

## The Lost History of Peak Forest, the Hunting Ground of the Peverels.

By JOHN PYM YEATMAN, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law.



THE historian has long essayed to learn something about this great forest field, given over eight hundred years ago by the Conqueror to William, founder of the House of Peverel, a hero over whose personality there has always been a glamour and a cloud almost impenetrable. The late Robert Eyton, in his marvellous "History of Shropshire," gathered together many little facts which go far towards bringing him back into the light of day, and the writer of this article, in his "History of the House of Arundel," has also published other facts, which he, too, has dug up from the depths of the lumber stowed away in the Public Record Office; but it is still open to any industrious student of antiquity to determine more accurately his actual relationship to the great Conqueror, and the discovery by the writer of a vast mass of Peak Forest Inquests of an early date, which had long been hidden in the Record Office, may help towards the solution of the problem, as they certainly supply the necessary history of Peak Forest.

These Inquests are of themselves of the highest interest, not only with regard to local history, but to the subject generally of Forestry and Venery, so very few Forest Rolls remaining accessible. The Record Office calendars show but a small collection, chiefly copies, and always fragments. The Rolls recently discovered

comprise a perfect series for about 100 years of a very interesting period of history—the thirteenth century.

It is well known that nothing can be seen at the Record Office unless the searcher can produce a reference from some Cartulary or Index deposited there, and known to the officials—a general search being an impossibility, owing to the rules of the establishment, which require the desired documents *to be specified*. These Records have not been thoroughly calendared, hence they have never seen the light, and, if any persons have seen them, they have never given the public the benefit of their knowledge. In gathering material for his “History of Derbyshire,” the author made many unsuccessful attempts to discover any Records relating to Peak Forest, and he had despaired of finding any, until the discovery of an *Inspeximus* by Queen Elizabeth, of a portion of an early roll relating to the Foresters of Fee of Peak, in the muniment room of Mr. Westby Bagshawe, of The Oaks, a descendant of one of these foresters, convinced him that the Records must be in existence.

The only trace of a Peak Forest Roll given by the Record Office is a mere fragment of the date of 13 Edward I., of a very similar character to the Roll inspected by Queen Elizabeth, but which latter, from comparison, was very clearly of an earlier period. In Queen Elizabeth’s reign it was deposited at Westminster. How, or why, or when, since that period, this record had strayed, can be only conjectured; but in some way it had found its way to Lancaster, and although a Royal Record, which should have been deposited in the King’s Court, it had become incorporated amongst the Duchy Records, and was described by Sir Thomas Hardy, in his report upon the Duchy Records, as of that character, and of the date of King Edward I.

The Rolls are of two separate dates, one set clearly dated the 13th Edward I., when the Forest was the property of the Duchy of Lancaster, and the other being only dated by a Saint’s day; but many of these rolls contain references to King Henry III. as the *then* King; and a further search showed that they must have been recorded after the 35th and before the 37th of that

King. A reference to the Patent Rolls of 36th Henry III., gives the commission to the judges who adjudicated upon these Inquests and upon the presentments of the Swainmote Courts, thus clearly dating them as of that year.

The old law books lay it down as a rule that the Courts of the Justices in Eyre were held every third year, but these Rolls show, from the clearest internal evidence, that no such Courts had been held from the 18th of King John to the 36th of Henry III., and only those offences which were committed in the reign of the then king were tried; and the later Rolls contain Inquests of occurrences from the latter date to that of the Inquest, 13 Edward I., again showing that no Court had been held between these dates. The Patent Roll of 36 Henry III. indicates that the object of the enquiry was concerning Purprestures *et alia* within the Peak Forest.

The Rolls prove that not only were Purprestures inquired into, but, under "*alia*," were considered Assarts, the building of houses within the Forests, the exactions and misconduct of bailiffs and officers, the number of horse-breeding establishments, with the number of horses and mares with their young, the grants of marriages of the heirs of the Foresters of fee, and lastly, but chiefest of all, the convictions upon presentments of the Foresters Verderers and of 36 freemen, of all offences of vert and venison, and with them an account of the customs of the Foresters. That these Inquests were not held periodically, and only recorded at the date above given, appears clear from the fact that a very large number of the persons convicted were described as being then dead, and their heirs were made liable.

The heirs, also, of Foresters and others who should have made presentments, and who had failed to do so, were brought before the Court and fined. The offences, whether of making assarts, purprestures, building houses in the Forest, selling trees, or crimes of vert and venison, although evidently tried at one date, were all approximately dated by reference to the bailiffs of the Forest who held office at the time of their committal. These bailiffs are mentioned in their order, and the number of years of

their separate tenures of office is given in several places. For instance, in ascertaining the profits of the King's mines, the record states that the Earl of Ferrars was bailiff in the time of King John, and received the profits for six years in the time of King Henry III., and that he received £15 during his term of office in the latter King's reign; that Brian de Insula held the office for five years, and received £12; Robert de Lexington, six years, £40; Ralf fil Nicolas, one year, £5; John Goband, three years, £7 10s.; Warner Engayne, £12 10s. in five years; John de Grey, £15 in six years; Wm. de Horsenden, for one year, 50 shillings. Rad Bugg, of Nottingham (the ancestor of the Lords Willoughby of Wollaton), extracted the minerals in the time of John Goband, and Wm. de Langsdon and Rad Bugg, of Bakewell (father or son of the former), in the time of John de Grey.

The Pipe Rolls confirm the above dates. They show that the Earl of Ferrars had a grant of the office in 18 John, that Brian de Insula had one in 7 Henry III., and that he farmed it for £100 per year, and that Wm. de Horsinden had one in 33 Henry III., and so forth. These dates are of the greatest value to Nottingham and Derby county history, for many undated charters are executed before the Bailiffs of the Honour.

It will thus be seen that a complete history of the Peak Forest exists from the time of King John, who, in accordance with his usual habits, granted away the Crown Revenues to his favourite subjects. Wm. Brewer, the great Judge, who was Regent of King Richard I., was in arrears for the farm of the Honour of Peverel, in the 1st of King John. No doubt the wily judge took advantage in this instance, as in many others, whilst King Richard was in the Holy Land and in prison, to obtain for himself this favourite resort of the Kings of England. It would also seem that unless there was a settled conviction or design known to King John and his friends that King Richard should be kept in prison, Wm. Brewer would not have dared to take such a property for himself.

It is clear from the Pipe Rolls that after the forfeiture of

Wm. Peverel, Henry II. resumed possession of this Crown property, and that he had it in hand during his reign. In his third year there is a charge of £10 16s. *in adequietatione corredio* for the expenses of the King at Peak Castle; £37 12s. 3d. for entertaining the King of Scotland there and at Nottingham; besides a charge of 72 shillings for wine at Peak. The same year Robert de Chalz paid 20 marcs for the administration of the King's Forests in Nottingham and Derby, and probably at that date he acted as Bailiff of the Peak.

In 14 Henry II., Matilda, the King's daughter, was resident at Peak, for there is a charge of £4 10s. for two watchers and one porter, and 30s. for one palfrey and one courser (*fugat*) for her use. There is also a payment of 10s. for two "pedicators" (trappers), who went to Normandy from thence to kill wolves.

In 22 Henry II., £135 was expended upon the operations (works) of the Castle, and in the same Roll there is a charge of 76s. 8d. for keeping the King's bears, and for expenses attending the Ursary of the King, and for taking the bears from Nottingham to Winchester. The capture of wolves was in ancient times a very important matter, though doubtless the breed was not wholly discouraged, on account of the good sport of hunting them, but they might become too numerous in the neighbourhood of the deer, and it was therefore necessary to keep them down within certain limits. In these Records it is stated that John the Wolfhunter and Thomas fil Thomas Foljamb held a bovat of land, which was formerly one Serjeantry, assigned for the taking of wolves in the Forest, and it was in ancient times divided, so that each of them held half a bovat, of which the said John held one part; and a certain Hugo de Morhayne, who formerly held the other part, gave it with his daughter Katherine, who afterwards sold it to Thomas Foljamb, and the jury being asked what liabilities or rights (*jura*) pertained to that Serjeantry, answered none, except that the land should not be assessed by the Bailiffs of Compana, but that in each year, in March and September, the Wolfhunters should go through the midst of the Forest for placing traps (*peditas*) for taking wolves where they were found by the

hounds, and, if the hounds could not scent them, they should go at other times, in the time of summer, at St. Barnabas' Day, when the wolves had young (*catulos*), and they should take a lad (*garcon*) to carry the traps (*ingenia*), who should be armed with a hatchet and a (*gesarme*\*), with a knife at his belt (*cutell' ad zonam*), but without bow or arrows, and he should have a mastiff not lawed (*expeditatus*), and trained for the purpose.

Judging from the fines imposed upon the convictions for venison trespasses, it would seem that the penalties for taking the king's deer, and for all kinds of venison trespass, were by no means so terrible as historians would make us believe. We find in these Rolls that the same men were fined over and over again; sometimes a few marks, occasionally only half a mark, certainly not grievous punishment, nor sufficient to deter them from a repetition of the offences. And, more than this, these punishments were administered charitably: some of the convicted were excused the payment of these fines on account of their poverty.

The presentments for venison trespass open with a tremendous indictment against Wm. Ferrars, Earl of Derby, who was then dead, Ralf Beaufoi of Trusley, Wm. May, the Earl's hunter, and Robert Curzon of Chaddesden, with Henry (Foljambe?) de Elton, who had taken during his six years of office over 2,000 beasts. This limit of six years shows that the enquiry evidently was confined to King Henry's reign, and did not extend to that of his father. Ralf Beaufoi was fined £10; Robert Curzon, 60 marks; the Earl's hunter had escaped (retired into Norfolk), where he was to be attached.

It does not appear from this Roll what the heirs of the Earl were fined, but it is very probable that the payments by Edward the king's son in 38 Henry III., of 102 marks and  $\frac{1}{2}$  mark were in respect of it. It was probably one of the occasions for bringing ruin to Robert, Earl of Derby, who was outlawed shortly afterwards and his possessions given to the king's son. Nearly all the chief men of the counties of York and Derby, and many of

---

\* *Hasta vel jaculum*, a spear or lance.—ED.

Nottingham, were convicted at this inquest. The Veseys of Fulbec, Warner Engayne, Thomas Gresley, Thomas de Furnival, Ralf Bagot (brother of the Earl), William, the then Earl of Derby, the Saviles, Albinis, and very many clerical magnates, the Bishop of Chester, his Archdeacons and Canons, and many of the secular clergy, some of them for hunting and others for receiving the hunters and consuming the venison. This latter was a very common offence, and the fact that men dared to run the risk of a conviction for the enjoyment of gracing a wedding feast with a haunch of vension would not indicate that the Forest Laws carried much terror with them at that period, as our veracious historians constantly assert. Nor were convictions a mere matter of course. Sometimes the Verderers failed to convict, though they seem generally to have been successful.

William de Vesci, Baron, Wm. Latun', Jo. de Auceville, brother of Robert, Wm. de Sattorp, and Robert Viator (? Venator), of the earl, were charged with taking three stags in the forest. John de Auceville was then in the Holy Land on a pilgrimage. William de Vesci protested before the Verderers that he took the stags by the gift of the king, and he brought the king's brief by Brian de Insula, then Justice of Forests, therefore they withdrew the charge, and William with his whole family were quit of it. An unpleasant story, and probably not an uncommon one, showing how lightly life was regarded in that age, appears in a charge against Matthew de Sipeley, Robt. de Burton, Matthew de Storches, Bate Bradule, Roger de Deneby, and Robt. de Rysley, for coming into the forest with their boys and with hounds to commit venison trespasses, in other words, to hunt. They were captured by the king's foresters and liberated by Robert de Esseburn, constable of Peak, for Ralf fil Nicolas (bailiff). They were ordered by the king's writ to be taken before Robert de Ros, then Justice of the Forest, but Robert de Esseburn appeared and said that Bate and Roger had escaped prison and he then beheaded them (*decollati*), and that he had discharged Robt. de Rysley and the other boys because they were youths. For this, Robert de Esseburn was in *misericordia*. It would have been satisfactory to

learn whether his fault was for his humanity to the younger boys, or for beheading poor Bate and Roger; anyway, it was a sad end of a happy hunting day. It would appear rather that he was fined for what was not his fault, for the record adds that he was fined 10 marks *for the escape*. Matthew de Sepley was fined 60 marks, as the chief criminal; Matthew de Storches, only 20s.

A party of clerical poachers fell into trouble upon a visit to the Abbot of Leicester at his house at Glossop, Roger de Wesham, Bishop of Chester, Magister Thomas de Ferneley, William, vicar of Glossop, Archdeacon Adam de Stamford, Magister Rich. de Stamford, John Clericus, and Roger Mariscal, were all found guilty of taking a doe (*Bissam*). John Clericus was a monk unknown, and, therefore, he got off, but the Archbishop was attached to compel the appearance of the Bishop before the Justices.

The Knight Jurors of the county of Derby presented Wm. Bardolf (a great Baron) for taking two stags, but he proved that he had the grant of the king, and so the Knight Jurors were themselves in *misericordia*.

Matthew de Sepeley, sen., Robert le Brun, and Ad. de Penkestone (who was then dead) took one stag, two bissa, and one fawn (*setonem*), and were imprisoned by Wm. de Ferrars, Earl of Derby, then bailiff of Peak (then dead), who took certain monies to liberate them, and this, adds the record "he could not do without the special mandate of the king or of the Justices of the Forest, therefore his heirs must answer for it. The word seton, here translated fawn, is a curious one, and difficult to trace.\*

John Saville, of the county of York, with his brothers William and Walter, took a stag in Langedale, which they carried to the house of John. He came before the Justices and produced the King's pardon for all forest trespasses dated the 7th February 35th year of the king's reign, therefore John and his brothers were quit of that transgression, but the Knight Jurors were not blamed or fined, since the very fact of pardon was an admission of guilt.

---

\* It would seem to be a corruption of Secta—offspring.—(see Ducange).

Matthew de Hathersage, a Baron, who had married the heiress of Musard, was presented for having a certain Buckstall in his own woods, in Hathersage, too near the King's Forest. This was a toil for taking deer, and Matthew said that he and his ancestors always had it and ought to have it, and that formerly they had it still nearer to the forest. It is difficult to understand the meaning of the verdict, for he was fined 20 marks, that his Buckstall should remain so that it should not be nearer to the forest than where it was; from which it would seem that he was only acting within his rights.

A sad occurrence is recited in a Roll of 13 Edward I. The jury presented that when the king *made his chase* at Compana, in the forest, upon the Wednesday next after the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary, in the 3rd year of his reign, William fil Rankelli of Hocklow, came, and when the king's hounds had got a stag at bay (*ad barum*) beyond the bounds of the forest, William shot the stag and killed the king's hounds; upon the king's hunters coming up they cried him (*exclamaverunt*) and he fled, and they took the venison to the king's larder.

In a Roll of 13 Edward I., there is a charge against Thomas de Furnival, Lord of Sheffield, to whom, in the 48th year of Henry III. was entrusted the Castle of Peak, that he with his familiars, Ivo de Heriz, Rad Barry, Rad de Ecclesall, a certain Knight Stout of Stuteville, all of Nottingham, and others, killed no less than 12 beasts. They were all severely punished.

In the same year there is a great presentment against Robert, Earl Ferrars, then Earl of Derby, who, with a great many Knights and high personages, his familiars (Knights) came into the Forest of Compana, on the day of St. Thomas the Martyr (48 H. III.) and took 40 beasts, and drove away other 40, and at the Feast of St. Peter ad Vincula (Aug. 1st), took 50 beasts and drove away 70, and at St. Mich. took 40 and drove away another 40.

These grave charges probably formed another link in the chain of events which culminated in the ruin of this great nobleman.

A curious case occurred at a Swanmote held at Chapel-en-le-Frith, in the Forest, on the Feast of St. Gregory, 8 Edward I.,

William Foljambe came before Thomas le Ragged, then Bailiff, and presented that Henry de Medwe took a doe with a certain black hound, which was called "Collyng," at Canehevid, and he agreed to prove this under 100 marks penalty. Henry de Medwe denied the charge, and said that William Foljambe himself, and Gregory, his brother-in-law, with his other familiars and shepherds (*pastores*), at Martyn gode Weston, and Wormhill, had destroyed 100 beasts of the forest—stags, does, and setons; and for the verification of these charges he bound himself in 100 marks, and for bail gave Wm. Martyn and Thos. fil Thomas Foljambe.

The Jury found Henry guilty, and he was fined 100s., for which were bail Thos. Foljambe of Gratton, Hy., his brother, Nich. de Lenne, and Roger de Baslow, Clic.

Wm. Foljambe and his associates were found not guilty of destroying 100 beasts, but only of 20 of all kinds, and he was fined 20 marks, and he found bail Wm. Martyn, Wm. de Oldreddy Robt. Capon, and Thos. Foljambe, of Gratton. This was evidently a pretty family quarrel, and Henry de Medwe was probably a Foljambe himself, as some of his bail were of that family.

Rad. Coterill, in 11 Ed. I., came into the Compana Forest within the Octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, with his bow and arrows hidden (*dissimulatus*), and shot at a herd of beasts; and upon this came John Daniel (a Forester of Fee of the Foljambe family), and cried him, and would take him (*attachiare voluit*), but he resisted, and shot two arrows at the said John. He was, however, at length captured.

Robt. de Melner, junior, who was outlawed at the time when he was a forester, took about 20 beasts, and carried them to the house of his father, Robt. de Melner.

William and Henry, the brothers of Thomas Foljambe of Gratton, were guilty of many forest trespasses, and Thomas Foljambe abetted them. This Thomas Foljambe was a clericus; probably only a lawyer, for he was married and had children, who succeeded to his inheritance.

Thomas Bozun, Bailiff 11 Ed. I., presented Michael fil Adam de

Wormhill for killing setons in the forest, and selling their skins at Bakewell and elsewhere in open market, and he was convicted in full Swanmote.

Rich. de Basselowe and Hebbe Piscator were in the company of Rich. Vernon when taking the King's deer at the Feast of the Holy Cross, 38 H. III., and they took two stags and three bissas.

Hebbe came afterwards, and was imprisoned, but the King pardoned him because he was poor. Rich. de Baslow was fined £20. This is a very curious entry, and it probably accounts for the fall of the family of Vernon, of Haddon. After the outlawry of Rich. Vernon this family ceased to be Lords of Haddon. The family who long after held this Manor, and whose heiress married Mannors (the ancestor of the present Duke of Rutland), were not Vernons, although they took the name, but were descended from a daughter of this Richard Vernon, who married one Gilbert the Frenchman, descended from a Yorkshire family, and their son assumed the name of Vernon some time after he obtained that inheritance.

William Venator and William Maynwaring, of the county of Chester, killed a stag in Courtes in Chisworth, on St. Barnabas' Day, 11 Ed. I., and carried the venison to the house of Thomas de Aston, of the county of Lancaster, and there it was eaten (*comesta fuit*) at a certain festival which was held on account of his marriage.

Numbers of persons were fined for harbouring the malefactors—judging from the names, generally their relations—and many more for harbouring the venison. It seems incredible that if the laws of Venery were so severe as it is generally supposed, that anyone could be found who, for the mere gratification of eating it, would run so great a risk. It would rather seem from these Rolls that, from the time of King John to the 36th Henry III., the Bailiffs, and not the Justices, adjudicated in Peak Forest; and, inasmuch as most of the Bailiffs were found guilty of the same offences, it was evident that no moral stigma accompanied the act. One can only conclude that the nobility and clergy, who not only illegally

participated in the chase but in the consumption of the venison, must have been very much astonished at the holding of this remarkable Inquest.

A more important class of Records to the inhabitants of Derbyshire is to be found in the Inquests concerning purprestures and assarts, and it would seem that just as the traffic in hunting and venison was customary, so it had become the fashion to clear the Forest and erect houses all over it. Probably under the early Norman Kings and the first Kings of the House of Plantagenet there were but few, if any, assarts made in this Forest, for every settler at this latter date seems to have been called upon to explain whether he cleared his assart or erected his dwelling with or without the consent of the King's Bailiff, and he seems to have been fined in both cases, though few seem to have been excluded from the occupation of the land.

It was part of the enquiry where and under whose jurisdiction the assart was made, and this is most valuable for genealogical purposes, giving a pedigree for many Peak families dating from the time of King John. The assarts were generally of small areas, but some of the more bold seem to have cleared twenty or thirty acres at a time, which must have made a serious inroad upon the Forest domains.

The Inquests of the horse-breeding establishments are very curious. At the first date, 36 Henry III., only about a dozen are mentioned. That of the Abbot of Welbec was at that time the most extensive. He had at Cruchel, in the Forest, 20 horses and 20 mares, in his Equitium, which King John had conceded to the monks of Welbec.

The Abbot of Mirevale had had for the past six years 16 mares with their young; the Abbot of Basingwerke, 20 with their young; Wm. de Rode had seven; Thomas Foljambe, the elder, had the same number, and he was dead, and Thomas Foljambe, his heir, was bound to make compensation for the same.

In 13 Ed. I. the Queen Consort was presented for having in her Equitium in the Compana 115 mares and foals (*pullanes*), to the great detriment of the Forest, and it was noted that many

others kept horses in the Compana under colour of belonging to the Queen's stud.

Peter de Shatton, Forester of Fee (he was probably ancestor of the Bagshawes—Nicolas Bagshawe, Forester of Fee, of 11 Edward II., was described as of this place), had eleven horses and mares feeding in the Compana, and he was fined and ordered to remove his "averia."

Thomas the Archer, Forester of Fee of Compana, had under him a certain foot forester (*For' peditu'*), Rich. de Baggeshaw, and he had a forester, a certain *garcon*, under him, and they both lived upon the country. They had sheep and their young feeding in the Forests, to the injury of the King's deer. Thomas Foljambe had a foot forester under him, and this Rich. Roboloe unjustly placed his swine in the vill of Olerenshaw, and took 10 marks unjustly for expeditating (lawing of dogs).

Wm. de Horsenden whilst he was bailiff exacted £10 for such penalties. Other bailiffs were convicted of the like and of other offences, and the Roll terminates with these words:—

"And because the said Foresters were convicted of the said and of other offences, and also other Foresters of the said Forest were fined for many transgressions and concealments, and many of them are poor and in a destitute condition (*debile statu*), by the judgment of the Justices, their baliwics are taken into the king's hands to be replevied at the will of the king when the required oblation shall have been made, so that no damage be done in the forest, so that they well, and wholly, keep their baliwics to the advantage of the king. [Some of them were merely fined for their transgressions and for permission to hold their baliwics during the king's pleasure as follows: Robt. de Melner, Forester of Fee, £10; Thomas le Archer, 2 marks; William Hall, 2 marks, because he was poor; Thos. le Ragged of Berde, 1 mark; Robt. Balgy, 20 shillings; Adam Gomfrey,  $\frac{1}{2}$  mark; Jacob Maynwaring, 1 mark; Peter de Shatton, 1 mark; Peter le Hore,  $\frac{1}{2}$  mark; Roger Wodrove, 1 mark; Wm. le Heyr,  $\frac{1}{2}$  mark; Hy. de Medwe, 20 shillings; Thomas de Gratton, 20 shillings.]

"And because the king now of late, that is to say, for the past twelve years appointed certain Knightly Foresters (Forestarii Equitii) through the whole Forest, Nich. Lenne, who took for his custody £18 4s. per annum, and was deputy of Robt. Boson, who is Bailiff of Peak, and who held his baliwic for three years, and was not guilty of transgressions."

Wm. de Horsenden when Bailiff made two forges for iron. Rad Bugg in the time he was Bailiff, after Wm. Horsenden, for 1½ years kept 80 beasts at the damage of 20 shillings, for which Rich. de Bingham who was his heir is answerable. The same Ralf had 60 cart horses (jumenta) feeding in *Compana and Eydale* for 1½ years at the damage of 150 shillings, and 4 (*carac. bov.*) yoke of oxen feeding in the Forest, 31 shillings.

Gervase de Bernak, Bailiff of Peak, had for three years 23 oxen feeding, 30 shillings, for which Rich. de . . . of the county of Derby his heir is now answerable. Thomas de Orreby, Bailiff of Peak, had 4 yoke of oxen, 60 shillings. Rich. le Ragged, 3 yoke of oxen, 20 shillings; Thos. le Ragged, of Berde, his heir.

Thos. Foljambe, Bailiff, was answerable for 3 yoke of oxen feeding in the Forest.

There is a fragment of a Roll entitled "of the marriage of the heirs of Foresters of Fee," which might be extended to the satisfaction of the genealogist indefinitely. Unfortunately, it only contains the record of two of these transactions. Brian de Insula (6-11 Henry III.) married Matilde, eldest daughter of Simon de Melner, Forester of Fee of Languedale, without the king's assent to William de Insula, who died, and Thomas Turbott sold the custody and marriage of Isabel, her sister, to Roger de Stafford for £10.

John de Grey, when Bailiff of Peak (27-33 Henry III.) sold the custody of Robert fil and heir of Simon de Stanley, Forester of Fee of Compana, to Robt. de Wurth, who sold it to Rich. de Trafford, whose daughter Robert fil Simon de Stanley married. There can be but little doubt that this was the ancestor of the Earls of Derby, whom the heralds at this period call de Audeley.

These records show that an earlier Robert de Stanley made an assart in the Forest of Peak (6-11 Hy. III.). This family also had land in Cheshire.

For the satisfaction of those who would care to consult these records for themselves, it may be noted that at present they may be called for as "Duchy of Lancaster Records," Class F. 50.6.