s. 8d. About 1282 the average cost of the affrus was 21s., and of the ox 16s.; of cows, 11s. 6d.; of sheep, 1s. 9d.; whilst pigs were about the same price as a hundred years before.—ED.

for Robert, his brother, paid £73 6s. 8d. for his lands. The Sheriff also accounted for two oxen, sold for 12s. which William Foljambe bequeathed to the king by his will, no doubt his heriot; this was in 18 Henry II. Some twenty years later we find Thomas Foljambe residing at Tideswell.

In 30 Henry II. the Sheriff accounted for the proceeds of William Luvitot's three estates as follows:—

In Halumshire 40 cows and 4 bulls, £8 16s.; 8 oxen, 40s.; 12 scrophis and 7 verres, 13s.; and 1 affrus, 2s. 6d.

At Wirkstop 10 cows and 1 bull, 44s.; 8 oxen, 40s.; 300 sheep, £12.

At Gringelay 10 cows and 1 bull, 44s.; 8 oxen, 40s.; 100 sheep, £4; 5 scrophis and 1 verre, 6s.; in all £36 5s. 6d.

The same year, at Stapelford (another Heriz's estate), 12 oxen and 100 sheep, 9 cows, and a bull, were valued at £4 16s.

In 32 Henry II. the Sheriff was allowed out of the estate of Hasculf Musard, which was farmed at £60, as many shillings in money to Johanna his widow for her dowry, and £10 for her children and servants, and £43 for feeding and clothing his daughters, and for feeding and clothing the son of Walter de Eston, of whom he had the custody.

In 18 Henry II. Robert Mantel and William fil Ralf accounted for the pannage of the king's forest through the whole of England. It would seem that this return was entered upon the Nottingham and Derbyshire Roll because William fil Ralf, the Justiciar of Normandy was then Sheriff of Nottingham. This list is well worth transcribing. They accounted for the the sum of 32s. 2d. for Scardibuc, 15s. for Pickering, £12 4s. 4d. for Cubland, £4 19s. for Stanley, 67s. for the New Forest, 9s. for Gravelings, 78s. for the whole of Essex, 45s. for Brollis de Rutland, £21 10s. for Dene, 55s. for Herefordshire in Wales, 27s. 2d. for Fecheha, 2s. 5d. for Hanley, 36s. 8d. for Northumberland, £6 15s. for Windsor, for the past year; and for the present, £7 12s. for the New Forest, 38s. for Northumberland, 26s. 8d. for Cannoc, 30s. for Scardburc, 15s. for Pickering, 2s. for Langwade, £4 8s. for Galtris, 8s. for Graveling, £6 for Windsor, 7s. 4d. for Monte

Gislebti, 10s. 5d. for the Haiar of Stanley, 5s. for Lecher, 60s. 1d. for Essex, 59s. 6d. for Shirlet, 10s. 7d. for Ernestreu, and £8 7s. 9d. for Cumberland.

In 12 Henry II. there is a curious list of the names of those who perished by the ordeal of water, the Sheriff accounting for their goods and chattels, the same producing no less than £37 6s. 10d., the aggregate amount of the goods of thirty unhappy persons who met their death in these two counties this year. Amongst them is recorded the name of Godfrey de Hetcota, whose goods fetched 16s.

In the following year the men of Hulmo paid 10 marks for false judgment; some one disputing the verdict of a jury, got a new trial and reversed it, and so the unhappy jurors were fined heavily. Geoffrey Torchard, of the Hucknal Torchard family, was this year fined four marks for not appearing before the Justices of the Exchequer, two marks of which he paid the following year. In 8 Richard I. he paid 100 shillings for having a writ of right against Will Pitie for two knights' fees in Hucknal (Huggenhale) and Lambcote. Avice, the widow of Roger de Makefield, owed 20 marks for having the chattels and debts of her husband, who had been killed.

William de Stanley paid half a mark for some default in 15 Henry II. He was of the family of Stanley Park, upon which, according to the chronicle of Thomas de Musca, in King John's reign was founded the Abbey of Dale, or Depedale, by Galfry de Salicosa Mara and Matilda his wife, who purchased it of Nicholas fr William Child of Trowell. Possibly this William Child was the last of the Stanley family who held it, or he may have succeeded them. The word Child here, no doubt, is simply the younger. At Domesday it was Cilt, or Chidde, when it had the same meaning, although Mr. E. A. Freeman doubts it. Warner de Stanley was an outlaw, it appears, in 17 Henry II., when the Sheriff realised the sum of 2s. for his goods. William Francis was also a fugitive at the same date, and his goods realized 10s. The Sheriffs also accounted for 7s. realized for honey from the lands of William de Heriz.

In 23 Henry II. there is a very valuable account of the sums paid by the knights of the Earl of Derby in respect of his debt (*pro duello com de Ferrar*). This had reference, possibly, to the earl's submission to the king at Northampton, when Rees, Prince of Wales, had captured the earl's castle at Tutbury.

Robert de Albini, doubtless the grandson of Nigel Albini, of Domesday, who married the daughter of Watchelinus de Ferrars, was chief tenant, and paid 5 marks; Robert, uncle of the earl, 40s.; Henry, uncle of the earl, the same; Robert Curcun, 40s.; Arnold de Becco, 20s.; Henry de Becco, half a mark; Maurice Snelston, the same; William de Perario, half a mark; William de Montgomery, 40s.; Roger de Biron, 1 mark; John Fitz Herbert, Rad de Boschville, and Walter de Bakepuz, each half a mark; John de Bakepuz, 2 marks; Herie de Tuch, the same; Henry de Greslea, half a mark; Alan Fitz Harold and Alan of Tickenhale, the same; Robert de Gresley, 2 marks; Nic Fitz Pag, Robert fil Adam de Stanton, William de Colville, and Robert de Trussley, each half a mark; in the whole £20 6s. 8d.

In 15 Henry II. there is an entry showing that Richard, Dapifer of the Earl de Ferrars, owed 10 marks for a duel which he said he would wage in the Court of the King on account of the Earl's Court, and in which he made default, for which he should answer in Berkshire.

The following very valuable list of amerciaments of the 22 Henry II. is of such immense value to the genealogist, that no apology is requisite for giving it:—

De mia repis pro foresta sua.

Will fil Rann c m de mia pro foresta

Ro^{bt} fil Philip c m de eadem

Reg^{ld} de Anesliga c m

W^m de Luvitot 60 m

Roger fil Rand de Mareseia c m

Simon fil Ric 40 m

Johes de Aincourt 20 m

In pdon p br Ripi Johi 20 m

Henry fil Fulcher 40 m de mia Fulcher fil suu p eod

- Ada de Moretoni 30 m
 Sanson di Stradlega x m°
 Rich de Ernhalā 20 m
 Serlo de Plesleg^a 60 m
 Roger de Buron x m
 Osb Selvein 20 m
 Hugo de Bussei 20 m see in Lincolnshire
 Nigel de Flaburc 10 m
 Roger de Aencurt 10 m
 Johes fil Aissulfi 20 m see in Everwick
 Hugo Bardulf 5 m
 Emma de Luvitot 10 m
 Ro^{bt} de Maisenil 10 m
 Ro^{bt} Sumvell et fil sua 10 m
 Rich de Hoton 10 m
 Rad de Cromwell 10 m
 Galf Barret 10 m
 Gerb de Archis 10 m see in Everwic
 Hu^g Sanson 10 m
 Ro^{bt} de Crokeston 5 m
 Herve de Sutton et Ro^{bt} ho suu 5 m
 Matti fil W^m fil Wulfrici 40/-
 Milo de Langetot, 10 m
 Will de Belewe 20 m
 Co^m de Ferrar 200 m
 Ro^{bt} fiil Rann 20 m
 Ro^{bt} de Molbrai 40 m in Northumberland
 Roger de Stokes 5 m
 Soka de Mamefield 10 m.
 Ro^{bt} fil Walt 4 m
 Rog de Feninglay 5 m
 Ro^{bt} fil Walt de Eston 6 m
 Vill de Spondon 5 m
 Ro^{bt} de Heriz 5 m
 Rad fil Hu^g 4 m
 Rand de Wandeslega 3 m

Willi de Sandebi 4 m
 Suein de Holanda 4 m
 Vill de Greslega 40/-
 Gilb de Hetton 2 m
 Hu^{bt} de Hetton 2 m
 Rog fil W^m de Maresia 2 m
 Will Pinc de Hocreton 2 m
 Elmton and Creswella 2 m
 Regin de Insula 3 m
 Romeisim et fil ej 20s
 Ro^{bt} de Alvers 40/
 Walter de Wudburg 20/-
 Roger Puheri 5 m
 Jacob de Stokes 2 m
 Ro^{bt} de Bussei 2 m
 Vill de Rippeleg 2 m
 Rob Niger de Sutton 20/-
 Ro^{bt} de Baalega 2 m
 Jo^{hs} Burdū 3 m
 Step de Stokes 2 m
 Vill Warsop 40/- Alfreton 2 m
 Ro^{bt} de Bidon $\frac{1}{2}$ m see in Oxfordsh
 Johes de Boskervill 6 m
 Ad de Stretton 2 m
 Roger Flandr 2 m
 W^m Blund and John de Calnatton 2 m
 Hugs fil Aldredi 20/
 Engelr de Heddon 20/
 Vill de Bulewell 20

Names of those who perished by the ordeal of water, with the value of their goods :—

Wallec de Boneia 3/
 Ada de Radeslea 4/6
 Turkill de Cneshala 22/6
 Leofwin de Wivelastorp 6/
 Tom de Boleton 111s

Ulfkil fil Ase 43/5

Rad fil Lune 10/8

Swein de Polac 18/6

Fulk de Marcha 26/6

Gilbto Vle 4/

Ro^{bt} fil Aveline 16/

Swein de la Kerneille 60/8

Aelwin Ruff de Horseleg 8/10

The lead mines of Derbyshire are frequently mentioned in these rolls. Ralf fil Engleram accounted for £18 in 2 Henry II. respecting them. In 23 Henry II. there is a charge of 10 marks for 20 carretates of lead for the use of the king at Windsor. In 26 Henry II. 20 marks are charged for 40 car of lead which the king gave to the Cistercians, and 100 shillings for carrying the same lead from Peak to St. Botolf's (Boston), and £33 6s. 8d. for 100 carretates for the work of the church at Waltham, and for carrying it from the Peak to St. Botolf's, and from thence by ship to London, £14 13s. 6d.

Carriage was not always very expensive. For carrying the treasury from Newark to Doncaster, 5s., and from Nottingham to Northampton, 4s.; for carrying the charters of Aaron (the Jew) from Nottingham to Northampton only 3s. was charged; and for carrying the money (denariis) of the Archbishop of York and of Aaron (which the king gave to John his son for going into Ireland) from Nottingham to Stutibr (Tutbury), 18s.

Majister William Testard, in 9 Richard I., paid a fine of 300 marks for having his archdeaconry. In 3 John, Elias the Dean paid 100 marks for having (*amica* sua*) and his children and servants.

Very curious entries are made relative to buying marriages. The following is worth notice:—Godfrey de Albini, the brother of the Earl of Arundel, accounted for £1000 for having to wife the great Nottinghamshire heiress, Matilde de Caux (Calceto) the widow of Ralf fil Stephen, “if she would have him,” was modestly added (*si ipsa voluerit eum accipere*). However, it would not appear that the lady accepted him, nor did the attempt cost him

*Possibly this word is *amita* (aunt).

much, for it was stated that there was nothing in the treasury, and the king excused him the payment of the £1000. Godfrey Albini, like his brother the earl, was probably a special friend of King John. But for this entry he would be lost to history.

In 33 Henry II. there is an entry for breaking (*frangendo*) the vivarium at Clipstone, and for carrying the fish to another vivarium, 58s. From a previous entry it appears that over £100 had been spent upon this fish pond.

In 17 Henry II. there is an entry of great interest to the writer of this article. The Sheriff accounted for the farm of the Honour of Peverel, out of which Mereaduco and Roger de Powis were allowed 46s. 8d. by the writ of Richard de Lucy, the chief justice. In the last year of King John, Richard de Bradmer was allowed £10 out of the rents of Wennuwin, the descendant of these brothers. The value of this entry is only appreciable by one conversant with the writer's *History of the House of Arundel*. In that work he has propounded a theory of the identity of the Fitz Pain family, who were undoubtedly of the same stock as Meredith and Roger de Powis, with the family of Peverel. Mr. Thomas Bond, who has broached a different theory, has attacked the author most bitterly in the pages of the *Genealogist*. This entry, together with the interesting confirmatory evidence of that great genealogist, the Rev. Robert Eyton, should teach Mr. Bond to be more cautious as well as courteous.*

It is to be hoped that this slight account of the Pipe Rolls will attract more attention to them. They abound with valuable information on many subjects.