

## IX.—THE LAY SUBSIDY ROLL OF 1296:

NORTHUMBERLAND AT THE END OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

By FREDERICK BRADSHAW, M.A., D.Sc.

[Read on 27 May, 1914.]

Few counties have a more tantalizing social and economic history than Northumberland in its early days. For a brief period the Ecclesiastical History of the Venerable Bede sheds its powerful searchlight upon our past. We have fitful glimmers from later chroniclers such as Simeon, who probably had access to the lost Northumbrian annals, but Domesday fails us completely, and we have nothing so early or so interesting as Boldon book. The Black Book of the Exchequer, the Red Book and the Testa de Neville are only feudal rolls of the local baronage, and there are no early court rolls left. What scanty records the Norseman and the Norman spared the Scots destroyed. Fortune, however, has spared one priceless document to us—the Lay Subsidy Roll of 1296—and this roll gives us, if properly interrogated, a striking picture of Northumberland on the very eve of her ruin in the fourteenth century.

The roll of 1296<sup>1</sup> is practically complete for all the wards of Northumberland under the direct control of the king's sheriff. Of course Hexham, the franchise of the archbishop of York, is omitted, as are the lordships of Tynedale and Redesdale, and one naturally finds that 'North Durham,' that is Northamshire, Islandshire, and Bedlingtonshire, is equally held to be outside the county. On the other hand the boroughs are included and there are two valuable entries which are practically a census of Newcastle, and Corbridge, the next important town.

<sup>1</sup> Ref. in P.R.O., 158/1. The page references in this article are to the transcript in the library of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries.

Only two fragments of other Edwardian rolls exist for Northumberland. One<sup>2</sup> is a single membrane, all but illegible. It records the assessment for one-eleventh in the liberty of Hexham in the 23rd year of Edward I, and is, of course, part of the corresponding roll for that liberty. The other<sup>3</sup> records the assessment of one-tenth for the liberty of Tynemouth and Glendale, which is almost certainly the grant made by the parliament of November, 1294.<sup>4</sup> Although only six membranes have survived, and those six have come down to us partially illegible and much repaired, the roll is interesting from its headings, of which there are two. The first reads: 'Rotulus de Libertate de Tynemouth de liberis hominibus non de nativis incipienti ad villam de Tynemouth.' The roll shows 25 free tenants at Tynemouth worth altogether 32*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.*,<sup>5</sup> and 8 free tenants at Shields (Schels) worth 14*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.*<sup>6</sup> A later membrane is headed, 'Rotulus de Warda de Glendal incipienti ad villam Ewrth.' As nothing is mentioned here about excluding 'nativi,' it is probable that there were by this time few outside the liberty of Tynemouth.<sup>7</sup> There is an entry 'Summa (*i.e.* paid) 8*l.* 4*s.* 10<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>*d.*,' but probably this is misplaced owing to some membranes being lost, for there is no total given for the ward of Glendale. The boundaries of the wards seem to have been somewhat uncertain. In the roll of 1294 'Middeford' appears as part of the liberty of Tynemouth, but in the later roll it is in the ward 'Inter Wanspike et Coket.' Similarly Wooler is in Glendale in the earlier and in East Tynedale in the later roll.

<sup>2</sup> Ref. in P.R.O., 242/79.

<sup>3</sup> Ref. in P.R.O. 242/80.

<sup>4</sup> See Stubbs, *Constit. Hist.*, II, 132.

<sup>5</sup> In the roll of 1296 there are 15 tenants worth 19*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.* Those tenants which appear in both rolls are generally worth a little more in the later assessment.

<sup>6</sup> In 1296 the 13 tenants at Shields are worth 18*l.* 1*s.* 8*d.*

<sup>7</sup> See the *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.). From the entries in these rolls it is clear that the *nativi* in Northumberland did not find it impossible to assert their liberty.

However, no roll, either of an earlier or a later<sup>8</sup> date, can be compared in any respect with the roll of 1296. It consists of about 60 complete membranes,<sup>9</sup> 24½ inches long and 11¾ inches wide, sewed together to form one long roll. The membranes are ruled horizontally for names and vertically for figures on the right hand portion of each membrane. Except for the endorsement and for the first membrane the writing is exceedingly clear and legible, and the ink has lasted well. At least two and probably three 'hands' can be traced in the roll, the final membranes being the best.

The endorsement of the roll is 'Computacio' and a little below [Hunc] Rotulum receipt Ph. de Wilugby tenens locum thesaurarii xxj die Julii anno regni regis Edwardi xxv per manum Rogeri Mauduyt et Magistri [Roberti de Merle]<sup>10</sup> taxatorum.' A little lower again is the entry: 'Summa totalis undecime comitatus Northumbrie dcccxlj*li*.<sup>11</sup> xxii*jd*. [de quibus] subtrahuntur viij*li*. ijs. xjd. pro xj<sup>ma</sup> et septima priorum bonorum religiosorum et aliorum, pro eo quod decimam bonorum et beneficiorum suorum regi concesserunt eodem anno, et bonorum Magistri Militie Templi et villanorum suorum qui finem fecerunt cum rege pro xj<sup>a</sup> sua, et remanent de claro dcccxxxiv*li*. xixs.

Summa Totalis septime ejusdem comitatus cliv*li*. vs. ix*d*. ob.

Summa Totalis xj<sup>o</sup> et vij<sup>o</sup> conjuncta preter viij*li*. ijs. xjd.  
excepta supra dccciiij<sup>xx</sup>ix*li*. ivs. ix*d*. ob.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> There is a roll of 10 Edward III (ref. in P.R.O., 158/7) which gives a fairly full list of the various villis under their respective wards. Under each vill is given a list of the taxpayers and the amount they paid, generally only a few pence. There is also a roll of 6 Edward II, but it is very imperfect (ref. in P.R.O., 158/6).

<sup>9</sup> The actual number of membranes is somewhat larger but several are incomplete.

<sup>10</sup> The second name, illegible in the roll, is supplied by *Rot. Par.*, I, 227.

<sup>11</sup> *Sic* in MS., but it should obviously be Dcccxlj*li*.

<sup>12</sup> *I.e.* 'Account. Philip de Wilugby, acting-treasurer, received this roll on July 21st in the 24 Edward (*i.e.*, 1296) by the hand of Roger Mauduyt and

On the face of the roll is the heading 'Rotulus taxacionis septime et undecime de comitatu [Northumbrie] anno regni regis Edwardi filii Henrici vicesimo quarto.' Immediately following the heading comes the name of the first ward, 'Westindale,' and then the name of the first vill, Dyveleston (Dilston). Next occurs a list of the taxpayers arranged in no obvious scheme but with one unvarying formula, *e.g.* :

'Summa bonorum Lucie de Dyveleston xij*li.* xiv*s.* xd. unde domino regi [xxx*s.* ij*d.*]'<sup>13</sup>

At the foot of the entries follows 'Summa totius villae predictae (elsewhere hujus villae) xxxix*li.* xvii*s.* ij*d.* unde domino regi lxxi*s.* vij*d.* ob.' At the left hand side of the word 'summa' occurs the formula *p<sup>b</sup> i.e. probatum* = 'checked.' The vills like the names follow no obvious order, but at the end of each ward occurs the entry, *e.g.* :

'Summa Ward' de Westindale l*li.* v*s.* ix*d.* ob.'

In this case the names of the twelve jurors and their assessment follow the 'summa of the ward,' but in other cases it precedes this 'summa.'

Before dealing with the actual information about Northumberland which is contained in the roll of 1296, it is perhaps not out of place to explain the nature and origin of this special kind

master Robert de Merle, commissioners for taxes. The total sum of the eleventh of the county of Northumberland is 84*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.*, from which is deducted (the sum of) 8*l.* 2*s.* 11*d.*, for the eleventh and seventh of the personal possessions of the religious and others in consideration of their grant to the king of a tenth of their goods and benefices in the same year, and of the goods of the Master of the Knights Templar and his villeins who made fine with the king for their eleventh. And there remains (the sum of) 834*l.* 19*s.* net. Sum total of the seventh of the same county 154*l.* 5*s.* 9½*d.* Sum total of the eleventh and seventh together, deducting the 8*l.* 2*s.* 11*d.* excepted above, 889*l.* 4*s.* 9½*d.*'

<sup>13</sup> MS illegible. For Lucia de Dyveleston see new *Hist. North.*, x, 243, 244; she was the daughter of Sir William Heron of Ford.

of parliamentary grant known as a subsidy.<sup>14</sup> The only direct tax of pre-Conquest times was the Danegeld levied by the miserable Ethelred the Unready to buy off the Danes. Although this impost was continued by the Danish kings it was abandoned by Edward the Confessor. William the Conqueror, however, re-imposed it at an increased rate and fixed it definitely on the land. The history of Danegeld is obscure but it disappears early in the reign of Henry II.<sup>15</sup> Danegeld had been based on the 'hide,' largely a convention in practice, but Henry II insisted on real measurements, and under Richard I the tax on land appears under the new name of 'carucage,' and two shillings were levied on every carucate or plough-land of 100 acres.

However, Danegeld and Carucage were only levied on land because in early times land was the only obvious source of revenue, but Henry II before he died had tapped a fresh source. The Saladin tithe of 1189 was levied on moveables, and even earlier, in 1181, the Assize of Arms had obliged the owner of rent and chattels to equip himself for war in proportion to their value. So long as taxation was levied on land it was possible to rely, for each person's liability, upon a document or survey such as Domesday book, but clearly it would not be fair to the king to allow an individual to assess his personal property as he thought fit, nor would it be just that the king's officers should set their own value upon a subject's moveable wealth. Hence, quite early in the reign of Henry II when he replaced the Danegeld by other taxes, we find difficulties arising. By 1181 Henry had come to see that the fairest assessment in the case of moveables would be that made by a jury of the neighbourhood, and this course was henceforth followed.

By the beginning of Henry III's reign the wealth of the nation

<sup>14</sup> Subsidy is, of course, the English form of the Latin *Subsidium* and means 'assistance.' The corresponding feudal term was *auxilium*, or 'aid.'

<sup>15</sup> Stubbs, *op. cit.*, I, 623.

had so increased that the king found the taxation of moveables very profitable. At the Christmas court of 1224 the justiciar in the king's name demanded one-fifteenth of all the moveables of his subjects. In return for a specially solemn confirmation of Magna Charta, Hubert de Burgh obtained this grant, which was assessed by juries and collected through the local machinery. Henceforth the king's demands for financial help took the form of some fractional part of his subjects' moveable goods, and to this grant was given the name of 'Lay Subsidy' to distinguish it from a similar clerical subsidy.

These subsidies were granted to the king by the barons<sup>16</sup> in the Great Council in their own name and that of their tenants and by the clergy in their Convocations. The king generally succeeded in obtaining a larger proportion from the clergy than from the laity, and in the year 1294 Edward I took advantage of the danger from Wales and Scotland to demand special terms from the boroughs<sup>17</sup> also. To the parliament of this year he had summoned not only the greater barons but also two of the knights or lesser barons from each county. From this body he obtained a grant of a tenth, but he also sent commissioners to the boroughs and exacted through them the promise of a sixth.

Edward found he had tapped a new supply in the boroughs and the third Welsh war being but the prelude to the even more serious struggle with Scotland and France, Edward determined

<sup>16</sup> According to Magna Charta (article 14) all the king's tenants-in-chief were summoned to the Great Council. The chief tenants received a personal summons, the lesser tenants were summoned generally, through the sheriff of their county.

<sup>17</sup> Of course, the boroughs had not escaped before. Such as were not under the control of a noble or prelate were assumed to be directly under the king and were liable to be tallaged by him as their feudal lord. In 1273 and 1283 and perhaps on other occasions, representatives of the towns were summoned to national councils, but these were not legally parliaments. It is probable that before 1295 the towns were asked for their financial contributions by special commissioners. Cf. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 45.

to put matters on a regular basis. He would summon two members from each borough to the new parliament, as in the preceding year he had summoned two knights or lesser barons from each shire. As he told the prelates in their summons he considered that 'what touches all alike should be approved by all,' and on 30 September and 1 October, 1295, he issued a series of writs to the barons, prelates, and sheriffs ordering a new parliament to meet on November 13th, 1295. Seven earls and forty-one barons received a special summons. Edward made perfectly clear the object of the parliament and the duties of its respective members.

The king told the clergy that the whole nation, not merely Gascony, was threatened. If the French king's power should be equal to his malice, he would entirely destroy the English tongue. The interests of the English church, as well as those of the English people, were at stake. The appeal to the barons and the sheriffs was equally emphatic. The clergy and baronage were to treat, ordain and execute measures of defence; the representatives of the other estates were to bring full power from those estates 'to do' (*i.e.* to find money for) such measures as should be determined by common counsel.

Such was the origin of the famous Model Parliament of 1295.<sup>18</sup> Actually it met on November 27th instead of November 13th. It heard the king's formal request for an aid, and then each estate separately discussed the amount it should offer. The barons and knights of the shire offered an eleventh, and the borough members a seventh. For the clergy, the archbishop of Canterbury offered a tenth of all church goods for two years, and though Edward demanded successively a third and then a quarter, he had to accept a tenth. Had the negotiations continued a few weeks longer, he would have been told in 1295 as

<sup>18</sup> For the story of this parliament see *Matthew of Westminster*, pp. 425-426. For the various writs see *Parl. Writs*, I, 45.

he was told a year later, that the clergy had been prohibited by the papal bull 'Clericis Laicos' from giving anything at all. Unfortunately for Edward, much of the grant<sup>19</sup> he received from this Model Parliament had to be spent during the spring and summer of 1296 in the campaign in Scotland, which resulted in the victory of Dunbar and the surrender of Balliol. Edward had to entrust the defence of Gascony to his brother, Edmund of Lancaster, and he never felt free to throw the whole national force into the French war.

It may be interesting to record here the names of the first members of Parliament for the county and boroughs of Northumberland, who voted the eleventh and seventh accounted for in the roll.

For the county itself the two members<sup>20</sup> are

*Walter de Cambou*, knight. His sureties<sup>21</sup> were William le Forester, Thomas de Kenesclift, William Nypet, and Thomas Datness.

*William de Halton*, knight. His sureties were Thomas de Scireburn, Walter de Haleyn, John Croyd and John de Bamburg.

Three boroughs in Northumberland, *i.e.* Newcastle, Corbridge and Bamburgh were ordered to return representatives to the Model Parliament, but in the case of Bamburgh the order was more a compliment to its past glory and the strength of its castle than to its wealth or population.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> We learn from the endorsement on our roll that the Northumberland contribution was not paid into the Treasury until July 21st, 1296.

<sup>20</sup> The authority for these names is *Parl. Writs*, I, 40.

<sup>21</sup> The elected persons had to find sureties with the sheriff that they would appear at Westminster on the day named in the writ. In the case of Nottingham, of the elected members it is said 'manucapitur veniendi.'

<sup>22</sup> Morpeth, Alnwick, Newbiggin, Chatton and Alwinton all had a larger population and greater wealth but they ranked as vills and paid at the county rate. However, Bamburgh castle was, it is all but certain, the *old* castle whose glory faded before the better strategic position of its younger rival on the site of *Pons Aelii*.

The members for Newcastle were:—

*Hugo de Karliol.* His sureties were Nicholas de Are, William Russell the baker, John Sterman, and Laurence Sweyn.

*Peter le Graper.* His sureties were Robert Spurnrose, Gilbert de Tynemouth and Robert Lomnay.

The members for Corbridge were:—

*Adam, son of Alan.* His sureties were Richard, son of Alan, Gilbert Aerñ, Adam de Pasider and Hugh, son of Astelin.

*Hugh, son of Hugh.* His sureties were Alan de Brighton, Thomas de Brighton, Hugh, son of Simon, and Andrew de Corewell.

The members for Bamburgh were:—

*John de Graystones.* His sureties were William Beaupont, William Mayle, Henry le Albaster and John the Clerk.

*William the Coroner.* His sureties were Germanus de Brokisfeld, Ralph Sturdy, Robert Cryde and John Gleye.

As soon as possible after the grant of the eleventh and seventh had been formally made, Edward I issued letters patent for the collection of the money in these terms<sup>23</sup>:—‘The King to the Knights, Free Tenants and all the Community of the County of Northumberland greeting. Since the earls, barons, knights and others of our kingdom have acted liberally in support of our war on this as on former occasions in our reign and in those of the kings of England our ancestors and have courteously and gladly granted to us an eleventh of all their moveable goods, and the citizens, burgesses and other good men of the cities on our demesne and of the boroughs of the same kingdom have granted us a seventh of all their moveable goods, except those

<sup>23</sup> The original Latin is to be found in *Patent Roll* of 24 Edward I, m. 22, and *Rot. Parl.*, I, 227, no. 8.

goods which were excepted in the tenth last granted to us. We, desirous to provide that the eleventh and seventh aforesaid may be levied and collected with as little loss and trouble as possible to the people of our said kingdom, assign our beloved and faithful Röger Mauduit,<sup>24</sup> knight, and Master Robert de Merle<sup>25</sup> (clerk), or either of them on such occasions as both are unable to act on account of one of them being hindered by severe infirmity, to assess tax, and collect the said eleventh and seventh, to bring it to our Treasury and there pay it in at the terms underwritten, that is one half before the Feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary next to come (*i.e.* Feb. 2nd) and the other half before the Feast of Pentecost (May 14th, 1296) next following. And so we command you, the said Roger and Robert, to be strenuous, obedient, prudent and helpful in the aforesaid duty according as we on our part shall instruct you. In testimony whereof, witness the King at Westminster on the fourth day of December (1295).'

The record in the rolls of parliament continues<sup>26</sup>: 'And it is commanded to the sheriffs aforesaid, according to their several writs, that they shall diligently assist the above mentioned commissioners, or any one of them who shall happen to be present, and their clerks and shall cause their bailiffs to assist them to levy and collect the aforesaid eleventh and seventh as the aforesaid commissioners for taxation shall instruct the said sheriffs on behalf of the king and whenever demand shall be made by one or the other of them—witness as above.'

Then follows a Latin note to the effect that the taxations made in virtue of the earlier commissions are to be found

<sup>24</sup> Roger Mauduit is, of course, the well-known Northumbrian of that name.

<sup>25</sup> It is probable that Master Robert de Merle was a clerk or cleric, and perhaps a member of the noble house of Merle or Merlay of Morpeth. Certainly in the case of the other counties the two taxatores are a knight and a cleric.

<sup>26</sup> P. 228.

neither in the Exchequer nor in the Treasury, but specimens of the seventh of 24 Ed. 1 and the fifteenth of 29 Ed. 1 for Colchester alone survive.<sup>27</sup> Colchester and Newcastle were seaport towns of about the same size in 1296 and the Colchester record fills in the gap in our story. It runs as follows:—

‘In the twenty-fourth year of the reign of king Edward, son of King Henry, a taxation was levied in the borough of Colchester, assessed on the goods and chattels of every burgesse as held by him on St. Michael’s day last past (*i.e.* September 29th, 1295). [The Commissioners collected the seventh<sup>28</sup>] granted gladly to the aforesaid king Edward for the protection of the kingdom and as a subsidy for the war lately begun against his enemies and ours, the rebels in France, by twelve burgesses of Colchester as a jury, viz. [Here follow the names of the Colchester jurors], who say upon their oath that:—*e.g.*

Richard Norays had on the aforesaid day a hide, barks and utensils in his tannery worth 10s., etc.’

From the above documents we can form some idea of the method of procedure. The king appointed in each county, probably from among the inhabitants, a knight and a cleric and sent them with a commission to the sheriff of that county. Notice would be sent to the bailiffs of the various hundreds—in Northumberland of the wards—and to the bailiffs—or in the case of Newcastle the mayor—of the boroughs to impanel juries of the inhabitants ready for the visit of the king’s commissioners on a given day. On that day the twelve jurors would swear an oath that the assessments they handed in were correct, and the names of the persons assessed and the amount of their wealth followed by the amount of the king’s seventh or eleventh as the case might be, would be entered on the roll for that county. It

<sup>27</sup> Both are printed in vol. 1 of the *Rot. Parl.*, p. 228 *et seq.*, and in part by Dowell in his *History of Taxation*, vol. 1, app. 11, p. 229.

<sup>28</sup> The MS. is defective here, but the context clearly demands *Taxatores septiman collegerunt*.

is probable that the commissioners collected the money on the spot, but it may be that in the first instance it was paid down by the sheriff and recovered from the individual taxpayers later. Certainly it is difficult to conceive how the inhabitants of a tiny hamlet could find the actual cash<sup>29</sup> if we consider the nature of the wealth even of burgesses as revealed by the details of the Colchester roll. The following are a few typical examples<sup>30</sup>:—

Richard, prior of the church of St. Botolph, at 'Wyke in the Suburbs,' had 10 qrs. of rye worth 5s. a qr., 12 qrs. of barley worth 4s. a qr., 8 qrs. of oats worth 2s. a qr., 4 draught horses worth 3s. each, 4 oxen worth 6s. 8d. each, one bull worth 5s., 6 cows worth 5s. each, 32 sheep worth 8d. each, 7 lambs worth 6d. each. Total, 10*l.* 12s. 6d. The king's seventh was 1*l.* 10s. 4d.

Edward de Berneholte, a salter, had 12½ qrs. of salt, worth 5s. a qr., one iron bowl on a pillar worth 25s., 30 qrs. of sea coal worth 6d. a qr., two silver cups worth 12s., one cup (or bowl) of mazer wood worth 3s., a bronze vessel worth 2s. 6d., four silver spoons each worth 10d. Total, 6*l.* 3s. 4d. The king's seventh was 17s. 7½d.

Henry Pakeman, a tanner, had four qrs. of rye worth 5s. a qr., 12 qrs. of barley worth 4s. a qr., a hide barks and utensils in his tannery worth 5 marks, a woollen cloth worth 10s., a cow worth 5s., 1 bed worth 4s., two silver spoons worth 10s. each. Total, 8*l.* 1s. 4d. King's seventh was 1*l.* 3s. 0½d.

Dulcie Pikes had 1 qr. of oats worth 2s., 1 cow worth 5s., 2 pigs worth 20d. the two. Total, 8s. 8d. The king's seventh was 1s. 3d.

Edmund the parchment-maker had 10s. worth of skins, ½ qr. of wheat worth 3s., a bronze vessel worth 12d. Total, 14s. 4d. The king's seventh was 2s. 0½d.

John the dyer had 1 qr. of rye worth 5s., and 2 bushels of rye worth 15d., 4 qrs. of barley worth 4s. a qr., two cows worth 5s. each, a little woollen cloth worth 6s. 8d., 4 lbs. of wool worth 2s. a lb.; cinders worth 13s., one robe worth 6s. 8d., one bed worth 4s., two silver spoons worth 10d. each, a bronze vessel worth 3s. Total, 3*l.* 15s. 3d. The king's seventh was 10s. 9d.

<sup>29</sup> The Jews had been expelled in 1290, and, of course, there were no banks. The authorities of the churches and monasteries seem to have lent money, especially the prior and convent of Durham, but as the wealth of the richest consisted of their crops, flocks and herds the amount of cash would be small.

<sup>30</sup> The original Latin version of these entries is to be found in *Rot. Parl.*, i, 227 *et seq.*

Godfrey the trader ('Mercator') had 1 qr. of rye worth 5s.,  $\frac{1}{2}$  qr. of barley worth 2s., 1 bushel of peas worth 6d., one heifer worth 4s., merchandize worth 4s., one pan worth 6d. Total, 16s. The king's seventh was 2s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

Roger Lamb (probably a butcher or dealer in meat) had  $\frac{1}{2}$  qr. of wheat worth 3s. 4d.,  $\frac{1}{2}$  qr. of rye worth 2s. 6d., 3 qrs. of oats worth 2s. a qr., six bullock carcasses worth 5s. each, 16 sheep carcasses worth 6d. each, one ox worth 8s., four pigs worth 8s., 1 bed worth 3s., four gallons of lard worth 8d. each, tallow worth 5s., 3 bundles of chopped wood worth 2s. each, a bronze vessel worth 2s. Total, 4l. 5s. 6d. The king's seventh was 12s. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

Vitalis the baker had 2 qrs. of wheat worth 6s. 8d. a qr., 2 qrs. of barley worth 4s. a qr., 1 qr. oats worth 2s., one horse for the mill worth 3s., two pigs worth 2s., a bronze vessel worth 12d. Total, 29s. 4d. The king's seventh was 4s. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

Margery Chaluners had 1 qr. of barley worth 4s., 1 qr. of oats worth 2s., one pig worth 12d. Total, 7s. The king's seventh was 1s.

Katharine the linen draper had one poor (*debilis*) horse, and one piece of linen cloth, her merchandize. Total, 9s. The king's seventh was 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

As has been already stated the custom of assessing the value of moveables by a jury can be traced as far back as the Assize of Arms in 1181. It is impossible to say definitely how the jury of 1295 was chosen and the actual collection made, but we have very full particulars as to the way in which the grant of a thirtieth was collected in 1237, and probably the method varied little.

According to the royal writ<sup>31</sup> of that year, the king officially informed the sheriff of the various counties that the barons and prelates had met according to his summons at Westminster on January 20th, 1237, and there the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors and the 'clergy having land not belonging to their

<sup>31</sup> Printed in Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 366. It is interesting to trace the development of the methods by which subsidies were assessed and collected. Stubbs gives several earlier writs. The general tendency of assessing the aliquot part by local juries of those who would have to pay the subsidies finally culminated in the creation of a National Jury or Parliament in 1295 and a conventional assessment of the liability of the various districts in 1332.

churches,' and the earls, barons, knights and free men, for themselves and their villeins, had granted the king a thirtieth part of all the moveables they should possess on the morrow of the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross in the autumn (*i.e.* September 15th, 1237), when the harvest had been gathered in; that is, on their corn, ploughs, sheep, cows, pigs, stallions, plough-horses and other cattle and goods; however, church goods and the church lands of ecclesiastics were to be exempt, as were gold and silver, palfreys, pack-horses, war-horses, draught-horses, arms, looms and vats.

The king then told the sheriff that the grant would be collected by certain specified commissioners, as in 1295, who would take an oath before the sheriff that they would perform their duties as faithfully and conscientiously as possible. These commissioners, in 1237 four knights and a cleric, were to arrange for the election of four men of the better sort in each vill, and give instructions to the sheriff to summon these village representatives in each of the recognized hundreds of the county to meet them at a given time and place. Here, in the presence of the lord's bailiff of each vill, if he wished to be present, the four village jurors were to swear that they would faithfully assess the aid and affix a reasonable price on all the goods that had to be valued, according to the common and fair estimation and value, not influenced by love, favour or hatred or any other pretext. And afterwards the jurors were to show the details of all the chattels and their value to the aforesaid four knights and the clerk, and collect the money under the direction of the said knights and clerk, and bring it to the said knights and clerk. The four jurors were to pay over the money by tallies and by rolls containing the details, and, in the case of Kent, it was to be deposited in the priory of the Holy Trinity at Canterbury.

The sheriff was instructed by the king to help the collectors in their task by executing distraint for the money where it might

be necessary. In the case of archbishops, bishops, abbots and priors who held lands or franchises in any county it was ordered that they were to proceed in like manner to assess, collect and pay the aforesaid thirtieth to the aforesaid four knights appointed for this purpose, by means of four lawful knights of theirs, or free and lawful men if they had no knights.

One is not surprised to learn that the four jurors from each vill were not allowed to swear as to their own possessions or to appraise them, but other four men from each village chosen for this purpose by the aforesaid knights were to make the necessary sworn declaration as to the chattels of the aforesaid former four men, according to the form aforesaid. Moreover no poor man or woman was to be asked to contribute to the thirtieth unless the goods possessed were worth more than 40*d.*

The money aforesaid was to be paid in two instalments, the first on the morrow of St. Andrew's day (*i.e.* on December 1st, 1237), and the second on the morrow of Holy Trinity (*i.e.* on May 31st, 1238). Then follows the usual admonition to the sheriff to give all the help he can. Henry III ends by promising, as usual, faithfully to keep all the charters and not to make this grant a precedent for future exactions.

It is almost certain that this elaborate system was used as a precedent for the collection of the seventh and eleventh in 1296. It would be of course modified in the case of Northumberland by substituting our local wards<sup>32</sup> for the hundreds into which English counties are generally divided. Great care was taken

<sup>32</sup> Whatever may have been the origin of the sub-division of the county known as the hundred, its corresponding unit in the northern counties known as the 'ward,' certainly originated in the needs of local defence against the Scots. In Westmoreland each barony was sub-divided into two wards, but the Northumberland and Durham wards are larger areas, dating perhaps to Anglian times. For the boundaries of the ancient wards and their parishes, see W. Dixon, *The Wards, Divisions, Parishes and Townships of Northumberland*. Alnwick, 1833. (There is a copy in the Society's library.)

in the selection of jurymen, who, twelve in number, represented not the vills but the whole ward or the borough. However, a large vill such as Neubighing had its own jurors.<sup>33</sup> They were generally men of wealth but occasionally poor men are found acting, as in the case of East Tyndale ward, where one juror, Thomas Baronius, only paid on chattels valued at 16s.<sup>34</sup> Both in East Tynedale and the neighbouring ward of 'Between Tyne and Wanspike'<sup>35</sup> (*i.e.* Castle ward) we find at least one juror returned as worth under 1*l.* for taxable purposes, and several under 2*l.*<sup>36</sup> The jurors in the liberty of Tynemouth<sup>37</sup> are on the average the least wealthy of all, four being returned as possessed of chattels worth under 1*l.*; only in one case, that of Ralph the 'serviens' of Seaton, do we find chattels worth more than 4*l.* It is difficult to believe that in the liberty of Tynemouth at any rate there was any real popular election of jurors, for here there are at least four instances of two men being chosen from one vill, to the unnecessary disfranchisement of other vills.<sup>38</sup> It is perhaps natural to find clergy represented on the various juries<sup>39</sup> but one is hardly prepared to find a lady juror.<sup>40</sup> However, the lady, Matilda de Deviliston (Dilston),<sup>41</sup> probably sent her steward or a relation as proxy. The roll gives no jury for the ward of

<sup>33</sup> Transcript, pp. 93-4. From the entry 'Total for the Liberty of the Prior of Tynemouth together with the vill of Newbighing,' it seems that there was some connexion between the vill and the ward. The vill was much richer than the rest of the liberty for it paid the king nearly 9*l.* out of total of just under 39*l.* paid by the ward and vill jointly. <sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34. <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

<sup>36</sup> It is noteworthy that the juries in each ward represent very fairly the different grades of wealth in the ward. <sup>37</sup> Transcript, p. 93.

<sup>38</sup> Mr. H. H. E. Craster suggests that there was a Standing Committee of 12 (*Northumberland County History*, VIII, 215), but it is by no means certain that this system was followed outside the liberty of Tynemouth.

<sup>39</sup> Transcript, pp. 11, 98 etc. <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34. <sup>41</sup> Although Dyveleston is a vill of West Tyndale, Matilda appears in the jury of East Tyndale. Thomas fil. Matild' de Dyvelist, witnesses a Greenwich hospital deed, 16.A.1, in 1301. See new *Hist. North.*, x, 244, n.i.

West Coquetdale, but that is probably due to the carelessness of the scribe who made the fair copy of the entries relating to that ward.

It seems highly probable that in view of the repeated requests for subsidies made by the king the assessment of 1295-6 was not carried out very stringently. At any rate we possess the fragment of a subsidy roll of 6 Edward II,<sup>43</sup> and unless we accept the unlikely view that Northumberland had grown in wealth and population between 1296 and 1313, despite Scottish raids, it is clear that not only were many poor men exempted altogether in 1296 but that even those who paid were allowed a generous rebate on their real liability.<sup>44</sup> Certainly complaints did arise that the assessments became more stringent, and so great was the outcry in 1332 when the towns paid a tenth and the counties a fifteenth, that the king had actually to agree to accept the assessment of that year as the basis of all future grants and so be content with a fixed sum of about 39000*l*. This is not the place to pursue the matter farther, and it must suffice to say that by the fifteenth century not only did the value of the fifteenth and tenth under this fixed assessment decrease in amount, but also large rebates had to be given to specific towns and districts. Gradually a new form of subsidy appeared alongside the fifteenth and tenth under the Tudors and the old lay subsidy was last granted in 1624.

<sup>43</sup> Pollock and Maitland, *Hist. of English Law*, I, 482-485, carefully discuss the legal position of women in the middle ages, but they are clearly too definite when they say (p. 484) 'we never find women as Jurors except in . . . . case of the Jury of Matrons.'

<sup>43</sup> Ref. in P.R.O. is 158/6.

<sup>44</sup> The following are a few examples almost at random:—

Name.	Total Assessment.						Total Number of Taxable Units.	
	1296.			1313.			1296.	1313.
Heaton ...	£8	3	4	£23	14	6	5	8
Pandon ...	29	9	8	70	2	9	20	30
Bolam ...	15	11	8	23	8	4	12	17
Morpeth ...	47	14	11½	60	4	8	35	26 (but probably 12 jurors should be added).

In attempting to obtain from the roll of 1296 information as to the wealth and population of Northumberland one must bear in mind this system of exemptions and rebates. It is probably a safe estimate to take it that about one-third of the householders escaped altogether in 1296, but we can form some idea of the comparative wealth and population of the various wards of the county. The towns are an interesting problem and deserve a section to themselves.

In 1296 there were eight wards and two liberties under the control the sheriff. The wards were, in the order of the roll, West Tynedale, East Tynedale, Tyne and Wansbeck, Wansbeck and Coket, Glendale, Bamburgh, East Coketdale and West Coketdale. The liberties were Tynemouth and Emildon (Embleton). The total number of taxable units is given as 3886, but they are naturally rather unevenly distributed, and the number of villis in each ward varies considerably. The following table is interesting.

Name of Ward.	No. of Villis.	No. of Taxable Units.	King's eleventh per unit.	
			s.	d.
West Tynedale ... ..	29	304	3	6
East Tynedale ... ..	79	679	4	2
Tyne and Wansbeck... ..	64	501	3	1 $\frac{3}{4}$
Wansbeck and Coket ... ..	50	518	6	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Liberty of Tynemouth ... ..	24 <sup>45</sup>	260	2	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Liberty of Emildon ... ..	13	116	3	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ward of Glendale ... ..	38	388	5	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ward of Bamborough ... ..	42	415	3	11 $\frac{1}{4}$
East Coketdale ... ..	22	236	3	10 $\frac{3}{4}$
West Coketdale ... ..	39	469	3	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ten wards		containing 400 villis and 3,886 taxable units.	Average eleventh is } 4 2	

It is highly probable that on these figures and allowing for exemptions there were about 5829 households in the country

<sup>45</sup> It is a little difficult to enumerate the separate villis here as four villis, Bacworth, Eglingham, Ambel and Lilburne occur twice and Est Chirton appears both as a separate vill and in conjunction with Wyteley.

districts of the county as opposed to the towns in 1296. On that estimate the population would not exceed 30,000. It must be remembered, however, that much of the county was at that time pasture and waste, and that even to-day population is very scanty beyond the 600 feet contour line. Moreover, Hexhamshire and North Durham were then not reckoned as part of the county.

The table just given shows that the richest ward was the Wansbeck and Coket,<sup>46</sup> where the actual amount paid to the king was 6s. 10½*d.* per unit. Much of the land in this ward is a fairly fertile plain and 18 out of its 50 villis contained from a dozen to 33 taxpayers. Among these villis were Horseley (23), Hertwayton<sup>47</sup> (16), Stanton (20), Witton (23), Middeford (20), Alnemewe (28), Alnewyke (33).<sup>48</sup> Probably in this ward the villis more resembled those described in Boldon book, than was the case in the county generally where small villis were more common than large villis.

The next richest ward was the fairly compact district of Glendale, which lay on each side of the river Till between the Cheviots and the coast. Fourteen out of its thirty-eight villis contained from a dozen taxpayers as at Heyreslaw and Bollisdon to thirty at Dodington. The next largest vill is Lowycke (20), whose neighbour, Bayremore, produced 14 taxpayers. Fifteen paid at Hesselrig and Langcest'r. Other large villis were Akeld (13), Homildon (13), Ewarth (13), about the Upper Till. Etal (12), and Crucum (13) lie farther down the Till. It is perhaps significant that there are only two villis of any size west of the Till. These are Hethpol (18) on the College burn at its junction with the Elsdon burn and Learmewe<sup>49</sup> in the valley of the Tweed near Cornhill.

<sup>46</sup> Now called Morpeth ward.

<sup>47</sup> Now Hartington.

<sup>48</sup> Alnmouth and Alnwick each had its own independent jurors but each was taxed only at one-eleventh. Transcript, pp. 83, 84.

<sup>49</sup> The modern forms of these names are Doddington, Lowick, Barmoor, Hazelrigg, Lanton, Akeld, Humbleton, Ewart, Etal, Crookham, Heathpool, Learmouth.

The third richest ward was East Tynedale. It was bounded on the south by the Tyne, and probably on the west by the northern Watling Street. On the east it was parted from the Tyne and Wansbeck ward by an imaginary line running between Prudhoe and Belsay, while the course of the North British Railway from Scots Gap to Bellingham marks approximately its northern boundary. It was actually the most populous of all the wards and its numerous vills lay clustered fairly thickly together especially in its south-eastern portion. However, only 16 out of the 79 vills produced twelve or more taxable units. West Matfen was the largest vill in the actual ward and had 23 taxpayers, but there were 14 others in the neighbouring vill of East Matfen. Near by was Fenwick with 16 and Stamfordham with 15 taxpayers. In the Tyne Valley itself there were no large vills. South of the Tyne and facing Bywell was Bromley<sup>50</sup> with 14 taxpayers. Horsley, a little distant from the north bank of the river had the same number. Prudhoe, despite the castle, had only 11 taxpayers, and its neighbour, Mickley, 10. The only other populous vills cluster about the road that runs from Hexham to Rothbury along the foot-hills. Here running roughly from south to north are to be found Swinburn (15), Colwell (20), Thockrington (18), Great Bavington (18), Little Bavington (11), Kirkharle (22), West Harle (9), Whelpington (15), and West Whelpington (11). Great Hetton (18) and Kirk Hetton (15)<sup>51</sup> lie a little east of the Bavingtons and with 'Yghow' (18)<sup>52</sup> form a link with the Fenwick-Matfen group of vills. Three outlying vills remain for notice. Belsay and Shaftoe with 12 taxpayers each lie a little south-east of the foot-hills along the Otterburn-Newcastle road. Wooler, the remaining vill, is one of the problems of the roll. After giving the total of the ward of East Tynedale as 129*l.* 15*s.* 8*½d.*, the roll furnishes a full return for the vill

<sup>50</sup> Now spelt 'Broomley.'    <sup>51</sup> Now spelt 'Heaton.'    <sup>52</sup> Now spelt 'Ingoe.'

of Wooler with 34 taxpayers, who paid the king 12*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.*, of which the sum of 3*l.* was paid by one man named William de Caldmerton.<sup>53</sup> Then occurs the curious entry 'Sum total for the ward of East Tindale together with the vill of Wooler, 141*l.* 17*s.* 2½*d.*'<sup>54</sup> However, Wooler is about 30 miles north of the apparent boundary of the ward and has no obvious connexion with it. It seems plain from these figures that about half the taxable population of the ward was to be found in some twenty vills—a bare quarter of the total, and the inference is that elsewhere the population was scanty or too poor to be worth taxation.

Next to East Tyndale in order of taxable value came the little liberty of Emildon with an average of 3*s.* 11¼*d.* paid by 116 taxpayers in 13 vills. It was a narrow strip of territory between the present North-Eastern main line and the sea, with its northern limit at Newton-by-the-Sea and its southern at Craster. The largest vill is Newton-by-the-Sea with 17 taxpayers. Yerdill and Emildon<sup>55</sup> each had twelve, allowing them to count the jurors they supplied. However, the thirteen vills included several such as Yerdill, which lay outside the main group.

Emildon was merely part of the coastal district of the neighbouring ward of Bamburgh, which had an average of 3*s.* 11¼*d.* for its 415 taxpayers scattered over 42 vills. Seventeen of these vills had twelve or more taxpayers. By far the most important was North Sunderland with 30 taxpayers. Then came Long Houghton (19), Bedenal (18), Belford (18), Tughall (18), Scorton<sup>56</sup> (14), Bulmer Denewicke (14), Spinilston<sup>57</sup> (14), Howick (14), South Charleton (14), and Middleton (14). Yhessington,<sup>58</sup>

<sup>53</sup> His was far the highest assessment either in the vill or the ward and was one of the highest in the whole county.

<sup>54</sup> Transcript, p. 35.

<sup>55</sup> Now Earle (near Wooler) and Embleton.

<sup>56</sup> Now Shoreston.

<sup>57</sup> Now Spindleston.

<sup>58</sup> Now Easington.

Ditchburn, and Lesbury had 13 taxpayers each, and there were 12 each at Ellingham, North Charlton and Dychend.<sup>59</sup> Most of the population of the ward was to be found in the vills along the great north road, or those near the coast between Bamburgh and Newton-by-the-Sea. Bamburgh itself appears separately among the boroughs of the county, but was by no means the most populous place in the ward. The western division of the ward was mainly hill and moor.

The neighbouring ward of East Coketdale shows an average taxable unit of 3s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., and its 22 vills produced 236 taxpayers. West Coketdale had an average of 3s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., produced by 39 vills with 469 taxpayers. The real relation of the two wards of Coketdale to the ward of Bamburgh is far worse both as to population and wealth. Nominally although Bamburgh's taxpayers paid a slightly higher average figure than those of East Coketdale and the latter a higher average than those of West Coketdale, the average number of taxpayers per vill in the respective wards was 9·8, 10·8, and 12. However, we must compare the acreage of the wards. Bamburgh ward to-day, including Emildon, contains 69,326 acres. The modern ward of Coketdale, including the East and West Coketdale of 1296, has an acreage of 300,650. Thus we can take it roughly that in 1296 whereas 130 acres of Bamburgh ward contributed 3s. 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. to the king, it required 426 acres of Coquetdale to produce their average contribution of 3s. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per taxable unit. Even to-day much of the western district of East Coketdale consists of hills and moors such as Framlington moor and Alnwick moor, and the western district of West Coketdale is a maze of hills sloping up to Cheviot itself. Thus the actual distribution of the population of the two wards in 1296 is the natural result of their physical configuration.

Of the 22 vills of East Coketdale, only 6 can produce 12 or

<sup>59</sup> Now Detchant.

more taxpayers, but two others produce 11, and four others 10 each. By far the largest vill in the ward, indeed, the largest vill properly so-called, is Chatton, which produced 40 taxpayers. It stands at the junction of two cross roads with the great north road a little east of Wooler on the Upper Till. Follebir,<sup>60</sup> with 15 taxpayers, lies about two miles west of Chatton, and West Lilburn, with the same number, lies a little farther to the south-west. Trikelington (3) is probably the modern Trickle, near West Lilburn, and between Chatton and West Lilburn lies Chevelingham (11) (Chillingham). Farther south is another group of vills, lying just west of Alnwick moor. Alburwyke,<sup>61</sup> all but on the Aln, had 14 taxpayers, and a little to the west again were Bolton (15) and Titlington (9). The northern outlying member of this group was Benley (12).<sup>62</sup> A third group of vills lay near Warkworth. Here were Bottlesdon (Lower) with 11 taxpayers, Bottlesdon<sup>63</sup> (Higher) with 10, Gysings (5),<sup>64</sup> Bilton (8), Schiplingbotill (10).<sup>65</sup> With the outlying vill of Rugley (7) one might almost add Bondegate in Alnewike (10) and Canongate in Alnewike<sup>66</sup> (6) to this south-eastern group, and to it also belong the remaining vills of Brotherwike, Quithill,<sup>67</sup> Wolverdon,<sup>68</sup> Ackedon,<sup>69</sup> and Haysand,<sup>70</sup> which respectively returned 3, 1, 10, and 6 taxable units.

This attempt to fix the situation of the vills of East Coketdale reveals the curious fact that the ward is a comparatively narrow strip of territory about 20 miles long and from three to eight miles wide, stretching from the neighbourhood of Wooler to the lower reaches of the Coquet, where it is at its widest. Even this strip consists of three detached pieces separated by Alnwick moor and Berwick moor. It is impossible to conjecture

<sup>60</sup> Now Fowberry.<sup>61</sup> Now Abberwick.<sup>62</sup> Now Beanley.<sup>63</sup> Now Buston.<sup>64</sup> Now Guyson or Guizance.<sup>65</sup> Now Shilbottle.<sup>66</sup> Curiously enough Alnewick itself is classed with the Wansbeck and Coket, *i.e.*, Morpeth ward. Transcript, p. 83.<sup>67</sup> Now Whittle.<sup>68</sup> Now Wooden, near High Buston.<sup>69</sup> Now Acton.<sup>70</sup> Now Hazon.

the reason why this part of Coketdale was given separate treatment in 1296, but, undoubtedly, the land must have been more fertile than much of the western part of Coketdale to support so many comparatively large and populous vills on so small an area.

Apparently the rest of the modern ward of Coketdale is taken as Coketdale West in the roll of 1296, but here again the inhabited area is very small. It is in shape like an inverted letter T. Its greatest length from the two Middleton vills near Wooler to its southernmost vill of Wytton,<sup>71</sup> near Rothbury, is roughly 16 miles. From its westernmost vill, Alwinton, to the vill of Lemoton<sup>72</sup> on the east, the distance is about 15 miles, and in this southern belt with an average width of about six miles are to be found 30 out of the 39 vills of the ward and about  $\frac{5}{8}$  of the taxable units. The only vills outside this six miles wide belt are, starting from the north, 'Midilest' Midilton<sup>73</sup> (8), South Midilton (12), Ilderton (13), Rustheden<sup>74</sup> (9), Rodum<sup>75</sup> (7), Weperden<sup>76</sup> (5), Reveley (7), Bromdon<sup>77</sup> (10) and Angram<sup>78</sup> (9).

To the west of these vills the ward slopes up sharply towards Cheviot. On the south is the watershed between the Breamish and the Aln, then apparently without human habitation. The remaining 30 vills are divided into two unequal groups. The easternmost group consisting of Glanteley and Overgars<sup>79</sup> (6), the two Framlingtons (15), and Swarland (5), are geographically part of the ward of East Coketdale from which they are only parted by the Morpeth-Alnwick road whereas they are cut off from the rest of Coketdale West by Framlington moor and Rothbury north forest. The 27 vills west of Rothbury north forest lie mainly along the banks of the Aln and the Coket, roughly in the form of a triangle with the salient points at Alwenton, Lemoton and Wytton. Fourteen of these vills return

<sup>71</sup> Now Witton.      <sup>72</sup> Now Lemmington, on the edge of Alnwick moor.

<sup>73</sup> Now Old Middleton. (North Middleton does not occur in the roll.)

<sup>74</sup> Now Roseden.    <sup>75</sup> Now Roddam.    <sup>76</sup> Now Wooperton.    <sup>77</sup> Now Brandon.

<sup>78</sup> Now Ingram.    <sup>79</sup> Now the separate villages of Glantlees and Overgrass.

12 or more taxpayers. The largest vill by far is Alwenton with 40 taxpayers. Its neighbour, Harbottle, is not mentioned here, being in the liberty of Redesdale, but near by are Clenhyll<sup>80</sup> (7) Bytelesden<sup>81</sup> (17), and Borudoune<sup>82</sup> (18). Between Borudoune and Lemoton are Naddirton<sup>83</sup> (20), Scranwod<sup>84</sup> (12), Yetlington (13), Eslinton (9), Caluley<sup>85</sup> (17), Wytingeham cum Barton (14), Thorneton<sup>86</sup> (13) and Edlingham (7).

The remainder of the vills lie in the valley of the Coket, with the exception of Lurebodil<sup>87</sup> (12) and Tirwyth<sup>88</sup> (21) which are to be found on the northern edge of Rothbury forest. They are, from west to east, Scharperton (14), Hephale<sup>89</sup> (10), Bykerton (8), Flotweyton (9), Warton (10), Thropton (10), Snytter (22), The Tossons (18) (Magna Tossyn (15) and Parva Tossyn (3)), Ryhill (9), Neuton in Roubir' (11), and Wytton with the cow-pastures in Rothbury forest (14). It is evident that the first colonists occupied the only parts possible for settlement and few, if any, fresh villages have been founded outside of the area first settled. Vills seem to cling to river valleys or the little patches of plain country among the hills and outside the colliery area or the industrial district of lower Tyneside, it is probable that the population of Northumberland in 1296 was only slightly if at all smaller than it is to-day. The population was scanty simply because the area fit for human habitation or at least for agriculture was not large. Such wealth as the peasantry possessed at least in the north and west would be due rather to the number of their sheep and cattle than to the richness of their crops.

It is probable that pastoral rather than tillage farming accounts for the wealth of the hilly district of West Tynedale. In the roll of 1296 West Tynedale's 304 taxable units, scattered in 29 vills, produced an average of 3s. 6d. per head. Twelve of

<sup>80</sup> Now Clennell.<sup>81</sup> Now Biddlestone.<sup>82</sup> Now Burradon.<sup>83</sup> Now Netherton.<sup>84</sup> Now Srenwood.<sup>85</sup> Now Callaly.<sup>86</sup> Now Thrunton.<sup>87</sup> Now Lorbottle.<sup>88</sup> Now Trewhitt.<sup>89</sup> Now Hepple.

these vills had a dozen or more taxpayers but 8 had less than 6 taxpayers. The area of the modern ward of Tynedale is given as 536,884 acres, and that includes the liberties of Hexham, Tynedale and Redesdale then not in the sheriff's hands. West Tynedale ward covered all the county west of the Derwent and Watling street, quite three-fourths of the modern ward of Tynedale, but only in the river valleys were any settlements made and they were not large. On the south of the Tyne, between the Derwent and the Devilswater, were a few vills, none of any great size. The easternmost was Shotley with 16 taxpayers, and near by were Laley<sup>90</sup> (4), Falserley<sup>91</sup> (7), Quikcumstal<sup>92</sup> (12). Stretched along the Devilswater almost from its source to its junction with the Tyne were Appiltreley<sup>93</sup> (2), Dukesfield (5), Slaveley<sup>94</sup> (10), and Dyveleston<sup>95</sup> (12). Then came the liberty of Hexham<sup>96</sup>. Another group of vills 'Wullawe and Schelis' (5), Newbiging (4), Crumclef (7), and Woderendles (2), probably lay a little south-west of Shotley.<sup>97</sup> Farther west still on the left bank of the upper South Tyne lay Lambley (1), Langeley (17), Feyrstanhalth<sup>98</sup> (17), Wyden (8), and Blenkenshopp<sup>99</sup> (6). The next group of vills lay farther down the South Tyne not very distant from its junction with the North Tyne. Here is the largest vill in the ward—Haydon<sup>100</sup> with 30 taxpayers, a little to the north-east are Allerwas<sup>101</sup> (7), Fourstanes (7), and Wardun<sup>102</sup> (4). The fourth group of vills lay between the North Tyne and Watling street. Here were Colden Chollerton (15), Barnysford<sup>103</sup> (6), Gunewarton<sup>104</sup>

<sup>90</sup> Now ?Healey.<sup>91</sup> Now Fotherley.<sup>92</sup> Now Whittonstall.<sup>93</sup> Now Apperley.<sup>94</sup> Now Slaley.<sup>95</sup> Now Dilston.<sup>96</sup> Consisting of the parishes of Hexham, St. John Lee, and Allendale. Corbridge is outside the liberty.<sup>97</sup> Wullawe perhaps survives in 'Wall' House and 'Schelis' in Esper-shields. Crumclef is almost certainly Cronkley, and Newbiging is the village of that name on the Derwent, just west of Blanchland. Woderendles I cannot identify, but it was probably near Cronkley.<sup>99</sup> Blenkinsopp. <sup>100</sup> A little east of Haydon Bridge.<sup>98</sup> Featherstone. <sup>101</sup> Now Allerwash.<sup>102</sup> Now High Warden.<sup>103</sup> Now Barrasford.<sup>104</sup> Now Gunnerton.

(16), West Swynburne<sup>105</sup> (10), Chipches<sup>106</sup> (12), Birteley (10), Bewbund<sup>107</sup> (3), and Botland<sup>108</sup> (7).

West Tyndale ward bears a curious resemblance to the ward of Coketdale West both in the geographical disposition of the vills and their taxable capacity, though probably the former ward is, on the whole, the less populous even allowing for the areas not counted in the ward in 1296. Only in the river valleys was agriculture at all possible and certainly outside a few favoured districts the inhabitants depended largely on cattle and sheep, as they do to-day.

It is somewhat surprising to find the two divisions of the modern Castle ward last on the list as regards wealth. The west division of Castle ward is called the Tyne and Wansbeck ward in the roll of 1296.<sup>109</sup> It has 501 taxable units spread over 64 vills with an average per unit of 3s. 1½*d.* The average number of taxpayers per vill is only 7·8 the lowest of all the wards and liberties. Only nine vills were able to produce 12 or more taxpayers. The largest was Hertlaw<sup>110</sup> with 21 taxpayers. Its neighbour, Seton de la Vale, had 17 but the other vills of the group, Haliwell, Neusome, Horton and Copon,<sup>111</sup> only produced respectively 5, 3, 7, and 6 taxpayers.

In the neighbourhood of Newcastle were a number of vills spread out in the shape of a fan along the main roads. 'Pamped' extra Burgum' had 20 taxpayers, Byker had 4, Heton juxta Castrum and Walker had 5 each. Magna Benton with 14 taxpayers is the centre of another group of which the other members are Parva Benton (4), Killingwrth (10), Wydislad Suth (4), and Wydislad North (5). Ecclesiastically Wydislad's neighbour Gosford North (11), belongs to this group. Near by was Gosford

<sup>105</sup> Now Great Swinburn.      <sup>106</sup> Now Chipchase.      <sup>107</sup> Bewclay (?).

<sup>108</sup> Now Buteland.

<sup>109</sup> The boundaries do not exactly correspond, and the coastal district from Holywell to Cowpen, near Blyth, is in the Tyne-Wansbeck ward in 1296.

<sup>110</sup> Now Hartley.      <sup>111</sup> Now Holywell, Newsham, Horton, and Cowpen.

South (4), and then running roughly parallel to the North Road were Kynton (6), Neubying 'Faudon' (8), Burnton West (8), Burnton Est (6), Donigton (6), and Bronchelawe<sup>112</sup> (6).

Another group of villas lay along the Roman Wall. Benwell returns 7 taxpayers and then comes Denton (3), Walbotell (10), Villat' de Neuburn<sup>113</sup> (14), Trockelawe<sup>114</sup> (6), and Dewillawe<sup>115</sup> (4). A little to the north of Denton were Buterlawe<sup>116</sup> (6) Calverdon<sup>117</sup> (10), Calverdon Darayns (6), and Calverdon de Valence (4). A little farther north again was Ponteland with 15 taxpayers whose neighbours Merdisfen<sup>118</sup> and Prestwicke had 8 each. A little west of the Ponteland road lay Dissington de la Val, Milburn, Neuham and Blakeden<sup>119</sup> with 7, 6, 10, and 6 taxpayers respectively. A little east of the Ponteland road there stretched a long line of villas up to the northern boundary of the ward, approximately the river Wansbeck. They were Berewick (10), Crekelawe<sup>120</sup> (10), Oggill<sup>121</sup> (2), Trewyke (3), Qualton<sup>122</sup> (13), Bolum (12), and Middilton South (10). Near the Wansbeck or on the actual banks of the stream were Angreton (16), Neshow<sup>123</sup> (3), Meldon (8), and Mollisdon (7), while between the Wansbeck and the Blyth in two roughly parallel lines lay Idington (5), Shilwinton (8), Saltewick (4), Twysill (5), Tranwell (7), Clifton (6), Dodden Est (6), Dodden West (3), and Stanigton (8). The remaining three villas of the ward lay to the east of these. They

<sup>112</sup> The names of the villas around Newcastle have changed little even in spelling. Wydislad is of course Weetstade and Burnton the modern Brunton, and there is no doubt that Donigton is Dinnington and Bronchelawe Brenkley.

<sup>113</sup> Villat' should mean the 'people' as opposed to the 'vill' of Newburn-on-Tyne, but there is no obvious reason for the unusual form of entry.

<sup>114</sup> Now Throckley.      <sup>115</sup> Now Dewley.      <sup>116</sup> Now Butterley.

<sup>117</sup> Now Callerton.      <sup>118</sup> Now Mason.

<sup>119</sup> Now Black Heddon or perhaps Blagdon.

<sup>120</sup> Now Kirkley.      <sup>121</sup> Now Ogle.      <sup>122</sup> Now Whalton.

<sup>123</sup> Probably this vill is the modern 'Temple Thornton' near Angerton. See *Arch. Ael.*, 2 ser., xvii, 40.

were Hepiscotes<sup>124</sup> (9) to the north of the Blyth, and Schotton (10) and Cramlington (8) to the south of it. It is evident from the most cursory study of the vills especially in this ward that they were large in area, proportionately to their population and 'discrete' in character. In several cases the so-called vill plainly consisted of at least two hamlets and there are indications of outlying 'farms' being attached for purposes of taxation, at any rate to the nearest vill.

It is significant of the moors and marshes of South Northumberland that the liberty of Tynemouth competes with its western neighbour, the Tyne and Wansbeck ward, for the position of being the least wealthy division of the county. The average taxable unit of the liberty was 2s. 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., and its 260 taxpayers were scattered over 24 vills. However if the 49 taxpayers at 'Newbigging'<sup>125</sup> be subtracted from the total of 260 the average population per vill is brought down from 10.8 to 9.17 and without the contribution of 'Newbigging' the average taxable unit of the liberty only amounts to 2s. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. A closer examination of the vills entered under the liberty reveals the curious fact that five vills occur twice over. Four of these, Bacworth, Eglington, Lilburne, and Ambel, have each two separate entries while Est Chirton occurs once separately and again in conjunction with Wyteley. On p. 88 of the transcript Ambel, Eglington, Lilleburn, Hertford and Cupun are grouped together as 'hamlets' with a total of eight taxable units but elsewhere only Eglington and Lilleburne are styled hamlets while Ambel is termed a vill.

Another fact that emerges is that the liberty was by no means a compact political or economic unit, even in 1296. It had already a number of outlying members. At the mouth of the

<sup>124</sup> The names in this group have undergone little change since 1296. Idington is Edington, Shilwinton is Shilvington; and Duddo, Hepscott and Stannington are easily identified.

<sup>125</sup> Now Newbigging-by-the-Sea.

Coket were Ambel (10), and Haukeslaw<sup>126</sup> (12). More to the south on the Blyth were Hertford (1) and Cupun<sup>127</sup> (2). Other villis lay more to the west, Lilburne<sup>128</sup> (4), Eglingham (4), and Bewyk<sup>129</sup> (16) on the Alnwick-Wooler road, while Welteden (8), Wylum (12), Dissington (9), and Estwyke<sup>130</sup> (6) lay between the Tyne and the Newcastle-Ponteland road. The peculiar relation of Newbighing to the liberty has been already referred to. The nucleus of the liberty was Tynemouth (15) and the surrounding villis. On the coast was the vill of Wyteley<sup>131</sup> (8). Its immediate neighbour was Seton<sup>132</sup> (11), and to the south lay the villis of Morton<sup>133</sup> (5), and Preston (8). On the Tyne were Scelis<sup>134</sup> (13), Est Chirton (6), Mydil Chirton (9), and West Chirton (12). The 'hinterland' villis of Erdiston (14), Bacworth (8), and Seghale<sup>135</sup> (6) were also entered under the liberty of Tynemouth in the roll. The information provided by the roll of 1296 is especially puzzling with regard to the liberty of Tynemouth. One is led to suspect from its poverty that all the population did not contribute to the lay subsidy. It has already been suggested that the assessment was not levied very strictly and in the case of this liberty chance has preserved information of the highest importance.

A tallage was taken in 1294 and from the tallage roll and other sources we get a truer picture of the actual population of the district around Tynemouth. The average bondage holding consisted of 36 acres of arable. There were 7½ full holdings at Preston, but 16 persons paid the tallage in 1294 and only 8 paid the subsidy in 1296. There were 8 bonds at East Chirton and 11 at Middle Chirton, but we know that there were others besides

<sup>126</sup> Now Amble and Hawkesley.

<sup>127</sup> Now Hartford and Cowpen.

<sup>128</sup> East Lilburne.

<sup>129</sup> Now Old Bewick.

<sup>130</sup> Now Welton, Wylam, South (?) Dissington and Elswick.

<sup>131</sup> Now Whitley-by-the-Sea.

<sup>132</sup> Now Old Monkseaton.

<sup>133</sup> Now Murton.

<sup>134</sup> Now North Shields, included with East Chirton.

<sup>135</sup> Now Earsdon, Backworth and Seghill.

the bonds at East Chirton in 1294 although only 6 paid the lay subsidy there in 1296; at Middle Chirton 14 persons paid tallage in 1294 although only 9 paid in 1296. At Monkseaton there were 15½ bondage holdings but although we know that there were 15 bonds in this vill 21 persons paid tallage in 1294 and only 11 paid the lay subsidy in 1296. There were 17 bondage holdings at Earsdon but only 14 persons paid the lay subsidy in 1296. At Tynemouth itself 15 persons paid the lay subsidy in 1296 but as there were 15 bondage holdings in 1336 the actual population would be much greater.<sup>136</sup>

Other instances might be given, but perhaps these will suffice to prove the true nature of the Lay Subsidy Roll of 1296. It is evidently far from being a complete census of the householders of Northumberland and is probably only a very moderate estimate of the county's actual wealth on the eve of the Scottish raids, but it is all we can hope for. Even allowing for the difference in the purchasing power of money we see that the resources of the population were very scanty and must conclude that a considerable proportion of the inhabitants were too poor to contribute even under the lenient assessment of 1296.

The next part of our enquiry must be into the information afforded by the roll as to the character of the vills<sup>137</sup> and their inhabitants, reserving the boroughs to the last.

The vills differed enormously both as to size and wealth. Technically a 'vill' in this roll is a group of taxpayers who pay at the shire rate, *i.e.* one eleventh. Their assessment is ostensibly made by the ward jury, but in the case of certain vills not

<sup>136</sup> I am indebted for these figures to the new *Northumberland County History*, VIII, p. 228 *et seq.*

<sup>137</sup> The general title of the village group in this roll is 'villa' here translated 'vill,' but there is one curious exception, Newburn-on-Tyne, in connexion with which is the heading Villat' de Neuburn (Transcript, p. 58). There seems to be no obvious reason for the difference in description.

always of the largest size a separate jury appears.<sup>138</sup> It will, perhaps, be better to deal with these quasi-boroughs later in connexion with the boroughs proper, and to consider here only the ordinary villis.

Wooler<sup>139</sup> is easily the richest of the ordinary villis. It returned 34 taxpayers, worth altogether 135*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* However, one man, William de Caldmerton, perhaps a wealthy flock-master, accounted for 33*l.*, and another, Adam the Dyer, for 12*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.* The remainder falls so easily into two classes, rich and poor, that we might safely label them respectively bondagers and cotmen. For some not very obvious reason Wooler is included in the ward of East Tynedale.

If we consider wealth and population together, 'Chatton cum le Scheles'<sup>140</sup> is a good second to Wooler in importance. It returned 40 taxpayers worth altogether 78*l.* 13*s.* 8*d.* Its geographical position on the Till at the meeting place of four roads must always make it an important local centre. The most important inhabitant was the lady Isabella de Vesey, who paid on goods valued at 5*l.* 17*s.* 0*d.*, but actually the richest inhabitant was William, son of Robert, who paid on 5*l.* 19*s.* 11*d.* It seems fairly safe to conclude that the 15 persons who paid on less than 1*l.* were cotmen, but we have little information about the rest. One of the 'cotmen' is called Henry the cobbler, and he paid on 16*s.* 4*d.* Another is called William the smith and he paid on 12*s.* Thomas the 'noteman' who paid on 11*s.* 6*d.* was probably the village herdman, and William of the 'chamber' (*de camera*) may have been a servant of Lady Isabella. The miller who paid on 16*s.* 6*d.* seems, contrary to custom, to have been rather a poor man and his Christian name is not given. Chatton had three reeves;

<sup>138</sup> There was a separate jury for Morpeth (Transcript, p. 47); Rothbury (*Ibid.*, 48); Alawick (*Ibid.*, p. 83); Alamouth (*Ibid.*, p. 84); and Newbiggin (*Ibid.*, p. 93).

<sup>139</sup> Transcript, pp. 34-5.

<sup>140</sup> Transcript, pp. 128-9. For the lady Isabella see *post* p. 237.

William paid on 2*l.* 0*s.* 3*d.*, Reginald on 2*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*, and Adam on 3*l.* 15*s.*, and the son of William and of Reginald if not also of Adam appear respectively among the 'cotmen.' There was also a forester Adam who paid on 2*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* Two other names excite curiosity. One wonders as to who Roger Strature,<sup>141</sup> and Unnane were. Roger may have derived his name from one of the four roads, but Unnane who paid on 4*l.* 4*s.* 5*d.* possesses a name which is as rare as it is apparently meaningless.

Another large vill was Alwinton or Alwenton<sup>142</sup> on the upper Coket at the foot of the Cheviots. With its 40 taxpayers who were assessed on 72*l.* 14*s.* 11*d.*, it was by far the largest vill in West Coketdale. The most important man was Gilbert de Umfraville, without doubt the neighbouring lord of Redesdale. He paid on 15*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* In curious contrast with him comes the stranger from far Lincolnshire, Robert de Grimesby, who paid on 1*l.* 11*s.* We also find a 'chaplain' Germanus who paid on 1*l.* 10*s.*, and a 'cleric' Henry who paid on 1*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.* No reeve is mentioned but Richard, the reeve's son, paid on 3*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* Thomas and John who paid, respectively, 1*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.* and 1*l.* 10*s.* are styled 'dil burn,' and we find a certain Simon 'attestanes' who paid on 1*l.* 11*s.* 4*d.* The only name distinguished by its owner's occupation is that of Adam the shepherd (*bercarius*).

A good example of the prosperous vill is North Sunderland.<sup>143</sup> Both this vill and Doddington<sup>144</sup> had 30 taxpayers but those of the former were worth 78*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.*, and only four out of the 30 were assessed at or under 1*l.*<sup>145</sup> The 30 at Doddington were assessed on 65*l.* 6*s.* 2½*d.* and the wealth was less evenly distributed.<sup>146</sup>

<sup>141</sup> 'Anicia Stratur' was assessed on 1*l.* 1*s.* at Hephale. Transcript, p. 143.

<sup>142</sup> Transcript, pp. 146-7. <sup>143</sup> Transcript, p. 114. <sup>144</sup> Transcript, p. 103.

<sup>145</sup> For the story of this very interesting vill, see the new *Northumberland County History*, I, 306.

<sup>146</sup> William 'pincerna' (*i.e.*, butler) de Dodington, one of the jurors of Glendale ward was assessed on 13*l.* 11*s.* 4*d.* Transcript, p. 112.

Other examples of prosperous villas are Horsley,<sup>147</sup> Ewart<sup>148</sup> and Akeld.<sup>149</sup> The last-named vill is especially interesting. Its 13 taxpayers were worth, on the average, 4*l.* per head. William Palmer with 13*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* was richer than the 'Lady Lucia' who had only 10*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.*, but it is rather surprising to find that Thomas, the chaplain's servant, possessed 3*l.* 8*s.* 10*d.* to the 1*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* of his master, John. The border villas as a whole, especially those in Glendale, seem to have been very prosperous at the end of the thirteenth century.

It is perhaps too much to expect the Roll of 1296 to give us detailed information about the manorial system of Northumberland. Since the statute 'Quia Emptores' had been passed in 1290 a manor had become technically a separate estate created before that date. However, the manors in Northumberland varied greatly in size and importance, and as elsewhere there were lords who owned many manors and villas, which were served by two or more lords. It was the rule for the manor to be conterminous with the vill, but exceptions were often found.

Some of the villas were very small, and seem to have been settlements worked by members of a single family. For example, out of nine taxpayers at Eslinton,<sup>151</sup> four had the surname of King, and at East Duddo<sup>152</sup> Ralph de Twysil and his three sons were the only taxpayers with the exception of Richard the reeve and another Richard, perhaps a cotman, while at Weetslade South<sup>153</sup> the only names on the roll are Walter de Thornton, who

<sup>147</sup> Transcript, p. 68.    <sup>148</sup> Transcript, p. 104.    <sup>149</sup> Transcript, p. 110.

<sup>150</sup> The word 'manerium' only occurs six times in the roll and in each case seems to mean the manor-house. The cases are Transcript, p. 32, Manerium de Coys, the vicar of Corbridge, 4*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.* *Ibid.*, Manerium de Neuton, Sir Robert de l'Isle, 9*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.* *Ibid.*, p. 33, Manerium de Styford, 12*l.* 11*s.* *Ibid.*, p. 62, Manerium Prioris de Haxam, 22*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* *Ibid.*, p. 102, Etal, Sir Robert de Manerio. *Ibid.*, p. 118, Dominus Manerii de Newham, 29*l.* 15*s.* In the last three instances the 'manerium' is given as only one of several taxable holdings and was plainly a 'house.' <sup>151</sup> Transcript p. 144.

<sup>152</sup> Transcript, p. 55.

<sup>153</sup> Transcript, p. 57.

paid about half the total assessments, and the three sons of Eustace, perhaps his nephews. An even more striking instance is the small vill of Wallington<sup>154</sup> where the only names are those of the lady Luciana de Wallington, and perhaps her son and daughter and a certain Henry, son of Gilbert. Even if we allow that some of the inhabitants escaped the assessment they would be too unimportant and too few to affect the point. It is almost certain that many of the smaller vills were purely pastoral and there are indications that others, such as Whitton,<sup>155</sup> near Rothbury, depended largely upon their pastures for their wealth.

Sometimes as at Netherton,<sup>156</sup> Kirkley,<sup>157</sup> and Ulgham,<sup>158</sup> we find what is obviously a vill conterminous with a manor. At Netherton there were 20 persons assessed on 29*l.* 14*s.* in all. The lord of the manor, 'dominus Johannes de Neddirtou,' paid on goods valued at 4*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.* Twelve others, including Ralph the miller, seem to have held full bondages and paid on an assessment varying from 1*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* to 2*l.* 15*s.* The remaining 7 were apparently 'cotmen' with possessions valued at from 1*l.* to 16*s.* 10*d.* Judging by the names, we find two cases where the bondagers were brothers as were two of the cotmen, and probably there are two instances of father and son each holding a bondage. In one instance, unless the proximity of names is accidental, the father and grandfather held bondages while the son was a 'cotman.'<sup>159</sup> The neighbouring vill of Burradon<sup>160</sup> was of a

<sup>154</sup> Transcript, p. 73.

<sup>155</sup> Transcript, p. 139. Roger and Nicholas are described as 'de vaccaria,' i.e., of the 'cow-pasture,' and were apparently the herdsmen employed by the other inhabitants and lived in the forest. The cow-pastures of Rothbury belonged to Sir Robert fitz Roger, *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 219. Two herdsmen also appear at Long Witton, Transcript, p. 75.

<sup>156</sup> Transcript, p. 145, and see *post* p. 246. <sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65. <sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77.

<sup>159</sup> We find 'Ranulph de la Cahowe,' 'Alan, son of Ranulph' and 'Roger, son of Alan' occurring consecutively.

<sup>160</sup> Transcript, p. 145, and see *post* p. 244.

somewhat similar character as to the relations between the lord 'dominus Walterus de Bouroud' and the bondagers and cotmen.

At Kirkley<sup>161</sup> we find a good example of the close relationship between the villagers. Here the richest person was 'Agnes the widow, who was assessed on 4*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.*, and probably was the widow of Sir Hugh de Eure who bought the vill from Roger Bertram III, lord of Mitford. She was the only important person in the vill so far as the assessment of 1296 was concerned. Out of the remaining nine inhabitants, the reeve and his two sons composed half the 'cotmen.' Of the rest, Robert the smith, a cotman, probably served the surrounding vills, but it is curious to find Elyas the tailor (*parmentarius*) with 1*l.* 17*s.* 8*d.* to his credit as the second most highly assessed person in the vill.

Ulgham is another interesting vill. Here 'dominus Johannes de Graystocke' assessed at 9*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*, is, of course, lord of the manor,<sup>162</sup> and we can trace five rather poor bondagers assessed at from 1*l.* 1*s.* 8*d.* to 1*l.* 11*s.* 0*d.*, and five 'cotmen.' One of the bondagers was the reeve, and one of the 'cotmen' seems, from his name, Robert de Coquina, to have had duties connected with the lord's house. At Ulgham we can certainly identify two brothers among the bondagers, and perhaps the son of one of them was a cotman. If the reeve's name had been a less common one than John, we might find two of his sons among the bondagers and a third among the cotmen.

Although it is clear that many vills had no resident lord, and, as in the case of Ulgham, were merely part of some large estate, yet there are several cases where, as is known from other sources, the manor was divided among two or even three

<sup>161</sup> Transcript, p. 65.

<sup>162</sup> Transcript p. 77. John had succeeded his father, William, in 1289, inheriting among other lands the moiety of the Merlay fee which had fallen to William's wife, Mary, as daughter and co-heiress of Roger de Merlay. For Ulgham see Hodgson, *North'd.*, vol. II, part ii, p. 173, *et seq.*

lords. For example the baronies of Bolbec, Merlay and Muschamp, became extinct in the male line during the thirteenth century, and were accordingly divided among the various co-heiresses of the last male holder. We frequently meet with the husbands or descendants of these co-heiresses in the roll of 1296.<sup>163</sup>

There are also instances of 'twin' vill, such as the two Chevingtons and the Wittons.<sup>164</sup> West Chevington was part of the inheritance of Sir Hugh de Morwick III, who died in 1270. The most important name in 1296 was that of 'dominus Laurencius de Sammore' (Laurence de Sancto Mauro) who held one-third of the vill as the husband of Sibilla, eldest co-heiress of Sir Hugh,<sup>165</sup> and paid on 8*l.* 17*s.* 2*d.* Actually he was dead in 1295. He perhaps lived in the south, although he had lands at Newton-by-the-Sea and Earle, as a tenant of the Vescys,<sup>166</sup> and the inquisition held after his death stated that he held nothing in his demesne as of fee at West Chevington.<sup>167</sup> The highest assessment at East Chevington was that of Robert Mautaland or Mautalent, who paid on 2*l.* 12*s.* 4*d.* William de

<sup>163</sup> For example at Angerton (Trans., p. 64) the three co-heiresses of Hugh de Bolbec II were represented by 'dominus Johannes de Longcast'r,' 'Walterus de Huntercomb' and 'dominus Robertus fil. Radulphi,' who were each assessed at 4*l.* 8*s.* 0*d.* For the inheritance of Hugh de Bolbec see *Cal. of Inq.*, vol. I, no. 25, and new *Northumberland County History*, VI, 224. Walter de Huntercomb had also a share in the Muschamp inheritance at Belford and Lowick with Nicholas de Graham. Trans. pp. 112 and 106. Similar cases occur at Bickerton (*Ibid.*, p. 147), Biddlestone (*Ibid.*, p. 143) and South Milburn (*Ibid.*, p. 62). <sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78-9.

<sup>165</sup> See new *Northumberland County History*, V, 387, and *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 720. He also paid on 18*s.* 0*d.* at Hiburne (Hebburn near Wooler). Transcript, pp. 78 and 95.

<sup>166</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, II, no. 723 (p. 447). In 1271 he and John de Vescy went to the Crusade in 1271 and received protection for four years. *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1266-72, p. 588.

<sup>167</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, III, No. 386. His wife Sibilla survived until 1298. *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 461.

Vescy had transferred the vill to Ernulph de Morwick and the Mautalents of Howick, *c.* 1170,<sup>168</sup> and Robert Mautalent also held half Howick from John de Vescy.<sup>169</sup> He was assessed at 3*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.* in 1296.<sup>170</sup>

The vill called Witton in the roll of 1296 is the modern Long Witton, while 'Witton cum le Schel' corresponds to Nether Witton and Witton Shields. At Witton cum le Schel 'dominus Robertus de Sumervill' paid on 7*l.* 8*s.* 0*d.*, while in the neighbouring vill of Wingates (Windegat cum Gerardisley) one taxpayer is called William de Camera de Wytton.<sup>171</sup> Originally the three townships of Long Witton, Nether Witton, and Wingates, belonged to the Gospatric fee. The two latter came to the Merlays through Juliana Gospatric by marriage, but Long Witton apparently did not.<sup>172</sup> Roger Merlay III, the last male in the direct line, died in 1265, leaving three daughters. Before his death he had married his eldest daughter Mary, to William, son of Thomas de Graystock (otherwise Greystoke, or Crestoke) of Cumberland, and had betrothed his second daughter, aged ten at his death, to the son and heir of Marmaduke Tueng. Robert de Eure, however, appears as her betrothed husband in 1271, in a suit with William and Mary over the inheritance of the third daughter, Alice, who died unmarried in 1267 or 1268, aged 10.<sup>173</sup> Actually Isabel married, some time before 1279,<sup>174</sup> Sir Robert de Somerville, lord of Wichnor in Staffordshire, who died in 1297, leaving as heir his son Edmund.<sup>175</sup>

Long Witton probably belonged, at least in part,<sup>175</sup> to John

<sup>168</sup> *New Northumberland County History*, v, 398.      <sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 340.

<sup>170</sup> Transcript, p. 120.    <sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77, and *cf.* *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 775.

<sup>172</sup> Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, pp. 309 and 315.

<sup>173</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, I, nos. 636, 683, 775. *Cf.* Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, p. 374.

<sup>174</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), 165*n.*, 252, and 305.

<sup>175</sup> *Newminster Chartulary* (66 Surt. Soc. publ.), 281, and *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 392.

de Hertwayton or Hartington, for 'the seneschal of Hertwayton' was assessed here at *1l. 5s. 2d.*<sup>176</sup> John himself is one of the more interesting minor lords mentioned in the roll.<sup>177</sup> He held Hertwayton from Thomas de Bekering 'by the service of one knight's fee and rendering one mark yearly for the guard of the castle of Newcastle, and scutage when it shall happen.'<sup>178</sup> He frequently appears as a witness to Fenwick and Ogle deeds,<sup>179</sup> where he is styled a knight (*miles*), and his name often occurs among the 'Recognitors' in the Assize Rolls.<sup>180</sup> He seems to have been fond of litigation, and had one lawsuit with Robert de Insula (de l'Isle)<sup>181</sup> concerning the latter's claim to custody of the manors of Fenwick and Matfen, and another with Gilbert de Umfreville<sup>182</sup> as to the custody of a certain Thomas de Hertwayton, perhaps his own son,<sup>183</sup> or at any rate, a near relation, who was a kinsman and heir of Thomas de Fenwyk, and therefore, according to Gilbert, his ward, as the Fenwyk lands were held by 'military service.' On another occasion he had a violent quarrel with his neighbours, arising out of his attempt to imprison their beasts for alleged trespass on his 'separate' meadow.<sup>184</sup>

Another curious example of the inter-relation of the villis is supplied by a taxpayer called Thurby, who is assessed on *1l. 17s. 8d.* at North Seaton,<sup>185</sup> where William, son of Thurby,

<sup>176</sup> He was perhaps a tenant of the Robert, son of John de Wytton, who is referred to in the *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 237. This Robert may be identical with the Robert de Wytton who, as a juror of the ward, paid on *4l. 7s. 6d.* (Transcript, p. 83). Margery de Gosebek died in 1285 seised of the services of John de Vallibus at Wytton (Long Witton). *Cal. of Inq.*, II, no. 570. In 1240 the vill was held by John, son of Waldeve, lord of Edlingham. Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, p. 308.

<sup>177</sup> He paid on *8l. 12s. 4d.* at Hertwayton. Transcript, p. 72.

<sup>178</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, II, no. 679. <sup>179</sup> Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 279 and 387.

<sup>180</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 137.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 224. <sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 280 <sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 237. <sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256, etc.

<sup>185</sup> Transcript, p. 91.

is assessed on *1l. 2s. 5d.* In the neighbouring vill of Earsdon we also find a Thurby assessed on *1l. 13s. 2d.* By a curious coincidence, if it is nothing more, there are also in Seaton taxpayers called John Hert, Adam, son of John, and Matilda Hert, while in Earsdon we find a Robert Hert, and in Nether Witton and Witton Shields a John Hert. Sometimes a family seem to divide themselves up between two vills, as for example when John 'buton' appears as assessed on *2l. 17s. 3d.* in Thornton,<sup>186</sup> where he is the richest man, while his wife, 'Elene uxor botun' is assessed on *2l. 12s. 10d.*, and his son, 'Adam fil. boton,' on *1l. 3s. 0d.* at Witton Shields. All these names are sufficiently rare to warrant at any rate the suggestion of a relation.

Although many of the vills seem to be composed purely of bondagers and cotmen, and some were only hamlets, there are occasionally examples of what may be termed industrial vills.<sup>187</sup> At Whalton,<sup>188</sup> where Hugo Gobyon, a free tenant of Sir Robert fitz-Roger, is assessed on *10l. 2s. 8d.*, the population probably consisted of many more than the thirteen who actually appear as taxpayers. Among the thirteen are two reeves, a shepherd, a forester, a smith and an ale-wife. The vill of Boulton,<sup>189</sup> similarly with 15 taxpayers, had as its chief inhabitant the master of the hospital, who was assessed on *36l. 15s. 6d.* out of the total village assessment of *49l. 7s. 6d.*, but there were also a smith, a miller, a forester, and two mysterious individuals described, one as Thomas le Serjeant and the other as Roger 'mercator.' The former paid on *14s. 8d.*, and may have had some connexion with the hospital, but as Roger was only assessed on *11s. 6d.*, it is probable that 'mercator' was either a bye-name or that he was a pedlar. At Karham<sup>190</sup> on the Tweed only five taxpayers appear;

<sup>186</sup> Transcript, p. 75.

<sup>187</sup> Of course large quasi-boroughs such as Alnwick (Transcript, p. 83) are not referred to here. They will be dealt with later.

<sup>188</sup> Transcript, p. 62.    <sup>189</sup> Transcript, p. 129.    <sup>190</sup> Transcript, p. 111.

three of these, Agnes the ale-wife, Edith, widow of Geoffrey the carter, and Peter Porter paid on *1l. 8s. 0d.* each, while the other two, Gilbert the fisherman and Henry of the bakery,<sup>191</sup> paid on *11s.* Perhaps the most extraordinary instance of all is the vill of Abberwick.<sup>192</sup> Here out of 14 taxpayers three are described as carpenters, John being assessed on *1l. 5s. 6d.*, William on *1l. 0s. 6d.*, and Robert on *16s. 3d.* The only other taxpayers whose occupation is given is Adam le Vacher—probably the neatherd. Of the next the only important names are ‘magister (of the hospital), Robertus de Alburwyke’ assessed on *8l. 11s. 0d.*, and two others, Robert de Rotesey and John, son of John, assessed on *4l. 6s. 2d.* and *5l. 16s. 7d.* respectively.

The roll also gives us a certain amount of information as to individuals, and it is interesting to find examples of wealthy men, apparently of humble origin, as well as others of good family. Probably the richest plebeian in the county outside Newcastle, so far as the personal estate is concerned, was Thomas<sup>193</sup> the baker, a juror of Glendale and perhaps a resident at Karham.<sup>194</sup> He was assessed on *42l. 4s. 8d.* Probably William de Caldmerton,<sup>195</sup> who was assessed on *33l.* at Wooler, was of equally humble origin, but he was by far the richest man in that vill, which was remarkable for the number of taxpayers rich in personal estate.

Naturally, the historic Northumberland families bulk largely in the roll of 1296. At Callaly, near Rothbury, Robert fitz-Roger was assessed on *20l. 12s. 8d.*, and on *14l. 9s. 4d.* at Newburn-on-Tyne.<sup>196</sup> At ‘Werkeworth extra Burgum’ he only paid on *6l. 1s. 4d.*,<sup>197</sup> although he is generally best known as one of

<sup>191</sup> Was he one of the employees of ‘Thomas the baker’ who, as a juror of Glendale, was assessed on *42l. 4s. 8d.*? Transcript, p. 112.

<sup>192</sup> Transcript, p. 133.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.

<sup>194</sup> See *ante* n. 191.

<sup>195</sup> Transcript, p. 35.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 58 and 137.

<sup>197</sup> Transcript, p. 191. The only other taxpayer here is John de Werkeworth, *2l. 9s. 0d.*

the earlier lords of Warkworth. His son, known as John de Claveringge, from his Essex estate, succeeded him in 1310, and from him descended the Claverings, although Warkworth itself passed to the Percys.<sup>198</sup> The Delavals, of course, are also prominent. Sir Robert Delaval was assessed on 12*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* at Dissington Delaval and on 15*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.* at Seaton Delaval.<sup>199</sup> His nephew, Sir Hugh Delaval, who paid on 5*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* at Styford,<sup>200</sup> on 4*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.* at Dukesfield and on 6*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.* at Newsome,<sup>201</sup> had become the second husband of Maud, or Matilda, daughter of Hugh de Bolbec II, and so in 1296 was enjoying a share of the magnificent Bolbec inheritance.

Hugh had died in 1262, leaving four daughters.<sup>202</sup> Maud, the wife of Sir Hugh Delaval, died childless, as did Alice, the wife of Sir Walter de Huntercomb, and after their respective deaths and the death of the husbands their share of the inheritance fell to the descendants of the other sisters, Philippa and Margery. Margery's first husband was Nicholas Corbet, 'cousin' of Alexander III, king of Scots,<sup>203</sup> and for her second husband she married Ralph fitz William, lord of Grey-stoke. Her eldest son, by the latter, Robert fitz Ralph,<sup>204</sup> ultimately shared the Bolbec inheritance with the son of Philippa

<sup>198</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 219, and see new *Northumberland County History*, v, p. 27.

<sup>199</sup> Transcript, pp. 65 and 50. For the family see new *Northumberland County History*, ix, p. 135.

<sup>200</sup> Styford was the Anglian name of the barony of Bolbec. The manerium or manor house of Styford, assessed at 12*l.* 11*s.* 0*d.*, appears in the roll without any owner's name, but Philippa seems to have lived there in 1275. New *Northumberland County Hist.*, vi, p. 226. <sup>201</sup> Transcript, pp. 33, 1, and 52.

<sup>202</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, i, and see new *Northumberland County Hist.*, vi, pp. 224 *et seq.*

<sup>203</sup> Bain's *Cal. of Documents relating to Scotland*, i, nos. 2325 and 2327. Actually Nicholas was grandson of Patrick, fifth earl of Dunbar, by Ada, natural daughter of William I, king of Scotland. Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, p. 112.

<sup>204</sup> See *ante*, p. 222 n. 163.

and her husband, Roger de Lancaster,<sup>205</sup> whose name appears in the roll under the various forms of Sir John de 'Longcast'r' at Angerton, John de 'Loncaster' at Newbigging in Tynedale, and John de Lancaster at Great Bavington; his assessments at these places were respectively 4*l.* 8*s.* 0*d.*, 1*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.*, and 5*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.*<sup>206</sup> Angerton and Newbigging were part of the Bolbec inheritance, but he probably held his land at Great Bavington from Gilbert de Umfreville.

Besides enjoying a share of the Bolbec estates through his wife, Walter de Huntercomb also inherited a portion of the great Muschamp fee through his mother Isabella, who had married William de Huntercomb. Robert de Muschamp died in 1249.<sup>207</sup> Of his other daughters, Cecilia, who married Odinel de Ford, died before him, and her daughter and only child Isabella was dead before 1254, leaving no descendants.<sup>208</sup> The third daughter, Marjory, left as her heir another Marjory, who married Nicholas de Graham, and also a daughter, Muriel, who became countess of Mar. On Robert's death the barony was divided into three parts, but after the death of Isabella, his grand-daughter, her share was divided so that Isabella, Walter de Huntercomb's mother, obtained an additional sixth, making one half of the Muschamp inheritance, while Marjory de Graham and her sister Muriel received the other half between them. By 1292 Muriel, countess of Mar, had died, leaving no children, and thus in 1296 Walter de Huntercomb and Nicholas de Graham appear in the roll as dividing the Muschamp estates between them.<sup>209</sup> At Belford<sup>210</sup> 'dominus Walterus de Huntercomb' paid on

<sup>205</sup> Roger was the illegitimate brother of William de Lancaster, baron of Kendal. Hodgson, vol. 1, pt. ii., p. 239. <sup>206</sup> Transcript, pp. 64, 2, and 18.

<sup>207</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, 1, no. 202.

<sup>208</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 341.

<sup>209</sup> For the partition see *Cal. of Inq.*, 1, no. 341, and new *Northumberland County History*, 1, 375 *et seq.*

<sup>210</sup> Transcript, p. 112. Belford seems to have been a prosperous place. Only one of its eighteen taxpayers was assessed on less than 1*l.* He was 'John the cleric,' who paid on 1*4s.* 6*d.*, but John, son of William, the cleric, paid on 3*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.*, and Sir Alan, the chaplain, on 4*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.*

11*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.* and 'dominus Nicholus de Graham' on 9*l.* 18*s.* 0*d.*, while at Lowick<sup>211</sup> Huntercomb<sup>212</sup> only paid on 4*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.* as against Graham's assessment of 7*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.*

Walter de Huntercomb's father came from Oxfordshire, and Walter himself did not confine his activities to the north. He was for some time governor of the Isle of Man and was also employed by Edward I to raise troops for the Scottish wars and for the defence of Northumberland.<sup>213</sup> After the death of Alice de Bolbec he took a second wife, Ellen, whose family is unknown. She survived him, and on his death in 1313 received the usual dower. As Walter left no son he was succeeded by his nephew, Nicholas, who eventually sold his Belford and Easington moiety to his father-in-law, John de Lilburne, in 1335.<sup>214</sup> However, a cadet branch of the Muschamps continued to maintain itself at Barmoor, which was held by a quarter of a knight's fee from the senior line and their successors.<sup>215</sup> To this cadet line probably belonged William de 'Muschauns,' the juror of the Glendale ward who paid on 2*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.*<sup>216</sup> and the unnamed lady<sup>217</sup> (domina de Bayremore) who paid on 22*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.* at Barmoor.<sup>218</sup>

<sup>211</sup> Transcript, p. 106.

<sup>212</sup> Huntercomb also paid on 9*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.* at Chillingham (Transcript, p. 127). Chillingham was part of the Muschamp inheritance, but held of the barony of Alnwick. It was leased by Walter's nephew and heir, Nicholas de Neubaud to the de Hetóns as a security for a loan of 200 marks, but in 1324 it was settled on John, son of Nicholas and his wife, Constance de Lilburne, in tail. *Arch. Ael.*, 2nd series, xxv, p. 67. Huntercomb also paid on 1*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.* at Doddington, where 'Adam del Halle,' who paid on 6*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.*, may have been his steward. Transcript, p. 103.

<sup>213</sup> See *Cal. of Close and Patent Rolls*, *passim*.

<sup>214</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 403, and see new *Northumberland County History*, I, 381.

<sup>215</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 226.

<sup>216</sup> Transcript, p. 112.

<sup>217</sup> She was probably the widow of Stephen de Muschamps, the father of William, the juror of Glendale. See *Charter Rolls* (1257-1300), p. 339, for his grant of free warren in his demesne lands at Barmoor in 1289. The land was afterwards part of the dower of Ellen, the second wife of Walter de Huntercomb. *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1313-1318), 58-59.

<sup>218</sup> Transcript, p. 110.

The other moiety of the Muschamp fee went to Marjory de Graham and her husband, Nicholas, as explained above. He was of Scottish descent, and was declared a rebel by Edward I in 1298, his lands in Belford and elsewhere going to Lady Isabel de Vescy, the kinswoman of queen Eleanor.<sup>219</sup> However, he had made his peace with Edward by May, 1304, and his lands were restored.<sup>220</sup> He was dead in April, 1306, and apparently his son, John, died soon afterwards, for in June of that year Marjory, his wife, was allowed by Edward to have seisin of half the barony of Muschamp as being her inheritance.<sup>221</sup> Being left a childless widow, Marjory in 1315 sold her half of Belford to Nicholas de Meynell, a Yorkshire gentleman, who paid 10*l.* to have the reversion on her death.<sup>222</sup>

The partition of the third great fee, that of Merlay, has already<sup>222a</sup> been referred to in dealing with Sir Robert de Somerville, the husband of Isabel de Merlay. It has also been explained that Mary, the elder daughter, took her moiety to her husband, William, son of Thomas de Graystocke of Cumberland. He died in 1289, leaving as his heir his son, John de Graystocke, who has already<sup>223</sup> been referred to under the vill of Ulgham (Wlweham). He also appears as assessed on 3*l.* 9*s.* 0*d.* at Hepscoth.<sup>224</sup> As John grew older, we are told<sup>225</sup> he became very stout, and, thinking that he was not going to have any children of his own, he conveyed his estates to his 'kinsman,' Ralph, son of William, with the proviso that he himself should hold them for life, with reversion to Ralph and his heirs on his death, which indeed took place soon afterwards in 1306.<sup>226</sup>

<sup>219</sup> *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1296-1302), p. 508.    <sup>220</sup> *Ibid.* (1302-1307), p. 138.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392, and *Cal. of Inq.*, iv, no. 364.

<sup>222</sup> *New North. County Hist.*, i, p. 378 (quoting Ford papers, 8 Edward II).

<sup>222a</sup> *Ante*, p. 223.

<sup>223</sup> *Ante*, p. 221.

<sup>224</sup> Transcript, p. 56.

<sup>225</sup> See the curious Latin chronicle printed in Hodgson, vol. II, pt. ii, p. 472. For the Merlay-Graystocke pedigree see *Ibid.*, p. 374. The chronicle is also printed by Dr. Fowler as an Appendix to the *Newminster Chartulary* (66 Surt. Soc. publ.)

<sup>226</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, iv, no. 375.

Ralph, son of William, who thus obtained 'the manor and barony of Crastok, the manors of Dufton and Ulgham, and John's whole pourparty of the manor of Morpath and the manors of Crosthwayt in Tesdale and Conesclive, together with the advowsons of the churches thereto appertaining,' had obtained a share of the Bolbec fee, also as second husband of Margery de Bolbec, and thus passed on a splendid inheritance to his son, Robert fitz Ralph,<sup>227</sup> on his death in 1316.

The historic family of Bertram of Mitford does not appear on the roll, for some thirty years before the Roger Bertram of that day had espoused the cause of Simon de Montfort and the barons against Henry III. He was taken prisoner at Northampton in 1264 and alienated part of his inheritance to William de Valence, half-brother of the king, perhaps in the hope of winning pardon.<sup>228</sup> Other portions he had sold to his neighbours with doubtful legality,<sup>229</sup> and he seems to have got himself into the hands of the Jews.<sup>230</sup> He left a scanty inheritance to his son, Roger Bertram IV, who died in 1311.<sup>231</sup> Agnes, daughter of Roger IV, died childless, and her heirs were the descendants of his sisters.<sup>232</sup> However, a younger branch of the family appears at Bothal, where Sir Robert Bertram paid on 24*l.* 13*s.* 3*d.*<sup>233</sup> Near by, at Ogle, Sir John de 'Oggill' paid on 5*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.*, and the only other

<sup>227</sup> Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, p. 377.

<sup>228</sup> Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, p. 37.

<sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36. For the 'Bertram of Mitford' pedigree, see *Ibid.*, p. 40. For Mitford generally see *Ibid.*, pp. 25 *et seq.*

<sup>230</sup> *Cal. of Pat. Rolls* (1266-1272), p. 577. Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, p. 36, thinks that he mortgaged his lands to the church in many cases.

<sup>231</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 294. See also *Proof of Age*, II, no. 848. The exact date of Roger Bertram III's death is uncertain, but Hodgson, vol. II, p. 41, thinks it was before 1275, and quotes an inquisition held under the Statute of *Quo Warranto* in that year, which states that his heir Roger IV ought to have been a royal ward.

<sup>232</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 294.

<sup>233</sup> Transcript, p. 70. Actually Richard Bertram, lord of Bothal in 1196, was uncle of William Bertram II, then lord of Mitford. Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, p. 152. For Bothal generally see *Ibid.*, pp. 14 *et seq.*

taxpayer in the vill is Roger Gobyon, a free tenant of the Merlay-Graystocke fee, who paid on 1*l.* 7*s.* 0*d.*<sup>234</sup>

Another famous Northumberland house—the Herons—is well represented. Sir William 'Heyrun' of Hadeston paid on 5*l.* 18*s.* 0*d.*<sup>235</sup> while his two sons, Odenell 'Heyron' of Tritlington and Gilbert 'Heyron' of Ford paid on 6*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* and 37*l.* 18*s.* 0*d.* respectively.<sup>236</sup> Sir William was the son and namesake of the notorious sheriff of Northumberland under Henry III. The family apparently sprang from Hebburn, also called Hebron or Heron, a few miles north-west of Morpeth, where they were free tenants of the Bertrams of Bothal.<sup>237</sup> The first important member of the family was Jordan 'Hairun,' who lived in the time of Henry II, and succeeded to Hadeston as a kinsman of the preceding owner, Ralph de Wirecester. His son, Sir William, held Hadeston from Henry III, by the service of one knight, and, dying childless, was succeeded by a younger brother, William, the father of William the sheriff. The latter married Mary, 'daughter, and ultimately sole heiress of Odonel de Ford, lord of Ford,' and by her became father of the William Heron who appears in the roll of 1296. William Heron III had four sons—Walter, Gilbert, Roger, and Odinel,<sup>238</sup> and a daughter, Isabella.

<sup>234</sup> Transcript, p. 63. Sir John de Oggill fought on the barons' side in 1265. His son and heir, John, married Margaret, daughter and heiress of Sir Hugh Gobyon, sheriff of Northumberland in 1294, who paid on 10*l.* 2*s.* 8*d.* at Whalton (Transcript, p. 62). Roger Gobyon, of Ogle, was perhaps his brother. Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, p. 38. <sup>235</sup> Transcript, p. 79.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, 70 and 109. <sup>237</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 416. For Hebburn see Hodgson, vol. II, pt. II, 128 *et seq.*

<sup>238</sup> The pedigree in Raine's *North Durham*, pp. 304-5 gives the order as 'Walter Roger Odonell and Gilbert.' Raine styles Mary, wife of William Heron, II, the 'daughter' of Odonel de Ford. Actually Odonel's daughter was named Isabella (*cf. ante*, p. 228), and she was succeeded at Ford by her uncle Richard de Ford in 1255 (*Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 341). As Richard's age is given as 26, it is possible that Mary was his and Odonel's sister, and daughter of the earlier 'Odonel de Ford.' According to the *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384b, Odonel de Ford held Ford of the Muschamp barony . . . . and the heir of Odonel de Ford, Junior held 'Hedrislawe' in free marriage.

His eldest son, Walter, married Alice de Hastings, and appears to have been his father's free tenant at Bockenfield in 1279.<sup>239</sup> Their father seems to have desired to provide for all his sons in his life-time, perhaps because as Walter, who predeceased him,<sup>240</sup> left only a daughter, Emmeline, he wished to perpetuate the family name in the county. At any rate, he executed a deed<sup>241</sup> by which he gave Ford to Gilbert, with remainder to Roger and his heirs, Odenell and his heirs, and the heirs of Walter, his eldest son, in that order. Perhaps Gilbert had been settled at Ford, and Odenell at Tritlington—a vill on the Hebron estate—just as Walter was at Bockenfield before<sup>242</sup> the deed was actually executed, and Roger was provided for by his marriage with Elizabeth, third daughter and co-heiress of Adam de Swinburn.<sup>243</sup> William Heron III died at Newcastle in 1296, and was succeeded at Hadeston by his grand-daughter Emmeline, aged six, daughter of Walter Heron,<sup>244</sup> who afterwards married John lord D'Arcy of Knayth in Lincolnshire. Apparently, Gilbert Heron left no issue,<sup>245</sup> and was succeeded at Ford (according to the deed above)

<sup>239</sup> He had a law-suit in that year with Adam de 'Bockingfeld' over common of pasture in Bockenfield. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 265.

<sup>240</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 398.

<sup>241</sup> Lansdowne MS. 326, folios 43 and 51 (or Dodsworth MS. 49, f. 7).

<sup>242</sup> The exact dates of Walter's death and of the deed referred to are uncertain, but in 1294 Robert Heron, 'parson of Ford,' sued Gilbert Heron, 'lord of Ford.' *Assize Roll (Divers Counties)*, 22 Edward I, Duke of Northumberland's Transcripts 20, p. 299. Robert Heron is also styled 'king's clerk,' and was treasurer of the funds for the local defence against the Scots. *Cal. of Pat. Rolls* (1292-1301), pp. 215 and 315.

<sup>243</sup> Hodgson, vol. II, pt. ii, p. 233, and III, pt. ii, 302 (Abridgement of the Originalia Rolls), and new *Northumberland County History*, IV, p. 309. Roger's son, William, inherited 'Simonburn, Espleywood, lands in Nunwick and Shotlington, and one-third of a messuage in Newcastle.'

<sup>244</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, III, 397.

<sup>245</sup> A certain 'Thomas, son of Gilbert' paid on 1l. 14s. 7d. at Ford and there was also a William Heyron at Doddington who paid on 1l. 7s. 3d. Transcript, p. 103.

by his brother, Roger, who founded the family of the Herons of Ford.<sup>246</sup>

One would naturally expect that important local families, such as those of Lucy, Umfraville, and de Lisle (de Insula) would appear prominently in the roll of 1296. Actually the direct male line of the Lucy family had died out. The Sir Thomas de Lucy who paid on 5*l.* 6*s.* 0*d.* at Langley and on 6*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* at Allerwash<sup>247</sup> was really Sir Thomas de Multon, who had acquired these vills and others by his marriage with Isabella, the eldest co-heiress of Adam de Tindale,<sup>248</sup> but he took the surname of his mother, the co-heiress of the Lucy estates in Cumberland. Under the more accurate description of Thomas fil. Lucy he paid on 9*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* at Fourstones.<sup>249</sup> Gilbert de Umfraville, the famous lord of Redesdale, and first earl of Angus, did not pay on his Redesdale franchise according to the roll, but as Gilbert de 'Umfravile' he paid on 15*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* at Alwenton, as Gilbert 'Homfravill' on 18*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* at Hyrlaw, and as Gilbert de 'Hunfravill' on 10*l.* 2*s.* 4*d.* at Prudhoe.<sup>250</sup> Two other members of the family are entered in the roll as taxpayers. The Robert de 'Umfravil' who paid on 8*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.* at Flotterton<sup>251</sup> may have been Gilbert's son who succeeded him as second earl of Angus in 1308, although Gilbert had also an uncle named Robert.<sup>252</sup> William de 'Umfravill,' who paid on 16*s.* at Long Benton, was actually rector there.<sup>253</sup> He may have been Gilbert's great uncle,

<sup>246</sup> Roger Heron obtained a grant of free warren at Ford in 1304. *Cal. of Charter Rolls*, 32, Edward I, no. 58. (Quoted in Hodgson, vol. II, pt. iii, 393.)

<sup>247</sup> Transcript, pp. 10 and 7.

<sup>248</sup> Hodgson, vol. III, pt. II, p. 364. Thomas de Lucy died in 1305, leaving his son, Thomas, heir to the manor of Langley, property in Newcastle, and lands in 'Allerwas, Fourstanes, Allerwasheles and Wardoun' besides large possessions in Cumberland. *Cal. of Inq.*, IV, no. 322. For his pedigree see *Arch. Ael.*, 1 ser. I, 385.

<sup>249</sup> Transcript, p. 7.      <sup>250</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 32 and 11.      <sup>251</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139.

<sup>252</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, V, no. 47. For the Umfraville genealogy see Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, p. 5.

<sup>253</sup> Transcript, p. 57, and see *post*, p. 256.

William, who was a benefactor of Newminster,<sup>254</sup> or, more probably, his son.

The original Northumberland home of the de Lisles was at Woodburn, and this elder branch is represented in the roll by Sir Robert de Lisle, who paid on 9*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.* at the 'Manerium de Neuton.'<sup>255</sup> Robert succeeded his father, 'Otwelus alias Otwerus' in 1250 at the age of 28<sup>256</sup> to the original Woodburn estate in Redesdale, held from the Umfravilles, as well as to East Newton, held from the Balliol fee, Gosford held from 'the heirs of Roger, son of John,' 'Berehill and Haukewell, Thurneton, and Burneton, Fenwic and Matfen,' held from the Bolbec fee. However, in the roll of 1296, he only paid on the Manerium de Newton; a certain William de Lisle, who paid on 5*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* at Thornton and on 3*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* at Kirk Harle,<sup>257</sup> may have been his son,<sup>258</sup> but, if so, he must have predeceased his father, as the latter made over all his estates in Northumberland and Redesdale to his nephew, John, son of his brother, Nicholas (who is not referred to in the roll), and himself died in 1300 childless.<sup>259</sup>

The Robert de Lisle, who, in 1296, paid on 9*l.* 9*s.* 0*d.* at Chipchase, and on 4*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.* at Whittle,<sup>260</sup> was the son of another

<sup>254</sup> Dugdale, *Monasticon*, II, p. 917, and *Newminster Chartulary* (66 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 300. He obtained a market and a fair at Elsdon from Edward I in 1281. Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, p. 87.

<sup>255</sup> Transcript, p. 32. 'Neuton' is East Newton, in the parish of Bywell St. Peter (new *Northumberland County History*, VI, p. 123). It was held for one knight's fee and suit to the Bywell court of Hugh de Balliol. *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 773. <sup>256</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 191., <sup>257</sup> Transcript, pp. 4 and 27.

<sup>258</sup> According to Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, p. 172, William de Lisle held Matfen, Fenwick, Thornton, Angerton, Hedwin and Burnton of the Bolbec fee. He would hold Kirkharle from the Bolbec heiress Philippa (died 1294), and her husband Roger de Lancaster, and, in 1296, from her son John de Lancaster. Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 238, 239 and *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 177.

<sup>259</sup> Hodgson, vol. I, pt. II, p. 174. This branch of the Lisles obtained Felton in 1422 through a co-heiress of Aymer de Athol. *New Northumberland County History*, VII, p. 255.

<sup>260</sup> Transcript, pp. 4 and 7. Chipchase fell to the Herons of Ford by the marriage of Walter Heron, youngest son of Sir William Heron, of Ford, to Cecily, daughter of John de Lisle, and heiress of Robert de Lisle, in 1348. *New Northumberland County History*, IV, p. 340.

Robert de Lisle who died *ante* 1269 and was a kinsman of Sir Robert de Lisle of Woodburn.<sup>261</sup>

It is, perhaps, not surprising to find that actually the highest assessment outside Newcastle was that of Sir William de Vesey or Vesey, whose total taxable wealth was returned at 48*l.* 7*s.* 0*d.* He paid on 30*l.* 8*s.* 0*d.* at Tuggall, on 10*l.* at Holen (Hulne, near Alnwick), and on 7*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* at Ellington.<sup>262</sup> He was the younger brother of Sir John de Vesey, one of the 'northern barons' who fought for Simon de Montfort at Lewes and Evesham.<sup>263</sup> William and John both became friends of Edward I, and the former was made by him justice of all the royal forests. He was also a candidate for the Scottish throne.<sup>264</sup> He was the last Vesey to live at Alnwick, and he himself lived largely in Ireland, where he had inherited lands through his mother, and was also lord justice. He fought for Edward I in Gascony 1294-6 and died at Malton in 1297. As his only legitimate son, John, had predeceased him, he had enfeoffed Anthony Bek, bishop of Durham, of his Northumberland estates in trust for his illegitimate son, William of Kildare, but in 1309 Bek, using as an excuse some 'slanderous words' of his ward, treacherously sold the estates to Henry de Percy.<sup>265</sup>

Another interesting member of this famous house is the third

<sup>261</sup> Hodgson, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 173.      <sup>262</sup> Transcript, pp. 125, 122, and 82.

<sup>263</sup> John de Vesey presented one of the feet of earl Simon to Alnwick abbey as a holy relic. He had to stand a siege at Alnwick, but was able to make his peace with Edward and accompanied him to the Holy Land in 1270; he was present when the gangrened flesh was cut from the prince's arm after he had been stabbed at Acre. He afterwards fought for Edward in Gascony in 1288, and died there in 1289. Edward showed great favour to his widow. See Tate *Hist. of Alnwick*, pp. 75-8, and *Cal. of Inq.*, II, no. 723.

<sup>264</sup> He was a descendant of Margaret, illegitimate daughter of William the Lion, and so his claim was worthless.

<sup>265</sup> Tate *Hist. of Alnwick*, I, p. 105 *et seq.*, and *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 443. William Vesey of Kildare, who had large estates elsewhere, fell at Bannockburn in 1314. *Cal. of Inq.*, II, no. 723.

wife of John de Vesey (1244-1289) referred to in the roll as domina Isabella de Vesey at Chatton and as Isabella de Vessy at Bulmer, Denewick, where she paid respectively on 5*l.* 17*s.* 0*d.* and 6*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.*<sup>266</sup> She held these lands as part of her dower. Originally she was known as 'Isabella de Bello Monte, daughter of Agnes de Bello Monte, sister of Henry de Bello Monte, kinswoman of the queen (Eleanor) of England.'<sup>267</sup> 'In consideration of her good service to his queen Eleanor,' Edward I bestowed on her temporarily the barony of Caral in Fife and the lands of the rebel, Nicholas de Graham in Northumberland.<sup>268</sup> She was made governor of Bamburgh castle,<sup>269</sup> and at another time received a licence to import wool into Newcastle and sell it to whom she pleased despite the royal proclamation confining all sales of wool to the king.<sup>270</sup>

Sometimes we find the names of taxpayers in the roll who are really more important than appears at first sight. For instance, the 'Sir Robert de Manerio,' who is assessed on 27*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* at Etal, is only one link in a chain of ancestry which stretches from the Testa de Nevill to the modern family of the 'Manners,' dukes of Rutland,<sup>271</sup> while the nameless 'dominus de Manerio de Newham,' who was assessed at 29*l.* 15*s.* 0*d.*<sup>272</sup> is really an echo of the Scottish wars of Edward I. The former lord of Newham, Edmund Comyn, had supported his relative, John Balliol, and so forfeited his English estates.<sup>273</sup>

Two other interesting names are those of 'Dominus Robertus

<sup>266</sup> Transcript, pp. 128 and 116.

<sup>267</sup> Tate *Hist. of Alnwick*, I, p. 404.

<sup>268</sup> *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1296-1302), pp. 10 and 508, *Ibid.* (1302-7), p. 311.

<sup>269</sup> *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1302-1307), p. 299. She was also governor of the castle at Scarborough, and benefactor of the friar-preachers there, in whose church she was buried on her death in 1334. Tate *Hist. of Alnwick*, I, p. 404, and *Cal. of Inq.*, VII, no. 622. <sup>270</sup> *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1296-1302), p. 104.

<sup>271</sup> Transcript, p. 102. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384*b*. Etal was held by the Muschamp barony by half a knight's fee (of the new feoffment), *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 202.

<sup>272</sup> Transcript, p. 118. <sup>273</sup> *New Northumberland County History*, I, p. 272.

de Stutwill,' who paid on 9*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* at Stanford<sup>274</sup> in the liberty of Emildon, and Robert de Clifford, who paid on 9*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* at Osburghwyk<sup>275</sup> (Newstead, near Ellingham). Stutwill was a member of a famous Northumberland family, whose name is also variously spelt Stuteville and Estoteville. He had married Eleanor de Genouere, widow of Alexander de Balliol, lord of Bywell, after the latter's death in 1278.<sup>276</sup> Eleanor was related to Eleanor, wife of Henry III, and the fact stood her in good stead and enabled her to obtain a grant of Mitford castle and other lands. Robert died in 1306, leaving as his heir a son named John.<sup>277</sup> Robert de Clifford, however, although perhaps connected with the Cliffords who were found at Murton, near Orde, in Islandshire, in the early thirteenth century, came to Osburghwyk in 1279 as kinsman and heir of Adam the leper, the last of the Gaugy family to hold the barony of Ellingham or Gaugy. According to a survey of 1292, Clifford had already granted one-third of the manor of Osburghwyk to Robert Gray and his wife, who were assessed on 6*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* in 1296.<sup>278</sup> Clifford did not die until 1339,<sup>279</sup> and was succeeded by his grandson, John.

The roll of 1296 also shows us early members of other famous Northumberland families, but space only allows detailed reference to three more—the Fenwicks, the Swinburnes, and the Taylleboys. The vill of Fenwick itself was held of the barony of Bolbec by the Lises of Woodburn, but they had granted it to the family who came to be known by the name of that vill.<sup>280</sup> Thomas de Fenwick, who held the vill in Henry III's reign, engaged in extensive litigation with his neighbours over lands in

<sup>274</sup> Transcript, p. 97.

<sup>275</sup> Transcript, p. 120.

<sup>276</sup> *New Northumberland County History*, VI, p. 52.

<sup>277</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, IV, no. 369.

<sup>278</sup> *New Northumberland County History*, II, pp. 233 and 235, and *Cal. of Inq.*, II, no. 321. <sup>279</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, VIII, no. 224. <sup>280</sup> *Cf. Testa de Nevill*, 382b.

West Matfen and Little Bavington.<sup>281</sup> He was, however, a generous benefactor to Hexham priory,<sup>282</sup> and he went to the Holy Land as a crusader with the future Edward I.<sup>281</sup> He did not long survive his return, and in 1279 we find the guardianship of his kinsman and successor, Thomas de Hertwayton—called Thomas de Fenwick in the roll<sup>283</sup>—claimed by Gilbert de Umfraville on the ground that some of the Fenwick lands were held by military service,<sup>284</sup> while Robert de Lisle claimed custody of the manors of Fenwick and Matfen as being held from him by cornage.<sup>285</sup> In each case the defendant was the John de Hertwayton referred to earlier. Robert de Lisle lost his case, whilst Umfraville had to be content with a merely nominal acknowledgment of his rights, for John de Hertwayton seems to have retained possession of the person and lands of Thomas, who may have been his nephew. It is, perhaps, impossible to trace the relation of the earlier Thomas de Fenwick to the Robert de Fenwick and his son (?), Gilbert, who paid on 5*l.* 7*s.* 0*d.* and 1*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* respectively at Catcherside,<sup>286</sup> but the Robert de Fenwick and Alexander de Fenwick, who paid on 6*l.* 17*s.* 0*d.* and 1*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* respectively at Magna Hetton or Capheaton, were perhaps his kinsmen,<sup>287</sup> and Christiana de Fenwick, who paid on 9*l.* 0*s.* 0*d.* at Fenwick itself,<sup>288</sup> was probably his widow.

<sup>281</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 185 *et seq.*

<sup>282</sup> *Memorials of Hexham* (46 Surt. Soc. publ.), 114-5. Probably the Thomas de Fenwick who was prior of Hexham c. 1300 was his kinsman. *Ibid.*, 44, p. clx.

<sup>283</sup> Transcript, p. 22.

<sup>284</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 280. Probably Umfraville's claims related in part at least to the vill of Capheaton, for in the deed of 1274 transferring it to the Swinburnes Fenwick claimed to have the consent of his 'lord' Gilbert de Umfravill. Hodgson, vol. I, pt. iii, p. 1.

<sup>285</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 224.

<sup>286</sup> Transcript, p. 24. For the later Fenwicks

of Catcherside see Hodgson, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 196. <sup>287</sup> Transcript, pp. 20, 21.

<sup>288</sup> Transcript, p. 22. As explained immediately below, Thomas de Fenwick had sold Capheaton to the Swinburnes in 1274. In 1296 'Alexander de Fenwick' paid on 1*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* He was probably representative of a cadet branch. Cf. Hodgson, vol. II, pt. iii, pp. 8 and 9.

By 1296 the Swinburnes had already struck deep roots into the county. Sir William de Swinburn, the treasurer of queen Margaret of Scotland in 1259, became rector of Fordun, Kincardineshire, in 1260, but afterwards he divested himself of his Orders, and married. He acquired Chollerton in 1269. His brother, Alan, rector of Whitfield in 1264, purchased Capheaton from the Thomas de Fenwick already referred to, in 1274, but ten years afterwards, being desirous of settling that manor on his brother William, and his heirs, while retaining a life-interest for himself, he carried out a fictitious exchange of Capheaton for his brother's manor of Chollerton. Afterwards, William's son, Alexander, granted Capheaton, thus held for life by Alan, to his own son, William, from whom were descended the later Swinburnes of Capheaton.<sup>289</sup> 'Alan de Sweneburne'<sup>290</sup> accordingly appears on the roll of 1296<sup>291</sup> as assessed at 5*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.*

William and Alan were the sons of 'John de Swynburn,' lord of West or Great Swinburn, in 1257.<sup>292</sup> However, they had elder brothers, named Nicholas and Robert. Nicholas left only three daughters, on his death, in 1279, and the manor of West Swinburn was portioned among them in 1281. The husband of Christiana, the eldest daughter, was the Thomas de Fisseburne, who paid on 5*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.*, at 'West Swyneburne,' in 1296.<sup>293</sup> The 'domina Juliana,' who paid on 2*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*, was the second daughter. Her first husband was the elder<sup>294</sup> Gilbert de Middle-

<sup>289</sup> Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 231, and vol. ii, pt. iii, p. 7.

<sup>290</sup> Transcript, p. 20. No member of the Swinburne family paid at Chollerton in 1296. Transcript, p. 5.

<sup>291</sup> An interesting taxpayer at Capheaton is William de Herle. Although he only paid on 18*s.* 4*d.* he was the clerk who drew up and witnessed the deed of 1284, and Hodgson (vol. i, pt. ii, p. 239) suggests that he was perhaps identical with the son-in-law of John de Lancaster, and so obtained Kirk Harle and other Bolbec vills. He afterwards became Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. <sup>292</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, i, no. 416. <sup>293</sup> Transcript, p. 4.

<sup>294</sup> It was his son, the younger Gilbert, who carried off Lewis Beaumont, bishop of Durham, as his prisoner in 1317. Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 352.

ton, but she was a widow, apparently, in 1296. Before 1306, she married Aymer de Rotherford, but was again a widow by 1310, when she granted her lands, in West Swinburn, to her son, John de Middleton. Avicia, the third daughter, married John Swayn, who is probably the 'John de Faloudon,' assessed in the roll on 4*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* 'Richard, son of Alan,' who is assessed on 2*l.* 14*s.* 0*d.*, seems to be the same as Richard, son of Alan de West Swinburn, a member of a cadet branch of the family.<sup>295</sup>

At East or Little Swinburn, was settled another branch of the family, which had apparently obtained that vill from Ralph de Gunwarton, in 1236, in return for the vill of 'Filton.' John de 'Swyneburne,' who paid on 4*l.* 11*s.* 0*d.*; in 1296, was a benefactor of Baliol college, *circa* 1270.<sup>296</sup> His elder son, Adam, had a stormy career. In 1296 he 'led the hordes of Athol and Menteith' to the destruction of Hexham, and incidentally, also of his own inheritance at East Swinburn. He was imprisoned for a time at Berwick in 1297, but was so far restored to favour, that from 1315 to 1317 he acted as sheriff of Northumberland. In the latter year he was thrown into prison for resenting Edward II's wholly justifiable comment on the disturbed state of the Border. Promptly his kinsman, Gilbert de Middleton, the younger, broke out into revolt, and was joined by the Scots, and many of the English borderers. The rebels spread their plundering forays

<sup>295</sup> For the Swinburnes, of West Swinburn, see new *Northumberland County History*, iv, p. 276 *et seq.*

<sup>296</sup> John de Swinburn was a very wealthy man. He possessed property in Newcastle and at Colwell, and in 1296 he acquired the manor of Gunnerton (Gunwarton), which went to his youngest son, Robert. In the roll of 1296 Gunnerton's 'richest' taxpayer and owner was Nicholas de Gunewarton, who paid on 6*l.* 14*s.* 8*d.* (Transcript, p. 5). His claim to Gunnerton was disputed by his uncle Peter on the grounds of illegitimacy. This may have been the cause of the sale to John de Swinburn, who was wise enough to buy from Nicholas, and also secure a quit-claim from Peter. New *Northumberland County History*, iv, p. 325. John de Swinburn died in 1313, or just before, for in 1313 the bishop of Durham granted an indulgence for the souls of John and his wife Avicia.

as far as Yorkshire, and even captured Lewis Beaumont, bishop of Durham, and a cardinal, who was one of his companions. Gilbert was finally besieged and captured in Mitford castle. Betrayed by his own men, he was executed, and his own estates and those of his cousin, Sir John de Middleton of Belsay, were forfeited to the crown.<sup>297</sup> Adam de Swinburn, on his death in 1326, left three daughters as his co-heiresses. Christian married John de Widdrington, Elizabeth became the wife of Roger Heron, afterwards lord of Ford, and the third, Barnaba, by his second wife, Idonea de Graham, carried East Swinburn itself to her husband, John de Strivelyn,<sup>298</sup> through whom it passed to the Middletons of Belsay.

One mile east of West Swinburn is the vill of Colwell. Here John de 'Swyneburne' paid on 3*l.* 17*s.* 0*d.* in 1296, and the *next* names on the roll are Adam, son of John, and 'Symon, son of John,' who paid on 2*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.*, and 2*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* respectively.<sup>299</sup> It is highly probable that Adam and John are identical with Sir John de Swyneburne of East Swinburn, and Adam, his son, but there is another Adam de Swynburne at Colwell,<sup>300</sup> as Hodgson seems to assume. Mr. J. C. Hodgson, however, identifies<sup>298</sup> Adam the sheriff, with the Adam de 'Swyneburne' whose name comes *immediately* after Simon's, on the Colwell section of the roll, as assessed at 3*l.* 7*s.* 0*d.* It is a curious fact that there are two 'Inquisitiones post mortem' of 'Adam de Swyneburn,' one dated

<sup>297</sup> Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 352. His account is based on the *Scalacronica* (Maitland Club ed., p. 144). However it must be said that Mr. J. C. Hodgson (in the new *Northumberland County History*, iv, p. 307) effectively criticizes the received version of Adam's arrest by pointing out that he was blackmailing the Collectors of Peter's Pence at Durham as late as December 6 of that year, 1317, while the kidnapping of the bishop by Gilbert de Middleton took place on September 1.

<sup>298</sup> For the Swinburns of East Swinburn, see new *Northumberland County History*, iv, p. 309.

<sup>299</sup> Transcript, p. 19.

<sup>300</sup> Hodgson, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 233. It is only fair to admit that Hodgson knows nothing of 'Simon, son of John,' of whom, despite his comparatively high assessment, I have been unable to trace outside the roll of 1296.

1318, and the other 1326.<sup>301</sup> The holdings are, to a large extent, identical, but the latter inquisition contains certain Northumberland properties not mentioned in the former. Moreover, the heir of the Adam who died in 1318 is given as Henry, aged 22, while the heirs of the later inquisition are Adam's daughter, Barnaba, aged 34, and his grandsons, Gerard de Woderington, and William Heron, sons of his two other daughters, Christiana and Elizabeth respectively.

Mr. J. C. Hodgson, who, of course, knew of these two inquisitions, boldly cuts the Gordian knot by saying that they both referred to the same man. Adam the sheriff died in 1318, and both his estates and those of his son, Henry, were confiscated, according to his view, and on the deposition of Edward II, a fresh inquisition was taken, and the estates were restored to his surviving daughter, Barnaba, and his two grandsons. He accounts for the change of heirs by assuming that Henry had died in the meantime, and he suggests<sup>302</sup> that the reason why Barnaba got East Swinburn, was that she was the only full sister to Henry, who would have been heir.<sup>303</sup>

At Hephale or Hepple, Luke Taylleboys paid on 14*l.* 0*s.* 2*d.*<sup>309</sup> He was lord of the vill and head of the family which long held Hepple, and only died out in the male line in 1541. The family of Taylleboys was considered important enough to intermarry

<sup>301</sup> *Cal. of Inq.*, vol. VI, nos. 164 and 751.

<sup>302</sup> *New Northumberland County History*, IV, p. 308. In its original form this paper discussed the two views more at length, but Dr. Dendy, to whom the writer is indebted for much kind help and criticism, informs him that Sir Arthur Middleton, of Belsay, is on the point of publishing a full account of the whole matter based on family documents.

<sup>303</sup> John de Swynburne paid on 2*l.* 0*s.* 0*d.* at Belsay. Transcript, p. 26. Hervey de Swynburne paid on 2*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.* at Little Whittington. Transcript, 28.

<sup>309</sup> Transcript, p. 143. Lucas Taylleboys de Ophale appears in connexion with a *Placitum de quo Waranto*, of 18 Ed. I. Hodgson, I, pt. III, p. 168. For the Taylleboys genealogy see *Ibid.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 6, and *Arch. Ael.* (1st series), II, p. 334.

with the powerful house of the Umfrevills of Redesdale and Prudhoe.

It is by no means easy to settle a man's social position simply by the amount of his assessment in the roll, but when a man is distinctly styled 'dominus,' we can presume that he is in most cases the immediate lord of the vill.<sup>310</sup> The following table contains a list of all the taxpayers to whose Christian name the title 'dominus' is prefixed, and who have not been already dealt with:—

Name of Vill.	Name of 'dominus.	Assessment.			Ref. to Transcript. page.
		£	s.	d.	
Faludon (Fallogen) ...	Albert de Annewike <sup>311</sup> ...	8	1	0	126
Berewik (Berwick) ...	John de Berewik <sup>312</sup> ...	9	14	4	65
Borudoune (Burradon) ...	Walter de Bouroud <sup>313</sup> ...	9	13	0	145
Burnton (Brunton) West ...	William de Burnton <sup>314</sup> ...	6	19	4	60
Bradeford ...	Alexander de Bradeford <sup>315</sup> ...	4	10	4	120
[Cambhowe?]	John de Cambhowe <sup>316</sup> ...	10	17	0	112
Camhow (Cambo) ...	Walter de Camhow <sup>317</sup> ...	16	12	8	72
Coupland ...	David de Coupland <sup>318</sup> ...	8	16	8	102

<sup>310</sup> The converse of course does not necessarily hold good.

<sup>311</sup> He held it from Robert de Lucker, see *post* p. 248, n. 335.

<sup>312</sup> He held it from the barony of Mitford. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 383. John is referred to in *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 281.

<sup>313</sup> One of the ten towns of the Umfraville lordship of Harbottle. Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 23. See also *post* p. 246, n. 327.

<sup>314</sup> Brunton belonged to the barony of Whalton. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 382.

<sup>315</sup> Held as an independent barony, the smallest in the county. New *Northumberland County History*, i, pp. 294 *et seq.* *Testa de Nevill*, p. 382b.

<sup>316</sup> A John de Cambhowe was assessed at Rock on 4l. 8s. 0d. Transcript, p. 118. He held Horton from John de Vesey in 1289. *Cal. of Inq.*, ii, no. 723 (447).

<sup>317</sup> A Walter de Camhow was assessed at Hepple on 8l. 7s. 4d. Transcript, p. 143. Walter de Camhow, or Cambhou, was sheriff of Northumberland in 1278. He held 'Camhowe and Shafthow' from Margery de Gosebeck in 1285, as parts of the Bolbec fee (*Cal. of Inq.*, ii, no. 570). For him see Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 283. John de Cambhowe was his son.

<sup>318</sup> David's son Simon styled, 'fil domini,' paid on 1l. 10s. 0d. Coupland was held of the barony of Muschamp. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384b. For David see *Northl'd. Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), 229, 232, 234-6, and 387.

Name of Vill.	Name of 'dominus.'	Assessment.			Ref. to
		£	s.	d.	Trans- script page.
Halton... ..	William de Halton <sup>319</sup> ... ..	13	7	0	31
Horton... ..	Gwyssard de Charron <sup>320</sup> ... ..	9	2	8	59
Craucester (Craster)	Richard de Craucester <sup>321</sup> ... ..	10	4	8	45
Eschedon (Ashington)	Ralph de Eschedon <sup>322</sup> ... ..	1	3	0	81
Dychend (Detchant)...	Henry de Dychend <sup>323</sup> ... ..	11	16	4	123
Feyrstanhalth (Featherstone- haugh)	Thomas de Feyrstanhalth <sup>324</sup> ... ..	4	10	2	10
North Charleton ... ..	Ralph Fitz Roger <sup>225</sup> ... ..	4	9	0	121
North Midilton ... ..	John de Midilton <sup>326</sup> ... ..	5	6	4	110

<sup>319</sup> The three villis of Halton, Claverworth and Great Whittington formed a single 'thegnage' holding. For the family of William de Halton III (the one referred to here) see new *Northumberland County History*, x, 389 *et seq.*

<sup>320</sup> This was the son of the notorious adventurer who came over to England in the suite of Peter of Savoy, uncle of Henry III's queen Eleanor. He was sheriff in 1267-1270. For him see Hodgson, vol. II, pt. ii, pp. 260-1, and new *Northumberland County History*, ix, p. 250 *et seq.* Horton was held of the barony of Whalton. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 382.

<sup>321</sup> Richard de Craucester held Craster for half a knight's fee from 'Edmund the king's brother, who died seised of the liberty of Emildon in 1298.' *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 423 (p. 304). See also *Northumberland County History*, II, 171.

<sup>322</sup> Ashington was held of the barony of Bothal. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 387. For Ralph himself see *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 208, 288, and 397.

<sup>323</sup> Dychend was held of the barony of Muschamp by one quarter of a knight's fee. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384b. *Northumberland County History*, I, p. 401. *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 403, p. 226.

<sup>324</sup> He held the manor of 'Feyrstanhalth' from the barony of Nicholas de Bolteby in Tindale, in socage and by half a mark rent, Hodgson, vol. III, pt. ii, p. 354. 'Thomas de Feyrstanhalth, junior' (his son), paid here, on 2l. 6s. 6d., and a 'Thomas de Fethersthanawe' paid on 3l. 19s. 8d. at Bradford (*Transcript*, p. 16).

<sup>325</sup> He was son and heir of 'Roger, son of Ralph' (*Excerpta e Rot. Fin.* II, 122), who, according to *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384, held North Charlton of the barony of Vescy. He successfully pleaded the statute of Merton against his tenant, Robert de Doxford, executor of Robert Mautalent's will, and made a vain attempt to claim 'pit and gallows' for his manor of Ditchburn, which he held from Edward I. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 143 and 327. Bain's *Calendar*, I, no. 2254.

<sup>326</sup> He was son of another John de Middleton, who in 1240 held half of

Name of Vill.	Name of 'dominus.'	Assessment.			Re. to Trans- script. page.
		£	s.	d.	
Neddirton (Netherton) ...	John de Nedderton <sup>327</sup> ...	4	7	4	145
Heddon on the Wall... ..	Walter de Otrinton <sup>328</sup> ...	4	16	6	31
Reveley ... ..	Robert de Reveley <sup>329</sup> ...	4	10	0	149
Woderington (Widdrington)	Gerard de Woderington <sup>330</sup> ...	4	3	4	80

Besides the above, to whose name 'dominus' always occurs as a prefix, *e.g.*, dominus Albertus, dominus Johannes, there are six instances where the word 'dominus' follows instead of precedes the Christian name of the taxpayer:—

Name of Vill.	Style of Taxpayer.	Assessment.			Ref. to Trans- script. page.
		£	s.	d.	
Burnton West (West Brunton)	Walterus dominus de Burnton ...	2	10	0	60
Faudon ... ..	Robertus dominus de Faudon ...	3	19	0	60
Lucker ... ..	Robertus dominus de Lucker ...	13	8	8	124
Mulssen (Mousen) ... ..	Henricus dominus de eadem ...	8	17	4	122
Ponteland ... ..	Ricardus dominus Curtays ...	1	15	0	66
Ulcester (Outchester) ...	Robertus dominus de eadem ...	12	19	0	124

There are also examples of the similar use of 'domina' in the Glendale ward at Kyleo, Holburn and Barmoor, although the Christian name is omitted, but in the case of the last, and perhaps also of the other two, the unnamed lady was probably the widow of the former tenant.<sup>331</sup>

It seems impossible to take this use of the word 'dominus' as indicating that the villas were held 'in drengage,' since only one

North Middleton or Middleton Morell from the barony of Bolbec. Margaret de Middleton, mother of the former and so widow of the latter John, paid on 39l. 18s. 6d. in this vill. Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 303.

<sup>327</sup> Netherton was one of the ten towns of the Umfraville lordship of Harbottle. Hodgson, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 23. They were held by the Umfravilles of the barony of Alnwick. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384.

<sup>328</sup> Heddon on the Wall was held of the barony of Bolbec (*Testa de Nevill*, p. 382), but I cannot trace Walter de Otrinton.

<sup>329</sup> Reveley (Angerham, or Ingram, cum Reveley) was another of the ten towns referred to in *n.* 327.

<sup>330</sup> Widdrington was held of the barony of Whalton. Hodgson, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 225.

<sup>331</sup> See *ante*, p. 229, and *post* p. 249.

of them, Mousen, occurs in Hodgson Hinde's list.<sup>332</sup> Perhaps, however, the position of *dominus* after the Christian name means that the taxpayer in question had not formally taken up his knighthood. For example:—Robert de Ulcester held one knight's fee of Robert de Muschamp in 1249, and in 1278 another Robert, perhaps his son, and identical with the Robert referred to in the roll of 1296, was threatened with distraint of knighthood.<sup>333</sup> It may be argued against this theory that Ponteland did not belong to 'Ricardus dominus Curtays (? Surtees) in 1296. Originally part of the Mitford inheritance, it had been alienated to William de Valence, half-brother of Henry III, 1264, by the owner, Roger Bertram, perhaps to obtain pardon for his share in the rebellion. William de Valence died in June 1296, and, therefore, Curtays may perhaps have been holding the fortalice of Ponteland for him earlier in that year.<sup>334</sup> However, it is difficult to assume that the position of 'dominus' after a man's Christian name is accidental, when in the same vill of West Brunton we find *dominus* Willelmus de Burnton, and Walterus *dominus* de Burnton, assessed at 6*l.* 19*s.* 4*d.* and 2*l.* 10*s.* respectively. Perhaps it is only a coincidence that the six vills fall

<sup>332</sup> In the roll of 1296 the actual word 'dreng' does not occur as a title, but in forms such as Drynge it occurs as a surname, e.g., Peter Drynge, who was assessed on 2*l.* 13*s.* 0*d.* at Killingworth. Transcript, p. 58. For list of vills held 'in drengage,' see Hodgson Hinde, p. 257. For Mousen, see new *Northumberland County History*, I, p. 209.

<sup>333</sup> Robert held Ulcester for one knight's fee of the old enfeoffment. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384*b*. See also *Cal. of Inq.*, I, no. 202, and new *Northumberland County History*, I, p. 201.

<sup>334</sup> Hodgson, II, ii, p. 41, 'Ricardus dominus Curtays' is not mentioned in the I.P.M. of William of Valence. *Cal. of Inq.*, III, no. 362. He was perhaps the son of the Richard Curtays who in 1240 held from the king in chief the vill of Gosford, which had been in his family since the time of Henry I. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 392*b*. The only other possible member of the family I can trace in the roll is 'Hugo Curteys,' who paid on 1*l.* 9*s.* 0*d.* at Calverdon Darayns (Transcript, p. 67). For Nicholas, son of Walter Curteys, of North Gosforth, ward of Henry Scot, mayor of Newcastle, see *post* p. 272.

into two well-marked geographical groups, of which the northern is near the 'Old Castle' at Bamburgh, while the southern is near the 'New Castle' on the Tyne.<sup>335</sup>

Perhaps a brief reference should be made to the use of the word 'magister' before certain names in the roll. It is most commonly used as the title of the head of one of the hospitals, dealt with later in this article,<sup>336</sup> but it is also used of others, perhaps because they have held official rank. For example, the notorious foreign adventurer, Guischart de Charron, who was sheriff of Northumberland under Henry III, and was also employed locally in judicial matters by Edward I,<sup>337</sup> may be intended by the taxpayer who is styled 'magister Gyssarde' as a taxpayer at Horton,<sup>338</sup> near Wooler, although at the better-known Horton,<sup>339</sup> near Blyth, he is described as 'dominus Gwyssard.' Magister Roger de Hecham<sup>340</sup> and magister John le Surrays<sup>341</sup> were burgesses of Newcastle, as was, probably, magister Adam de Novo Castro,<sup>342</sup> who was assessed on 1*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, at Apperley.

Women as well as men were assessed to the Lay Subsidy of 1296, probably in their capacity of householders. It is even

<sup>335</sup> Of the remaining vills, Lucker (together with South Charlton, Hoppen and Fallogen) were held by Robert by service of one knight's fee and 13*s.* 4*d.* yearly for castle-guard from the barony of Alnwick (new *Northumberland County History*, I, pp. 234 *et seq.*, and *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 536 (p. 316), and *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 383*b* and 384, while Fawdon and Brunton were members of the barony of Whalton, *Testa de Nevill*, p. 382. <sup>336</sup> *Post* p. 259.

<sup>337</sup> *Cal. of Patent and Close Rolls*, and *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), *passim*. Incidentally, it may be added, he did not prove either incorruptible or trustworthy.

<sup>338</sup> Transcript, p. 107. He paid on 2*l.* 18*s.* 10*d.* Unfortunately, his I.P.M. is missing. Horton, near Wooler, was held by William Turberville for one half of a knight's fee of the barony of Vescy in 1240 (*Testa de Nevill*, p. 384). In 1316 Edmund Tubervill was its owner, but  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the manor was held of him *except 129 acres of arable and 7 acres of meadow* by Robert 'Turbelvill' who died in that year.

<sup>339</sup> Transcript, p. 54. <sup>340</sup> Transcript, pp. 60 and 43, and see *post* p. 280.

<sup>341</sup> Transcript, p. 40, and see *post* p. 290. <sup>342</sup> Transcript, p. 11.

possible that they were recognized as having chattels separate from that of their husbands, at least for the purpose of taxation. Sometimes the taxpayer is definitely styled 'vidua,' or 'relicta,' and then the husband can be with certainty counted as dead, but there are cases where the woman is styled 'uxor,' *i.e.*, wife, not widow, as in the case of 'Alice uxor Ade de Horseley,<sup>343</sup> who paid on 2*l.* 0*s.* 8*d.* at Stanton, and there is the example of the husband and wife being assessed in different vills, already referred to.<sup>344</sup> However, it is curious to find entries where the wife's Christian name does not appear at all, but where she is merely described as *e.g.*, 'the wife of John, son of Ralph,' who paid on 1*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.* at Newbiggin.<sup>345</sup>

Some of these taxpayers bear the prefix 'domina,' or lady. They were probably in most cases the widows of deceased *domini* and some were very well off. However, in such cases the lady is not as a rule described as 'vidua.' The following table may be interesting:—

Name.	Vill.	Assessment.			Ref. in Transcript. page.
		£	s.	d.	
Domina [Anon. <sup>346</sup> ] ... ..	Barmoor ... ..	22	3	4	110
Domina [Anon. <sup>347</sup> ] ... ..	Kylum (Kyloe) ... ..	2	11	8	105
Domina [Anon. <sup>348</sup> ] ... ..	Honburn (Holburn) ... ..	2	6	0	106
Domina Alicia Vidua <sup>349</sup> ... ..	Broomhaugh ... ..	2	11	1	13

<sup>343</sup> Transcript, p. 73. There were two taxpayers named Adam at Horseley. See Transcript, p. 68.

<sup>344</sup> John 'buton' paid on 2*l.* 17*s.* 3*d.* at Thornton, his wife 'Elene. uxor botun,' paid on 2*l.* 12*s.* 10*d.*, and his son, 'Adam fil. boton' on 1*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* in the neighbouring vill of Witton Shields, Transcript, 75 and 76. See *ante*, p. 225.

<sup>345</sup> Transcript, p. 94.

<sup>346</sup> See *ante*, pp. 229 and 246.

<sup>347</sup> She was perhaps the widow of Eustace de Kilei, who held Kyloe from the Muschamps in 1275. Raine *North Durham*, p. 191. *Testa de Nevill*, 384*b.*

<sup>348</sup> Holburn was held of the barony of Muschamp by one quarter of a knight's fee in 1240 by James de Hoburn. The lady may have been his daughter or his son's widow. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384*b.*

<sup>349</sup> Broomhaugh belonged to the barony of Bolbec. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 382. The Lady Alicia may have been the free widow who held seven acres of land and paid 12*d.* and one lb. of cumin to Hugh Bolbec in 1262, or more probably her daughter. *New Northumberland County History*, vi, p. 262.

Name.	Vill.	Assessment.			Ref. in Transcript page.
		£	s.	d.	
Domina Avora <sup>350</sup> ... ..	Hayden ... ..	14	9	0	8
Domina Johanna de Corbet <sup>351</sup> ... ..	Stanton ... ..	11	0	8	72
Domina Aline de Cranwood <sup>352</sup> ... ..	Screnwood ... ..	1	17	0	136
Domina Johanna <sup>353</sup> ... ..	Beanley ... ..	2	7	0	126
Domina Juliana <sup>354</sup> ... ..	West Swinburn ... ..	2	10	0	4
Domina Lucia <sup>355</sup> ... ..	Akeld ... ..	10	15	2	160
Domina Isabella de Vesey <sup>356</sup> ... ..	Chatton ... ..	5	17	0	128
Domina Luciana de Walinton ... ..	Wallington ... ..	4	10	4	73

It will be seen from the above table that the 'dominae' mentioned in the roll are in general assessed lightly, and the title is applied rather arbitrarily. For example, lady Isabella de 'Vescy,' although widow of the great lord of Alnwick, John de Vescy, is merely styled Isabella de 'Vessy' at Bulmer-Dene-wick.<sup>357</sup> Moreover her assessment in 1296 bore no real relation to her total wealth as is so often the case in the roll. Again her assessment of 4*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.* might mislead us as to the importance of lady Luciana de 'Walinton.' Actually, she was the widow of John de Middleton, who had succeeded to a moiety of Belsay in right of his first wife, a daughter of Walter le Scot,

<sup>350</sup> Hayden was held of the barony of Tindale. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 381.

<sup>351</sup> Stanton was held of the Gospatric barony. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 385*b*. The Lady Johanna was heiress to Stanton and widow of Walter de Corbet. Hodgson, vol. II, pt. ii, p. 109. The grave slabs of Sir Walter Corbet and his wife Johanna were discovered at Newminster in 1914. *Proc. Soc. Ant. Newc.*, 3 ser., vi, p. 211.

<sup>352</sup> Screnwood was held of the barony of Alnwick. It is wrongly printed 'St'venwod' in *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384. Domina Alina was probably the daughter of the Erchebald de Duneglas and his wife Alina, who were tenants in a Feet of Fines made at Newcastle in 1240 with Robert Batayle, lord of the vill as plaintiff. See *North. Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ., p. 407).

<sup>353</sup> The lady Johanna was probably the daughter or son's widow of the John of Beneleye, who held the manor of Beanley c. 1240. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 385*b*.

<sup>354</sup> For the lady Juliana see *ante*, p. 240.

<sup>355</sup> The lady Lucia was probably the daughter or son's widow of the William de Akeld, who held 'Akyld, Coupland, and Yever, of the barony of Muschamp c. 1240. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 384.

<sup>356</sup> For the lady Isabella de Vesey (Vescy) see *ante*, p. 237.

<sup>357</sup> Transcript, p. 116.

and to a moiety of Thornborough, and lands in Wallington by the death of his father. The heir to the Belsay and Thornborough lands was John's son by his first wife, Walter, surnamed le Scot of Welton, *jure uxoris*,<sup>358</sup> but it is possible that the Wallington lands went in part at least to the children of Luciana.<sup>359</sup> The roll mentions Alicia de Walinton and William de Walinton, who paid respectively on 2*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* and 2*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.*, and a Richard de Walington, who was a juror of the ward and paid on 2*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*<sup>360</sup> Which, if any, of these were the children of Luciana, it is impossible to say, nor can we prove the possible relationship to Luciana of the 'John Grey de Walynton,' who witnessed a Bywell deed at York in 1318.<sup>361</sup>

Other interesting names of ladies of good social standing, but not styled 'dominae,' are Margaret de Middleton, who has already been referred to,<sup>362</sup> and Alicia Gobyon, who was assessed on 5*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.* at Longhirst.<sup>363</sup> A third taxpayer, Christiana del Plessis, who paid on 4*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.* at Shotton and on 1*l.* 19*s.* 4*d.* at the neighbouring vill of Clifton,<sup>364</sup> was probably the daughter or

<sup>358</sup> New Northumberland County History, x, pp. 327 and 328.

<sup>359</sup> Sibylla de Crauden held Wallington of the barony of Bolbeck in 1240 (*Testa de Nevill*, p. 382), and the Philip de Crauden who was distrained for knighthood in 1278 was perhaps her son. Hodgson, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 253, admits that he is unable to trace the passing of the land from the Crauden to the Grey de Wallington family. Perhaps Luciana was heiress of the Crauden family, and Philip's sister or cousin. In 1269 she and her husband, John de Middleton, were plaintiffs in a Feet of Fines at Newcastle (*Northumberland Assize Rolls*, 88 Surt. Soc. publ., p. 417), concerning lands in Wallington. As John de Middleton pre-deceased his wife some considerable time before 1296, Luciana may have been the mother of John Grey de Walynton by a second husband.

<sup>360</sup> Transcript, p. 83. A 'Richard de Walington' also paid on 1*l.* 9*s.* 6*d.* at Halton. Transcript, p. 31.

<sup>361</sup> Hodgson, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 253*n.*

<sup>362</sup> *Ante*, p. 246, *n.* 326.

<sup>363</sup> Transcript, p. 70. Alice Gobyon was probably the mother of Robert Bertram who at the age of 21 succeeded his kinsman, Robert Bertram, of Bothal, in 1308. *Cal. of Inq.*, v, no. 52 (p. 17). For other members of the family see *ante*, pp. 225 and 232.

<sup>364</sup> Transcript, p. 54.

daughter-in-law of the John de Plessis who held Shotton, Blagden and North Weetslade in 1240 of Roger de Merlay.<sup>365</sup> Another name, that of Dionis de Bechefeld, who paid on *2l. 4s. 4d.*,<sup>366</sup> recalls the thrilling abduction of a wealthy widow by Walter de Swethop, steward of the liberty of Redesdale, who desired to marry her to his son, Richard.<sup>367</sup>

The information disclosed by the roll as to the position of women in the county on the eve of its ruin by the Scots proves that, at any rate, for taxable purposes they were considered to have a separate chattels, even in the life-time of their husbands. Some of them were comparatively well-off, although clearly of humble birth. 'Emma, wife of William,' who paid on *6l. 2s. 3d.* at Akeld,<sup>368</sup> is only one of many such instances.

The roll contains a large number of entries relating to payment of the eleventh and seventh by ecclesiastics, although the entry already quoted<sup>369</sup> from the dorse of the roll states that 'from the sum total of the eleventh of the county is deducted the sum of *8l. 2s. 11d.* for the eleventh and seventh of the personal possessions of the religious and others in consideration of their grant to the king of a tenth of their goods and benefices in the same year, and of the goods of the master of the Knights Templar and his villeins who made fine with the king for their eleventh.'<sup>370</sup> Probably the solution is that certain of the clergy had wealth and possessions apart from their official income—*i.e.*, their 'spiritualities,' and paid only on these non-official possessions.

Before discussing the actual meaning of the evidence furnished by the roll it may be convenient to present the evidence in tabular form so as to admit of easier reference. It is only incidentally that the roll mentions the clerical status of the taxpayer and it is highly improbable that the list given below is exhaustive, although it may contain many names of the clergy especially of the 'chaplains' which have been hitherto unknown.

<sup>365</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 383b.

<sup>366</sup> Transcript, p. 24.

<sup>367</sup> See *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. xxv and 369, and the 'Hundred Roll' printed in *Arch. Ael.* (3rd series), III, p. 190.

<sup>368</sup> Pp. xxv and 369.

<sup>369</sup> See *ante*, p. 188.

<sup>370</sup> MS. Roll, m.l.d.

PAYMENTS BY ECCLESIASTICS.

253

Name of Parish or Vill.	Name of Ecclesiastic.	Assessment. £ s. d.	In what Vill Assessed.	Ref. in Trans. Page.
<i>Rector.</i>				
Mitford ... ..	Stephen <sup>371</sup>	... 5 19 0	Pykeden [Pigdon]	... 69
<i>Vicars.</i>				
Corbridge ... ..	Anon. <sup>372</sup>	... 4 6 6	Manerium de Coys [? Cold Side]	32
Shilbottle ... ..	Thomas	... 2 8 0	Schiplingbotill (Shilbottle)	133
<i>Parsons.</i>				
Ditchburn <sup>373</sup>	{ Adam ...	... 2 7 6	Dicheburn	... 118
	{ Walter ...	... 1 2 6	Dicheburn...	... 118
Matfen East ,	Richard	... 3 7 0	Mathefen E. [Matfen E]...	21
Stanwrcham(? Stam- fordham)...	Anon. <sup>374</sup>	... 4 13 4	Dodden West (Duddo W.)	53
<i>Clerics.</i>				
Alwinton ... ..	Henry ...	... 1 4 8	Alwenton ... ..	147
Belford ... ..	John ...	... 0 12 6	Belford ... ..	112
Bewick ... ..	{ Alexander	... 1 13 10	Bewyk ... ..	89
	{ Thomas	... 0 15 2	„ ... ..	89
Bolam ... ..	Thomas...	... 0 15 4	Bolum ... ..	64
Bradford ... ..	Thomas	... 3 3 10	Bradford ... ..	16
Branxton ... ..	Robert	... 0 17 9	Branckirton ... ..	104
Chevington E.	Robert	... 0 14 4	Chevington E. ... ..	79
Druridge ... ..	Simon ...	... 1 17 2	Dryrige ... ..	80
Embleton ... ..	Willam	... 2 12 8	Emildon ... ..	98
Fowberry ... ..	John de Follebire <sup>375</sup>	11 6	Follebire ... ..	127
Holywell ... ..	Robert	... 2 4 0	Halliwell ... ..	50
Haydon ... ..	Walter ...	... 2 0 6	Hayden ... ..	8
Killingworth	John ...	... 2 2 8	Kyllingwrth ... ..	58
	Adam ...	... 1 3 0	Kyrkerl ... ..	17
Kirk Harle	{ William	... 0 12 0	Kyrkerl ... ..	17

<sup>371</sup> Stephen does not appear among the taxpayers of Mitford. See Transcript, p. 85. Mitford is now a vicarage. Cf. *post* pp. 225 n, 379, and 257.

<sup>372</sup> MS. reads vicar 'de Corbr.' His name was Walter de Warthewyk. For him see new *Hist. Northd.*, x, 200.

<sup>373</sup> It is not absolutely clear that Adam and Walter were really ecclesiastics. Technically there could not be two parsons (*personae*) in the same parish, but one may have been retired.

<sup>374</sup> MS. reads 'Parsona de Stanwrcham.' Geographically, Stannington is more probable than Stamfordham.

<sup>375</sup> MS. styles him 'Johannes de Follebiri clericus.' He was the most highly assessed man in the vill.

## 254 NORTHUMBERLAND AT END OF THIRTEENTH CENTURY:

Name of Parish or Vill.	Name of Ecclesiastic.	Assessment. £ s. d.	In what Vill Assessed.	Ref. in Trans. Page.
<i>Clerics—continued.</i>				
Kirkheaton ...	Robert ...	... 0 16 0	Kyrke Heton ...	... 23
Merdisfen (Mason)	John ...	... 2 2 0	Merdisfen ...	... 63
Newbiggen ...	John ...	... 0 15 2	Neubighing ...	... 93
Neuton near (Roth- bury)	Adam ...	... 3 0 0	Neuton in Roubir	... 144
Pandon ...	John ...	... 1 0 0	Pamped' extra burgum	... 51
Thockrington ...	John ...	... 1 7 6	Throckerington ...	... 26
Throckley ...	John ...	... 1 10 6	Throckley ...	... 65
Welton ...	William ...	... 0 18 0	Welteden [as Juror]	... 93
West Matfen (in West Tynedale)	Robert ...	... 2 6 4	West Matfen ...	... 15
[No vill given] ..	Laurence	... 1 4 0	[Juror of West Tyndale]	11
Witton Nether with Witton Shields	Walter	... 1 18 4	Witton cum le Schell	... 76
Woodhorn ...	Robert, son of Adam Baret	1 8 0	Wodehorn ..	... 82
<i>Chaplains.</i>				
Akeld ...	John ...	... 1 7 6	Akild ...	... 109
Alwinton ...	Germanus <sup>376</sup>	... 1 10 0	Alwenton ...	... 146
Bavington (Little)	Edmund	... 0 17 10	Parva Bavington ...	... 22
Belford ...	Sir Alan	... 4 11 2	Belford ...	... 112
Birtley ...	William	... 4 11 0	Birteley ...	... 6
Burradon ...	John ...	... 1 0 0	Borudoune ...	... 146
Byker ...	Sir Adam	... 2 14 4	Byker ...	... 57
Coupland ...	Sir Alexander	... 3 16 0	Coupeland ...	... 102
Cramlington ...	Sir William	... 2 4 8	Cramlington ...	... 54
Fenton ...	Sir Ranulph	... 4 10 10	Fenton ...	... 95
Gosforth (North) ...	Sir Robert	... 1 10 8	Gosford N....	... 52
Gunnerton ..	Richard	... 1 12 11	Gunewarton ...	... 5
Ilderton ...	Hugo ...	... 1 0 8	Ildirton ...	... 149
?Ouston ...	Sir Michael	... 2 5 6	Olkiston ...	... 32
Shotton ...	Sir Robert	... 5 3 4	Schotton ...	... 54
Stamfordham ...	Robert ...	... 0 17 8	Stanfordham ...	... 29
Stanton ...	John ...	... 1 5 10	Stanton ...	... 73
Swinburn West	Walter ...	... 1 0 10	West Swyneburne	... 4
Thornbrough ...	Richard	... 2 4 2	Thorneburch ...	... 30
Thornton ...	Thomas ..	... 2 0 6	Thornton ...	... 75
Twizel ...	William	... 1 17 0	Twysill ...	... 55

<sup>376</sup> He may have been chaplain of the hospital there. See Clay, *Medieval Hospitals of England*, p. 312.

Name of Parish or Vill.	Name of Ecclesiastic.	Assessment.			In what Vill Assessed.	Ref. in Trans Page.
		£	s.	d.		
<i>Chaplains— continued.</i>						
Yghow (Ingoe) ...	Roger ...	...	3	0	6	Ighow ... .. 16
Waringford <sup>377</sup> ...	Sir Robert ...	...	4	16	4	Waryndham cum Creklaw 97 [Warrenton with Kirkley]
Whelpington E. ...	John ...	...	3	2	10	Welpington E. ... .. 18
Witton (Nether) with Witton Shields	Peter ...	...	2	3	0	Witton cum le Schell ... 76
Widdrington ...	Sir Roger ...	...	0	14	6	Woderington ... .. 80
<i>? Presbyters.<sup>378</sup></i>						
Heddon-on-the- Wall	Alan 'presbit'	...	1	3	6	Hedon sup' Mur' ... .. 31
Merdisfen ...	Adam 'Pres- byter'	...	1	8	4	Merdisfen ... .. 63
Ponteland ...	Adam 'Prest'	...	0	18	2	Ponteland ... .. 67

From the above tables it will be seen that one rector, two vicars, four parsons, 28 clerics, 26 chaplains, and, perhaps, three presbyters, were assessed to the Lay Subsidy of 1296 with respect to their non-official possessions, but it is impossible to say definitely, what proportion of the ecclesiastical establishment of Northumberland was constituted by these 64 clergy. Not only do we find both a 'cleric' and a chaplain in some vill, *e.g.*, Alwinton and Belford, but the above list allows barely one cleric for every seven of the 400 vill in the shire. Probably the names of some ecclesiastics lie hidden among the names of those taxpayers who have no distinguishing label, and it is certain that there were rectors,<sup>379</sup> whose endowments were sufficient for their sustenance and the same may hold good of the vicars. In

<sup>377</sup> Sir Robert may have been chaplain at the leper hospital here. See Clay, *Medieval Hospitals of England*, p. 312.

<sup>378</sup> There is also a mysterious Julian Prechur of even more doubtful ecclesiastical status who was assessed on 11s. 6d. at South Milburn. Transcript, 62.

<sup>379</sup> It is perhaps significant that the only rector named, Stephen, rector of Mitford, is not mentioned under Mitford. Transcript, p. 69.

at least one instance, at Horsley,<sup>380</sup> the vicar's son is referred to but the vicar himself does not appear on the roll. Again there are side references to clerics and chaplains, who are not personally referred to, at Alnwick, Belford, North Middleton, Rotheley and Woodhorn.<sup>381</sup> The parish of Long Benton is a good illustration of the omissions in the roll. The rector, William de Umfravill, is not so designated and is only assessed at 16s. There is no chaplain mentioned by name, although the chantry of the Blessed Virgin Mary had been founded in 1282 by the Scropes of Little Benton, but there is a John the cleric mentioned under Killingworth.<sup>382</sup>

The position of the ecclesiastic termed a rector or vicar is quite clear, but it is not so easy to say who the 28 clerics were if they were not merely in minor orders. Although some were assessed on under 1*l.* others were obviously among the wealthy, and one cleric at least, John de Follebiri, assessed on 7*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* was the most highly assessed man in Fowberry. We know too little about the ecclesiastical history of the county at this date to dogmatize, but the church in the see of Durham was rich enough, at any rate before the raid, to provide resident even if unbeneficed clergy for the more important centres, in addition to the endowed chantry priests.

The chaplains or *capellani* are easier to understand. The chaplains did not merely say masses at some chantry in a parish church, but they very often served a little local chapel in the outlying parts of the parish, whose site has in many cases faded even from tradition. Even before the Reformation, Scots' raids, pestilence and civil war, had done their work and many of the chapels were deserted and in ruins. Sometimes as perhaps at Alwinton and Warenford they served the local hospital. The

<sup>380</sup> Transcript, p. 68.

<sup>381</sup> Transcript, pp. 83, 112, 74, 74, 82.

<sup>382</sup> See *Desultory Notes of the Church and Vicarage of Long Benton*. M. A. Richardson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1843.

chaplains mentioned in the roll vary considerably in their assessment, the range being from the 14s. 6*d.* of Sir Roger of Widington to the 5*l.* 3s. 4*d.* of Sir Robert of Shotton. On the whole the chaplains seem to have been assessed at a slightly higher figure than the clerics, and in vills where both chaplain and cleric are found the former certainly appear to have been the more prosperous. Ten of the chaplains bear the prefix *dominus* or sir, but of course only in its medieval ecclesiastical sense.

One thing that emerges from the ecclesiastical entries on the roll is that the prohibition of clerical marriage was openly disregarded in thirteenth century Northumberland. In one case, at Alnwick, Agnes, is entered definitely as the wife—*uxor*—of Marcus the cleric.<sup>383</sup> The vicar of Horsley had a son as had the clerics of Belford, Rotheley, and Woodhorn, and the chaplains of North Middleton and Warrenton.<sup>384</sup> In the latter place Sir Robert the chaplain of the hamlet of Warenford, who had a son Adam, paid on by far the highest assessment of the vill 4*l.* 16s. 4*d.*, and seems to have been an important person. The only woman mentioned is 'Christiana,' who paid on 1*l.* 14s. 4*d.*, but has no label and so we cannot definitely identify her with the mother of Adam. Another probable case of clerical marriage occurs at Pykeden (Pigdon) where there are 'Stephen, rector of the church of Mitford,' and William, son of Stephen, although it should be added that 'rectoris' does not occur.<sup>385</sup> A third example of ecclesiastical marriage is perhaps to be found in the neighbouring vills of Linton and Woodhorn. In Linton Adam Baret paid on 1*l.* 5s. 6*d.* His son, Robert the cleric, definitely styled son of Adam Baret, paid on 1*l.* 8s. 0*d.* at Woodhorn, and in the same vill Adam, son of the cleric, paid on 14s. 0*d.*<sup>386</sup>

<sup>383</sup> Transcript, p. 83.

<sup>385</sup> Transcript, p. 69.

<sup>384</sup> Transcript, pp. 68, 112, 74, 82, 74, 97.

<sup>386</sup> Transcript, p. 82.

There are several references to the lord prior of Hexham.<sup>387</sup> The prior was assessed on 3*l.* 10*s.* at Slaley, 10*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.* at Wyden, 11*l.* 6*s.* 0*d.* at East Matfen, 9*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* and 17*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* at the Granges of Stelling and 'Chesburch' (Cheeseburn) respectively, a total of 52*l.* 1*s.* 1*d.*<sup>388</sup> In the case of the two granges, a writ from or to the prior seems to have been necessary before they could be entered.<sup>389</sup> There is also another reference to the prior. Between South Milburn and Whalton on the roll occurs 'Manerium Prioris de Haxam,' on which the prior is assessed at 22*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* Thus in all he is assessed at 72*l.* 7*s.* 5*d.*—the highest figure in the roll.

There are curiously few references to other monastic houses. It is perhaps not surprising to find the prior of Carlisle assessed in Northumberland, but the amount on which he paid at Wydon—12*s.*—is very small when compared with the 10*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.* of the prior of Hexham in the same vill.<sup>390</sup> Blanchland is only referred to once, at Styford, where the abbot is assessed on 1*l.* as compared with Sir Hugh Delaval's 5*l.* 19*s.* and the 12*l.* 11*s.* of the *manerium*, whose owner is not mentioned.<sup>391</sup> The prioress of Lambley paid on 5*l.* 16*s.*—apparently the only taxpayer in the vill. 'William of the abbey,' who paid on 2*l.* 15*s.* at Hepscot, probably belonged to the famous house of Newminster, but it is less easy to place Roger the kanon, who was assessed on 3*l.* 1*s.* 8*d.*, at Newham.<sup>392</sup> Thomas, 'the servant of the canons,'

<sup>387</sup> The spelling varies. 'Hexelsham,' 'Exiltham,' 'Hexilham,' 'Hexildesham,' 'Haxam' are all found. <sup>388</sup> Transcript, pp. 1, 9, 21, 31.

<sup>389</sup> The marginal note here reads, 'Breve Prior de Hexildisham.' The single word 'breve' occurs in the margin opposite the entry concerning the 'manerium' of the prior. Transcript, p. 62. 'Breve' also occurs opposite the vill of Falloden (Transcript, p. 126), and attached to the entry concerning Neshow are the words, 'Villa Magistri Militum Templi breve.'

<sup>390</sup> Transcript, p. 9. But the prior of Carlisle had tenants at Corbridge. See Transcript, p. 45.

<sup>391</sup> Transcript, p. 33, and see *ante* p. 227, n. 200. <sup>392</sup> Transcript, p. 61.

who was assessed on *l. 14s. 0d.*, at Kyloe,<sup>393</sup> was probably connected with the canons of Nostell.

One would not expect tithes to appear in the roll, but at the end of the entry of the Wylam taxpayers, we find Thomas Stranhale assessed on *6l.*, 'pro decima de Hirlaw,' and William de Stanop on the same sum for the tithe of Wylam.<sup>394</sup> Either the priory of Tynemouth had alienated or more probably leased the tithes of these two vills to laymen, or perhaps Thomas and William were stipendiary priests in charge of the district.

There are many references to hospitals in the roll. These were very largely intended for the accommodation of the sufferers from the medieval scourge of leprosy. By this name were designated the various forms of skin disease, often infectious, to which our ancestors were liable from their winter diet of salt meat and the scarcity of green food. The hospitals were endowed as a work of charity by some wealthy patron who provided for a master and a varying number of brethren or sisters under his care. In some instances the inmates were not lepers but simply 'aged and deserving poor.' The master had certain clerical duties to perform and, besides being responsible for the spiritual state of his little flock, he was legally master of the hospital's revenues except that he was bound to provide for the inmates according to the statutes. It is, as a rule, possible to find out from other sources the nature of the various hospitals of the county but the roll does not distinguish them. Their sites are, however, easy to find on a modern map for places marked 'Spittal' are quite common even where little else remains. Not all lepers were segregated in Northumberland, for at Fowberry, for example, Roger, who is styled 'leper,' is assessed on *l. 18s. 10d.*<sup>395</sup> The following table is an abstract of all the entries relating to hospitals outside Newcastle:—

<sup>393</sup> Transcript, p. 105.

<sup>394</sup> Transcript, p. 92.

<sup>395</sup> Transcript, p. 127.

Name of Hospital.	Name of Master.	In what vill Assessed.	Amount.			Ref. Trans. script.
			£	s.	d.	page.
Alliriburn <sup>396</sup> ...	Magister de Alliriburn... ..	Magna Tossyn	4	11	2	143
Alnwick ...	Hospital S. Leonardi de Anne- wicke ... ..	Bulmer ...	3	7	0	116
		Magister ejusdem loci ... ..	Denewike ...			
Boulton ...	Magister hospital de Boulton ...	Boulton ...	36	15	6	129
Chaceburn <sup>397</sup> ...	Magister de ... ..	Tranwell ...	7	8	0	55
Mitford <sup>398</sup> ...	Ospital ( <i>sic</i> in MS.) de Mitford	Benridge ...	2	3	4	68
Stagschaue ...	Hospital de Stagshaue ... ..	Stagshaue ...	2	9	4	34
Thropton ...	Magister Hospital S. Jacobi ...	Thropton ...	3	10	10	143
Welkeden <sup>399</sup> ...	Hospital de Welkeden ... ..	Welkeden ...	3	18	0	33
Wooler ...	Magister Ospitalis de Wlouer...	Hamildon ...	6	14	1	110
? Yverne <sup>400</sup> ...	Barnard de Ospital ( <i>sic</i> in MS.)	Yverne ...	1	11	10	101

Two other hospitals are referred to besides the above. The taxpayer at Neusome, or Newsham, styled William de Sancto Maria del Westgate was almost certainly the master of St. Mary's hospital, Westgate road, Newcastle. He was assessed on 8*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.*<sup>401</sup> Another interesting entry is that of the 'magister hospitalis' who paid on 1*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* in Spitilgat, then reckoned a separate vill from the town of Bamburgh.<sup>402</sup>

The roll contains several references to the Templars—the 'Militia Templi'—on the eve of their suppression by the pope. Their connexion with Northumberland is preserved in the farmhouse known as Temple Thornton,<sup>403</sup> which lies a little distant from the north bank of the Wansbeck facing Meldon park. In

<sup>396</sup> Rye-hill, N.W., of Great Tosson.

<sup>397</sup> Catchburn, a little east of Tranwell.

<sup>398</sup> Spital Hill between Mitford and Benridge.

<sup>399</sup> Spittle, a little S.E. of Welton.

<sup>400</sup> There is no indication in the roll whether Barnard belonged to a hospital at Yverne (Yeavinger) or as is possible to the hospital at Wooler.

<sup>401</sup> Transcript, p. 52.

<sup>402</sup> Transcript, p. 46. Miss R. M. Clay in *Medieval Hospitals of England*, p. 311, mentions XIII century hospitals at Alwinton, Bolam, Hartford, and Warkworth, of which I can find no trace in the roll.

<sup>403</sup> See *Arch. Ael.*, 2 ser. XVII, 40.

the roll the little vill which occupied this site in 1296 is termed Neshow and attached to the entry is the rubric: 'Villa Magistri Militiae Templi—breve.' Only three names appear:—William Dodding was assessed on 1*l.* 6*s.*, Adam, son of John, on 1*l.* 2*s.*, Richard, son of Andrew, on 1*l.* 1*s.*<sup>404</sup> Probably the vill was never a very large one and there are indications that the inhabitants were freely allowed to leave, no doubt on the usual terms of paying the head-tax or *chevagium*. Few of them had risen beyond the lower ranks of society in 1296, but they were scattered widely over the county, and are easily identified by the name Tempilman—in one instance latinized as 'Homo Templi.' Nicholas 'Homo Templi' had only wandered as far south as Kenton where he was assessed on 2*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* the richest of his clan.<sup>405</sup> At Burton, near Bamburgh, was Robert Tempilman, who paid on 16*s.* 9*d.* and still further north at Kyloe, Adam Tempilman paid on 1*l.* 14*s.* 0*d.*—the second richest of the wanderers<sup>406</sup>—and Alexander Tempilman on 11*s.* 6*d.* at Holburn.<sup>407</sup> The fifth and last of the men of the Temple, Roger Tempilman lived at Boulton, near Alnwick, where his assessment, 11*s.* 6*d.*, seemed to point to his being a cotman on the lands of the hospital there.<sup>408</sup>

So far as can be gathered from the entries in the roll the population of the county owed little to outside immigration in 1296. For the most part, such migration as took place was from the neighbouring villages to other villages, or to Newcastle. It was not easy for the free peasant to obtain a holding where he was not known, while the unfree had to take the risk of starvation if he went away secretly or agree to pay a special head-tax if he won his lord's permission to depart. There are very few names in the roll which can with any certainty be said to be those of persons who by birth or ancestry belong to other

<sup>404</sup> Transcript, p. 63.<sup>405</sup> Transcript, p. 60.<sup>406</sup> Transcript, p. 105.<sup>407</sup> Transcript, p. 106.<sup>408</sup> Transcript, p. 129.

counties. From Yorkshire came John de Driffeld, Hugo de Otley, Roger de Rypon, and perhaps William de Funtayns, while Walter de Lincoln and Robert de Grimesby were from the county across the Humber. Henry de London and William de London were only assessed on 1*l.* 2*s.* and 18*s.* respectively, and probably had good reason to hide themselves in the remote villages of Blenkinsop and Bradford, and the Scotsman, John de Perth, who paid on 13*s.* 4*d.* at Schipley, could not expect to find a fortune in the liberty of Emildon equal to those made by the 'Scots' who went to Newcastle. However, there were several other Scots in various parts of the county. Ranulph de Dover, who lived at Longbenton, and Elias de Donwiche, who lived at Pandon, had probably come by sea to Newcastle and were rather more prosperous. Occasionally we come across names which suggest that the original owners came from Durham or some other of the neighbouring counties, perhaps as escaping serfs.

The non-territorial names of the roll are often most interesting examples of the time when surnames properly so-called were becoming the custom. In the roll it is rare to find a person without some kind of a surname. Many of these defy interpretation, but others are sometimes very amusing. We can trace the origin of many modern names in examples such as 'Atte-tounend,' 'Attehill,' 'Atteredside,' 'Attedikes,' 'Attestanes,' 'Attemore,' 'Attegreen,' 'Attelydegate,' 'sub hoga,' 'ad pontem,' etc. Other names are merely rude attempts at humour which derive their point from some personal characteristic, usually a defect. Examples from the roll are: Adam Crakenot, Alan Roughhead, Goodrobyn, Henry Broadhead, John Armbruke, John Coldbones, Roger the fool, Robert Greteschanke, Robert Strabidheved (?twisted head), Robert Drinckemilke, Utting with the beard, William Brownbeard, William Bug. Names borrowed from animals and fishes are fairly common, such

as Colt, Herring, Lamprey, Wolf, etc. There is one Archer and one man emphatically styled Newcomer.

The Christian names in the roll are a most interesting study in themselves. Norman French names such as Bernard, Geoffrey, Gilbert, Laurence, Robert, are almost as popular as Henry, John, Thomas and William. Andrew, Mark, and Peter are fairly common, while Patrick is not very unusual. Paul is all but absent, although Elias is fairly common. The old Angle names have not survived to any large extent. The more usual are names like Huttred, Urkil and Utting, but Siward and Waltheof are also found. Albert, Edmund, and Edward are rarer. A few of the more extraordinary names taken almost at random are Unnane, Makky, Vered, Thurby, Effocke, Melcolinus, Tyocke, Tunnok, Edoke, and Medde.

The majority of the villagers are engaged in agricultural operations, or at any rate we can safely assume this in the absence of any descriptive epithet, but occasionally the entries refer to other occupations. As we might expect, the servants of the lords form the wealthiest section of the village community in many cases. We read of procurators or agents, seneschals or stewards, servientes—a word of vague meaning—butlers and other domestics. 'of the hall,' as they are styled. Of course, the usual village officers occur frequently. The prepositus, or reeve, is sometimes called a provost, as at Ancrum, Callaly, Framlington, and Trewhitt. Two reeves or two provosts to a vill are not unknown, while as if to compensate for the absence of even a single provost or reeve in some vills we find three provosts at Callaly and three reeves at Chatton. The reason for this apparent anomaly is perhaps that one or more of the superfluous officials served a neighbouring vill, as we find that Chatton, for example, is linked with 'Le scheles' in the roll. As a rule the reeves are among the more prosperous of the villagers. Less frequently the 'messor' or harvestman is men-

tioned as at Alnwick and Meldon, but he is not assessed as highly as the reeves of some villages. Naturally we find frequent references to the village millers, herdsmen, shepherds, smiths and pinders, and the following tradesmen are also mentioned: baker, brewer (sometimes actually an ale-wife), butcher, carpenter, carter, cobbler, cook, cooper, dyer, fisherman, forester, fuller, goldsmith, mason, mercer, porter, tailor, and tanner. These tradesmen are sometimes quite absent from whole districts, but on the other hand, we find, for example, that three of the fourteen taxpayers at Abberwick were carpenters.

#### THE BOROUGHES OF NORTHUMBERLAND IN 1296.

Strictly speaking, there were only three boroughs in the shire in 1296, for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Bamburgh and Corbridge alone pay at the borough rate of one-seventh. Each of these places was, either in 1296 or originally, a vill on the royal demesne. Corbridge seems to have been the capital of one of the sub-divisions of the old Anglian kingdom of Northumbria and remained in the possession of the kings of England until it was alienated by king John to Robert fitz Roger in 1204. Bamburgh, the capital of Bernicia, was almost certainly the 'Old Castle' of the shire, whose place was more and more taken by the 'New Castle' on the Tyne until it became but the shadow of its former self after the Wars of the Roses, and in 1545 was alienated by king Henry VIII to Sir John Forster. Newcastle was too important a place in the middle ages to allow of any risks being taken, and even the borough, despite its many charters, did not secure freedom from the sheriff of Northumberland till 1400. In Edward I's reign the fortifications were completed and thanks to them and the Scottish raids, Newcastle remained the only borough of importance down to quite modern times.

However, besides the three legal boroughs just mentioned there are other quasi-boroughs that deserve special notice and

are indeed in some cases given a special type of entry in the roll. After the entries for the wards of West Tynedale and East Tynedale there occurs a series of entries of villis grouped without any reference to their geographical position. First is the entry for Wooler<sup>409</sup> which is followed by a rubric giving the 'total for the ward of West Tynedale together with the vill of Wooler,' though there is no obvious connexion between the two. Then follows another rubric—'Taxatio Septime Novi Castri supra Tynam,' after which follow the entries for the separate parishes of Newcastle and the borough jury.<sup>410</sup> Then comes another rubric—'Taxatio Septime *ville* de Corbrig.' Similar rubrics introduce the entries for the *vills* of Bamburgh, Morpeth, Rothbury, Felton, and Warkworth which occur in that order. In each case a separate jury of twelve is mentioned.<sup>411</sup>

The roll then proceeds to give the entries for the ward 'Inter Tynam et Wanspike' and for the ward 'Inter Wanspike et Coket,' but after the jury of the latter ward has been duly entered, we find separate entries<sup>412</sup> for Alnwick, Alnmouth and Mitford, followed by a total for the whole ward, although Alnwick and Alnmouth are separated from Morpeth ward by the villis of Coketdale East.

In the case of all these boroughs and quasi-boroughs with the exception of Wooler, Felton, Warkworth and Mitford, separate borough juries appear, even at Rothbury where there are only 12 jurors and 12 non-jurors assessed to the lay subsidy. In the roll, Warkworth is definitely styled a 'borough' in another place,<sup>413</sup> and we know that Mitford was a 'borough.' Thus it is clear that the separate jury was by no means a decisive mark of distinction in a quasi-borough. In another membrane of the roll we find mention of the separate jury of the vill of Newbigging.

<sup>409</sup> Transcript, p. 34. <sup>410</sup> *Ibid.*, 35-43. <sup>411</sup> *Ibid.*, 43-49. <sup>412</sup> *Ibid.*, 83-85.

<sup>413</sup> Transcript, p. 78, where we learn that as at Bamburgh and Corbridge the borough did not comprise the whole vill.

One is tempted to say that the possession of a separate jury was dependent on the size of the vill, and yet Wooler contained 34 persons who paid the tax as compared with 24 at Rothbury, while Chatton and Alwinton each had 40 taxpayers and though they ranked on this account only after Newcastle, Corbridge and Newbigging, they have neither special jury nor special rubric in the roll.

It is possible that the explanation of the absence of a jury in such places as Felton and Warkworth lies in the fact that from poverty all the burgesses were not able to contribute to the lay subsidy. A jury would be impanelled as usual, but as the king was only concerned with the taxable inhabitants, only such inhabitants as paid to the lay subsidy appeared on the roll whether jurors or not. It is suggestive that at Alnmouth the rubric is 'Alnemewe cum xij Juratoribus,' and the words 'cum xij Juratoribus' may easily have been omitted from the next entry as to Mitford. In the next entry before Alnmouth, *i.e.*, Alnwick the rubric 'Alnewyke' corresponds with the rubric 'Middeford' but the entries for the jurors follow immediately on the list of the ordinary burgesses and are merely marked by a marginal note 'xij Juratores.' In the case of the former boroughs the totals for the ordinary burgesses and for the jurors appear under different rubrics.

We may say, therefore, that in the shire in 1296 there were two kinds of boroughs—the three royal boroughs of Newcastle, Corbridge and Bamburgh, and the baronial boroughs or quasi-boroughs about which very little is known. Certainly their rights would be as limited as were those of the burgesses of, say, Gateshead, Durham or Sunderland in the neighbouring palatinate.

The rubric for Newcastle is simply 'Taxatio Septime Novi Castri supra Tynam,' and the final rubric is 'Summa Septime ville Novi Castri supra Tinam.' The 'vill' throughout the roll

is purely a geographical term, and a comparison of the entries for the various boroughs reveals the interesting fact that all who paid at Newcastle were full burgesses. It was not so at Corbridge, where we are distinctly told that the tenants of the church, that is of the prior of Carlisle, paid only at the rate of one-eleventh 'because they remained outside the borough.' In the same way at Bamburgh, not only were the tenants in Spitalgate taxed at the rate of one-eleventh 'because they were outside the borough,' but there were also four other persons taxed at the same rate, who presumably lived in the vill itself. Again at Warkworth, there were two classes of tenants; eight apparently belonged to the borough proper, while two others, Sir Robert fitz Roger, the lord of the borough, and John de Werkeworth, are described elsewhere as inhabitants of 'Werkeworth extra Burgum.'

In 1296 Newcastle had not even annexed Byker and Heaton, but it was extending a hand to Pandon, which in 1299 was actually given to the borough by the king. It is natural therefore to find in the roll 'Pamped' extra Burgum taxata ad xj<sup>m</sup>, but the 20 taxpayers entered under this rubric perhaps lived in the actual vill of Pandon. Probably there were a certain number of non-burgesses in Newcastle itself, but they must have been few in comparison with the large accretions of population the town received during the Scottish wars, and they must have been poor or they would have appeared on the roll of 1296.

The taxable inhabitants of Newcastle were entered under the heading of the four ancient parishes of the town, *i.e.*, St. John's, St. Andrew's, All Saints, and St. Nicholas's. The following tables give the figures supplied by the roll for Newcastle's four parishes and for the vill taken in since 1296.

It is impossible to press these figures with absolute confidence as a means of deducing the population of Newcastle in 1296. As the lowest assessments are fixed at what is probably

a conventional sum of 7*s.*, it is difficult to believe that more than one-third of the householders escaped payment of the subsidy. I am inclined to estimate the actual numbers of households in the town in 1296 as being slightly over 400, which would give a total population of approximately 2,000,<sup>414</sup> exclusive of about 400 for the vills given in table II.

TABLE I.—THE FOUR PARISHES OF NEWCASTLE.

Parish.	Taxable Units.	Total Wealth.			King's Seventh.			Ref. in Trans. Page.
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
St. John's ...	62	235	0	5	33	11	6	35
St. Andrew's ...	50	65	19	2	9	8	5½	37
All Saints' ...	83	199	8	8½	28	9	9¾	39
St. Nicholas's ...	68	327	15	4	46	16	5¾	41
Twelve Jurors ...	12	90	19	2	12	19	10¾	43
	275	919	2	9½	131	6	1¾	

TABLE II.—THE OUTLYING VILLS LATER ABSORBED IN NEWCASTLE.

Vill.	Taxable Units.	Total Wealth.			King's Eleventh.			Ref. in Trans. Page.
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
Benwell ...	7	16	7	4	1	9	8½	59
Byker ...	4	6	5	0	0	11	4½	57
Elswick ...	6	12	2	2	1	2	0½	92
Heaton ...	5	8	3	4	0	14	10½	57
Kenton ...	6	9	6	0	0	16	11	60
Pandon ...	20	29	9	8	2	13	7½	51
Walker ...	5	10	9	8	0	19	1	56
Total ...	53	92	3	2	8	7	6¾	

<sup>414</sup>Mr. Hodgson Hinde using the Poll Tax Returns for 1377, which show that 2,647 persons were liable to the tax, estimates that the population of Newcastle in 1377 was 3970 [*Arch. Ael.*, 2nd ser. III, 62]. It must be remembered that despite the unknown mortality in Newcastle in 1349 due to the Black Death, the population of the town would be greatly increased in the 80 years following 1296 both by natural growth and commerce as well as by the influx of refugees due to the unsettled state of the country in consequence of the long war with Scotland. Mr. H. H. E. Craster estimates the population in 1296 at 6000, but he assumes that only one in twenty of the population paid to the lay subsidy. See new *Hist. Northd.*, x, p. 77.

The parishes evidently varied enormously in wealth, and it is curious to find that even in 1296 St. Andrew's was the home of the poorer classes, while the wealthy lived in St. Nicholas's parish, the less wealthy living in St. John's parish. All Saints was, of course, the parish of the sailors, and would appear far less wealthy than the figures indicate, if we took into account that the three richest men are answerable for 60*l.* out of the total assessment of 327*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.* The difference among the parishes is even greater when the figures are analysed.

A.—*St John's Parish.*—Here the average assessment is 3*l.* 15*s.* 9*d.*, but 24 are assessed at between 7*s.* and 10*s.*; *i.e.*, 37·09 per cent. The richest man is Peter Sampson, who is assessed on 31*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*, and has two 'servientes,' Peter, assessed on 5*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.*, and Thomas, assessed on 2*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.* We can safely identify him with the Peter Sampson who was bailiff for four months during 1291.<sup>415</sup> He was one of the many 'drapers' who were fined half a mark for selling cloth 'contrary to the assize.'<sup>416</sup> As several of the accused were exporters of wool, and so probably importers of foreign manufactures, we may take it that the wealth of Peter Sampson and of many other of Newcastle's early 'merchant princes' was the result of their importation of 'cloth of different kinds and quantities from foreign markets.' It is

<sup>415</sup> The writer desires gratefully to acknowledge the help and information he has received from Mr. A. M. Oliver, town clerk of Newcastle, in providing him with references from the MS. *Liber Cartarum* which he is editing for the Surtees Society, and other sources.

<sup>416</sup> The Assize of Cloth issued by Richard I in 1197 was an attempt to favour those who practised weaving as a handicraft, both against those who used it as a by-industry and against those who imported cloth from abroad. Simon de Montfort definitely took steps to aid the English cloth manufacture, and Edward I copied him. Partly for political reasons also, he prohibited the export of English wool to the manufacturing towns of Flanders, 1271-1274, and he appointed an Aulnager or official cloth measurer to encourage native industry. See Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (*Medieval Times*), 5th ed., pp. 192-193. For the list of 'drapers' fined in 1279 see *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 394-395.

a curious fact that at this date we find few traces of weaving as a local industry.<sup>417</sup>

The second highest assessment in this parish, 28*l.*, was that of Henry le Escot. He and his nephew,<sup>418</sup> John, who was assessed on 1*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.*, frequently appear among the lists of mayors and bailiffs of the town.<sup>419</sup> Their common ancestor was Sir Peter Scot, mayor of Newcastle in 1251, and founder of the friars preachers in this city. Sir Peter left two sons, Sir Nicholas Scot, the elder, father of John Scot, and a younger son, Henry, who had also a son, named John. Nicholas was mayor in 1273, and had been appointed a collector of murage in 1272 and at earlier dates,<sup>420</sup> but he does not occur in the roll of 1296. Henry was also frequently a collector of murage.<sup>421</sup> His wealth was undoubtedly derived from the export of wool overseas, especially to Flanders.<sup>422</sup> He seems to have occasionally acted in partnership with Richard de la Haye<sup>423</sup> and Thomas de Karliol,

<sup>417</sup> See *post* p. 287.

<sup>418</sup> For the Scott family see the incomplete pedigree printed in the *Proceedings* of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries (3rd series), III, p. 196.

<sup>419</sup> Henry was elected mayor the Monday after Michaelmas in 1374, 1282-5, 1288-9, and also acted during part of 1293, according to Mr. Oliver. Henry le Escot was also mayor in 1283 (*Cal. Pat. R.*, 1281-1292, p. 60), and in 1290 (*Ibid.*, p. 388). It is unfortunately impossible to rely wholly on the printed lists of mayors and bailiffs; certainly in few cases are they assigned to the correct year. Mr. Oliver has supplied the corrected dates as far as possible.

<sup>420</sup> Welford's lists; *C.P.R.*, 1266-1272, p. 667, and *Ibid.*, 1272-1281, p. 373. Murage was an *octroi* duty on goods brought into the borough for sale. The collectors were allowed a percentage on the amount they realised, and the remainder was devoted by royal authority under view of the mayor and bailiffs to the repair of the castle and town walls, and later to the building and extension of the Edwardian walls. See the interesting references *C. C. R.*, 1307-1313, p. 40, *C. P. R.*, 1272-1281, p. 373, and *C. P. R.*, 1281-1292, p. 388.

<sup>421</sup> See *C. P. R. passim* under years 1277, 1279, 1299.

<sup>422</sup> *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1272-1279, pp. 320, 546. *C. P. R.*, 1266-1272, p. 689. *Ibid.*, 1272-1281, p. 15, etc. In 1279 he was fined two marks at the Assizes 'for selling cloth contrary to the Assize.'

<sup>423</sup> Richard de la Haye who is called 'king's merchant,' *C. P. R.*, 1266-1272, p. 703, is frequently mentioned in the Patent and Close Rolls as an exporter

and on one occasion in 1273, the three local merchants and a London merchant, Thomas de Basing, bought from Edward I. wool which had been confiscated from Flemings at Newcastle, during the king's quarrel with their ruler. Part of the wool was with difficulty rescued from confiscation by Roger Bigod, the earl marshal, at Harwich, as being Flemish wool on a Flemish ship, but worse remained to be faced at Abbeville, for the Flemish-merchants, John de Bolebrok and his fellows, claimed the wool as theirs, and the Newcastle exporters had to invoke the aid of their king, with the mayor and *échevins* of Abbeville.<sup>424</sup>

Like his father, Henry Scot was a benefactor to the church, and in 1304 gave 'six marks of rent to a chaplain celebrating Divine service daily in the church of St. John, for the souls of himself, his ancestors, and all the faithful dead.'<sup>425</sup> However, he seems to have acted with rather a high hand towards a certain Thomas Witewell, a fellow burgess, perhaps as mayor, and in 1276 was accused of taking a horse from Witewell, and also ejecting his tenants from two houses in the town.<sup>426</sup> On another occasion, in 1280, he had to be forbidden by the king to molest Hugh de Merchingle and Geoffrey de Catefield, who were farmers of the murage, and so perhaps his supplanters.<sup>427</sup>

of wool, and he occurs as bailiff in Welford's Lists as early as 1255. His name does not appear in the roll of 1296, and so he was probably dead by that time. Thomas del Hay, who paid on 11. 1s. 0d. in St. John's parish, Hervey del Hay who paid on 14s. in All Saints' parish, and Henry del Hay whose servant Edmund paid on 7s. in St. Andrew's parish, were perhaps his sons.

<sup>424</sup> C. C. R., 1272-1279, pp. 32 and 33.

<sup>425</sup> C. P. R., 1301-1307, pp. 291-292. Some years previously, in 1260, the bishop and convent of Carlisle, as rector of the parish of Newcastle, had granted a 'place of inclusion' to an anchoress, Christiana Umfred, in the churchyard of St. John's, for her to inhabit for life. *C.C.R.*, 1258-1266, p. 118.

<sup>426</sup> C. P. R., 1272-1281, p. 175. Perhaps Henry Scott was acting on behalf of John Comyn, who in the same year complained that Thomas de Witewell and Thomas de Karliol and others had carried away his wheat, wine, and other victuals, 'as well at Tynedale as in a ship in the port of Newcastle.' *Ibid.*, p. 178. Thomas Withewel was coroner of Newcastle in 1272. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 367. For Witewell's action see *Ibid.*, 296.

<sup>427</sup> C. P. R., 1272-1281, p. 388.

Like so many of the successful Newcastle merchants, Henry Scot owned land outside the borough. He paid on 10*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* at Benwell, and on 1*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* at Newton Underwood,<sup>428</sup> and in 1279 he bought the custody, during his minority, of the heir and of the lands of Walter Curteys, tenant-in-chief (Surtees of Gosforth), and his marriage.<sup>429</sup>

John Scot was not so prominent in public life as his uncle. However, he was elected mayor at Michaelmas, 1296, a collector of murage in 1295<sup>430</sup> and several times bailiff, and in 1297 he was a commissioner for the re-establishment of the town of Berwick-on-Tweed.<sup>431</sup> John Scot and Henry Scot both appear as witnesses of the deed by which Robert de Byker and Laderana, his wife, surrendered to the king their lands in Pandon,<sup>432</sup> which were afterwards bestowed by Edward I on Newcastle. Perhaps he was identical with the John Scot who was killed in self-defence by Norman le Miller, of North Middleton, in 1304.<sup>433</sup> Certainly his son, Nicholas, appears in 1309 as collector of murage.<sup>434</sup> The sons of John and Henry carried on the tradition of public service, and frequently appear in the Patent and Close rolls of Edward II. Nicholas, son of John, and John, son of Henry, adopted the cause of Thomas of Lancaster and received a formal pardon from the helpless Edward II in 1313,<sup>435</sup> together with many other burgesses of Newcastle.<sup>436</sup>

<sup>428</sup> Transcript, pp. 59 and 69.

<sup>429</sup> C. P. R., 1272-1281, p. 310. We learn from *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 354 and 356, that his name was Nicholas, and that besides North Gosforth he held lands in Durham. In 1296 Richard Scot, perhaps Henry Scot's son, paid on 1*l.* 14*s.* 8*d.* at North Gosforth. Transcript, p. 52.

<sup>430</sup> C. P. R., 1292-1301, p. 159.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227.

<sup>432</sup> C. C. R., 1296-1302, p. 290.

<sup>433</sup> C. P. R., 1301-1307, p. 263.

<sup>434</sup> C. P. R., 1307-1313, p. 361.

<sup>435</sup> C. P. R., 1313-1317, pp. 24-25.

<sup>436</sup> The following who received their pardon were probably all burgesses of Newcastle, although not definitely described as such:—Gilbert Gategange, Nicholas de Cardoil, Thomas de Frismarays, Gilbert Flemyng, John de Pampeden, Samson Peytvyn, Henry de Neuton, John de Ellerker, Geoffrey

Another high assessment was that of James, the tanner, who paid on 23*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.*<sup>437</sup> Indeed, tanning the hides of the local sheep and cattle seems to have rivalled the export of wool and skins as the chief source of Newcastle's wealth at this time. Nicholas, son of David, who paid on 22*l.* 16*s.* 0*d.* is described as a butcher in one of the University college deeds relating to Newcastle.<sup>438</sup> Perhaps, like the father of Thomas Wolsey, he was a grazier. Scarcely less wealthy was Alexander le Furbur who paid on 21*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* Alexander had won more than local fame as having been miraculously cured of dropsy about 1287 by the intercession of St. Francis, after he had vowed to visit his tomb.<sup>439</sup> The vow was duly paid, and, probably after his return, he was made bailiff in 1291. Two other important taxpayers were Gabriel, the baker, who paid on 13*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.* and John de Blakeden (Blagdon), who paid on 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* The latter was bailiff in 1297, and was the son of Adam de Blakeden, another bailiff, and one of the 'drapers' fined in 1279. Probably John was also a 'draper,' and we find his brother, Nicholas, shipping wool from Newcastle in 1314.<sup>440</sup> Nicholas lived in All Saints' parish in 1296, but only paid on 14*s.*

Lewyn, Robert de Angerton, Nicholas de Ellerker, Gilbert de Oggil, Robert le Keu, Adam le Rous and Richard de Aketon. Apparently their offence was that they assisted Thomas earl of Lancaster, Guy earl of Warwick, and Robert de Clifford to seize at Newcastle the jewels, horses, and other possessions of the royal favourite Piers Gaveston. *Cf. Ibid.*, pp. 25-26, and 34.

<sup>437</sup>James was important enough to be one of the twelve jurors in the recognition under the Grand Assize in the case of John de Insula, who in 1279 claimed certain property in Newcastle. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 294. He died before 1300 leaving land in 'Market St.' (*in vivo fori*) to his son Richard. *Arch. Ael.* 1st series, III, p. 82. *Brit. Mus. Add. ch. xxix*, 64.

<sup>438</sup>*P. fasc. 4*, no. 3. These are deeds in possession of University College, Oxford, of which Mr. A. M. Oliver has transcripts. They relate to lands in Newcastle given to that college in 1447 by Alice Bellasis.

<sup>439</sup>Chronicle of Lanercost (Maxwell's edition, 1913), p. 53.

<sup>440</sup>Bishop Kellawe's R. P. D., II, 1025, tells how Nicholas de Blakeden, Richard de Emeldon, and other Newcastle merchants were robbed off Scarborough by pirates from the Cinque Ports.

Other taxpayers should be mentioned for the light they throw on the industries of the parish in 1296. Besides James, the tanner, already mentioned, we find two other tanners, 'Thomas of Gosforth' and Simon, who paid respectively on *1l. 17s. 0d.* and *1l. 15s. 0d.* By the help of the detailed Colchester assessment we can surmise that James was probably caught with a far larger stock of hides than the other two, whose lower assessment perhaps mainly represented the utensils of their craft, such as vats and dye-stuffs. It is curious to find that the three goldsmiths were comparatively poor, but they were probably accustomed merely to work up the gold provided by their patrons. Robert, the goldsmith, senior, and his son of the same name, were only assessed in each case on the sum of *7s.* Walter, the goldsmith, was richer, and paid on *1l. 1s. 0d.*, but even he was less wealthy than the two goldsmiths of Alnwick, who paid respectively on *3l. 7s. 11d.* and *4l. 0s. 11d.*<sup>441</sup> There were two bakers, Gabriel, already referred to as paying on *13l. 10s. 8d.*, and William, who only paid on *1l. 1s. 0d.* There are three other occupations represented in this parish; Ingram Marescallus,<sup>442</sup> assessed on *9l. 7s. 0d.*, was probably, as his name implies, a farrier; Elyas Illuminator was doubtless an artist who decorated manuscripts with those wonderful initials, whose colours survive unfaded by lapse of time; but the third craftsman, already referred to as Alexander 'le Furbur,' is less easy to place. Probably both he and William 'Furbur' of Corbridge<sup>443</sup> were craftsmen who repaired, if they did not make the armour of the knights and men-at-arms, though it is possible that if Alexander had lived later he would have been a dealer in old clothes, which the rich discarded and sold to him for re-sale to the poorer classes.

<sup>440a</sup> Walter the goldsmith was alive in 1302. *Liber Cartarum*, no. 21.

<sup>441</sup> Transcript, p. 84.

<sup>442</sup> He occurs as witness to a deed in Dodsworth MSS., vol. 32, no. 60. His son Roger gave two messuages in Newcastle to the abbey of Newminster in 1315. C. P. R., 1313-1317, p. 213.

<sup>443</sup> Transcript, p. 46.

Alexander<sup>444</sup> was one of the 'drapers' who were proceeded against at the Assizes of 1279 'for the sale of cloth contrary to the assize.'

Besides the tradesmen just referred to, the roll contains the names of many persons of whom we would fain know more. Perhaps William Putstan, who paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.*, obtained his name from his skill at that sport. Robert de Fratribus or Robert of the friars was probably the superior of the Franciscan friars whose house stood on the site of the present Lloyds bank in Grey street. Another interesting personage is Isabella, styled 'uxor prepositi.' However, she was only assessed on 7*s.*, and it is difficult to believe that she was really the wife of the mayor at that time.<sup>445</sup>

It is interesting to speculate on the origin of the population in the various parishes, and some evidence is afforded by the occurrence of the word 'de' in many of the names, for this was about the period when we find the rise of surnames, properly so called. It may not be altogether fanciful to see in the possessors of the 'de' names, newcomers into the town, while those burgesses with surnames properly so called may belong to families settled in the town for some little time. It is, perhaps, better to consider the parishes together from this point of view, and merely to refer under each parish to any surname of outstanding interest. All surnames had originally a very definite meaning, although that meaning was often lost at a very early date. Names such as Nicholas, son of David, were certainly at first personal, as were

<sup>444</sup> His name is coupled with that of Ralph de Raveneworth, who may have been his partner. A Robert le Furbur is mentioned as a burgess of Newcastle in 1269. *North. Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 162.

<sup>445</sup> It is not known who was mayor between Michaelmas 1295 and Michaelmas 1296. Hugh de Karliol was mayor during the preceding year, but his wife's name was Joan. The mayor elected at Michaelmas, 1296, was John Scot.

the jeering surnames of Nicholas Bendbone and Richard Blanotfir (*i.e.*, blow not fire). William Creler and Gilbert Cokeman, perhaps, obtained their names from some ancestor's occupation, even if William himself did not make osier baskets or Gilbert burn lime with sea-coal, and there are few names in this parish which are absolutely incapable of at least a plausible explanation. Richard Caritat's name is curiously reminiscent of those manumission charters in which a lord declares himself to be moved by 'caritas' or affection to free his serf, and the surname of Henry Runcy perhaps tells us that he led pack-horses over the execrable roads of that day.

B.—*St. Andrew's parish* shows the lowest average assessment, namely 1*l.* 6*s.* 4½*d.*, and 23 out of its 50 taxpayers, *i.e.*, 46 per cent., are assessed on sums ranging from 7*s.* to 10*s.* Only two persons paid on more than 5*l.* Symon Mirield,<sup>446</sup> the richest, was assessed on 13*l.* 17*s.* 0*d.*, and William Sude on 10*l.* 0*s.* 8*d.* Symon, perhaps in partnership with Walter, son of John, was one of the 'drapers' who in 1279 were fined for breaking the assize of cloth. Even the religious houses were poor, or, at any rate, were assessed very lightly. The hospital of St. Mary Magdalene paid on 2*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.*, while the rest are not referred to by name, although it is probable that Robert Russell de Fratibus was superior of the Dominicans or Black friars, through whose garden the west wall of the borough had just been run. However, he only paid on 10*s.*

There were apparently four mills in the parish. Henry, the fuller, paid on 1*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.*, and Thomas, the fuller, on 4*l.* 13*s.* 10*d.*; Godfrey, who paid on 14*s.*, and Edmund, who paid on 7*s.*, were probably corn-millers. There were two carters, Stephen and Walter, who paid respectively on 7*s.* and 10*s.*; and we find a cobbler, Richard of Bywell, who paid on 12*s.* The

<sup>446</sup> He appears as witness of a deed c. 1292 in Dodsworth MSS., 32, no. 60

wealthiest craftsman was Thomas<sup>447</sup> the pelterer (*pelliparius*), who paid on 3*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.*, and the next wealthiest, Robert, the farrier, paid on 1*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.* There is also a mercer, Alexander Sayer, who, like the mercers of Colchester, seems to have merely been a dealer in small wares, as he was only assessed on 9*s.* It is doubtful whether John le Spenser,<sup>448</sup> who paid on 1*l.* 1*s.*, was actually a steward as his name would suggest. The only other names that may be descriptive of occupation are those of John Forester and William Forester, who paid respectively on 10*s.* 6*d.* and 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.*

Among the non-territorial names in this parish occurs that of Gilbert le Gros, or the fat, who paid on 7*s.* Le Gros was evidently a personal nickname, as was that of William Longerbayn, *i.e.*, Longbone or Longshanks, who also paid on 7*s.* Richard del Maudelanis and Peter de la Maudelanis, who paid respectively on 14*s.* and 7*s.*, were doubtless tenants of property belonging to the hospital of St. Mary Magdalene, in the neighbourhood of the present Northumberland street, or perhaps, officials of the hospital itself.<sup>449</sup> Similar names, at least in origin, are those of William del Clay, *i.e.*, of the clay-pit, who paid on 10*s.*, and of Henry del Hay, *i.e.*, of the enclosure, whose servant, Edmund, paid on 7*s.* Henry<sup>450</sup> himself does not occur in the roll, but he Thomas del Hay,<sup>451</sup> who paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.* in St.

<sup>447</sup> In 1293 Thomas Pelliparius, junior, owned land in 'Synedegate (*i.e.*, Sidgate or Percy St.), according to University College Deeds, P. fasc. 13, no. 3.

<sup>448</sup> John le Spenser was tenant of land in Market street, adjoining the New Gate, according to U. C. Deeds, P. fasc. 15, no. 2.

<sup>449</sup> The hospital of St. Mary Magdalene paid on 2*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.*

<sup>450</sup> Henry was bailiff from Michaelmas, 1291, to 4 Feb., 1292, when the town was taken into the king's hands. He also occurs as a witness to a deed executed between 1283 and 1285, *Bowes Charters*, no. 53, printed in *Arch. Ael.*, 3rd series, v, p. 56.

<sup>451</sup> There is also a Thomas del Hay, who paid on 7*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* at South Gosforth. Transcript, p. 57. Perhaps he was the eldest son, as Richard de la Hay possessed lands at South Gosforth. Cf. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 230.

John's parish, and Henry del Hay,<sup>452</sup> who paid on 14s. in All Saints' parish and on 13s. 4*d.* in Pandon, were probably kinsmen, if not sons, of the Richard de la Hay, king's merchant, already referred to.<sup>453</sup> Sometimes we can trace a family connexion as in the case of Waldevus or Waltheof Groume and his sons-in-law, William and Richard; he paid on 10s. and they on 7s. each. Another case is that of Nicholas Tod and his son, John, who paid respectively on 14s. and 7s.

C.—*All Saints* was by far the most populous parish in 1296, at least from the point of view of assessments. The average of the 83 tax-paying units was just over 2*l.* 8s. 0*d.*; only 20 of these, or 24 per cent. of the whole, possessed between 7s. and 10s., and in this respect the parish of St. Nicholas alone held a better position.

In 1296, as later, All Saints seems to have been the seamen's parish. William Russel, the sailor (*nauta*), is its richest man, and his assessment was 2*l.* 14s. 0*d.*<sup>454</sup> He was one of the keepers of the Tyne bridge, and perhaps Russell chare, referred to in the licence for the foundation of St. Katherine's chantry in All Saints' church in 1336,<sup>455</sup> took its name from his family. Almost as rich was John Thorald,<sup>456</sup> with 20*l.*, who was bailiff in 1302 and 1303, and collector of murage in 1299.<sup>457</sup> Emma 'Torald,' who was probably a relation, paid on 3*l.* 5s. 6*d.* She had a windmill on rising ground a little east of Pandon burn,<sup>458</sup>

<sup>452</sup> Transcript, p. 52. Henry and his wife Mariota were defendants in an action brought by Simon de Taunton, prior of Tynemouth in 1314, before the Court of Common Pleas *re* a message in Newcastle. *Arch. Ael.* 3 series, vi, p. 44.

<sup>453</sup> See *ante*.

<sup>454</sup> C. 1288, *Liber Cartarum*, no. 103. Perhaps he was the William Russel whose son Robert, aged 10, was accidentally killed by a stone thrown during a game called 'platepere.' *Northumberland Assize Rolls*, p. 362.

<sup>455</sup> Printed in Welford, i, p. 95, and Brand, i, 638. *Inq. ad quod.*, file 235, no. 6.

<sup>456</sup> He was perhaps son of the Thomas Thorald, of Newcastle, who occurs in the Assize Roll of 1256 (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 62.

<sup>457</sup> C. P. R., 1292-1301, p. 435.

<sup>458</sup> C. C. R., 1296-1302, p. 290.

and also land in Pilgrim street.<sup>459</sup> It was alleged against her by William de Borneton, that during the shrievalty of Robert de Hampton (Nov. 5th, 1272—Oct. 16th, 1274), she had unjustly accused him of appropriating a cartload of hay and three horses, without being able to make good the charge.<sup>460</sup> A few years later, at the assizes of 1279, Emma 'Thorold' appears as one of the 'drapers' who sold cloth contrary to the assize.

William Porter, who paid on 18*l.*, is mentioned three times in Mr. Welford's history.<sup>461</sup> On Jan. 29th, 1319, he and his wife, Isabella, received from Henry of Wallsend the 'cleric,' a messuage in Pandon, and another in the street of All Saints. In 1323 Porter surrendered both messuages to 'Sir' Thomas Hylton, the chaplain. In 1361, Porter, who must now have been a very old man, had a house at the end of Pilgrim street, which he granted to John Chambers,<sup>462</sup> mayor in 1362 and 1363, on condition that he paid the prioress and convent of Lambley 18*s.* per annum.<sup>463</sup> Probably this house was a portion of the land granted to him by Robert Winchelse in 1290.<sup>464</sup> Despite his wealth Porter was never mayor or bailiff, and in the deeds is merely styled 'burgess.'

Another interesting personage is Roger de Burnton, who was assessed on 10*l.* 14*s.* 0*d.* His wealth was increased later by certain tenements in Market street (*vicus fori*), Pilgrim street and Butcher row, presented to him in 1319, as chaplain of the chantry of St. Thomas, in St. John's church, by Adam Durham, a bailiff of the town, to secure a daily mass at that altar for the souls of himself, his father and mother, and of Adam

<sup>459</sup> U. C. Deeds, P. fasc. 13, no. 3. <sup>460</sup> *Arch. Ael.*, 3rd series, III, p. 190.

<sup>461</sup> *Newc. and Gateshead*, 49, 58, 161.

<sup>462</sup> He was the mayor who took a leading part in the rebuilding of St. Nicholas's church.

<sup>463</sup> The grant of the rent to Lambley by Porter is printed in the *Proceedings* of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries, 2nd series, VII, p. 130.

<sup>464</sup> Durham Treasury deeds, 1-1, Spec., No. 63.

Ifolde, and Melina, his wife.<sup>465</sup> Adam Durham is probably the same as the Adam de 'Dunelm' who paid on *2l. 2s. 0d.* in St. John's parish, and there is a Nicholas de 'Dunelm' who paid on *14s.* in the parish of St. Nicholas. Laurence de 'Dunolm,' who is not mentioned in the roll of 1296, endowed a chaplain to celebrate Divine service daily in St. Nicholas's church in 1318.<sup>466</sup> Perhaps Adam, Nicholas and Laurence were brothers.

It is by no means possible to estimate a man's importance by his assessment in the Lay Subsidy roll. Magister Roger de Hecham affords a proof of this. Actually he was only assessed on *1l. 8s. 0d.*,<sup>467</sup> but he was bailiff at least on one occasion, in 1304,<sup>468</sup> and he was appointed coroner for Northumberland in 1293.<sup>469</sup> He was, however, disqualified from acting by Edward I, apparently on the ground that he was collector of murage, and also superintending the building of the town walls.<sup>470</sup> He was also a collector of murage in 1299.<sup>471</sup> He was probably a kinsman of Hugh de Hecham, another bailiff not mentioned in the roll of 1296, who was also mayor and M.P. for Newcastle.<sup>472</sup>

Two members of the Karliol family<sup>473</sup> are assessed in the parish of All Saints. Hugo de Karliol paid on *1l. 8s. 0d.*, and

<sup>465</sup> *Inq. ad. quod damnum*, 12 ed., II, file 136, no. 23. *Liber Cartarum*, no. 186. Cf. Welford, I, p. 50.

<sup>466</sup> C. P. R., 1317-1321, p. 235, Laurence's wife is here called Itonia. According to C. P. R., 1307-1313, p. 359, he was a collector of murage in 1311.

<sup>467</sup> He was also perhaps assessed on *5l. 0s. 4d.* at Quikcumstal (or Whitton-stall) as Roger de Hetcham. Transcript, p. 3.

<sup>468</sup> Apart from the untrustworthy printed lists, Roger de Hecham occurs as bailiff in a deed of 1304, dated 1319(?) in *Arch. Ael.*, 3rd series, v, 57, relating to Gilbert Fleming's lands in the Close.

<sup>469</sup> C. C. R., 1288-1296, p. 307.

<sup>470</sup> C. C. R., 1302-1307, p. 2.

<sup>471</sup> C. P. R., 1292-1301, p. 435.

<sup>472</sup> Hugh de Hecham was lessee of a colliery at Elswick, and a limeburner, who got into trouble in London with the mayor in 1329 for attempting to form a limeburners' 'ring' to raise the price of lime. Welford, I, 74 and 72.

<sup>473</sup> For the Karliol genealogy see new *Northumberland County History*, VII, p. 389. In the roll of 1296 the name is given as de Carliolo.

Thomas de Karliol paid on 3*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* They were respectively the elder and younger sons of Thomas Karliol, the elder, mayor of Newcastle, 1264-1279, who about 1270 purchased Swarland from Agnes Cousdecine, who had obtained it from her grandfather, Roger Bertram III, of Mitford.<sup>474</sup> Thomas, the elder, was brother of Henry de Karliol, who was several times bailiff and mayor of Newcastle.<sup>474a</sup> The elder Thomas was perhaps at times a partner with Henry le Escot and Richard de la Haye, and exported wool to the continent.<sup>475</sup> He died *circa* 1292, and in that year Thomas de Karliol, the younger, quit-claimed all his rights in Swarland to his elder brother, Hugh.

Hugh or Hugo de Karliol was several times bailiff of Newcastle, and was mayor in 1291, and was elected again in Michaelmas, 1294 and perhaps in 1295, and together with Peter Graper, represented Newcastle in the Model Parliament of 1295. He witnessed the surrender of Robert de Byker's land in Pandon. Probably, like his father, he was an exporter of wool, and his name appears among the drapers who were fined at the Assizes of 1279 for selling cloth contrary to the assize. Hugh left at least three sons, Thomas, John and Hugh, and a daughter, Alice, wife of James, the apothecary, who received from her father in free marriage a messuage 'under the moat.' Thomas was mayor of Newcastle in 1314, and M.P. in 1313. He was collector of customs in 1304, 1321 and 1323, and survived, at least, till 1336. He left only daughters, and Cecilia, the eldest of the five, married Peter Graper, the younger.

<sup>474</sup> *Hundred Rolls*, II, p. 17. According to C. P. R., 1266-1272, p. 577, Thomas carefully stipulated that he was not to be responsible for Roger Bertram's debts to the Jews. See also new *Northd. Co. Hist.*, VII, p. 385.

<sup>474a</sup> Mr. A. M. Oliver informs me that Henry de Karliol was bailiff during the mayoralty of Peter Scott, *ante* 1252, and several times mayor. He occurs as mayor 3 April, 1253 (P.R.O. *Ancient Deeds*, B. 3082), and as bailiff Mich. 1233 (Madox, *Formulare Anglicanum*, p. 375).

<sup>475</sup> See *ante*, p. 270. In 1266 he and other two partners, John le 'Flemmang' and Alan Wodeman, had a ship and goods captured by pirates and taken into Scarborough. C.P.R., 1266-1272, p. 125.

Hugo's second son, John, occurs as one of the receivers of the new custom in 1304,<sup>476</sup> and is, perhaps, the John Carliol, who was in 1336 presented for an encroachment on the Castle garth.<sup>477</sup> Hugh, the third son, was vicar of Bolam. Their uncle Thomas is not easy to distinguish from other members of the family with that name, but he is certainly the 'Thomas, son of Thomas de Karliol' who in 1280 leased Colewell and Petlington from Robert, son of Roger.<sup>478</sup> And the 'Thomas de Karliol, junior,' who occurs several times as bailiff between 1260 and 1289, was the son of Henry de Karliol.<sup>478a</sup>

Thomas de Karliol, the elder, had a brother, Adam,<sup>479</sup> who was assessed on *6l. 13s. 4d.* in St. John's parish, and Adam's son, Nicholas, held many civic offices in Newcastle, and represented the borough in parliament. Adam and Nicholas were both benefactors of Tyne bridge,<sup>479a</sup> and Adam was one of the 'drapers' who were fined in 1279 for infringing the assize of cloth.

Many of the remaining surnames tantalize us by inviting guesses. Matilda del Redehowe was assessed on *7l. 8s. 0d.* Was she a member of the family of Redheugh across the Tyne, one of whom Alexander witnessed a charter about 1280?<sup>480</sup> Apparently a branch of the family was established in Newcastle, for a William de Redhough owned land in the borough in 1312,<sup>481</sup> and 'Thomas, son of Gilbert del Redehough of Newcastle' occurs in a deed dated 22nd December, 16 Edward II (1322).<sup>482</sup> Almost as wealthy was Isabella, widow of Gilbert, son of Richard, perhaps the burgess of that name who was fined half a mark for a purpresture at the Assizes of 1279. She paid on *7l. 7s. 0d.*

<sup>476</sup> C. P. R., 1301-1307, p. 263.

<sup>477</sup> Welford, I, 95.

<sup>478</sup> C. P. R., 1272-1281, p. 395. <sup>478a</sup> *Ex inform.* Mr. A. M. Oliver.

<sup>479</sup> He is called Adam de Balliolo in the Transcript, p. 36.

<sup>479a</sup> Adam, son of Henry de Karliol, and Nicholas, son of Adam de Karliol, are mentioned in the list quoted by Brand, I, 41, from Bourne, pp. 129-130.

<sup>480</sup> Welford, I, p. 265. For their genealogy see Surtees, *Durham*, II, 132.

<sup>481</sup> C. C. R., 1307-1313, p. 558. <sup>482</sup> *Brit. Mus. Add. ch. xxix*, 18.

One can surmise that relationship existed between Robert Leman who paid on 2*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*, and William Leman, perhaps his son, who only paid on 7*s.* Robert was probably the witness of that name in a deed dated *c.* 1294, in the *Liber Cartarum*.<sup>483</sup> In another deed<sup>484</sup> perhaps Adam de Pampeden conveys land in Pilgrim street to him, 'next to the land of Emma Thorald.' It is interesting to find two members of the famous Gateshead family of Dolfemby settled in Newcastle in 1296. Their names were William and John, and each paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.* Of Robert de Norton,<sup>485</sup> who paid on 8*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, one can only suggest that he belonged to the same family as, and was perhaps the father of, William Norton, who was master of the hospital of the Virgin Mary in Westgate in 1358.<sup>486</sup> Roger Roskil may be a descendant of some settler from Röskilde in Denmark, and be a hint as to the rise of the Baltic trade in Newcastle. Thomas de Silksworth who paid on 5*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.*, can be identified with the burgess who purchased certain lands and buildings in Pilgrim street from the chaplain, Nicholas Terry, in 1310.<sup>487</sup> Adam Elwald who paid on 4*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, occurs as witness to a charter of Adam de Pampeden.<sup>488</sup> The latter is not mentioned in the roll, but his servant, Patrick, paid on 14*s.*, and similarly 'Roger, servant of Roger de Lanton, paid on 14*s.*, although his master does not pay.

Adam de Pampeden was a fairly important person who has already<sup>489</sup> been referred to as owning land in Pilgrim street. He was a bailiff in 1272-1281,<sup>490</sup> and perhaps several times later.

<sup>483</sup> No. 185.

<sup>484</sup> *U. C. Deeds*, P. fasc. 9, no. 1. The name here is 'Lemanman.'

<sup>485</sup> He occurs as a witness *c.* 1290. *Durh. Treas.*, 1-1, Spec., no. 63.

<sup>486</sup> *Liber Cartarum*, no. 24.

<sup>487</sup> *Dur. Treas.*, 1-1, Spec. no. 67. Welford, I, p. 19.

<sup>488</sup> *U. C. Deeds*, P. fasc. 9, no. 4.

<sup>489</sup> *Ante n.* 484.

<sup>490</sup> He was one of the bailiffs who at the Assizes of 1279 were accused of not arresting Robert Sautemareys for causing the death of James Fleming. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 367. Mr. Oliver informs me that the later references to Adam in the printed lists are misdated, and that he was probably not bailiff after the mayoral year 1281.

He is mentioned in the Patent Rolls as a partner with Henry de Burneton in the export of wool from Newcastle in 1272.<sup>491</sup> Roger de Lanton was perhaps a kinsman of 'Alan Langton, burgess of Newcastle and Berwick, who in 1305 became lord of Wynyard and Redmershill in right of his wife, Katherine, daughter of Sir John L'Isle.'<sup>492</sup>

Other taxpayers of some standing in All Saints' parish were Roger and Adam le Rus, Laurence Swain, Roger Paytefin, Gilbert de Cugat, and Alan de Wilum, senior. Roger le Rus, who paid on 4*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, was exporting wool from Newcastle as early as 1273. Perhaps he also imported wine, for at the assizes of 1279 he was fined the comparatively large sum of 20*s.* for infringing the assize of wine. Adam le Rus, who paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.*, appears in the list of pardoned Lancastrians,<sup>493</sup> and may have been the brother of Roger, or perhaps his son. Laurence Swain, who paid on 4*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, acted as surety for Hugo de Karliol when the latter was elected M.P. in 1295, and was, perhaps, son of Hugo Swayn or of Nicholas or Thomas Swayn, all three of whom were among the burgesses of Newcastle who were indicted for an attack on the property of Tynemouth priory at the assizes of 1269.<sup>494</sup> Another member of the family, Peter Swayn, was appointed custodian of the tronage—or weighing of wool—at Newcastle in 1311 in place of Gilbert Haukin.<sup>495</sup> Roger Paytefin, who paid on 3*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*, is perhaps the same as Roger Peytevin, who was a collector of murage in 1290,<sup>496</sup>

<sup>491</sup> C. P. R., 1266-1272, p. 703. He is here called 'Adam de Pappedene.'

<sup>492</sup> Welford, I, p. 10. Alan also held certain lands from the Balliol fee in the Close. *Ibid.*, p. 14. Dur. Treas. Misc. Charters, 6614. In 1291 he is styled merchant and burgess, and obtained a safe conduct for his ship to trade beyond the seas. C. P. R., 1281-1292, p. 432.

<sup>493</sup> C. P. R., 1313-1317, p. 25.

<sup>494</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 162. Nicholas Swayn was among the offenders against the assize of wine in 1279. According to C. P. R., 1301-1307, p. 223, the wife of Laurence Swayn was called Dionysia. <sup>495</sup> C. P. R., 1307-1313, p. 357. <sup>496</sup> C. P. R., 1281-1292, p. 392.

and who, as Roger le Petevin, was fined for an offence against the assize of wine in 1279. Perhaps the Samson Peytevin who received pardon as a Lancastrian in 1313<sup>497</sup> was his son. Gilbert de Cugat (Cowgate), who paid on 3*l.* 0*s.* 6*d.*<sup>498</sup> was one of the 'drapers' who were fined in 1279 for infringing the assize of cloth. Alan de Wilum, senior, paid on 4*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.* He may have been a son or brother of the Ralph de Wylum who took part in the affray on the property of Tynemouth priory, already referred to.<sup>494</sup> Alan himself had a grant of land from the Virgin Mary hospital.<sup>499</sup>

There are other interesting names, such as John Rayncoke, who paid on 1*l.* 15*s.* 0*d.*, Robert Nutbyehay on 15*s.*, Henry Mariman on 1*l.* 15*s.* 0*d.*, and William Cotefot on 14*s.*, but we have lost the clue to the meaning of their names.

For the most part, the craftsmen of this parish present no difficulty of interpretation. William Russell, the baker, paid on 2*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.*; Walter, the cook, on 2*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.*; Ralph, the cooper, on 14*s.*; and Thomas of Pandon, dyer, on 2*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.* With the exception of Ralph, these seem to have been fairly prosperous. Other tradesmen are William, the barber; Urkil, the smith; and John de Cugat (Cowgate), the fuller, all of whom were assessed on 7*s.* Another smith, Uthred, paid on 14*s.* There are also two foresters; Thomas, the forester, paid on 15*s.*, and John, the forester of Walker, on 8*s.* It is always doubtful, however, whether such names as forester and woodman have not already become ordinary surnames in 1296. We can certainly identify the name Wodeman in the roll as the surname of rather an important Newcastle family.

Peter Wodeman paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.* in 'All Saints' parish,<sup>500</sup>

<sup>497</sup> C. P. R., 1313-1317, p. 25.

<sup>498</sup> Gilbert de Cugat 'also paid on 7*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* at Pampeden' extra Burgum (Pandon), Transcript, p. 51.

<sup>499</sup> *Liber Cartarum*, no. 20.

<sup>500</sup> He also paid on 1*l.* 18*s.* 0*d.* at Byker. Transcript, p. 57.

and his brother, Henry, on *l. 4s. 8d.* in the parish of St. Nicholas. They were the sons of Alan Wodeman, who was a partner with John le Fleming and Thomas de Karliol in 1266 when their ships and goods were taken into Scarborough by pirates.<sup>501</sup> In 1272 Alan was exporting wool.<sup>502</sup> He died *c.* 1275 soon after making a will in which he bequeathed to his younger son, Henry, a messuage he had obtained by purchase. Although this bequest was in accordance with the customs of the borough, Peter, the elder son and heir, immediately on Alan's death, intruded into the messuage, and Henry appealed to the king for redress.<sup>503</sup> Henry 'Wudeman' and another brother, John, were fined in 1279 for breaches of the assize of wine.<sup>504</sup> Probably like their father, Alan, they exported wool, and the wine was part of their return cargo.

Other doubtful craft-names are Ralph Scherman, who paid on *7s.*, and may have derived his name for his skill in shearing sheep,<sup>505</sup> and Tunnok Sciver, assessed on *l. 15s. 0d.*, who may have been a leather-cutter. Adam Gunter, 'hoker,' who paid on *14s.*,<sup>506</sup> should have been a glover if Gunter is to be taken literally,<sup>507</sup> and 'hoker' perhaps means 'the stammerer.'<sup>507a</sup> Adam Gunter possessed land in Pandon near the Carmelite Friary a little before the date of the roll,<sup>508</sup> and he occurs in 1319 as witness to a document transferring certain messuages to William Porter.<sup>509</sup>

<sup>501</sup> C. P. R., 1266-1272, p. 125.

<sup>502</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 639.

<sup>503</sup> C. P. R., 1272-1281, pp. 119, 140, 182. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 285, 292, 293.

<sup>504</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 394.

<sup>505</sup> A 'John Scherman paid on *14s.* in St. Nicholas's parish.

<sup>506</sup> John Gunter, perhaps his brother, paid on *14s.* in this parish.

<sup>507</sup> Stephen le Gaunter, one of the pledges in the Sautemareys case, is also called Stephen le Glover.

<sup>507a</sup> Mr. Oliver informs me that he has come across several references in early deeds to a street called 'Hukergate' in Newcastle.

<sup>508</sup> C. C. R., 1296-1302, p. 290.

<sup>509</sup> *Dur. Treas.*, 1-1, *Spec.* 100a. Welford, I, 49. He must then have been a very old man for he was one of the burgesses of Newcastle who were accused of the attack on the lands of Tynemouth priory at the assizes of 1269,

Perhaps we are on surer ground with Hugo Chaluner<sup>510</sup> who paid on *1l. 1s. 0d.* He was probably the Hugh le Chaloner who, in 1298, was pardoned for the death of Gilbert de Dalton. The 'Chalon-websters' were the weavers of such articles as coverlets, but it is remarkable that with this doubtful exception no weaver is mentioned in the Newcastle portion of the roll, although there were at least two at Corbridge. However, it is impossible to doubt that some sort of cloth was made in the borough, as several fullers and dyers are mentioned. It is probable, however, that even in 1296 much of the finer cloth was imported from Flanders, both by foreign merchants and by the burgesses of Newcastle, who exported wool and wool-fells. We can, perhaps, trace in the numerous prosecutions for infringing the assize of cloth in 1279 the anxiety of Edward I to protect the native weavers against Flemish competition.

D.—*St. Nicholas*, the mother-parish, although it had only the second largest number of taxpayers, was easily the wealthiest, the average assessment reaching the high figure of *4l. 16s. 4d.* for each of its 68 taxable units. Out of these 68, only 11 persons possessed between *7s.* and *10s.*, *i.e.* 16·17 per cent., and not only was this percentage so low, but in the parish itself there were two assessments which stand out in the whole borough as well as in this parish by reason of their amount. The higher of the two is that of Sampson the cutler, bailiff in 1294,<sup>511</sup> who paid on

<sup>510</sup> C. P. R., 1292-1301, p. 357. Hugh, however, had to find sufficient manucaption or sureties that he would remain in the king's service at his own cost in the war in Scotland during the king's pleasure. He was only one of men who received a pardon on similar terms. William de Dalton, who paid on *1l. 15s. 0d.* in this parish was perhaps a kinsman of the murdered Gilbert.

<sup>511</sup> He may have been bailiff also in 1291. The only other office he held was that of borough juror at the assizes of 1279. It was perhaps in that capacity that he was ordered to attach John Kide for an assault on Henry Page. *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), pp. 366 and 399. Sampson was some connexion (perhaps father of the first wife) of Richard de Emeldon, 'who endowed Embleton church with land for a

53*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.* He owned land in the Vicus Fori.<sup>512</sup> The other assessment is almost unique in being a joint one for 84*l.* on Hugo, Gerard, and John, sons of Gilbert de Pampden. Their father, Gilbert, was an exporter of wool as early as 1272.<sup>513</sup> John de Pampden, whose name appears among the University College deeds relating to Pandon, was one of the Newcastle burgesses who received pardon as Lancastrians in 1313,<sup>514</sup> and several times occurs in the printed lists of bailiffs. He had land in the Close.<sup>515</sup> Hugo de 'Pampuden' occurs as defendant in a case of *novel disseisin* brought by Robert de Merchynley and Hawisia, his wife, at the Assizes of 1269.<sup>516</sup> The other joint assessment is that of Hugo Scot and Roger Sperru, who paid on 7*l.* Hugo Scot I cannot identify, but Roger Sperru's family in the form Spery or Sper is not unknown, and Roger may have been the son of the Roger Sper who was drowned by falling from a boat in the Tyne, *c.* 1279.<sup>517</sup> These two assessments are a plain proof that the tax was levied rather on households than on individuals.

The third largest assessment, 20*l.*, was that of Peter Graper or le Graper, who, with Hugo de Karliol, sat for Newcastle in the Model Parliament of 1295. He was several times M.P., mayor, and bailiff of Newcastle. He and Henry Scot were keepers of the king's customs at Newcastle,<sup>518</sup> and Peter was one of the royal commissioners appointed to re-establish the town of

chaplain to pray for himself, and for Sampson le Cotiller, and for his wife Agnes.' *New Northumberland County History*, II, p. 59. The eldest of Richard's three daughters was called Agnes.

<sup>512</sup> *U. C. Deeds*, P. fasc. I, no. 5.

<sup>513</sup> C. P. R., 1266-1272, p. 689.

<sup>514</sup> C. P. R., 1313-1317, p. 25.

<sup>515</sup> *Bowes Charters*, no. 47. *Arch. Ael.*, 3rd series, v, p. 57.

<sup>516</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 209.

<sup>517</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 363. In 1279 a certain John Spери was fined for an infraction of the assize of cloth. *Ibid.*, p. 395. Henry Sperru paid on 14*s.* in All Saints' parish.

<sup>518</sup> Brand, II, p. 38.

Berwick-on-Tweed in 1297.<sup>519</sup> He had grants of land from the keeper of Tyne Bridge<sup>520</sup> in 1297 and in 1308, and by the latter deed 2*s.* a year was reserved to the chaplain who served the altar of the Blessed Virgin Mary in St. Nicholas's church.<sup>521</sup> His family<sup>522</sup> owned lands in Colwell, and he himself was assessed on 4*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.* at Killingworth.<sup>523</sup> Hence it was no unequal match when his elder son, Peter (M.P. for Newcastle in 1348, and several times mayor) espoused Cecilia, daughter and co-heiress of Thomas de Karliol, and his youngest son, Adam, became the husband of Agnes, daughter and co-heiress of Richard de Emeldon. Peter left a third son, Adam, and four daughters. The Graper family died out in the direct male line when Peter Graper II's son, Thomas, left only three daughters.

Walter de 'Cugat' (Cowgate), bailiff in 1294, and collector of murage in 1299<sup>524</sup> paid on 17*l.*, and Thomas de Tindal, bailiff and collector of the king's customs, paid on 14*l.*<sup>525</sup> He was also a collector of murage in 1290.<sup>526</sup> At the assizes of 1279 he was fined for infraction of the assize of wine as well as of the assize of cloth. Almost as wealthy was Adam Jargun, with his assessment of 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* He was, doubtless, descended from ancestors from the once famous port of Yarm-on-Tees. In Newcastle he owned land near the bridge chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr.<sup>527</sup> From the Close Rolls we learn that his wife's name was Isabella, and that he left a son, Roger.<sup>528</sup> Perhaps the

<sup>519</sup> C. P. R., 1292-1301, p. 227.

<sup>520</sup> *Liber Cartarum*, nos. 77 and 81.

<sup>521</sup> *Ibid.* and Brand, I, p. 254.

<sup>522</sup> For the Graper genealogy see new *Northumberland County History*, VII, p. 391. Bourne also calls Peter 'le Draper.' This may be due to some tradition that like the other rich men of Newcastle he exported wool and imported cloth, but his name does not occur in the Patent Rolls in either of these capacities.

<sup>523</sup> Transcript, p. 58.

<sup>524</sup> C. P. R., 1292-1301, p. 435.

<sup>525</sup> Welford, I, pp. 13 and 15.

<sup>526</sup> C. P. R., 1281-1292, p. 392.

<sup>527</sup> *Liber Cartarum*, no. 184.

<sup>528</sup> C. C. R., 1288-1296, p. 516; *Ibid.*, 1296-1302, p. 305.

Emma Jargoun who was accused of an encroachment on the castle liberties in 1336, was his daughter.<sup>529</sup> Another wealthy taxpayer was Matilda le Barbur. As she paid on 10*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* it is difficult to believe that she actually followed so humble an occupation.<sup>530</sup> Robert de Mitford who paid on 9*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.* was a bailiff, and in 1281, mayor. He was for some years keeper of the Tyne bridge.<sup>531</sup> Robert de Newton who paid on 8*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*, though not a civic official himself,<sup>532</sup> was probably father of Henry de Newton who was bailiff in 1304, 1312, and 1313.

This parish provides fresh illustrations of the fact that wealth was not sole criterion of fitness to hold civic positions. *Magister* John le Surrays did, it is true, also hold possessions at Kenton worth 2*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.* as well as others worth 1*l.* 8*s.* 0*d.* in this parish. He was bailiff in 1294, after the town was restored by the king, and during the succeeding mayoral year. He was a fuller by trade.<sup>533</sup> A similar case is that of Thomas de Frismarais or Frismarisco, who though only assessed on 1*l.* 15*s.* 0*d.* was bailiff at least seventeen times between 1300 and 1325. He represented Newcastle in parliament in 1301, and was a collector of the king's customs.<sup>534</sup> He, or his son of the same name, was engaged in the importation of corn and other victuals into Newcastle in 1322,<sup>535</sup> and nine years earlier he was one of the pardoned Lancastrians.<sup>536</sup> We learn from a deed of Alan Langton that he possessed land in the Close.<sup>537</sup> His son, John, was in turn, bailiff, and his son, Thomas, was M.P. in 1358.

<sup>529</sup> Welford, i, p. 95.

<sup>530</sup> A family named Barber flourished in Newcastle in the xiv and xv centuries. Welford, i, pp. 222 and 378.

<sup>531</sup> *Liber Cartarum*, no. 57. It may be added that he was repeatedly a defendant at the various assizes.

<sup>532</sup> He was a recognitor in the action of Peter Graper, uncle of the first M.P., at the assizes of 1269. *North'land Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), 145.

<sup>533</sup> *Liber Cartarum*, no. 131.

<sup>534</sup> Welford, i, pp. 4 and 8. He was also known as 'Thomas clericus.'

<sup>535</sup> C. P. R., 1321-1324, p. 116.

<sup>536</sup> *Ibid.*, 1313-1317, p. 25

<sup>537</sup> *Durh. Treas. Misc. Charters*, 6614. Welford, i, p. 14.

It is at first sight surprising to find that the famous Richard de Emeldon was only assessed on *1l. 8s. 0d.* in 1296. Probably, however, he belonged to a younger generation than Peter Graper I, and Hugo de Karliol, and his importance was greater in the reigns of Edward II, and Edward III. Of his family<sup>538</sup> nothing definite seems to be known, but he may have been a son or grandson of the John de 'Everdon' (Elmedon or Emeldon) who, *c.* 1256, owned land in Hebburn,<sup>539</sup> and was, perhaps, identical with John de Emeldon, an absentee juror in connexion with a lawsuit concerning lands in Lucker in 1256.<sup>540</sup> Mr. Welford and Dr. Dendy have already told the story of his life. He first appears in a public capacity as representing Newcastle in a convention of merchants at York in 1303, and henceforth his career was one long triumph, both as a citizen and a merchant. He was repeatedly bailiff, mayor and member of parliament. As a merchant he was a prototype of the famous Roger Thornton, and like all the great Newcastle merchants of early days he probably owed his wealth to the wool trade with Flanders.<sup>541</sup> He served the state as well as his fellow burgesses under both Edward II and Edward III, and at last, when an old man, faithful alike to his king and his city, he fell at the head of the gallant Newcastle contingent that died to a man in the battle of Halidon-hill, near Berwick, in 1333.<sup>542</sup>

<sup>538</sup> For an interesting sketch of Richard de Emeldon's career see Welford's *Men of Mark*, II, pp. 180-184, and for further details, Dr. Dendy's *History of Jesmond* (*Arch. Ael.*, 3rd series, vol. I), pp. 58 *et seq.*

<sup>539</sup> *Northumberland Assize Rolls* (88 Surt. Soc. publ.), p. 18.

<sup>540</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9. Lucker is not far from Embleton, and Richard de Emeldon endowed a chaplaincy there. *New Northumberland County History*, II, p. 59. A certain John de Kertinden paid on *2l. 5s. 0d.* as a juror at Emildon in 1296 (*Transcript*, p. 99). Was he Richard's father?

<sup>541</sup> His representative at Bruges in 1308 was his kinsman, Robert de Emeldon, 'through whose drunkenness, neglect, and crime,' the house of his host, Peter Zwim, was burnt down. *C. C. R.*, 1307-1313, p. 138.

<sup>542</sup> For the very interesting and full inquisition taken on his death see *Cal. of Inq.*, VII, no. 536.

There are many other names in this parish to which reference might be made, but we must not omit the two taxpayers, Agnes le Escot who paid on 5*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, and Elias, servant of 'Isold' de Pampden, who paid on 2*l.* 13*s.* 0*d.* Agnes was probably a member of the famous Scot family, and she paid on 2*l.* 14*s.* 8*d.* at Swarland,<sup>543</sup> and perhaps Isold, who herself does not appear in the roll of 1296, was related to the Adam de Pampden, or the Gilbert de Pampden, already mentioned.

The craftsmen in this parish are of the usual kind. Besides Sampson, who has already been referred to, there was another cutler, Walter, who only paid on 8*s.* Ralph, the cooper, paid on 7*s.* 6*d.*; the other cooper, Walter, had apparently died, leaving a widow, Inete, who paid on 5*l.* 14*s.* 4*d.* William, the baker, paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.*; Hugo Bel, the pelterer, on 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, and William, the miller, on 1*l.* 8*s.* 0*d.* Adam Sturnel, the cobbler, paid on 11*s.* 6*d.*, and William, the saddler, on 7*s.* Thomas, formerly the only dyer in the parish was dead, but Sibella, his widow, paid on 14*s.*, and one must not forget that the magister John le Surrays, already mentioned, was a fuller. These are the only trades represented in the parish, unless the mysterious John le Sunen, who paid on 1*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.* was a craftsman of some kind.

The twelve jurors of the borough were all men of substance, ranging from Walter, son of John, with the comparatively high assessment of 14*l.* 19*s.* 4*d.* to the 3*l.* 6*s.* 0*d.* of William de Oggill, the average assessment being a little over 7*l.* 11*s.* 7*d.* How they were appointed we have no hint, but the two first names on the list, Adam Brydoke and John, the cook, may have been the electors who co-opted the other ten on the analogy of the assize jury, and perhaps owed their own appointment to the bailiffs.

Adam Brydoke, assessed on 14*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, I have been unable to identify; he was probably a kinsman of the Ralph Brydoke of

<sup>543</sup> Transcript, p. 135. *Liber Cartarum*, no. 125.

'Gateside,' who in 1323 was a benefactor of Tyne bridge,<sup>544</sup> and of the Robert Bridok who in 1319 joined with William de Denton and others to plunder the Yorkshire estates of 'John de Britannia,' earl of Richmond.<sup>545</sup> John Cook (*Cocus*) who paid on 8*l.* may be the father of the John Cook or Coke who left by will in 1379<sup>546</sup> 6*s.* 8*d.* to the altar of St. Mary in St. Nicholas. Of William de Speriden, assessed on 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, I can find no trace, nor of Ivo, the baker, nor of Waltheof (Waldevus), the dyer, who paid on 6*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* and 6*l.* respectively. William de Oggill who paid on 3*l.* 6*s.* 0*d.* was several times a bailiff during the latter part of Edward 1's reign, and occurs as a witness in one of the charters of the hospital of the Blessed Virgin Mary.<sup>547</sup> He was also collector of murage in 1311.<sup>548</sup> The seventh juror, Thomas de Hertburne, who was assessed on 4*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.* I cannot identify further, but the eighth, John Lubald, assessed on 8*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.*, witnessed a deed of gift by Gilbert Fleming to his son, John, in 1304.<sup>549</sup> The ninth juror, Roger de Ponte, was, perhaps, son of Walter de Ponte who appears in the printed lists as bailiff in 1255. The tenth name on the list, Walter, son of John, has been already referred to as being the most highly assessed of all the jurors. In his younger days he took part in the attack on the lands of Tynemouth priory, and in 1279 he and his partner, Simon Miriel (or Mirield), were among the 'drapers' who were fined for offences against the assize of cloth. The eleventh juror, Adam de Ireby, assessed on 9*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.*, was probably a kinsman of William de Ireby, who, according to the *De Banco rolls*, was at this time vicar of St. Nicholas's church.<sup>550</sup>

<sup>544</sup> Brand, I, 41, quoting Bourne, p. 130.

<sup>545</sup> C. P. R., 1317-1321, p. 359.

<sup>546</sup> Brand, I, 255.

<sup>547</sup> Bourne, p. 31.

<sup>548</sup> C. P. R., 1307-1313, p. 361.

<sup>549</sup> *Arch. Ael.*, 3rd series, v, p. 57. *Bowes Charters*; no. 57.

<sup>550</sup> The family is probably that of 'de Ireby' of Cumberland who were benefactors of Holm Cultram abbey. For their charters and genealogy see *Arch. Ael.*, 1st series, II, p. 397. *D. B. R. Anno 23-4* Ed. I, m, 232d.

The twelfth juror, Hugo Hangard, assessed on 4*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.*, witnessed the charter of Richard, son of James, the tanner.<sup>551</sup>

As we might expect, the population of Newcastle seems to have been recruited mainly from Northumberland, and this holds good of all the parishes. The immigrants seem to have drifted into the town for the most part from the neighbouring villages, especially from those near the main roads. Few came from beyond the twenty miles limit. After Northumberland, Durham supplied the largest quota, about fifteen in all, including settlers from Hartlepool, Norton-on-Tees and perhaps Darlington (?Dorngton).<sup>551a</sup> Cumberland contributed about half-a-dozen settlers, and Westmorland, Yorkshire, and North Lancashire were also represented. Besides the Le Escots there were several others of obviously Scottish origin, but it is uncertain whether Adam de Galwid' was connected with Galloway in Scotland or Galway in Ireland. The only representative of London, Adam, lived in the parish of St. Nicholas, but was only assessed on fourteen shillings. Perhaps his neighbour, John de Galton, came from the village of that name in Dorset and could thus claim to be the farthest travelled of all the immigrants.

It may be as well here to sum up the evidence provided by the roll on the economic state of Newcastle in 1296. It is clear that the majority of the population were agriculturalists. Perhaps the beginnings of the Eastland trade were there, but of the export of coal there is no direct trace. Indeed such coal as was used merely furnished fuel for lime-burning. The roll does not even show us any men engaged solely in the fishing industry, with the dubious exception of William Creler. Shipping there doubtless was, for William Russell is distinctly styled

<sup>551</sup> *Arch. Ael.*, 1st series, III, p. 83. William de Oggill, the sixth juror was another witness to this charter.

<sup>551a</sup> Mr. Robert Blair suggests Doddington in Northumberland. Its old name was Dorrington.

*nauta*, or sailor, and he was a wealthy man. The Scots and Karliols, and many of the richer men in the various parishes had interest in sea-borne trade, and it is hard to believe that Sampson the cutler's wealth arose from an industry for which Newcastle has never been especially famous. The main industries of the place seem to have been the tanning and preparing of skins and perhaps, even at this early date, the collection and exportation of wool, for Newcastle was the natural port of the pastoral north-country districts. Wool was certainly dyed and fulled in the borough to a large extent, as the dyers and fullers were wealthy persons, but, as has been previously pointed out, no weavers are referred to at Newcastle in the roll of 1296. It seems an undoubted fact that Newcastle as a flourishing industrial centre is the product of the long Scottish wars. To secure the north against the Scots the king no longer relied solely upon the bishops of Durham, but he helped the people of Newcastle to build their massive walls, and still more helpful, he lavished commercial privileges upon them in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, by which an enterprising and sturdy population was attracted to the city.

## APPENDIX.

## TAXATIO SEPTIME NOVI CASTRI SUPER TYNAM.

PAROCHIA Sancti Johannis. Summa bonorum			
Simonis Tannatoris	... .. xxxvs.	unde regi	vs.
Roberti Aurifabri	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Roberti de Fratribus	... .. xxxs.	„	ivs. iijd. ob.
Johannis de Wessington	... .. xs.	„	js. vd. ob.
Johannis Halt	... .. xs.	„	js. vd. ob.
Thome de Balho'	... .. xxvs.	„	iijs. vijd.
Thome de Gosford, Tannatoris	xxxvijs.	„	vs. iijd. ob.
Roberti fil. Agnetis	xxivs.	„	ijs.
Roberti Pyn	... .. xvijjs.	„	ijs. vijd.
Ricardi Blanatfir'	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi Putstan	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Hugonis de Dunfres	... .. vijs.	„	js.

PAROCHIA Sancti Johannis.		Summa bonorum-- <i>continued.</i>	
Roberti de Gunwarton	... xvijs. vjd.	unde regi	ijs. vjd.
Willelmi de Belincham	... lxs.	"	viijs. vjd.
Alani de Waln' junior	... xs.	"	is. vd. qd.
Willelmi Creler	... vijs.	"	js.
Roberti de Eland	... xivs.	"	ijs.
Rogeri de Waln'	... vijs.	"	js.
Isabell' uxoris Prepositi	... vijs.	"	js.
Johannis le Escot	... cciijs.	"	xxxjs. xd. qd.
Ricardi de Kirkandr'	... vijs.	"	js.
Johannis de Ebor'	... xs.	"	js. vd. qd.
Willelmi de Horneby	... xs.	"	js. vd. qd.
Elye Illuminatoris	... xxjs.	"	iijs.
Alexandri le Furbur	... ccccxvss.	"	lxjs. vd. qd.
Roberti de Morpath	... xxxivs.	"	ivs. xd. ob.
Johannis de Aynewike	... xviijs.	"	ijs. vijd.
Walteri Trusharnays	... xivs.	"	ijs.
Walteri de Kenton	... xxixs. vjd.	"	ivs. vjd.
Stephani de Neuton	... xlijs.	"	vjs.
Ade de Karliolo	... cxxxiijs. ivd.	"	xixs. ob. qd.
Walteri Aurifabri	... xxjs.	"	iijs.
Petri servientis Sampsonis	... cvijs. viijd.	"	xvs. ivd. ob. qd.
Johannis Burnet	... vijs.	"	js.
Roberti Aurifabri junior	... vijs.	"	js.
Thome servientis Sampsonis	... xlijs.	"	vjs.
Johannis de Blakeden'	... cclxvjs. viijd.	"	xxxviijs. jd. qd.
Ade de Richemond'	... xs.	"	js. vd. qd.
Nicholi Bendbone	... xs.	"	js. vd. qd.
Nicholi fil. David'	... cccclvjs.	"	lxiijs. ob. qd.
Roberti fratris Ingram	... lxxxs.	"	xjs. vd. qd.
Gabriel' Pistoris	... cclxxs. viijd.	"	xxxviijs. viijd.
Petri Sampson	... D.cxxxs.	"	xcs.
Johannis Malkin	... vijs.	"	js.
Henrici le Escot	... D.lxs.	"	lxxxs.
Jacobi Tannatoris	... cccclxivs.	"	lxvjs. iiijd. ob.
Thome del Hay	... xxjs.	"	iijs.
Ingram Marescalli	... clxxxvijs.	"	xxvjs. viijd. ob. qd.
Stephani Trottrand	... vijs. vjd.	"	js. jd.
Roberti de Burndon	... xviijs. vjd.	"	ijs. vjd.
Ade de Dunelm	... xlijs.	"	vjs.
Stephani Rambald	... lvjs. viijd.	"	viijs. iiijd.
Johannis Gere	... xxjs.	"	iijs.
Willelmi de Blaked'	... xvs.	"	ijs. ijd.

PAROCHIA Sancti Johannis. Summa bonorum — *continued.*

Willelmi Spinsmal ... ..	xvjs.	unde regi	ijs. iijd. ob.
Henrici Pondy ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Gilberti Cokeman ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Henrici Godeal ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Ade Wyth ... ..	xxxs.	„	ivs. iijd. ob.
Thome de Houburn ... ..	xs.	„	js. vd. qd.
Ricardi Caritat ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Henrici Runcy ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Summa Hujus Parochie cccxxvli	vd.	unde Domino Regi xxxiiijli	xjs. vjd.

## PAROCHIA Sancti Andree. Summa bonorum

Johannis Elgy ... ..	vijs.	unde regi	js.
Symonis Mirield ... ..	cclxxvijs.	„	xxxixs. vijd.
Ricardi de Bywell, sutor ...	xijs.	„	js. viijd. ob. qd.
Thome Sutherne ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Henrici Fullonis ... ..	xxivs.	„	iijs. vd.
Edmundi servientis H. del Hay	vijs.	„	js.
Agnētis filie Johannis Wymarke	xivs.	„	ijs.
Gilberti le Gros ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Johannis le Spens ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.
Juliane le (? de) Copon' ...	vijs.	„	js.
Walteri Burel ... ..	xvjs.	„	ijs. iijd. ob.
Ade de Burnton ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.
Fordham de Ossewrth ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Ade de Bingfield ... ..	xlijs.	„	vjs.
Nicholi Todde ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Johannis fil. Nicholi ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi de Burndon ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Waldevi Groume ... ..	xs.	„	js. vd. pb.
Hugonis Boniure ... ..	viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.
Stephani Carettarii ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Alexandri Sayer mercer ... ..	ixs.	„	js. iijd. ob.
Willelmi Longebayn ... ..	vijs.	„	js.
Roberti Marescalli ... ..	xxivs.	„	iijs. vd.
Nicholi fil. Meldr' ... ..	viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.
Thome Fullonis ... ..	xcs. xd.	„	xiijs. vd.
Nicholi de Hexildeham ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Roberti Russel de Fratibus ...	xs.	„	js. vd. qd.
Milissand Hild' ... ..	xs.	„	js. vd. qd.
Johannis Mauld ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.
Thome Pelleparii ... ..	lxvs.	„	ixs. iijd. ob.
Willelmi Sude ... ..	ccs. viijd.	„	xxviijs. viijd.

Parochia Sancti Andree. Summa bonorum—*continued.*

Ricardi del Maudelanis ...	xivs.	unde regi	ijs.
Johannis Forestar ...	xs. vjd.	,,	js. vjd.
Godefridi Molendinarii ...	xivs.	,,	ijs.
Hospital de Marie Magdalene	xlijs.	,,	vjs.
Willelmi generis Waldevi ...	vijs.	,,	js.
Petri de la Maudelanis ...	vijs.	,,	js.
Johannis de Heton ...	xxijs.	,,	iijs. iijd. ob.
Edmundi Molendinarii ...	vijs.	,,	js.
Ricardi generis Waldevi ...	xivs.	,,	ijs.
Willelmi Forestarii ...	xxjs.	,,	iijs.
Willelmi del Clay ...	xs.	,,	js. vd. qd.
Walteri Carettarii ...	xs.	,,	js. vd. qd.
Agnetis Gayteram ...	viijs.	,,	js. jd. ob. qd.
Thome de Burnton ...	xivs.	,,	ijs.
Willelmi de Hertelawe ...	xxijs. vjd.	,,	iijs. ijd. ob.
Gilberti de Tynemoue ...	viijs.	,,	js. jd. ob. qd.
Nicholi de Horneby ...	xlvijs. viijd.	,,	vjs. viijd.
Roberti de Bingfield ...	xlijs.	,,	vjs.
Thome de Horseley ...	vijs.	,,	js.

SUMMA hujus Parochie lxvli xixs ijd. unde Regi lxli viijs. vd. ob.

## PAROCHIA Omnium Sanctorum. Summa bonorum

Radulphi Cuper ...	xivs.	unde regi	ijs.
Thome de Corbrig ...	xxviijs.	,,	ivs.
Hugonis Chaluner ...	xxjs.	,,	iijs.
Alani de Wilum senior ...	lxxxjs. vjd.	,,	xjs. viijd.
Thome de Carliolo ...	lxxs.	,,	xs.
Rogeri de Burnton ...	cexivs.	,,	xxxxs. vjd.
Henrici de Haliwell ...	xivs.	,,	ijs.
Roberti Leman ...	xlvijs. ivd.	,,	vjs. ix d.
Nicholi de Blaked' ...	xivs.	,,	ijs.
Johannis Thorald ...	ccccxxs.	,,	lxs.
Johannis Gunter ...	xivs.	,,	ijs.
Laurencii Swan' ...	xciijs. ivd.	,,	xiijs. ivd.
Thome de Buringhill...	xxivs.	,,	iijs. vd.
Thome de Silkiswrth ...	ciijs. ivd.	,,	xivs. ix d.
Roberti Cambrn' ...	vijs.	,,	js.
Rogeri le Rus ...	xciijs. ivd.	,,	xiijs. ivd.
Emme Torald ...	lxvs. vjd.	,,	ixs. iijd.
Henrici Mariman ...	xxxvs.	,,	vs.
Ade Elwald ...	xciijs. ivd.	,,	xiijs. ivd.
Rogeri de Herterpoll ...	xs. vjd.	,,	js. vjd.

PAROCHIA Omnium Sanctorum.		Summa bonorum-- <i>continued.</i>	
Nicholi de Are	... .. vijs.	unde regi	js.
Patricii servientis Ade de			
Pampdene	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Willelmi Cotefot	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Ade Cully	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi Kype	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Willelmi de Pothawe	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Ade le Rus	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Walteri Coci	... .. xlijs.	unde regi	vjs.
Willelmi Russel Pistoris	... .. xlivs.	„	vjs. iijd. ob.
Johannis de Whitburnie	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Rogeri Paytelun	... .. lxxs.	„	xs.
Hugonis de Carliolo	... .. xxvijs.	„	ivs.
Johannis Fullonis de Engat	vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi de Hassingden	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Thome Tinctoris de Pampedon	xlijs.	„	vjs.
Johannis fil. Ade de Brincklawe	vijs.	„	js.
Johannis Wytsid	... .. xs.	„	js. vd. qd.
Gilberti de Cugat	... .. lxs. vjd.	„	viijs. vijd. ob. qd.
Willelmi Leman	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi de Dolfemby	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Henrici de Wermoue	... .. xviijs.	„	ijs. vijd.
Thome (fil.) Laurencii	... .. viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.
Andree Scaket	... .. xxxs.	„	ivs. iijd. ob.
Ade Gunter hoker	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Syg' de Muncketon'	... .. xs.	„	js. vd. qd.
Johannis de Barn'	... .. xxivs.	„	iijs. vd.
Thome Forestarii	... .. xvs.	„	ijs. jd. ob. qd.
Willelmi Colle	... .. viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.
Magistri Rogeri de Hecham	xxvijs.	„	ivs.
Isabellis Pemal	... .. ixs.	„	js. iijd. ob.
Johannis de Dolfemby	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Willelmi Porter	... .. ccclxs.	„	ljs. vd. qd.
Johannis de Henselsid	... .. xxivs.	„	iijs. vd.
Johannis Clerici	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Hutredi Fabri	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Roberti Nutbyyehay	... .. xvs.	„	ijs. jd. ob. qd.
Johannis forestarii de Walker	viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.
Lemmani de Pamped'	... .. xvijs. vjd.	„	ijs. vjd.
Nicholi de Burnton	... .. xxjs.	„	iijs.
Ricardi fil. Rogeri	... .. vijs.	„	js.

PAROCHIA Omnium Sanctorum.		Summa bonorum - <i>continued.</i>	
Petri Wodeman	... .. xxjs.	unde regi	ijs.
Johannis Rayncoke	... .. xxxvs.	„	vijs.
Petri Harchard	... .. xxjs.	„	ijs.
Thome del Swin	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Urkil fabri	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi Russel naute	... ccccxixvs.	„	lxijs.
Matildis del Redehowe	... cxlviijs. vjd. ob.	„	xxjs. ijd. ob. qd.
Nicholi Effocke	... .. xxjs.	„	ijs.
Isabellis relicte Gilberti fil.			
Ricardi	... .. cxlvijjs.	„	xxjs.
Andree Schepe	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Roberti de Norton	... .. clxvjs. viijd.	„	xxxvijs. jd. qd.
Rogeri Roskil	... .. cxxxiijs. ivd.	„	xixs. jd. ob.
Hervici del Hay	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Rogeri Servientis Rogeri de			
Lanton	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Tonnok Sciver	... .. xxxvs.	„	vs.
Henrici Sperru	... .. xivs.	„	ijs.
Roberti de Swalwell	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Walteri Gune	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Isabellis le Moyne	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Johannis de Driffeld	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Willelmi barbatoris	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Radulphi Scherman	... .. vijs.	„	js.

SUMMA hujus Parochie cxcix*li* viijs. viijd. ob.  
unde Regi xxviii*li* ix*s.* ix*d.* ob. qd.

PAROCHIA de Sancti Nicholi.		Summa bonorum	
Henrici de Eboraco	... .. xxvjs. viijd.	unde regi	ijs. x <i>d.</i>
Johannis Trotand	... .. lxvjs. viijd.	„	ix <i>s.</i> v <i>j.</i> ob.
Petri Gene	... .. xciijs. ivd.	„	xiijs. ivd.
Elye de Crecklawe	... .. xlijs.	„	vjs.
Walteri de Cugat	... .. ccxlvjs. viijd.	„	xlix <i>s.</i> v <i>d.</i> ob.
Thome de Quenley	... .. xxviijs.	„	iv <i>s.</i>
Matildis le Barbur	... .. ccxs.	„	xxx <i>s.</i>
Johannis Ruchfot	... .. xiv <i>s.</i>	„	ijs.
Ade Jargun	... .. cclxvjs.	„	xxxviijs. jd.
Hugonis Gerard' et J(ohannis)			
fil. (Gilbert') de Pamped'	M.D.clxxx <i>s.</i>	„	ccxl <i>s.</i>
Johannis de Pytington	... .. vijs.	„	js.
Cristiane Caldrun'	... .. viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.
Walteri Cutiller	... .. viijs.	„	js. jd. ob. qd.

PAROCHIA de Sancti Nicholi. Summa bonorum—*continued.*

Elie Servientis Isold' de				
Pamped' ... ..	liijs.	unde regi	vijs. viijd.	
Willelmi Cunty ... ..	ls.	„	vijs. jd. ob. qd.	
Johannis Crawe. ... ..	xvjs.	„	js. vjd.	
Roberti de Neuton ... ..	clxxs.	„	xxivs. iijd. ob.	
Thome Chepman ... ..	vijs.	„	js.	
Gilberti Schapakape ... ..	xxxvjs. viijd.	„	vs. iijd.	
Henrici Wodeman ... ..	xxivs. viijd.	„	iijs. vjd. ob. qd.	
Willelmi Chaunceler ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.	
Willelmi fil. Ede' ... ..	xxxs.	„	ivs. iijd. ob.	
Nicholi de Dunelm ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.	
Ricardi de Egirmond ... ..	vijs.	„	js.	
Johannis Scheding ... ..	xvjs.	„	ijs. iijd. ob.	
Thome Fraunces ... ..	xs.	„	js. vd. qd.	
Willelmi de Dornngton' ... ..	xvjs. viijd.	„	iijs. ix. ob. qd.	
Rogeri Godeson ... ..	vijs.	„	js.	
Alicie de Walsend ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.	
Ricardi Quisteler ... ..	xs. vjd.	„	js. vjd.	
Radulphi Cuper ... ..	vijs. vjd.	„	ijs.	
Ade Sternel Sutoris ... ..	xjs. vjd.	„	js. vjd. ob. qd.	
Willelmi Sellarii ... ..	vijs.	„	js.	
Roberti de Lamesley ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.	
Roberti de Avenill ... ..	xs.	„	js. vd. qd.	
Stephani Elgy ... ..	lxxxs.	„	xjs. vd.	
Nicholi de Faudon ... ..	lxivs. vjd.	„	ixs. ijd. ob.	
Inete relicte Walteri Cuper ... ..	cxivs. ivd.	„	xvjs. ivd.	
Roberti de Mitford ... ..	cxvvs. ivd.	„	xxvijs.	
Johannis Scherman ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.	
Willelmi de Benewell ... ..	vijs.	„	js.	
Sampsonis le Cutiller ... ..	M.lxijs. ivd.	„	cljs. xd.	
Ricardi de Emeldon ... ..	xxvijs.	„	ivs.	
Johannis de Redisdal ... ..	xxxvs.	„	vs.	
Ade Bradefot ... ..	xxivs.	„	iijs. vd.	
Ade Pyncke ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.	
Johannis le Sunen ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.	
Hugonis Scot et Rogeri				
Sperru ... ..	cxls.	„	xxs.	
Dyonis Benet ... ..	lxs. vjd.	„	viijs.	
Willelmi Pistoris ... ..	xxjs.	„	iijs.	
Willelmi Molendinariii ... ..	xxvijs.	„	ivs.	
Thome de Quicham ... ..	vijs.	„	js.	
Sibelle relicte Thome Tinctoris	xivs.	„	ijs.	

PAROCHIA de Sancti Nicholi. Summa bonorum—*continued.*

Emme Daynil ... ..	vijs.	unde regi	js.
Willelmi de Carliolo ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Johannis Daynil ... ..	xlijs.	„	vjs.
Hugonis Bel Pelleparii ... ..	lxvjs. viijd.	„	ixs. vjd. qd.
Willelmi Damys ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Ade fil. Gilberti fil. Ricardi ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Willelmi fil. Walteri de Benton ... ..	cxxs.	„	xvijs. ijd.
Ade de London ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Johannis de Galton ... ..	xivs.	„	ijs.
Ade de Galwid' ... ..	cs.	„	xivs. iiijd. ob. qd.
Thome de Frisymarays ... ..	xxxvs.	„	vs.
Petri Grapor ... ..	ccccs.	„	lixs. ijd.
Thome de Tindal ... ..	ccclxxxs.	„	xls.
Agnetis le Escot ... ..	cvjs. viijd.	„	xvs. iiijd.
Magistri Johannis le Surrays	xxvijs.	„	ivs.

SUMMA hujus Parochie cccxxviij*li* xvs. ivd.unde Domino Regi xlvi*li* xvjs. vd. ob. qd.

## Duodecim Juratores. Summa bonorum

Ade Brydoke ... ..	ccxciijs. ivd.	unde regi	xls. xjd.
Johannis Coci ... ..	clxs.	„	xxijs. xd. qd.
Willelmi de Speriden ... ..	cxxxiijs. ivd.	„	xixs. ob. qd.
Ivonis Pistoris ... ..	cxxxjs. vjd.	„	xviijs. ix <i>d.</i> ob.
Waldevi Tinctoris ... ..	cxxs.	„	xvijs. jd. ob. qd.
Willelmi de Oggill ... ..	lxvjs.	„	ixs. vd. qd.
Thome de Hertburne ... ..	xcijs.	„	xiijs. jd. ob. qd.
Johannis Lubald ... ..	clxxvijs. ivd.	„	xxvs. vd. ob. qd.
Rogeri de Ponte ... ..	lxxvjs. viijd.	„	xs. xjd. ob.
Walteri fil. Johannis ... ..	ccxcixs. ivd.	„	xlijs. ix <i>d.</i>
Ade de Ireby ... ..	clxxxivs.	„	xxvjs. iiijd. ob.
Hugonis Hangard ... ..	lxxxivs. viijd.	„	xijs. jd. ob.

SUMMA hujus duodenarii xcl*li* xixs. ijd. unde Domino Regi xij*li* xixs. xd. ob. qd.SUMMA SEPTIME VILLE NOVI CASTRI super TINAM. cxxxj*li* vjs. jd. ob. qd.