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## PREFACE.

MY best thanks are due, in the first place, to my friend Mr George Barnes of the Inner Temple, and when I say that he laboriously made and generously gave me that index of personal names which will add much to the value of this book, it will be seen that I have good cause to be grateful:-also to Mr J. M. Rigg of Lincoln's Inn for having copied (very carefully as I afterwards found) some thirty pages of the manuscript at a time when I was otherwise engaged :-also to Mr James Greenstreet, who has long known the manuscript, for some useful suggestions:-to the gentlemen who have charge of the Public Record Office, more especially to Mr Walford Selby, for many courtesies which have made my days among the rolls very pleasant:-to Mr Hampshire the Librarian of Exeter (Gathednal for a copy of a deed relating to Bracton's place of burial, which he kindly sent to me:- to Mr Melville Bigelow of Boston and Professor Thayer of Harvard for the encouragement given me by friendly letters
from a land where Bracton is at least as well known and at least as highly honoured as he is in England :-and lastly to my friend Mr. Frederick Pollock who has been ready always to listen to and generally to answer my questions, and from whom I first learnt to find an interest in the history of law. That the idea of connecting this book with Bracton was due to Professor Vinogradoff of Moscow, I shall explain below, and indeed this will be plain enough from the letter of his, which (by the permission of the editor of the Athenceum) is here reprinted: but I must add that in 1884 and again in 1886 I had the happiness of talking over his discovery with him.

When I say that I am not satisfied with the form in which the Note Book is here made public, this is no conventional protestation. Down to the last moment I have found so many faults in my own work, that I cannot but believe that there are many yet to be found. Down to the last moment I have been learning many things about the law of the thirteenth century which I ought to have known at the outset. For sins of commission no excuse shall be offered, for none should be accepted; but before I am blamed for having done less than might have been done in the way of collating rolls, giving varions readings, making indexes and notes, it will I hope be remembered that this has been a private enterpise. I have often had to count the cost ; also to reflect that another day in the Record Ottice or the British Museum would mean another
hundred miles in the train．So the reander gets no facsimiles of the manuscripts；he gets an index where he should have had a digest，perhaps a translation ；the luxmy of cancelling sheets instead of confessing some stupid blunders，has been denied me，and I am sure that there must be more to be learned abont Bracton＇s life than I have been able to discover：at this eleventh，nay thirteenth，hour I find what I believe to be his marks on a roll of King John＇s reign（Coram Rege Roll，No 18）．But as his treatise had lately been edited at the expense of the nation，and as there was no learned society whose business it was to encourage the study of English legal history（for the Selden Society was not yet born nor even thought of ），it seemed likely that the Note Book would remain unprinted for many years，unless some one would make such an edition of it as could be made at his own cost and without giving to it all his time．Perhaps I was not the man for the work；but I have liked it well．
F. IW. M.

FROOKNIDE，（AMBRIDGE：
sopt．． $189^{7}$.
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## ERRATA.

YOL. I.
p. 74, note 1. For 26 th Jam. 19 read 26th Jan. 1219.
p. 93, in the heading. For The Thirl Argument real The Fourth Argument.

YOL. II.
p. 22, 1. 6. The nunnery is that of Sinningthwaite in Yorkshire. Monast. vol. 5, p. 463.
p. 25,1 . 2. The reading was originally per breve Regis J. (by a writ of King John); the annotator turned $J$ into ingressu; seemingly in so doing he made a mistake.
p. 25 , Case 30 . I misunderstood this case. Jacob, the deforciant in the assize, vouches Benedict, but the voucher is not allowed because Simon, the plaintiff, claims to hold of Jacob. Andrew, Jacob's father, 'ineumbered' the tenement by enfeoffing Swanild, Simon's mother; so Benedict, Jacob's lord, is not bound to warrant Jacob against a claim arising out of this 'incumbramentum'. Bracton, f. 261, deals with just this point.
pp. 39, 40, Case 43. I misunderstood this case. In a mort dancestor the parol does not demur for the nonage of the defendant, if his ancestor entered as guardian in chivalry. This seems admitted. The case however apparently decides that it is otherwise when the land is held in socage; here the lord can have no business to enter on his tenant's death; if he enters he is a mere intruder, and there is no fiduciary relationship between him and the socager; therefore if he enters and then dies seised, the parol shall demur for his heir's nonage. This provokes from the annotator the exclamation 'Nota, mirum propter socagium!' He thinks it strange that in any case the parol should demur for the nonage of a person who has entered claiming (though not really entitled to) guardianship. In the marginal note for quam petit iniuste read quamuis iniuste.
p. 49, 1. 8. For fuerunt read fuerint.
p. $52,1.18$. The MS. has quo, but it should be quod.
p. 121, 1.15. ceperunt uadia sua; this merely means that the bailiffs took distresses (gages) from them. I thought that in connection with cloth madia might mean woad.
p. 138, 1. 5. The name must be Crunes.
p. 297, 1. 19. For Thome read Thomam.
p. 340, Case 420. The Longuerille in question is in Nomamy betwern Isigny and bayeux.

1. 341, 1. 16. For qui read que.
2. 369, Case 469 . The parunm brene in question was the vicontiel writ of muisance, as to which sec F. N. B. 184.
p. 373, 1. 7. For leginaldi read lieg', which probably stands for Regis; sce Case 1764.
p. 404, Case 516. Cuuyc is not Southwick, but Cowick near Exeter, where was a cell of Bec. Monast. vol. 6, p. 1043.
p. 490, l. 17. By ipse l'eter means himself. He asserts that his own son has better right than William.
p. 506, note 4. Seemingly I was wrong in supposing that the marriage was consummated before the gift was made.
p. 533 , note 4. For defendant read demandant.
p. 534 , note 8 . The point is this:-A father gives the marriage of his son to $X$; $X$ must get the son married during the father's life, for otherwise the father's lord will be entitled to the marriage.
p. G56, note 4. This must mean, not 'until the land shall be at peace', but 'until the land shall have acquitted itself', i.e. probably, until the land slall have repaid a sum of money for which it has been made security.
p. 666, 1. 16. nisi iudicium illum incumbaret (corr. incumbraret). I have given a very bad explanation of this. The king insisted that each of the relvellious barons should come to the court alone, and should go home alone, umless the judgment of the court should incumber, impede, him. Of course in case judgment should go against him there could be no talk of his going home; he would be 'incumbered' by the judgment. Bracton has a similar passage on f. 119. An accused person who is willing to answer the charge 'libere debet recelere, nisi indicium ei inenmberet '.

## VOL. III.

1. 16, line 25. The first pre in this line should be pro.
p. 33. In the heading, for filius read filil.
2. 132, Case 1115. Selden refers to this case in his Notes on Fortescue; Note 8; I owe this remark to Prof. Thayer. In line 9 on page 133 the words on the roll, which the copyist of the Note Book reads as et verbis, should be in omnilus.
p. 305 , note 1. I withdraw the remark that the name Mumegedene scems a corruption of Muntbegum.
p. 497, note 1. For Alice read Agnes.
3. 450 , line 6. For reognoscendum read recognoscendum.
4. 468 , line 1. For producati psa read producat ipsa.
5. 566, note 2. More probably this means that if any one gave judgment in the wapentake the king would hear of it.

## A LETTER OF PAUL VINOGRADOFF PRINTED IN

 THE ATHENAEUM FOR 19 JULY, 1884.lt is well known that the chief importance of Bracton's work on the laws of England is derived from the fact that it is based on a most extensive and careful study of the judicial practice of the thirteenth century. Building on this firm founclation, Bracton was able to produce a treatise which in arrangement, connecting theories, and even in many a particular point, testifies to the influence of Roman jurisprudence and of its mediæval exponents, but at the same time remains a statement of genuine English law, a statement so detailed and accurate that there is nothing to match it in the whole legal literature of the Middle Ages.

The great English judge did not content himself with setting forth in a general way what he held to be the law of his country ; he used systematically the rolls of Martin of Pateshull and William of Raleigh, and gives no fewer than 450 references to cases decided by his predecessors and teachers. This being so, it is surely not devoid of interest to inspect rather closely that groundwork of Bracton's treatise, and to trace as far as possible his way of selecting and handling his records. Now I think that a British Museum MS., numbered Add. 12,269, can help us very materially in this direction. It is a collection of cases written about the middle of the thirteenth century, with a good many notes on the margin. The first leaves and the last quires are missing, and there is no direct evidence as to the person who compiled and used the book, but the contents make it very

[^1]probable indeed, if not certain, that it was drawn up for Bracton and annotated by him or under his dictation.

If we leave aside the comparatively few instances when Bracton's treatise gives only general references, and take the quotations specifying court and year of the trial, we shall see at once that they may be classed under three heads ${ }^{1}$ : 1 . Cases tried in the King's Bench, ranging from Michaelmas, 2 Henry III., to Jaster, 18 Henry III. ; 2. Cases before the King's Council, from 19 to 24 Henry III.; 3. Cases tried in the Eyres of Martin of Pateshull and William of Raleigh during the first half of Henry III.'s reign. There remains a certain, very small, number of stray quotations which do not come under this classification ; as, for instance, casual mentions of trials Coram Rege in $31,32,38$ Henry III. They probably did not belong to the original text of the treatise; but even if they did, their occurrence does not alter the general arrangement.

Now the Add. MS. contains: 1. Cases tried in the King's Bench ranging from Michaelmas, 2 Henry III., to Easter, 18 Henry III. ; 2. Cases before the King's Council, from 19 to 24 Henry III. ; 3. Cases tried in some of the Eyres of Martin of Pateshull. Unfortunately the MS. breaks off right in the middle of a Staffordshire Eyre, so that we cannot judge how far the other circuits of Martin and those of William of Raleigh had been used. But even what is left is quite sufficient, as I take it, to establish a remakable coincidence between the book and the Add. MS. (A Patent Roll ${ }^{2}$ of 42 Henry 11I., quoted by Madox, 'History of the Exchequer,' ii. 257, enjoins Henry of Bracton to surreuder the rolls of M. de Pateshull and W. de Raleigh which he had been using.)

The extracts, 1 ought to mention, are made in a very irregular fashion as regards the order of rolls and terms. The compiler did not go by strict chronology, probally because he had not the whole set of records at his disposial at the same time. So we find that after a series of King's Bench terms of the second, fourth, sixth, seveuth, and ninth years, earlier rolls come on again. What is more, there are occasions when a roll from which extracts had been made was taken up again, and some new cases

[^2]copied out from it ${ }^{1}$. The last is a very important featme because it explains a fact which at first sight seems to tell against the supposed comexion of our MS. with Bracton, mamely, that not all the cases mentioned in the treatise are to be found muder their respective years in the note-book. As a considerable part of this seems to be lost, we camot expect book and treatise to fit completely.

Passing from a general survey to a closer examination of the contents, we must, of course, advert principally to the subjectmatter of the marginal notes in the MS. Are there any striking analogies between their wording and the text in Bracton's treatise? Most of the notes give only in a few short words the substance of the transcribed cases or call attention to particular points in them. But not seldom the amotator eriticizes the decision or supplements it by reflections of his own, and then the close relation between note-book and treatise becomes apparent.

An instance is afforded by the passage on the right of a widow to bequeath crops growing on the land she held in dower. Previous to the statute of Merton, 20 Hemry III., such it bequest would not have been valid. Bracton, 'De Legibus,' folio 96 l, says: "Nova superveniente gracia et pronisione......poterit uxor de fructibus et bladis siue a solo separata fuerint, siue non, testari et pro molmatate sua disponere." The Add. MS., folio $\because 09$ a, has: "Modo mutatum est de noua gracia quod potest testamentum facere de blado tirmo in terra ${ }^{\text {? }}$."

On $169 b$ of the note-book we find the following peculiar illustration: "Terminus terminans set indeterminatus et incertus, et ideo liberum tenementum sicnt ad vitam hominis, quia nihil certius morte, nihil incertius hora mortis." The same diction ocenrs in the treatise, folio $27 b:$ "Si autem tiat donatio ad terminum annorum, quamvis longissimum, qui excedat vitas hominum, tamen et hoc non leabebit donatorius liberum tenementum, cum terminus annorum certus sit et determinatus, et terminus vitre incertus, et quia licet nilill certins sit morte, wihil trmen incertius cst hora mortis.".

[^3]The whole disquisition about the natural and artificial, the common and the leap year, given in the treatise, is set out at greater length, but with a literal repctition of some characteristic sentences, in the note book ( 195 b ). The quaint comparisons of the year of 365 days to a bird without a tail and of that of 365 days and six hours to a bird holding its tail in its mouth occur equally in both texts ${ }^{1}$.

Speaking about the marginal remarks and insertions of the Add. MS., I must not omit to notice a very important feature in their composition : it is evident that they were written at very different periods. After the collection had been compiled the person for whom it was made seems to have gone through it two or three times. Two observations lead me to this conclusion. Some of the entries, especially where additional matter has been inserted on blank pages, are in distinctly later handwriting (for instance, 196 a). A note has been added sometimes where originally there was only a " $\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{a}}$ " to show that the passage deserved special attention. This peculiarity explains the presence of one or two writs which do not occur in Bracton's treatise (195 b), and scem to have been especially inserted because they did not occur there ${ }^{2}$.

Another point requires careful consideration: among the marginal notes of the Add. MS. there is a certain number of references to cases, mostly very incomplete, jotted down by the annotator from general recollection, without any attempt at definite quotation. One can fancy that in reading through the report of a trial of 1227 Bracton was struck by its similarity with a case which had come under his own personal knowledge, and wrote down in the margin: "fere casus Cole" $(40 b)^{3}$. A very good instance is given on 185 b . The text recites interesting pleadings of some peasants trying to vindicate their right of ancient demesne tenantry against their lord. The note says: " $\mathrm{N}^{a}$ de villanis Henrici de Tracy de Tawystok qui numquam fucrunt in manu Domini Regis nec antecessorum suorum et loguebantur de tempore Regis Edwardi coram Willelmo de

[^4]Wilton." The entry seems to refer to a trial of 47 Memy Ill., which, however, took place not before W. de Wilton, but before Middleton and Brewes (transcribed in a Coram Rege Roll of Michaelmas, 7-S Edward I.; cf. Placitor. Abbrev. 270)'. Unfortmately so many of the original rolls have been lost and the indications of the British Musemm Ms. are so general that it was impossible to trace out most cases in the way of such direct comparison.

But there were other chamels. The Patent Rolls give the appointment of justiciaries to try particular assizes, and the Fine Rolls record payments received for such appointments by the Exchequer. These documents give the approximate time of another marginal case. Fol. 276 a has the following entry opposite a Yorkshire assize of Martin of Pateshull: "Na casum Hugonis filii Wymund de Ralegh primogenitum et postnatum qui fuit infra etatem de concordia inter cos facta, coram $I I$. de Bratton." Wymund of Ralegh was still alive in 1256 , as is shown by a final concord between him and Warin of Ralegh in the King's Bench (Feet of Fines, Devon, Henry III., N. 492). In 1259 Bracton is appointed to try an assize of mort d'ancestor between Hugh and Warin of Ralegh, and that is most probably the case hinted at in our MS. (Patent Roll, 43 Henry III., membr. 13, dorso) ${ }^{2}$. In most instances the comnexion could not be so clearly ascertained. Still, the examination of the Patent Rolls is instructive even where it does not lead to the absolute identification of particular cases, because it narrows the range of possible identification to a very small area in space and time. To put it briefly, they point to Somerset, Devon, and Comwall as the counties, to Henry of Bratton as the judge, and to the years $42-46$ of Henry III. as the time with which the cases of Ralph of Arundell, Corbyn, and the heirs of Hokesham, mentioned in the note-book, are connected. Of course, there is evidence to show that the earlier parts of Bracton's treatise were composed before 42 Henry III., but the work as it presents itself does not look at all like a completed one, and nothing shows that it was not in process of elaboration in some of its parts as late as 46 Henry III., and even later.

Last, but not least, there is a definite trace left by the marginal cases of the note-book in one of the most important

[^5]MSS. of Bracton's treatise. It may lave struck many students of the author that parallel to the carefully arranged quotations from early rolls there runs a string of irregular references to later cases. A trial is mentionerl, for instance, to which the heirs of John of Mummuth were parties. Now the said Joln died immediately before $1259^{1}$ (Roberts, 'Calendarium Genealogicum,' i. 73), and so the castal illustration has been taken from a case fresh in the remembrance of the author when he composed the corresponding part of the treatise. The case Roger de Regni $r$. Robert de Shute, entered as a heading to one of the paragraphs in the editions, is nothing but a similar side reference to a trial which may be still read at the Record Office on an assize roll of Bracton for 125t (Coram Rege, Henry III., N. 96, m. 4). And so in the work itself we lave the like marginal illustrations as in the note-book, and a careful collation of the MSS. of Bracton would bring them casily out in their original character of side-notes. Now, one of the most interesting among the Bracton MSS., Dighy 22.2 in the Bodleian Library, of which that wondrous production called Sir Travers Twiss's edition of Bracton does not take the slightest notice, gives as marginal references two of the most conspicuons illustrative instances of the note-book, the Corbyn case on the sulbject of warranty and the Ralph of Arundell case.

Summarizing briefly the evidence in respect of Bracton's connexion with the note-book in the British Musemm, I lay again stress on the following points: 1. The abstracts from rolls in the Add. Ms. and the rolls which served as material for the drawing up of the treatise are substantially the same. 2. There are passages in the treatise which even in their wording connect themselves with notes in the Add. MS. 3. The illustrative references in the Add. MS. can be traced in some instances to Bracton's own practice, and in two cases are found to recur in MSS. of Bracton's work.

My paper has grown to such an inordinate length already that I do not venture to hint at the importance of the matter collected in the British Musem MS. It seems sufficient for the present to say that the note-book gives a copious and careful selection of cases from the early practice of Henry III.'s time, and that many of the rolls from which it was compiled have been

[^6]lost since．I intend to discuss some of the material questions arising from the study of these alostracts in the new quarterly which the Oxford Law school is going to start next year ；hat eren now I think it may be said without fear of going wrong that the integral publication of the MS．wonld afford the most fitting sequel to Palgrave＇s editions of Richard I．＇s and John＇s rolls．

I must not omit before conchuding to thank Mr W．Selby，of the Record Office，for the kind and valuahle help which I had from him on several occasions during my inquiry．

## PAUL VINOGRADOFF．

## NOTE ON THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE EXTANT PLEA ROLLS.

The yet extant Plea Rolls of Henry the Third's reign are arranged at the Public Record Office in theec classes, (1) Coram Rege Rolls, (2) Assize Rolls, (3) Tower Assize Rolls or Tower Coram Rege Rolls. This arrangement has been determined partly by the fact that in time past some of the rolls were preserved in the Tower and some at Westrminster. That a roll is now found in a particular class, is by no means a sure indication of its real nature, for instance, it may happen that one of two duplicate rolls will be among the Coram Rege Rolls and the other among the Assize Rolls. Therefore in citing a roll as Coram Rege Roll No. 91, Assize Roll M. 2, 3, 1, or Tower Roll No. 4, I imply nothing as to the character of the roll, but merely give the reader a name whereby he may obtain the document to which I refer. In citing a particular membrane of a roll, I refer to the figures which have been set upon its membra:es by a modern pencil.

## MSS. OF BRACTON'S TREATISE.

Note :--The following MSS. of Bracton's treatise I have occasionally consulted, and some of them are referred to in my Introduction by means of the letters here assigned to them. It should be understood however that the order in which they are here mentioned, is not an order of merit or of date, also that at least twelve other MSS. are known to exist, at seven of which, those in Lincoln's Imn, Gray's Inn, the Temple and Trinity College, Cambridge, I have glanced.

In the British Musoum.

| MA $=$ Royal 9 E. xv. | $\mathrm{MH}=$ Harl. 817. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{MB}=$ Add. 11,35:3. | M l = Harl. 1,242. |
| $\mathrm{MC}=$ Add. $21,614$. | MK = Harl. 3, 116. |
| $\mathrm{MD}=$ Add. $24,067$. | $\cdots \mathrm{L}=$ Harl. 3,42. |
| $\mathrm{ME}=$ Harl. 6.3. | $M M=$ Add. 32,340 . |
| $\mathrm{MF}=$ Harl. 6.56. | $M N=$ Stowe 72. |
| $\mathrm{MG}=$ Harl, 763. |  |

In the Eodleion Libran:\%
$\mathrm{OA}=$ Dighy 22.
$O D=$ Rawlinson (. 160.
$O C^{4}=$ Rawlinson C. 1.i9.


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{CA}=\text { Dd. vii. } 6 . \\
& \mathrm{CB}=\text { Dd. vii. } 14 . \\
& \mathrm{CC}=\text { Ec, iv. } 4 .
\end{aligned}
$$

## INTRODUCTION.

## § 1. Of Bracton his times and his urork. Generalities.

That Bracton's book on the laws of England is a good biractur and a great book very worthy of careful study, is no novel land marky opinion, but rather an old tradition which has stood the test and received the sanction of modern scholarship.

In truth that book both marks and makes a critical moment in the history of English law, and therefore in the essential history of the English people. About the middle of the thirteenth century, the time when Bracton was at work, our common law, the law which was to be common to Power and England and rast lands of which he never dreant, was hinds sourt rapidly and definitely assuming the shape that it was to keep, "1kiry III. but little changed for long ages. Yet a little while and Parliament would have come into being as the one proper organ of all legislation, hampering by its masterful but fragmentary and intermittent statntes any further development of menacted law, jealons of the royal power, jealons lest new writs, new forms of procedure, should mean new laws made withont its approval. At latest before the death of Edward the First the main outlines of the common law would, we may say, be drawn once and for all: an intricate superstructure might yet be reared, the ground plan conld no, longer be changed. But during the first part of the reign of Edward's father, the king's judges must have enjoyed such an opportunity of moulding a powerful, practical scheme of law as has rarely been given to men. Past history, the Norman eonguest, the rigom of king after king, the ill suceess of
M. I.
avery revolt, had decided that we should have one common law for the whole of England, that it should be the law of one great central conrt and that court the king's. Very truly had the king become the fountain of justice. Other springs there had been and were, communal, scignorial, ecclesiastical, the ancient courts of the shire and the hundred, the manorial courts, the Courts Christian. These, had our history been not quite what it was, might have become effective and independent sources of English law, or of manifold local customs. As it is, we, accustomed for centuries to our centralized royal justice, are apt to make too light of these old courts, to think of them only as they were in the last stage of their decay. In Bracton's day they yet flourished. The feudal jurisdictions were dearly prized and obstinately defended; the Great Charter had but lately protected them against royal invasion. Attendance at the county court was a burden, but a burden that knights of the shire would willingly bear if thereby they could check the proceedings of the king's professional judges. The tribunals of the church were zealons and ambitions, eager for work. Still by one means and another, by royal writs invented as circumstances required, the king was getting into his hands a monopoly of justice, was holding himself out as ready to intervene at any stage of any action and to draw the matter into his own court. We can not quite say of him in the wellknown words that he was "over all persons and in all causes "ecelesiastical as well as civil within his dominions supreme." That was not the theory of the time. The ecelesiastical courts were not his conrts, nor had he power in spiritual matters. That those courts obtained and retained exclusive cognizance of such (as they seem to us) purely temporal affairs as testamentary canses, is enongh to show, were other proof wanting, that royal justice harl at least one active rival. There were two swords; the king grasped but one. Still he had succeeded in setting to the ecelesiastical jurisdiction detinite bounds. These bounds if we think them wide, were none the less thought far too narrow by the elergy of the diy and were only maintained by the curemitting
rigilance of the royal judges. But, for all this, the king's justice had a large field and behind it was power not to be withstood.

If however history had decided that the English kingship moval power should be a very strong kingship and in particular that the liwnt. king should have an active control over all the justice in his realm, still a strong kingship is no absolute monarchy, and history had decided also that the king must judge aceording to law. Whatever danger there may have been that his court would be merely a machine for enforeing his personal will and pleasure was at an end, at least for a time. Happily, as it now may seem to us, the vast power of Henry the Second had come to the hands of John. Tyranny had provoked revolt and the charter was won. Happily again the revolt was not too successful, and happily the crown passed from John to a boy but nine years old. The minority of Henry the Third made it possible to distingnish between the impersonal 'Crown' and the little crowned head. Law could not be just what pleased this child. Quod prineipi placuit legis habet vigorem:-without much montruth this phrase might be applied to his mighty grandfather, though rather perhaps as a statement of plain matter of fact, than as a theory of the English kingship. Under Henry the Second, whose will had a way of making itself law, the writer whom we call Glanvill could at least hint that these famous and to a mediaeval lawyer almost sacred words were literally true in England ${ }^{\text {I }}$. Bracton plays with them and turns their edge. Alongside the king, indeed above the king stands the royal law that makes him king ${ }^{2}$. This let the king obey; so rloing he loses no whit of majesty or power, becomes subject to none but himself. Our Blessed Lady, even our Blessed Lord were thus obedient to the law for man ${ }^{3}$. A constitutional theory not yet embodied in definite institutions fond expression for a while in the glittering paradox that submission to selfimposed law is the supreme feat of Gorl's Ommipotence-

Non est inpotentia sed summa potestas,
Magna Dei gloria, magnaque maiestas ${ }^{4}$.

[^7]$$
1-\because
$$

A little later, perhaps before Bracton had done writing, something less mystical had become received, or at least probable, doctrine. The shiftless policy of the self-willed king set men thinking:-the king has peers and he who has peers has superiors ${ }^{1}$. But from the time when John, forced into a solemn covenant to deny right and justice to none, had set his will against his word and died a miserable death, (and it was just to this moment that Bracton carried back his search for precedents,) above the king there was eridently law ${ }^{2}$.

The julkes are learned.

From the same time it is that we first hear of judges in the king's court who are learned, professionally learned in the law of the land. It was still the part of all who aspired to be aught in church or state to do a good deal of judging. Not only in their own manorial courts but as justitiarii Domini Regis assigned to take assizes or hear pleas of the crown, earls, barons and knights, bishops and abbots decided causes and passed judgment. But by slow degrees the king's court (caria) was becoming distinct from the king's council (concilium); the work of hearing lawsuits was being separated from the general business of governing or helping to govern the comntry, and it was felt that study and book-learning, something more special than an ordinary experience of public
${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 34.
${ }^{2}$ The passages in which Glanvill (Prologus) and Bracton (f. 107) introduce the Quod principi placuit have often been discussed. It has been supposed that Bracton mistranslated the words. They, it will he remembered, run thus:-sed et quod prineipi placuit, legis habet vigorem, cum lege regia, quae de imperio cius lata est, populus ei et in emm omne sum imperium et potestatem coneessit (Inst. I. 2. 6). Bracton is arguing that the king onglit to rule according to law. This, he urges, is not contrary to the famons text, quod principi placuit legis labet vigorem, becanse that text goes on to say, cum lege regia quae de imperio cius lata est. Here he stops his citation, and some think that he takes rum to be a preposition. The
state of his text is at present so bad that the loss of a few words may perhaps be suspected; but I have looked fruitlessly at many MSS. in hope of finding a variant. If how. ever, as seems likely, he does take cum as a preposition it does not necessarily follow that he is guilty of a stupendous blunder. It is incredible that he should not have known and been able to construe the last words of the passage. I see here rather a playful perversity than a mistake. Similar dealings with the text of a book yet more sacred than the Institutes were not uncommon, half-sportive half-serions twistings of holy writ. See Selden, Diss. ad Fletam, cap. 3. sec. 2, and Hallam, Middle Ages, ed. 1837, vol. $2, ~ p .459$.
life, were needful for those who term after term were to sit in a certain place, in aliquo loen certo, and dectare tho law. Let us indeed remember, that Englishmen have never admitted in theory or in fact that none but a lawrer is fit to judge his fellows. Theoretically our highest court of law is an assembly of lords spiritual and temporal, while very practically at quarter sessions and potty sessions is much justice done by those whom lawyers call lay-men. Thronghout the middle ages the mprofessional element in our judicial constitution was strong and healthy, keeping common law at one with common opinion, preventing any wholesale adoption of an alien jurisprudence. But still from the begiming of Henry the Third's reign there were in the royal court learned judges, most of them ecclesiastics, who were making for themselves fame merely as great judges. Foremost among them there was Martin Pateshull, 'a man of 'wondrous wisdom and very learned in the law of the land ${ }^{1}$.'

And 'the gladsome light of jurisprudence' (to use Coke's Lawasubject fine phrase ${ }^{2}$ ) had dawned in England as elsewhere, an idea of law as of a reasonable system of comnected principles, providing in advance for all possible cases, a proper subject for cloubt, disputation, proof,-and yet no mere ideal existing only in the speculations of doctors and scholars, but the very law of the land, of which ordinances, charters, writs, decisions, ancient custom, wonted procedure, were authoritative though partial manifestations. Practice and theory had grown side by side reacting on each other. The concentration of justice in the king's court, the evolution of common law, were but one process. That the development of legal doctrine was rapid, we may easily see as we pass from that strange dark book the Leges Henrici Primi, through Glanvill to Bracton. But theory did not outgrow practice. Much had been and was being learned from civilians and canonists. The canon law was of vital importance to all Englishmen, to the laity as well as the clergy. The king's professional judges were, as already said, ecclesiastics deeply interested in the chureh's

[^8]law. Appeals to Rome were not uncommon and the English suitor might have to secure the services of the best Italian jurists, of Azo himself. But cosmopolitan tendencies were held in check by practical necessities. The king's justice was conquering and to conquer, but a regard, at least an outward regard, for ancient tradition, an adherence to settled forms and precedents, were conditions of its success; nor could it always succeed without concession and compromise. Our English lawyers seem from the ontset to treat the Roman law much as our church treats the Apocrypha; it is instructive but not authoritative; in other comutrics these leges scriptae prevail; our leges are non scriptae; English law is English.

Girowth of law not lampered lis procedure.

On the other hand the common law was not yet a struggling captive netted in the meshes of procedure. What in after times made it the most elaborate of labyrinths was the closed cycle of original writs, the catalogue of forms of action to which naught but statute could make addition. Now during the earlier part of the thirteenth century the
Now writs. king's general power to make new writs scems unquestioned, though protest, armed protest, may be made against a particular use of that power, specially if it interferes with the feudal jurisdictions. And many new writs must have been made. Of some we know the history. This was made by William Ralcigh ${ }^{1}$, that by Walter of Merton ${ }^{2}$. But as the struggle for a parliament drew near, as King Henry forced on that struggle by attempting to govern withont chancellor, treasurer, or justiciar, complaints of new and illegal writs became loud and the general principle was drawn into debate ${ }^{3}$. Bracton, writing some few years before the open outbreak, has left us a transitional doctrine. New miginal writs can be made as occasion may require, for wrong must not be without remedy; in strictness such new

[^9][^10]writs should be approved by the whole lingdon, that is, by the magnates; but the consent of the magnates may bu taken for granted; they consent if they do not expressly dissent, and it behoves the king to give remedy for every wrong ${ }^{1}$. A fiction of this kind could not be permancht and events deciled that the requisite consent of the common comeil of the realm should be a real consent. Thenceforward the common law was dammed and forced to flow in umnatural, artificial chamets. The supremacy of Parliament may have been worth the price paid for it; none the less the price was high.

The state of things at which we have glanced, the The tine fir powerful court, the yet flexible law soon to lose its flexibility, will, if duly considered, seem very worthy to be the theme, very likely to be the cause, of a great book, one which in declaring law will make law for ages, which will leave a distinct mark on national history, which will be read with interest when six centuries have passed away.

And the man who came to the work was able, very able Thin praises we must say if we compare him with his successors. We look back at them and him and he stands a head and shoulders taller than them all. Just so long as his influence was powerful lawyers conld produce such fairly readable books as those which we call Britton and Fleta; serviceable epitomes, what is good in them is Bracton's. One fact about sutecessisurs. them let us note. Bracton, we may safely say, did not fulfil the whole of his splendid plan. In the middle of an account of the writ of right his book stops short and then we have what looks like a brief fragment on the personal actions. Britton and Fleta carry their accounts of the writ of right to the same point, and then they too stop short. No one could finish that book: there was no one to beud the bow fallen from the master's hand. There come things which hardly may be called books, the Henghams, Fet Assawir, the Old Natura Brevium, the Novae Narrationes, useful things in their day for practitioners, but showing $1 \ldots$ interest in legal principle, no grasp of law as a whole, merely a care for the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .414 \mathrm{~b}$; compare Fleta, p. 7ti, 77.
details of practice, for the tithes of mint and cummin. In its last hours the tifteenth century is redeemed by Littleton's Tenures. Against " the most perfect and absolute "work that ever was written in any human science ${ }^{1 "}$ nothing shall here be said, for it is a masterpiece ; but still it is a small thing to set beside the heroic work of Bracton. Littleton, again, had neither rivals nor initators. English lawyers could make abridgements; write books they could nut ur would not. As to the chaos of Cuke it is bad chaos as it stands; what it would have been but for Littleton and Bracton one does not like to think. It is strictly true what Lord Campbell says, and Lord Campbell camot be charged with mediaevalism: Bracton "was rivalled by no English juri"dical writer till Blackstone arose five centuries afierwards"." Twice in the history of England has an Englishman had the motive, the courage, the power to write a great readable, reasonable book about English law as a whole ${ }^{3}$.
('omparison with foreign writers unprotitable.

We may more easily and more profitably compare Englishman with Englishman, than Englishman with foreigner. In the thirteentl century the task for the writer on law was very different in different comntries. Bracton was placed in favourable circumstances. He had to describe the most vigorous system that Europe could show. As an engine of masterful justice for the government of a large land, the court of our king had not its equal. Nor was the Englishman hampered by dead texts. He had but to describe what was really being done day by day and done on a large scale. It is almost uscless therefore to attempt a weighing of his merits against those of his French and German contemporaries, Philip, Beaumanoir, for example, or Eike of Repkow, or against those of the Italian doctors. Still we may take this from forcigners, that when we set our legal litcrature beside that of continental Europe it is not of Bracton that we need be ashamed.
${ }^{1}$ Coke's Prefice.
${ }^{2}$ Lires of the Chiej Justices, vol. 2, p. ie:
${ }^{3}$ If to any one what is here said of Bracton seems extravagance, he may be asked to think of some of

Bractou's contemporaries, of Edward the First, Simon de Montfort, Robert (irosseteste, lioger Bacon, Matthew laris; are they not sreater than their succes-ors:

If for one moment we set his book beside the Cinstoms of Beansais and the Saxon Mirror one fact worthy of note stares us in the face. The Englishman's work both in its $\begin{gathered}\text { rratonn ant } \\ \text { lrounan law. }\end{gathered}$ general structure and in many details has been influcneed by Roman jurisprudence. Really if we place ourselves in the thirteenth century and look only at the surface of things, it must seem very likely that England will soon adopt Roman law as a whole, while into Northern France and Germany it will make its way but slowly or never. After the event we can see why such a predietion would be foolish. The development in England of a centralized royal justice was rapid, precocious. Before the end of the thirteenth century the system with its stubborn writs and formulas had become too osseous to be much modified by new outlandish learning. And looking closer we see that Bracton had no intention of supplanting English by Roman law. It is Rationalism rather than Romanism that he learnt from Azo's book, and this fact that at an early date English law was rationalized by an able man, is not the least among the causes which protected us against Romanism in the following centuries.

Trying to state in general terms, (this is no place for misd dot to particulars,) what was Bracton's debt to the civilians we may the estiniatitul. put it thus:-First he had learned certain wide principles of jurisprudence, had found some of the highest premisses of all civilized law expressed in neat and accurate phrases. For these, at least for some of these, the England of his time was ripe. They are not, he might argue, specifically Roman; the Romans themselves regarded them as common to all mankind; they are dictates of reason implicit in all law.

> Justinian's Pandects only make precise What simply sparkled in men's eyes before, Twitched in their brow, or quiverel on their lip, Waited the speech they called but would not come ${ }^{1}$.

Then there are instances in which rules that are less general and more specifically Roman are adopted, or rather proposed, as solutions for concrete cases. For the more part

[^11]this is done very modestly and by way of suggestion. There being no English authority in point, why,

Imperious Caesar dead and turned to clay Might stop a hole to keep the wind away.
But his main debt is less palpable, for what he has converted to his use is spirit rather than substance, not these or those rules, but a method of reasoning about law, of perceiving the interdependence of rules, of making them take their places as members of a body. He is at his very worst when he copies matter from Azo, as he does very freely in those parts of his book, which, being the first, are unfortunately the best known. He is there dealing with high generalities abont things and persons; to these English law had not yet ascended, and (even when allowance has been made for the blunders of mediaeval copyists and the negligence of editors) we are forced to say that his copyings from Azo are not always very intelligent; he fails to take point after point made by the Italian master. Only when he comes to more concrete matters do we see the best that he has learned from abroad. There is no more copying; he has ample raw material of home growth; it is to be found in the rolls of the king's court; but by means of ideas and distinctions which have come to him from beyond seas he gets principle out of precedent and weaves a rational text. A parallel as good as most historical parallels is ready to hand. Within our own century a great foreign civilian has left his mark on some of the very best of our English text-books, not making them any the less English, only making them more reasonable by having placed their writers at a standpoint outside the English system, a standpoint whence a wood might be seen, not merely a quantity of trees. Azo was the Savigny of the thirteenth century ${ }^{1}$.

Bracton's Angrish authorities.

It is to be regretted that no one has yet printed a good text of Bracton alongside a good text of Azo. Only when this is done, shall we fully understand the intluence of Roman unon English law. But it is much more to be regretted that

[^12]110 one has printed Bracton's English authorities, those five hundred cases which he cited from the rolls. Many of those rolls are get in existence and surely this matter was worth some pains. Nothing is more remarkable in Bracton's min law is book than his profuse references to decisions. His law is case law. Now this is remarkable. It is very seldom indeed that any other mediaeval writer, Fleta, Britton, Hengham, Littleton, ever cites a case, and citations in the Year Buoks are out of the common : seldom is there anything more definite than a rague "It is so in our books." Shall we say that Bracton foresaw what after the lapse of centuries would become the most distinctive characteristic of English law ! It would be folly seriously to attribute to him any such marvellous power of prediction; but the fact remains, his law is case law. In dealing with concrete matters he appeals not to Azo, nor to Ulpian, nor again to Reason or Nature, but to this and that case adjudged by Martin Pateshull or Willian Raleigh. The rolls of the king's court, therefore, and in particular the rolls of Pateshull and Raleigh should have an interest for us. To say nothing of the light they throw upon every detail of mediaeval life, they contain the authorities, and it well may be, ultimate authorities for many a rule of the common law which hitherto has been traced no further than Bracton's merified assertion. However to print these rolls in full would be too large, too costly a task for private enterprise. We have been embarrassed by our riches, our untold riches. The nation put its hand to the work and turned back fainthearted. Foreigners print their records; we, it must be supposed, have too many records to be worth printing; so there they lie these invaluable materials for the history of the English people, unread, unknown, ahnost untouched save by the makers of pedigrees. Now to select important cases from these rolls would be difficult. The endeavour, likely enough would fail, for so much of our old law has been utterly forgotten that prhaps there is no one now competent to say what are the important, the leading cases. A false measure, an mifounded theory might well make the selection mfair and give us the ammalous insteme
of the normal. What then would we not give, such of us as really care for the history of our law, could we find the selection made for us by some thirteenth-century lawyer, could we find some note book in which such a lawyer had copied the cases which were the most interesting to him and the men of his time, some book in which he jotted down his own remarks on those cases? What would we not give could we indulge the hope that the maker of that book was Bracton?

Such a book chance has preserved.

## § 2. Of Vinograảoff's discovery.

In the summer of 1884 Paul Vinogradoff, Professor of

This Note lsook found. History in the University of Moscow, was in England seeking materials for mediaeval history. A study of the English manor led him to a study of Bracton's text and he went behind that text to Bracton's anthorities. He then heard, I believe from Mr Selby of the Public Record Office, of a MS. at the British Museum known as MS. Additional 12,269. Carefully rearking it he came to the conclusion that it was closely comnected with Bracton's work and indeed was probably Bracton's own note book. This discovery he published to the world in The Athenaeum for 19 July , 1884; some weeks earlier I had the pleasure of hearing about it from his own lips. His letter to The Athenaeum is printed at the beginning of this book. Hereafter I must repeat its arguments at greater length. But at once I will say that so fir as I am aware though the MS. had been used by others, the credit of perceiving its value in the history of law was wholly due to Vinogradoff. At least it should be understood that I claim no credit. I have but worked on the lines indicated by him in the letter which he published.

As I an about to begin an argument, or rather a

Valualle cven if it 13ractons: atement of evidence, which must needs be long and intricate, tencling to prove that the MS. in question is what on my title page it is called, namely Bracton's Note Book, I shomld like to say at onee that in my own opinion the value
of this book does not depend wholly or even chiefly on the snecess of my argument. It seemed to me that Bracton's or not Bracton's, the Note Book ought certainly to be printerl; this will hardly be denied by any, and if the version of it now published be a fairly accurate and useful version, then I have not failed in what was my main endeavour. If it be Braeton's so much the better. The evidence as to this is all of an indirect kind, consisting of many small details and minuts coincidences. Before we ean weigh it we ought to know some particulars about Braeton himself, about his selection of authorities, we ought to form some idea as to what would have been in his note book if a note book he had ${ }^{1}$.

## § 3. Of Bracton's life ${ }^{2}$.

Of the man himself there is seemingly little to be known.
1.ittle known We might indeed collect a large number of small facts about him, for his name oceurs very frequently during some twenty years on the Fine, Close and Patent Rolls. But with few exceptions these facts would be all of one not very interesting kind; he is commissioned to take this, that and the other assize of mort d'ancestor or novel disseisin. He can have played no leading part in the exciting history of his time. It was a time of great chroniclers; the greatest of our mediaeval lawyers, the greatest of our mediaeval historians, were contemporaries; Matthew Paris died a few years before Bracton; yet of Bracton Paris has nothing to tell; Paris was writing the history of the present, Bracton was making the history of the future.

[^13]way my debt to Dugdale, Selden, Madox, Güterbock and Foss, to the prefaces of Sir Travers Twiss, to the article on Bracton by Mr J. M. Rigy in the Dictionary of National Biography, to the Excerpts from the Fine Rolls edited by Mrr Roberts, and above all to the MS. calendars of the l'atent and Close Rolls in the Public Record Office, on which I have often relied.
llis name not
Fracton but Henry of Jratton.

A bevon-
shire manl.

One thing is clear. His name was not Bracton but Henry of Bratton. It is written a very large number of times upon contemporary Rolls and Feet of Fines and the only variant for Bratton tuat is at all common is Bretton. Certainly most of the MSS. of his treatise that I have seen give a clear Bracton; but their readings of proper names are extremely corrupt; one has, for instance, to recognize the English villages of Hatfield, Swanscombe and Itteringham under such monstrosities as Hecfenur, Snanthanis and Judliban ' . There is no room for donbt that the text writer was the judge whose name appears on roll after roll, or that the judge's name if not Bratton was Bretton. However Bracton he has been for centuries, and so let him be to the end.

He has been claimed by two Devonshire villages, Bratton Fleming near Exmoor, Bratton Clovelly near Dartmoor, also by Bratton Court in the parish of Minehead on the Somersetshire side of Exmoor. There is but little evidence in favour of any of these claims ; there is another Bratton in Somersetshire, Bratton Seymour near Wincanton, there are Brattons in Shropshire and Wiltshire, Brettons in Yorkshire and Wales; but there are good reasons for connecting him with Devonshire. In 1212 a William Raleigh was presented by the king to the church of Bratton Fleming ${ }^{2}$; he may have been the William Raleigh whose judgments Bracton has made immortal and Bracton may have been his pupil. As proof of Bracton's connection with Bratton Currt, a tomb in the church of Minehead has been shown as his, but it seems beyond doubt that he was buried in the nave of Exeter Cathedral where long afterwards Bratton's altar stood, Bratton's bell was rung, and Bratton's mass was chanted. We are thus absolved from believing that he had, like the
${ }^{1}$ OA and a few other MSS. of the treatise give the name as Bratton. I refer to f. 188 b where he takes his own name as an illnstration. As to the passage on f. 1, almost all MSS. make him speak of himself simply as fifo talis. The Devonshire Assize Rolls known as Coram Rege Rolls 60 and 96 must have come under his
own hand, and the corrections on them are very likely in his handwriting; his name throughont is Bratton. There was a contemporary judge, William le Breton; his name however is invariably spelt with a single $t$, while Menry always has $t t$.
$\because$ Rot. Fat. vol. 1, p. 93 b.
skeleton in the Minehead tomb, an abnormal number of teeth ${ }^{1}$.

The best proof of his burial in the Cathedral is given by mispare two interesting deeds relating to the manor of Thorverton. That manor lies near the Exe half-way between Exeter and 'Tiverton. Henry the Second had given it to the monks of Marmontier ${ }^{2}$. In 1272 they conveyed it to John Wiger, (probably a member of the family whose name is borne by Broadwood Wiger a village hard by Bratton Clovelly, subject to a charge of six pounds a year for maintaining two chaplains to celebrate masses in Exeter Cathedral for the soul of Henry of Bratton late chancellor of that chureh. Five years afterwards Wiger conveyed the manor to the Dean and Chapter, to provide at the altar in the nave of their church before which Henry of Bratton was buried, masses for the souls of the kings of England, of Henry of Bratton and of John Wiger the grantor ${ }^{3}$. Edward the First seized the manor as an escheat on Wiger's death, but, the conveyances being proved, the Chapter recovered possession of it ${ }^{4}$. The conveyance by the monks of Marmoutier was made in consideration of a sum of 392 marks described as paid to the monks out of the goods of the late chancellor and the goods of John Wiger by the hands of the said John Wiger. From this it would seem nis last will. very likely that Wiger was the executor of Bracton's will, and that in pursuance of his will the chantry was endowed ${ }^{5}$.

It is in the west country, more especially in Devonshire, that we find him active both as judge and as churchman, and the little that we can hear about his worllly possessions bears out the supposition that there was his home. That we should hear but little is to his credit. His earnest denunciations of judges who make a profit of their office are not vague generalities ${ }^{6}$; they have point enough when read in the light of contemporary history. Some of his fellows became very rich,

[^14][^15]scandalunsly rich if we may trist Mathew Paris; Thomas Multon ${ }^{1}$ for example and Robert Lexington ${ }^{2}$. Henry of Bath, the judge with whom Bracton is most commonly associated, amassed vast weclth by discreditable means; one of his companions, (perhaps it was Bracton,) charged him openly with taking bribes; he could afford to pay a fine of two thousand marks ${ }^{3}$. Still there are some signs that Bracton had other means of livelihood besides the judicial salary of forty pounds, thongh such signs are of uncertain value since he may have had a namesake. Thus when in 1254 John of Mmedene confesses that he owes eighty-four marks to Henry of Bratton, apparently the price of crops grown on land at Clopton in Suffolk, we cannot be quite sure that the creditor is our Bracton ${ }^{4}$. On the other hand we may well see him in the Henry of Bretton to whom in

His connec. tion with the thaleighs. 1261 Walter Raleigh and Isabella his wife grant for life the manor of Tykenbrede in Cornwall ${ }^{5}$. This manor we may perhaps identify with a spot called Tuckenbury which lies between Linkinhorne and Liskeard ${ }^{6}$. Again we may see him in the Henry of Bratton against whom as tenant of the manor of Samton in Devon, William of Punchardon and Ermengard his wife bring an action in 1253 for the dower whereof she was endowed by her former husband Thomas of Saunton ${ }^{7}$. The manor of Saunton Court lies in the parish of Bramon, a little south of Morthoe and the wild north coast, a few miles from the village which still bears the name of the family of Ermengard's second husband, the village of Heanton Punchardom. Will the reader remember this lady's not very common name-Ermengard wife of William oí Punchardon? She will be of use to us hereafter.

With many of the Devonshire landowners Bracton must. have been familiar. Year by year for twenty years he went
${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 4, p. 49. example of careful convevancing.
2 Mat. Par. vol. 5, p. 138.
${ }^{3}$ Mat. Par. vol. 5, pp. 213, 223, 240.

4 Tower Assize Rolls, No. 21, m.
26. 'The debt is secured elaborately by sureties and penalties.
${ }^{5}$ Feet of Fines, Cornwall, A. R. 45. No. 3. This is a noteworthy.
${ }^{6}$ I owe this suggestion to Mr Leslie Stephen.
${ }^{7}$ Coram Rege Roll, No. $93, \mathrm{~m} .27$. I have not been able to trace this action further, but the manor seems to have long remained in the family of Saunton. Risdon, Description of Levon, ed. 1714, vol. 1, p. 111.
among them as a judge of assize, heard their causes, associated them with himself as justices. Raleighs and Punchardons, Traceys and Beaupels sat with him on the bench at Excter, Morchard, Moulton, Torrington, Chulmleigh, Barnstaple, Umberleigh, for assizes were taken at many places ${ }^{1}$; no wonder then if some of them were his friends and he had his home among them. Wife or child he can not have had for a reason now to be given.

Like most of the great judges of his age he was an ecclesiastic, though it is only in the last years of his life that, to our knowledge, he had any benefice. In the thirteenth century the chapter of Exeter had among its members more lis career. than one famons lawyer. At one time the great William siastic. Raleigh was its treasurer ${ }^{2}$, at another Ralph Hengham was its chancellor ${ }^{3}$. Bracton became archdeacon of Barnstaple on 21 st Jan. $126 \pm^{4}$; after a few months he resigned the archdeaconry for the chancellorship of the cathedral which was conferred upon him on the 18th May $126 t^{5}$. In the autumn of 1268 that office was given to another and new appointments were made to prebends in the cathedral of Exeter and the collegiate church of Bosham which are described as those of Henry of Bratton ${ }^{6}$. We may conclude from this and some 1 is death. other evidence that he had but lately died. Already in February 1272 the manor of Thorverton was subject to the charge for maintaining masses for his soul.

That he studied law at Oxford, was professor, doctor Did he study utriusque juris and what not, has been repeated many times with much confidence. The sole foundation for the whole story seems to be the bare assertion of Bishop Bale, a flimsy foundation indeed ${ }^{7}$. That there was already a flourishing law school at Oxford is certain', that Bracton may have been of

[^16]ii.-xiii.; Oliver, Lires of Bishops of Ercter, p. 281.
7 See as to this myth the article on Bracton by Mr J. M. Rigg in the Jictionary of National Biography and the authorities there cited.
${ }^{8}$ See Chronicle of Evesham (Rolls Series), 1. 267.
it, is not unlikely but quite unproved; but he may well have got his law, as some of his greatest contemporaries got theirs, namely as a clerk in the king's court or the king's chancery. To suppose that he made his fame by "practising at the bar" would probably be an anachronism.

His judicial career.

For more than twenty years before his death he was a judge and during at least some part of that time he held pleas before the king himself. The evidence of this matter can hardly be weighed unless we know something of the judicial organization of the time. The king, who was now at Westminster now elsewhere, kept by his side a few professional judges who heard the pleas which followed the king. Other professional judges sat during term time on 'the Bench' at Westminster and heard the Placita de Banco. We ought not to think of these two sets of judges as forming two such distinct colleges as existed in later days; a judge who was at one time with the king would at another be on the Bench at Westminster; still the king seems generally to have chosen as his personal attendants judges of experience, and probably it was reckoned promotion when a judge was selected to hear cases, which in theory or fact were litigated coram ipso rege. At irregular intervals, five, six, seven years an eyre for all pleas (ad ommia placita) would be instituted in the counties. For each county two or three of the professional judges would be commissioned along with some prelate or baron and knights of the shire. Besides these general commissions, there were special commissions for the possessory assizes; generally one of the professional judges was empowered to hear this, that and the other assize of mort d'ancestor or novel disseisin, and was trusted to choose his own associates; a very large number of these special commissions was issued every year. The easy work of delivering the gaols was done ammally with more or less regularity, but the professional judges were seldom troubled with this.
Nature of the Now as to the names of the judges who go on an eyre, or
evidence. who are sent to take assizes, there is no lack of information; they occur on the Patent, Close and Fine Rolls. Also there is little diffienty in discovering who sat on the Bench at

Westminster in any given term. 'Feret of fines' exist by the thousand, and the judges before whom the coneord was made are always named in them. But as to the judges who wern with the king, the task is harder. Whether as yet they were appointed by any enrolled document seems very doubtful; the Plea Rolls seldom name them; and it is very rare to find the record of a fine levied coram ipso rege. This last fact will not surprise us, for in after days the Court of Common Pleas (and this 'the Bench' was coming to be) was the proper place for real actions and conseguently for fines. Still such records do exist, just in sufficient number to prove, were other proof wanting, that while certain judges were at the Bench certain others were holding pleas before the king himself ${ }^{11}$.

Now the first known fact in Bracton's jndicial carcer is Emporment that in 1245 he visited the comnties of Lincoln, Nottingham in eyre. and Derby as a justice in eyre along with Roger Thurkelby, Gilbert Preston and others; he was at Lincoln on the morrow of the Ascension, at Nottingham on the 30th of June ${ }^{2}$. Seemingly he was never sent on any other eyre of the common kind; but late in 1259 he was sent by the baronial comncil then in power on an eyre of a very special character for the redress of grievances ${ }^{3}$. In 1248 however there begins a long series of entries on the Patent Rolls which shows that from that time until his death he was constantly commissioned to take assizes in the south-western counties, Cornwall, Devon, As justice Someret, som Willi , sometimes Dorset and Witshire, rarely was he sent elsewhere ${ }^{4}$. This series goes on with hardly any break until the end of 1267 ; the last entry that I have found is dated the 26th of December in that year ${ }^{5}$; we have seen

[^17]H. 3, m. 10 d ; this seems the only one in this year; in two years time they become common. The tirst entry from the Fine Roll in the Exeerpta is from 1250 (vol. 2. p. 8:). The Coram Rege liolls 90 and 96 are rolls of assizes taken by him. They should be printed.
${ }^{5}$ Rot. Pat. 52 11. 3, m. 33 d. The last entry in the Fxeerpta e lot. Fin. is from 1267 (vol. 2, p. 4ns).
other reason for believing that he died in 1268 . Hence we might infer with certainty that he was one of the regular permanent judges. But further there is an entry on the Close Roll under date 7 th Aug. 12591, which declares that henceforth special justiciaries (speciales justiciarie) are only to be committed to the following persons, namely, Roger of Thurkelby, Henry of Bath, Henry of Bretton, Giles of Erdington, Gilbert of Preston, William of Wilton, John of Wyville. This seems to mean that a commission to take this particular assize or to hear that particular action is only to be granted to one of the judges here named. It looks like an attempt of the baronial council to limit the king's power of appointing any one whom he pleases, to act as justice for this occasion only, an attempt prophetic of future statutes ${ }^{2}$. Now with the exception of Bracton all these judges at one time or another sat on the Bench at Westminster and fines were there levied before them. But Bracton seems never to have sat on the Bench. I have examined several hundred feet of fines and thus constructed the table of justices who sat on the Bench, which will be found at the end of this Introduction; my results agree fairly well with those obtained by Dugdale, and Notasjustice so it appears certain that Bracton never held the placita de of the Bench. banco ${ }^{3}$.

That at times he held the placita coram ipso rege there

He holds the pleas which follow the king. is evidence, sparse indeed, but yet sufficient. In a cartulary of Waltham Abbey is found a copy of the chirograph of a fine levied as early as the autumn of 1248 coram ipso rege; the justices named in it are Henry of Bath, Jeremiah of Caxton
${ }^{1}$ Rot. Cl. 43 H. 3, m. 7 d.
${ }^{2}$ The justices of assize actually commissioned in the next year are all the above and Peter Percy, John Cave and Nicholas de la Tour. The number during the previous years had been considerably larger, fifteen or yet more, including some, e.g. Robert Walerand, who may have been regarded as royal partizaus. After this the number again increases slightly, and Walerand among others was again commissioned. (MS. Index to Patent Rolls.)
${ }^{3}$ I looked at the fines for Bedford,

Berks, Bucks, Devon, Derby, Fork and 'Divers Counties' until I obtained several concurrent authorities for the judges of each term. An examination of the fines for other counties might lead to some modifification of the list, but the search seemed quite sufficient to show that Bracton never was one of the regular occmpants of the Bench. In Rot. Hund. vol. 1, p. 14, jurors speak of a case as decided by Henry of Bath and Henry of Bretton justices of the bench; but this is but a verdict and refers to a past time.
and Henry of Bratton ${ }^{1}$. The foot of another fine levied between 1246 and $1 \because 56$ gives us as the judges who are with the king, Henry of Bath and Henry of Braston ${ }^{2}$. In another from the summer of 1257 Henry of Bath, Hemry of Bretton, and Nicholas de la Tour (de Turri) are the judges ${ }^{3}$. Just at this date we find Bracton in receipt of $\mathfrak{x t 0}$ a year from the Exchequer, the usual judicial salary ${ }^{4}$. A Plea Roll of $105: 3$ speaks of a past time when Jeremiah of Caxton and Henry of Bretton held the pleas coram rege ${ }^{5}$. In 1255 a case is to be heard by Henry of Bath, Hemry of Bratton, Henry de la Mare and Nicholas de la Tour and others of the king's council in the king's court ${ }^{6}$. In 12.5t the king provided Bracton with a house in London ${ }^{7}$, in 1253 and again in 1054 with royal venison ${ }^{8}$. Lastly Matthew Paris has preserved the record of a suit between the Abbot of St Albans and the Bishop of Durham. It followed the king; the writs commanded appearance coram nobis ubicunque fuerimus. In November 12.56 it came before Henry of Bretton and Nicholas de la Tour at Winchester; a judicial writ was issued and tested at Clarendon by Henry of Bretton; the next year it came before the same two judges at Westminster and the judicial writ was again tested by Henry of Bretton. ${ }^{\text {. }}$ At this moment Bracton seems to have been the premier of those judges whom the king had with him. From all this it may be inferred that from 1249 to 1259 or thereabouts, he was a judge constantly employed in hearing pleas beforc the king. That he should not either have been sent on cyre or have held the placita de banco is rather curious; but the same is true of Jeremiah Caxton with whom he is more than once associated, and of the more famous or notorious Robert Walerand; Nicholas de la Tour again does not appear on the Bench until many years after he has been hotding pleas

[^18][^19]before the king, and Henry de la Mare and William of Wilton, both distinguished judges, appear there but very casually. The natural inference is that the king found Bracton a useful man to have about him.

For the years after 1259 there is less evidence. Bracton steadily took assizes in the south west, but that he was with the king I have seen no proof. However when the time of storm and strife is over he again appears in high place. In the spring of 1267 he was appointed member of a commission of prelates, judges, barons and knights to hear the claims of 'the disinherited,' of those, that is, who had forfeited their lands by siding with de Montfort ${ }^{1}$. He and another royal judge, Richard of Middleton, are named between a bishop and an abbot and before all others, and he is named before Middleton. It seems likely then that all along and until his death he held pleas before the king and some have conjectured that he may be called chief justice. A thorough search among existing records would probably reveal a few more facts ${ }^{2}$.

It must not be dissembled, however, that as to his death a certain difficulty is created by an entry on the Fine Roll, which seems to have escaped the notice of his biographers, though it has long been in print. The roll for A. R. 49 (A.D. $1264-5$ ) has several writs which direct that the interest, fees and penalties due to the Jews in respect of the debts owed by certain favoured persons shall be forgiven. One such writ, dated Sth March, 1265, is made in favour of Adam le Despenser. Then comes the following entry:-

[^20]23), of Robert Bruce as chief justice to hold pleas before the king himself. This last date must be very near that of Bracton's death. But the elaims of Robert Walerand deserve consideration, for it seems that he pronounced the sentence of Winchester, Sept. 1265; such at least seems the meaning of the following lines from an ancient poem (Chroniele of Rishanger, Camd. Soe. p. 145):-

Exhaeredati proceres sunt rege jubente
Et mate tractati, Waleran I. dicta ferente.
'Consimilem literam habet Johanna soror et heres Hemici de 'Brattona qui interfectus fuit in conflictu habito apud Lewes ${ }^{1}$.' Less than a year after the battle this entry was made. However it is absolutely certain that Henry of Bratton the judge was not slain at Lewes; many entries on this very roll and other later rolls set this beyond doubt and debar us from the interesting question under which bamner he was fighting on the fatal day. We must suppose either that he had a namesake, or that the clerk who wrote the Fine Roll made a blunder. The latter alternative seems the more acceptable. Of a second Henry of Bratton no trace has been found, and the writ in question would hardly have been made in favour of a nobody. Two of the king's justices were killed at Lewes, William of Wilton fell by the sword, Fulk Fitz Warin was drowned ${ }^{2}$. It may be that the name of one of them should have appeared in this writ instead of that of their illustrious colleague.

But the mention of Lewes must remind us that the ten great events last years of Bracton's life were great years in English history, years of discontent and strife, of dissolution and reformation, of constitutional growth and civil war. The Mad Parliament, the Provisions of Oxford, the Provisions of Westminster, the paper constitutions, the fruitless negotiations and projects and compromises, the Mise of Amiens, the battle of Lewes, the Parliament of 1265, the battle of Evesham, the sentence of disherison, the clictum of Kenilworth-these are still famous. The question then is natural, what part did Bracton play in them? On the answer to this may depend our opinion as to the authenticity of the most celebrated of the words attributed to his pen.

The answer must be that he played no prominent, no deplayedno picturesque, part, did nothing that any chronicler wonld note. part in politics. A little more may be said. He became a judge at a time when Henry was already provoking the storm, when parliaments were already clamorous for reform, when year by year the complaint went up that despite waths and confirma-

[^21]He was trusted by all parties.
tions the charters were not kept, that writs were issued contrary to the law of the land. Such complaints, if they were complaints against the king, were complaints against his judges also. A royal judge of the time may have felt with the discontcnted barons, the discontented nation; Roger Thurkelby could confide to Matthew Paris his dislike of the non obstante clanse, his dread of the Poitevin favourites ${ }^{1}$; but an open attachment to what we are wont to think the patriotic and constitutional party would hardly have been possible. Bracton however grew in favour with the king, held the specially royal pleas before the king himself. Still when the storm burst he did not lose his place. On the contrary the entry on the Close Roll dated 7 th Aug. 12.59, of which we have already spoken, shows that he was trusted by the then dominant barons. He is one of seven judges who may be commissioned to take assizes. Again in the same year, directly after the publication of the Provisions of Westminster, the ruling barons sent out commissioners to inquire into and redress the popular grievances, especially the misdoings of the sheriffs and royal bailiffs. The work was to be done by the judges associated with trusted members of the baronial party. Bracton was commissioned for Gloucester, Worcester and Hereford along with Humfrey of Bohun Earl of Hereford. This seems clear proof that he was not regarded as a royal partizan ${ }^{2}$.

During all that follows Bracton is still commissioned to take the Devonshire assizes; men may come and go, constitutions may be established and annulled, king or earl may be victorious, but Bracton takes the Devonshire assizes.

[^22]should be read in connection with the statement of the Worcester annalist (Ann. Monast. vol. 4, p. 446) that the justices who came to Worcester on 1 July, 1261, were repulsed, because seren years had not elapsed since the last eyre. These statcments do not refer to Bracton's journey with the Earl of Hereford; but they are important illustrations of the national grievances. The king oppresses the nation; the judges are the instruments of oppression.

He is eommissioned before and after the day of Lewes, before and after the day of Ereshan. What we say of him might be said of at least some other of the judges. Willian of Wilton, who was layman and knight, fought and died for the king ; but on the whole the judges seem to be gaining that position outside party polities which we in this day think should naturally be theirs. Almost the last that we read of Bracton is that he is appointed to hear the complaints of the Disinherited ${ }^{1}$. It would seem then that he must have been a moderate, fair-minded man, whom all conld trust and regard as a great lawyer and a righteous judge, that they could say of him as he wished, Justus es, domine, et rectum judicium tum ${ }^{2}$.

One small fact of considerable value was revealed by the diligence of Madox ${ }^{3}$. In 1258 the barons of the Exchequer were ordered to procure that the varions plea rolls of Henry's reign which were in the hands of divers persons shonld be restored to the Treasury, the proper place for them; an The order order was made that Henry of Bratton should bring in the of the rutls. rolls of Martin of Pateshull and William of Raleigh; a similar order was made for the restoration of the rolls of Stephen of Segrave which were in the hands of the Abbot of Leicester and the Prior of Kenilworth ${ }^{4}$. The order may have been a very proper order; it was only right that the records of the king's court should be deposited in the custody of public officers ; and yet we may be the losers, for who shall say how much more perfect Bracton's book might not have been, had he not been deprived of the rolls whence he drew his law? At all events here is a fact to be remembered in the course of our investigation.

[^23]3, m. 12 d. Segrave died in the Abbey of Leicester, that is, the Abley of S. Mary des Prés. Mat. Par. vol. 4, p. 169.

## § 4. Of Bracton's Text.

The editions of the treatise.

We must now turn from the man to his text. But where are we to find that text? In 1569 an edition was published by Richard Tottell. A reprint of this was published in 1640, and what in substance was hardly better than another reprint was lately published under the authority of the Master of the Rolls. The text of 1569 was in its day a not discreditable product. The most serious fault to be laid to the charge of its anonymous author 'T. N.' is that to all seeming (though in his preface he shows himself aware that the manuseripts teem with interpolations) he wished to give as ample a text as possible and chose for his guide the manuscripts which would give the most. About forty variants, many of them trivial, were all that he found worthy of note; though he says that twelve manuscripts were examined. But though not discreditable in its day, the text of 1569 should satisfy no one in this more critical age, when the collation of MSS. has become a comparatively easy task. I have myself seen in London, Oxford and Cambridge near thirty MSS.; there may well be fifty in existence, some from the thirteenth, most from the fourteenth century. The differences between them are very numerous and very important, and the making of a good edition will some day demand several years of hard labour. Not that the true reading of any given sentence is often seriously doubtful; Bracton's language is simple and straightforward. Allowance being made for misprints and for the obvious blunders of copyists, many of which an intelligent reader can rectify by conjecture, the text of 1569 will generally give each sentence pretty correctly ; the proper names have suffered worst and this makes the verification of Bracton's citations a somewhat difficult task ; also the passages of Roman Law unfamiliar to the transcribers have suffered very badly. But when the question is what sentences should be in the book and in what order they should come, then there is often grave cause for doubt; the manuscripts
disagree, and the printed text is a thoroughly bad guide. Not unfrequently one will find in a MS. a passage which certainly does not come from Bracton. Two plain instances $\begin{gathered}\text { Interpwat } \\ \text { timas in }\end{gathered}$ may be seen in Tottell's text; reference is made to a case the Mors. before John of Metingham, a judge of Edward the First's day, a case which has been recently printed in one of Mr Horwood's Year Books ${ }^{1}$; also we read how the period of limitation for an assize of mort d'ancestor was changed in king Edward's day by the Statute (1275) of Westminster the First ${ }^{2}$. But in some manuscripts one will find worse things than these: sometimes a large selection from the Edwardian statutes is incorporated ${ }^{3}$, or again occasion is taken of Bracton's mention of the tree of consanguinity to foist in a whole treatise of this or that leamed camonist on the snbject of consanguinity and affinity ${ }^{4}$; in one case may be found embedded in the middle of Bracton's text what openly proclaims itself to be the work of the Spanish priest Johannes de Deo ${ }^{5}$.

Against such obvious interpolations it is possible to guard oneself; but there are subtler sources of error. A reader of the printed book, who reads with the persuasion that his author was a sensible, orderly-minded man, will note many passages which seem to be dislocated and some at least of Addicions. these he will suspect of being marginal notes which in the process of transcription have forced their way into the text. Occasionally what has all the appearance of being a note of this kind has lodged itself in the very middle of a sentence ${ }^{6}$. A glance, however superficial, at the MSS. will strengthen the suspicion. It is rare I believe to find a MS. which has in its margin notes, which are as old or nearly as old as
${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 26. This seems clearly the case from 1294 in Y. B. 21 and 22 Edw. I. p. 449 . I have not yet seen this case in any MS.
${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 253 b . Most of the MSS. give the new rule and seem to have as their common original some MS. into which that rule was interpolated; MB, MM, OA, OB, however give the old law fixing the return of John from Ireland as the period of limitation.

3 ME.

+ ME. OB.

5 MF. I have given some account of this in the Law Quarterly Revieu, vol. 2, p. 278.
${ }^{6}$ I have given one instance of this in the Law Quarterly Review, vol. 1, p. 340. See generally as to the state of the MSS. the article in $L, Q . R$. vol. 1, p. 189, by Vinogradoff, who in a few weeks learned, as it seems to me, more about Bracton's text than any Englishman has known since Sciden died.

Bracton's day; marginal notes which are clearly of a later time are not very meommon and a few of these have become part of the printed text ${ }^{1}$; but in most of our MSS. the older notes or glosses have alrcady got themselves out of the margin. Often enough however their true nature is revealed by the fact that they are to be found only in some of the MSS., while in others they appear now at this point now at that of the text; having once left their proper home they have wandered about in search of a convenient resting place. Then again there are MSS. in the margin of which one oceasionally finds the word $A d$-di-cio so written as to stamp as an addition the passage over against which it is set. This points to some older MS., the head of the family, which had these passages not in its text but in its margin. In one MS. there are at least nineteen passages thus marked. In more than one there are traces of these Addiciones having been numbered, thus Addicio Prima, Addicio Tercia, Addicio Undecima. In another MS. the word Plus has been used for the same purpose, and it may be suspected that the word Nota, which is very often found, has sometimes though not always a similar meaning ${ }^{2}$.

The Digby Ms.

There is, again, one MS. in the Bodleian Library ${ }^{3}$ which is of exceptional importance. Here a large part of what we have been wont to regard as Bracton's text stands in the margin. Two scribes at least were employed on the work; the parts written by one of them are rich with marginalia in his handwriting; the other either left marginalia uncopied or else incorporated them in the text. Now the matter which is still in the margin eomprises many, if not all, of the passages which in corresponding parts of other MSS. are stamped as Addiciones and many other passages as well ; in all they make a large mass, perhaps a thirtieth part of the printed book. The great majority of them are found as part of the text in the printed version of the treatise. They

[^24]one or more may be seen also in MB, MC, MD, MI, MM and CB, while MA has several passages marked as Plus, Plus usque huc and the like.
${ }^{3}$ Dighy, $2 x .2$, my OA.
consist mainly of explanations, illustrations, qualifications, of the text; but sometimes new topics are introduced and discussed at length. A decided opinion would be premature, but they look as if they might well have come from Bracton himself. The MS. has the semblance rather of a book which is still in the making, than of a book which was written by one man and afterwards glossed by another. Among the marginalia are citations of cases from very early years of Henry's reign, and I have not noticed any citations which might not have been made by Bracton. These marginal matters are not the rough notes of a practising lawyer made merely for his own behoof; some are elaborate and learned disquisitions. The passage for instance in which the Bracton of the printed Vulgate makes his greatest parade of Roman law with numerous citations from Code and Digest, stands in the margin ${ }^{1}$. But of course it were dangerous to dogmatize until a real effort has been made to settle the text by a detailed comparison of all existing MSS.

The best example of the problems which lie in wait for variances an editor of Bracton is afforded by what is perhaps the most between $\boldsymbol{M}$. remarkable passage in the whole book. Seldom have more momentous words been written in a lawyer's text, for this is the famous passage about the king so often quoted in the political trials of the seventeenth century, quoted by the President of a High Court of Justice when an English king was to be sent to the scaffold ${ }^{2}$, repeated over and over again by legal theorists and historians as giving the opinion of the great mediaeval judge. A brief digression about this matter will serve the purpose of showing how little trust should be put in the text of the printed book. Other illustrations might easily be chosen, but this should be of interest to others besides lawyers and antiquaries ${ }^{3}$.

Bracton ${ }^{4}$ in his orderly mamer has come to speak of

1 The whole of De Actionibus, cap. $12, \S 5$ (f. 114). CB also has this in the margin and in some other MSS. it is altogether wanting.
${ }^{2}$ State Trials, ed. 1809, vol. 4, col. 1009.
${ }^{3}$ See Vinogradoff's article in Law Quarterly Review, vol. 1, p. 189. I can add a little to what he there said, but the discovery, such as it is, is due to him.
${ }^{4}$ Br. f. 34.

The passage about the king and his masters.
charters, charters of feoffinent and so forth. He distinguishes royal from other charters. Concerning royal charters and the deeds of kings, he says, neither the justices nor private persons can nor ought to dispute, nor can they interpret them should any doubt arise. If the words are dubious, obscure or ambiguous, the king's interpretation and the king's pleasure must be awaited, for whose it is to grant, his it is to interpret; even if the charter be altogether false because of an crasure or a forged seal, still it is better to proceed to judgment before the king himself. Thus far the undoubted Bracton. Then comes the following :-

Item nec factum Regis nec cartam potest quis iudicare, ita quod factum domini Regis irritetur ${ }^{1}$. Sed dicere poterit quis quod Rex iusticiam fecerit, et bene, et si hoc, eadem ratione quod male, et ita imponere ei quod iniuriam emendet, ne incidat Rex et iusticiarii in indicium viventis Dei propter iniuriam. Rex autem habet superiorem Deum scilicet. Item legem per quam factus est Rex. Item curiam suam videlicet comites, barones, quia comites dicuntur quasi socii Regis, et qui habet socium, habet magistrum, et ideo si Rex fuerit sine fraeno, i. e. sine lege, debent ei fraenum ponere.

If, (the book continues,) the king is left umbridled by his barons, his subjects will cry to Our Lord Jesus Christ to

Jeremiah,
v. 15. bridle him; to whom the Lord will answer, 'Behold I will 'call upon them from afar a mighty nation and an unknown, 'whose tongue they shall not understand, which shall tear up ' their roots from the earth, and by such shall they be judged ' for they would not judge their subjects justly'; and in the end bound hand and foot He will send them into the fiery furnace and outer darkness, there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

The reader will feel a strange shock as he passes from these glowing words to the icy calmmess of the next sentence, 'If a private person make a gift of a certain

[^25]is obscure, and I have not found an acceptable variant. It seems to mean this-It is allowable to say that the king has done justice and right; this being so, it must be allowable also to say, when such is the truth, that he has done ill, and thos to impose on him the duty of making anends.
'thing for a future consideration it behoves that the things' 'which are to be given in return be certain.' This contradicted abrupt change of key might not arouse suspicion. But the passinkes. doctrine here delivered is Hatly contrary to several other passages in the book. The writer has already had and taken a good oceasion for explaining the nature of the kingship, when near the outset he made a classification of persons. All are below the king and he is below none save God. He has no peer in his reahm, much less a superior. He ought to be below no man, but only below God and the law. He ought indeed, like Christ whose vicar he is, to obey the law; but if he do wrong and will not make amends, it is his sufficient punishment that he must await God's vengeance. No one may presume to dispute his deeds, much less to go against his deeds (f. 5 b). Such is the theory which Bracton has put in the proper place for a theory of royalty. It does not stand alone. Elsewhere he says incidentally, Rex parem non habet, nee vicinum, nee superiorem (f. 52), Parem autem habere non debet nee multo fortius superiorem (f. 107)...erit iniuria ipsins Domini Regis, nee poterit ei necessitatem aliquis imponere quod illam corrigat et emendet nisi velit, cum superiorem non habeat nisi Deum, et satis erit illi pro poena quod Deum expectet ultorem (f. 368 b), Pares non habet, neque superiores (f. $41 \boldsymbol{2}$ ).

The contradiction is glaring and it is a contradiction over the most burning question of contemporary politics. May the earls and barons force the king to do right and abstain from wrong? There is yet however one passage to be noticed ; its authenticity seems unquestionable ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$. The king ought, when petitioned, to make atonement for his misdeeds, quod si non fecerit, sufficiat ei pro poena quod Dominum expectet ultoren, qui dicit, 'Mihi vindictam et Ego retribuam', nisi sit qui dicat quod uniuersitas regni et baronagium suum hoc facere debeat et possit in curia ipsius Regis (f. 171 b ). Now under this nisi sit qui dicat, Bracton may well be stating his own opinion. Most undoubtedly he held that the king was
${ }^{1}$ MA, MB, MC, MD, ME, MF, have I observed anything suspicious MH, MI, MK, ML, OA. In no MS. about this passaye.
bound by law, that God would exact of him a very strict account. The king who docs well is God's vicar ; the king who does ill is the devil's vicar (f. 107 b ). He is very much in earnest about this; doubtless he thought that the king was doing ill; many sentences in his book can have been no pleasant reading for Henry. But between this hint that the baronage and the incorporate realm may perhaps restrain an erring king and the dogmatic statement that the king is below his court, that the barons are his equals and his masters, that if they do not restrain him they will be damned, there is a vast gulf.

The contradiction soon perceived.

The discrepancies between these various passages were brought to light in the great trials of the seventeenth century. Every one cited, every one could legitimately cite Bracton. But long before they had been apparent to at least one reader. In the Cambridge library there is a sumptuous manuscript comprising Bracton's treatise and divers other books of law. Bracton's text has been elaborately glossed by one whom there is some reason for calling John of Longueville, a justice of the time of Edward II. Against the passage in which his author expressly treats of the kingship and says that the king has no peers (f. 5 b ), he sets down an argument drawn from the more questionable passage (f. 34), and proves with syllogistic parade that the king has equals, superiors, masters ${ }^{1}$. But indeed the contradiction lies on the surface. Conceivably the same man at different times wrote all these sentences; but he can not have intended that all of them should appear as parts of one book; one of them looks very much as if it had been written with the very object of explicitly contradicting the others. Nor even were there no manuscripts extant, could there be much loubt as to which passage should be regarded as the afterthought or interpolation. The statement that the king has fellows and masters is contrarlicted by at least five statements found in all parts of the book.

[^26]Now in the Digby MS. this passage is not to be fomm. The witnens Unfortunately however it is in a part of the treatise which was copied by that one of the two scribes who did not copy marginalia. In six other MSS. I have found no trace of it ${ }^{1}$. In an eighth it is not to be found but Addicio de Cetritis appears in the margin ${ }^{2}$. In another good Oxford MS. it is comprised in an Addi-cio ${ }^{3}$. Lastly the MSS. which give it differ among themselves as to where it shall come; very often it is made to precede the paragraph which in the printed book it follows ${ }^{4}$.

The conchusion then to which we are led is that this These famous passage is no part of the original text. Certainly it warts not is of ancient date; it is found in the Fleta ${ }^{5}$, a book which is original text. behieved to have been written in 1290 or very shortly afterwards ${ }^{6}$. Its vehemence savours strongly of the time of revolution which ended with the battle of Evesham. Bracton may have written it in the margin of his manuscript, having learned and unlearncd many things since he wrote the body of the treatise. On the other hand it seems unlikely that one who steadily acted as judge after the death of de Montfort, who was selected to hear the claims of the Disinherited, had written what must have been an earnest, almost violent, defence of the barons' cause. Of course however this interesting question cannot be solved by a priori speculations ${ }^{7}$.

[^27]
## §5. Of the Date of Bracton's Treatise.

Conclusions as to date must be provisional.

Now I have made no effort to settle Bracton's text; this could not be done as a bye work; some day it will, we may hope, be the serious task of a competent scholar. It seemed to me that I should best be furthering that task by publishing this Note Book. So though I have occasionally examined such MSS. of the treatise as lay readiest to hand, I have not gone very far behind the printed text. Enough has been said however to show that the printed text is very untrustworthy, that it contains many things which were better in the margin or in an appendix; and, this being so, the problem of assigning a date to the treatise, is obviously difficult. In particular we may be induced to fix too late a date by some few passages which will turn out to be no part of the original work. Still if this danger be had in mind a few cautious conclusions may be attained which will be valuable in the course of our argument. The first conclusion, as I think, is this that the book is unfinished, and therefore, in a certain sense, has no precise date.
The treatise untinished.

That it is an unfinished book seems most likely. The last part of it consists of an elaborate treatise on the writ of right. We naturally expect that this will end with some account of the trial, the duel and the grand assize. About this much might have been written which would have been of great use to practitioners; it is the consummation of the whole procedure : all that has gone before touching the forms of writ and comt, the summonses, defaults, essoins, warranties, exceptions, should be preliminary. But we are disappointed; instead of that for which we look we get three brief chapters about the mesne and final process in personal actions ; and so ends the book. This unsatisfactory ending is enough to rouse suspicion and the suspicion is confirmed if we remember that, when dealing with the trial by battle of criminal cases, Bracton told us that the reason for a certain rule would be given below when the wager of battle in a
civil action was described ${ }^{1}$. This is a distinct case of a promise never fulfilled; the wager of battle in a civil action is never described.

Other cases there are of unfulfilled promises, though tinnulanel these are less distinct. Thus there is a promise to treat of the action for recovering a villein (placitum de mutivis), of the action of debt ${ }^{3}$, of the action of trespass ${ }^{4}$, and of fines ${ }^{5}$. Now though the writer does touch these topics incidentally, still such casual treatment is not what he has led us to expect. What is more, if we look at the contemporary plea rolls, or at the eases in this Note Book, we shall see that an exposition of these matters is just what is required in order to make the treatise a very complete account of the law administered in the king's court. Bracton had Glanvill's work before him and Glanvill had devoted a book to the de nativo habendo, another to the placitum de debito, another to the finalis concordia. Fines were matters of daily importance; the action of debt was becoming common in Bracton's time and by the end of that time the action of trespass was by no means rare. The constant mention that he makes of villein status as a matter which may come into debate in the course of various actions sets us on hoping, but hoping in vain, that he will tell us about the one action in which the question of status can be directly raised and decided. Tho promises he gives us are promises which we have a right to expect and they are unfulfilled.

Unfulfilled, that is, in the printed book. The supposition that we have lost something should not be altogether excluded; and a diligent examination of all the MSS. might possibly bring to light some as yet umprinted chapters. But unfortunately there is much to make us think that we have

[^28]agentibus et jus suum prosequentibus in eisdem per breve de debito vel quasi, ideo inferius de debito plenius dieetur.
${ }^{4}$ lir. f. 164; ut infra de transgressionibus ubi plus de hao materia.
${ }^{5} \mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{f} .33 \mathrm{~b}$; et de hac materia inveniri poterit infra, de finali concordia.

Self-contradictions.
already the whole of what was written. The fact that Fleta and Britton break off where Bracton breaks off is an almost conchsive proof that the trial of the writ of right was never described; if Bracton's description of it has been lost, it was lost within a few years after his death.

That he at one time intended to perfect his account of the great ultimate remedy for the recovery of land seems to me certain, and I think it probable, though less certain, that his scheme comprehended some treatment of final concords, of actions of debt and of trespass and the action for reducing a fugitive serf into villeinage. Were this not so it would be rash to regard as evidence of incompleteness the occasional occurrence of self-contradictions; even in these days of print it is not unknown that a very good writer may contradict himself. When however we scan Bracton's work with the belief that it is unfinished, this belief will find fresh sustenance in many quarters. Passages which we should otherwise reject as interpolated by a later hand may be admitted as the author's afterthoughts though they do not harmonize with their context. In a few instances we find contradictions so glaring that we cannot ascribe them to confused thought or insufficient analysis. One striking example may be enough:-the question is three times raised, (surely a very notable question when regard is had to the "common law" of later days,) whether land can be made devisable per formam doni, that is to say, if there be a feoffment to $A$ and "his heirs, assigns or devisees" (tibi et heredibus tuis, vel cui dare vel ussignure in vita, vel in morte legare volueris) can $A$ devise the land ?-twice is this question answered in the affirmative, the devisee can recover from the heir; once the form of writ applicable for the purpose is given ${ }^{1}$; once it is said that such a writ, though as yet unheard of, may well be made ${ }^{2}$; but in a third passage it is denied after argument that the devise will be valid ${ }^{3}$. Now were we sure that Bracton finished his book we should be strongly tempted to reject one or two of these three passages; but as it is, they

[^29]may all well be his, representing the fluctuations of his own opinion or the fluctuations of judicial practice. So again, to refer once more to the ever famons words ${ }^{1}$, it is conceivable that Bracton wrote that the king has as superior to him his court, to wit his earls and barons, though the same Bracton repeatedly and emphatically denied that the king has any superior save God and the law, or even any equal"; just in his day such theories as these were being rapidly moulded and remonlded by the course of events.

On the other hand the opinion that we have here a mere The book an collection of various tracts written at different times and aranin hook, loosely strung together seems unfounded. It is an organic book, it has a definite intelligible plan, the parts are closely interdependent, references are made and in general correctly made to what has gone before and what is coming afterwards; some parts are more highly finished than others, but the whole hangs together very tightly and resists any attempt to cut it up into independent sections.

Finding a book left unfinished by one who died in 1268 it were a natural first guess that he was actively engaged upon it when death stayed his hand. Now it well may be that to the very end of his life he still from time to time added here a gloss and there a note to a manuscript which was yet in his possession ; but the text as a whole must have an earlier date, indeed the next piece of evidence that we have to consider would incline us to give it a much earlier date. This consists of the cases which are cited from the rolls. His manner of citing will be described more fully below; here it is enough to say that as a general rule he gives the date of the case, or else information which enables us easily to fix the date. A glance at the table printed at the end of this Introduction will show that at least nime-tenths of his cases come from the years between 1216 and 1240 .

With A.P. 24 (A.D. 1239-40) the continuons stream of $\begin{gathered}\text { very fuw }\end{gathered}$ citations ceases. I believe that only nine cases are vonched later cases. as being of later date than this, one from an eyre of A.R. 29

[^30]or $30^{1}$, two (one of which is twice cited) from A.R. $31^{2}$, one from A.R. $3 \mathfrak{2}^{3}$, one from A.R. $32-33^{4}$, one from A.R. $33^{5}$, one from A.R. $38^{6}$, one probably from A.R. $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ (the printed text gives A.R. 1:3) lastly one from A.R. 46 . Only nine cases from twenty-two years; one would like very much to say that these have been interpolated, for it must seem to us very strange that a text writer should prefer old cases to new. But saving only the first and the last two, I have not found in the MSS. any warrant for treating these citations otherwise than as part of the original text. The case from A.R. 38 is given without any mark that arouses suspicion, though A.R. 37 is the date to which it is most commonly assigned. The (itation from A.R. 42 may have been interpolated ${ }^{7}$, and there is good evidence that the citation from A.R. 46 was interpolated ${ }^{\text {; }}$; but I have seen nothing to show that the interpolator was not Bracton himself, and so far as MS. authority goes, these citations stand on the same footing as much that passes as Bracton's work. There are, again, cases which are cited without any date being mentioned. Their number is not very large, about forty if some vague references be included. Some of these I have been able to trace to the period from which Bracton has drawn most of his lore, the first four and twenty years of the reign. Others seem to belong to a considerably later time; one of them was tracked

[^31]according to the printed text, S . Archbishop of Canterbury, was party. The year or the initial letter must be wrong; but OA and several other MSS. give B., which stands for Boniface and is right. There is a case on the roll for Mich. A.r. 37-38 (Coram Rege Roll, No. $93, \mathrm{~m} .10 \mathrm{~d}$ ) which looks like the case in question.
7 Br . f. 277 b . The heirs of John of Monmouth. OA and other MSS. have a plain $x l i j$, which would easily be turned into xiij. See as to this case Roberts, Calendarinm Genealogicum, vol. 1, p. 73; I have found one stage of it in 1258, Coram Rege Roll, No. 106, m. 2.
${ }^{8}$ Br. f. 159. OA has this in the margin; it is not in MI or CA, or (according to Sir T. Twiss) the Parisian Ms.; still it is commonly found.
by Vinogradoff to A.k. 1.25 $4^{1}$; this and a good many others of its fellows seem not to have formed part of the text as originally written ${ }^{2}$. Inferences fomed on these imperfect citations would he hazardous. Of all passages open to the suspicion of having been marginal notes these are the most open. A note of a case which mentions no date might be very useful to the person making it; it would in general be very useless to others. Bracton writing for the world gives chapter and verse with laborions precision; Bracton, or any one else, scribbling in the margin for his own use wonld have no occasion to be so particular. On the whole then though the copious stream of citations ceases with A.r. 24 (A.D. 1239 -40) I have not found anthority for rejecting the few seattered cases which come from a time as late as A.R. 37 or 38 (A.D). $1252-4$ ) or even for supposing that yet later cases were not cited by Bracton himself. An ordinance made on the occasion of the dedication of the Abbey of Hayles, which took place on 5th Nov. 1251 is mentioned and I have seen no reason for consigning it to the margin.

That some of the interpolations come from Bracton some of the himself seems very probable. The printed text gives a $a_{\text {litest cita }}^{\text {tions due to }}$ Rriacton! subtle exposition of the doctrine of possession as applied to a liniusell. case in which a donee obtains physical control of part of the thing given, while the donor remains in possession of the other part. There are several good MSS. in which this is not found ${ }^{3}$. In the middle of it we read, Male actum fuit in 'contrarium inter Rogerum de Reyne et Robertum de Shute 'de terra de Vulverton.' Now this case (it concerned the hum-

[^32]Oxford, Br. f. 2s5b, which is in the margin of OA, and comes I believe from Mich. 1e\%;3. On the other hand the case of the Abbot of S. Albans and Geoffiry of Chillwick, Br. f. If b, seems part of the original text and must probably be later than 12.50 ; for compare Mat. Par. vol. 5, p. 129.
${ }^{3}$ See f. 49 b . The interpolation begins with Item si in carta donationis and ends in the same folio with per. usum summ nihil acquirit. It is not in OA, OB, MIH, MI.
dred of Dulverton) may be seen on the precious roll of assizes taken by Bracton in the year $125 t^{1}$. He held that a would-be donee had not obtained possession either of the land or of the hundred court which pertained to the land. The case was taken to the court above by the process of certificatio; as to the land Bracton's decision was affirmed, but as to the hundred it was reversed; this appears from a little strip of parchment annexed to the roll which well may be in Bracton's handwriting. "Male actum est in contrarium," then, is most likely the complaint of a judge over-ruled but not convinced. On the same roll there is a case between William Montacute and Andrew Wake ${ }^{2}$; in the margin of the Digby MS. of the treatise I have seen without any context the words Wake Munt Agu. That Bracton annotated his own work as late as 1254 seems plain, and unless some MS. will enable us to remove into the margin a yet larger mass of matter than that on which the Digby MS. casts suspicion, we shall have to hold that he was at work on his original text up to that date or a few years earlier.

This may surprise us when we remember that the vast majority of the cases on which he relied were already twenty years old. Now in this context we should note a passage which stands at the outset of his book. Stating the scope and purpose of his work, he tells us that he had given his mind to ancient judgments of the just ${ }^{3}$. The judges of to-day, this seems his opinion, are perverting the law, they are too often ignorant and partial ; we must go back to the wisdom of the men of old time. Now if due weight be given to this declaration it seems to follow that the judges whom Bracton revered, Pateshull and Raleigh, already belonged to a past age; their decisions were vetera judicia. Another passage may serve to show that by this phrase he did not necessarily refer to a very remote period ; he tells us how on a certain point there was a difference of opinion among the

[^33]f. 1. This is the reading of the printed text; but the MSS. generally give perscrutando and require a different punctuation of what follows.
ancients (contentio inter veteres) and solves the question by decisions cited from the fourth and sixteenth years of Henry the Third'. Still it was to old judgments that he went for his law. This may seem strange to us brought up in the belief that the latest decision of a court is of more value than any previous determination. But we have Bracton's word for it ; he deliberately chose old judgments, judgments of judges no longer on the bench, as the best authorities.

Thus much as to the earlier of the two limits within Work subwhich the book must be placed. As to the later; Bracton stannially did not die until 1268; but he cannot have written the main part of his book or have revised it during the few last years of his life. In the first place he repeatedly uses a phrase (donec terrae fuerint communes) which seems to imply that England and Normandy ought to be and (please God) will some day be, under the same ruler ${ }^{2}$. This phrase must have lost its meaning when in 1259 Henry resigned his claim to Normandy. Again it seems fairly certain that Bracton when he was writing did not know of the Provisions of Westminster, that he wrote therefore before October 1259. In some cases he states law inconsistent with those Provisions ${ }^{3}$; in others he ought to notice them if they be law. This would be a more thoroughly convincing argument were it not necessary to remember that there may have been moments at which some at least of Henry's judges treated the Provisions as null and void, the outcome of usurped power. Most of them were incorporated in and reenacted by the Statute of Marlborough in 1267; this would hardly have been done had they then been regarded as of indisputable authority. But Bracton would certainly have liked some of them to be law; would if he could have made them law. Thus he says that a murder fine should not be exacted in case of accidental death, but that a custom to the contrary prevails in some places ${ }^{4}$; the

[^34][^35]Provisions ordain that in such a case no fine shall be due ${ }^{1}$. Again it was one of the flagrant grievances of the time that no damages could be had in the assize of mort d'ancestor ; this in many cases enabled a lord to keep out the heir for a considerable while without making compensation; this grave abuse was redressed by the Provisions ${ }^{2}$ : Bracton uses strong language about it, thinks that damages should be given ad reprimendam malitiam dominorum capitalium, suggests (as it seems to me) that damages may be given, but confesses that hitherto (hucusque) they have not been given ${ }^{3}$. This is hardly the language of one who knew of the Provisions but held them invalid ${ }^{4}$.

No revision after 1:56.

But another date can be fixed with greater certainty. I think it most unlikely that Bracton wrote a certain part of his book or ever revised the whole of it after the 9th of May 1256. The part in question relates to the essoin de malo lecti. The essoinee is given a period of a year and a day for his sickness; at the end of that time he must appear. But how is the year to be reckoned; in particular what is to be done abont leap year? Bracton argues this question at length in a very curious passage ${ }^{5}$. The point, he admits, is disputed, but his own opinion is that in every case a year for this purpose means 36.5 days and 6 hours, so that the essoince will always have precisely the same space of time no matter whether a 29 th of February occurs or no. A closely similar passage is found in the Note Book, and there what Bracton regards as the true doctrine is ascribed to Martin, that is, doubtless, to Martin of Pateshull ${ }^{6}$. Now it has long been known that the law on this point was fixed by an ordinance? The Record Commissioners when printing that ordinance in their edition of the Statutes seem to have thought that the best authority for it was a copy in the Red Book of the Exchequer, where it

[^36][^37]is dated 9 th May 1256 , but that this date was questionable ${ }^{1}$. There is much higher authority: for the ordinance, as one would naturally expect from its form, is on the Close Roll with the date just given ${ }^{2}$. This fixes that date as certain. It is a close writ directed to the justices of the bench reciting that there have been differenees of opinion and providing that for the future the 29 th of Feb. shall be reekoned as making one day with the 2Sth. This decides the dispute against Bracton. But this is not all ; Bracton himself was present at the making of this ordinance. The emroment ends with these words, "This writ was provided and framed in the "presence of the king, Richard Earl of Cornwall, Richard " Earl of Gloucester, Henry of Bath, Henry de la Mare, "Henry of Bratton, Wralter of Merton and others of the "King's Council." So of course Bracton knew of the writ; we may well suppose that he said all that could be said against the making of it, for it ran counter to what seems to have been a pet theory of his; but after this there can have been no dombt as to what was law.

Another iurlication of clate must be mentioned; much part nut has been male of it by Giitolock has been made of it by Dr Giiterbock and rightly. As an ${ }^{12566}$ example of a gift dependent on a contingency Bracton takes "I give you this land if Earl Richard shall be made King of "Germany"." Now Richard was elected king in Jannary and crowned in May $1257^{4}$ and it is natural to argue that he camot have been elected, at least cannot have been crowned, when Bracton wrote this passage; it would be somewhat pointless to take as illustration of a contingency an already accomplished fact. But it is further urged that the words cannot have been written before the death of Richard's immediate predecessor, William of Holland, who did not die until January 1256. This argument though often repeated seems unsound. There was at least one earlier time at which it was probable, or (which is equally to the point) was thought probable in England, that Richard would be King or Emperor.

[^38]Already in 1250 during the lifetime of Frederick the Second the Pope having entertained Richard with marked honour, the rumour got abroad in England that Innocent would make an Emperor of the Earl ${ }^{1}$. At the end of the year Frederick died. In his account of the next year Paris says that the Pope offered the Empire to Richard, and that Richard refused it, whereupon the Pope turned to William of Holland". For some years however he pressed the kingdom of Sicily upon the unwilling Earl; Richard he wished to have as an ally, for Richard was very wealthy ${ }^{3}$. Of course the kingdom of the Romans was not the Pope's to give, either de jure or de facto. Still just at that time to be the papal candidate or nominee was to have a good chance. It seems certain then that in 1251 Englishmen were speculating as to Richard's chance, and at any time between 1250 and the coronation in 1257 wagers may have been laid that the crafty Earl of Cornwall would despite his protestations some day wear the imperial crown. Still the year 1256 is certainly the year to which the allusion most naturally points.

Conclusions as to date.

To sum up the whole matter. The book seems to be the unfinished book of one who died in 1268, who for anything we know never published what he had written ${ }^{4}$, who perhaps to the hour of his death hoped to resume his task and sometimes jotted down a new note in the margin of his manuseript, who in 1258 was deprived of the rolls that he had been using, who never revised his work as a whole after 1256, who was seriously engaged on it after 1250, who relied for his law chiefly on cases decided before 1240, who regarded such cases as retera judicia. Why he left it unfinished we cannot say; perhaps the loss of the rolls was irreparable; perhaps his duties as a hard-worked judge left him no leisure ; perhaps the voice of law was silenced by the clash of arms; perhaps sweeping innovations, such as the Provisions of Westminster, demanded changes in his text which he had not the energy

[^39]to make; at present an answer could be no better than a hazardous guess.

## § 6. Of Bracton's Selection of Authorities.

The later the date to which the book is assigned the selection of more remarkable is Bracton's selection of authorities; but authorities any way this is remarkable enough. We are ahmost justified in saying that what he writes is a treatise on the law of England as administered by two judges, Martin Pateshull and Willian Raleigh. Stress must be laid on this point, for it will be of much importance hereafter ; therefore of Pateshull and Raleigh a little should be said.

Martin Pateshull was from the beginning of Henry's $\begin{gathered}\text { Martin } \\ \text { pateshlull }\end{gathered}$ reign the foremost, perhaps in an untechnical sense we may say the chief, of the king's professional judges. He was not chief justiciar ; that title belonged to Hubert de Burgh, who of course was no lawyer; the chief justiciarship was not a post for a lawyer, at all events for a mere lawyer. But in any list of the regular justices Pateshull's name so constantly precedes all others that he must have enjoyed some preeminence, though perhaps not of a very definite kind. He was a churchman, archdeacon of Norfolk, dean of St Paul's ${ }^{1}$. He seems to have acquired a high reputation for learning and industry. It was hard work to go cireuit with him, so strenuous and zealous a judge was he ${ }^{2}$. Rolls extant, and for the more part in print, enable us to trace his movements in eyre after eyre; from other sources we can discover but very little about him. He is nearly the first, if not the very first, Englishman, who becomes famous as a learned industrious judge and no more. He died on the 14th of Nov. $1229^{3}$.

[^40]William Raleigh.

William Raleigh did not die mntil 1250, but his career as a judge came to an end some ten years earlier. Of him there is more to be said, since he becomes for a few years a striking figure in the history of England. He had already been for some time a judge in the royal court when the tronbles of 1234 raised him to the highest place. In 1232 the king broke with Hubert de Burgh and in his stead appointed Stephen Segrave chief justiciar of the realm ${ }^{1}$. On this followed the rising of the Earl Marshall and the delivery of Hubert from his prison at Devizes. The king was forced to dismiss his alien councillors and Segrave along with them. At Ascensiontide in 1234 the reversal of Hubert's outlawry was pronounced in a great assembly of prelates and barons by the mouth of William Raleigh. Henry did not fill up the vacant justiciarship, but it seems plain that during the few next years Raleigh was the premier judge, travelling about with the king and hearing those pleas which followed the king. He stood well with the king, was his trusted servant and councillor. We read how in 1237 the king deputed him to demand an aid from the barons ${ }^{2}$, how in the same year he went on the king's behalf to watch the legatine council at St Paul's, how he sat there in his surplice and canon's cope ${ }^{3}$, for besides being treasurer of Exeter he was a canon of St Paul's ${ }^{4}$. But he did not long enjoy the royal favomr. In 1238 the see of Winchester became empty. The king was bent on obtaining it for his wife's kinsman William of Savoy, bishop elect of Valence; but the monks wished for Raleigh, objecting to the king's candidate that he was a man of blood. Henry's angry retort alluded to Raleigh's judicial career"He has killed more men with his tongue than the Elect of
alive until 1232, on the ground that in Bracton's text (f. 50 b) a case is cited from an eyre of Pateshull in A.r. 16. The case is given in the Note Book (Case 1294) as coming from the eyre of A.r. $10-11$. Of sixteen MSS. of Bracton at which I looked fourteen referred in the plainest figures to A.R. 11; only two, $O B$ and $M N$, gave a.r. 16. Finally, if all known MSS. mentioned A.r.

16 , this evidence would be absolutely worthless when compared with the express testimony of the chronicles and the silence of the rolls and the feet of fines.
${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 3, p. 220.
${ }^{2}$ Mat. Par. vol. 3, p. 380.
${ }^{3}$ Mat. Par. vol. 3, pp. 416, 417.
${ }^{4}$ Hardy's Le Neve, vol. 1, p. 414 ; vol. 2, p. 403.
" Valence has with his sword'." The monks for a time gave up Raleigh and elected Raph Neville the king's chancellor: but the king induced the pope to quash the election. Meanwhile other chapters looked to Raleigh as to one who wonld make a good bishop, one to whom the king could not possibly object. In February 1239 he was elected bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, in April bishop of Norwich. He chose Norwich and was consecrated in September. But Winchester was still vacant; the monks would not have William of Savoy; nor when he died would they have Boniface of Savoy ; in September 1242 they again chose Raleigh and despite the king's opposition the pope confirmed their choice.

Henry then set himself to persecute Raleigh persistently and vindictively to principle so far as we can see, warrel with involved in the persecution; the royal will had been crossed and the king was obstinate and spiteful. Raleigh would not give way; he was driven from the country. Not until 1244 could the king be reduced to reason. In the spring of that year peace was made and Raleigh returned to England. All Englishmen, says Paris, save only some of the king's clerks who had fomented the discord, were glad at his return: Benedictus qui renit in nomine Domini was on their lips, for they had the highest hopes that good would come to king and kingdom from his ability and sound sense ${ }^{2}$. Very soon after this we find him taking a somewhat leading part in a parliament which resisted the king's demands for money and propounded a large scheme of reforms ${ }^{3}$. But we do not learn that he became an active politician, and he seems to have lived on fairly good terms with the king. In 1249 he left for France to live there frugally; he was sadly in debt, the struggle with Hemry having cost him dear. He never returned to England and died at Tours in September 1250.

It has been necessary to notice these things because the ${ }_{\text {Mra }}^{\text {Min }}$ question may for a moment arise whether Bracton in choosing atacturn as one of his two highest authorities a judge who became ${ }^{\text {political }}$

[^41]famous for his resistance to the king, may not be betraying some political partizanship. But this seems improbable. It is true that Raleigh came to be regarded as a champion of national and ecclesiastical rights; men compared him even to Becket and to Anselm; Paris dilates on his wrongs. But there is no reason to believe that either Henry or Raleigh was contending for a theory of church or state; the quarrel was personal; the bishop had got what the king wanted. Besides (and this seems decisive) it was Raleigh the bishop, not Raleigh the judge, who withstood the king. Raleigh the judge, whose judgments Bracton cites, was the king's confidential minister. Paris, on the other hand, though he speaks highly of Raleigh's legal knowledge, ability and general character, evidently did not regard his judicial career as matter for much praise. Raleigh was a Matthew called to the apostolate from the receipt of custom ; at his consecration there was joy in the presence of the angels of God over a repentant simer ${ }^{1}$. It can hardly then be a respect for constitutional government, a wish to curb the king, or indeed any political thought or feeling, which makes Bracton single out this judge from among all his fellows to be a father of law for all generations ${ }^{2}$.

Bracton's neglect of all judges except lates hull and Raleigh.

Now in Bracton's pages we may count the occurrences of the names of these two judges, Pateshull and Raleigh, by the dozen ; of any other judges he hardly ever speaks. The sum total of what he has to say of them is I believe this :- He mentions one case ${ }^{3}$ or perhaps two cases ${ }^{4}$ which came before Simon Pateshull, the great judge of John's reign, possibly a kinsman of Martin. Certain distinguished persons get named, because they accompanied Martin in some of his eyres and being of high rank were named before him in the commission, e. g. the Bishop of Durham and the Abbot of Reading; they however were not professional judges. William of York who

[^42]became bishop of Salisbury is mentioned thrice ${ }^{1}$, Roger 'Thmrkelby perhaps once ${ }^{2}$; both of them were among the foremost judges of their time. Of Robert Lexington whose judicial career was very long we hear merely that on two occasions he erred ${ }^{3}$; of his brother John of Lexington, who at one time kept the king's seal, we hear that he also erred, and we hear no more ${ }^{4}$. The name of Simon of Ropelay, who occasionally took assizes, occurs once ${ }^{5}$; and there is notice of an attaint taken by Engelard of Cigogné and others; but Engelard the keeper of Windsor Castle was most certainly no lawyer. ${ }^{6}$. All this is insignificantly little; or rather significantly little, for it makes Bracton's selection of authorities an extremely well marked, distinctive, selection. He is silent about his own colleagues, the men who sat with him on the bench, and of their imnediate predecessors, though among them there were several who became famous as judges, in particular , (iilbert Preston, Roger Thurkelby, Henry of Bath, William of York, Robert Lexington. But this is not all; having gone back to a past time he apparently picks and chooses anong the judges of that time. In particular he says hardly anything of a judge who was a contemporary of Pateshull and Raleigh, who rose to a more exalted place than was attained by either of them, who certainly was an able lawyer if he was an unscrupulous politician. He hardly mentions Stephen Segrave, about whom some words are necessary since a statement directly at variance with that which has just been made is found in a book of high authority.

From the beginning of the reign Stephen Segrave has a bracton's place among the royal judges second only to that of Pates- Steeranae. hull, and before Pateshull's death he was already high in the king's favour ${ }^{7}$. He joined in the plot of those who schemed for the fall of Hubert de Burgh, and when that fall was
${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 130 b, 183, 374. Consecrated in 1247. See as to liis reputation as a judge, Mat. Par. vol. 5, pp. 374, 534, 545.
${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 413 , comp. Twiss, vol. 6, p. 258. The MSS. are about equally divided between Thurkelby and Raleigh; but if it be Raleigh then the

[^43]compassed (29 July 1232) he received the justiciarship and was associated with Des Roches, Passelew and Rievaulx in the government of the realm ${ }^{1}$. Within two years (April 1234) the counter revolution threw him from power. He seems to have made himself very detestable to the insurgent barons and they ravaged his lands². He fled to the abbey of St Mary des Près near Leicester and found it convenient to revive a tonsure which had been long neglected ${ }^{3}$. The king called him to a strict account and for a while he remained in disgrace. He paid a heavy fine and was received back again into the royal favour. He once more became a member of the royal comeil ${ }^{4}$ and we find him taking part in its judicial proceedings ; but seemingly he never served again as one of the regular judges. He died in 1241. Now certainly he was a great lawyer. A man of what was reckoned humble birth ${ }^{5}$, he had made his way to the very highest station, had been chief justiciar of England. Whyo did Bracton neglect him ?

But did Bracton neglect him? It here becomes necessary to join issue humbly and respectfully with a great historian, the highest authority on such a question, except only Bracton himself. Dr Stubbs has written thus:-"It is a curious point......that Bracton, although himself clearly a constitutional thinker, gives the preference in almost all cases to the decisions of Stephen Segrave, the justiciar of Henry III, who supplanted Hubert de Burgh, and was practically a tool of the foreign party. It is clear that Segrave, though a bad minister, was a first-rate lawyer ${ }^{6}$." Now the facts are these. Bracton mentions Segrave but eight times. Only on three occasions does he notice a difference of opinion between Segrave and any other judge. Twice the difference is between Segrave and Raleigh; Bracton does not state very
${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 3, p. 220, 240.
${ }^{2}$ Ibid. p. 292.
3 Ibicl. 293.
4 Ibid. p. 368, 401, 521.
${ }^{5}$ Mat. l'ar. vol. 4, p. 169.
${ }^{6}$ Const. II ist. vol. 2, p. 190, note
3. Bracton's respect for Segrave seems to have struck Dr Stubbs so
forcibly that again on p. 294 he says, "Some of his [Henry's] bad ministers were among the best lawyers of the age. Stephen Segrave, the successor of Hubert de Burgh, was regarded by Bracton as a judge of consummate authority."
clearly whose opinion he prefers: but once, as it seems to me, he agrees with Segrave ${ }^{1}$, once with Raleigh ${ }^{2}$. Once again Segrave differs from Pateshull and Bracton takes Pateshull's side ${ }^{3}$. The 'almost all cases' therefore in which Bracton gives the preference to Segrave resolve themselves into one case or possibly two cases. This is almost all the notice that is taken of a famous judge and chief justiciar, one who undoubtedly was, as Dr Stubbs calls him, a first-rate lawyer. On five other occasions his name is barely mentioned ${ }^{4}$. There is no one citation from the roll of any cyre on which Segrave was sent without Pateshull, though of such rolls there can have been no lack. Ont the other hand citations from the eyre rolls of Pateshull and Raleigh occur in great abundance. This point, of infinitesimal importance in a history of the English constitution, must be of much importance to any one who professes that he is editing Bracton's Note-Book and therefore I am constrained to insist upon it.

Various explanations may be offered, though this can be but guess-work. The apparent preference of Pateshull and Raleigh may really be the result of mere chance; Bracton by some means or another got possession of Pateshull's rolls and Raleigh's rolls; Segrave's he had not got, they were at Leicester or Kenilworth; all rolls should by rights have been in the Treasury; Bracton could only use habitually such as had come to his hands by happy accident. More interesting would it be to detect some political inclination; Bracton "himself clearly a constitutional thinker" may have slighted the authority of "the tool of the foreign party". But Bracton's claim to be counted among those who sought

[^44]so this is the citation of a De Banco Roll. On f. 357 Segrave and Ra. leigh give a responsum to that inquisitive person lichard Ducket. On f. 369 b it is noticed that a certain case on the De Banco lioll, (it is Case 397 in the note-book,) was decided in the presence of Segrave and the Chancellor. On f. 293 b and 377 b two Coram Rege cases are cited as heard by Segrave.
to limit the kingly power rests mainly on a passage the authenticity of which is extremely doubtful, and William Raleigh whatever he may have become as bishop, was as judge distinctly a king's friend. More probable does it seem that the bias was not political, but juristic, that Bracton regarded Pateshull and Raleigh as the heads of a school of law and of lawyers. Of rival sehools of lawyers Englishmen know little. For ceuturies past our scheme of justice has been so concentrated that rival schools have been impossible. Every lawyer has belonged to the one orthodox school of Westminster, or has been simply 'no lawyer'. Blackburn, Mansfield, Hale, Coke, Littleton do not found seets; Bracton himself, so far as we know, founded none. But in the first half of the thirteenth century it may well have been otherwise and it was otherwise abroad. The rapid influx of civil litigation into the royal court must have demanded a rapid development of common law : and there well may have been strong and permanent differences of opinion among judges and lawyers even about fundamentals. There may have been Proculians and Sabinians. In particular the respect to be paid to Roman law may have been a hotly contested point. We do not know how this was; perhaps we hear only one side of the case; the school of Pateshull and Raleigh still lives and is eloquent; its rivals, if rivals it had, perished for they had no spokesman to match agaiust Bracton. Lastly we may not forget that when Bracton visits Devonshire, he chooses a Raleigh to sit with him on the bench, and that he holds land of the Raleighs. Possibly he was the pupil, the clerk, the friend of Bishop William.

At any rate the fact remains-the apparent preference of two judges of a past time above all other judges past or present. But in order to duly weigh this fact we must descend to particulars, and consider whence it was that Bracton obtained his lore of cases.

He cites as I reckon 494 cases; this includes some rague allusions to matters of uncertain date. The nature of his citations may be seen from the following table which is approximately correct.
Pleas in the Benclı, A.D. $1217-1234$. ..... $\because 71$
Pleas which followed the king, A.D. $1234-1240$ ..... 15
Pleas from eyres of Pateshull ..... 117
Pleas from eyres of Raleigh ..... 34
Later cases expressly dated ..... 9
Undated cases ..... 48
494

His method of vouching cases, when once it is mastered, will seem very orderly and intelligible. The citations fall into three great classes; a few specimens of each shall be three elasses given ${ }^{\text {. }}$ by him.

1. Citations of De Banco Rolls, the rolls of the Bench. pe Banco A complete citation of this kind will name no judges and no court, but will mention the names of the parties, the county, the year, and the term: thus-

Item ad hunc ultimum casum facit expresse de termino $S$. Hillarii anno Regis Henrici sexto in comitatu Staffordiae de Rannulfo Comite Cestriae et Priore de Kenelworth de ecclesia de Stoke. (f. 246 b.)
...probatur de termino Paschae anno Regis Henrici xvo. in comitatu Essexiae de Geruasio de Aldermanbury. (f. $407 \%$.)

Ad idem facit quod habetis de termino Paschae amno Regis Henrici xujo. in comitatu Suthantoniae de Engelardo de Cygoiny. (f. 407 b .)

Et ad hoc facit de termino S. Michaelis anno Regis Henrici xiiijo. incipiente $x^{0}$. in comitatibus Suffolkiae et Essexiae de Emma quae fuit uxor Rogeri filii Swani. (f. 312.)
2. Citations of Coram Rege Rolls. These are much coram Rege rarer. Bracton will say of a case vonched from such a roll that it is among the pleas which follow the king and will give the year, but no term ; thus-
...ut inter placita quae sequuntur Regem, anno regni Regis Henrici xix ${ }^{0}$., assisa ultimae presentacionis inter Priorem de Wallingford et Rogerum de Quincy et Simonem de Thennore. (f. 16 b.)
${ }^{1}$ It is the more necessary to explain this matter at length because the person who made indexes for Sir

Travers Twiss seems to have thought that every case belonged to some eyre.
...ut inter placita quae sequuntur Regem anno $\mathrm{xx}^{0}$. assisa nouae disseisinae de Waltero de Emdene et Alicia filia Ernaldi. (f. 195.)

Eyre Rohs.
3. Citations of Eyre Rolls. In making these Bracton names the county and almost always the judge. Often he specifies no year, because to do this is needless. Pateshull, for instance, visited Yorkshire more than once; therefore it will not do to speak merely of his Yorkshire eyre; one must be more particular, must say his last eyre, or his eyre of such a year. On the other hand it is quite sufficient to speak of Raleigh's eyre in Bedford, or Leicester, or Buckingham, for (at least as principal judge) he visited those counties but once, so there can be no confusion. Here are specimens:-
...ut de Itinere Episcopi Dunholmensis et M. de P. in com. Ebor. amo Regis Henrici tertio, assisa nouae disseisinae, Si Rogerus de Halgheton. (f. 50.)
...in Itinere M. de P. anno Regis Henrici decimo in com. Ebor. de Emma quae fuit uxor Raymeri le Franceys. (f. 304b.)
...ut de ultimo Itinere M. de P. in com. Ebor, anno Regis Henrici $x^{\circ}$. de quadam Juliana. (f. 298.)

Et de hac materia inueniatur in Itinere ML. de Pateshulla ad assisas nouae disseisinae capiendas et gaolas deliberandas in com. North., assisa nouae disseisinae, Si Rogerus de Deneford. (f. 169.)
...ut de Itinere W. de Ralegha in com. Bedf., assisa nouae disseisinae, Si Milo. (f. 170.)
...ut de Itinere W. de Ralegha in com. Bedf., de quadam Emma Bouastra. (f. 312.)

Explamation of this classification.

That the most important of the plea rolls would fall into these three classes is just what we ought to expect if we have read Bracton's account of the judicial organization of his time. There are justices travelling about under varions commissions; sometimes they are sent on a general eyre ad ommiu placitu, sometimes their power is more limited, they are to deliver the gaols and take the assizes, sometimes they are specially authorized to take just this, that and the other particular assize. In a classification of plea rolls, the rolls of cases heard under these special commissions should form a separate class as Assize Rolls. A few exist, notably two of

Bracton's and several of Preston's. But Bracton does not cite rolls of this class; they would not be first-rate authority, such assizes being taken by a single professional judge with lay associates, or sometimes by four laymen. Then there are justices residentes in banco. Lastly there are others who go about with the king, who are at the king's side. The yet extant rolls at the Public Record Office will fulfil this expectation; we find rolls of these three great classes.

Now with one exception ${ }^{1}$ Bracton, I believe, cites no Eyre Roll that is not a roll of Pateshull or of Raleigh. On the other hand he has more than a hundred cases from Pateshull's rolls, more than thirty from Raleigh's. Perhaps this fact will not seem so significant to the reader as it does to the writer of this. Therefore be it said that there must have been a very large number of other Eyre Rolls; many exist at this day; many have perished. Thus, for example, take the first eyre of the reign ; judges were sent into all the counties of England except eight ${ }^{2}$; every county would have its roll; Bracton cites but one of these rolls; from the roll for Yorkshire, which county was visited by Pateshull and the Bishop of Durham, he vouches a dozen cases. Again in 1227 commissions were issued for most of the counties ${ }^{3}$; Pateshull's journey in Kent, Essex, Hertford, Norfolk and Suffolk supplies Bracton with a profuse crop of cases; Segrave was sent into six counties, other judges were sent elsewhere; Bracton culls no one case from their rolls. By 1250 the number of Eyre Rolls of Henry's reign must have amounted to a hundred and more. Of course the very fact that there were so many rolls would have obliged a text writer, even if he had access to them all, to make some choice, to study and cite just a few. What I am at present concerned to urge, is that any other text writer or student than Bracton, would very possibly have thought it best or found it convenient, to read and to cite an entirely different set of rolls; to all seeming there must have been a vast supply.

[^45]No eyre rolls used but those of
l'ateshull and Raleigh.
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His choice of De Banco and Coram Rege Rolls.

When Bracton cites the De Banco Rolls and the Coram Rege Rolls, he does not as a general rule name the judges who heard the case. This is very natural for without their names the reference is complete and verifiable, and but seldom the their names appear upon the roll. These citations therefore do not explicitly set before us Pateshull and Raleigh as the two judges whose decisions are really sound law. Nevertheless the same principle or partizanship, eaprice or accident, which governed the citation of Eyre Rolls, seems to have been at work.
Differentiation of the Courts.

We are here tempted towards the slight anachronism of speaking of a Court of King's Bench and a Court of Common Pleas. It would be but slight for the differentiation of these two courts was almost accomplished; still it is best to adhere to the terminology of the time and we do not yet read of a Common Bench and a King's Bench. To judge from the extant plea rolls it would seem that at latest from the year 1234 onwards the state of affairs was this:Regularly every term judges sat on the Bench (in Banco) at Westminster, and the process which brought suitors before them was process compelling attendance coram justiciariis nostris apud Westmonasterium. At the same time the king was going about the country attended by judges; the process compelled attendance coram nobis ubicunque fuerimus in Anglict. What is more, there was an incipient differentiation of business; we find defendants who have been ordered to follow the king pleading to the jurisdiction and relying on the well known words of the Charter about communiu placita ${ }^{1}$; but as yet the special competence of cach court is only vaguely defined. Again, we find that crrors committed by the justices in the Bench can be corrected coram ipso rege ${ }^{2}$. Lastly there are two independent sets of rolls and between them there is this difference, (this will explain Bracton's method of citation,) that the rolls of pleas in the Bench are terminal rolls, while the rolls of pleas which follow the king are annual rolls ${ }^{3}$; it may be that
${ }^{1}$ See Cases $1213,1220$.
$\because$ Sen Cases 11ff, 118?, 1190.
${ }^{3}$ I am here speaking only of a few
years immediately following 1234 ; I believe that this distinction soon disappears.
cases might be heard corcom rege out of term as well as in term. In short we may fairly say that there were two different courts, provided that we do not take this phrase to necessarily comnote two permanently distinct bodies of judges ${ }^{1}$. The judges were the king's own servants dismissible at pleasure, and seemingly he moved them about as pleased him best. With this explanation, we may say that a Court of Common Pleas had by this time become a distinct court. There is more difficulty about saying that the pleas which followed the king were pleas in the Court of King's Bench, for the germs of what came to be three distinct jurisdictions are hardly yet to be distinguished, namely (1) the jurisdiction of the King's Bench, (2) that of the King in Council, (3) that of the King in Parliament. As a rule the cases found on the rolls of placita quae sequuntur regem seem to have been heard by some of the professional judges whom the king kept by his side, oceasionally by the king himself with, or possibly without, their assistance, for the notion that the king himself may not act as judge is not of Bracton's time ${ }^{2}$. But sometimes we read that the case was adjudged coram consilio domini regis, and sometimes the presence of many prelates and barons, named or unnamed, is noticed and the court seems a parliament ${ }^{3}$. As yet however all these cases are enrolled on the same rolls. Whether by anticipation we call the adjudicating body Parliament, Council, or King's Bench, these cases are placita quae sequuntur regem. Even distinctly legislative acts are recorded among these pleas ${ }^{4}$.

I have described this as being the state of affairs from Two Courts $12: 34$ onwards. It seems possible that a definite stage in the development of the Courts should be assigned to that year. I believe that the first of the scrics of rolls of pleas which follow the king, is a roll extending from the summer of 1234

[^51][^52]to the summer of 1235 (a.r. 18-19). This I mean is the first of that series which is now extant. On this fact by itself little stress should be laid, for the series after that date is very imperfect. But this is also the earliest roll of ' kingfollowing pleas' that Bracton cites ${ }^{1}$, while for cases in the Bench he goes back as far as 1217. From the rolls yet preserved it may be gathered, that from the very beginning of Henry's reign there were justices sitting in the Bench every term, except when an eyre in many counties took them all away from Westminster. A large number of their rolls we have, though not a perfect set. Now the court that they held seems, in Bentham's phrase, omnicompetent. On the same roll, on the same membrane, one may find appeals of felony, writs of right, actions of debt, the peculiar commodities of the King's Bench and those of the Common Pleas. Further, especially during the King's minority, one may sometimes find it said about a case on one of these rolls, that it was adjudged coram consilio domini regis; such a case is generally one which touches royal rights ${ }^{2}$. The Council certainly sat as a judicial body, but seems to have had no roll of its own; its judgments are recorded on the rolls of the Bench. So when the minority is over, on these same rolls one reads of judgments delivered coram ipso rege ${ }^{3}$. Doubtless the king when he came of age did justice in person; the doubt is whether he did it so usually and systematically that there was a separate and continuous set of rolls for cases which came before him and such judges as he might choose to have by his side. Occasionally important cases were evoked or adjourned before him, but seemingly he did not as yet make regular judicial progresses through the country, or only did so occasionally ${ }^{4}$.

[^53]the assizes of mort d'ancestor and novel disseisin for five particular counties should be summoned before him, Rot. Cl. vol. 2, p. 15t. I have seen a fine levied before him at Leominster on what seems to have been this occasion. The Justiciar, the Chancellor, Robert Lexington, William Fitz Warin and William of London were with him.

Now here it should be remarked that this roll of A.R. 18-19 begins exactly at a memorable date, Whitsuntide 1234 . From the beginning of the reign until 12:32 Hubert de Burgh was the chief justiciar. In that year, as alrearly said, he fell, was supplanted by Stephen Segrave. The formidable revolt of the Earl Marshall, the threats and persuasions of the bishops compelled the king to another change of mind. Just before Whitsuntide 1234 he turned against Segrave and the foreigners: Hubert and the insurgent barons were inlawed, or rather their outlawry was proclaimed a nullity. No justiciar was appointed; the king as it seems intended to be for the future his own first minister. Now it is just at this moment that begins the first yet extant roll of pleas which follow king Henry, and the first roll of that class which Bracton has cited, a roll full of reminiscences of the recent insurrection, of the misrule of Segrave and Des Roches. It looks as if the king had determined to get all the highest justice of the realm done under his own eye by professional judges who would not be too powerful, whom he could trust, whom at all events he conld watch. It was a recurrence to an old practice ; Henry would do what his forefathers had done ; but the consequence was that thenceforth there were what we can not but call two separate tribunals, each with its own record ${ }^{1}$.

Now Bracton cites the rolls of the Bench for almost every term from the beginning of the reign up to and including that for Trinity 1233. I think that he certainly has a case from Hilary $1234^{2}$ and one from Easter $1234^{3}$. Here he pateshull and Raleigl. quits this series of rolls, though many later members of it there must have been when he wrote and not a fow remain to this day. He turns to the rolls of pleas which followed the king and cites cases from the rolls for a. R. $19,20,21,22$,

[^54]23,24 ; in all fifteen cases. Here his continuous chain of citations is broken. After a considerable interval there come six cases from A.R. 29-33. If now we look to the list of judges who sat on 'the Bench', we find that from the beginning of the reign until the early part of 1229 Pateshull was evidently the foremost judge of the court; he sits below no one unless it chances that an Earl or the Justiciar himself, Hubert de Burgh, is present. In 1229 Pateshull died. Within a year Raleigh is on the Bench, but not as premier judge. He sits below Thomas Multon and below Stephen Segrave, but Segrave is very seldom present and Raleigh generally has the second place; at length even Multon gives way to him. Raleigh sits on the Bench until the summer of 1234 , until the exact moment when Bracton ceases to cite the rolls of the Bench. Raleigh then becomes the principal judge attendant on the king's person and such he continues to be until he is made a bishop in 1239. It is almost exactly, if not quite exactly, from this period that Bracton cites pleas which followed the king; records of later date than the time when Raleigh was consecrated, these Bracton could not obtain or else he thought them of comparatively little value ${ }^{1}$.

We have been long in coming to the Note Book. The reason for the delay was this. It was necessary to establish that Bracton's selection of rolls was very distinctive, perhaps determined by accident and necessity (for all rolls should have been in the Treasury) perhaps determined by political partizanship, juristic theories, personal friendships, but at any rate distinctive. His is a treatise on English law as administered by Pateshull and Raleigh. Not every lawyer's

[^55][^56]note book would be like his note book; not every student would have had access to just the same rolls; there were many other rolls; there had been and were other great judges.

## § 7. Of the Note Book.

And now to the Note Book. It is a stout volume, about Deseription 11 inches high by 9 broad, wears a handsome binding and Book. carries on its back three labels thus lettered:- | Placita et Assisae 1-2t Hen. III.| Mus. Brit. Jure Emptionis.| Externals 12,269 Plut. clxxii. c. $\|$ The two lowest labels have been placed there since the book was acpuired for the national collection, but the binding is of older date and so I am informed is the legend on the topmost label.

A vellum fly leaf at the beginning has on its front in ink - Fly-ceaf. Purch of Cochran 12 Feb. 1842 (from Holmes's Library of Eust Retford ${ }^{1}$ ). On the back of this fly-leaf is written in pencil-The first two folios of the first quaternion are wanting. Each quaternion contains 12 leares.

This last statement is not quite true. The book is now xumber made up of 24 quires or quaternions of parchment; but of ${ }^{\text {of tuires. }}$ these two are imperfect and one is abnormally long. Each perfect quire should consist of six pieces of parchment laid one inside the other and bound together by their middlles, so as to present twelve leaves and twenty-four sides. The first $\mathbf{l}$.nss of a quire has lost its outside sheet, so that, had the pages been numbered back and front in the modern fashion, pp. $1,2,23,24$ would be wanting. Undoubtedly this sheet once existed and bore writing. The matter which stood on what, but for the loss, would have been the twelfth leaf (pp. 2:3, 24), I have been able to supply with some certainty in a mamer explained below. What now is the outside sheet of this first quire is sadly damaged. Seemingly this quire was at one

[^57][^58]Other losses (if any) occurred long ago.
time lying loose from the rest of the book and suffered ill usage. The rest of the book is well preserved.
At the beginning of the second quire (top margin of what now is f . 11), there is an important legend written in what seems to me a hand of the fifteenth century. This however, most unfortunately, has been in part erased. Apparently the erasure is due to some person who, perhaps in the same century, numbered the first 34 leaves of the book. He scratched out part of the legend in question in order to make room for "fo. xj"". Possibly a skilled palacographer might still read the whole. What I can read is this:-

Md quod iste liber continet in se viginti quatuor quarterna et constat. ex dimissione.

Number of leaves.

The writer therefore seems to have known the book as containing four and twenty quires; hence we may infer that it ended then where it ends now, that nothing has been lost since his day.

The ninth quire has but eleven leaves. The extracts from a certain roll come to an end half-way down the front of the eleventh leaf; the rest of the front and the whole of the back of that leaf are blank; the tenth quire begins with a new title and extracts from a new roll. I infer that here there has been no loss, merely an economizing of parchment. The tenth quire again is ampler than the rest; it has fourteen leaves. The leaves have been recently numbered in pencil from first to last. Altogether there are 287 leaves (first quire 10 leaves, ninth quire 11 leaves, tenth quire 14 leaves, twenty-one quires of 12 leaves each, total 287 leaves). The quires begin with the leaves numbered $1,11,23,35,47,59$, $71,83,95,106,120,132,144,156,168,180,192,204,216$, 22S, 240, 252, 264, 276.

Seemingly when the book was originally made the quires were numbered consecutively, the number being placed in the bottom margin of the first leaf of each quire and catchwords were put at the end of each quire. These have suffered much from the binder's shears ; but I see no reason to believe that anything has perished out of the middle of the book save
the last leaf of the first quire. In most cases it is plain that the quires still follow each other in right order.

But the end of the book has in all probability disappeared. Iromany the The text now breaks off at the very end of a quire and at ${ }^{\text {endub }}$, thlee what may or may not be the end of a case. From the book itself we cannot learn whether anything has been lost. Some information on this point I shall presently supply from another quarter. That the loss is not of recent date we may gather from the alreally ancient statement that there were four-and-twenty quires.

The front and back of almost every leaf are covered with writing. The number of lines on a page varies considerably decreasing as we go through the book from 53 to 40 . This makes the end much handsomer and more legible than the begimning.

The contents may be briefly described as transcripts of the contents entries on the judicial rolls of the first twenty-four years of Henry III. These transeripts have been made by several different scribes. Certainly there were as many as four ; I think that there were five. I believe that the hand-writing of all of them may be safely ascribed to the middle of the thirteenth century or thereabouts. The extracts from the rolls do not follow each other in strict order of date. The arrangement, we may say, looks as if chronology had been tempered by catastrophes. We proceed with some regularity from earlier to later rolls and then leap back to earlier rolls which have been omitted. In some cases as we turn over the MS. we can see reasons for this procedure. A clerk, for example, has been copying pleas from the sixteenth year, and brings his work to an end in the middle of a quire ; another clerk has begun another quire with pleas of the seventeenth year; here then there were three or four blank leaves which would serve for pleas from the ninth year. Having observed many small indications of this kind, it seems to me that the collection was rapidly made by some one who could command the services of several clerks. He set them to work transcribing from different rolls and pieced the book together as best he could. And there are signs of haste; in writing one
part of the book two clerks constantly relieved each other at very short intervals. The work of these various copyists could not always be quite neatly fitted together ; hence a few blank pages. In one case a blank thus left was afterwards utilized. Extracts from a roll for the twenty-fourth year (the latest roll used) end on f. 195 b ; extracts from a roll of the second year (the earliest roll used) begin on f. 197. The interval contains in several different hands (1) the discussion of a hypothetical case, (2) a disquisition on leap-year, (3) the assize of bread, (4) two decided cases, one from the fourth, the other from the tenth year. The assize of bread is given in French, (this is the one piece of French that occurs,) and is written in what seems a later hand than any other employed upon the book. With the exception of these apparently interpolated entries, the whole collection looks as if it had been made at one time. About the middle of the thirteenth century some man had this book made for him.

That man's writing may yet be seen. The margins are rich with notes. These notes are due to two different persons. One of them has written but very few. For the sake of distinction I call him "the occasional annotator", and he seems to me to have been one of the copyists. The other I call " the usual annotator". His handwriting has a strongly marked character of its own, very upright and in general very distinct, but I believe that it may be safely described as a legal hand of the middle of the 13th century. That he was a contemporary of the copyists and had the note book made for him there can be little doubt, for in a few instances he has written pieces of the text. He has written the heading which announces a new term and also the first word or two of the first entry under that heading, thus starting the transcriber on his task ${ }^{1}$. The book then was made for him and under his eye.

A glance at my printed text will show that the marginal notes are capriciously distributed. On page after page there will be nothing in the margin, and then again for a while
${ }^{1}$ Sce f. 3, 35, 45. I think that he also wrote the first few words of the
almost every entry will have its note. The annotator seems to have returned to the work at several different times and made notes by fits and starts, taking up now one part of the book and now another. In some instances a case has two notes apparently made at different times. Again the comparatively few notes made by him whon I call the occasional amnotator, occur in batches, chiefly in one batch (f. $50-54$ ). They are of the same kind as the other notes, but rather less hastily written. I take him to have been an amanuensis of the usual amotator. Of the import of these notes much must be said hereafter; at present we are still concerned with externals.

There are a few hasty marginal scribblings in what I take Later marto be a hand of the sixteenth or fifteenth century, just single words such as Corona and the like, showing the title under which the case would fall in an Abridgement or Digest. The person who wrote these or some contemporary of his has numbered some of the quires. About the same time too some one with the book upside down scrawled a precedent of a writ of entry on the margin of f . 285 b . At a quite recent date some one has observed in the middle of f. 145 b , that in the beginning God made man in his own image. His offence is venial compared with that of one who must be charged with having made some wanton and purposeless erasures near the beginning of the book (f. $\unrhd, 2 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{11})$.

We must now pass for a moment from the British Museum to the Public Record Office. For about half of the terms from the rolls for which this book has extracts, there are no extant rolls; for about half there are extant rolls. But fortune has been capricious; in many cases there are two still extant rolls for the same term; for one term there are three. It is, I may observe, a common thing to find what pupleate we may call duplicate or triplicate rolls. These will be rolls for the same term, recording the same cases in almost the same words; yet it will be plain that one is not a copy of the other. The same eases will be found on the two, but not in the same order. In general under each heading denoting one of the days for the return of writs, e.g. the Octave
3. 1.
of S. Hilary, there will be found on both rolls the same cases: but not in the same order, and no rearrangement of membranes would bring the cases into the same order. Further, on a closer examination it will appear, that though the two records of one case will agree in substance, still there will often be many small verbal differences, variances such as copyists do not make. And more important differences are occasionally found; in particular when both rolls agree that the parties pleaded to issue or prayed judgment, one roll will and the other will not record how at a later day a judgment was given or a verdict found. Sometimes this judgment will have been given or this verdict found at a time considerably later than the term with which the roll deals, and it will be recorded on the roll by way of postseript. In short, to put the matter technically, one of the duplicates will give a Postea not to be found on the other. The origin of these duplieates seems this, that besides the principal roll kept by the protonotary, each judge had his roll kept for him by a clerk, and these rolls were used to check each other. Some cases referring to this practice occur in our Note Book and Bracton discusses what is to be done when there is discord between several rolls ${ }^{1}$. How it comes about that the cases occur in different, often very difierent, order, on the different rolls, I can not here discuss. My present point is that when there is a roll extant for a certain term, we can not at once say that this roll was used by the maker of the Note Book. Most fortunately however we have other means of telling very surely which of the rolls now fortheoming were in his hands.

Marks on the markin of the Rolls connecting then with the Note Book.

When having copied some pages of the Note Book, I took my transcript to the Record Office, in the hope of finding the original records, I expected that the work of hunting for my cases would be tedious. To my surprise and delight on taking up the first roll I discovered that the work was done for me. Every case that I wanted had against it a mark of an obvious, unmistakeable kind. In the margin of the roll down the whole length of the case somenc had drawn a firm

[^59]heary line, in colour a dark rusty lnown; to look at, it was much such a line as might have been drawn by the old fashioned red-lead pencil. I soon learnt to know that this 'scoring,' as I call it, was the work of the man who had the Note Book made for him ${ }^{1}$.

Whenever there was a scored roll, the cases in the Note Proof of Book agreed perfectly with the eases on that roll, saving the thection. immaterial omissions, of which hereafter, and saving mere clerical blunders. When there was a roll not seored, the cases in the Note Book did not agree perfectly with the cases on that roll; the cases did not always occur in the same order; the Note Book occasionally gave Posteas which were not on the roll. I found that the copyists who wrote the Note Book had very faithfully obered the direction to copy implied in the scoring. Very rarely indeed did 1 find any case in the Note Book which had not been scored; so rarely, that it seemed fair to attribute the few instances to mere inadvertence or accident. More frequently a scored case had not been copied. As regards the majority of the rolls this happened so seldom that one might properly set it down to the clerk having scamped his work; only as regards two or three rolls should I say that the number of cases scored but not copied, was too considerable to be accomnted for by this supposition; and about these we may perhaps hold, that the maker of the Note Book changed his mind after he had marked out the work for his seribes. In some instances the copyist has apparently obeyed what he took to be his intstructions, with a slavish obedience; he has left out the important end of a case, because the mark on the roll did not go far enough, or has copied just the first lines of the next case, because the mark went a little too far ${ }^{2}$.

The person who scored the rolls did not content himself with this. In some instances he has numbered the membranes

[^60]director of a seriptorium. The marks on the rolls are, I take it, not indelible, but of course I have not attcmpted to prove this.
a See my notes to Cases 75. 320, 710, 711, 5:
at their tops, while at their bottoms he has scrawled the words Visus est, as much as to say, 'I have examined this 'sheet.' Then over against the scored cases he has sometimes written a word or two. These words are such as to show that he was collecting cases and had various categories in his mind. Thus he writes-De recto (A Writ of Right), De dote (An Action for Dower), Ass' no' (An Assize of Novel Disseisin), Quis aduoc' (An Assize of Darrein Presentment), De sum' et uttach' (Summonses and Attachments, Mesne Process), De communibus (Common Form). Occasionally he even writes Error on the roll. A more important note oceurs over against an action between the Prior of Merton and the men of Ewell ${ }^{1}$. A long particularization of the villein services demanded by the Prior is on the roll. We find that this has been omitted in the Note Book where it is merely said that the Prior claimed 'certain' services. Looking again at the roll we see scribbled in big letters Loquatur mecum de hoc capitulo; the meaning seems plain-He must have a talk with me before he copies this entry and I will tell him what to leave out ${ }^{2}$.

The cases are copied with omissions.

As a general rule when a case is taken from the roll it is copied into the Note Book word for word; but certain omissions, which were considered immaterial, are habitually made. The most common omission is that of the names of attorneys, jurors and the like; occasionally too when there are numerous defendants, the name of the first of them only will be copied. Such omissions are usually indicated by the use of the words talis and et infira. Thus if an assize of novel disseisin be brought against ten persons, the Note Book will say that the assize comes to recognize whether the Prior of Merton et tales, or whether the Prior of Merton et infra, disseised William Smith; et infra means that there is more upon the roll. Dates again are frequently omitted, the omission being indicated by tali die; so are the formal parts of charters and the ends of some common formulas; but in general an etc. in the Note Book represents an etc. on the

[^61][^62]roll. Only in very few instances have I noticed anything that could be called an abridging or abstracting of the entry on the roll; as a rule the entry is copied verbatim with such omissions as I have just mentioned.

The copyists have done their work fairly well, though, as The copying it seems to me, quite mechanically. They are guilty of is fecurraty omissions and repetitions of the kind usual with those who are paid to copy what they do not care to understand. Sometimes they leave blanks to represent words which were ill written on the roll; they deal very roughly with proper names; occasionally they are guilty of very stupid blunders, for instance, one of them habitually writes sic', or even sicut in full, when he finds Ric' (Ricardus) on the roll, to the great detriment of good sense; they distribute stops in a way which shows that they do not think about the meaning of what they write. The writer of the last half of the book was, I should say, much more careful and intelligent than his fellows; his work is in general very legible and trustworthy.

Having observed the manner in which the rolls had been $\begin{gathered}\text { The nissing } \\ \text { parge surpticied }\end{gathered}$ marked, it seemed to me possible to supply the matter which , rom the roll. stood on one of the two lost leaves of the Note Book. As already said the outside sheet of the first quire has perished. What stood on the half of this which would have made the first leaf, I cannot say, for the Note Book now begins with extracts from a term for which no roll has been found. But the gap occasioned by the loss of the other half of this sheet, occurs in the middle of extracts from a term for which there are two rolls, and one of these is scored. The hiatus in the Note Book occurs between the middle of Case 67 and the middle of Case 68. Between these two cases I found on the scored roll eight cases which were scored. These I have copied and printed as an Appendix to my third volume. The mass of matter thus printed is considerably too long to have stood in the Note Book between Cases 67 and 68. Something must be allowed for the omissions of immaterial particulars which the copyist of the Nute Book would have made; but enough cannot be allowed to bring down my

Appendix to the requisite size; perhaps then the copyist omitted one of the cight cases. That one of them was in the Note Book is made the more probable by this, that the same case at a later stage appears in another part of the Note Book, and the amnotator has there written in the margin alibi supra, meaning that the same case was to be found above, which would only be true if it stood on the page now lost ${ }^{1}$.

The method employed for restoring this lost page might, I thought, be also used for determining the question, whether anything and, if anything, what, had been lost from the end of the Note Book. The process could only be applied in a one-sided fashion; it might give positive but could not give negative results. The fact that a roll was not scored, would prove nothing, for the maker of the Note Book might have had a duplicate roll. The fact that a roll was scored, would go to prove that extracts from it were once in the book; though this would not be quite certain, for the direction to copy might never lave been obeyed, or the copy might have been made in some other book. A search, (I dare not say an exhaustive, but still a diligent search,) through the plea rolls of the first forty years of Henry's reign, ([ must gratefully acknowledge the help given me by Mr W. F. Noble,) resulted in the discovery of but two rolls, from which there were no extracts in the Note Book, and which yet were scored in the to me familiar fashion. This result if small was satisfactory. One of these two rolls was a roll for the cyre of 1221 , that eyre of Martin Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in the mid-western counties which Bracton has made famons; the county was Worcester ${ }^{2}$. Now cases from this eyre, Leicestershire and Staffordshire cases, are the last things now in the Note Book. The probability therefore seems very strong that the marks on this Worcester roll were obeyed; extracts from that roll are just what we might expect to follow cases heard in other comities during the same eyre. This Worcester roll, again, has one inscription

[^63]which deserves note. There is a case on it which has been disordered by the intrusion of a postscript; one ought to read what comes below before what stands above. Against this he who scored the roll has scribbled (the worls are faint but legible)—primo scribatur ibi postea supra; this is a direction to the copyist to transpose two sentences. We may then conclude with some certainty that the Note Book once had extracts from this roll. The second of the two rolls now in question, was the record of the eyre of A.R. ; in Lincolnshire, an erre in which Pateshull apparently took part and from which Bracton cites a case ${ }^{1}$.

What else, if anything, may have been lost from the end of the book we cannot decide: but the fact that no scored roll has been found for any year from A.R. -2. to A.R. 40 both inchsive, a period from which very many rolls are still preserved, tends towards proof that there cannot have been many extracts in the Note Book of later date than the latest of those which now appear there. Beyond A.R. 40 my search has not been systematically prosecuted, and it must be confessed that the discovery of any rolls of considerably later date, bearing marks of just the kind that has here been described, would bring some of my inferences to the ground; but having compared roll after roll, case by case, with my transcript of the Note Book, it seems to me quite certain that the marks on the rolls were put there by the compiler of the Note Book.
§8. Of the Relution betureen the Note Book and Bracton's Treatise.

It is now to be considered what reasons there are for why Rracsupposing the Note Book to be Bracton's.

The comparison of handwritings is not one of the tests soproof that can be applied, for we have no mannscript of Bracton's parisun of treatise, (at least I have seen none,) that can clain to be the writinss.

[^64]autograph. On the two rolls which record his labours in Devonshire as a justice of assize, there are some corrections and interpolations, which very likely were made by his hand; they seem to be just of the kind that would be made by the judge himself. There does seem to me to be much likeness between them and the notes in the Note Book; but they are too brief to be trustworthy material; the inference that Bracton made them is but an inference; I have no skill in comparing hands; therefore no stress whatever is laid upon the resemblance. As to the few words occasionally written on the margin of rolls by the person who 'scored' them, these are hasty scrawls made with some blunt instrument, and cannot be profitably compared with the notes in the Note Book. We must look then beneath the external form to the matter which our book contains, and our first argument will be founded on the choice of rolls whence extracts have been made.

## The First Argument: The Selection of Rolls.

The selection of Rolls.

Now speaking largely we may say that the compiler of the Note Book has used just the set of rolls that Bracton used. Such is the general result, but the comparison must descend to details, and the three classes of rolls may be taken separately.

## 1. Rolls of the Bench.

Rolls of the Bench. -

Some difficulty is occasioned at starting by the loss of the earliest rolls of this class and the loss of the Note Book's first page. Henry III. was crowned on the 28th Oct. 1216. Almost the whole of his first year was taken up by the civil war, which was ended by the treaty of Lambeth on the 11th Sept. 1217. Thereupon a court began to sit at Westminster, and the first pleas after the war were of Michaelmas term 1217 (A.R. 1-2). Bracton had a roll for this term and the Note Book has extracts from it. But it is not for another two years, namely until Michaelmas 1219 (A.R. 3-4), that we find an extant roll. The Note Book has extracts
from the roll for Easter and Trinity 1219 (A.R. 3). These are preceded by fifteen cases, the first now in the book; they have no heading because what was once the first page has disappeared. They certaiuly belong to the interval between Michaelmas term 1217 (A.R. 1-2) and Michaclmas term 1219 (1.R. :3-4) and ther do not belong to Easter or Trinity 1219 (A.R. 3). The terms left open for them are Hilary, Easter, Trinity, Michaelmas 1218, and Hilary 1219. Their date should be fixed.

The adjourmments seem to point to a Trinity term : this The earliest among other reasons led me when I had them printed to ascribe them to Trinity 1218 (A.R. Q). Bracton cites several of them; he cites Case 5 from Trinity A.r. $\xrightarrow{-}$; Case 8 from term. S. Mich. A.R. 2 post guerrem, that is probably from Michaelmas 1217 (A.r. 1-2); Case 12 as inter primu placita post guerram (a rather rague phrase): for what seems to be a later stage of Case 11, he vonches the roll of Michaclmas A.R. $2-3(1218)$, while Case 9 is spoken of as having come before Pateshull in A.R. 2 but no term is mentioned. This evidence is somewhat perplexing; but we must remember that the same case often appears in different stages on several different rolls. Bracton cites five cases from Trinity 1218 (A.r. 2) and one from Michaelmas 1218 (A.r. 2-3), none of which are in the Note Book: he cites no case, at least expressly, from either Hilary or Easter 1218 (A.r. 2). Again on one occasion he cites a case (f. 302) in secundo rotulo post guerram de termino S. Trinitatis. This led me at one time to believe that the Court did not sit in Hilary or Easter 1218 (A.r. 2); bat on examining the feet of fines I had to abandon this notion ; the Court sat in all four terms of 1218. I now think that there was but one roll for the three first terms of that year. In the early years of the reign it is not uncommon to find a roll covering more than one term. This would explain the citation "in the second "roll after the war, from Trinity term." Also it will explain a note in the margin of the Note Book over against Case 9, namely, De term. S. Trin. amn. eodem $i j^{\circ}$. The annotator has probably put this somewhere about the place where the
transactions of the Easter term end and those of the 'Trinity term begin. If that be its meaning I do not think that it is quite in the right place, for in Cases 5 , $k$, and 7 we read of what was done three werks after S. Jolm's day i.e. Midsummer. On the whole I still think that the fifteen extracts in question, or all but the first two or three, belong to Trinity A.D. 1218 (A.R. 2 ), but that they may well have been preceded in the Note Book by a few extracts from the Hilary and Easter terms.

In that case the maker of the Note Book had the rolls for all terms from the begiming of the reign down to and including Trinity 121 S . From Michaclmas 1218 (A.1. 2-3) there are no extracts. The Court sat in that term and Bracton cites a solitary case. So this we must account an instance of Bracton having had a roll which the maker of the Note Book is not proved to have had. From Hilary 1219 (A.R. :3) we get no extracts; but Bracton cites no case ; no fines have been found; an eyre on a large scale was going on, and we may conclude that the Bench at Westminster was mocenpied ${ }^{1}$.

From the next nine terms the Note Book has extracts and Bracton has citations. We pass therefore unchecked to Trinity 1221 (A.R. 5). From this the Note Book has nothing. Bracton apparently has one case. But I have found no roll and no fines and think it very doubtful whether the Court sat. On the norrow of Trinity, Pateshull, Hareng and Lexington, three of the usnal judges of the Bench, began an eyre in the west which seems to have kept them away thronghout the summer and far into the antumm ${ }^{2}$.

From the next term again, Michathas $12 \underline{2} 1($ A.R. $5-6)$ there is nothing in the Note Book. Bracton does not cite any cases distinetly from Mich. A.R. 5-6; but he cites eight from Mich. A.R. G. 'I'his seems at first sight ambignous; but six out of the eight are essoin cases which would, I suppose, be artjudged on the first days of the term, and I infer therefore

[^65]that the term to which ther belong is Michaelmas 6-7: the essoins of that term would be taken before the cormation day.

The next term for which the Note Book has nothing is Trinity 122:3 (A.R. 7) and from this Bracton rouches two cases. No roll has been foruct and no fines; but Bracton's citations are perhaps correct.

Term now follows term in the Note Book until Trinity A.R. 10 is reached. That and the next two terms are unrepresented. So they are in the treatise also. No roll is extant and I have seen no fines. Probably the Court did not sit; a great eyre ${ }^{1}$ was taxing the judicial resources. In the Note Book the pleas for the next tem, Easter 1227 (A.R. 11) are described as 'Placitu...post reditum iusticiariorum de itinere ${ }^{2}$. On these follow cases from Trinity term of the same year, but it seems clear ${ }^{3}$ that after these the Note Book proceeds to give withont any new heading, (the omission may be due to mere carclessness,) cases from the Hilary and Easter terms of 1228 (A.R. 12). Thus a leap is made orer Michaelmas 1207 (A.r. 11-12). From that term Bracton draws no case: I have found neither roll nor fine; an eyre in many counties was begun in September ${ }^{4}$; probably the Bench was without an occupant. Trinity 1298 (A.r. 12) is unrepresented in the Note Book, the treatise, the rolls, the fines.

No check now occurs until Hilary 1232 (A.r. 16). Bracton has one citation: the Note Book no extract: no roll is found, but there were judges taking fines at Westminster and at times Raleigh was of them. As to the Trinity term of the same year we are everywhere met by negatives; no extracts: no citations; no roll; no fines. This was the time when Raleigh made that tour in the midlands which supplied Bracton with many decisions. The Note Book has nothing from Easter 1233; but Bracton has nothing from this term: apparently a Court was sitting at Westminster, but Raleigh was not there. Without any break the Note Book has

[^66]extracts from the four next terms, ending with Easter 1234 (A.D. 18). This is the last roll from which it gives extracts and with it Bracton's continuous series of citations from the rolls of the Bench comes tr an end.

Summary as to the Rolls of the Bench.

To sum up then, the Note Book has extracts from all the rolls from which Bracton took his cases, except four viz. that for Michachas 1218 (A.r. 2-3) from which one case is vouchet, that for Trinity 1221 (A.R. 5) from which one case is wouched, that for Trinity 1293 (A.R. 7) from which there are two citations, that for Hilary 1232 (A.R. 16) which yields a solitary case. This list of exceptions might perhaps be yet further reduced, for it seems doubtful whether the Court sat in Trinity 1201 or Trinity 12:32, and very possible that the apparent mention of those terms in the treatise is due to some mistake of the author, his copyists or editors. But taking things as they stand, it is plain that if Bracton had rolls from these four terms he has used them very sparingly.
2. Rolls of pleas which followed the King.

Pleas which followed the king.

As regards the rolls of pleas which followed the King the case is very simple; Bracton and the maker of the Note Book had just the same six consecutive rolls.

## 3. Eyre Rolls.

Eyre Rolls.
The Eyre Rolls cannot be so briefly dismissed. Bracton had about twenty eyre rolls of Pateshull and five of Raleigh. The Note Book gives selections from but eight rolls, all of them are rolls of Pateshull, all save one of them are rolls used by Bracton. These selections from eyre rolls are the last things in the Note Book. We have above seen reason for believing that the end of that book has perished, also for believing that the part that has perished comprised extracts from the Worcester eyre roll of $1 \because 21$ and the Lincoln eyre roll of 1219. To both of these Bracton has appealed for cases. There is nothing, as it seems to me, to be said against the supposition that, were the Note Book as complete as once it was, it would give us extracts from all the eyre rolls cited by Bracton. But then there is nothing to be said for
that supposition. Such rolts as are extant give ns no aid, for mofortmately, with I belicve five exceptions, just thuse rolls which we would ghadly examine are not to be had; not one of Raleigh's eyre rolls is forthcoming. The exceptions consist of five rolls from the memorable eyre of 1221 , one from Shropshire, two from Warwick, two from Gloncester. None of them is seored ; but no inference can be drawn from this, for as already said, there were often duplicate and triplicate rolls.

But now reviewing our comparison as a whole, the result summary as though by no means conclusive must arouse the belief that tion of rolls. Bracton and the maker of the Note Book were but one person. Both begin collecting cases from the rolls of the Bench at the same point. Both at the same point cease taking cases from the rolls of the Bench and begin taking eases from the rolls of pleas which follow the king. Of rolls of the latter kind both use precisely the same six, the six which just cover the time when William Raleigh held the placita coram rege. Both, working years after Pateshull was in his grave, seem either to treat the rolls of his eyres as the best of all eyre rolls, or to happen to have those partieular rolls ready to hand. But we must pass to another argument.

## The Second Argument: The Selection of Cases.

If all or almost all the cases cited by Bracton were found The selection in our manuscript, we might say with some confidence that this was not the result of chance. It should here be explained that only a small part of the matter which appears on any roll has been copied into the Note Book; only the cases which were thought of more than usnal interest have been taken. The proportion borne by the selected cases to the whole mass of matter on the rolls varies greatly from roll to roll. It cannot be estimated very aceurately, but taking one roll with another I should say that not more than a tenth part has been copied. Now that so small a selection should
comprise all Bracton's cases and yet that Bracton should have had nothing to do with the choice, would be most unlikely. A calculation of chances is indeed impossible for some cases were doubtless more interesting than others, and a certain agreement between different lawyers as to what cases were of most value might be expected : still the coincidence would be so remarkable that we might reasonably infer that it was not fortuitous.

But our case is by no means so strong as that here supposed. As already explained, the Note Book has no selections from a considerable number of rolls, mostly eyre rolls, used by Bracton. But considering only those rolls from which there are extracts in the Note Book, the result to which I have come is, that among these extracts there are rather more than half the cases which Bracton vouches from the same rolls ${ }^{1}$. Some allowance must be made for mistakes of mine. I may well have failed to identify some of Bracton's cases. The proper names which occur in his text have been horribly distorted by copyists, for example an Archdeacon of Totness (Archidiaconus de Tottona) has become Alfridus de Cottone and Viel D'Engaine (Vitalis de Engaine) has become the Vicar of Gaine; this throws difficulties in one's way. Again a good many cases Bracton cites anonymonsly, that is to say, he merely states that a case about this or that matter will be found on a particular roll, but does not name the parties. It is sometimes hard for a modern to be certain whether he has found such a case; and if any mistake has been made by copyist or printer in giving the date, the case will hardly be found. That such mistakes have occurred is certain; still I would not attribute to them any weighty influence on the general result now under our consideration. Certainly not a few of the cases, which Bracton has cited and which yet are not in the Note Book, may be found just where they ought to be, on the rolls whence they are cited by the Bracton of the printed book; others I have not found; but on the whole considering how badly proper names have

[^67]fared, I have been surprised at the safety with which dates have passed through the hands of transeribers.

Altogether Bracton cites just about jo0 cases and I be-resulta lieve that just about 200 of them will be fomet in this book, if the comwhich contains in all just about 2000 cases, so that every tenth case in it or thereabonts has been eited by Practon. This result, though it may not strengthen, will not I think weaken the argument founded on the selection of rolls made alike by Bractom and by the owner of the Note Book. Of course we camot arghe that when writing his treatisn Bracton was wholly dependent on this book for his anthorities. But we have known all along that this could hardly be true. Not until 12.ss was he bidden to surender the rolls which were in his possession, while probably he hat finisher the main part of his text two or three vears before that date. We may guess perhaps that he had another note book with other casces in it. At the begiming of one set of axtracts in our MS. there is written in the margin De hoc termino michil alibi, and this suggests that the owner had somewhere else another collection of authoritics.

But the reader may ask, What need had Bracton of any why did transcripts of cases if the very rolls themselves were in his a Nutote luok hands? The answer is, that, even with the aid of a note if hells? book, his feat of citing some five hundred eases seattered about in some fifty rolls was a gigantic feat of patience, industry, memory, and that without some such aid the feat would have been impossible. Imagine fifty rolls, each composed of twenty or thirty membranes, each membrane as long as one's arm, as broad as one's span, each mombrane covered back and front with writing, whereon are no headnotes, no catch-words, nothing to guide the eve save the names of counties in the margin. Such was the raw material; to have transplanted five hundred cases directly out of this disorderly mass into their proper places in a systematic exposition of the law, would have been beyond the power of any man. Bracton, we may surely say, though he had the rolls themselves would have wanted a note book or several note books. Of course howerer we may not leap from this
inference to the assertion that his note book or one of his note books has come to our hands, and it must be frankly admitted that had we no other evidence than what has already come before us, any such assertion would be rash; we might speak of 'curious coincidences,' say that 'not 'impossibly' this book was Bracton's, but beyond this we could not go.

Treatise and Note Book are alike unique.

Still the miqueness of the treatise, the uniqueness of the Note Book should be had in mind. It is not as though we argued-' Here is a note book containing very many of the 'eases cited in "Sugden on Powers"; it must have belonged to 'Lord St Leonards.' Bracton's treatise with its five hundred eitations stands quite alone. He is the one and only man of his time whom we know to have collected eases from the records. His successors, Britton and Fleta, abridging his work to meet the demands of lawyers, omit the eitations. Of the uniquencss of the Note Book we may not speak quite so positively; still nothing of the same sort has yet been made public. We are dealing with rarities; with an unique treatise, with a collection of eases which, so far as we know, is unique; one in every ten of the cases in the latter is eited in the former; this is not an insignifieant result.

The Third Argument: The Relation between Passages in the Treatise and Marginal Notes in the Note Book.

Marsinalia in the Note Book.

We pass now to evidence of a more interesting kind, that offered by the notes in the margin of our book, and, leaving Bracton out of sight for a while, something should first be said of their nature and their date.

One part of the annotator's work no printed version could adequately represent. Many of the eases he must have studied earefully, pen in hand. In the manuscript one may see how he has touched up badly formed letters, corrected here and there a false concord, and 'expuneted' redundant words. When he has interpolated anything into the text attention will be drawn to the fact by a foot-note. Such
interpolations are not very uncommon. Sometimes a word which obviously was missing, for instance an all-important, non, has been supplied; sometimes a proper name is inserted so as to explain an ambiguous ipse, ille, smum: sometimes a link of reasoning is introduced: but generally if there is much to be said, this is said in the margin.

His marginalia fall into three main classes. The largest sature consists of brief statements in general terms of the point Mirrinalial. decided by the case; statements not mlike the head notes of our modern reports. Occasionally we find mere catchwords which refer cither to the matter of the case or the names of the parties, thus, 'Bustardia,' 'De fine fucto,' 'De Bello Monte,' 'Gorges.' A much smaller but more valuable class is made up of criticisms and speculations; thus the word 'Error' marks the decision as bad law; sometimes a reason is given for its condemnation, sometimes not; praise is bestowed by 'Bomum,' 'Optimum,' 'Magnum et bonum. recordum,' and the like; it is noted that since the case was decided the Statute of Merton has altered the law ; or again the amotator speculates as to what would have been the judgment had the facts been rather different. In a third and smallest class we must place what seem to be references to other cases; a name is written which is not the name of any of the parties to the case against which the note is made, thus 'Nota Whitcherche,' 'Nota Corbyn,' 'Casus Radulphi de Arundelle similis isti,' 'Fere casus Cole.' Such allusions as these are enigmas to be diseussed hereafter. The meaning of the other notes will in general be plain to a reader who has first studied the cases, but hardly to one who has not, for the notes are mere notes, intended for no eye but the amotator's and often have little or no grammatical structure.

The date when the book was compiled we cannot fix with perfect accuracy; but we cannot go far wrong. It cannot have been earlier than the year 1240 ; a plea roll of A.R. 24 is the last of the series of rolls whence excerpts have been taken. On the other hand it can hardly have been later than 1256. There are two passages which to all appearance were eopied on a blank page of the book after that book had M. I.
come into existence. The first of these is a disquisition on leap year; and this is followed immediately by the second, which is an assize of bread ${ }^{1}$. The former is an elaborate argument in favour of what we know to have been Bracton's contention as to the true method of reckoning 'year and day,' when an essoinee is privileged to keep his bed for that period. We know also that on the 9th of May 1256, in Bracton's presence, the king and council over-ruled this contention, ordained that a 29th of February should be reckoned as forming but one day with the $28 \mathrm{th}^{2}$. It is improbable that after this any lawyer was at pains to set down in writing a long reasoned statement of a doctrine which had been thus exploded. The tariff known as the assize of bread there is reason for attributing to this same year, 1256; under that date the Amals of Burton relate that the justices who were sent throughout England to correct the weights and measures, published this assize ${ }^{3}$. The Annals give the document in Latin, the Note Book in French; but the tariff is the same. The appearance of a French document may cause a momentary suspicion as to whether this part of the Note Book was written so early as 1256 ; but this suspicion will be allayed when it is remembered that in 1258 the king's adhesion to the Provisions of Oxford was proclaimed in French as well as in English and Latin; indeed this is just the moment when French is taking its place beside Latin as a language for laws. Now the occurrence of these two documents one after the other, must suggest that they were copied into the Note Book in 1256 or thereabouts. The assize of bread was just being published and the problem of the bissextile was a warmly debated question pressing for an authoritative answer. The rest of the Note Book's text may have been transcribed some years earlier; but not before 1240 .

Date of the marginal notes.

The date of the marginal notes is of course a different matter. They may have been written at intervals during a space of several years; but they cannot well be of much later date than the text. In the first place, it seems clear

[^68]from evidence already mentioned that the annotator himself presided over and interfered with the work of the copyists ${ }^{1}$. In the second place, his writing would I believe be attributed by any expert much rather to the reign of Henry III. than to that of any Edward. In the third place, he thrice refers to changes in the law made by the Statute of Merton (1236) which once he calls 'noua gracia', while he never expressly refers to any later legislation. To say that he never betrays knowledge of any more recent statute or ordinance, would perhaps be an assertion which no man now living is entitled to make; I dare say no more than that such betrayal, if any there be, has escaped me ; but by means of footnotes referring to Bracton's text, I have tried to ease the task of any reader who will be at pains to consider this matter for himself. Now it seems improbable that any lawyer of a later time would have written all these notes without alluding, and that clearly, to such comprehensive enactments as the Statute of Marlborough (1267) or the Provisions of Westminster (1259), highly improbable that a lawyer of Edward's day would not have noticed that sweeping code which we know as the Statute of Westminster the First. Lastly, indications of date shoukl be given by the names of cases noted in the margin, by such allusions as 'fere casus Cole' and the like. Such success as I have had in deciphering these indications shall be described below: nothing has been found inconsistent with the conclusion for which I am now arguing. In only two instances has the annotator given us any easy means of settling a date. Twice and no more he names the judge who decided the case to which he alludes; in the one he names William of Wilton who was slain at Lewes (1264) and who first appears as a judge in 1247; in the other he names ' $H$. de Bratton,' a judge of whose history we have already said something, and to whom we now return.

Now the resemblances between the notes and passages in Coincilencers Bracton's text are many and striking. But let us not make with's too much of this. Having come to the conclusion that Bracton and the annotator are contemporaries we shall

[^69]expect that they will in many instances say much the same things; for both are English lawyers, both are dealing with the same subjects, both are often discussing the very same decisions. The minds of all lawyers ought, it may be said, to be very much alike, for there is a strict legal orthodoxy, from which he who departeth doth surely err; even verbal agreement will be frequent for the legal vocabulary is small. Perhaps there was much less agreement among the good lawyers of the thirteenth century about elements of the law than there would be among good lawyers of our own day; still coincidences if they are to prove anything must not consist merely in the statement of the same rules of law in the same or very similar words. Consequently no attempt will be made to collect here the numerous instances in which Bracton and the annotator say the same things; when this happens attention is drawn to it by a foot-note; but a few examples will now be noticed in which the agreement is of such a kind, that, when they are taken all together and in conjunction with the evidence already discussed, they make a strong case for holding that Bracton and the annotator were but one man.

Examples.
(1) Bracton ${ }^{1}$ treating of the cases in which a donor is not bound to warrant a donee, says that the terms of the gift may except certain particular persons from the scope of the warranty, as e.g. if I say "I and my heirs will warrant against all the world except, so and so." To prove that such an exception will be effectual, he cites from the Warwick eyre (A. D. 1221) of the Abbot of Reading and Martin Pateshull an assize of mort d'ancestor, Si Willelmus Trussell. He immediately adds that the donor may not be bound to warranty even though he has received the donee's homage ; warranty may be excluded by the terms of the gift, as e.g. if the charter says, that in case the donce be impleaded, the donor shall not be bound to warrant or give an exchange, "sicut de Willelmo de Bruere in multis cartis suis." These last words refer doubtless to the William Briwere, who when he died an old man in 1226, had for some forty years been a ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 390 b.
trusted royal servant, had amassed great wealth and liberally endowed religious houses, especially in the west country ${ }^{1}$.

Now in the Note Book ${ }^{2}$ we find the assize Si Willelmus Trussel, not indeed at the stage at which Bracton cites it, but at a later stage, when it came before the Bench. The case had nothing to do with William Briwere. The charter then in question was one granted by Amicia mother of William Basset to Hugh of Chawcombe with an express saving of the rights of the heirs of William Trussel. It was decided that under this deed Basset was not bound to warrant Chawcombe against Trussel's heirs. The annotator states in the margin the rule involved in this decision. He then adds, "It will be the same if homage be taken 'saving the right of "every one,' or with an express exclusion of warranty secun"dum W. Briwerre."

This connection then of Trussel's case with Briwere's opinion or practice as to the receipt of homage, we find both in the treatise and in the Note Book, and the coincidence is of a very striking kind, particularly when we reflect that Briwere died some twenty years before either book can have been compiled. With Briwere's transactions Bracton may well have been familiar; his son, William Briwere the younger, was bishop of Exeter from 1224 to 1244 , and a judge who took the Devonshire assizes would often have seen the charters of the founder of Dunkeswell, Torre and Polslo. Still the number of lawyers living between 1250 and 1260 to whom Trussel's case would have recalled Briwere's name cannot, one would suppose, have been very large, even if it was a very uncommon thing for a donor to expressly stipulate that the receipt of homage should imply no warranty.
(2) The formula of novel disseisin inquires of the recog- Juste propter nitors whether the plaintiff has been disseised iniuste et sine justed inv- inter judicio. This might suggest that it is possible to disseise a person sine judicio and yet not imiuste. Such however is not, as it seems to me, Bracton's doctrine. Whenever a person is

[^70]Brieguerre. Sue Stubbs' Hoveden, Vol. 3, p. Ixxii.
2 Case 196.
disseised without a judgment, he is disseised unjustly. The strictly limited cases in which a disseisor may be lawfully ejected by the true owner flagrante disseisina, are met by the theory that in such cases the true owner has not yet lost seisin in law ( possessio civilis), though he has lost seisin in deed (possessio nuturalis) ; so that here the disseisor is not even disseised, much less unjustly disseised. Suppose then that the true owner be thoroughly dispossessed, that the time for self-help is past; he disseises his disseisor ; shall we say that he has done this iniuste? Bracton gives his answer in these words", "Juste facie prima propter jus, sed iniuste propter iniuriam, quia sine judicio" (Justly if we regard only the right of property, but unjustly because of the injury to possession). This jingling gloss we find in the Note Book also and in the same context":-"Juste propter jus, set iniuste quia sine judicio." Justices are convicted of false judgment, jurors of perjury, because they do not observe the true theory of possessory actions, and think that a man may be disseised without a judgment and yet not unjustly.

Montacute $c$ Bestenore.
(3) Careful readers of Bracton's treatise will perhaps remember his citation of Montacute v. Bestenore ${ }^{3}$, first because it brings out clearly the difference between villein status and villein temure, secondly because it suggests that the judges of 1219 considered that a tenant in villeinage holding by services of the most 'villeinous' kind, including merehet and uncertain tallage, could not lawfully be ejected by the lord so long as he performed the villein services. This very interesting case is in the Note Book ${ }^{4}$. The judges held that Bestenore was a free man though he held in villeinage. Now both Bracton and the annotator commenting on this case find the distinction between villein temure and villein status in the fact that the free man who holds in villeinage can leave his tenement if he pleases; "quia potest relinquere tenementum," says the annotator; " quia poterit relinquere villenagium et ut liber homo

[^71]recedere," says Bracton. About leaving the land, the record itself says nothing.
(4) This case occurs in the Nute Book ${ }^{1}$ : - The Abbot of Rinton n. Ramsey disseises Richard of Ripton; Richard brings an likinst of assize, but before the case is heard has recourse to self-help and disseises the Abbot. The Abbot pleads no special plea; the assize proceeds and the facts are found. The judgment is that Richard has recovered his seisin and that the Abbot be amerced, but that Richard also be anerced for the usurpation. Commenting on this case the annotator speculates as to what would have happened if the Abbot had brought an assize:-"I believe," he says, "that the latter "assize (the Abbot's) shall proceed, and the former assize "(Richard's) is extinguished and amulled as a penalty for "having taken the law into his own hands when he shonld "have recovered by judgment." Bracton ${ }^{2}$ cites this case and indulges in a similar speculation; he even thinks that in Richard's assize it was open to the Abbot to counterelaim (agere de recomuentione) and so recover scisin. The case itself, we may notice, does not prove that the Abbot could. either by cross action or by counterclaim, have reobtained possession; but it suggested the same speculation to the annotator and to Bracton.
(5) Still more to our point is the following. Bracton ${ }^{3}$ itenement says that the obligation of the donor to warrant the donce warranty. may not be a merely personal obligation, it may bind some tenement, that is to say, the burden of the contract may 'run with' land of the donor and bind that land in the hands of a purchaser. "A tenement may be thus bound expressly or tacitly; expressly, as if it be said in the deed of gift ' I and my heirs will warrant this gift out of such and such ' a tenement into whosesoever hands it may come,' in which case the thing is expressly bound to warranty, as is shown by the case concerning R. de Renge, Pasch. A. r. 16 com. Mid.; tacitly, as if the feoffor has at the time of the gift assets for the warranty, in which case, even without express

[^72]words, what he then has is bound; for a personal obligation is of no avail moless the person bound has property out of which he can make the exchange in case of need." Now I understand Bracton to mean by this, that on principle the warranty should always be treated as binding not only the warrantor's person but also all the lands that he has when he makes the contract, whether anything be expressly said on this point or no; for a warranty would be a useless thing if the warrantor could for all practical purposes destroy it by conveying away his property to others. But Bracton has not got a case that goes nearly this length; his authority goes no further than the point that by express bargain the burden of the warranty may be imposed upon a specific tenement.

The case that he cites is easily recognizable in the Note Book ${ }^{1}$; it shows how a house in London was expressly bound to warrant land at Stepney. It interested the annotator; on two occasions has he marked it as Optimum ; meditating over it pen in hand he has drawn a helmeted head. The result of his meditation is a note to the effect that 'from this case it would seem that as the property that 'a donor or vendor has on the day of the sale may be 'expressly bound by the warranty, so it may be tacitly 'bound, for a warranty is of no avail unless the warrantor 'has property whence he can make the warranty and the 'exchange.' Nay, the two writers (if two they were) use almost the same words:-

Bracton-quia non valet obligatio personae nisi habeat si opus fuerit unde possit excambium facere.

The Annotator-quia non valet warantia nisi habeat unde possit warantian facere et escambium.

Now this piece of reasoning makes what must seem to us a very rash transition from 'This can be done by express bargain,' to 'This always is done by tacit bargain.' Both writers give it; both argue in the same way, in the same

[^73]phrase, that this must be so otherwise warranties will be of little worth. Further though there are a very few traces in later books of the rule that specific land might by express words be subjected to the burden of warranty, the much wider doctrine as to the tacit obligation, never became, so far as we know, part of the common law ${ }^{1}$.
(6) Next we may note a coincidence which canght the stature Vinogradoff's eye. Bracton ${ }^{2}$ says that formerly the doweress had no power to bequeath the growing crop. The change in the law made by the Statute or Provisions of Merton he then states thus:-"sed noua superueniente gratia et proui"sione......poterit uxor de fructibus et bladis......testari et "pro voluntate sua disponere." Against a case ${ }^{3}$ decided under the old law the annotator has written thus:-" Modo "mutatum est de noua gracia quod potest testamentum "facere de blado firmo in terra." This coincidence in the use of the phrase noua graciu, which lies a little outside the lawyer's everyday stock of words, will seem the more striking when it is said that both Bracton and the amnotator speak of the Provisions on other occasions without using this or any similar phrase.
(7) On f. 26 b . Bracton speaks of a particular class of pifts, namely gifts made to the donce until (quousque vel termininans ( donec) some other provision shall be made for him. He points out the distinctions which will arise according as the heirs of the donor, and again the heirs of the donee, are or are not mentioned. Four cases are possible (1) 'until I 'provide for you,' (2) 'until I or my heirs provide for you,' (3) 'until I provide for you or your heirs,' ( 4 ) 'until I or my 'heirs provide for you or your heirs.' He then passes on to speak about estates pur uutre rie, gifts to the donce for the life of the donor, and then touches on gifts for terms of years. Aud here he has this phrase:-"Si autem fiat donatio ad

[^74][^75]"terminum annorum, quamuis longissimum, qui excedit "vitas hominum, tamen ex hoc non habebit donatorius "liberum tenementum, cum terminus annorum certus sit et "determinatus, et terminus vitae incertus, et quia licet "nihil certius sit morte, nihil tamen incertius est hora " mortis." All the matter here described occurs in the space of a single page.

In the Note Book there is a case ${ }^{1}$ which interested the amnotator a great deal. It concerns Stephen Segrave. The fallen favourite was sued by the king for certain manors. The case seems to have been that King John had given these manors to David Earl of Huntingdon until (quousque) King John should make other provision for Earl David, and that Segrave derived such title as he had from Earl John heir of Earl David. Judgment, it seems from a note which the annotator himself has interpolated, was given for Segrave. The report is not so full as might be wished; but the annotator suggests that the case turned on this, that the king had never made another provision for Earl David himself and that nothing had been said about any provision being made for Earl David's heirs; "prouisio non tetigit "haeredes." He thinks with Bracton that if the clanse be ' until I provide for you,' then after your death your heir will have a fee in the land not to be defeated by my tendering him other lands. Incidentally too he notices, as Bracton does, that quousque and donec are equivalent terms. But he adds another note which must be quoted in full-"Terminus "terminans set indeterminatus et incertus, et ideo liberum "tenementum sicut ad vitam hominis (a gift to you until I " otherwise provide for you, gives you the freehold, for though " a term is set to your estate, it is an uncertain term, such as " is set to the estate of every tenant for life), quia nichil "certius morte, nichil incertius hora mortis."

These are Bracton's very words, and the coincidence seems particularly remarkable, for Bracton introduces this phrase about the certainty of death the uncertainty of the hour of death, immediately after he has been diseussing.
what the amotator thought was the point of Segrave's case, namely the effeet of such words as 'until I otherwise provide ' for you.'
(8) The two books contain two very similar disquisitions fear and as to the meaning of 'a year and a day '.' Both writers maintain that the 'year' is always 365 days and 6 hours; that a leap year makes no difference; both argue against the contrary opinion; it is a mistake caused by the interpolation of an additional day in every fourth year; that day is interpolated to prevent the absurdity of keeping Christmas in the summer and the Nativity of the Baptist in the winter; no such absurdity would be caused by holding that the essoinee's 'year' is always the same; both compare the year of 365 days to a smake without a tail, the year of 365 days and 6 hours to a snake with its tail in its mouth; both think it necessary to preface their argument with some general considerations about the length of years, months, weeks, days, hours and moments. In short, it is not too much to say that the two disquisitions are substantially the same; both maintain by the same arguments, in the same phrases, a doctrine, which even if it ever was uncontroverted law, was abolished in 1256.
(9) In the Note Book the argument about leap year is The duat immediately preceded by the discussion of a hypothetical case $^{2}$. I will ask any reader who is familiar with Bracton's mode of thought and strain of language, and who is also familiar with the terminology of the rolls, whether this discussion is not extremely like Bracton's work. It concerns a matter which seems to have given him a great deal of trouble, namely the dual possession, or dual seisin, of freeholder and termor. For each of them has a legally protected possession or seisin, the one protected by the assize, the other by the quare ejecit infra terminum. How can one represent this in theory; how can one do so in the reasonable Roman terms that one finds in Azo's book? The discussion in the Note Book deals with a problem which

[^76]raises this question. The writer introduces the doctrine of two concurrent possessions
quia simul stare possunt seisina proprietarii et firmarii, unius quantum ad liberum tenenentum et alterius quantum ad usumfructum.

Bracton more than once states this theory
quia bene sese compatiuntur de eadem re duae possessiones, dum tamen ex diuersis causis......quia ususfructus per se stare $f^{\prime \prime o t e s t}$ in persona unius, et liberum tenementum per se in persona alterius (f. 44 b.).
quia sese compatiuntur terminus et feoffanentum de eadem terra, quia ibi sunt diuersa jura; ad feoffatum vero pertinet proprietas feodi et liberum tenementun, firmarius vero nihil sibi vendicare poterit nisi usum fructumen (f. 27 ).
poterit enim quilibet illorum sine praeiudicio alterius in seisina esse eiusdem tenementi, unus ut de termino et alius ut de fcodo et libero tenemento (f. 220 b .).

Further it will be observed that the writer of the passage in the Note Book uses the words proprietarius and ususfructus. Now it may, I believe, be denied with much confidence that these were terms of English law. I have copied near two thousand cases without having once had to write either of them. The tenant for years never has a usufruct, the freeholder never is a proprietor. Such terms belong not to the language in which lawyers plead, in which justices deliver judgment, they belong to the language of the rationalistic jurist who has come under romanesque influence, who will expound English law according to the best modern ideas. To say that no man but one could have written this passage, would be absurd enough; still we may say that of the only two passages in the Note Book in which there is anything that can be called a sustained argument, this one about the double seisin, states a theory which Bracton held in the terms which Bracton used, which were not the technical terms of English law, while the other is the dissertation on leap-year, the relation of which to a passage in Bracton's text is curiously intimate.

It will probably be allowed that these nine examples sumary. (which of course have been chosen as being the best) bring the work of the amotator very near to the work of Bracton. Still it might be rash to infer that the annotator and Bracton were one. They may have been two close friends, two members of the same school, perhaps pupil and master, interested in just the same problems of jurisprudence, solving such problems in the same way, in the same terms; they may have discussed together the bearing of Trussel's case on the charters of Willian Briwere, have talked over the binding of land by warranty, have heard Martin Pateshull expound the true theory of 'year and day,' have learned from each other or from their common preceptor the 'Juste 'propter jus sed iniuste propter iniuriam,' the 'Nihil certius 'morte, uihil incertius hora mortis;' the theory of the dual seisin, the terms 'proprietor' and 'usufruct' may have belonged to a school, a school of speculative lawyers who strove to reconcile English law with Rome and Reason. Less theoretic, more purely personal, links must be found between these two writers, before the connection will have become so close that we must acknowledge them to be not two, but one Bracton.

## The Third Argument: The Cases 'noted up' in the margin of the Note Book.

We turn now to the most enigmatical class of notes, those the cases nuted ul. namely which seem to be allusions to cases which are not in the Note Book. Often such notes consist of just a proper name and no more. All the notes of this class shall here be collected, and we will inquire whether there are any reasons for comecting Bracton with the cases, which have thus been ' noted up.'
(1) Against an action for dower ${ }^{1}$ we find this note :-

Ermeiard et herede de Hokesham.
Now on the 13 th December 12.55 , as we may learn from : irmengrad ${ }^{1}$ Case 1843.
an inquest post mortem ${ }^{1}$, died William of Hockesham or Hoggesham, that is of Huxham near Exeter, leaving a son four years old. The wardship, however, of this child was worth nothing, because the father shortly before his death gave his land at Huxham to William "de Punchard," as the jurors call one whom we may easily identify with William of Punchardon. Punchardon lies in the parish of Kentisbere some ten miles as the crow flies from Huxham ${ }^{2}$. The reader may possibly remember that William of Punchardon married Ermengard widow of Thomas of Saunton, and with his wife brought an action for her dower against one Henry of Bratton ${ }^{3}$. That Bracton had dealings with Ermengard is established, that Ermengard had tronble with the heir of Huxham whose father had enfeoffed her husband, is very probable. This is how I would explain the note Ermeiard et herede de Hokesham. It is a note about a case affecting a lady whom the annotator knew so well that he did not give her a surname.

Apart from this very conclusive evidence, it may be shown that Bracton had cause to know something of both the families concerned in this case. A case concerning William of Punchardon, Henry Tracey and the heir of Roger Beaupel is cited without date in the printed treatise, and the MSS. prove that this citation was originally a marginal note ${ }^{4}$. William of Punchardon sat with Bracton as a justice of assize ${ }^{5}$. In 1257 Bracton was appointed to take an assize concerning land at Huxham, to which William of Punchardon was party ${ }^{6}$. Ermengard was convicted before Bracton of a disscisin perpetrated at Cheriton ${ }^{7}$. In 1262 Bracton was commissioned for an assize between Thomas Brother and Emma widow of William of Huxham touching common of
${ }^{1}$ Calend. Geneal. vol. 1, p. 73.
$\because$ See Lysons, Britannia, vol. 6, p. 85, where it is said that Robert de Hokesham conveyed the manor of West Buckland to Sir William Pnnchardon, whose heiress brought it to the Raleighs. The entry which enabled me to identify Hokesham or Hoggesham with Huxham is in Rot. Hund. vol. 1, p. 66, which showed

[^77]pasture in Huxham ${ }^{1}$. In 1267 this same Emma paid a halfmark to have an assize before Bracton ${ }^{2}$.
(2) No cases seem to have interested the amotator more Corbn's than those which concern the demurrer of the parol. Be it then explained, that very often when an action for land is brought against an infant, the action will remain in suspense until the infant is of age; in technical phrase the parol (loquela) demurs (remanet) ; or to use another term of art, the infant habet etutem suum, has or is allowed his age, that is, he need not answer until he has attained majority ${ }^{3}$. Such is the case if the infant has come to the land as the heir of an ancestor who died seised as of fee. But according to Bracton stress must be laid on these words as of fee; for if, e.g. the ancestor came to the land as guardian in chivalry, then his heir though under age will have to answer at once to the suit of the ward who is being kept out of his inheritance. Again the parol may demur because a person who has been rouched to warranty is under age. As may well be imagined many difficulties occur in working out this general principle, for lords are given to dealing in unauthorized modes with the lands which come to them by way of wardship; the lord, for example, who has A's land will enfeoff X, then X will die and his infant heir Y will enter, and when A sues Y , then Y will assert that the parol should demur. Or again the feoffee of the lord, or that feoffee's heir, will, when sued, vouch the lord's heir, who will be an infant.

Cases in the Note Book which raised such points as these are freely annotated, and it seems plain that the annotator thought that some of them were wrongly decided. Apparently his inclination was to confine the privilege of infant tenants and vouchees within as narrow bounds as possible. Now against several of these cases he writes the name Corbyn. The following are the instances in which this name oceurs.

Case 30. Assize of mort d'ancestor brought by Simon on

[^78]nonage was abolished in 1830 by 11 Geo. 4 and 1 Will. 4, cap. 47, sec. 10 .
the death of his mother Swanill against Margaret and Jacob. Margaret as doweress vouches Jacob who is an infant. Simon asserts that Swanill held of Jacob's father who on Swanill's death entered by intrusion ("by intrusion," says the annotator "for the tenement was held in socage"). Held that the assize should proceed. Against this case stands the name Corbyn.

Case 1722. Assize of mort d'ancestor brought by Richard Montacute on the death of his father William Montacute against Gilbert of Say, who vouches his own wife, who vouches Matthew of Clevedon, who vouches the infant heir of Drogo Montacute. Matthew claims under the deed of Drogo's father. Richard however alleges that Drogo's father obtained possession of the land in the character of lord and guardian on the death of William Montacute, Richard's father. Held that the assize must proceed without waiting for the majority of Matthew's vonchee. Against this the note is, Corbin de Ricardo de Monte Acuto.

Case 1827. Assize of mort d'ancestor brought by Eudo Fitz Walter on the death of his father against Randolph Braham who vouches Roger son of Earl Hugh the Bigod; Roger is an infant. Eudo alleges that his father Walter died seised in fee, and that under an agreement with William of Toftes who was Eudo's guardian, Earl Hugh intruded and kept the land. Randolph denies that Walter died seised in fee. Held that the assize must proceed. Against this case stands the note, Nota pro Corbyn quod etas non expectatur. Also the amnotator has added this note-' To the same effect ' you have a case in the Suffolk Eyre of Martin Pateshull, ' A.R. 12. Ass. mort. antec. If Roger of Cloucester. There 'the age is not awaited of the heir of a chief lord, who made 'a feoffment while the very heir [of his tenant] was within 'age, but the assize was taken, saving to the feoffee the right 'to recover in exchange when the [lord's] heir should have 'attained full age. And the same ought of rights (de jure) to 'be observed when an alienation is made after a writ has ' been purchased by the very heir whether the very heir be 'under age or no.' 'These last words, it will be remarked,
introduce a somewhat different topic, namely the effect of alienation pendente lite.

Case 1898. On the margin of a later page the case of Roger of Gloucester is copied from the Suffolk Eyre Roll. Assize of mort d'ancestor brought by John son of Roger of Gloucester against Richard Paide, who vonches William infant son of William de Ros. John alleges that Roger died seised and William de Ros the elder entered as guardian. No reply is made and the action is compromised. It would seem therefore that the annotator was mistaken when he said (in commenting on the case of Eudo Fitz Walter) that the assize was taken. This case is prefaced by the words, Corbyn. De warrantia ipsius qui est infra etatem.

We have then four allusions to 'Corbyn' and the context into which this mysterious word is introduced is always much the same. We turn to the places in which Bracton discusses the demurrer of the parol.

On f. 275 he cites the cases of Eudo Fitz Walter and Roger of Gloucester, and, like the annotator, treats the latter as an authority against the demurrer of the parol. But also on f. 269 b , he gives Eudo's case at length in such a context as to show that in his mind, as in the annotator's, the rule that the parol does not demur for the nonage of a vouchee whose ancestor entered merely as guardian, was closely connected with the rule about alienation pendente lite, the rule qui dolo desït possidere pro possessore habebitur. Now in the Digby MS. the whole of this passage (twenty-four lines of the printed book ${ }^{1}$ ) is in the margin, and has above it the words Casus Corbin. It would seem therefore that in Bracton's mind, as in the annotator's, this topic was comnected with Corbyn's Case.

On the 10th of April 1260, Bracton was appointed to take an assize of mort d'ancestor between Richard Corbyn and Adam le Bel for land in the township of Montacute in the county of Somerset", on the 3rd of June in the same year to

[^79]take a similar assize for land in the same township between Richard Corbyn and Ralph le Bel ${ }^{1}$. Is not this the explanation of the four notes in the Note Book and of the note in the Digby MS.? I had hoped to make the answer more certain by finding Corbyn's case on a plea roll; in this I have failed; but it will not escape remark that all the cases in conneetion with which we have found Corbyn's name are assizes of mort d'ancestor ${ }^{2}$.
(3) Against a case ${ }^{3}$ from 1219 we find Nota Whitcherche. The name which assumes the various forms of de Albo Monasterio, Blancmoustier, Blanchminster, Whitminster and Whitchurch, was not uncommon in the thirteenth century: but in that century a family of 'Blanchminster or De Albo Monasterio in some records called Whitminster' was seated in the parish of Stratton in Cornwall ${ }^{4}$, near the Bristol Channel and near the boundary of Devon. In 1261 Bracton was appointed to take an assize between Ramnulf de Albo Monasterio and the Prior of Launceston for the church of Stratton ${ }^{5}$; from the next year we have a fine whereby Rannulf recognized the Prior's right to the church ${ }^{6}$.
(4) The Note Book has a case ${ }^{7}$ in which a lord elaims wardship of the heir of a female tenant against the infant's father. The father pleads that he is tenant by the curtesy and that therefore no wardship is due. On this plea a day is given for judgment. Against this case stands a note:-

## Casus Radulphi de Arundelle similis isti in Cornubia.

That the allusion is to a Cornish case needs no proof. A Ralph Arundell, who is regarded as the founder of the great Cornish house Arundell of Lanherne, was sheriff of Cornwall

[^80]which one Walter Corbyn was plaintiff. Coram Rege Roll, No 90, m. 16. ${ }^{3}$ Case 25.
${ }^{4}$ Lysons, vol. 3, p. cxxiii.
${ }^{5}$ Rot. Pat. 45 Hen. 3, m. 9 d.
${ }^{6}$ Feet of Fines, Cornwall, 46 Hen. 3, No. 7. In 1259 Rannulf and his wife were parties to another fine. Cornwall, 43 Hen. 3, No. 1.

7 Case 266 .
in $\mathbf{1 2 6 0}{ }^{1}$. He held the manor of Trembleth in St Erran and in 1259 and 1262 was party to real or simulated litigation ending in fines ${ }^{2}$. Moreover in 12.54 and 12.57 three different assizes in which he was engaged, all touching tenements in Cornwall, were brought before Bracton ${ }^{3}$.

We turn to that Bodleian treasure, the Dighy MS. At the bottom of one of its pages we find without context the note Memorandum de casu $R$. de Arundelle. On this page there is nothing that we can comnect with the case in the Note Book; but on the page next before it there occurs a statement that tenant by the curtesy is seised of the frechold, and so can bring an assize, though he is not seised as of fee: possibly then the note in the Digby MS. has wandered a little way from its proper place ${ }^{4}$. It seems the general opinion of Cornish antiquaries that Ralph Armodell owed his estates in Cornwall to his having married an heiress, the heiress of Trembleth. At any rate here again we find a link between the Digby MS. and the Note Book.

But further, at the very bottom of the first leaf of each of the five first quires of the Digby MS. may be seen the words Dominus Radulphus (in some cases Randulphus) de Ardell'. Then at the end of a later quire ${ }^{5}$ there stands a more eloquent legend, which I read thus:-

Mittuntur $J$. de bello prato septem peciae et dimidia subsequentes rubricam istam viz. quod non est capienda comuictio super conuictionem, et de illis tenetur respondere domino (a blurred word which may I think be Rad') de Arundell'.

The meaning of this seems plainly to be that the seven and a half quires following the rubric Quod non est capiendu etc. ${ }^{6}$, are lent to J. de Beaupré, (probably in order that he may have them copied,) and that he is bound to answer for them to Sir Arundell. We may infer then that this very MS. belonged to a Sir Ralph Arundell. Beaupre

[^81][^82]again was a good Comish name. In the fourteenth century Arundells and Beauprés marry into the same family, their souls are prayed for in the same church ${ }^{1}$. What here concerns us is the connection between the Note Book and this MS. of the treatise; still it is interesting to guess that the latter, a MS. which gives us the treatise in what seems an exceptionally pure form, may be traced to the house of a man who was sheriff of Cornwall when Bracton took the Cornish assizes; but this trail must be followed by others.
(5) There is an appeal of mayhem ${ }^{2}$; the appellee did not appear and the sheriff returned that he was not to be found ; thereupon the sheriff was directed to exact him in three county courts and inform the justices of the result. Against this is written

Casus ipsius qui desponsauerat uxorem Radulfi de Gorges antequam dictus Radulfus.

This I believe refers to a case found elsewhere in the Note Book ${ }^{3}$. One Thomas of Bayeux carried off the king's ward Ellen daughter of Ivo of Morville and married her: the king had intended to give her to Ralph Gorges; steps scem to have been taken to ontlaw Thomas and his accomplices (this is the point that the annotator takes;) when Thomas appeared it was arfjudged that Ellen being an infant was not bound by the marriage; they were separated and she afterwards married Ralph ${ }^{4}$. This allusion therefore seems sufficiently explained by the Note Book itself; but it may be added that the family of Gorges gave its name to the manor of Braunton Gorges which lies in the same parish as that manor of Saunton which was once in the hands of Henry of Bratton, also that in 1258 and 1262 Bracton was appointed to hear assizes in which Ralph Gorges was concerned ${ }^{5}$.
(6) Cole was, as it is, a common name, therefore when we find against a case fere casus Cole ${ }^{6}$ we learn little.

[^83]However in 1238 a Richard Cole held land in Comwall. A fine is preserved which was levied between him and the Prior of Launceston touching the church of St Julintts; another levied between him and Willian atte Hasse ${ }^{1}$. In 1254 or thereabouts a Richard Cole was charged before Bracton with a disseisin done at Kadekeber' (Cadbury ?) in Devonshire ${ }^{2}$; on another occasion a Richard Cole of Sebrittescot' comes before Bracton as a juror along with a Raleigh, a Tracey and others ${ }^{3}$. In 1202 one of the assizes which Bracton was commissioned to hear was brought against Nartin Cole for land at Coombe in Devonshire ${ }^{4}$.
(7) Casus de Cormu ${ }^{5}$. A family which bore the name cornu. De Cornu was scated at Horwood a few miles east of Bideford ${ }^{6}$. Ralph de Cornu was sheriff of Devon in $1250^{7}$. In the same year Roger Le Cornu and Fina his wife paid a mark for an assize before Henry of Bratton ${ }^{\text {s }}$.
(S) Against a case ${ }^{9}$ illustrating the rules of descent, we Winsoot. have Fota Wynescot. There is a place called Winscot in the parish of St Giles in the Wuod near Torrington, which gave its name to a family of landowners ${ }^{10}$. A Johannes de Wyescote appears several times on Bracton's two Assize Rolls, once as engaged in litigation touching common at Morchard Bishop ${ }^{11}$; a Walterus de $W_{\text {ynescote }}$ is also mentioned ${ }^{12}$; but the case to which allusion is made in the Note Book has not been found.
(9) Against a case ${ }^{13}$ deciding that an infant is not bound kaleigh. by his fine, we have Sota casum Hug' fl' W'ymundi de Ralegha primogenitum et postnatum qui fuit infra etutem de concordia inter eos facta coram H. de Brattona. There is no need here to prove that Bracton was concerned with the case to which reference is thus made. There is extant the foot of

[^84]a fine ${ }^{1}$ levied in A.r. 40, before the justices in eyre at Exeter between Wymund of Raleigh and Warin of Raleigh, whereby, (this early specimen of elaborate conveyancing is worth notice) Wymund recognizes land a $\pm$ Bolleham to be the right of Warin, to hold of Wymund and his heirs to Warin and the heirs of his body, and after his death if he die without issue, to Wymund younger brother of Warin and the heirs of his body, and after his death if he die without issue, to Reginald brother of Wymund and the heirs of his body, and after his death if he die without issue, to Richard brother of Reginald and the heirs of his body, and if Warin, Wymund, Reginald and Richard die without issue, then the land is to revert to Wymund of Raleigh and his heirs. In 1259 Bracton was commissioned to take an assize of mort d'ancestor between Hugh and Warin of Raleigh for land at Belham ${ }^{2}$. This may well be the case to which the annotator refers. Again in 1265 Warin of Raleigh and Hawisia his wife pay a halfmark for an assize before Bracton ${ }^{3}$. That Bracton himself held land of a Raleigh has been shown above ${ }^{4}$.
(10) Nota de villanis Henrici de Tracy de Tawystocke qui nunquam fuerunt in manu Domini Regis nec antecessorum suorum et loquebantur de tempore Regis Eadwardi coram $W$. de Wiltona ${ }^{5}$. This must allude to a case from Bracton's time: William of Wilton was just his contemporary ; Tavistock, it were needless to say, is in Devon; Henry of Tracey sat as justice of assize along with Bracton, and was often appointed to deliver the gaol at Exeter. In 1279, as appears from a case in the Placitorum Abbreviatio ${ }^{6}$ the men of Tavistock were again disputing with their lord as to whether they were entitled to the protection given to tenants of the ancient demesne. Two records, as it seems, were produced against them, the earlier of which was a case before Bruce and Middleton justices of assize in the 47 th year of King Henry (1262-3). I should suppose that the case before

[^85]Wilton was yet earlier than this ; mueh later it camot have been, for Wilton was killed at Lewes on 14th May, 1264.

Even in imagination it is pleasant to walk in Devon. Giegraply
We take the train to Barnstaple; Bracton was archdeacon of Barnstaple. The next morning we may stroll easily to Raleigh, the cradle of the great house, and so on through Heanton Punchardon and Braunton Gorges to Saunton the manor whieh Bracton held: we have left Bratton Fleming some six miles to our right. Crossing the Braunton Burrows, we may be ferried over the estuary of the Taw and Torridge to Appledore; and so to Bideford ; there will yet be time to visit Horwood where the Cornus livel. If we would see Winscot we must go south to Torrington, and then a third day's walk will take us over the Cornish border to Stratton, the home of Blanchminsters or Whitchurches: the church there claims our notice; Rannulf Blanchminster and the Prior of Launceston fell out abont it and Bracton heard the eanse. Then our way will lie in pleasant places; one day along the shore to St Juliott's, pretending if we can that we are interested in the Prior of Launceston, for this chureh also he acquired from one Richard Cole. We are not far now from the home of Ralph Arundell. But let us cross the Bodmin moors; on their south-eastern verge near the Cheese Wring we find Tuckenbury, and we remember how the Raleighs gave Bracton the manor of Tykenbrede for his life. On to Tavistock, where the villeins of Henry Tracey quarrelled with their lord and relied in vain on Doomsday Book. Richard Corbyn's manor of Belstone we can reach next day; the way lies straight across Dartmoor; it is a wild way, but (teste meipso) there is none pleasanter in England. Of course we can go round by the high-road, and a detour, none too long, will take us throngh Broadwood Wiger and Bratton Clovelly. To Exeter will be no long walk from Belstone; we must enter the cathelral, seek the spot where they laid the body of Henry Bratton, where they prayed for his sonl and the soul of John Wiger. At his tomb our pilgrimage might end ; but if one day more can be spared, we will go through Huxham and Thorverton, find Punchardon in
the parish of Kentisbere and catch the train at Tiverton. Montacute we might visit on our way back through Somersetshire, if we cared to see the scene of the 'Casus Corbyn'. Not far out of our track have lain Ash Reigney, Buckland Brewer, Bovey Tracey, Newton Tracey, Nymet Tracey, Colaton Raleigh, Combe Raleigh, Withycombe Rawleigh. Many questions are solved by walking; Beati omnes qui umbulant.

These ten cases 'noted up' in the margin of the Note Book seem to supply a link of just the kind that was wanted. Our two writers not only select the same rolls, rolls of Pateshull and Raleigh, ponder over the same cases, hold the same juristic theories, use the same unusual phrases, but also are interested in the same counties, in the same set of people, Arundells, Punchardons, Traceys, Raleighs; they have personal as well as professional interests in common. If more be needed to make them one, perhaps it is that both should have been guilty of the same astonishing blunder.

## The fifth Argument. The Baroniul Nolumus.

special Bastardy.

The Statute of Merton.

The last point which can be discussed is of some curiosity, for it concerns the legitimation of bastards and that famous baronial Nolumus of which all have heard; but we must proceed cautionsly and patiently, for we have to deal with an intricate question. The rearler may be asked to keep two dates steadily before his mind, the 12th of October 1234, and the 23 rd of January 1236.
(1) The Statute of Merton as printed by the Record Commissioners ${ }^{1}$ professes to have been made on the 23rd Jan. 1236, the morrow of S. Vincent in A.r. $\mathfrak{2}^{0}$. It contains eleven chapters the subject matters whereof are as follows:-
cap. 1. Damages in actions for dower.
2. Widows may bequeath the crop on their clower lands.
3. Procedure and punishment in case of redisseisin.

[^86]4. Approvement of common
5. Usury shall not run against infant heirs.
6. and 7. Ravishment of ward; valor maritagii.
8. Periods of limitation for divers writs.
9. Special bastardy.
10. Suit of Court by attorney.
11. Imprisomment of those who trespass in parks.
(2) There is no doubt that a parliament was held at row much Merton on the clay just mentioned and that it enacted laws. Merton? On the other hand the evidence for the full form of the statute printed by the Record Commissioners is not first rate. This full form has not been found on any extant roll. Whether there was at this time or for many years afterwards a Statute Roll, is very doubtful. Legislative acts are often found on the Patent, Close, and Coram Rege Rolls. Thus the Provisions of Westminster are on the Close Roll ; the ordinance touching leap year is on the Close Roll; instances of legislative acts found on Coram Rege Rolls will be given hereafter. The best evidence for the full form of the Statute is a comparatively modern MS. which professes to be a copy of a Statute Roll not now forthcoming ; but substantially the same form is found in other old private MSS.
(3) The evidence against this full form is briefly this :- ouly part
(a) Writs directed to the sheriffs amouncing the laws Maderton. made at the Parliament of Merton are emrolled on the Close Roll under date 30th Jan. 1236 ${ }^{1}$. They mention chapters $1,2,3,4,5$, but not the other chapters.
(b) Matthew Paris under the year 1236 gives chapters $1,2,3,4,5$ and 11 , but not the other chapters ${ }^{2}$.
(c) The excellent Annals of Burton give as the laws made at Merton on the 23 rd Jan. 1236, chapters $1,2,3$, 4,5 and 11, but not the other chapters ${ }^{3}$. Since chapter 11 does but report an abortive discussion about the right to imprison those found trespassing in parks, and declare that

[^87]for the present there is to be no change in the law, the omission of this in the writ to the sheriffs is explicable.
(d) Almost certainly chapter 8 ehanging the periods of limitation was not enaeted at Merton. It is not mentioned in the writ of 30 th Jan. 12:36. On the other hand a writ annomeing this change to the people of Ireland is enrolled on the Patent Roll under date 20th March, 12:37 ${ }^{1}$. Also the Annals of Burton give it as having been made on 5th Feb. $1237^{2}$. Lastly our Note Book gives it among extracts from the Coram Rege Roll of A.R. 21 (A.D. 12:37-8), which roll is not now forthcoming, and describes it as having been made at a general council held at Westminster in that year ${ }^{3}$.

The story of the Nolumus.
(4) The ehapter (cap. 9) then with which we are concerued, the celebrated ehapter about the legitimation of bastards, stands in suspieious company so far as regards its date. But let us note the substance of it:- the bishops said that they would not answer the inquiry whether a person was born before or after the marriage of his parents, for this would be against the common order (contra communem formam) of the church; they then in their turn asked the barons to consent that children born before marriage should inherit; this request the barous met with the Nolumus. The discussion therefore was sterile; no law was made; therefore there was nothing to be published to and by the sheriffs; therefore the silence of the Close Roll, of Paris, of the Burton Amalist is not umnatural. For the sake of brevity I shall speak of the transaction deseribed in this chapter as 'the Nolumus.'

The Ordinance of $1: 3$
(5) It is an indubitable fact that about bastardy there had been legislation some fifteen months before the parliament of Merton. This is proved by the Coram Rege Roll for A.R. 18-19, a roll still extant and extremely well dated. Under the heading Die Jovis proxima post festum S. Diomisii amuo Regis Hen. fil. Reg. J. arvïj, (St Denis is Oct. 9, a Monday in 1234, so this date is 12 Oet., 1234,) stands a provision made by the king, Archbishop Edmund, ten named

[^88]bishops, eleven named earls, and many barons named and unnamed. It is to this effect-When in the king's court it is objected to any that he is a bastard because born before the marrage of his parents, the plea is to be sent to the bishop to inquire whether he was born before marriage, or no. This in substance is all that is said; the terms in which the bishop must make his return to the writ are not expressly prescribed ; there follows a provision against appeals, and a clanse making the rule applicable to suits already pending as well as to suits not yet begum. I shall refer to this as 'the ordinance of 1234 '.
(6) Supposing for a moment that the date of the relation of T-lus is The Nolumus Nolumus is uncertain, what we may ask is its relation to the to the ordinance. ordinance of 1234? Now had we nothing but internal evidence to guide us, we might for a moment be inclined to regard the ordinance as a settlement of the dispute disclosed by the story about the Nolumus; the bishops gave way and consented to return a direct answer to the king's writ. But this doctrine would leave inexplicable the later practice of the king's courts, which did not send the issne of special bastardy to the ordinary; it could hardly be squared with certain letters which Robert Grosseteste bishop of Lincoln wrote to William Raleigh ; it is flatly contradicted by an unquestionable authority. A few months after the Parliament at Merton an entry dated 9th May, 1236, was made on the Close Roll. This entry has been printed by Blackstone ${ }^{1}$. It consists of a writ addressed to the Archbishop of Dublin and the Justiciar of Ireland. They have asked how to proceed in case of special bastardy. They are told that there was a question as to where such an issue should be decided; that in the year past (amo preterito) it had been ordained that the issue should be sent to the Court Christian ; that afterwards however (postea vero processu temporis) the bishops finding that they were required to state specifically whether the person was born before or after marriage, (and not generally whether he was legitimate or no,) had protested that they could not do this; that consequently the issue was ${ }^{1}$ The Great Charter, Introduction, p. Ivii., from Rot. Cl. 20 Hen. 3, m. 13 d .
for the future to be tried in the king's Court; but that whether it was to be tried by jury or by other proof was not yet determined. This seems to settle decisively the sequence of events. The ordinance of 1234 said that the question was to be sent to the ordinary; the bishops perhaps had hoped that they would be allowed to say merely 'This man is legitimate'; the king's Court would not be put off by this, would press the question 'Born in wedlock or no?'; then (almost certainly at the Merton Parliament) the bishops made an attempt to get the law altered; in this they failed; still they succeeded in establishing their refusal to answer the obnoxious question.

Grosseteste's letter.

All this agrees with the later practice and with Grosseteste's letters to Raleigh and to Archbishop Edmund. In one of his letters to the Archbishop there is a passage to the following effect:-‘The king and his comcil are attempting 'to compel me to answer the question, whether a person was 'born before the marriage of his parents or no; I have 'refused to do this and have been cited before the council. 'Also the king and his comeil say that you along with the 'bishops, earls and barons of England, have consented to this 'form of question and answer. I beg of you to tell me ' whether you did so consent. If you did, then what am I to 'do? If I answer the question, I fear to fall into the hands ' of the living Goll; if on the other hand I refuse to answer 'and you have consented to the form in which the question 'is put, I shall hardly escape from falling into the hands ' of men.' This letter was written after Grosseteste had been consecrated bishop of Lincoln, that is, after the 3rd of June, 1235 ; Dr Luard has assigned it to the year 1236 but it can not well have been written after the Nolumus. From it we may gather that the question had lately been debated and that, according to the contention of the royal judges, the lishops had then consented to answer the king's writ word for word, but that whether, in their own opinion, they had really consented to this, was not very clear, was at all events not well known to the newly conseerated bishop of Lincoln ${ }^{2}$.

[^89](7) Hitherto we have left Bracton out of account; when liracton we turn to him our real difficulties begin. What he does is daters. this:-In the first place he tells the story of the Nolumus. His rersion is an expanded version of that which is in the Statute Book. He agrees with the Statute Book as to place and date. The debate took place at Merton on the morrow of S. Vincent in A.R. 20, that is 2:3rd Jan. 12:36. So far all is well; but he immediately procects to say that afterwards on the Thursday next after S. Denis in the same yeur a provision was made by the king, archbishop, bishops, earls and barons. This provision we find to be an expanded version of the ordinance of 12 th Oct. 1234 . The day is rightly described as the Thursday next after S. Denis: but the year is wrong, wrong by two years. There can be no doubt that it is the ordinance of $123+$ to which he refers; he gives a long list of the prelates and magnates who assisted at its making; this agrees with the list on the Coram Rege Roll ; and though Bracton has handled his text very freely, still it is plain beyond doubt that the provision the substance of which he professes to give, is the ordinance of 1234 .
(S) Clearly then as Selden pointed out there is a Themistake blunder in Bracton's text ${ }^{1}$. The suggestion is ready to hand is Bracton's. that this is a blunder of copyists or editors, and, though I have looked at many MSS. for a variant and none has appeared, one would be very willing to make a small conjectural emendation if this would mend the matter. But no little change would suffice, nothing short of the rewriting of a chapter. The text distinctly represents the ordinance as a settlement of the debate which had provoked the Nolumus. To make this the clearer the words of the ordinance have been tampered with, (as I shall show hereafter), so as to represent the bishops as definitely and expressly consenting to answer the question, 'Born before marriage or no?' 'Then, says Bracton's text, by reason of this common consent it is in the king's election whether to address this inquiry to the ordinary or to determine it in his own court. According to the authentic text of the ordinance the bishops did not ${ }^{1}$ Selden, Titles of Honour, Part. 2, chap. 5, $\$ 23$.
consent definitely and expressly to answer word by word an inquiry so framed. Bracton's text is wrong and seemingly no small verbal change will set it right.

One other fact will however suggest that his memory (or his note book) had served him some trick about the proceedings of the parliament at Merton. One of the changes in the law made then and there was the change which enabled a dowager to bequeath the growing crop; this clause of the Statute is beyond suspicion. Bracton alludes to it but cites the Coram Rege Roll for A.R. 18 -sicut patet de pronisionibus apud Merton inter placita quae sequuntur Regem Henricum amno regni sui decimo octauo ${ }^{1}$. At times, then, he may have thought that the Merton Parliament took place in Jan. 1234 , and therefore before the making of the ordinance about special bastardy.

The Note Book inverts the dates.
(9) Having seen what Bracton did, let us now see how the maker of our Note Book dealt with this same matter. He had the Coram Rege Roll for A.r. 18-19 in his hands. His marks may be seen upon it at this moment. He extracted many cases from it. We have in the Note Book a legislative provision touching the assize of darrein presentment which is taken from the front of one of its membranes. On the back of that membrane stands the ordinance of 12th Oct. 1234. This also is copied into the Note Book though in an expanded form. But before this stands the story of the Nolumus in almost precisely the expanded form in which Bracton gives it. For this the roll whence extracts are being made gives no warrant whatever. In the Note Book no date is assigned to the story, but the transaction is described as having taken place at Merton. Then the ordinance is introduced with Postea vero alio die. The maker of the Note Book therefore believed as Bracton believed that the ordinance came after the Nolumus; he ascribed both to 1234 ; Bracton ascribes both to 1236 . This matter of bastardy finished, we have then in the Note Book

[^90]and I have examined eleven; some give 15 , some 18 , some ' 15 alias 18 '.
more extracts from the same roll ; the cases which are scored on the roll are duly copied.
(10) Let us now suppose that Bracton and the maker of conjectura the Note Book were but one person. That person believed, the uilistake. for some reason or another, that the famons disenssion between bishops and barons took place before the publication of the ordmance. When his clerk muder his eye was copying from the roll of 1234 and had come to the entry about bastardy, then to make matters clearer, he from some other source furnished that clerk with an accome of the Nolumus. This was inserted to explain the ordinance which was then to be copied, and which was copied though not (as we shall see) without interpolations. At a later time this same person was using the materials that he had collected, was writing a treatise on the laws of England; his own Note Book puzzled him; he remembered that the parliament of Merton, at which the barons said Nolumus, was held on 23 rd Jan. A.r. 20 ; how then could the subsequent ordinance have been made in A.R. 18? There was nothing for it but to change the latter date and to give the ordinance to A.r. 20. Unfortmately however A.B. 18 was the right date.

This of course is conjecture, the conjectural history of a muddle; the man who antedated the parliament of Merton, had afterwards to postlate the ordinance. He was persuaded erroneously, that the ordinance came after the fruitless debate at Merton; this being so, he could not get the dates straight though he tried first one expedient and then another.
(11) But the matter does not rest here. I have said the docuthat Bracton gives an expanded form of the ordinance and pered tianan expanded form of the story told in the Statute Book about the Nolumus. So does the Note Book, and in each case the version in the Note Book seems intermediate between Bracton's version and the original text. This may best be manifested by printing in each case the three versions in such a manner that comparison may be easy.

Here then are the three versions of the ordinance: (A) the genuine text of the Coram Rege Roll, (B) the text in the Note Book, (C) Bracton's text.

A Provisum fuit et concessum quod de caetero cum talis bastardia
B Provisum fuit et concessum quod de caetero cum talis bastardia
C Provisum fuit et concessum quod de caetero cum bastardia
A objiciatur alicui in curia domini Regis quod
B objeeta fuerit alieni in euria domini Regis quod
C objecta fuerit alicui de tali causa in curia domini Regis quod
A natus fuit ante
B bastardus sit et ideo bastardus quia natus ante sponsalia sive
C bastardus sit et ideo bastardus quia natus ante sponsalia vel
A matrimonium contractum inter patrem suum et matrem suam mittatur
B matrimonium contractum inter patrem suum et matrem suam mittatur
C matrimonium contractum inter patrem suum et matrem suam mittatur
A loquela ad episcopum loci ad inquirendum utrum
B loquela al episcopum loci ut inquiratar per haec verba utrum
C loquela ad ordinarium loci et fiat inquisitio per haec verba utrum

| A | talis natus fuit ante predictum | matrimonium vel |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| B | talis natus fuerit ante | sponsalia vel matrimonium vel |
| C | videlicet talis natus fuerit ante | sponsalia sive matrimonium vel |

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { A } & \text { post } & \text { ita } \\ \text { B } & \text { post } & \text { ita }\end{array}$
C post et rescribat ordinarius per eadem verba domino Regi sine aliqua ca-
vellatione. Et
$\left.\begin{array}{cccc}\text { A } & \text { quod in } & \text { inquisitione illa } & \begin{array}{c}\text { cesset omnis appellatio sicut in } \\ \text { B }\end{array} \text { quod in } \\ \text { inquisitione illa } & \text { cesset omnis appellatio sicut in }\end{array}\right)$

A transmissum erit ad curiam cristianitatis
B fuerit transmissa ad curiameristianitatis episcopo vel ordinario
C fuerit
$\begin{array}{lcc}\text { A } & \text { ita quod nulla appellatio inde fiat extra regnum. } \\ \text { B } & \text { facienda et ita maxime quod nulla fiat appellatio extra regnum }\end{array}$
C facienda et maxime quod nulla fiat appellatio extra regnum
A Et ideo
B side necessitate contingat appellari. Et ildeo tunc preceptum fuit quod
C side necessitate contingat appellari. Et tunc preceptum fuit quod
A decactero ita teneatur tam de illis de quibus
B ita teneretur et observarctur in futuro tam de illis de quibus
C ita teneretur et observetur in futuro tam de illis quam de quibus


A objiciatur.
B objiciatur.
C objiciatur ex tali cansa.
It seems to me fairly evident that the second of these versions marks a stage in the process whereby the third was evolved from the first ; it agrees now with the one and now with the other. It agrees, for example, with the third in giving some important words about appeals from the ordinary which are not in the original document, introducing maxime and si de necessitate contingat appellari. It agrees again with the third as to the last clause, and the form in which they give it is not very intelligible. On the other hand it agrees with the first and not with the third in wanting the very material words which bind the ordinary to answer precisely the question 'Born before wedlock or no!' This is a serions interpolation. Did the bishops in 12:34 distinctly bind themselves to answer this question? Their conduct in 1236 and Grosseteste's letters make it improbable that they did so. It seems much more likely that they did not fully understand what would be expected of them, that when they were pressed to answer the precise terms of the writ they refused and successfully maintained their refusal. One can not help for a moment charging Bracton with dishonesty in having tampered with the text of an important document; but the manner in which he inverts the dates of the two transactions shows, as it seems to me, that he had gone utterly wrong about this piece of history. Such a mistake made by a royal judge about events but, twenty years old, may be very wonderful; but the mistake is there.

And now let us compare the three versions of the story about the Nolumus, (A) that printed in the Statute Book, (B) that given by the Note Book, (C) Bracton's.
II. I.

A
B cui huiusmodi bastardia obiecta esset natus esset ante sponsalia sive
C
matrimonium vel post, et cum
ante

A hoc esset contra communem formam ecclesiae.

| B | hoc esset in | praeiudicium | ecclesiasticae dignitatis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C | loc esset in | praeiudicinm sanctae ecclesiae | ut dice- |


| A rogauerunt omnes Episcopi | Magnates, nt | consentirent |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| B rogabant | Magnates, nt ad hoc consentirent |  |
| O rogabant | regem et Magnates, quod ad hoc consensum |  |


| A | quod natiante matrimonium essent | legitimi |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| B | quod natiante matrimonium ita | legitimi essent |
| C | praeberent quod natiante matrimonium quoadomnia legitimi esse | possent |

A sicut illi qui nati sunt post matrimonium quantum ad
B sicut et illi qui post sponsalia vel matrimonium quoad
C sicut illi qui post,
A successionem hereditariam quia ecclesia tales habet
$B$ successiones parentum et eorum hereditates quia ecclesia tales habet
C
A pro legitimis, et ommes Comites et Barones una voce
B pro legitimis, et omnes Comites et Barones quotquot fuerunt una voee
C et omnes Comites et Barones quotquot fuerunt
A responderunt quod nolunt leges Angliae mutare quae
$B$ responderunt quod noluerunt leges Angliae mutare quae
C responderunt una voce quod noluerunt leges Angliae mutare quae
A usitatae sunt et approbatae. [Statute Book.]
B usque ad tempus illud usitatae fuerunt et approbatae. [Note Book, Case
1117.$]$

C usque ad tempus illud usitatae fuerunt et approbatae. [Bracton, f. 416 b .]
Here again the version given in the Note Book seems intermediate between what we may regard as the original document and Bracton's text ; the mean agrees now with the one extreme, now with the other.

On the whole then, though it is very difficult to get to Summary as the bottom of this curious matter, it brings the Note Book bastardy. into close connection with Bracton's treatise. Both give similarly interpolated versions of two records; both invert
the true dates of those two records; the mistake (for deliberate misrepresentation seems out of the question) is a very strange one; that two independent persons should have committed it, would be stranger still.

Ad judicium.
And now the question whether this Note Book was really Bracton's or no, must be left to the judgment of the learned world. An effort has here been made to state the evidence impartially; but of course I was happy in believing that his work was in my hands, and my eyes may have been shut to facts which made against this pleasant belief. What is now to be wished is that some one will go through the book with the design of showing that it is not entitled to the name under which it is here published. Some one fact established by him, might make worthless every argument drawn from the manifold coincidences: for instance, he might prove that the annotator has referred to events which happened after Bracton's death. But meanwhile and on the evidence here adduced, Bracton scems fairly entitled to a judgment, a revocable judgment. The treatise is absolutely mique ; the Note Book, so far as we know, is unique; these two unique books seem to have been put together within a very few years of each other, while yet the Statute of Merton was noua gracia; Bracton's choice of authorities is peculiar, distinctive; the compiler of the Note Book made a very similar choice; he had, for instance, just six consecutive rolls of pleas coram rege; Bracton had just the same six ; two fifths of Bracton's five hundred cases are in this book; every tenth case in this book is cited by Bracton; some of Bracton's most out-of-the-way arguments are found in the margin of this book, in particular that about the binding of land by warranty, that about the ejectment of a disseisor; the same phrases appear in the same contexts, Juste propter jus sed iniuste propter iniuriam, Nihil certius morte, nihil incertius hor $\begin{aligned} & \text { mortis ; Corbyn's case, Ralph Arundell's case are ' noted }\end{aligned}$ up' in the Note Book; they are ' noted up' also in the Digby MS. of the treatise; with hardly an exception all the cases thus 'noted up' seem plainly to belong to Bracton's country, to affect persons whom Bracton must have known, Raleighs,

Traceys, Gorges, Blanchminsters, Winscots, Arundells, Punchardons; lastly we find a strangely intimate agreement in error; the history of the ordinance about special bastardy and the Nolumus of Merton, is confused and perverted in the same way in the two books. Must we not say then that, until evidence be produced on the other side, Bracton is entitled to a judgment, a possessory judgment?

Et ideo consideratum est quod Henricus recuperauit seisinam suam, saluo jure cuiuslibet.

## § s. Of Fitzherbert's use of the Note Book.

Whether this book was originally Bracton's or no, there
The Sot.
Book cane
to the hands
of Fitzcan be but little doubt that some two hundred and fifty years after its making it came to the hands of another very famous lawyer, of Chief Justice Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, who published his Grand Abridgement in 1514. Here again the evidence is the indirect evidence of numerous coincidences : but it is very convincing and should be briefly stated. If Bracton introduces, Fitzherbert closes one great period of English law, the age of the Year Books. A modern reader will probably turn the pages of this book with deeper interest, if he knows that from it Fitzherbert learned all, or almost all, that he knew of any law older than the days of Edward the First.

When already a great part of my work was done, I Exidence remembered having seen in the Abridgement a few cascs from the reign of Henry the Third. It occurred to me to ask, Whence did Fitzherbert get these very ancient cases; did he really read the plea rolls, and if so what plea rolls; or had he Year Books earlier than any that have come down to us? I went through the Abridgement, took out all the cases of Henry's time and arranged them in chronological order ${ }^{2}$. The result was very remarkable. Henry reigned

[^91]else had long ago done exaetly the same piece of work; he made a table which is found in a MS. in the Cambridge Library, Id. vi. 3!. I have used his results to correct my own.
for 56 years; Fitzherbert had 207 cases from the first 24 years of the reign; only 7 from the last 32, and these 7 all from a single eyre, the Devon and Cornwall eyre of a.R. 47. Moreover the 207 cases foll into three groups, (1) cases for which Fitzherbert gave year and term, (2) eases for which he gave the year but no term, (3) cases for which he gave year and eyre. The first group ranged over the period beginning Michaelmas A.r. 2 and ending Easter a.r. 18. The second covered the regnal years 19 to 24 inclusive. It seemed then that Fitzherbert had consulted just the very De Banco Rolls, and just the very Coram Rege Rolls, which had furnished matter for the Note Book; for as already explamed ${ }^{1}$ the De Banco Rolls were terminal rolls, the Coram Rege Rolls were annual rolls. As to the Eyre Rolls, the case was not so clear; Fitzherbert seemed to have had a roll, or two rolls, from which the Note Book had no extracts. But at any rate here were facts which demanded further investigation ; it remained to see how many of the 207 cases could be found in the Note Book.

I believe that every single one of them may be found there. In a table printed at the end of this Introduction I have endeavoured to show how this may be done. It will I think be allowed that in the vast majority of instances the case in the Note Book is certainly the case to which Fitzherbert referred; in a few instances this is more doubtful ; sometimes the note in the Abridgement is very brief indeed and it would be impossible to say positively that one had found the corresponding record ; but on the whole I have no doubt that all the 207 eases are in the Note Book.

It has been necessary indeed to suppose that Fitzherbert or his printer made some mistakes, not very many, in their references to years, terms and eyres; such matters are very apt to go wrong. But some of these mistakes are very instructive; they make it the more certain that the author of the Grand Abridgement was the possessor of the Note Book. The best example is this:-Scattered about in his book Fitzherbert has 8 cases professedly from Trinity term

[^92]A.R. 9 ; out of these S, only 3 are to be found in the Nute Book as of Trinity term A.r. 9 ; the other 5 are there, but as of Hilary term A.r. 17. This five times repeated mistake seems very odd, until one has seen that in the Note Book's capricious arrangement, Trinity A.r. 9 is followed immediately by Hilary A.r. 17 ; when this is observed the mistake is no longer odd, but the most natural thing in the world. There are several other errors of a similar kind due rather to the Chief Justice than to his illustrious printers. Some doubts were at one time raised in my mind by the apparent fact that he had three cases from a Stafford eyre of A.R. 12 and one from a Leicester eyre of A.B. 15, from which eyres, (if any such eyres there were,) the Note Book had nothing; but the last mentioned case is found in the Leicester eyre of A.R. 5 , and the three others in the Suffolk eyre of A.r. 12 ; 5 has been changed into 15 and Suff. into Staff. One case we can casily see from the names of counsel concerned in it, belongs not to the reign of Henry, but to that of Edward the Third ${ }^{1}$.

This is not all. Under the title Prohibicion, Fitzherbert has a continuous string of eighteen cases from Henry the Third's reign. The order in which they occur is the following :-A.r. ${ }^{2}$; Mich. a.r. 4; Mich. a.r. 4; Hil. A.r. 6 ; Hil. a.r. 6 ; Trin. A.r. 6 ; Hil. a.r. 8 ; Mich. A.r. 13 ; Trin. A.r. 13 ; Mich. A.r. 15 ; Pasch. A.r. 15 ; Mich. A.r. 16 ; Trin. A.r. 9 ; Hil. a.r. 17 ; Mich. a.r. 18 ; Trin. A.r. 4 ; Hil. a.r. 5 ; Hil. A.R. 7. It is a curious order, with its interpolation of A.R. 9 between A.R. 16 and A.r. 18 and its leap backwards from A.R. 18 to A.R. 4 A curious order; but the order of the Note Book. There are several other instances of the influence exercised by the arrangement of the Note Book over the arrangement of the Abridgement; but this is the most perfect ${ }^{2}$.

After weighing this evidence the reader will hardly doubt that our MS. came to Fitzherbert's possession, that he relied on it, studied it, used it largely. His 200 cases are found in

[^93]this collection of 2000 . That this should be the result of chance is beyond measure improbable; there were hundreds of thousands of cases on the rolls of Henry the Third. And then why stop citing placita de banco exactly at Easter A.r. 18; why cite placita coram rege just from the years 19 to 24 ?

The last 32 years of the reign, as already said, are represented in the Abridgement by 7 cases all from the Devon and Cornwall eyre of A.r. 47. Of these I have nothing to say. It is plain that they were taken, not from a Year Book, but directly or indirectly from the record. Possibly Fitzherbert had come by a stray roll. There seems no reason for supposing that the lost end of the Note Book had cases from this eyre, an eyre of Bruce and Middleton which took place near the end of Bracton's life; the other 207 cases can be so satisfactorily accounted for, that the loss would seem to have happened before Fitzherbert's day. The appearance of these 7 lonely cases should not, as I think, detract from the force of the evidence stated above. They serve only to make the surrounding darkness visible, these 7 cases from 32 years, following 207 cases from 24 years. The author of the Abridgement would have gladly given more if he could have got them without much trouble; but the days when lawyers habitually studied the plea rolls, if such days there ever were, were long since past; the Year Books themselves were becoming an unmanageable mass; good luck and the splendid industry of the thirteenth century supplied Fitzherbert with a collection of cases from Henry the Third's reign; he used them. We may guess that the few French words seribbled here and there in the margin of the Note Book in a hand which seems to be a hand of Fitzherbert's day ${ }^{1}$, were written by him ; they are of no value, but just catch-words, showing under what title the case against which they are written might be arranged in an abridgement.

Influence of the Note Book whon fink.

For a second time therefore our Note Book entered into the history of English Law. Mediately through Fitzherbert it became one of Coke's main authorities, (the treatises

[^94]of Glanvill and Bracton are the others, ) for what was law before the days of Edward the First, his only authority for the case law of those days. One does not turn over very many folios of the Commentary upon Littleton without seeing a stray reference to some case of Henry the Third's reign. That is a reference through the Abridgement to this Note Book. To take one example-"A man" says Coke ${ }^{1}$ "shall be tenant by the curtesie of a house that is Cuput " Baroniue or Comitutus: but it appeareth by 4 H. 3. Dower, 180, that a woman shall not be endowed of it." If the reader now cares to verify this citation he can easily do so. Turning to the table at the end of this Introduction he will find Fitzherbert's ' Dower 180' under a.r. 4, and will then be directed to Case 96 in the Note Book, where he will find the ultimate warrant for what Coke says. That Coke had studied at first hand the rolls of the thirteenth century, there are very few signs indeed; he was dependent on Fitzherbert and Fitzherbert was dependent on this Note Book. And so the labours of the copying clerks, the generous love for learning of him who set them their task and paid them their wages, bore fruit again and again; will bear fruit yet once more, for the history of English law will some day be written.

## §9. Of the making of this edition.

It remains to describe the relation of the text here scheme of printed to the MS. at the British Museum. In the MS. the this edition. usual stenographic signs have been very freely used: I should guess that at least a quarter of all the words in the Note Book are in some way or another abbreviated. Many of these signs have a perfectly distinct meaning and give very little trouble to any one who has once learned their significance. But besides these the indiscriminating dash is largely employed to represent every kind of termination, more especially when the words are part of some common formula. Thus, Assisa venit recogniture is hardly ever

[^95]written in full; instead of it one finds $A \overline{s s} v \overline{e n} r e \bar{c}$; I believe that I have never but once seen the whole word recognitura. The one syllable rēe is made to do duty for every voice, mood, tense, number, person, case of the extremely common words recognoscere, recognitor, recognitio, recuperare.

Expansion of contractions.

Now it may well be urged that the fairest way in which to print the matter thus written is to use what is called record type, type imitating as closely as possible the various marks of abbreviation. Certainly that is the fairest way; but then it requires of every reader that he shall be instructed in an art which, though it is not really difficult, still can not be mastered without some trouble and practice. It might be wished that there was a large class of students so much interested in the history of law as to be able to read the original records readily and rapidly. But who will say that such a class exists? The fact is patent that for two centuries past extremely little use has been made of the invaluable plea rolls; also that extremely little use has been made, at least in this country, of those rolls of Richard's reign and John's, which Sir Francis Palgrave printed in record type ${ }^{1}$. The old fables and fallacies are repeated; tenth-hand hearsay is preferred to first-hand evidence; it is so much easier to copy down as gospel truth what Coke said, than to face what one is like to call a repulsive mass of pothooks and hangers. An appetite for abbreviated documents may come in time; even record type may be pronounced unsatisfying; readers will not be content until they can see the very upstrokes and downstrokes reproduced by photography ; but to suppose that such an appetite exists at the present day, would be a foolish dream; to provide food for it, would be waste of money:

Sources of error.

Again, mistakes of the worst and most dangerous kind, no type however ingenious can prevent. The very commonest source of misreadings is the likeness between $u$ and $n$, and between $u i, n i, i u, i n$ and $m$; such a word as minimum, if

[^96]at all badly written, becomes a sore puzzle. The resemblance again between $c$ and $t$ is very fatal; in some hands and some combinations they are practically indistinguishable. An editor meets with a word which may be indiciis or may be iudiciis, which may be amita or may be amica. Here the type-founder can not help him ; the context must tell him which word it is, and if there is any real doubt, he should state this in a foot-note. What is more, the stenographic signs are in general the very easiest things to read and to understand, and if one can not be trusted to expand them correctly one can not be trusted to copy them correctly. Take the common abbreviation of persona; one meets a $p$ surmounted by a little $a$ and with a line drawn through its tail, $\stackrel{\sim}{p}$; the man who does not happen to know what this means, will probably think that the $p$ is not a $p$. My belief is that the use of record type saves but few blunders of serious importance at the cost of deterring many readers.

Therefore in this edition an attempt has been made to write out the words in full, except when so to do seemed really dangerous. I can not but suppose that I have made mistakes and therefore ought to warn the reader of the perils which he may run if he puts too much faith in what is here printed. Some instances shall be given.

Tenses and moods are often doubtful especially when the nificultras verb occurs in some common formula. Thus when a deman- toters. dant is successful, it is adjudged quod rec' seisinam suam. Now in this context, when (which is seldom the case, the word is written in full, I have seen recuperet and recuperat, but far more commonly recuperauit; it is adjudged, not that the demandant do recover his seisin, but that he has recovered his seisin; the judgment seems to recognize an already accomplished fact; therefore I have used the perfect indicative as the proper expansion of the ambiguous rec'. Tenses and moods in the common formulas the reader must therefore be asked to regard with some suspicion; I have attempted to find out from the best evidence, what the phrases really were, but the terminations may sometimes express a hasty inference from an insufficient induction.

Difficulty as to words.

In some instances it is very hard to find what was the exact form of some very common word. Just because it was so very common, it was never written in full. The word which stands for our substantive common (in such phrases as 'common of pasture ', 'he claims common',) is a good illustration. One does not often see it in full; the form communia seems to have been used at a later time and is found in the printed law books; but it seems plain to me from clear examples that in Bracton's day the word was commune, and therefore communa I have printed. There is a similar difficulty about the word which our esplees translates; hardly ever will one find more than expl'. I have occasionally seen expletia or explecia, and this form scems ultimately to have prevailed in our Law Latin; but much more often have I seen expleta, and this I suppose to be the better and the older form. Having come across the word exhereditacio written in full, I fear that I may have used this form too often, and that in some instances it would have been better to print exhereducio. These are specimens of the doubts that have occurred to me.

Difficulty as to grammar.

Grammar too has been troublesome. In our Law Latin, for example, people are always coming to do this, that and the other, they come to make suit, to view the wound, to collect apples, to certify the justices, veniunt ad faciend" sectam, ad vidend' plagam, ad colligend' poma, ad certificand' justic'. I have been persuaded by numerous instances that in such cases the gerund was used, not the gerundive ; that one ought to read, ad faciendum sectam, ad videndum plagam etc.; but except in my first few sheets, I have left the word abbreviated when I found it abbreviated, and if I use the gerund it is because in the MS. the gerund is written in full. As another illustration of the verbal difficulties that have occurred, notice may be drawn to a curions use of the word perquirere. It begins by meaning 'to acquire', 'to purchase'; then it is specially used of purchasing an original writ, the first step in an action; A perquirit sibi breue de recto versus $B$; then this phrase is twisted and we find such forms as a perquirit sibi per breue de recto, and a perquirit se
versus $B$; in short, the terms perquirere sibi, perquirere se become part of a technical slang, and they mean 'to bring an action'. It is sometimes difficult to expand the signs in which such slang is expressed. I have tried to be careful of small things. I have not said with the immortal Bartolus, 'De verbibus non curat jurisconsultus ${ }^{1}$; still I have felt with a yet more famous lawyer, that

> 'Law is the pork, substratum of the fry,
> 'Goose-foot and cocks-comb are Latinity.'

Some blunders in mediaeval etymology and grammar should be forgiven if the legal sum and substance of these two thousand cases are rendered with fair correctness.

Contractions being expanded, my endeavour has been to $\mathbf{3 s}$ printed reproduce what was in the MS. word for word, never altering worrd. what was there in favour of something which might be better grammar or better sense. Even glaring false concords and obvious clerical errors I have kept in the text suggesting a better reading in a foot-note, when of this there seemed any need. On the very few occasions on which for the reader's convenience an opposite policy has been adopted, express warning of this is given in a foot-note. When a word in the text is printed in italics this means that in the MS. it is indistinct or very doubtful. The first page of the MS. is sadly defaced; in my representation of it the words printed in italics and within brackets, stand for words which are almost illegible. When the first page is past, all goes pretty smoothly.

Again I have tried to preserve the spelling. Conse- speling. quently, for example, I have never used the diphthong ae but have left the simple $e$ of the original. On the other hand I have not preserved the capricious use of capital letters, for this has no grammatical significance, but is a matter of mere convenience. So both $u$ and $v$ which are very indiscriminately interchanged are here represented by $u$; it seemed to me that greater fidelity would simply make

[^97]unnecessary puzzles; but perhaps in this I was wrong. In expanding contractions I have sought to maintain the strain of spelling, but in some respects this varies from clerk to clerk and I may not always have succeeded in catching it. One may casily see, for example, that they usually wrote umquam instead of unquam; but whether they wrote numquam instead of nunquam is more doubtful, for this word is almost always abbreviated. But the most difficult problem is caused by the great similarity between the characters $c$ and $t$, and the tendency of $t$ in particular combinations to become $c$. For some clerks, one is inclined to lay down the rule, that whenever in a Latin word $t$ is followed by $i$ and then by another vowel, the $t$ has become $c$; thus not only does one find as matter of course such forms as aduocacio, inquisicio, conuiccio, contradiccio, but the genitive plural of pars is clearly parcium and the perfect of peto is pecii. But this rule does not hold good for all writers; for example, the annotator of the Note Book seems generally to use $t$ where we should use it. Perhaps in the text here printed the $c$ has been rather too freely used; but sometimes it is almost impossible to say whether a clerk has written peciit or petizt.
l.ocal names. Again the terminations of the names of places are so commonly abbreviated, (e.g. Ditton', Trumpinton', Hatfeld', Hatfeud', Winterburn', Watford', Wokindon') that often it is hard to decide whether what is omitted is a latinized termination, or a final indeclinable $e$. I doubt whether any universal rule could be laid down. Many of the larger towns certainly had declinable names, e.g. events take place apud Gloucestriam or apud Gloverniam; on the other hand it seems to me that some names were treated as indeclinable, e.g. those ending in ham; but about many of them I am doubtful and the reader should know of this doubt.
l'metuation. As regards punctuation. Both the Note Book and the Rolls are punctuated; the dread of stops had not yet taken possession of lawyers; and the Note Book is often very stupidly punctuated, for the copyists did not eare to understand what they wrote. For a while I thought that fidelity
obliged me to reproduce their vagaries and I did not grow wiser until some sheets were beyond my control. After this I placed a few commas and full stops where I thought that they would be useful and called attention in foot-notes to any departure from the original which secmed of any importance. In general a legal record is quite unambiguons when all stops are omitted, and punctuation should be treated as of no authoritative value whatever.

The notes found in the margin of the MS. are printed in Marginal the margin of this book. It should be understood that all matters in the margin, except the 'marginal venues', were written by him whom I have called 'the usual annotator', unless something to the contrary is said in a footnote.

When this was possible I have collated my transcript collation of of the Note Book with the rolls. What rolls are extant the reader may discover from a table at the end of this introduction. To indicate rolls which have been 'scored', and which therefore, as I infer, were used by the maker of the Note Book, I have employed the letter A : other rolls are referred to as B and C . A foot-note to the beginning of a case refers to the membrane of the roll on which it is found. The object of the collation was merely to discover whether the cases were on the rolls, whether they were copied with substantial accuracy, whether the roll would explain what the Note Book left mexplained. This is an edition of the Note Book not of the rolls; therefore I have not as a rule supplied what the maker of the Note Book systematically omitted, e.g. the names of umimportant persons, nor have I thought it expedient to notice variances except when these were of real legal importance. He was a lawyer and his book, whatever interest it may have for others, must in the main be a book for lawyers.

## § 10. Of some noteworthy cases in the Note Book:

(ases of historic importance.

By a few last paragraphs attention may be begged for some of the matters in the Note Book which seem the most noteworthy.

The record which shows how the outlawry of Hubert de Burgh and of the barons who took his part was reversed ${ }^{1}$, may be welcome even to those who are not lawyers; and there are some other records which illustrate the struggle of $1233^{2}$. A statement by the king's court in 1237 that Gualo the papal legate had been 'quasi tutor domini regis et custos regni' deserves remark ${ }^{3}$. There is a similar statement that Hubert de Burgh 'habuit regnum Angliae in manu sua'4. The latter occurs in a case touching the feudal relations between the king of Scotland and the king of England, a case which contains an emphatic statement of the doctrine of prerogative wardship. Four valuable entries concern the partition and therefore destruction of the most formidable outcome of English feudalism, the palatinate of Chester ${ }^{5}$; the difficulty of making a palatine earl answer out of his own palatinate, the ascription of palatine rights to the Earl Marshall, the demand for a judicium parium, the doubts of the assembled magnates over this unprecedented case, the rejection of foreign, presumably French, precedents, the reference to Roman or Canon law as a possible supplement for English jurisprudence, the afforcement of the court, the elaborately reasoned judgment, will not go unheeded ; clearly these were important suits. One of these entries and another record ${ }^{6}$ here printed are Coke's oldest authorities, (he had them from Fitzherbert,) for the law as to the abeyance of titles of honour ${ }^{7}$. There is a claim by William Longsword to the earldom of Salisbury, or perhaps to a

[^98]hereditary shrievalty of Wiltshire ${ }^{2}$, and there are several cases which turn on the doings of Henry Fitz Coment who had asserted a right to the county of Comwall and issued writs in his own name ${ }^{2}$. Traces of that great disseisor Fawkes of Breanté, are not far to seek: William Marshall the younger offers a thousand marks for the privilege of fighting him ${ }^{3}$. The court suspends its sittings in order that William of Albemarle may be besieged and suppressed ${ }^{4}$. Law has to recognize that a tempus guerrue is not uncommon.

That a large mass of material for the history of many Famitry famous families is here printed for the first time, will listory: perhaps in the eves of some be the best point of this book. Title is often pleaded from the days of Henry the First, and the Norman Conquest is still the period of prescription.

Some of the pleas which followed the king are of special constith interest as showing the action of the royal court where royal rights are concerned. Whether the king can be compelled to warrant his gifts seems a moot point, or rather a political question of grave moment ${ }^{5}$. It seems probable that he does justice in person and decides debated problems. If the second husband is tenant by the curtesy, it is because the king does not wish to change the ancient custom of England ${ }^{6}$, though Segrave held that this custom was unreasonable ${ }^{7}$. If the king's rights are concerned, his pleasure must be taken; he has no superior, he cannot be summoned, none may give him orders ; therefore no action will lie against him ${ }^{8}$. His comeil, which is now becoming a definite boty, supervises the administration of the law. Justices in eyre are summoned before the king's council and the justices of the bench, and are amerced for having hanged a man unlawfully ${ }^{9}$; the justices of the bench themselves have to come before the council and answer for their mistakes of law; they plead that they knew no better ${ }^{10}$. The open sale of justice is becoming a thing

[^99]${ }^{5}$ See Index, King disseisin by, King as warrantor, etc. J3r. f. 381 b .
${ }^{1}$ Case 1182.

- Br. C. 438.

8 Case 110x.

* Case 67 .

10 Case 1166 .
of the past ; but there are sundry procedural advantages for the grant of which a mark or demi-mark is expected, and occasionally heavy sums are offered and accepterl, even a thousand pounds ${ }^{1}$.

The relations between the spiritual and the temporal jurisdictions are brought out by a copions supply of 'prohibitions'. The lay court seems to have spent a very large part of its time in preventing the Courts Christian from doing business, in watching jealously their interferences in case of breach of faith (luesio fidei), their efforts to sanction wills of land ${ }^{2}$. One may see here in detail the grievances of which Grosseteste and churchmen of the straiter sort com-plained-not real grievances according to Bracton; but Bracton, if an ecclesiastic, was first and foremost a royal judge ${ }^{3}$. More valuable yet are the glimpses we get of the feudal and communal courts, especially of the latter. The county courts are busy, largely attended by the freeholders of the shire, who have to sit there as judges and make the judgments. The work is burdensome, but judgments cannot be made by the sheriff; the work is hazardous, for disappointed litigants are apt to complain to the royal court, and then four knights must repeat the record of the county court, and if it be contradicted, then the county will have to fight for it by the body of the county champion ${ }^{4}$. For all manner of purposes four knights of the shire are employed, they must ride to see whether a sick man has appointed an attorney, whether an essoinee is actually in bed without his breeches; the day seems, (and of course really is,) near at hand, when knights of the shire will represent the shire in a parliament. Nor will it escape us that all sorts of private men had to labour much and journey far in the work of justice. Notwithstanding the Great Charter ${ }^{5}$, notwithstanding an occasional use of the nisi prius ${ }^{6}$, four knights, twelve jurors, are constantly wanted at Westminster, and come they must from the furthest corners of the kingdom. It
${ }^{1}$ Case 1106.
2 Index of Actions, Prohibition.
${ }^{3}$ Br. f. $401 \mathrm{~b}, 416 \mathrm{~b}$.

* Index, Court County, Court Hun-

[^100]is of men thens drilled to do justice that parliamonts can be made ${ }^{1}$.

A little can be learnt even of the procedure in the local proedure. courts, procedure by suit and compurgation and battle, a procedure which knows nothing of that new-fangled royal institution, the jury. 'Who shall go to the proof?', and not 'Who has proved his case?' was the question which perplexed the hundred court of Somming". When Edith of Wackford vindicated stokn swine in the manor court at Windsor, she held one of the pigs in her hand ${ }^{3}$. But in the king's court itself trial be jury was still struggling with trial by battle and with compurgation. Wragor of law was still permissible within a large, though always narrowing, sphere. Many records bring home to us the reality of that production of suit, which eren in our oldest Year Books is fast becoming an unreality ${ }^{5}$. One camot as a general ruke put oneself upon one's combtry to prove an assertion without first (as wr. should say) 'making a prima facie case' by the testimony of sectatores. Especially in cases relating to dower, it is so common for the judges to decide disputed questions of fact upon the testimony thus produced, and withont the us. of a jury, that the Note Book may leave us wondering at the very complete victory that trial by jury gained over 'trial ly witnesses ${ }^{6}$. The many cases about suit and wager of law will help towards the moderstanding of several passages in our later legal history, and so will the many cases which place suit alongside charter or writing (curtu, scriptum) as the known modes of evidence, and contrast them with nude parol (simplex dictum, simplex loquela, simplex vor.). We may be led to doubt whether the judges of this age regarded a seal as having any mysterions virtue: on the

[^101][^102]other hand the practice of collating seals may help us to understand how a rule of evidence became a rule of substantive law ${ }^{1}$. The judges can tell the date of documents by the appearance of the wax; one who was bold enough to forge an original writ without first mastering the style of the Chancery is detected and hanged out of hand in a singularly summary fashion ${ }^{2}$. Forgery, and the fraudulent use of seals are, one observes, not uncommon, and the religious houses profit by death-bed gifts of questionable validity.
Parties interrogated.

The court's habit of interrogating the parties or their attomies, of thus eliciting fatal admissions and saving the trouble and cost of trial, may seem very rational to us and perhaps very strange, though Coke has noticed $\mathrm{it}^{3}$; and we may be surprised at the ease with which third parties intervene of their own accord or are summoned to declare whether they claim any right. It will perhaps be doubted whether the listory of legal procedure has been the history of an umbroken progress, whether the necessary growth of a class of professional lawyers if it did much good, did not also some harm.

A few curious archaisms appear from time to time. Of certain tenants in Kent it is written, "if one of them has a child born in fornication he shall pay childwyte, and if any married man has a son born in adultery he shall be in the king's mercy for all his movables, and if one of them sheds blood he shall pay blodwyte ${ }^{4 \prime \prime}$. In Herefordshire, it seems, they still pay and receive the wergild of the murdered man and hold this ancient custom dear ${ }^{5}$. All this while Bracton is speculating about the animus possidendi and writing his enlightened sentences. On the whole, however, we hear less of local customs than might be wished; they were rapidly disappearing before the common law of the king's court. The attachment of the men of Kent to their traditional usages is well marked and is very interesting. There is question whether a Kentish widow loses her dower

[^103]by a second marriage; knights of the shire intervene to pray that the libertics and customs of the county may be respected ${ }^{1}$. There is question whether Kentish land escheats for felony; the parties put themselves on the judgment of the justices and eight knights of the shire: the knights declare that they had never known a case of any Kentish knight being hanged, but that undoubtedly in gavelkind there was no escheat for felony secundum legem Kuntice ${ }^{2}$. For some cause or another the county spirit seems to have been stronger in Kent than elsewhere ${ }^{3}$.

Land law, which feudalism would make the foundation tand law. of all law, naturally fills a large space. The actual working of the military tenures will be much better seen in these records than in the Year Books, for feudalism is on the wane before the Year Books begin. Much that is quite new is not to be expected, for the land law was so vastly important that the main outlines of its history were carefully preserved in legal tradition; but numberless points are here set in clear light; thus the lord's right of marriage as it was before the statute of Merton is well illustrated. Subinfeudation was going on apace and giving rise to intricate problems; especial notice may be taken of those arising out of the rule that the same person camnot be both lord and heir. A series of records which goes far behind the Quia Einptores should be valued by all who wish to understand the practical meaning of that statute. We might wish to read more of that forerumer of the estate tail 'the fee conditional at common law', for much that is written in later books 'about it seems hardly better than guesswork ${ }^{4}$. Certainly it was a quite common thing that land should be given to a man and the heirs of his body, still commoner that land should be given in maritagium ${ }^{5}$. Several points may be

[^104]made clear by this book, but the exact extent of the tenant's power of alienation does not come out very plainly. It should be remembered the whole learning and even the very conception of 'estates' belongs to a later time: Bracton had not the word 'estate', nor any equivalent for it. Also it should be remembered that but a short time back the man who held land to him and his heirs conld by no means always disappoint his heir apparent'. Just a trace or two of this we may find, but on the whole it belongs to the past; the heir apparent may be disimherited. As against the lord freedom of alienation, (in favour whereof Bracton argues with unusual earnestness ${ }^{3}$,) seems very perfect, and we look in vain for cases to show that the restrictive clause in the charter of 1217 had any considerable effect: we may well doubt whether the king's justices thought well of that clanse or of some other clanses in the charter ${ }^{4}$. Primogeniture is extending itself rapidly, but there does not seem to be any very definite presumption against the partibility of socage land, and much of it is still partible ${ }^{5}$. The so-called 'Borough English' custom is regarded as a mark, though not a complete proof, of villein tenure ${ }^{6}$.

Possession and Property.

The operation of the possessory assizes may be seen in abundant examples. Probably we shall think well of the novel disseisin, a true possessorium, which worked speedily and effectively. The notion of seisin is firmly grasped ; the parties, the jurors, are pimed down to the question whether there has been seisin and disseisin, and, if so, there must be no talk of proprietary right. Taking up at this point the

[^105]the restraint on alienation. Gifts in mortmain were freely made as one may see from almost every page of the book. The Statute de Viris Religiosis begins with a reference to an earlier provision; this is not, as often supposed, a reference to the charter of 1217 ; it is a citation of the Provisions of Westminster of 1259 cap. $1 \%$.
${ }^{\circ}$ Inclex, Dessent, Partible Inheri. tance.
${ }^{6}$ Index, Inescent. Villeinate.
history of the so-called ' 'real actions' we find them no such inextricable tangle as they afterwards became. On the one hand there stands the proprietary action, the writ of right, which ought normally to be tried in the lord's eourt, which must at any rate be begun there. It leads to battle or the grand assize and is a very slow and solemm affair. On the other hand there are the rapid royal remedies whereby Henry the second cast his kingly protection over the seisin of every freehokder, very summary remedies indeed. The interval between these extremes is being filled up gradually, by writs of entry devised to meet cases in which the assizes will not lie, but in which some definite flaw of recent date can be found in the tenant's title, e.g. thongh no disseisor, he has come to the land through or under a disseisor, or he is a tenant holding over after his term has expired, or he aequired his seisin from a dowager, from a husband who alienated his wife's imheritance, or again his feoffor was a guardian, an infant, or of msound memory. In theory, it may be, there is here an extension of the roval protection of possession. Feudal principle, the words of the Great Charter ${ }^{2}$, forbade the king's court to make itself a court of first instance for the trial of proprietary right, save when the tenant held immediately of the king. Hence the elaboration mistory of of these writs of entry; hence also the fetters which confine ene exions. them; they can only be used when the flaw in the title is recent, and when there have not been more than two subsequent alienations or transmissions. When Willian Raleigh invented the writ of cosinage ${ }^{3}$ as a supplement for the mort d'ancestor, there was 'contencio inter magnates' orer it : for some held that it was against the Charter: Bracton had to argue that they were wrong. A gradual process by which the king's court makes itself (practically, not theoretically, no not until $18: 3: 3^{5}$.) the one court of first instance even for

[^106][^107]proprietary causes-this seems the main clue to the history of the real actions. In this book we may pick up the thread. It is hopeless to attack the matter in the Year Books without a training in earlier law; the material has become much too complex; a beginning must be found when as yet the writs of entry were novelties and the proprietary writ of right was still sharply opposed to the possessory assizes ${ }^{1}$. This sharp contrast is emphasized by the large mass of litigation about advowsons and presentations which is here published. It may be repulsive to the modern reader, but if he is in earnest with legal history he may be asked not to shirk it, for in studying it he may acquire a tight hold of the idea of seisin. The intrusion of that all pervading idea even into the region of marriage will not escape $\mathrm{him}^{2}$.

I'ses, common, villeinage.
. tion may be two cases which seem to show that feoffments to uses are as old as the days of Henry the Third ${ }^{3}$. Perhaps the cases which will find most readers (if indeed any of them be read at all) will be those about common rights and those about villeinage. As to common rights, the typical struggle of the time is not a struggle between lord and commoners, but a struggle between the men or the lords of two different townships. The social and economic position of the villein we are beginning to understand from the monastic cartularies, but to fix his legal position we must have litigation in the king's court, and this desirable end some of the many cases here printed should certainly serve.
Hopes.
In the eyes of a few comnoisseurs the gems of this collecbeginning to understand from the monastic cartularies, but Lastly there are two tasks which should be undertaken without much delay. In the first place Bracton's treatise ought to be carefully and lovingly edited. If this be not done by an Englishman, it will be done by a foreigner, as it is written, Vocabo super eos gentem robustam et longinquam et ignotam cuius linguam ignorabunt ${ }^{4}$. In the second place

[^108][^109]the history of English law, at least from the thirteenth century downwards, should be thoroughly well written. That both these great works will be made easier by the Note Book, I make no doubt; that this edition of it may not be too bad to be useful, has been and yet is my hope ${ }^{1}$.


#### Abstract

${ }^{1}$ In the summer of 1885 the case of Bidder v. Bridges came before Mr Justice Kay. It was an action for common rights over land at Mitcham in Surrey. Mr R. E. G. Kirk, the record agent of the plaintiff commoner, in the course of a long and laborious search for documents, found in a cartulary of Merton Priory a copy of the assize here printed as Case 1281. He then found the same case in the Note Book. The roll being lost, it was desired to put these copies in evidence. Mr Kirk found that I was engaged in transcribing the Note Book and collating my transcript with such rolls as were extant. I was therefore subpoenaed as a witness and stated what I then knew as to the general


accuracy of the extracts in the Note Book and as to the marks on the rolls; of course I was not asked anything about Bracton. Kay J. decided that the copy could not be received as evidence and the action was dismissed. The plaintiff appealed, but unsuccessfully; I was not present in the Court of Appeal; I balieve that there was some talli about the book and that the Lords Justices looked at it; but whether the question of its admissibility was determined, I do not know. The decision of Kay J. is reported, $54 \mathrm{~L} . \mathrm{T} .529$; 34 W . R. 514 ; but I have not been able to find any report of the proceedings in the Court of Appeal.

## END OF INTRODUCTION.

## Postscript.

I have said on p. 7 that Britton and Fleta carry their accounts of the writ of right to the point at which Bracton stops short. This is trie of Fleta, but not of Britton ; he does not get so far. As to the incompleteness of his book and of Bracton's also, see Nichols, Britton, vol. 1. p. xlv. It is very remarkable that we have no account of the duel and the grand assize later than that given us by Glanvill.

As regards the manor of Tykenbrede which Bracton held for his life (p. 16) see Case 1151 in which a Ralph of Tykambreche is mentioned. I cannot find any place in Comwall with which to identify it other than Tuckenburs.
the termination of which name may, as it seems to me, be a rationalistic perversion by English mouths of something Celtic.

On pp. 50, 51 I have said that there are but three occasions on which Bracton notices a difference of opinion between Segrave and any other judge, that once the difference is between Segrave and Pateshull, twice between Segrave and Raleigh. I now see that on f. 438 where Bracton speaks of Segrave's doctrine about the second husband's curtesy, he does not say that the opposite opinion was held by Raleigh. My statement therefore would be more correct if it ran thus:-"Once the difference is between Segrave and Pateshull, once between Segrave and Raleigh, and once Segrave is represented as holding that the law has been misunderstood and perverted." It seems elear that Segrave's opinion as to curtesy did not become law. See Case 1182, also the Statute de Donis and Coke's comment thereon, 2 Inst. 336, 8 Rep. 35 b .

On p. 76 I have said that Bracton apparently had three De Banco rolls from which there are no excerpts in the Note Book, but that this number might perhaps be reduced were the manuscripts examined. I believe that I can reduce it by one. In the first four manuscripts at which I look (MA, MB, MC, MI) the ease which the printed book (f. 342 b) cites from Hilary A.k. 16 , is cited from Hilary a.r. 18. I have not however been able to get rid of the citations from Trinity a.r. 5 and Trinity A.k. 7.

As regards Cole's case (p. 100), it may be observed that one Roger Cole was a canon of Exeter in 1224, see Case 920 .

## TABLE THE FIRST.

TABLE SHOWING THE NAMES OF THE JUSTICES WHO SAT AT THE BENCH DURING THE REIGN OF HENRY THE THIRD.

Note:-This Table is the result of a comparison of many, but not nearly all, of the Feet of Fines yet extant. When a justice is mentioned in some but not all the fines of a term his name is enclosed in [ ].

| $\begin{gathered} \text { A.D. } \\ 1217 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A.R. } \\ & 1-2 \end{aligned}$ | Termi. <br> Mich. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1218 | 2 | Hil. <br> East. | M. Pateshull, R. Hareng, S. Segrave, S. de L'Isle. Pateshull, Hareng, Segrare, de L’Isle, [J. Gestling], [Eustace of Falconberg, the Treasurer]. |
|  | 2-3 | Trin. Mich. | Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Gestling, de L'Isle. William Earl of Arundel, Pateshull, Alan Basset, Hareng, Segrave, Gestling, de L'Isle. |
| 1219 | 3 | Hil. |  |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | Trin. | Pateshull. Hareng, Segrave, de LiIsle. |
|  | $3-4$ | Mich. | [Hubert de Burgh], Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Gestling, de L'Isle. |
| 1220 | 4 | Hil. | Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Gestling, de L'Isle. |
|  |  | East. | [Hubert de Burgh], [Robert Earl of Oxford]. Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave. |
|  |  | Trin. | Earl of Oxford, Pateshull, Hareng, [Segrave], Thos Heydon. |
|  | 4-5 | Mich. | Earl of Oxford, Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Hey don, Roh. Lexington. |
| 1221 | 5 | III. | Larl of Oxford. Pateshull, Itareng, Segrate. Hevion. |


| ${ }^{\text {A.D. }}$ | A.R. | Telim. East. | Earl of Oxford, [John of Monmouth], Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Heydon, R. Lexington. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 5-6 | Mieh. | [Pateshull], [Segrave], Hareng, Heydon, [R. Lexington]. |
| 1222 | 6 | Hil. | [H. de Burgh], [John of Monmouth], Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Heydon, R. Lexington. |
|  |  | East. | Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Heydon, R. Lexington. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 6-7 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1223 | 7 | Hil. | Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Heydon, R. Lexington, G. le Savage. |
|  |  | East. <br> Trin. | [H. de Burgh and] the same. |
|  | 7-8 | Mieh. | Pateshull, Hareng, Segrave, Heydon, R. Lexington, Savage. |
| 1224 | 8 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | Pateshull, Thos. Multon, Segrave, Heydon, R. Lexington, Savage. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 8-9 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1225 | 9 | Hil. <br> East | Pateshull, Multon, Heydon, R. Lexington, Savage. The same |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 9-10 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1226 | 10 | Hil. | Pateshull, Multon, Heydon, R. Lexington, Savage, Warin Fitz Joel. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 10-11 | Mieh. |  |
| 1227 | 11 | Hii. |  |
|  |  | East. | Pateshmll, Multen, Heydon, R, Lexington |
|  | 11-12 | Mich. |  |
| 1228 | 12 | Hil. | Pateshull, Camvill, Willian de L'Isle, Richard Ducket. |
|  |  | East. | Pateshull, Segrave, William Fitz Warin, William de L'Isle, [H. de Burgh], [John Marshall]. |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 12-13 | Mieh. | Pateshull, Multon, Segrave, R. Lexingten, Camvill, William of London. |
| 1229 | 13 | Hil. | [Pateshull], Multon, Segrave, R. Lexington, Camvill. |
|  |  | East. | Multon, Segrave, [W. Kaleigh], R. Lexington, Camvill. |
|  |  | Trin. |  |


| A.D. | $\begin{gathered} \text { A.R. } \\ 13-14 \end{gathered}$ | Term. Mich. | Multon, Segrave, Raleigh, R. Lexington, W. de L'Isle, London, Rob. Shardelowe. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1230 | 14 | Hil. | Multon, Segrave, Raleigh, R. Lexington, London, W. de L'Isle, Shardelowe, Ric. Reinger. |
|  |  | East. | Multon, Segrave, Raleigh, R. Lexington, London, W. de L'Isle, Shardelowe. |
|  |  | Trin. | Multon, Raleigh, R. Lexington, London, Shardelowe, Ralph of Norwich. |
|  | 14-15 | Mich. | Multon, Raleigh, R. Lexington, W. de L'Isle, London, Shardelowe, Reinger, Norwich. |
| 1231 | 15 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | The same [with William of York]. |
|  |  | Trin. | Multon, Raleigh, York, Norwich, [Reinger]. |
|  | 15-16 | Mich. | Multon, Raleigh, R. Lexington, York, Shardelowe, Norwich. |
| 1232 | 16 | Hil. | [Multon], [Segrave], [Raleigh], R. Lexington, York, Shardelowe, Norwich, Adam Fitz William. |
|  |  | East. | Multon, Raleigh, R. Lexington, York, Shardelowe, Norwich, Fitz William. |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 16-17 | Mich. | Multon, Raleigh, R. Lexington, York, Norwich, W. de L’Isle, Fitz William. |
| 1233 | 17 | Hil. | Multon, [Raleigh], R. Lexington, York, Norwich, Fitz William. |
|  |  | East. | Multon, R. Lexington, York, Norwich. |
|  |  | Trin. | [MIUlton], [Raleigh], R. Lexington, York, Norwich, Fitz William, Will. of St Edmunds. |
|  | 17-18 | Mich. | Raleigh, [Multon], R. Lexington, York, Norwich, W. de L'Isle, Fitz William, St Edmunds. |
| 1234 | 18 | Hil. | Raleigh, Multon, R. Lexington, York, Norwich, W. de L'Isle, Fitz William, St Edmunds. |
|  |  | East. | [Raleigh], R. Lexington, York, Norwich, W. de L'Isle, Fitz William, St Edmunds. |
|  |  | Trin. | R. Lexington, York, Norwich, W. de L'Isle, Fitz William. |
|  | 18-19 | Mich, |  |
| 1235 | 19 | Hil. |  |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 19-20 | Mich. | Multon, William of Culeworth, John of Kirkby. |
| 1236 | 20 | Hil. |  |
|  |  | East. | Multon, Fitz William, Culeworth, Kirkby. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 20--21 | Mich. | R. Lexington, Fitz William, Culeworth, St Ell munds. |
| 1237 | 21 | Hil. | R. Lexington, [York], Norwich, Fitz William, Culeworth, [Kirkby], St Edmunds. |


| A.0. | A.R, | Term. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | East. <br> 'Trin. | R. Lexington, York, Fitz William, Culeworth. The same. |
|  | 21-22 | Mieh. | The same. |
| 1238 | 22 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | R. Lexington, Culeworth, Hugh Giffard, Henry of Bath. |
|  | 22-23 | Nich. | R. Lexington, York, Culeworth, Bath. |
| 1239 | 23 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | $23-24$ | Mich. | The same. |
| 1240 | 24 | Hil. |  |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 24-25 | Mich. |  |
| 1241 | 25 | Hil. |  |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | 'Trin. |  |
|  | $25-26$ | Mich. |  |
| 1242 | 26 | Hil. | R. Lexington, Culeworth, Gilbert Preston, [Jollan Neville, R. Beauchamp]. |
|  |  | East. | R. Lexington, Culeworth, Preston, Neville. |
|  |  | Trin. | R. Lexington, [Culeworth], [Roger Thurkelby], Neville. |
|  | $26-27$ | Mich. <br> Hil | Neville, R. Lexington, Thurkelby, Preston. R. Lexington, Neville, Rob. Esseburn |
| 1243 | 27 | East. | R. Lexington, Thurkelby, Neville, Preston. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 27-28 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1244 | 28 | Hil. | R. Lexington, York, Thurkelby, Neville, Preston. |
|  |  | East. <br> Trin | Thurkelby, Neville, John of Cobham. |
|  | 28-29 | Mich. | [R. Lexington], Thurkelby, Neville, Preston, Robert of Notingham, J. Cobham. |
| 1245 | 29 | Hil. | Bath, Thurkelby, Notingham, Neville, Preston, <br> J. Cobham. |
|  |  | East. | Notingham, J. Coblam, Will. of St Edmunds, Rob. Shardelowe. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | $\because 9-30$ | Mich. | Bath, Thurkelby, Notingham, Neville, Preston, Shardelowe, J. Cobham. |
| 1246 | 30 | Hil. | [Bath], Thurkelby, Notingham, Neville, Preston, <br> J. Cobham. |
|  |  | Last. | Bath, Notingham, Neville, [Alan of Watsand]. |
|  |  | Trin. | Bath, Neville, Watsand. |
|  | $30-31$ | Mich. | Bath, Watsand. |



| A.t. | A.r. | Term. East. Trin. | Bath, Walton, Shotiugdon, Bruce. The same. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 41-42 | Mich. | Bath, Bruce. |
| 1258 | 42 | Hil. <br> East. | Bath, Bruce, Nicholas de Handlo. Brucz, Handlo. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 42-43 | Mich. | Thurkelby, Preston, Handlo. |
| 1259 | 43 | Hil. | Thurkelby, Preston, Wyville. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 43-44 | Mieh. | The same. |
| 1260 | 44 | Hil. | Thurkelby, Preston, Wyville, John de Cave. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | [Thurkelby], Preston, Wyville, Cave. |
|  | 44-45 | Mich. | Preston, Wyville, Cave. |
| 1261 | 45 | Hil. | Wyville, Cave. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 45-46 | Mieh. | Preston, Wyville. |
| 1262 | 46 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 46--47 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1263 | 47 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 47-48 | Mich. | Preston, [Wyville], [Nicholas de Turri]. |
| 1264 | 48 | Hil. |  |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | Trin. |  |
|  | 48-49 | Mich. | Preston, de Turri, Hervey of Borhan, Willianı Bonquer. |
| 1265 | 49 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 49-50 | Mich. | Preston, Bonquer. |
| 1266 | 50 | Hil. | Preston, Walter Berstead. |
|  |  | East. | Preston, John de la Lynde, Walter Berstead. |
|  |  | Trin. | Preston, de la Lynde, [Berstead]. |
|  | 50-51 | Nich. | Preston, Bonquer, de la Lynde. |
| 1267 | 51 | Hil. | Preston, Adaun de Greinvill. |
|  |  | East. |  |
|  |  | Trin. | Preston, Roger Messenden. |
|  | 51-52 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1268 | 52 | Hil. | Martin Littlebury, Roger Seyton, John of Coblam (the younger). |
|  |  | Last. |  |


| A.b. | A.k. | Term. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | $22-53$ | Mich. | The same. |
| 126i9 | 53 | Hil. | The samm. |
|  |  | Eatst. | 'lhe same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | $23-51$ | Mich. | The samu. |
| 1270 | 51 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | 'The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | -itm | Mich. | Littleburs, Sexton. |
| 1271 | $\therefore$ | Hil. | Littlehary, Seyton, Colman. |
|  |  | East. | Littlehary, Stephen Herm, Robert Fuleon. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | 55-56 | Mich. | The same. |
| 1272 | 56 | Hil. | The same. |
|  |  | East. | The same. |
|  |  | Trin. | The same. |
|  | .6--.57 | Miell. | The same. |

## TABLE THE SECOND.

## TABLE SHOWING BRACTON’S CITATIONS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDELi.

Note: The object of the following table is to show (1) what cases bracton cites, (2) whether they are in the Note Book, (3) whether there is any extant roll on which they are or ought to be fonnd. The citations are arranged in fon classes,
A. Pleas in the Bench.
B. Pleas whiel followed the King.
C. Pleas in the Eyres.
D. Undated or otherwise imperfectly eited eases.

The numbers in the first column refer to the folios of Bracton's Treatise; those in the last column to the Cases in the Note Book.

## A.

## PLEAS IN THE BENCH.

1217, a.k. 1-2, Mirhuelmas Term to 1こ19, A.r. 3, Milary Term incluswe ${ }^{1}$.

Cases in Note Book 1095-1359 (whieh are from Mich. a.n. 1-2) and 1-15 (which are of uncertain date but probably from Trinity A. 1: , '2). No Rolls extant.
f. 77. Essex. H. de Abecot. in rotulo de primis placitis post guerran.
f. :376 h. Jucks. Wilhelmus de Abruncis et Matilda axor cius. 12 inter prima placita post gnerran.
f. 239. Anon. Essoins.
de term. 内. Mich. A.s. $\because$.
1 All cases from this priod are phaced in one chass as, owing to the loss of kuals and of the Note Book's tirst jage, it is in some instances difficult to tix the exact date, see above 1 . 73.
f. 313 . Kent. Auon. Dower in qavelkind. 9 and 133 K de term. S. Mich. A. i. 2 post guerram.
f. 308 b . I $\quad$ abellis de Gravenel, Thomas de Wederhal. 9 and 133 s coram Martino in banco A.s. 2 .
f. 376 b. Esex. Matilda de Say, Wilhemms de Mamdevill. of de term. S. Mich, a. r. 2 post guerram.
f. 302. Sussex. Maria de Cromestam.
f. 314 b. Jors. Hamo de Hahmodoston.
f. 37s. Kent. Abbas de Nutleght.
f. 37 s b. Kent. Vagister Militiae Templi.

Trinity A.k. 2
the second roll after the war.
f. 380 . Wilt. Galfridus de Chessewicke.
f. 239. Somers. Wihhem Bukker, Priom S. Nicholai Evon. A, dutom, S. Trint A.s. $\because$.
f. HO!. Kont. Natilda filia Simonis. Se 11 de term. S. Mich. A.s. 2 incip, 3.
f. 27 b . Magister Militiae Templi.
f. 219. Glonc. Richardus Cimpet, W. Comes Marshal jumior.
f. 277 b
and 421 . Dors. Hamelimus filins Radulphir.
f. 4:33. Kent. W. Comes Marescallns, Faleasinc de Breyante.

Cases of A.r. 3, reserved from theevre for judgment.

1•1! A.R. :3. Easter amd Trimit! Terms.
Gases in Note Book 16 4.
Noroll extant.
f. 65. Sussex. si Radulphus de la Roche. 44
f. 113. Ebor. si Wilhelmus Ie Seneschal. 37

1. 2s0. Sussex. si Padulphus de Rupe, Gilebertus de Arpuila. 44
f. 301 b. Bucks. Alicia quate fuit uxor Symonis de Stentenham.
f. 330. Sirres. Gylbertus de Albyngeworth, Reginaldus de Brewese. 40
f. 375 b. Anon. cira finen rotuli. Count hegins with one who was never seised.
f. 442 b .

Anon. Bailiff of franchise amereed. 20 and 2n

1219, A.R. : - f. Michaelmes: Term.

Two Rolls extaut. $A=$ Coram Rege Roll No. .2. $\mathrm{B}=$ foran lieqe lioll No. 1.
f. 23. Bedf. Richardus be Hare. (il
f. 50 . Anon. Jonor and donee in possession torether.
f. 199 b . Sussex. Johames de Monte Acuto, Martinu- de Beste-
f. 243 b . Norf. Thomas Bardolf. ..... 49
f. 248 b-9. Oxf. Robertus de Harpdene, Reginaldus de Albo Mo- nasterio. ..... 68
f. 258 b. Essex. si Brianus pater Henrici. ..... 47
f. 310. Surrey. Margeria de Bellanallie.
f. 316. Norf. Thomas de le Enueyse. ..... 56
f. $336 . \quad$ Surrey. Robertus de Basings. ..... 10
f. 372. Anon. Default by both demandant and tenant.
f. 424 b. Sussex. Johannes de Bruse, Reginaldus de Bruse. ..... 46f. 437. Sussex. si Matilda amita Rogeri de Barlegh.f. 440 b Anon. Mesne process in personal
action. Appendix to vol. 111.. case 2
1220, A.R. 4. Milary and E'aster Terms.Cases in Note Book 80-124.
Two Rolls extant. A = Coram Rege Roll No. 3.$B=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 5.
f. 151 b. Essex. Elyas Pigon.
f. 199 b. Sussex. Johannes de Monte Acuto, Martimus de Bestenonere. ..... 88
f. 200. Sussex. Martinus de Bestenouere (warranty by a villein).
f. 393. Anon. (cirea finem). Doweress can not sue or besued without her warrantor. 109
f. 433. W. Comes Mareseallus. ..... 102
12응, A.R. 4. Trinity Term.
Cases in Note Book 1360-1474.
Two Rolls extant. $A=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 6.
$B=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 7.
f. 53 and 53 b. Lincoln. Ecclesia de Wiehine, Prior de Markeby. ..... 1418
f. $93 . \quad$ Northam. Theoballus de Lassel. ..... 96
f. 200. Dorset. Hamelinus filius Ladulphi. ..... 1411
f. 241 b. Worc. Ecclesia de Eldersen, Robertus de Bradelegh. ..... 1428
f. 305 b . Suff. Alexandria. ..... 1392
f. 312. Norf. Isolda quae finit uxor W. ..... 83f. 319. York. Petrus de Malo Lacu, Prior de S. Oswaldo.
f. 375. Wilts. W. de Lusteshille, W. de Coneleffend. ..... 1360
f. 377 b . Anon. View after defanlt. ..... 1436
ᄃ. 387. Isaae Judens de Northwico. ..... 1376
f. 414. Midd. Hamond le Brood.f. 430 b . Somers. Anon. Coparceners to be joined. Bastardy.
f. 130 b . Hants. Johames de Brywes.
f. 133. Bedf. W. Comes Marescallus. ..... See 102
f. $13: 3 \mathrm{~b}$. Bucks. Hugo de Gimnay. ..... 1.165
f. 136 h . (ilone. Robertus Cusin. ..... 1427
f. $4: 37 \mathrm{~b}$. Midd. si Robertus Coetrs.

Cases in Note Book 300-325.
Two loolls extant. $\lambda=$ Corim licge Roll No. 9. I = Coram liege lioll No. 8.
f. 6:3 b. Lincoln. Bartholomens tilinc lichardi. 303
f. 65 b. Lincoln. Ozbertas tilias Richardi. 303
f. 146. Suff. de Rogra de kirken et hatede de Ver.
f. B67. Bucks. Johannes tilins Rolandi. 307
f. 357 . Anon. Default by tenant who has vonched.
f .413 b . Radulphus Harang.
f. 432 b . Anon. Alicuation by temant after smmons.

1를, A.R. 5. Hilury and Euster Terms.
Cases in Note Book 1475-1551.
Two Rolls extant. $\quad I=$ Coram liege Roll No. 14.
$B=$ Coram liege lioll No. 11 .
f. 69. Norf. Petrus Constabularius de Manton. 150;
f. 153. York. Robertus tilius Johannis (in principio rotuli). See 1517
f. 375 b . Anom. Omission to name in count a person having equal or greater right.
f. 433. Fork. Petrus de Malo Lacu.

$$
1 \because 21 \text {, A.R. .). Trimity Termr. }
$$

No cases in Note Book.
No roll extant.
f. 286. Gerardus de Huwell, Richardas rector de Claypoll.

1221, A.R. 5—6. Michaelmas Term.
No cases in Note Book.
Roll extant. Coram Rege Roll No. 1巳.
Bracton cites no cases.
1221 or 1222, A.R. ( . Michuelmus Term.
Bracton cites from Mich. A.s. 6 the following, leaving it uncertain whether he means Mich. A.r. $\tilde{-}-6$, or Mich. a.r. (6-7.
f. 245 . Herford. Prior de Lantony, Walterns Byseehe.
f. 245 b .
Anon. Ass. dar. pres. (iift of advowson by tenant by
curtesy.

[^110]f. 350. Devon. Matilda de Curtney.
f. 350. Sussex. (talfridus de Lucy.
f. 350. Sussex. Prior de Blibing.
f. 350. Glouc. Robertus Toniguy.

Cases among the essoins.
f. 350. Sussex. Philippus de Redham.
f. 350 b. Noting. Emma de Bel'a Fago.

> 12อ1-2, A.R. 6. No term mentiomed.
f. 351. Gilbertus Marescallus, Alanus de Hyda.

1611
1292, A.R. 6. Hilary Term.
Cases in Note Book 125-171.
No Roll extant.
f. 53 b. Staff. Raul. Comes Cestriae, Prior de Kenelwyte. See 199
f. 83. Dors. Alanus de S. Georgio. 16 .
f. 246 b. Staff. Rayn. Comes Cestriae, Prior de Kenelworth. See 199
f. 259 b. Midd. si Aluricus Huse. Matilda de Albo Monasterio. siee $5!$ and $155!$
f. 364. Bucks. Alicia de Iarpmille, Petrus de Immere.
f. 407. Warw. Precentor Lincolniae. 152
f. 407 b . North. Radulphus persona de lrelinhourghe. 162
122.2, A.R. 6. Easter Terin.

Cases in Note Book 172-184.
No Roll extant.
Bracton cites no cases.
1292, A.R. 6. Trinity Term.
Cases in Note Book 185-214.
Roll extant. $\mathrm{B}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 15 .
Bracton cites no cases.
1222, A.R. 6-7. Michaelmas Term.
Cases in Note Book 1555-1570.
No Roll extant.
f. 143. Anon. Appeal of rape.
f. 259 b. si Aluricus Huse, Matillis de Albo Monas-
terio.
1559 , see also 59
f. 420 b . Anon. Inquest as to villein tenure after death of tenant.

$$
12 \because \cong — 3, \text { A.R. } 7 . \text { No term mentioned. }
$$

f. 306 b. (iumora nxor Johannis filii Hugonis, Matilda de Berneres. 1573
f. 3.51 b. Anon. Essoins of barons. 1637

## 129:3, ג.1. 7. Hilary Term.

Cases in Note Book 1571-1606.
Roll extant. $B=$ Coram licge Roll No. 16.
f. $\mathbf{1 4 1}$ b. Norf. Durandas Sissor, Memricus de Ver. $\mathbf{1 5 9 7}$
f. 34!. Vitalis Engayne, Eeelesia de Ho.
f. 375 b . Anon. Ancestor entering religion.
f. 376. Camb. Aanas de Bassingborne, liobertus de Insula. 1578
f. 407. Bealf. Gylbertus pexsona de Ienham.
f. 437. Lint. W. de Fomitrogne.
f. 437 b. Linc. simon de liale.

102:3, A.R. 7 . Ester 'Term.
Giases in Note Book 1607-1618.
No Roll extant.
f. 55 b. Bedf. Falkz de Briante, Prior de Nywenham. $160 \%$
f. 82. Heref. Wilhelmas filius Benedicti, (Galfridus de Luci.
f. 95 S Somers. Emma uxor Wilhelmi Dati.
f. 244. Bedf. Falcanus he Briante, Prior de Neueham. 1607
f. 320 b. Buck. Ginido de Wyndeslore.
f. 320 b. Kent. Alicia nxor Richardi.
f. 392 b. Devon. Wylhelmus Paynel, Abbas de Doneckswell.
f. 433 b. Sussex. Nicholaa nxor Thomae de Casteneys. 1609

## 12ロ:3, A.r. 7. Trinity Term.

No euses in Note Book. No Roll extant.
f. 97 b . Essex. Ilonea.
f. 432 b . Oxf. Jocetus de Ilungenay.

> 1293 , A.R. 7 -8. Michuelmas Term.
> Cases in Note Book 1619-166s.
> Holl extant. A=Coram Rege Roll No. 17.
f. 12. Anon. A leper camot grant. fits
f. 85 b . Sork. Anon. No relief, marriage, or wardship in socage lame
f. 230 b . Anon. Quo Jure. Common; right to enclose. 1624
f. 311. Thomas de Nassendene. 1644
f. $349 . \quad 16 ; 34$
f. 349 b. Sussex. Alanus de S. (reorgio.
f. 350 b. North. Henry de Gayton.
f. 350 b . Devon. Alicia Malet. Escoin Cases.
f. 350 b. Buek. Hugo de Broke.
f. 3500 b. Lanc. Alicia de Lanc, W. de Tahann.

## $122: 3 — 4$, A.R. S. No term mentioned.

f. 306 b. Agnes nxor Roberti de Hactone. $154 ;$

1224, A.R. ※. Hilary Term.

> Cases in Note Book $214-240$.
> No Roll extant.
f. 29. Noting. Robertus de Walingl. 224
f. 326 b . Linc. Thomas de Estotengni. $2: 34$
f. $3 \times 7$. Berks. Henry de Quevnt. 235
f. $390 \mathrm{~h} . \quad$ Anom. Departure in pleading. 1627
f. 398. Norf. Raduiphus de Lerlinge, Prior de Thefford. 222
f. 414. Heref. Richardus filius Godfrey. 227
12.24, A.R. ※. Easter Term.

Cases in Note Book (4.t-985. No Roll extant.
f. 75. Wilt. Thomas de Cymeges.
f. 246 . Kent. Prior de Snthworth, Warin de Monte Kas. Eceleria de Snanthanis.
f. 2!s. Berks. (imnora nxor J. filii H., Matilda de B. See $1120,1176,157 \%$
$129+$ A.R. S. Trinity Term.
Cases in Note Book 986-1031.
No Foll extant.
f. $3: 2 \mathrm{~b}$. Anon. Voucher of heir.
f. 392 b. Hugo de Bailol. 132
10.) A.R. S-9. Michuelmas Term.
Cases in Note Book sry-943.
Two Rolls extant. A $=$ Tower Roll No. 2.
B $=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 18.
f. 54 b. Bedf. Johannes de Trahillz, Prior de Niwenham.
f. $212 . \quad$ York. si Rogerus Clerieus. 907
f. : $4 t$. Bedf. Johannes de Traylie, Prior de Neueham.
f. 298. Warw. Johannes de Marr, W. de Cantnlupo. 904
f. 304. Hertf. Alicia uxor Rogeri de Camera. 891

1225, A.R. 9. Milary Term.
Cases in Note Book 1032-1067.
Roll extant. $B=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 22 .
f. 53b. Norf. Abbas de Messendene, Hubertus de Burgo. 1064
f. $24 . \quad$ Linc. Irior de Osneby, Conanus de Weleton. 1035
f. 246. Norf. Walterns Abhas de Messendene, Hubertus de Burgo. 10rid
f. 301 b . Devon. Alicia uxur W. de Thornton. ..... 1065
f. $30 \& \mathrm{~b}$. North. Wilhelmus de lanentre. ..... 1067
f. 37. Berks. Reginaldus Morin. ..... 10:34
f. 434. Derby. Koterus de Drayton. ..... 10.55
f. 43. Warw. liobertus de Cherletom.
12.5, A.R.!. Euster Term.
Gases in Note Book 1069-110\%.No lioll extant.
f. 33 i. Corn. Richardus de Wyss, Prior de Triwardray. 1000
f. 142 b. Essex. Hugo de (iodingham, Hugo de Cantilupo. ..... See 913
f. 244 . Norf. Matilda de Rochesfori, Robertus de Tunston. ..... 1072
f. 246 b . Cumb. Richardus Wyke, Prior de Trywardray. ..... 1070
f. 316. Norf. Margeria de Raylie.
f. 332 b. Hunt. Wilhelmus Hatechrist. ..... 1079
f. 364. Bucks. Henry de S. Warerico.f. 390. Midd. Julinna, Hemricus, IV. filins Herewardi.
12.2., a.r. !. Trinity Term.
Cases in Note Book 703-794.Two Rolls extant. $A=$ Coram Rege Loll No. 20.$\mathrm{B}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 21.
f. 436. Nidd. Henry de Haquebut. ..... 716
1205, A.R. 9—10. Michuelmurs 'Ter'm.Cases in Note Book 1663-1691.
Three Rolls extant. $\quad A=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 19.$\mathrm{B}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 23.$\mathrm{C}=$ Tower Roll No. 3.
f. 54 b. Prior de Lewes, Adam de Novo Mercato. ..... 1655
f. 83. Kent. Isabella de Hotot.
f. 85. Staff. Mirgareta Baggod, Rogerus la Zusche. ..... See 1043
f. 116 b . Hertf. Hemricus de Romband. ..... 1691
f. 137. Kent. Adam de Burgh.
f. 141. Hertf. Hemricus de Romband. ..... 1691
f. 146. Worc. Thomas de Rupe. ..... 1664
f. 160 b . Norf. Suff. Simon de Rakfeld.
f. 246 b. York. Prior de Lewes, Adam de Novo Mercato. ..... 1685
f. 296 b Alexander de Walpole, Johannes filius Roberti. ..... 1668
f. 301 b. Essex. Asselina axor Alani.
f. 304. Oxf. Alicia uxor Jacobi de Cardevile. ..... 1669
f. 312. Northam. Nargeria uxor Henry de Northon.


$$
12.2\left(6-7, \text { A.R. } 10 . N_{0}\right. \text { term mentioned. }
$$

f. 306. Juliana uxor Thomae Fughelstone. 1703

1226, a.k. 10. Hilury Term.
Cases in Note Book 16:2-1730. Roll extant. $\quad \mathrm{B}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 24 .
f. 423 b. Kent. Prior de Merton, Nigellus de Mumbrey.
f. 423 b. York. W. de Carleton, R. de Percy.
f. 430. York. Line. Adam Tusset.
f. 433 b. Bedf. Richardus de Bavadum.
f. 440 . York. Nicholans de Statevil.

1226, a.r. 10. Euster Term.
Cases in Note Book 1731-1763.
Roll extant. $B=$ Coram Rege lioll No. 25.
f. 54 b. Leic. Walterus de Rideware, Prior de Undeleigh. 1758
f. $246 . \quad$ Norf. Simon de Nodarum, Ecclesia de Judlibam. 176:
f. 246 b . Leic. Walterns de Kedware, Prior de Sudleghe. 175 s

> 1226, A.k. 10 . Trinity Term ${ }^{1}$.
> No cases in Note Book. No Foll extant.
> Bracton entes no cases.

1226, A.R. 10-11. Michaelmes Term'.
No cases in Note Book.
No Roll extaut.
Bracton cites no cases.
1227 , a.R. 11. Milary Term'.
No cases in Note Book. No Foll extant. Bracton cites no cases.

[^111]1207，A．R．11．E＇uster Term．
Cases in Note Book 211－2．2．
Roll extant．$B=$ Coram Liege Roll No． 27 ．
f． 63 b ．Sussex．Johammes de Monte Achto． 247

1227，A．R． 11 ．Trinity Term．
Cases in Note Book 25：－265．
Roll extant． $\mathrm{B}=$ Coram liege Roll No． 27 ．
f．$: 2 l$ ．Heref．Agnes uxor Johamis de Westwickham．

12゚ース，A．R．11－12．Michuelmas Term．
No cases in Note Book．
No Foll extant．
Bracton cites no cilses．

122S，A．R．12．Milary and E＇aster T＇erms
Cases in Note Book 269－287．
No Roll extant．
f． 92 b．Linc．Idonea uxor Nicholai Burdeth． 279
f． 200 Wirw．Wilhelmus de Bissopeston． 281
f．288．Anon．Assisa utrum dute virgatite．2n．
f．398．Hunt．Egidius de Merck． 2 sif
f．413．Berks．Henricus de Siccario．
f．418．Berks．Robertus Hachard．2心7

1208，A．R．10．Trinity Term．
No cases in Note Book．
No Roll extant． Bracton cites no cases ${ }^{1}$ ．

120 S，A．k．12—1：3．Nichuelmus Term．
Cases in Note Book 2ns－2．99．
Two Rolls extant． $\mathrm{B}=$ Coram liere Roll No．！9． $\mathrm{C}=$ Comam Rege Roll No．35．
f．260．Hants．si Robertus filius Cihul．

[^112]
# 1299, a.r. 13. Hilary ''erm. 

C'ases in Note Book 311-325.
Roll extant. A = Coram Rege Roll No. 34.
f. 34ti. Devon. Thomas de Tyndland.

> L22!, A.R. $13 . \quad$ Easter Term. Cases in Note Book $326-333$. Two Rolls extant. $\quad \begin{array}{r}\mathrm{B}=\text { Coram Rege Roll No. } 31 . \\ \text { C }=\text { Coram Rege Roll No. } 32 .\end{array}$
f. 225 b. Noting. Radulphus tilius Petri.

## [229, a.r. 13. Trimity Term und Middleses Eyre of Willium Ruleigh.

Cases in Note Book 334-347.
No lioll extant.
f. 95 b. Midd. si Johannes Blundus.
f. 177 b. Midd. si Johannes Calbus.

339
f. 200. Midd. Anon. Various elasses of tenants distinguished.
f. 200 . Midd. si (iodefridus.

343
f. உ26. Midd. si Stephanus Archiep. Cantuar. 336
f. 348 . Midd. Anon. Writ not returned.

1229, A.R. 1:3-14. Michuelmus Term.
Cases in Note Book 348-374.
No Roll extant.
f. 27 b . Anon. Gift first to one, then to another; warranty.
f. 226 b. Abbas de lianseghe. 360
f. 315. Anon. Admeasurement of dower. 365
f. 388 b. Hertf. B. nxor li. Hinssel.

1230, a.r. 14. Hilary Term.
Cases in Note Book 375-394.
loll extant. $\mathrm{A}=$ Coram Reqe Roll No. 33 .
f. 93. Northamp. Christiana uxor Walteri. 377
f. 213 b. Suff. Maria de Walemus, Herbertus de Alezini. 380
f. 391. si (ialtridus pater (rilberti. 387
f. 3:8. Rogertus de Dantuleser et Matilda uxor eius. 375
f. Hs. Midd. Abbas S. Albani, Willelmus tilins Radulphi. 39.4

1230, A.R. It. Euster Term. Cases in Note Book 395-40s.

No lioll extant.
f. $319 . \quad$ Wilts. Raduphins de Moigne. 102
f. 320 . Dors. Matilda uxor Stephani de Bosco.
f. 35\%. Anon. Essoin in action on a fine.
f. 3.5. Anon. Eswoin ; view ; licence to rise. the
f. 356 b . Koting. Linc. W. Thesaurarius Ehormm, Wilhelmus de Camera. 40.5
f. 369 b b. Panlinus de Wychelesse, Stephanns de Fredewylle. 397
f. 375. Hunt. W. Archidiaconus Wellensis. t 11
f. $3 \times 4$. Anon. Warranty; value of land, how ascertained.

1230, A.r. 14. Tirinity Term.
Canes in Note Book 409-429.
Foll extant. $\mathrm{A}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 3 m .
f. 301. Norf. Letitia de Eggefend.
f. 339 b . Suff. Ecelesia de Trilliaw. 427
f. 356. Norf. Prior de Longa Villa. 420
f. 415 . Surrey. Prior de Novo Jocw. 416
f. 437. Norf. Richard Angod.

1230, A.k. 14—15. Wichuelmas Term.
Caves in Note Book 430-4ヶ0.
Roll extant. $\mathrm{A}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 37.
f. 130. Kent. Wilhelmus Mnsard. 462
f. 250. Derby. Eeclesia de Eltdene. 480
f. 297 b . Warw. Johannes filius Elfridi.
f. 297 b. Kent. Ernaldus de Camerin.
f. $312 . \quad$ Suff. Essex. Emma uxor Rogeri filii Swani.
f. 379 b. Anon. Dispute as to how much land put in view. 456
f. 407 b . Suff. Hugo de Monte Causo. 442
f. 421 . Salop. Fulco filins W.
f. 430. Essex. Assisa utrum, J. persona de Messe, Radulphns de Ardern.

> 1231, A.R. 15. Hillery Term.
> Cases in Note Book $481-514$. No Roll extant.
f. 302. Derby. Agnes uxor Nicholai.
f. 374. Bucks. Walterus de Bosco.
f. 391 b. Berks. Prior de Bradley, Wilhelmns de Cyfrewast. 512
f. 423 . North. W. de Lungesper et Idonea uxor eius. 513
1231, a.r. 15. Easter Term.
Cases in Note Book 515-568. No lioll extant.
f. 9:3. Camb. Anon. Dower in socare. ..... (923
f. 230 b. Bnck. Anon. Common pur eause de vicinage. ..... 561
f. 286 b . Sussex. Pior de Lewes, Gylbertus de Aquila. ..... 539
f. 302 . Surrey. Joetta de la Strode.
f. 407. Somers. Richardus persona de Hideford. ..... 547
f. 407 b . E'ssex. Gervasius de Aldermanbury. ..... 5.50
12:3, A.R. 1.). Trinity Term.
Cases in Note Book 56!)-623.
Roll extant. $13=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 3s.
f. 316 b. Bedf. Petrus de Peyime. ..... 607
f. 351 b . Worc. Adam de Thormmarton. ..... 60.)
f. 407 b. Oxford. Prior de Berncestre. ..... 570f. 436. Hunt. Ginlleburga.
12:31, a.R. 1.)-16. Michuelmes Term. Cases in Note Bowk 6et-ififi. No Roll extant.
f. 15. Berks. Robertus do Burneby. ..... 63:
f. 22. Salop. Rogerus de la Suche, Petronilla de Wyneslogh. ..... (i64
f. 29. Linc. si Helewisa ..... (in)!
f. 303. Hants. Aldithia. ..... 647
f. 343. Camb. Osbertus. ..... $66: 3$
f. 346. Midd. Gyllertus de Hendon.
f. 361 b . Salop. Anon. Knights sent to essoinee. ..... 651
f. 422 b . Suti. Alicia uxor Lncae Brokenhed.
1232, a.r. 16 . Hilur!, Terin.
No Cases in Note Book.
No lioil pextant.
f. B4: b. Johannes de Karum.
12:30, A.R. 16 . Easter Term
Cases in Note Book 6iti7 70.
No loll extant.
f. 3:46. Norf. Galfridus filius Baldwini.f. 3if. ( $x$ f. Fray Pinchard.gisi
f. 3se Midd. Alicia de Warr, R. de hemere. ..... 714
f. 342 b. Kont. Nicia de bendenges.
f. 3:2 b. Line. Hichardus de Elings.
f. 407 b . Hants. Engelardus de Crgoiny: ..... isel
f. fos. Devon. Themas de Buttyler, Alfidus de Cottone. ..... 1;7
12:3… A.R. 16 . Trinity Term².No eases in Note Book.No Roll extant.Bracton citos no cases.
$12: 32$, a.R. 16-17. Michuelmes Term.
Cases in Note Book nijs-ss.lioll extant. 13 = C'oram liege Roll No. 3!.
f. so. Sufi. Wilhelmus do Flaxino. ..... $\$ 71$
f. 305 b . Nalop. Emma. ..... $7: 37$
f. 341 . Essex. Etho filus Wilhehmi. ..... 8.7
f. 342 b. I. Bathoniensis Episcophs. ..... (19)
f. 387. Midd. W. de Raleish, Tohannes l'igon. ..... 856
f. 422 b. Snff. Juliana uxor Alani de Guseham. ..... 8 si
f. 433 . Anon. Plea of non-renure; copareeners.
123:3, a.s. 17. Hilury Term.
Cases in Note Book 72j-7.5.).
No Roll extant.
f. 87 b. Kent. Warinus de Jonte Caniso, Robertas de Hucham. ..... 743
f. 298. Linc. Eudo de Calethorpe. ..... 730
123:3, A.R. 17. Enster Term.
No Cases in Note Book.
No Foll extant.
bracton cites no cases.
12:3: A.k. 17. Trimity Term.
Cases in Note Book 760_-7N3.No Roll extant.
f. 29. Norf. Petronilla uxor Wilhelmi de S. Martino. ..... 777

1. 260. Bucks. si Rogerus de Estwicham.
[^113]123:3, A.R. 17-18. Michaelmas Term.
Cases in Note Book 784-825.
Roll extant. A = Coram Rege Roll No. 40.

$$
123+\text { A.R. 18. Hilury Term. }
$$

Cases in Note Book 826-843.
No Roll extant.
12:34, A.R. 18. Easter Term. Cases in Note Book 84--857. No Roll extant.
f. 230 b. Sussex. Simon de la Pynd, Johannes de Kynelworth.

## Later Guse. A.r. B8.

f. 339 b. Kent. Archep. Cantuar, Rotertus de S. Johamne.
$B$.Pleas which foldowed the kina ${ }^{1}$.
$1234-5$, A.R. $18-19$
('ases in Note Book 110M-1132.
Roll extant. $\mathrm{A}=$ Tower Roll No. S .
I. 16. Prior de Wallingford, Rogerus de Quiney. ..... 112
$123.0-6$, A.R. $1!$ - 20.
Cases in Notr Book 11331171.No Roll extant.
f. 19\%. Buck. Wralterus do Emdene, Alicia tilia Emaldi. ..... 1139
f. 317. Line. Johames de Diseo, Filiat Johamis de Bray. ..... See 1201
f. 133 b. Bedf. Johannes de Traylie, Walterus de Godardville. ..... 1133

[^114]$$
1236-7, \text { A.R. } 20-21 .
$$

## Cases in Note Book 1172-1218. No Roll extant.

f. 31 b si Simon filius Wydonis. 1203
f. 195. York. si Wilhelmus de Stocbrige.
f. 272. York. si Stephanus de Pulthorp. 119.5
f. 292 b. Linc. Lambertus filius Lamberti. 1209

$$
1237-8, \text { A.R. } 21-22 .
$$

Cases in Note Book 1219-12:3.
Roll extant. $A=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 45.
f. 54 b. Salop. Godefridus de Gamages. 1224

1238-9, A.R. 22-23.
Cases in Note Book 1239-1274. No Roll extant.
f. 169 b. Robertus de Toteshall, Prior de Bricksete. 1248
f. 195 and 200 si Robertus Bieard (Byrd).
f. 195 and 200 .
si Richardus de Merlay.
f. 195. Suff. si Radulphns filius Roberti.
f. 200. Norf. si Robertus de Rikinghale.

$$
1239-40, \text { A.R. } 23-24 .
$$

Cases in Note Book 1275-1288.
No Roll extant.
f. 373. Hants. Dom. Rcx., W. de S. Johanne.

Later Cases. A.R. 31.
f. 414. Michael Abbas Glastoniensis, Rogerus Episcopus Bathoniensis.
f. 414 b. Petrus de Solandia, Abbas de Rivall.

$$
\text { A.R. } 32 .
$$

f. 234 b. Hants. Simon de Vendenge, Jordanns de Insula.

$$
\text { A.R. } 32-33 .
$$

f. 241. Norf. W. Bardolf, et heres de Meanton, Eeelesia de Suterlege.
A.R. 33.
f. 368 Richard Syward.
A.R. 46.
f. 159. Petrus de Sabaudia.
M. I.

## C.

Pleas from the Eyre Rolls.

Reign of John (?). Eyre of Pateshull in Leicester.
f. 364 .

Anon. Essoin. Record of four knights.
1218-9, a.R. 3. Eyre of Pateshull and the Bishop of Durham in Yorkshire.

Commission Rot. Cl. vol. r. p. 380 b.
f. 50. si Rogerus de Halgheton.
f. 200 b. si Jacobus filius Siwardi.
f. 272. si Rogerus de Maundeville.
f. $277 . \quad$ si Rogerus de Amundevil.
f. 297. Alicia uxor Adae filii Petri.
f. 297. Alicia uxor Hugonis de Alencester.
f. $298 . \quad$ Matylda uxor Roberti de Haywarde.
f. 303 b. Muriella uxor Hugonis de Hauerton.
f. 320 Aghevilda Murdac.
f. 320 Reginaldus Murdaker.
f. 322 Anon. Entry sur cui in vita.
f. 394 b. Anon. Warranty.
f. 395. Wilhelmus de Vavasour.

1219-20, a.r. 4. Eyre of Pateshull in Lincoln.
Roll extant. Tower Roll No. 1.
f. 298. Dernia uxor Roberti Bryton.

1220, A.r. 5. Eyre of Pateshull and R. de Vere, Earl of Oxford in Hertford.
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. r. p. 473 b .
f. 200 b Anon. Attaint. Villeinage.
f. 430 b. si W. de Ludwich.
f. 430 b. Matilda filia Godwini.

1220, A.r. 5. Eyre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Worcester:
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. r. p. 476.
Roll extant. Assize Roll M. 6, 31. 1.
f. 54 b and 246 b . Anon. Gift of alvowson by one who has not prescnted.
f. 128 . Anon. Ontlawry.
f. 141. Anon. Appellant must be eye-witness.
f. 244 b. Ecclesia S. Mariae de Wichio.
f. 285 b . Anon. Layman brings a Juris Utrum.
f. 332 b. Anon. Privilege of Templars and Hospitallers.

1220, A.R. 5. Eypre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Gloucester.

Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. i. p. 476.
Rolls. Coram Rege Roll No. 13. Assize Roll M. 2, 14. 1.
f. 166 si Philippus le Riche.
f. $288 . \quad$ Anon. Assisa utrum una hyda terrae.
f. 307 b. Clementia de Dodervell.
f. $390,390 \mathrm{~b} . \quad$ Radulphus Chandos.

1220, A.R. 5-6. Eyre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Hereford.

Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. I. p. 476.
f. $13 . \quad$ Anon. Gift to concubine and children.
f. 124 b. Anon. Manupast. [The name Hertford in the printed book should be Hereford.]
f. $273 . \quad$ si Laurentius Galant.
f. 311. Ascelma Pickednese. [Wrongly cited from Hertford.]

1220, a.R. 5. Eyre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Warwick.

Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. i. p. 476.
Rolls. Assize Roll MI. 6, 16. 1.
Assize Roll M. 6, 16. 2.
f. 83 b . Robertus de Halgeford.
f. 180. si Will. de Ludington.
f. 199. si W. de Ardern.
f. 266 b . Anon. Ass. mor. ant. against lord who pleads partial non-tenure.
f. 269 b . Anon. Ass. mor. ant. against lord who pleads partial non-tenure.
f. 270 b. si Fredericus.
f. 272. si Will. Turpin.
f. 275 b Anon. Gift of socage land by infant.
f. 340 b . Anon. Full age of tenant in socage.
f. 381 b. Egidius de Erdington, W. de Norf.
f. 390 b. Will. Trussell. Ass. mor. ant. See 196.

1220, A.R. 6. Eyre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Leicester.

Cases in Note Book 1942-1971.
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. I. p. 476.
f. 23. si Robertus filius Martini. 1965
f. 272. si Gilbertus.
f. 275 b si Walterus filius Wilhelmi. 1957
f. 370 b. Hugo filius Wilhelmi.

1220, a.r. 6. Eyre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Stufford.

Cases in Note Book 1972-1982.
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. I. p. 476.
1220, A.r. 6. Eyre of Pateshull and the Abbot of Reading in Shropshire.

Commission, Rot. C1. vol. I. p. 476.
Assize Roll M. 5, 8. 1.
f. 278 Anon. Assize turned into jury by consent. Bastardy.
f. 280 b. Anon. Probably same case as last.
f. 340 b . si Vineentius. [Date doubtful.]

1222, a.r. 6. Eyre of de Burgh and Pateshull in Norfolk. Cases in Note Book 1791-1807.

No commission found. Bracton cites two of the cases which are in the Note Book ( 1798 and 1803) as from Pateshull's eyre in Norfolk A.r. 10, of which eyre no other trace has been found. De Burgh was at Norwieh from 13 to 23 Sept. 1222 (Rot. Cl. vol. I. p. $510-1$ ).

1225, A.R. 9. Eyre (general commission of assize and gaol delivery) of Pateshull in Hampshire.

Commissiou, Rot. Cl. vol. II. p. 76.
f. 167. si Radulphus de la Haye.
f. 170 b . si Adam Gerun.

1225, A.r. 9. Eype (general commission of assize and gaol delivery) of Pateshull in Northampton.

See Rot. Cl. vol. ir. p. 76 and 78 b (last entry).
f. 169. si Rogerus de Deneford.

1225, A.R. 9. Eyre (general commission of assize and gaol delivery) of P'ateshull in Norfolk'.
f. 398. Anon. Witnesses to deed not present at its making.

1295-6, A.R. 10. Eygre of P'uteshull in Norfolk:
See abore under Norfolk Eyre of A. i. 6.
f. 212 b. Anon. Two coparceners bring assize; husband of one is outlaw.

1798
f. 239. si Bartholomens de Waterdene. 1803

1•25-6, A.R. 10. Eyre of Puteshull in Sussex.
No trace has been found of any such eyre. One of Dracton's two citations has been traeked to Suffolk, whieh probably is the right comity for both.
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { f. } 238 \mathrm{~b} . & \text { si Adam de N. } & \\ \text { f. } 238 \mathrm{~b} . & \text { si Thomas de Coluile. } & 1909\end{array}$
1226, A.R. 10. Last Eyre of Pateshull in Lincoln.
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. in. p. 151.
f. 142 b . Gilbertus filins Aldrendi, Alanus Swadi.
f. 146 b . Thomas de liasue.
f. 271 b and 277 . si Agnes filia Evae (Eliae) de Benyngworth.
f. 277 b. si Leonata.
f. 296 .
f. 297 b . si Petrus filius Wymund.
f. 309. Helewiza uxor Wasae.
f. 309.

Basilia uxor Henrici filii Wareni.
f. 310 .

Robertus de Armondel et Katerina.
f. 314 b Alicia uxor Ricardi filii Divae.
f. 314 b. Anon. Admeasurement of dower.
f. 426 b . Thomas de Rasue.
f. 430 b . Hugo de Hull.
f. $438^{2}$.

Walterus de Lyne, Terra de Grimesby.
1226, A.R. 10-11. Last Eyre of Pateshull in Yorkshire. Cases in Note Book 1814-1890. Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. ir. p. 151.
f. 28. Anon. Gift shortly before death. 1876
f. 260 b . si Walterus Chamlenger. Assize talien on default of warrantor.

[^115]| f. $277^{1}$. | si Odo filius Thorsin. | 1878 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| f. 280. | Anon. Bastardy. |  |
| f. 298. | Juliana. | 1873 |
| f. 304 b. | Emma uxor Raymeri le Franceys. | 1848 |
| f. 381. | Petrus de Malo Laeu, Johannes de Besaere. | 1869 |
| f. 414. | Rogerus de Fanborne. | 1847 |
| f. 418. | si Radulphus de Bully. | 1859 |

1220, A.in. 10-11. Last Eyre of Pateshull in Lancashire.
Case in Note Book 1294. Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. ir. p. 151.
f. $50 \mathrm{~b}^{2}$. Rogerus de Monte Vegonis. 1294

1227, A.R. 11-12. Eype of 1'ateshull in Kent.
Cases in Note Book 1764-1790.
Roll. $\mathrm{A}=$ Coram Rege Roll No. 28.
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. n. p. 213.
f. 205 b . Anon. Lord seizing land for arrears of rent. 1767
f. 239 .

Anon. No resummons in the eyre. 1778
f. 244 b .
f. 261 .

Prior de Lewes, Wilhelmus de Arbervil.
si Robertus de Wylington.
1766
f. 274 .
f. 275 .
f. 276 b .
f. 280 b .
f. 280 b .
si Manasserus de Hastings.
si Emma mater Rogeri. 1783
si Henricus filius Yaonis.
si Wilhelmus de Herst. 1775
si Henricus Paynefore.
1780
f. 371 .
f. 417 and 418 b.

Ingerianus de Shoford.
si Henricus Pamsore (Pamfurere).
1780
f. 418 b .
si Wilhelmus de Herst.
1775
f. $430 \mathrm{~b}^{3}$.
f. 433 b .
W. filius Roberti.

Godefridus de Resiton.
1227, a.r. 12. Last E'yre of Pateshull in Suffolk.
Cases in Note Book 1890-1938.
Roll. $A=$ Tower Roll No. 14.
Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. II, p. 213.
f. 50. si Anselmus. 1919
f. 50. Johannes filius Hugonis. 1921
f. 205 b .
f. 226 b .
f. 239.
si Joceanus de llesture. See 1913
si Jolannes de Stantone.
si Radulphus de Wadleyham.

[^116]f. 271. Mabilia et Johanma. 1906
f. 273 b and 277 .
f. 27.1.
f. 275 .
f. 278 .
f. 278 .
f. 285 b .
f. 286.
f. 286 .
f. 297.
f. $301 \mathrm{~b}^{1}$.
f. 320 .
f. $340 \mathrm{~b}^{1}$.
f. 388 .
f. 398.
si Wilhelmus de Carleton.
si Rogrerts Battayl.
si Rogerus de Gloc. 1898
si Philippa de Cockfend.
si Walterus Curteys.
1921
Fobertus de Ledentone. 1920
Anon. Assisa utrum.
Thomas persona de Framesdon.
Agneta uxor Rufi. 1936
Comitissa de Oxonia, Wilhelmus Blundus. 1916 Wilhelmus de Wanham. Anon. Majority of socager. Matilda uxor Mathiae de Thurfenne. si Mabilla. 1891

1227, a.r. 12. Eyre of Puteshull in Norfolk.
Cases in Note Book 1808-1843. Commission, Rot. Cl. vol. ir. p. 213.
f. 148. Radulphus de Sherings.
f. 212. si Gylbertus filius Gilberti.
f. 269 b and 275 .
si Eudo pater Walteri.
1827
f. 420 .
si Henrieus de la Stoke. 1810

1229, A.k. 13. Eyre of Raleigh in Middlesex.
See above Pleas in the Bench of Trinity Term a.r. 13.
1232, A.R. 16-17. Eyres of Ruleigh in Warwicl, Leicester, Northampton, Bedford, Buckingham.
Commission, Rot. Pat. 16 Hen. 3, m. 11 d .

## Warwick.

f. 188. si Gerardus filius Wilhelmi.
f. 226 .
f. 260 b . si Augustinus.
f. 320 b .

Anon. Ass. mor. ant. Death of one co-plaintifi.
f. 330 b .
f. 381.
f. 381 .
f. 393 b . Hugo de Cayel Marestorp.
Anon. Record of summons by sergeant of the hundred.
Anon. Warranty of tenant's assignce.
Sibilla. Dower.
f. 417 b .

Will. fil. Robert.
si Will. de Munworth. Ass. mor. ant.

## Leicester.

f. 159 b. Rogerus le Suche.
f. 199 b. si Rob. Freeman.
f. 266 b. Humfredus de Leyc'. et Juliana ux. ejus.
f. 286. Anon. Assisa utrum.
f. 311. Anon. Dower. Land assigned to another woman.

## Northumpton.

f. 266 b and 273 b . Wilhelıus de Camera.
f. 27.4.
f. 319 .

Liadulphus Basset, Thomas D'ictesle.
Petrus de craldington.

## Bedford.

f. 170. si Milo.
f. 247 b .
f. 312 .

Hubertus de Vallibus.
Emma Bovastra.
Juliana de Nodariis.
Anon. Curtesy.
Buckinglum.
f. 200. si Walterus le Gardner.
f. 200 b .
si Lucia.
si Simon de Hokedes.
si Alicia.
f. 271 .
f. 271 b and 277 b .
si Hemricus Russell.
f. 272 b and 277 b . si Ric. Faber.
f. $274 . \quad$ si Ric. Avenel.
f. 304. Alicia ux. Baldwyn.
f. 390.

Alicia de Rupella.
Date uncertain. Eyres of Raleiyh in Lincoln and Kent.
f. 435 b Linc ${ }^{1}$. W. de Berningehurst.
f. 276 b. Kent. si Adhelolphus.
f. 280 b . Kent. si Adam le Gardener.

## Later Case.

f. 113 Anonymons case cited from eyre of Raleigh in Notting. ham in A.r. 30 but according to many MSS and in all probability from the eyre of Thurkelly (with whom was Bracton) in s.k. 29.

## D.

## Undated Cases.

| f. 26. | Case before John of Metincham. An interpolation; not in any MS. that I have seen. |
| :---: | :---: |
| f. 27. | Cecilia de Stradesete. From a Hilary term in an unspeeified year. See Note Buok, Case 8336. |
| f. 29. | Godfrey of Creweombe, Robert of Muscegros. In but few MSS; sometimes in margin; marked as I'us in MA. |
| f. 32. | Eeclesia in Hebland. Lincolnshire. |
| f. 35 b. | Abbess of Barking. See Case 758. |
| f. 45. | Case before John of Lexington. In some MSS this is not found. |
| f. 49 b . | Roger de Reyne, Robert de Shute. A case of 1254 heard by Bracton. See above p. 39 . |
| f. 50. | Case from an eyre of Simon Pateshull (a judge of John's reign) in Leicester and Suffolk. The MSS generally read $S$ or Simonis; but this may be a mistake. |
| f. 56 b . | Abbot of St Albans and Geoffrey of Childwick. Pro. bably after 1250. See Mat. Par. vol. 5, p. I29. |
| f. 65. | William Mandeville, Earl of Essex and Maud, Countess of Hereford. An early case for the Earl died in 1227. See Case 297. |
| f. 88 b . | Henry de Tercy (corr. Tracy), William of Punchardon, Roger Venpel (corr. Beaupel). An addition relating to Bracton's Devonshire neighbours. In margin of $\mathrm{OA}, \mathrm{OB}$ and not in some other MSS. |
| f. 93 b . | Countess of Lincoln widow of Walter Earl Marshall. He died in 1245. |
| f. 114. | Abbot of Pievauls and Peter of Savoy. Part of a long passage which is marginal in OA and not in some other MSS. It is again eited Br. f. 44 b and from a.r. 31 (1246-7). |
| f. 125 b and 128. | "Responsa" given to Richard Ducket by Martin Pates. hull, who died in 1229. |
| f. 141. | Richardus Neale, Radulphus de Gray (corr. de Bray), vicarius de Gaine (corr. Vitalis Engayne). This comes from 1225; see Case 1673. Citation marginal in OA. |
| f. 144 b . | A man of Cookham. From Raleifh's time. Marginal in OA ; not in several other MSS. |

f. 183. An opinion of William of York. Before 1246 when he bccame Bishop.
f. 183. Case of Walter de L'Islc and Prior of Kenilworth, or perhaps (Br. f. 433 b ) of Wenlock. A marginal note, not in all MSS.
f. 194 b .

Thomas of Vipont. Probably a marginal note.
f. 207 b .
f. 212.
f. 261.
f. 270.
f. 275.
f. 285.
f. 285 b .
f. 290 b .
f. 292.
f. 293 b .
f. 302 b .
f. 307.
f. 309 .
f. 310 b .
f. 311 b .
f. 312.
f. 330 .
f. 350 .
f. 377 b .
f. 382 b .
f. 403 b .
f. 403.
f. 405.
f. 406.
f. 418.
f. 420 b .
f. 421 b .

Opinion of Pateshull as to disseisin.
A perambulation between the king and Richard Perey.
Ass. mort. ant. si Brianus. Case 47.
Case of Robert de la Zuehe.
Ass. mort. ant. si Eudo pater Walteri. Case 1875; from A.d. 1228.
Johannes de Daco. Case 1201.
Assisa utrum. Church of S. Mary, Oxford. From Miehaelmas 1253; see Coram Rege Roll No. 93, m. 32. In but very few MSS.

Henry de Movewedene. Case 1294.
de Alberto Comite Somers'. No such person as Albert Earl of Somerset.
Geoffrey of Mandeville. Attaint before the king at Woodstock in presence of Simon (corr. Stephen) Segrave, who died in 1241.
Consultation of Pateshull by Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester.
Consultation of Pateshull by bishop of Worcester.
Custom as to dower in York. Case 1889.
John of Braose, William of Braose.
Johannes de Herlezim de London. A case of 1221. See Liber de Antiquis Legibus (Camden Soc.) p. 5.
A Lincoln case. Alicia, T. de S. Licyo.
A Laneashire custom approved by Pateshull.
Hugo de Brock. An essoin case.
Thomas de Dunholm. Plea whieh followed the king; before Segrave.
Ordinance made on the occasion of the dedication of the Abbey of Hailes, 5 th Nov. 1251. Sce Mat. Par. vol. 5, p. 262.
Vaeancy of bishopric of Rochester. This occurred Feb. 1235-Nov. 1238.
Arehbishop Edmund called Saint. He died 16 Nov. 1240 ; was canonized 16 Dec. 1246.
Walter Muschet. Bastardy. See Case 299.
Consultation of Pateshull.
Adam of Aston. Judgment of Robert Lexington reversed by Pateshull.
Case before the king as to the heir of Herbert Fitz Pcter.
W. Burdon de Deseburgh, who marricd a nun.

| f. 422 b . | William Longsword, Earl of Salisbury. Sce Case 1235. |
| :---: | :---: |
| f. 421. | Countess de Lissle, W. de Creeure, W. de Honywell. |
| f. 427 b . | W. Earl Marshall and M. (corr. Ingelram) de Feynes owe allegiance to kings of France and England. The last person who can be described as W. Earl Marshall is Walter who died in 1245 . |
| f. 430. | Countess of Oxford and W. Blund. Case 1916. |
| f. 433 b . | Marginal note. Case of W. de L'Isle and Prior of Wenlock, or of (see Br. f. 182) Kenilworth. |
| f. 438. | Opinion of Segrave as to curtesy. |
| f. 438 b . | Raleigh devises a writ for Ralph of Dadescomb. |

## TABLE THE THIRD.

## 'TABLE OF FITZHERDERT'S CASES FROM THE REIGN OF HENRY THE THIRD, ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER AND IDENTIFIED WITH CASES IN THE NOTE BOOK.

## A.R. 2.

Mich. Age 149
Graunt 89
Prescription 59
Voucher 283
1306
1338
1349
1306
Hil.
l'asch.
Trin.
No term specified.
Dower 199
1335
Prohibicion 13
11
View 144
12
A.R. 3.

Mich.
Hil.
Pasch.
Essone 186
23
Trin.
No term specified.
Prescription 56
A.R. 4.

Mich.
Darren Present ment $22 \quad 100$ (Hil.)
A.R. 4.

Dower $179 \quad 110$ (Hil.)
Dower $180 \quad 96$ (Hil.)
Estrepement 12115 (Hil.)
Formedon $64 \quad 61$
Prohibicion 1448
Prohibicion $15 \quad 50$
Waste $129 \quad 56$
View $145 \quad 56$
Hil.
Pasch.
Trin.
Devise 261409
Prohibicion $28 \quad 1109$
Waste $140 \quad 1371$
Briefe 7661361
A.R. 5.

Mich.
Essone $187 \quad 309$
Hil.
Essone $196 \quad 1591$
(Hil. A.R. 7)
Prohibicion 29 1585
(Hil. A.R. 7)
Pasch.
Morlauncestor 531478 Trin.





## INDEX OF ACTIONS.

Note :-It is difficult to classify the English forms of action according to any one principle, because the traditional classification has undergone many gradual changes, e.g. an action which one age called 'real', another called 'personal' or 'mixed'. In making this Index I have thought more of the convenience of modern readers than of the legal logic of Bracton's day. Proceedings are here arranged under twelve heads:(i) Writs of Right, (ii) Dower, (iii) Writs of Entry, (iv) Assizes of Novel Disseisin and of Nuisance, (v) Assizes of Mort D'Ancestor, Nuper Obiit, Cosinage, (vi) Assizes Utrum, (vii) Assizes of Darrein Presentment, Quare impedit etc., (viii) Miscellaneous Proccedings, most of which are reckoned in later days as real or mixed actions, but some of which are closely allied to trespass, (ix) Personal Actions, including actions on Fines and Warrantia Cartae, (x) Criminal Proceedings, (xi) Proceedings of au Appellate Character, including Attaint, Error, False Judgment, etc., (xii) Prohibition.

## I.

Writs of Right.
Good examples. $10,17,40,86,102,141,185,212,243$, $393,400,488,551,671,851,867,895,950,980,1004$, $1105,1220,1436,1675,1935$.
Praecipe in capite. 10.
Little writ of right close. 834.
De rationabili parte. $8,332,508,510,635,653,702,795$, $934,959,1009,1023,1074,1127,1213,1565,1566$, 1663, 1707, 1708, 1748.
For customs and services. 107, 190, 197, 207, 242, 273, $441,468,482,497,586,608,624,655,664,666,727$, $747,753,772,784,789,869,895,960,1005,1045$, $1053,1063,1214,1225,1230,1279,1615,1616,1632$, 1687, 1704, 1738, 1747, 1765, 1782, 1966.
M. I.

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.
Whits of Right.
Of advowson. $89,111,114,199,248,262,272,329,416$, 488, 551, 569, 690, 693, 769, 853, 915, 1064, 1336, 1365, 1367, 1509, 1558, 1634, 1813.
Writ of right of ward. $33,236,266,288,349,505,643$, 661, 681, 695, 708, 731, 742, 758, 763, 812, 845, 860, 868, 873, 906, 908, 990, 1076, 1183, 1231, 1606, 1608, 1682, 1872.
Writ de rationabilibus divisis. 249, 445, 509, 534, 535, 590, 1485, 1521, 1547.
Procedure in the lord's court. 26, 40, 212, 1436, 1847.
Procedure in the county court. 40, 212, 243, 955, 1360, $1436,1513,1672$.
Pone. 445, 542, 556, 823, 1079, 1638, 1776.
Summons etc. $10,39,924,1458,1547,1667$.
Essoins. 20, 28, 54, 69, 118, 166, 175, 212, 288, 309, 353, 397, 404, 406, 418, 421, 441, 509, 579, 587, 609, 618, 621, 662, 735, 745, $746,760,858,886,896,922,923$, 926, 945, 954, 957, 958, 1019, 1039, 1050, 1052, 1059, 1086, 1116, 1291, 1369, 1385, 1450, 1481, 1484, 1513, 1575, 1577, 1591, 1611, 1637, 1642, 1901.
View. 8, 39, 119, 235, 315, 510, 534, 590, 595, 603, 936, $1055,1318,1323,1414,1509,1646$.
Default. $40,54,69,117,212,235,307,430,468,522,542$, 604, 614, 688, 735, 856, 924, 945, 958, 1003, 1082, 1266, 1301, 1318, 1385, 1399, 1538, 1587, 1602, 1612, 1626, 1634, 1672, 1710, 1737, 1901.
Warranty. 117, 141, 185, 413, 534, 562, 614, 615, 624, 634, 671, 689, 708, 889, 945, 1087, 1220, 1234, 1268, 1373, 1399, 1410, 1414, 144, 1695, 1717.
Count, examples of. $86,90,181,199,209,213,224,233$, $298,411,476,488,703,855,892,947,949,1040,1055$, 1336, 1360, 1365, 1395, 1578.
Pleas.
Non-tenure. 8, 102, 227, 322, 327, 364, 403, 452, 557, 656, 662, 681, 694, 846, 1067, 1164, 1220, 1229.

Non-joinder. 181, 227, 676, 726, 800, 1010, 1031, 1044, 1057, 1351, 1437, 1584, 1663, 1708, 1748, 176.1, 1933.

Infancy. 46, 1442.
Ancient demesnc. 6 62.
Kinship. 230, 315, 358, 554, 637, 980, 982, 1048, 1360, 1630, 1678.
Finc. 147, 302, 403, 715, 716, 831, 849, 853, 991, 1095, 1427, 1558, 1621.
Feoffment. 224, 250, 272, 393, 467, 671, 848.

The numbers refer to the cases not to the payes.
Writs of Right.
Pleas.
Quit-claim. 386.
Jus tertii. 61, 227, 213, 662, 676, 1001.
Bastardy. 228, 257, 303, 1229.
Limitation. 280.
Long possession. 507.
Varions. 114, 226, 232, 283, 416, 650, 702, 807, 905, 1233, 1400.
Mise, examples of. $112,170,180,197,209,242,329,379$, 476, 809, 1001, 1628.
Grand assize. 17, 53, 84, 112, 114, 118, 120, 180, 197, 248, $251,262,329,411,535,554,569,615,671,715,769$, $772,789,809,831,816,950,960,1018,1089,1225$, $1336,1486,1558,1569,1625,1630,1681,1694,1701$, $1705,1715,1738,1751,1759,1764,1800,1819,1865$, 1866, 1905, 1938, 1943, 1944.
Battle. 26, 53, 102, 180, 185, 243, 328, 400, 551, 554, 634, 895, 980, 1082, 1360, 1427, 1568, 1672, 1675, 1678, 1717, 1754, 1764.
Trial by Jury. $17,33,170,242,278,292,608,634,772$, 89.), 1004, 1225, 1568, 1678, 1694, 1715, 1717, 1738, 1779, 1819.

## II.

Dower.
Examples. 4, 18, 154, 191, 253, 767, 941, 968, 1919.
Pro dote nominata. $106,156,377,457,914,1027,1083$, $1525,1603,1824,1963$.
Unde nihil habet. $83,101,108$.
Against husband's feoffee. $156,571,633,877,941,1083$, $1102,1413,1525,1683,1736,1821,1963$.
Procedure.
Summons. 7, 738, 1313, 15s0.
Essoin. 267, 437.
Default. $7,124,267,560,573,738,938,972$, 1091, 1320, 1372, $1455,1649,1741,1751$.
View. 129, 109., 1093, 1305, 1375, 1456.
Warranty. $191,284,436,491,558,560,571,573,605,633$, $658,712,714,738,767,852,968,1024,1083,157!$, $1580,1603,1668,1683,1700,1728,1736,17$ [1, 17 [9, 1821.

Pleas.
Misnomer. sss.
Non-tenure. $98, \pm 70$.
Non-joinder. 611, 1939.

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.
Dower.
Pleas.
Husband alive. 163, 356, 374, 455, 502, 545, 898, 1307, 1586, 1595.
Never married. 98, 324, 642, 647, 944, 1142, 1669.
Another claimant. 1142, 1703.
No warrantor. 71, 195, 730, 882, 904, 938, 1314, 1321, 1341.
Divorce. 1027, 1564.
Dower already assigned. 66, 83, 108.
Husband not seised. 814, 970, 994, 1002, 1098, 1970.

Not so endowed. 91, 192, 204, 220, 265, 345, 377, 457, 518, 721, 953, 1065, 1434, 1919.
Not endowed at church door. $1669,1718,1875$.
Capital messuage. 1007, 1042.
Caput baronie. 96 .
Villeinage. 591, 794, 1531.
Estoppel. 861, 1011, 1459.
Excessive dower. 1355.
Various. 160, 184, 279, 459, 466, 714, 931, 937, 965, 1008, 1396, 1573.
Jury. 154, 192, 721, 794, 953, 1335, 1603, 1919.
Admeasurement of dower. 150, 365, 632, 1107.

## III.

Whits of Extry.
Sur disseisin. $76,131,372,383,434,493,872,993,1133$, 1405, 1883.
Sur intrusion. $140,208,774,1222$.
Ad terminum qui praeteriit. $57,133,171,183,186,188$, $234,313,323,359,425,451,499,575,641,650,663$, $669,686,751,761,787,790,1419,1488,1490,1619$, $1750,1868,1869$.
Cui in vita. $203,233,290,294,363,389,483,525,528$, $572,679,736,816,15: 0,1756,1769,1863,1888,1889$, 1929, 1981.
Sur cui in vita. 22, 60.
Cui ante divortium. 836 .
Ad communem legem. $146,385,487,601,682,733,822$, 918, 996, 1073.
on alienation by a villein, 713.
on alienation by a bastard who dies without issue, 402.
on alienation by one to whom king has granted year
day and waste, 462, 597.
Dum fuit infra etatem. $342,440,517,596,893,977$, 1099, 1936.

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.
Whits of Entry.
Dum non fuit compos mentis. 354.
Sine assensu capituli. 866.
Sine assensu conventus. 1727.
Procedure.
Summons. 1869.
Essoin. 140, 208, 483, 663, 1222, 1550.
Default. 48:3, 663, 1222.
View. $140,517,572,663,1550$.
Warranty. 203, 290, 342, 525, 528, 663, 679, 893, 918, $1302,1405$.
Pleas.
Non-tenure. 389, 483, 499, 597, 641, 686, 1133.
Title. 188, 234, 359, 363, 425, 451, 493, 528, 575, 641, 663, 669, 679, 774, 787, 790, 918, 1133, 1488, 1490, 1619.
Limitation. 186, 234, 402, 499, 1889.
Estoppel. 872.
Proof of entry. 57, 188, 233, 234, 425, 451, 575, 751, 761, 790, 816, 1868.
Trial by battle. 234, 893 .
Grand assize. $323,363,402,499,787,918,1488,1490$, 1750, 1756.
Jury. 131, 146, 188, 359, 669, 686, 751, 893, 1769.

## IV.

Assize of Norel Disseisis,
for Common. 80, 336, 360, 1194, 1197, 1208, 1274, 1284, 1820, 1975.
for Rent. 338, 1205, 1239, 1844, 1890.
for a Fishery. 1915.
for suit to a Mill. 1979.
Procedure.
Attachment, etc. 1778, 1815.
Tiew by Jurors. 1192.
Default. 1033, 1204, 1223, 1239, 1247, 1252, 1778, 1791, 1795, 1802, 1890.
Warranty. 371, 1153, 1950.
Pleas.
Non-tenure. 1826, 1864, 1874.
Non-joinder. 1798.
Death of a defendant. 336, 180s, 1826, 1890.
Ancient demesne. 1973.
No seisin of free tenement. $270,291,428,429,617$, 780, 1191, 1240, 1241, 1731, 1801, 1838, 1978, 1979.

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Assize of Noyel Disseisin.
Pleas.
Entry under judgment. 1195, 1297, 1667, 1793, 1836.

No assize by lord against tenant. 1861.
Villeinage. 281, 1030, 1203, 1242, 1812, 1885, 1887, 1914.
Trial by jury. 825, 1150, 1251, 1256, 1290, 1793, 1885, 1887, 1891, 1894, 1899, 1924.
Assize turned into perambulation. 907.
Assize proceeds. 318, 339, 360, 428, 471, 617, 779, 781, $885,985,1032,1033,1147,1149,1193,1194,1239,1241$, $1242,1245,1246,1247,1258,1259,1260,1261,1284$, $1470,1471,1791,1792,1794,1796,1797,1809,1814$, 1815, 1816, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1861, 1886, 1890, 1892, 1893, 1895, 1904, 1906, 1907, 1910, 1911, 1922, 1925, 1946, 1949, 1965, 1974, 1975, 1976. Vicontiel writ. 469.
Assize of Nulsance.
Instances. 701, 806, 1081, 1196, 1253, 1785, 1804, 1953.

## V.

As ize of Mort D'Ancestor.
On death of father. $47,59,77,225$, etc.
,, ", mother. 1476,1773,1849,1877,etc.
", ", brother. 196, 271, 299, 370, etc.
,, ,. sister. 659, 1128, 1475, 1857, etc.
,, ,, uncle. $44,93,123,144$, etc.
On death in pilgrimage. 196, 271, 306, 1148, 1397, 1787.
On entering religion. 1850.
l'roccdure.
Summons, etc. 1311, 1803, 1832, 1856, 1879, 1956, 1959.
Essoin. 24, 370, 1799.
Dcfault. 370, 878, 1293, 1306, 1311, 1348, 1807, 1832, 1855, 1856, 1879, 1909, 1956

The numbers refer to the cases not to the payes.
Assize of Mort D'Ancestor.
Warranty. $30,42,43,47,77,190,331,387,734,833,1157$, $1293,1306,1394,1476,1508,1529,1557,1722,1803$, $1827,1849,1570,1576,1898,1917,1927,1931,1948$, 1954.
l'arol denumring. $30,43,331,336,4 \div 1,1247,1508,1557$, $1722,1774,1775,1783,1827,1849,1870,1898,1948$, 195ั, 1954, 1957, 1958.
l'leas.
Non-tenure. 37, 292, 326, 421, 729, 870, 986, 987, 1465, 1479, 1781, 1787, 1955, 1963, 1977.
Non-joinder. 1571.
I am next heir. 1475, 1829, 1952.
He is not dead. 1805.
He did not die seised. 1462, 1487, 1770, 1818, 1823, 1851, 1853, 1912, 1971.
You have been seised. 1397, 1773.
Kinship. 44, 299, 326, 833, 1128, 1161, 1480, 1784, 1830, 1858, 1884, 1927, 1954.
Bastardy. $1780,1859,1917,1927,1962$.
Fine. 93, 123, 799, 1881.
Feofiment. 250, 331, 1487.
Limitation. 340, 1877.
Other litigation is proceeding. 1789, 1967.
Villeinage. 343, 1833.
Jus tertii. 1311, 1821, 1852, 1878, 1881, 1903.
Various. 37, 45, 282, 1176, 1766, 1822.
Assize proceeds. $45,144,225,250,306,870,879,984,1348$, 1477, 1770, 1821, 1853, 1855, 1876, 1877, 1879, 1909, 1912, 1931, 1948, 1959, 1963.
Trial by jury. 87, 250, 282, 1572, 1722, 1833, 1951.
Nuper Obitr.
Instances. 12, 1357.
Cosinage.
Instance. 1215.

## VI.

Assize Urruar.
Instances. 21, 55, 179, 285, 308, 368, 539, 841, 887, 1020, $1025,1156,1359,1430,1555,1790,1845,1924,1980$.

## VII.

Assize of Darrein Presentuent.
Examples. 40, 51, 69, 172, 260, 310, 516, 798, 820, 983, $1035,1070,1238,1312,1416,1452,1542,1607$.

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.
Assize of Darrein Presentment.
Procedure.
Resummons. 5, 6, 155, 427, 759, 1190, 1319, 1491, 1536.
Essoin. 5, 6, 427, 1028.
Default. 139, 155, 261, 427, 759, 765, 1028, $1172,1190,1391,1454,1469,1491,1556$, 1685, 1686, 1755.
Warranty. $310,516,648,1295,1685$.
Pleas.
Plenarty. 1, 51, 58, 173, 187, 300, 304, 305, 310, $636,864,928,983,1300,1312,1339,1352,1354$, $1415,1545,1684$.
Fine. 344, 481, 1618, 1686.
Charters. 1, 51, 72, 97, 100, 172, 173, 211, 243, $260,305,406,480,516,523,648,820,928,1196$, $1295,1379,1387,1635,1685,1686,1697,1731$, 1758.

Plaintiff never seised. 49, 91.
Estoppel. 912.
Various. 519, 798, 1469.
Intervention of third party. $5,6,1072,1196,1238$.
Assize proceeds. $72,97,187,305,319,376,515,636,765$, $813,983,1028,1072,1163,1339,1364,1469,1570$, $1653,1684,1685,1697,1744,1755,1762,1928$.
Trial by jury. 205, 243, 1070.
Trial by charters. 1, 412.
Quare mpedit, Quare non permisit, Quare non admisit.
Instances. $34,74,111,142,182,255,276,350,355,357$, $395,423,426,438,474,625,644,692,724,782,785$, $793,797,1006,1166,1219,1418,1594,1726,1760,1831$.

## VIII.

De natido habenio, De libertate probanda.
Instances. $70,1005,1167,1828,1934$. See also 1041, 1162.
Ejectment of warb, Ravishaent of ward, etc.
Instances. $178,195,256,687,1232,1263,1278,1280,1283$, $12 \mathrm{~s} 6,1520,1660,1709$.
Mesne.
Instances. $275,362,390,506,674,811,838,849,1043$, 1211.

Monstrauerunt.
Instances. 1230, 1237.
I'irquae serticia.
Instances. $236,369,593,598,627,773,948,1622$.
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Quare capit tholoneum.
Instances. 16, 145, 1123, 1188, 1250, 1720.
Quare cepit excambium.
Instances. 512, 612.
Quale hefonchat.
Instances. 82, 321, 394, 559, 583, 666, 916, 1151, 13×1, $1406,1417,1740,1712$.
Quare instringit.
Instances. $660,773,791,1049,1110,1277$.
Quare nuxit in cxorem.
Instances. 1090, 1278, 1596.
Quare medecit.
Instance. 1140.
QCare exigit.
Instance. 1679.
Quare finem fecit.
Instances. $584, \mathbf{1 3 6 3}, 1589,1706$.
Quare intrusit.
Instances. $312,566,639,697,1104,1174,1439,1441,1554$, $1629,1746$.
Quare lecuelt furcas.
Instance. 1114.
Quare maritadit.
Instance, 1280.
Quare permisit se maritari.
Instance. 1286.
Quare se facit impregnatam.
Instances, 137, 198, 1503, 1605.
Quare tenet mercatca.
Instances. $494,578,786,1283$.
Quare trahit in placitún.
Instances. $374,384,498,1650$.
Quare tulit assisam.
Instance. 1411.
Quid juris clamat.
Instances. $121,126,295,581,713,727,929,967,1034$, 1182, 1581, 1583, 1729, 1747.
Quo June.
Instances. $\quad 193,223,274,330,392,433,561,606,628,673$, $709,720,803,818,909,914,942,971,974,1588,1624$, $1628,1721$.
Quo Warranto.
Brought by the king. $241,268,391,422,440,578,581,750$, $840,862,930,1066,1111,1119,1162,1224,1271,1272$, $1274,1275,1288,1666$.
Brought by a subject. 35, 95, 219, 253, 501, 1013, 1014, $1108,1136,1141,1175,1181,1296,1358,1390,1512,1846$.
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Quod capiat homagium.
Instances. 41, 53, 168, 967, 1374, 1438, 1620.
Quod fermittat.
Instances. 685, 1930.
Secta ad molempinem.
Iustances. 161, 504.
Waste.
Instances. $27,56,115,388,443,461,485,527,540,574$, $580,607,632,640,691,717,718,739,880,1075,1131$, 1165, 1304, 1371, 1617, 1743.

## IX.

Warrantia cartae.
Instances. 116, 237, 297, 419, 486, 495, 503, 526, 531, 538, $594,620,657,749,804,837,964,966,969,979,1000$, 1001, 1097, 1398, 1401, 1566, 1559, 1633, 1648, 1659, 1665, 1771, 1811, 1835, 1880, 1881, 1900.
De fine facto.
Instances. 2, 125, 158, 169, 200, 254, 296, 311, 361, 396, 417, 438, 446, 447, 454, 463, 478, 496, 520, 546, 563, $672,700,973,992,1015,1101,1186,1386,1433,1443$, 1457, 1511, 1514, 1526, 1579, 1631, 1647, 1652, 1690, 1777, 1834, 1867.
Coyenant.
Instances. 36, 167, 581, 613, 638, 792, 804, 805, 890, 1058, 1129, 1378, 1549, 1656, 1702, 1739.
Accocert.
Instances. 796, 859.
Debt.
Instances. 52, 177, 325, 352, 381, 568, 645, 732, 776, 801, $830,897,900,901,924,936,946,963,1324,1421,1422$, 1543, 1574, 1610, 1693, 1969.
Detinue.
Instances. 194, 202, 832, 936, 1366. See also 1115.
Replevin.
Instances. 78, 157, 333, 477, 616, 677, 773, 842, 883, 1049, $1062,1146,1407$.
Trespass.
Instances. 85, 287, 314, 378, 465, 567, 616, 821, 835, 839, 843, 1041, 1121, 1232, 1520, 1735.
Conspiracy (?) 479.

## X.

Criminal proceedings.
Appeal.
Of homicide. $138,490,918,1137,1460,1548$, $1600,1711$.

The numbers reger to the cases not to the pages.

## Criminal hroceemings.

Appeal.
Of wounds. $134,259,511,548,592,943,1697$.
Of mashem. $\quad 346,1084$.
Of larceny. 135, 824, 1159, 1431, 1435, 1417, 1517, 1539, 1597, 1692.
Of robbery. 484, 699, 723, 1368, 1424, 1456, 1664.

Of coining. 1.533.
Indictment. $67,136,588,705,1031,1453,1172,1473,1474$, 1517. See also $1723,1725$.

## XI.

Celitifichte.
Instances. 63, 371, 382, 431, 771, 856, 1144, 1209, 1265, 1281, 1928.
Attant.
Instances. $151,174,262,285,301,513,524,530,778,899$, $917,933,1046,1209,1265,1294$.
Recordart faclas.
Instances. $15,26,40,185,213,243,281,318,512,530$, $554,592,824,871,917,976,1069,1077,1115,1138$, $1146,1159,1285,1393,1406,1436,1441,1513,1539$.
Error.
Instances. $564,1166$.
False Judgment.
Instances. $40,445,511,592,824,834,955,1019,1122$, $1342,1412,1436,1672$.

## XII.

## Prohbition to Court Christhan.

Lay fee. $11,50,73,79,132,221,407,442,444,464,547$, $552,576,610,626,629,665,722,755,762,788,802$, $817,865,910,1073,1143,1402,1403,1404,1409,1420$, 1464, 1561, 1680.
Adrowson. 62, 64, 143, 350, 453, 539, 537, 725, 799, 874, 918, 1388.
Chattels. $48,130,162,210,293,341,351,423,544,555$, $570,599,646,649,670,678,683,684,756,762,766$, $768,808,810,847,875,877,1361,1370,1423,1467$, $1585,1599$.
Fidei laesio. 50, 599, 670, 792, 1361, 1464.
Debts. 152, 162, 550, 719, 810.
Matrimonial causes. $341,442,550,570,629,646,683$.
Testamentary causes. $550,756,810,847,1409$.
Indicauit. 799, 874.

## INDEX OF THINGS.
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Abandonment of action, 131, 643, $765,790,798,820,823$
Abatement, see Intrusion.
Abatement of action by death, 432 , $440,663,689,894,1425,1437$, 1499
Abatement of nuisance, 700,1081
Abbot and Monk, $3 \ddagger 1$
Abduction of wife, 1597
Abeyance, 12
Abjuration, 67, 938, 1137, 1179, 1180, 1296, 1431, 1723
Absence beyond seas, $93,123,302$, 403, 716, 1779
Absolution ordered, 670, 766, 817, 1143,138 ?, 1671
Accessories, 1469, 1548, 1600, 1711
Acquiescence, $154,182,200,205$, $379,558,959,1126,1434,1913$
Action, wrong form of, 1656
Actions, classification of as real and personal, 803
Actions, order of, 31, 37, 94, 99, 122, $157,240,416,-162,692,829,846$, $1000,1077,1091,1176,1233,1519$, $1573,1601,1789,1835,1945,1967$
Admcasurement of pasture, 1130
Adultery punished, 753
Advancement, 1018
Advocate of a priory, 248, 525
Advowson, 49, 91, 97, 114, 305, 322, $39.5,423,426,515,536,644,797$, $820,1015,1064,1240,1395,1509$, 1578, 1618, 1726, 1731

Age, for fighting, 1548
Age, full in socage, 1847, 1899, 1957
Age, procf of full, 46, 687, 1131, 1362
Agency, 873
Aid, granted by tenants, 1146
Aid, feudal, 506, 792, 1146
Alien, $110,730,750,1220,1396$
Alienation, covenant against, 18,36 , $419,543,680$
Alienation, power of, $105,386,401$, $566,617,631,930,944,1054,1102$, 1248, 1289, 1665
Alienation, by tenant for life, 1470
Alienation by a bastard, 402, 1289, 1706
Alienation, lord's consent to, or confirmation of, $428,627,660,947$, $1070,1248,1607,1616,1665$
Alienation, fraudulent, to aroid action, $483,8.16,1024$
Amends, tender of, 1199
Amercement generally, 28, 54, 79, $213,214,360,391,427,489$, $770,798,1149,1159,1170,1191$, $1239,1249,1623,1794,1890$
of franchise court, 821,834
of county, $40,168,185,1130,1412$, 1436
of sheriff, 10,40
of justices, 67, 530,564
of pleader, 298
Ancient demesne, 292, 652, 83t, 907, $951,1099,1122,1230,1231,1237$,
$1400,1524,1973$
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'Anefang', 824
Anglo-Saxon charters pleaded, 1628, 1716
Annuity, 52, 438
Appeal by woman, 1600
Appellant must have seen the crime, 723,1597
Appellant must be one injured, 857, 1664
Appraisement, 365
Approvement of common, 1261, 1881, 1975
Approver, 135, 821, 1159, 1431, 1447, $1472,1517,1692,1723,1763$
Appurtenances, 322, 395, 403, 426, 454, 504, 681, 1015, 1064, 1236, 1433,1726
Arbitration, 649, 732, 983
Archbishop, appeal to, 647
Archdeacon, 255, 324, 366, 544, 547, 1312
Arrest, see Imprisonment.
Assets, 525, 563, 571, 633, 638, 748, $852,944,961,1024,1234,1525$, $1652,1683,1736$
Assignment of contract, 804
Assigns, 106, 332, 617, 804, 867, 1289,1906
Assize must be taken in county, 1478
Assize, justices of, 213, 214, 281, 318, $367,428,430,431,512,530,564$, $777,829,871,894,917,976,1061$, $1232,1285,1478,1716$
Assize of bread and beer, 842, 1110, 1292
Astrarius, 230, 892, 951, 982, 988, 1830
Attorney, 41, 113, 118, 120, 173, 231, $395,492,532,651,661,764,788$, $866,932,941,953,1047,1088$, $1266,1306,1310,1537,1546,1566$, $1575,1591,1642,1658$
Attorney, infant's, 1387
Attornment, 126, 338, 398, 524, 533, 541, 586, 627, 856, 1087, 1135, $1148,1169,1277,1344,1616,1796$, 1940, 1966

Bail, none for homicide, 1716
Baron, essoin of, 1637
Barony, 96, 501, 1182, 1276, 1284, 1390
Bastardizing the dead, 1160, 1181
Bastardy, 31, 121. 180, 227, 228, 243, 257, 287, 299, 315, 358, 394, 619, $662,984,1175,1229,1475,1554$, $1620,1706,1811,1859,1879,1909$, 1927, 1962
Bastardy, ordinance touching, 1117
Battle, trial by, 2, 26, 40, 47,53, 65, $102,243,259,316,634,893,895$, 914, 980, 1006, 1019, 1082, 109\%, $1226,1360,1393,1412,1427,1436$, $1548,1619,1672,1717,1754,1764$, 1936, 1961
Battle actually fought, $147,164,185$, $328,363,400,551,815,1159,1336$, 1435, 1447, 1469, 1675
Bedell, 1230
Bench, the, $92,208,243,268,318$, $354,367,382,439,530,680,735$, $1079,1107,1116,1166,1189,1190$, 1269, 1412, 1681, 1846
Bezants, rent reserved in, 350, 990
Bishop, appeal to, 544, 766
Bishop, certificate of legitimacy, 243, 299
Bishop, certificate of marriage, 324, 642, 647, 944, 1142
Bishop, certificate of plenarty, 111, $139,173,296,300,304,516,625$, $675,864,928,1312$
Bishop, consultation with, 1389
Bishop must produce clerk, 276, 407, $438,537,576,722,801,802,865$, 1368, 1463
Bishop, process against, 1402
Blanch ferm, 66
Bloodwite, 753
Boar, free, 881
Boon works, $916,960,1005,1103$, 1661
Borsholder, 821
Borough, see Municipal Bodies.
Boundaries, disputed, 249, 445, 509,

## The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

534, 535, 590, 781, 1021, 1257, 1521
Botes, 56, 254, 311, 632, 672, 685, 749
Bread, assize of, $842,1110,1292$
Bread, prohibition against sale of, 827, 1282
Bread, tax on sale of, 666
Bull, free, 881
Burgage, devisable, 11, 73

Cambridge, chancellor of, 722
Cancellation of forged or fraudulent deeds, $250,286,342,412,934,976$, 1589, 1706
Capital messuage, 1007, 1042, 1390
Capons, rent reserved in, 1665
Carta, Magna, 513, 1213, 1215, 1220, 1227, 1248, 1478, 1730
Castle-guard, 275
Cell of monastery, $5,6,1715$
Challenge of jurors, 806
Champion, 2, 39, 65, 116, 164, 185, $234,243,328,400,551,554,634$, $856,893,895,955,980,1019,1038$, $1082,1095,1360,1412,1416,1427$, $1436,1672,1675,1687,1754,1764$, 1935
Chancellor, 397, 1545, 1847
Chancery, 76, 1173
Chantry, 1200
Chapel, $112,187,300,329,350,357$, $376,625,693,769,874,1006,1312$, 1377
Charter, see Carta.
Chase, 806
Chattel real, 73, 559
Chester, county of, $505,876,1127$, 1213, 1227, 1273
Childwite, 753
Chirograph, 344, 448, 586, 619, 831, $976,1380,1690$
Chirograph amended, 417
'Church', grant of a, 1418
Church, Mother-, 625, 693, 769, 1006
Church and State, relation between, $351,355,391,741,770$

Churchyard, 75.)
Civil death, 455 , 1057, 1139, 1586, 1594, 1920
Clergy, benefit of, $355,490,548,588$, 1453
Clerk, assault on, 444, 766
Clerks of the Bench, 382, 1577
Clerks, actions between, 719, 808, 1583
Clerks, marriage of, 1245,1917
Clerk, process against, $143,276,338$, $407,576,801,802,865,1368$
Cognizance, claim of, $314,548,577$, $589,622,952,1205,1381,1598$, 1678
Coining, 1533
Common, 80, 174, 193, 223, 254, 274, $330,336,392,433,469,547,561$, $628,673,709,720,749,817,818$, $839,909,914,962,971,1078,1097$, $1155,1194,1196,1197,1198,1218$, $1253,1274,1284,1417,1582,1588$, $1624,1628,1721,1804,1881,1885$, 1915, 1975
Common Pleas, 1213, 1220
Common, tenants in, 1939, 1947
Condition, 172, 270, 964, 1200, 1607, 1965
Conditional gifts, see Fee conditional.
Confession of villeinage, 1411
Confirmation, 199, 250, 467, 660, $1258,1274,1555$
Conquest, Norman, title from pleaded, 906,1237
Conquest, Norman, as period of prescription, $34,223,274,392,422$, $582,628,818,835,843,909,971$, 1271, 1272, 1621
Conspiracy, 479
Contempt of Court, 464
Contract confirmed by oath, 1671, 1893
Contract, how proved, 68, 86, 177, $287,645,663,732,830,890,897$, $1129,1358,1543,1549,1846,1935$
Contract, principles of, $18,50,167$. 482, 581, 613, 653, 749, 792, 804,

## The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

873, 890, 937, 1129, 1223, 1378, $1426,1526,1656,1806,1846$
Contribution, 447
Cornage, 1270, 1715
Cornwall, county of, claim to hold in fee, 1512, 1666
Coroner, 138, 514, 842, 1016, 1019, 1623
Corruption of blood, 862
Costs, 439, 544, 1430
Council, common of the realm, 1171, $1215,1217,1273$
Council, king's, 12, 67, 73, 81, 110, 167, 354, 741, 743, 857, 1108, 1117, $1133,1172,1189,1190,1220,1221$, 1235, 1273, 1306, 1309, 1396, 1585, 1593, 1639
Count countant, 1383
County, see Court, County.
Court Baron, 2, 26, 39, 277, 384, 531, 773, 824, 1030, 1115, 1297, 1436, $1616,1619,1681,1767,1847,1916$
Court, Counts, $40,67,136,168,185$, 191, 212, 234, 243, 445, 497, 513, $554,585,911,955,1019,1077$, $1130,1146,1189,1269,1360,1383$, $1406,1412,1436,1471,1672,1681$, 1711, 1730, 1766, 1776
Court, Hundred, 78, 197, 242, 249, $445,700,775,842,1110,1115$, $1159,1187,1711,1713,1730$
Coverture, see Husband and Wife.
Crops, bequeathed, 221, 847, 1409
Crops, distrained, 1207
Crown, see King.
Crown, deseent of, pleaded, 199
Crusaders, mortgages by, 183, 1770
Crusaders, privileges of, 59, 942, 1377
Curia elaudenda, 1661
Curtesy, 266, 291, 319, 413, 487, 566, $779,917,1071,1182,1425,1686$, 1771, 1774, 1801, 1921
Customary eourse of agriculture, 1662
Customary tenants, 995
Customs, local, 9, 11, 233, 263, 278, $282,294,589,623,666,779,834$,
$951,988,990,1023,1338,1436$, $1441,1473,1644,1662,1888,1889$, 1899, 1902, 1981

Damage essential to nuisance, 494
Damage feasant, 1680
Damages, 165, 285, 318, 348, 352, $390,401,477,506,781,917,1104$, $1129,1145,1187,1281,1283,1423$, 1512, 1867, 1896
Deaf-mute, 413
Dean and Chapter, 866
Death-bed gift, 104, 109, 142, 144, 211, 1187, 1818, 1850, 1865, 1866, 1876, 1971
Debt, 152, 162, 325, 381, 568, 756, $810,1361,1543,1574,1610,1693$
Debts cannot be bequeathed, 550,684 , 810
Debts, payment of, out of lands, 1554
Deceit, 10, 107, 168, 208, 296, 500, $645,1173,1184,1629,1690,1747$, 1924, 1931, 1946
Deed, see Seal and Writing.
Deed, enrolled, 1171
Deed, lost, 323
Defamation, 629
Demesne, 370, 379, 671, 704, 83f, 838, 841, 1025, 1436, 1465, 1717, 1790
Departure in pleading, $3,86,105,152$, 471, 851, 921, 1627
Descent, Canons of
Whole and half blood, 32, 44, 797, $833,834,855,955,1128$
Representation of dead parents, 90 . $230,892,968,982,1185,1830$
Nephew and uncle of dead man, 1297
Gavelkind rule, 154, 499, 703, 704, $795,959,1009,1023,1048,1074$, $1565,1663,1770$
Borough-English rule, 79t, 100:5, 1062
Other customary rules, $951,98.8$
Possessio fratris, 855, 1128
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Descent, Canons of
Lord and heir, 61, 564, 637, 774, 869, 949, 1105, 1244, 1694, 1857
Devise, 11, 79, 867, 1206, 1906
Diligence in litigation, 883
Disarowal of tenure, 1063, 1277, 1687
Disclaimer of seignory, $563,674,838$
Discretion of the Court (consilium curiae), 273, 785, 786, 900, 940, 1376
Disscisin, what, 338, 371, 469, 781, $856,1021,1032,1199,1204,1205$, 1208, 1239, 1242, 1246, 1257, 1261, 1297, 1794, 1840, 1864, 1891, 1904, 1925, 1965
Disseisin by justices, 1445
Disseisin ox, 277
Disseisor, who, 367, 617, 854, 1191, $1243,1258,1890,1897$
Disseisor disseised, 360, 1731, 1801
Distress, 2, 78, 202, 270, 273, 333, $390,477,513,1049,1199,1207$, 1623
Distress, power of, 126, 439
Distress, sale of, 1623
Divoree, 341, 550, 574, 690, 830, 931, 1027, 1565
Dower, generally, 4, 18, 96, 148, 150, 191, 204, 279, 345, 365, 377, 571, 632, 749, 794, 814, 878, 891, 941, $944,953,965,970,1007,1008,1026$, 1083, 1098, 1193, 1246, 1334, 1390, 1413, 1525, 1589, 1824, 1919, 1963
Dower of after aequired lands, 970 , 977, 1531
Dower ex assensu, 4, 91, 220, 265, $502,518,721,737,972,1335$
Dower, excessive, 1355
Dower of a moiety, 7, 124, 253, 459, 475, 500, 577, 591, 622, 623, 642, 721, 758, 767, 1080, 16668, 1843
Dower of the whole, 1902
Dower in gavelkind, 9, 1338, 1644
Dower of advowson, 109, 261, 380, 1592
Dower of wardships ete., 695
Dower forficited, 1873

Dower, appraisement of, 148, 203, 632
Dower out of dower, 1008, 1017
Dower, lands of church, 547, 841
Doweress, fine of, 1516
Duress, 182, 200, 229, 243, 342, 750, 1126, 1643, 1913
Durlam, palatinate of, 1096, 1213
Earl, third penny of county, 633, 1036
Earl, how enfeoffed of countr, 1036
Easement, 720, 843
Eels, rent reserved in, 624
Election between actions, 347, 1233
Emblements, 1193, and see Botes.
Enfranchisement of land, 1245, 1771
Enfranchisement of villein, 343,1749 , 1814
English language, 1582, 1644
Escheat, 402, 420, 462, 487, 503, 519, $566,597,750,840,862,1175,1184$, $1220,1275,1334,1510,1644,1794$
Esplees, 780, 1256, 1816, 1865, 1866
Esplees of a chureh, 1928
Estates, limitation of, 77, 86, 151, 250, 331, 375, 429, 487, 631, 778, $779,855,948,968,1074,1851$, 1912, 1921, 1960
Estoppel, 74, 243, 291, 307, 316, 350, 394, 409, 460, 669, 680, 704, 747, 829, 861, 1011, 1181, 1195, 1235, 1273, 1436, 1620, 1667
Estray, 1115
Evidence pleaded (et hoe bene patet quia), 612, 669, 679, 959, 979, 1011, $1224,1565,1616,1663$
Eyre, justices in, 20, 21, 67, 92, 201, 281, 1069, 1280, 1412, 1413, 1620, 1681
Eyre, summons of, 18.56
Examination of secta, 424, 1115, 1693
Exchange, 169, 528, 633, 634, 780, 852, 1214, 1268, 1616, 1845
Exchequer, 33, 503, 519, 1095, 1554, 1665
Exchequer, batons of 25, 1554, 1665
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Excommunication, 48, 444, 544, 552, $646,670,766,817,1143,1361$, 1388, 1403, 1680
Executor, 52, 162, 381, 412, 550, 559, $756,810,1409,1441$
Exhumation of dead body, 514
False imprisonment, 405
False oath, 500, 917, 1209, 1510, 1895
FaIse suggestion, 1184
Fama patriae, 705, 8.57
'Father to the bough,' 1644
Fealty, 441, 524, 924, 1205
Fee conditional, 77, 86, 105, 151, $250,331,375,429,487,566,631$, $948,968,1124,1200,1244,1260$, 1569, 1851, 1921, 1960
'Fee' implies inheritance, 411
Felony, 1184, 1275, 1334, 1599, 1644, 1687
Feme covert, see Husband and Wife.
Feoffment, 45, 144, 224, 250, 323, 375, $754,825,870,1169,1258,1505$, 1843, 187\%. See Seisin.
Feoffment of lord by tenant, 354
Feoffment to hold of chief Iord, 627 , 779, 947, 984, 1616, 1924
Fidei laesio, 50, 351, 670, 683, 1361, 1464, 1671, 1893
Fieri facias, 352, 506, 613, 732, 837, $900,925,1187$
Finality of proceedings, 374, 384, 498, 583, 1235
Fine (as means of conveyance), 125, $127,189,254,403,446,448,546$, $627,672,715,778,948,1095,1223$, 1589
Fine and non-claim, 18, 93, 123, 147, $302,316,403,566,716,831,853$, 991, 1011, 1427, 1558, 1618, 1621, $1779,1800,1821$
Fine by disseisor, 1012
Fine by infant, 171, 183, 189, 200, 1884
Fine by married woman, 419, 566, $1171,1650,1690$
Fine made in county court, 147,168 , 180, 316

Fine made in court baron, 26,992 , $1223,1616,1619$
Fine, fraudulent, 107, 168, 584, 97t, 1186, 1589, 1629, 1706, 1747
Finis duelli, 147, 168, 316, 363, 815, $8.51,103 \%, 1619$
Firma Burgi, 1640
Fishery, 616, 666, 700, 835, 839, 1255, 1915
Flemings, lands of, 1220
Flight, forfeiture for, 1216
Forest, 80, 254, 440
Forester, appointed to prevent waste, 56, 67:
Forfeiture, 67, 107, 398, 401, 1173, 1216, 1644
Forgery, 102, 187, 222, 412, 934, 110.5, 1847
' Fork and flail,' tenure by, 1419
Fornication punished, 753,1179
Franchise
Bailiff of, 20, 28, 435, 1218, 1406, 1436, 1443
Courts, 277, 513, 592, 655, 1154, $1406,1436,1551,1598,1676$, 1716
Return of writs, 20, 38, 277, 435, $520,722,1218,1436,1443$
Toll, 16, 145, 1188, 1250, 1720
Frankalmoign, 21, 594, 660, 755, 758, $808,1079,1143,1218,1430$
Frankmarriage, see Marriage portion.
Frankpledge, 242, 513, 655, 1110, $1214,1431,1793,1752$
Frand, see Deccit.
Fraudulent recovery, 1544, 1793, 1946
Frcebench, 1338, 1774
Frechold, what is, 281, 112t, 1210, 1768, 1979
French langnage, 1292

Gallows, private, $1114,16.51$
Gaol delivery, $430,472,473,474,1714$
Gavelkind, 9, 499, 666, 1644, 1769, 1770, 1779
Gift, see Feoffment.
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Gloves, rent reserved of, 778
Goitre, 354
Grant, see Feoffment.
Guardian, action by ward against, $485,1056,1075,1840$
Guardian forfeits seignory, 1840
Guardian forfeits wardship, 1743, 1746,1840
Guardian representing ward, 437,480 , $571,845,968,1083,1366,1367$, $1442,1712,1783,1820,1958$
Guardian, waste by, 485, 739, 1056, $1075,1144,1165,1201,1743,1746$

Hearsay, 663, 723
Heir, sce Descent.
Heir, liability for debts, $52,550,756$, 1513, 1693, 1969
liability for damages, 165
sues for debts, 325,810
disinherited, 1054
'Heirs,' mention of, $964,968,1235$, 1811
Herrings, rent reserved in, 1076
High-way, 1907
Homage, 41, 53, 168, 196, 428, 441, $600,654,671,747,1100,1944$
Homicide, 196, 355, 462, 490, 514, $918,1137,1216,1460,1473,1474$, $1548,1600,1711,1878,1908$
'Horn under horn,' 818
Hors de son fee, 1049
Hotchpot, 934
Hue and cry, 662, 147t, 1697, 1711
Hundred, see Court, Hundred.
Hundred in private hands, 78, 141, $157,197,242,463,513,531,655$, $775,821,842,1110,1115,1279$, 1614, 1713, 1716
Hundred Penny, 141, 242, 531
Husband and wife
Gifts between, 224, 659, 777, 1107, 1851, 1888, 1960
Wife's disabilities, 294, 419, 561, 574, 611, 800, 1004, 1171, 1340, $1361,1379,1427,1650,1685,1798$, 1916

Wife's freehold, $146,233,290,294$, 317, 419, 566, 629, 679, 1089, $1097,1171,1355,1477,1688,1704$, $1729,1754,1755,1771,1929$, 1981
Husband vouches wife, 124, 1302, $1466,1508,1510$
Will of wife, 550
Seal of wife, 939, 1171
Wife as husband's attorney, 342, 1361, 1507
Wife's contracts and debts, 568,830
Wife's crimes and torts, 1138,1755 , 1890
Waste by husband, 574, 1617
Wife is 'sub rirga', 1685

Ignorance as exeuse, 496
Impossible condition, 172
Imprisonment, summary, $10,17,79$, $174,187,208,256,286,312,342$, $351,384,496,498,566,583,584$, $586,588,788,933,980,1052,1105$, 1187, 1443, 1633, 1946
Improvements, allowance for, 365 , $574,878,917,1145,1281,1896$
Infangthief, 821, 1651
Infant, condition of, 42, 46, 100, 142, 171, 183, 189, 191, 205, 250, 319, $406,436,446,566,716,998,1098$, 1176, 1226, 1235, 1267, 1379, 1477, $1621,1780,1799,1800,1820,1821$, 1828, 1848, 1884, 1909, 1912, 1948, 1956
Infant, how enfeoffed, 754
Infant, parol demuring for non-age of, $30,43,159,164,200,335,421$, 440, 503, 523, 1287, 1382, 1506, $1543,1722,1775,1783,1827,1840$, 1898, 1943, 1951, 1958
Inheritance, see Descent.
Inquest by sheriff directed, 83,130 , $327,359,388,414,443,475,478$, $497,580,632,640,718,795,973$, 1135, 1510
Inquest, irregular, 585, 1173
Interdict, 351
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Intrusion, 30, 43, 140, 566, 697, 774, 813, 1174, 1794, 1904
Inundation, 557
Italian clergy, 110 s

Jeopardy, 327, 389, 391, 456, 475, 595, 1055
Jews, 169, 301, 581, 918, 1140, 1179, $1376,1445,1554,1895$
Jews, Exchequer of, 169,1445
Jews, justices of, $581,1445,1825$
Jews, trial of, !18
Judicium parium, 857, 1213
Jurisdiction in private hands, 277 , $391,511,513,592,655,821,870$, $1110,1114,1127,1154,1512,1598$, 1651, 1716
Jurors,
unanimity of, 376,524
ignorance of, 21, 34, 306, 524, 771, 887, 1163, 1207, 1653, 1762
too poor, $6,883,1279,1322$
removed, $278,798,806,883$
coerced by justices, 285
questioned, $306,316,524,530,758$, 887, 960, 978, 1189, 1197, 1209, 1251, 1685
Jury, noteworthy cases, $67,116,134$, $771,798,887,1187,1189,1226$, $1294,1929,1903$
Jury with deed-witnesses, 51, 188, $205,220,222,250,269,286,332$, $412,495,634,825,1189,1831,1891$, 1896, 1929
Jury with transaction-witnesses, 91, 154, 631, 1603, 1707
Jury with kinsfolk, 1041, 1167
Jury, payment for, $86,90,102,134$, $145,180,230,233,241,316,363$, $393,554,567,641,685,786,809$, $893,895,1226,1436,1548,1558$, $1694,1929,1935$
Jury refused, 123, 136, 489, 6600, 918, 959, 1539, 1723
Jury of matrons, 198
Jury of nine, 373,1392
Jury of thirty-six, 1204

Jury of forty, 1279
Jury in franchise court, 511,59 :
Justice, sale of, 1106
Justices amerced, 67, 530, 564
Justices as arbitrators, 983
Justices, illegal acts of, 1445
Justiciar, the, 66, 127, 214, 262, 351 , $376,403,530,563,750,778,786$, $885,956,1221,1334,1546,1593$

Kent, customs of, 1338, 1644
King as fountain of justice, 503,743 , $857,895,1063,1084,1106,1182$, 1500, 1639, 1717
King, consulted by judges, 262, 1154, $1163,1236,1766$
King, disseisin by, 76, 401, 769, 857, $1059,1106,1111,1133,1136,1593$
King, as warrantor, $164,254,272$, 393, 750, 1036, 1108, 1136, 1141, $1153,1162,1183,1306,1365$
King, actions by, 187, 199, 241, 433, $440,519,578,582,628,750,785$, $869,908,929,930,1111,1113,1114$, $1124,1219,1220,1224,1234,1250$, $1267,1274,1300,1364,1545,1731$
King, proceedings against, 391, 56.7, $857,1106,1108,1136,1141,1153$, 1221,1235
King, charters of, 226, 239, 272, 750, 857, 1111, 1236, 1274, 1429, 1639, 1688
King, pleas which follow, 258, 268, $339,393,741,743,986,1106,1166$, $1176,1183,1189,1190,1201,1213$, $1220,1227,1228,1264,1551$
Knight scrvice, $33,202,288,361,758$, 1226,1493
Knights, recognitors should be, 585 , 1052, 1322
Knight's fee, 227, 772, 1182, 1612

Laches, 550, 1643, 1681, 1697, 1918
Lapse, presentation on, 187, 205, 308, $357,438,515,883,1238,1389,1570$, 1697
Larceny, 67, 1138, 1159, 1180, 1435,
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$1456,1461,1539,1692,1723,1725$, 1763
Law, wager of, $7,143,184,195,325$, $390,396,477,531,537,580,629$, $645,700,731,741,742,763,770$, $786,788,799,811,812,874,875$, $897,936,1079,1097,1101,1125$, 1151, 1404, 1436, 1457, 1467, 1543, $1549,1566,1574,1579$
Lawdays, 197, 1587, 1606, 1641, 1647
Leap year, 1291
Legacy, 162, 381, 684, 756, 847, 1441
Legate, papal, 412, 1219, 1235, 1238, 1273, 1388
Legate, Gualo, custos regni, 1219
Legislative acts, 1117, 1215, 1217
Lent, no battle in, 1675
Lent, no oaths in, 387
Ieper, ineapacity of, $807,841,1648$
Liability for acts of others, 779, 781, $969,1199,1243,1745$
Liege poustie, 255, 495, 671, 1148, 1277, 1289, 1572
Life, tenant for, alienation by, 540 , 828
Life, tenant for, waste by, 443,540
Limitation of actions, $186,234,280$, $340,428,429,499,550,617,700$, 884, 1688, 1877, 1889
Limitations, a Statute of, 1217
Litigation, protracted, 302, 566, 960, 991, 1424, 1486
Litigation more speedy in Court Christian, 351
Lord and Heir, see Descent.
Lord representing tenants, 666, 1582
Lunatie, see Non eompos mentis.
Lunatic, homicide by, 1878, 1908
Magnates, the, 277, 354, 857, 1108, $1117,1189,1217,1227,1235,1273$, $1396,1593,1730$
Mainour, 136, 138, 821, 1461, 1473, 1474,1539
Malicia, 687
Manor and member, 1669)
Manor, parcel of, 695, 1061, 1078, 1116

Market, 494, 578, 786, 82音, 1037, $1162,1282,1720$
Maritagium, see Marriage portion.
Narriage, validity of, 291, 324, 570, $642,944,953,1142,1176,1267$, 1895
Marriage on death - bed gives no dower, $1669,1718,1875,1895$
Marriage of infants, $349,696,965$, 1098, 1267
Marriage, lord's right, 12, 178, 270, $696,776,850,965,1090,1098$, $1112,1131,1267,1278,1280,1283$, 1286, 1596
Marriage portion (maritagium), 61, 86, 105, 207, 241, 295, 315, 361, 487, 550, 566, 629, 664, 751, 752, $778,779,811,855,948,1008,1018$, $1071,1685,1912,1921,1958,1960$, 1981
Marriage settlement, 151, 442, 646, $683,1107,1392,1683,1960$
Marriage, breach of promise of, 570, 659
Marriage, promise in consideration of, 646, 683
Marriage, snit to establish, 1677
Marshall, Earl, palatine rights of, 1213
Nayhem, 346
Measure, customary of land, 778
Merchet, 63, 70, 88, 281, 395, 465, $753,794,895,916,1005,1030$, $1041,1062,1103,1210,1225,1230$, 1374, 1661, 1812
Merton, Statute of, 1117, 1217, 1409, 1881, 1975
Mesne process, 526, 527, 796, 801, $802,900,925,1232,1286,1296$, 1308, 1324, 1370, 1376, 1384, 1398, $1407,1408,1420,1421,1422,1446$
Mesne tenure, 158, 202, 209, 273, $275,333,362,390,506,546,563$, $624,657,660,674,698,837,849$, $1043,1146,1184,1207,1211,1401$, $1622,1652,1687$
Metayer tenure, 1•771, 1735
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Mill, suit to, 161, 479, 482, 504, 700, 895, 1979
Mortgage, 50, 160, 156, 301, 370, 458, 5559, 581, 612, 641, 889, 901, 1140, $1441,145,1464,1736,1770,1855$, 1971
Mortmain, 1248
Municipal bodies and franchises, 16 , $145,278,294,314,351,489,520$, $577,589,622,952,1123,1188,1205$, $1228,1393,1421,1429,1441,1640$
Murder fine, 1713
Mutilation, as punishment, 1651, 1725

New Trial, 63
Next friend of infant, $717,1056,1743$, 1840
Nisi prius, 534, 537, 538, 541, 694, 721, 760, 1583, 1618
Non compos mentis, 104, 211, 255, $354,635,716,825,929,1102,1189$, 1262, 1878, 1908
Non est factum, $1,51,90,102,188$, 237, 671, 675, 849, 1659
Non obstante, 1388
Normandy, loss of, 503, 565, 1172
Normandy, recovery of, 1172
Normans, lands of, 97, 503,519 , 565, 750
Nuisance, $469,494,578,701,786,1037$, $1081,1162,1253,1255,1282,1953$

Oath, testimony of jurors without, $870,1287,1397,1774,1787,1955$, 1963, 1977
Oath by attorney on principal's soul, 1124, 1404
Odium et atia, 134, 1548
Official, Arehdeacon`s, 544, 766, 1416
Official, Bishop's, 647, 722, 766
Onerous tenure, 1758, 1762
Ordeal, 592
Ousting the jurisdiction, 679, 808
Outlawry, 82, 85, 135, 346, 422, 483, $840,857,943,1132,1154,1232$, $1266,1548,1798,1822$

Palatinate, see Chester and Durham.
Palatine, partition of a county, 1127 , 1213, 1227, 1273
Pannage, $274,963,998,1230,1561$, 1661
Paralysis, 635, 932
Pareeners, 441, 50s, 521,579, 603, 639, $648,676,800,924,934,1040,1134$, 1227, 1437, 1571, 1584, 1708, 174~, 1757, 1782, 1919
Pareeners and lord, 677, 869, 1045, $1053,1273,1279,1596,1765$
Pardon, prerogative of, 840,1216
Parol, mule (simplex dictum), 79, 260, 261, 425, 451, 494, 499, 507, $528,655,575,600,613,660,816$, $8.51,800,1065,1068,1129,135 s$, 1565, 1672, 1863, 1868, 1936
Parson, alienation by, 1033
Parson as corporation sole, $610,8 \not 4$, 887, 1627, 1826
Parsons, hereditary succession of, 887
Partible inheritance, 703, 704, 959, $1009,1023,1074,1252,1565,1663$, $1769,1779,1933$
Peers, judgment of, 857
Pensions payable from chmrehes, 305 , $306,310,350,357,366,453,515$, 636
Pepper, rent reserved in, 317, 446, 594, 1000
Perambulation, 249, 254, 907, 1155, 1197, 1582, 1871
Peter's pence, 1661
Petty serjeanty, 743, 758
I'leader, 131, 298,1106
l'loughing as evidence of seisin, 870 , $1749,1792,1794,1797,192$ 」
Ploughshares, rent in, 1767
I'ledges for various purposes, 325,384, $490,506,770,779,792,875,1075$, 1308, 1637
Pledges as bail, 256, 1600
I'ledges to prosecute, 214, 274, 542, 790, 798, 1637, 1802
I'ledges for amereements, 21.), 777, $78: 3$
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Pope, charters of, 305
Pope, writ from, 62, 490, 536, 1387, 1388, 1928
'Possessio', 187, 240, 356, 427, 474, 1354, 1684
Possession, theory of, 1290
Possessorium, 536, 1388
Possessory and proprietary actions, $34,37,39,240,416,530,564,998$, $1122,1184,1195,1203,1206,1238$, $1274,1387,1452,1470,1560,1582$, 1762, 1804, 1828
Posthumous heir, 137, 1013, 1746, 1816
Praecipe, breve quod vocatur, 1215
Prebend, 114, 171, 3577, 1555
Precarious exercise of right, 685,843
Precedent, 834, 1227, 1273
Pre-emption, right of, 543
Pregnancy, 128, 137, 198, 1503, 1605
Prerogative, royal, 12, 226, 239, 840, 895, $907,908,1221,1278,1294$, $1500,1665,1705$; see also King.
Prescription, 223, 274, 392, 628, 818, $835,843,909,971,1271,1272$, 1624
l'riority of feoffment, 661, 868, 906 , 1698
Prison, guardian of, 1315
Prison, private, 229, 277, 773,821 , 1716
Privilege of not being impleaded in any court but the king's, 911
Production of deeds ordered, 229, 237, 747, 997
Prohibition of sale, 1920
Proof of obvious facts, 194
Proof of facts, instances of, 227,243 , $256,291,303,455,586,588,595$, 727, 824, 1224, 1226, 1362, 1539, $1659,1680,1690$
l'roof, burden of, $460,507,528,613$, $660,663,761,782,826,851,890$, 1068, 1713, 1735, 1758
Protection, 530, 1500
P'ublic advantage, plea of, 178.5
I'urpresture, 1032. 1081

Questions asked of parties and others by the Court, 234, 296, 303, 349, $478,550,558,734,797,814,851$, $902,955,1004,1139,1149,1240$, $1620,1627,1661$
Quit-claim, 386, 634, 653, 845, 902, $1102,1758,1929$
Quousque, seizure, 291, 363, 394, 1149, 1554

Ratification, 317, 1243
Ready to perform contract, plea of, 668
Record, court of, 471
Record of county court, written, 243
Record, trial by, 70, 74, 88, 307, 384, 519, 583
Recreancy, 511, 592, 1460
Re-entry, for defanlt of service, 2 , 348, 370, 792, 1767
Reeve, 989, 1005, 1230
Regent, William Marshall, 10, 1306, 1309
Relief, feudal, 506, 546, 758, 1053
Religion (monastic profession), 31, $104,455,931,1057,1139,1189$, $1572,1586,1594,1608$
Religious Houses-change of head, $415,448,654,981,1356,1395$, 1523,1714
Remainder, 86, 429
Rent, 236, 338, 410, 470, 583, 779, 946, 1205, 1239, 1259
Repairs, liability of tenant, 485
Responsalis, 118, 120, 651, 667, 764, $844,1575,1642$
Reversal of judgment, 374, 1166, 1445
Reversion, 487, 779, 948, 1085, 1186, 1706
Revocation of judgment, 397
Rolls of court, $70,149,583,829$, 1224, 1411, 1455
Rolls of Exchequer, 503, 519
Roman Law, 1227, 1290
Runnymede, chartcr of, 513
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Sacrilege, 48, 130, 755, 1585, 1595
Sale, $313,645,873,1358,1671,1832$
Sanctuary, 1137, 1180
Satisfaction, 66, 83, 749
Scot and lot, 1640
scot-ales, 666
scotland, king of, 1221
Scutage, 140, 202, 288, 333, 361, 390, 447, 664, 727, 789, 795, 1049, 1214, 1226, 1674, 1687
Seals,
unsealed document, 1095, 1846
collation of, $1,51,102,234,: 237$, $671,744,849,1659,1831$
frandulent use of, 182, 211, 250, $255,336,1000,1189,1847,1921$
forged, 187, 584, 934, 110.5
Seignory, disclaimer of, 563, 674
Seiguory, grant of, 236
Sccurity against waste, 1144,1165
Seisin generally, $219,422,428,524$, $780,871,985,998,1033,1104$, $1133,1149,1240,1241,1247,1256$, $1258,1294,1470,1560,1715,1731$, $1792,1816,1850,1910,1911,1922$, $1940,1941,1959,1965,1975,1976$, 1978
Seisin, colourable, 1209, 1243, 1838
Seisin as of fee, 151, 889, 1975
Seisin of adrowson, 34, 39, 49, 75, $114,182,260,426,488,644,813$, $1035,1064,1070,1072,1219,1275$, $1452,1578,1607,1684,1685,1686$, 1760
Seisin of chattels, $67,136,194,824$, $1138,1474,1539,1597$
Seisin of common, 1208
Seisin of framehise, $16,145,391,821$, $842,1123,1651,1716,1720$
Seisin of scrvices, 608, 747, 7.53, 860, $895,1076,1205,1687,1738,1966$
Seisin, by husband of wife, by wife of hasband, 642, 1142, 1597, 1703
Seisin, livery of, $45,144,375,428$, $524,755,777,947,1147,120!$, 1258, 1838, 1865, 192.2
Self defence, 1081, 1210

Serjeanty, 283, 401, 743, 862, 915, $1183,1231,1270,1280,16655,1670$
Service, default of, $2,270,348,370$, 477, 792, 1767
Service, forinsec, $236,275,288,361$, 660, 664, 698, 703, 978, 1076, 1631
Service, liability for arrears incurred in time of former tenant, 477
Services, noteworthy, $70,524,60 \mathrm{~s}$, $753,758,879,895,916,960,1005$, $1041,1062,1103,1230,1419,1661$, 1715, 1819
Set-off, 572
Sewers, duty of maintaining, 263 , 1785
Shecp-gavel, 753
Sheriff, action agrainst, $1269,16 \because 3$
Sheriff, aid of, 417
Sheriff, duties and liabilities of, 10 , $40,256,408,465,465,513,530$, $705,775,802,1016,1110,1175$, 1623,1730
Sheriff, hereditary, 1235, 1512
Simple seisin, $348,779,1149,1290$
Socare, full age in, 1847
Socage, guardian in, 613, 752, 75\%, $908,1109,1683$
Socage, holden in capite, 1109
Socage tenure, 30, 33, 43, 282, 258, $693,643,703,752,758,795,990$, 1076, 1231, 1848
Sokemami, 133s
Spiritual discipline, 766
Spoliation, action for in Court Christian, 626, 755, 817, 877, 910, 1143
Spurs, reserved as rent, 458,1546
Stallage, 666, 1720
Statu liber, $1837,1894,1931$
Statutes, read in court, 842
Stolen goods, 67, 588, 8.24, 1138, 1461
Stolen goods, search for, 1.539
Street-gavel, 666
Subinfeudation, effects of, 158, 27.7, $333,362,340,657,838,1043,1146$
Subinfeudation, elaborate, 126, 2ss, 627, 6.57, 698, 8197, 1374
Suicide, 1111
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Suit (witnesses), 47, 57, 68, 102, 115, $116,123,177,194,197,204,233$, $247,265,279,293,313,325,345$, $356,374,377,385$, 396, 424, 451, 457, 479, 494, 499, 518, 545, 555, $574,588,600,613,645,649,663$, $665,739,758,761,762,768,773$, $790,882,890,897,898,910,941$, $946,953,1002,1065,1102,1115$, $1129,1131,1146,1307,1311,1390$, $1433,1586,1595,1603,1604,1693$, 1713, 1848, 1863, 1867, 1868, 1894, 1919,1936
Suit of Court, 78, 141, 157, 197, 242, $275,463,531,655,677,727,728$, 837, 842, 1214, 1230, 1279, 1567, 1614, 1713
Summerhouse, obligation to build, 1661
Sunday, Court sits on, 242, 248, 261
Supposititious child, 247, 303, 1229, 1761
Sureties, 1543, 1574, 1641, 1671, 1969
Swinkage, 1034, 1245, 1554, 1669, 1816

Tallage, 784, 792, 794, 895, 1005, $1041,1062,1167,1210,1225,1230$
Tally, 177, 325, 568, 645, 830, 897, 1693
Taxation, local, 268, 666, 1640
Tenure, eltange of, $\mathbf{1 6 6 3}$
Term of years, assigmment of, 804
Term of years, recovery of, 1739
Term of years, tenant for, 106, 269, $395,607,638,641,658,767,783$, $847,970,1140,1290,1304,1371$, 1768
Third heir in coparcenery, 441, 1045
Third heir in frankmarriage, 207, 241, 295, 664, 811
Third party intervenes, $5,6,23,483$, 525, 55s, ( $542,750,7!7,798,407$, 815, 821, 1004, 1072, 1126, 1238, 1781, 1813
Third party stumonel, 229, 236, 237, $2.33,254,273,581,586,438, ~ 487$.
$713,727,747,748,773,812,967$, $1034,1045,1949,1300,1479,1813$
Third party puts in claim, 250, 251, 688
Third penny of county, 633
Time made essence of the issue, 685 , 950, 1558
'Tithes, 210, 293, 453, 536, 693, 725, $799,874,877,918,1561,1671$, 1680
Title deeds, deposit of, 1169, 1201
Title deeds, suit for production of, 997
Toll, 16, 145, 1123, 1246, 1250, 1720
'Tourn, sheriff's, 513, 773, 775, 1110
Township, common within, 561
Township, represented in County Court, 513, 1029, 1981
Townships, the four, in criminal cases, $136,592,8.24,1474,1517$, 1600
Township, misnomer of, 1030, 1177, 1788
Township, how amerced, 1170
Transfer of mortgage, 1140
Treason, 857, 1673
Treasurer, the, 376
Trespass, 85, 378, 566, 567, 616, 839, 1121, 1232, 1520
Tumbrell, 1651
Turbary, 1194

Underwood, 632
Uncertainty in pleading, 190,390 , 481
Uses (ad opus), 641, 754, 999, 1244, 1683, 1851
Usufruct, 1290

Venue, 192, 332, 359, 375, 608, 612, $635,641,779,817,1424,1441,1600$, 1720,1919
Verdicts, remarkable, 144, 151, 174, $196,375,376,524,771,824,978$, 1025, $1041,1103,1169,1189$
Verdicts of grand assize, 251, 262, 769, 9600, 1701, 1865, 1920

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Vicarage, $72,173,296,305,310,350$, 357, 366, 515, 636, 675, 928, 1317, 1349, 1416
Villeinage, status and tenure, 31, 63, 70, $38,225,281,334,343,466,475$, 524, 591, 652, 702, 713, 784, 794, 879, 916; 1005, 1010, 1025, 1029, 1030, 1041, 1062, 1103, 1167, 1203, $1210,1225,1228,1230,1237,1242$, $1256,1411,1419,1650,1661,1681$, 1701, 1715, 1745, 1812; 1814, 1819, $182 \mathrm{~s}, 1833,1834,1837,1839,1885$, 1857, 1894, 1902, 1905, 1914, 1918, 1934
Villeins, destruction of, 485, 574, 632, 691
Villein, marriage with, 702, 1010, 1139
Villeins of villeins, 1715

## Waif, 1266

Wapentake, 1730
War, time of, $51,62,130,251,412,798$, 857, 1036, 1126, 1304, 1542, 1543
War of $1215-7$, allusions to, 39,48 , $51,62,200,798,1057,1163,1303$
War in 1233 between the king and barons, 857
War, sitting of courts suspended, 1492, 1493, 1495, 1496, 1527, 1528
Ward by right of ward, 708
Ward placed in a numnery, 1608
Wardship, 33, 236, 247, 256, 266, 279, 282, 288, 349, 485, 643, 661, 681, 717, 743, 752, 758, 812, 845, 860, 868, 906, 908, 990, 1131, 1221, 1608, 1698, 1838, 1840
Ward penny, 417, 655
Warranty, principles of, 116, 164, $196,199,284,290,387,495,512$, $535,563,600,612,633,638,714$, 734, 804, 836, 852, 944, 945, 966, 1211, 1268, 1559, 1589, 1652, 1665, $1683,1717,1744,1752,1900,1920$, 1937

Warranty, tenement bound by, 63s, 748, 1024
Waste, 27, 56, 115, 388, 443, 461, 485, 540, 574, 580, 607, 632, 640, 691, 717, 718, 880, 10.57, 1075, 1165, 1201, 1304, 1371, 1617
Waste, permissive, 739
Watch and Ward, 655
Watercourse, diversion of, 701, 1254
Way, right of, 414, 843
Wergild, 1474
Widow, king's, 1278
Will, last, $52,73,79,221,381,684$, $810,847,857,1206,1409$
Will, tenant at, 102, 323, 337, 656, $663,1230,1841$
Withernam, 333
Witnesses to deeds, $1,47,51,102$, 114, 188, 205, 220, 222, 255, 269, $286,332,342,375,412,634,825$, $975,1189,1891,1929$
Witnesses to transactions, 91, 154, $256,447,456,613,778,973,1115$, 1603, 1707
Witnesses of death, 163, 356, 545
Witnesses before a jury, 1187
Wolves, tenure by eatching, 1670
Wreck, 1271, 1272
Writ, illegal, 76
Writ, inappropriate, 55, 392, 691, 791, 823, 914, 1097, 1415, 1776
Writ, invention of new, 1215, 1930
Writ, loss of, 29, 434, 1552, 1553
Writ, neeessity for, $372,489,609$, 1298, 1313
Writing when necessary, 68, 86, 260, 287, 425, 489, 851, 890, 1224, 1268, $1565,1693,1735,1843$
'Year,' meaning of, 1291
Year, day and waste, 462, 597, 810 , 1798
Year, to year, tenancy from, 337, 452, 650, 1080

## INDEX OF PLACES ${ }^{1}$.
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| Abbedestona | Adbaston | Staf. 1082 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abefeldia |  | Ox. 1276 |
| Abselegha, see Aspele |  |  |
| Acholt | Occold | Suf. 255 |
| Aclande |  | Suf. 1223 |
| Acle | Akeley | Buck. 1545 |
| Acle | Acle, Norf. (?) | Ess. 1404 |
| Acle | Oakley | Suf. 1893 |
| Acleya | Akeley | Buck. 1303 |
| Aco' | Accomb (?) | York. 1887 |
| Actona | Acton | Mid. 1564 |
| Adelingtona |  | Norf. 1831 |
| Adingtona | Addington | Northamp. 820 |
| Agmodesham | Amersham | Buek. 8 |
| Ailesbiria | Aylesbiny | Buck. 652, 1487 |
| Akene | Hackney | Mid. 335, 1029 |
| Akum | Acklam (?) | York, 171 |
| Aldebiria | Albury | Sur. 928 |
| Aldeburgum | Aldborough | Norf. 384 |
| Aldegate | Aldgate | Micl. 383 |
| Aldemannestona | Aldermaston | Berk. 812 |
| Aldestrate | Old Street | Mid. 1311 |
| Aldewicus | Old Street | Mid. 554, 686 |
| Aldrestuna | Alderton | War. 281 |
| Aldungtona |  | Hants. 317 |
| Aleinesmora | Allensmore | Heref. 304 |
| Alesbiria | Aylesbury | Buck. 29 |
| Alesfordia |  | War. 941 |
| Alfinctona | Alphington | Dev. 516 |
| Alfleutona | Alpheton | Suf. 110 |
| Alnchechurehe | Alvechurch | War. 123: |
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| Alingtona | Allington | Linc. 279 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allestorpe | Althorp | Rut. 488 |
| Almundebiria | Alconbury | Hunt. 1134 |
| Alnestowe | Elstow | Bed. 1608 |
| Alre | Aller (?) | Som. 668 |
| Aluesteyn | Allerston (?) | York. 1878 |
| Alurestona | Alvestone | Staf. 1974 |
| Aluringtona | Alvington | Dev. 1121 |
| Ambresbiria | Amesbury | Wilt. 1139, 122s |
| Andebiria | Handborough (\%) | Ox. 70 |
| Andevere | Andover | Hants. 496 |
| Andrintona |  | Northamp. 74, 898 |
| Anecastrum | Ancaster | Linc. 1730 |
| Anemere | Anmer | Norf. 814 |
| Anestay |  | York. 1848 |
| Anesty | Anstey | Wilt. 1.101 |
| Appelby | Apperley (?) | York. 220 |
| Appeltona | Appleton | York. 24, 37 |
| Ardientona |  | Hants. 1013 |
| Arewe | Arrow | War. 392 |
| Arlegha | Arley | Staf. 1233 |
| Arnecline | Arncliffe | York. 155 |
| Arnhale |  | York. 1879 |
| Arnhol | Arnoll | Not. 1365 |
| Artindona | Artinglon | Sur. 1171 |
| Aselbach |  | Derb. 315 |
| Askeham | Askham | York. 697 |
| Aspele | Aspley Guise | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bed. } 180,385,829,1108, \\ 1377,1607,1625 \end{gathered}$ |
| Assele |  | Dev. 290 |
| Atford |  | Dors. 35 |
| Aucrintona | Alkerton | Ox. 1157 |
| Audeby | Alby (?) | Norf. 632 |
| Audrintona | Alderton | Wilt. 1388 |
| Auena | Aron | Wilt. 773 |
| Auilers | Aveley (?) | Ess. 833 |
| Aumbresburia | Amesbury | Wilt. 5.53 |
| Aune | Abbott's Ann | Hants. 326 |
| Aure |  | Som. 922 |
| Aylefordia | Aylesford | Kent, 1306 |
| Aylmartona | Aylmerton | Norf. 937 |
| Ayndona | Eydon | Northamp. 72 |
| Axstede | Ashtead | Sur. 1375 |
| Bacheswrthe | Batchworth Heath | Herts. 1480 |
| Baculf' |  | Kent, 1786 |
| Badialtona | Bathealton | Som. 1008 |
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| Baggeshee' | Bagshot | Sur. 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baggetorr' |  | Dev. 85 |
| Bagingedena | Badgington | Gloue. 365 |
| Banham | Banham | Norf. 473 |
| Bardestaplia | Barstaple | Ess. 1279 |
| Bartona | Barton | Camb. 1045 |
| Bartona | Barton | Hants. 19 |
| Barwella | Barwell | Leic. 1953 |
| Bastlestuna | Basildon | Ess. 551 |
| Batefordia | Battisford | Suf. 1248 |
| Bathecumba | Bateombe | Som. 828 |
| Bandona (corr. Bandona) | Bandon | Sur. 1284 |
| Beann' |  | Kent, 1638 |
| Becham | Beckham | Norf. 1806 |
| Bedefeuldia | Bedfield | Norf. 1926 |
| Bedefordia | Bedford | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bed. } 307,354,519,611 \text {, } \\ & \quad 664,829,1030,1377 \text {, } \\ & 1640,1720 \end{aligned}$ |
| Bedel |  | Hants. 92 |
| Bedingeham | Bodingham | Norf. 785, 799, 874 |
| Bedingham | Beddingham | Sus. 643 |
| Bedintona | Beddington | Sur. 1284 |
| Begeleby | Bellerby | York. 1200 |
| Beinflet | Beutleet | Ess. 892 |
| Beintona | Bainton | York. 1339, 1458 |
| Bekenefeldia | Beaconsfield | Buek. 1600 |
| Belagha |  | York. 144 |
| Belestede | Belstead | Suf. 1507 |
| Beletona | Belton | Suf. 56.4 |
| Benetham | Bentham | York. 1866 |
| Beneringtona |  | Sus. 44 |
| Beningewrthe | Benniworth | Linc. 1092, 1102 |
| Bensingtona | Bensington | Ox. 434 |
| Bentlegha | Bentley | Suf. 1918 |
| Bera | Bere Forest | Hants. 1689 |
| Berchamstede | Berkhampstead | Herts. 8, 179, 608, 1406 |
| Lerdefeldia | Bardfield | Ess. 1037 |
| Bere | Beer | Som. 1150 |
| Berefordia | Barford | Norf. 369 |
| Berefordia | Barforth | York. 220, 1873 |
| Berenic | Barwiek | York. 1817 |
| Berewe | Barrow | Sal. 1225 |
| Bergedona | Barrowden | Rat. 1399 |
| Bergtona | Barkston (?) | Line. 747 |
| Beriehe |  | Nort. 1925 |
| Berkinges | Barking | Ess. 758, 1691 |
| Berlawe |  | Northumb. 132 |
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| Berlay | Bierley | York. 1867 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berlega | Birley | Herts. 183, 1511 |
| Berlesdma | Basildon (?) | Ess. 5.1 |
| Bermundeseia | Bermondsey | Siur. 1118 |
| Bernete, la | Barnet | Herts. 435 |
| Berningelam | Barningham | Norf. 355, 1928 |
| Bertherest |  | Sur. 807 |
| Bertona | Barton | Camb. 31, 1353 |
| Bertona | Barton | Suf. 1434 |
| Bertona | Barton | York. 97 |
| Besaera | Bessacre | York. 1869 |
| Benerlacus | Beverley | York. 145, 1083 |
| Bewicus | Bewick | Northumb. 226 |
| Bicham |  | Sur. 126 |
| Bichamstede |  | Hunt. 558 |
| Biham | Bytham | Linc. 1208, 1538 |
| Bikebroc | Begbroke | Ox. 815 |
| Bikehulle | Bickenhall | Som. 853 |
| Biker' | Bicker | Suf. 28 |
| Billebroc | Billbrook | Som. 956, 1657 |
| Billetorpe | Bilsthorpe | Not. 1410 |
| Billingeburgum | Billingborough | Linc. 441 |
| Billingeheic | Billinghay | Linc. 174, 1092, 1417 |
| Binetre | Bintry | Norf. 1076 |
| Bingham |  | Kent, 1784 |
| Biricholt | Bircholt | Kent, 1777 |
| Birketorpe | Biscathorpe ( $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$ | Linc. 211 |
| Birlingeham | Burlingham | Norf. 1801 |
| Birstaudeby | Birstall | Leic. 1026 |
| Bissopestre | Bishopstrow | Wilts. 463, 1177 |
| Blackam | Blackenham | Suf. 66 |
| Blakeberke |  | Not. 433 |
| Blakegraue |  | Wore. 1231 |
| Blanefordia |  | Sur. 1447 |
| Bledelawe | Bledlow | Ox. 274 |
| Bleroc |  | Corn. 1015 |
| Bliburgum | Blythburgh | Suf. 1639 |
| Blithinge | Blything | Suf. 1271 |
| Blockesham | Bloxham | Ox. 436 |
| Blumbilla | Blymhill | Staf. 1043,1980 |
| Blundesduna | Blundsdon | Wilt. 789 |
| Bockele |  | Kent, 169 |
| Boclonde | Buckland | Berk. 12, 837 |
| Bocstede | Boxted | Ess. 778 |
| Bocstede | Boxted | Suf. 1542 |
| Bodehale |  | Sur. 868 |
| Bodekesham | Bottisham | Camb. 1580 |
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| Bodmine | Bodmin | Corn. 213, 1539 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bokelintona | Bockleton | Worc. 1352 |
| Bokintona |  | Staf. 187 |
| Bolehurst | Bolnhurst | Bed. 980 |
| Bolendena | Bullingdon | Ox. 513 |
| Borstal | Borstall | Kent, 495 |
| Bosewicas |  | York. 1083 |
| Boteffordia | Bottesford | Linc. 1364 |
| Bothorpe |  | Leic. 1943 |
| Bouelegha | Bowley | Heref. 882 |
| Boultona | Bolton | Lanc. 130 |
| Boutona | Boughton | Kent, 743 |
| Boytona | Boyton | Suf. 1896 |
| Braburne | Brabourne | Kent, 102 |
| Braddena | Bradlen | Northamp. 366 |
| Bradeford | Bradford Abbas | Dors. 927 |
| Bradeham | Bradenham | Buck. 255 |
| Bradeham | Bradenham | Norf. 672 |
| Bradelega | Bradley | York. 1870 |
| Bradelcgha | Bradley | Suf. 592 |
| Bradeshulla | Bradwell (?) | Buck. 601 |
| Bradewater |  | Norf. Suf. 369 |
| Bradewella | Bradwell | Buck. 45.5 |
| Bramlegha | Bromley | Mid. 1557 |
| Bramwicus | Kirk Bramwith (?) | York. 1193 |
| Braundefeuldia | Bramfield | Suf. 642 |
| Bray | Bray | Berk. 951, 988, 1400 |
| Braybrok | Braybrooke | Northamp. 1513 |
| Braytoft | Bratoft | Linc. 1563 |
| Braytona |  | Leic. 1457 |
| Breintoft, sec Braytoft |  |  |
| Brelay |  | York. 869. |
| Brembre | Bramber | Sus. 46, 1362 |
| Bremele | Bremhill | Wilt. 773 |
| Bremle | Bramber | Sus. 709 |
| Brethenham | Brettenham | Norf. 809 |
| Brethenham | Brettenham | Suf. 13 |
| Brethoc |  | Corn. 965 |
| Bridelestir |  | Buck. 510 |
| Brimhurst | Bringhurst | Leic. 1457 |
| Brimingham | Briningham | Norf. 1829 |
| Brimiona | Brinton | Norf. 1423 |
| Brimstona | Branstone (?) | Staf. 1975 |
| Bringliam | Briningham | Norf. 637 |
| Brinkele | Brinkley | Camb. 663 |
| Brinton | Brington | Northamp. 42 |
| Brisele | Brisley | Norf. 993 |
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Bristollium
Briwerne
Broc
Brocbergum
Broctona
Broctona
Brocwde
Brohnrst
Broken'
Bromfeldia
Bromlegha
Bromwicus
Brumlegha
Brumlegha
Brunesthorpe
Brunwardestuna
Buggeslawe
Bukeham
Bukerelle
Bukesworthe
Bukeswrthe
Buleha
Bulewicus
Bulkintona
Buningtona
Burcota
Burendishe
Burgesse
Burgum
Burgum
Burgum
Burgum
Burgum
Buringeham
Burlega
Burn'
Burnham
Burrethe
Burstal
Burstede
Burstowe
Burtona
Burtona
Burtona
Burtona
Burtona
Byrlawe

Bristol
Broughton
Broughton Hackett
Brookwood

Glonc. 1179
Glone. 963
Dev. $1575,164^{\circ}$
Bed. 11s:
Ox. 772
Worc. 680
Sur. 1129
Sus. 774
Camb. 236
Northamp. 1033
Sur. 553, 679
Staf. 388, 1024, 1094
Ess. 682
Sur. 1118
Leic. $196^{\circ}$
Der. $62 t$
Suf. 1903
Norf. 839
Dev. 1148
Camb. 1620
Hunt. 1658
Ox. 68
Northamp. 96
Leic. 132
Kent, 263
Buck. 1293
Suf. 1247
Sus. 1010
Camb. 623
Norf. 456, 1842
Northamp. 888
Suf. 210
York. 1497
Linc. 783
War. 1
Suf. 846
Norf. 1836
Linc. 534, 535
Suf. 1241
Ess. 270, 374
Herts. 485
Lanc. 448
Leic. 921
Northamp. 1113
Not. 433
Wilt, 621, 1177
Northumb. 1096
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| Cadeswurthe |  | Sur. 1661 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cadewelle | Cadwell | Linc. 303 |
| Caldicote | Caldecote | War. 919, 1105 |
| Callingland |  | Staf. 260 |
| Calthorne | Cawtiorne | York. 1169 |
| Caltwayt |  | York. 254 |
| Cantebrigia | Cambridge | $\begin{gathered} \text { Camb. 103, 307, 523, } \\ 751,1393,1620 \end{gathered}$ |
| Cantuaria | Canterbury | Kent, 623 |
| Capetona |  | Suf. 564 |
| Castre | Caister | Norf. 1791, 1796 |
| Cates | Coates | Linc. 251 |
| Catesthorpe |  | Suf. 1932 |
| Cateshilla |  | Suf. 700 |
| Catteshulla | Catshill | Sur. 1171 |
| Cattone | Catton | Norf. 185 |
| Caundeuere | Candover | Hants. 882 |
| Canstona | Cawston | Norf. 1046 |
| Ceningeswurthe | Theddingworth (?) | Leic. 146, 208 |
| Certeselegha | Chartley | Staf. (?) 1127 |
| Certesey | Chertsey | Sur. 282 |
| Cesterfordia | Chesterford | Ess. 497 |
| Cesterhunt | Cheshunt | Herts. 475 |
| Cestretona | Chesterton | Hunt. 269, 286 |
| Chadenwik |  | Wilt. 906, 1691 |
| Chadewilla |  | Ox. 1326 |
| Chadhangre |  | Berk. 1178. |
| Chaffunt | Chalfont | Buek. 368, 524 |
| Chagingeford | Chingford | Ess. 78 |
| Chalhistre |  | Sus. 525 |
| Chamfunt' | Chalfont | Buck. 307 |
| Chammelega | Chulmleigh | Dev. 170, 1569 |
| Chautona | Chaulton | Bed. 1611 |
| Chedena | Cheddon Fitzpaine | Som. 853 |
| Cheggewella | Chigwell | Ess. 584 |
| Chelewella | Chilwell | Not. 379, 604 |
| Chelewrthe | Chilworth | Sur. 928 |
| Chelewude | Chelsworth | Suf. 66 |
| Chelewurthe | Chelworth | Wilts. 359 |
| Chelmerefordia | Chelmsford | Ess. 427, 1681 |
| Chenelfeuldia | Chesfield | Herts. 864 |
| Chepemanescumba | Chaffeombe (?) | Som. 452 |
| Chepham |  | Som. 1752 |
| Cherlewode | Charlwood | Sur. 1650 |
| Cherringe | Charing | Mid. 337 |
| Chesele |  | Norf. 1534 |
| Cheucleswelle | Chieveley | Berks. 229 |
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| Chidingelam | Chiddingstone (?) | Kent, 1505 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Childerst | Chithurst (?) | Sus. 50.5 |
| Chillewlla | Chinwell | Jerb. 315 |
| Chinkeford | Chingford | liss. 78 |
| Chinnouere | Chinnor | Ox. 1126 |
| Chippeham | Cippenham | Butck. 1571 |
| Chippeham | Chippenham | Wilt. 219 |
| Chiriel |  | Sur. 375 |
| Chiselhamtona | Chiselhampton | Ox. 1669 |
| Chiueleffordia |  | Ess. 166\% |
| Chineslegha | Chieveley | Berk. 1616 |
| Cimaye |  | Lanc. (?) 234 |
| Cipham |  | Buck. 491 |
| Cirencestria | Cirencester | Glouc. 1427, 1499 |
| Claipol | Claypole | Linc. 1430 |
| Clakelase | Clackclose | Norf. 1159, 1716 |
| Clare | Clare | Suf. 1162 |
| Clareburgum | Clarborough | Nots. 329 |
| Clarendona | Clarendon | Wilts. 1228 |
| Claxeby | Claxby | Linc. 345 |
| Claxtona | Clawson | Leic. 1000 |
| Clauerlega | Claverlcy | Staff. 187 |
| Clanertona | Claverton | Som. 866 |
| Clayheye | Clayhythe | Camb. 299, 1582 |
| Clemestona |  | Corn. 1591 |
| Clenefeudia | Clanfield | Hants. 276 |
| Clere | Kingsclere | Hants. 470 |
| Cleyore | Clare | Ox. 566 |
| Cliftona | Clifton | Bed. 581 |
| Cliftona | Cliffton | Bucks. 406 |
| Cliftona | Clifton Campville | Staf. 94, 602 |
| Clinctona |  | Ox. 630 |
| Clipesby | Clippesby | Norf. 48, 1843 |
| Clipstona |  | Northamp. 72: |
| Cliuedena | Cliefden | Buck. 298 |
| Cliuelanda | Cleveland | York, 254 |
| Clypesby, sce Clipesby |  |  |
| Cnapetona | Knapton | York. 129 |
| Cneshale | Kncesall | Nots. 522 |
| Cnodishale | Knettishall | Suf. 1907 |
| Cnotinges | Knotting | Ised. 1028 |
| Cnouldena | Knowlton | Kent, 704 |
| Cnoushale | Knotishall | Staf. 1627 |
| Cocham | Cookham | Berk. 98s |
| Codeffordia | Codford | Ox. 1004 |
| Codenham | Coddenham | Suf. 428, 1746 |
| Colecestria | Colchester | Ess. 77s, 779 |
| M. I . |  | 14 |
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| Coleham |  | Mid. 336 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Colstewrthe |  | Northamp. 1289 |
| Colingeham | Collingham | Nots. 330 |
| Colintona | Colyton | Dev. 100 |
| Colnm | Colne Engaine | Ess. 1639 |
| Copedae | Copdock | Snf. 1906 |
| Coplande | Coupland | Cumb 1154 |
| Corby | Corby | Line. 1042 |
| Cornhulla |  | Kent, 1047 |
| Cornlegha | Corley | War. 1416 |
| Corteseye | Chertsey | Sur. 36 |
| Cote | Coat | Ox. 787 |
| Cotes | Coates | Camb. 999, 1634 |
| Cotes | Coates | Glouc. 687 |
| Cotes | Cotes Deval | Leic. 1956 |
| Cotes | Coates | Linc. 1093 |
| Cotesmora | Cotesmore | Rnt. 1059 |
| Cotingeham | Cottingham | York. 1106 |
| Cotingwicus | Cottingwith | York. 1871 |
| Cottona | Coton | War. 1586 |
| Couentria | Coventry | $\begin{aligned} & \text { War. 801, 989, 1127, } \\ & 1690,1810 \end{aligned}$ |
| Conesgraue | Cosgrove | Northamp. 311 |
| Coulegha | Cowley | Staf. 1679 |
| Crakemere | Crakemarsh | Staf. 1979 |
| Cramfordia | Cranford | Mid. 1350 |
| Cranefordia | Cranford | Northamp. 1466 |
| Craneswrthe | Cranworth | Norf. 1009 |
| Crawemerse | Crowmarsh | Ox. 827 |
| Crawenho |  | Ess. 691 |
| Crawestoke |  | Sur. 465 |
| Crayo | Cray | Kent, 90 |
| Cree | Crick | Northamp. 1586 |
| Creck | Creake | Norf. 506, 754, 1489 |
| Creitona | Creighton | Staf. 1979 |
| Cretinge | Creeting | Suf. 478, 1891, 1931 |
| Cretona | Creaton | Northamp. 514, 1726 |
| Crikecot |  | Suf. 1920 |
| Cristehale | Chrishull | Ess. 550, 1001 |
| Cristemelefordia | Christian Malford | Wilt. 157 |
| Cristesham |  | Buek. 1621 |
| Croftona | Croughton | Northamp. 32 |
| Croherst | Crowhurst | Kent, 477 |
| Crokestona | Croxton | Norf. 64 |
| Croperie | Cropredy | Ox. 1142 |
| Croptona |  | Camb. 736 |
| Cruk |  | Dev. 1098 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Crumbeclive |  | Northumb, 432, 1096 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crundelia | Crondall | Hants. 1237 |
| Cudelam | Cordenhan | Suf. 1216 |
| Culewrthe | Culworth | Northamp. 1056 |
| Culintona | Colyton | Dev. 1581, 1601 |
| Culkertona | Cuckerton | Gloue. 961 |
| Cumba | Coombe | Dev. 1143 |
| Cumbe |  | Glouc. 110 |
| Cumbresdalo | Cummersdale | Cumb. 1040 |
| Cumquintin | Cumwhinton | Camb. 1040 |
| Cumptona | Compton | Som. 190 |
| Cumptona | Compton | War. 8 |
| Cuneleffeldia |  | Wilt. 1670 |
| Cunningeburgum | Conisborough | York. 26, 1685 |
| Cuuningeby | Coningsby | Linc. 986 |
| Cuntebiria | Countesbury | Dev. 197 |
| Cunstorpe | Coneythorpe, York (?) | Linc. 1739 |
| Cuscrigge | Courage | Berks. 1078 |
| Cuueleffeldia | Corrsfield | Wilt. 1360 |
| Cycestria | Chichester | Sus. 1783 |
| Cyle | Chetrey | Som. 5 |
| Cyrencestria, see C |  |  |


| Dachet | Datchet | Bucks. 868 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dakeham | Dageuham | Ess. 758 |
| Daletona | Dalston | Cumb. 1155 |
| Dallinge | Field Dalling | Norf. 614 |
| Dalwode | Dalwood | Dors. 1312 |
| Danecastum | Doncaster | York. 1329 |
| Dauby | Dalby | Leic. 1295 |
| Dauintona | Darington | Kent, 17, 767 |
| Dauintre | Daventry | Northamp. 31 |
| Dautona | Dalton | York. 772, 1016 |
| Debbeham | Debenham | Sut. 917 |
| Dedenham | Dedham | Ess. 746 |
| Dedhamptona |  | Hants. 764 |
| Denchewrthe | Denchworth | Berks. 1537 |
| Denemere |  | Norf. 672 |
| Dentorp | Danthorpe | York, 1871 |
| Deon' | Deane | Hants. 20\%; |
| Depedena |  | Sur. 37.5 |
| Derefeld | Darfield | York. 1853 |
| Deretemuwe | Dartmouth | 1)ev. 78.5 |
| Derlintona | Darlington, Dur. (?) | York. 1163 |
| Dersingtona | Dersington | Norf. 1128 |
| Deseburgum | Desborough | Northamp. 571 |
| Deuerel Lungpont | Longbrilge Deverill | Wilt. 12s1 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Dichingham
Dictona
Didenham
Dikeleswurthe
Dilintona
Dimescherche
Dingelby
Dingelmareis
Dinham
Ditenheshale
Dittona
Dittona
Dittona
Jinisae
Dockinge
Dodene
Dodingtona
Dorcestria
Dorcet'
Dorkinge
Dorsingtona
Douera
Drastesete
Drautona
Draytona
Drengo
Dreycota
Dudingtona
Dudingtona
Duldceota
Dunelmum
Dunewicus
Dunesslanda
Dungemareys
Dunham
Dunham
Duningtona
Dinmawe
Dunnestaplia
Dunstaplia
Duntona
J)untona
I)untrope
I) unwicus
D) unyuetona

Dustona
Duue, aqua de

Ditchingham
Deighton

Dickleborough (?)
Dilliriston
Dunchurch

Dengemarsh
Downham

Fen Ditton
Ditton
Thames Ditton
Devizes
Docking

Dorchester

Dorking
Dorsington
Dover
Stradsett (?)
Draughton
Drayton Beauchamp
Dringhoe
Draycot Cerne
Toddington
Duddington
Dulcot
Durham
Dunwich

Dengemarsh
Dunham
Denham
Jonnington
Dunmow
Dunstaple
Dunstaple
Dinton
Downton
Dunthorpe
Dunwieh
Dennington (?)
Duston
Dove

Norf. 695
York. 1883
Wilt. 1277
Norf. 865
Hunts. 1261
War. 1606
York. 660
Kent, 1667
Ess. 1485
York. 1470
Camb. 299, 1582
Kent, 481
Sur. 375, 1524, 1594
Wilts. 857, 862
Norf. 1797
Som. 667
Buck. 106
Dors. 831
War. 941
Sur. 545
Glouc. 840
Kent, 269, 1137
Norf. 1159
Northamp. 625
Buck. 1055
York. 1097
Wilt. 1494
Bed. 296
Northamp. 503, 565
Som. 1413
Jur. 1873
Suf. 1421, 1429, 1899
Dev. 290
Kent, 253
Norf. 1255
Suf. 1915
Heref. 507
Ess. 139, 1037
lied. ss9
Bed. 933
Ess. 237,575
ITeref. 8s?
Ox. 1527
Suf. 1123
Suf. 1706, 1937
Northamp. 904
York. 254

The numbers refir to the cases not to the payes.

| Eatona | Nuncaton | War. 12:0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eboracum | York | $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { York. } 16, & 237, & 1083, \\ 1158, & 1671, & 1867, \\ 1888, & 1859 & \end{array}$ |
| Eekeles | Eceles | Norf. 378 |
| Edeleintona | Edmonton (?) | Mid. 310 |
| Edelinebrugge | Edenbridge (?) | Kent, 666 |
| Edenewrthe | Edingworth | Som. 1391, 1469, 1191 |
| Edinetorpe | Edingthorpe | Norf. 1213, 1818 |
| Edmerse |  | Berk. 1176 |
| Edredstona | Earsdon (?) | Northmmb. 1385 |
| Eggewere | Eligware | Mid. 1068 |
| Eggestornia | Eythorn | Kent, 1699 |
| Egingtona | Egginton | Derb. 752 |
| Eglesago |  | Corn. 166t |
| Eklesburnia | Ebbesborne (?) | Wilt. 1019 |
| Eldefordmelne | Old Ford Mill | Mid. 419 |
| Eldrefeldia | Eldersfield | Wore. 1128 |
| Elenedena | Elmdon | Ess. 1007 |
| Elingelam | Ellingham | Norf. 1631 |
| Elinhain | Elmham | Norf. 1801 |
| Elkeduna |  | Derb. 480 |
| Ellefordia | Aylesford | Kent, 127t |
| Ellefordia | Elford | Stat. 260 |
| Ellerige |  | Dev. 53 |
| Ellintona |  | 1192 |
| Elmedona | Elmdon | War. 1319 |
| Elmigham | Helmingham, Suf. | Norf. 724 |
| Elteham | Eltham | Kent, 1788 |
| Eluertona |  | Wore. 1664 |
| Elwyesham | Eyusham (?) | Ox. 397 |
| Emmesby | Ormesby (?) | York. 1862 |
| Enefend | Enfield | Mid. 8, 343, 1397 |
| Enemede | Emneth | Norf. 1516 |
| Engleffeuldia | Englefield, Berk. | Buck. 390 |
| Erdele | Yardley | Herts. $35 \%$ |
| Erdintona | Ardington, Berks. (\%) | Sur. 1410 |
| Erdlegha | Eardleigh, Staf. (?) | Sal. 1136 |
| Erdletorpe | Eddlethorpe, York (?) | Linc. 1185 |
| Ere |  | Kent, 16:38 |
| Eringtona | Harrington (\%) | Northamp. 1015 |
| Erlega | Arley | Staf. 1681 |
| Erlide | Arley (\%) | Stat. 16:2 |
| Ermingtona |  | Dors. 117 |
| Ernebergum |  | Keut, 1638 |
| Ersham | Horsham (?) | Sus. 561 |
| Eseby | Easly | York. 1580 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Esserraut |  | Kent, 1782 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Esingtona | Easington | York. 1061 |
| Esse | Ash Reigney | Dev. 976 |
| Esselega |  | Dev. 290 |
| Essenedona |  | Hants. 1645 |
| Essingeham | Effingham (?) | Sur. 574 |
| Estanostige |  | Dev. 826 |
| Estanetona | Staverton (?) | Northamp. 1707 |
| Estaunfordia | Stamford | Linc. 538 |
| Estberdesheles |  | Northumb, 432 |
| Estbrent | E. Brent | Som. 1491 |
| Estehattona | E. Hatley (?) | Camb. 736 |
| Esterburghum |  | Norf. 1827 |
| Estenetona |  | Hants. $1 \check{0}$ |
| Estenetona | Sterenton | Berk. 303 |
| Esthenlegha |  | Buck. 1130 |
| Estillebiria | E. Tilbury | Ess. 690, 797 |
| Estkeles | E. Keal | Linc. 1033 |
| Estona | Easton | Berk. 302 |
| Estona | Exton | Hants. 138 |
| Estona | Easton | Norf. 1652 |
| Estona | Easton | Northamp. 205, 975 |
| Estona | Easington (?) | Ox. 787 |
| Estona | Easton | Som. 252 |
| Estona | Easton | War. 412 |
| Estrudham | E. Rudham | Norf. 1624 |
| Estuna | Easton | Northamp. 514 |
| Estuingtona | Steventon | Berk. 271 |
| Estweinz | E. Winch | Norf. 669 |
| Estwic |  | Northamp. 1522 |
| Estwode |  | Os. 1276 |
| Etona | Eton | Buck. 331, 1431 |
| Etona | Eaton | Not. 1510 |
| Ettona | Eton | Buck. 1750 |
| Ettona | Easton (?) | Som. (?) 172 |
| Euenle | Evenley | Northamp. 1522 |
| Euertona | Everton | Bed. 899, 933 |
| Eukintorpe |  | Linc. 1102 |
| Euro | Iver (?) | Buck. 75 |
| Euro | Oare (?) | Kent, 1770 |
| Ewelle | Ewell | Sur. 1661 |
| Eyllesbyry | Ailesbury | Buck. 285 |
| Eyluathestona | Aylton (?) | Heref. 227 |
| Eyltona |  | Sus. 44 |
| Eytona | Eaton | Leic. 949 |
| Eye | Quy | Camb. 108\% |
| Eywenthe | E.wworth | Bed. 1085 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Exonia | Exeter | Dev. 67, 170, 1172 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farenbergum | Farnborongh | Mants. 433 |
| Farendale | Farudale | York. 254 |
| Fareuduna | Faringdon | Berks. 728, 817 |
| Faringefordia | Fringford | Ox. 793 |
| Farlegha |  | Sus. 44 |
| Farnham | Farnham | Ess. 225 |
| Fauconliam | Fakenhan | Suf. 593 |
| Febbinges | Fobbing | Ess. 929 |
| Felebrigge | Felbrigg | Norf. 261, 937 |
| Felstede | Felstead | Ess. 413 |
| Feuddraytonz | Fen-Drayton | Camb. 30 |
| Fendraitona | Fen-Drayton | Camb. 991 |
| Feningeham | Finuingham | York. 1223 |
| Ferebrigge | Felbrigg | Norf. 261 |
| Ferenduna | Faringdon | Berk. 655 |
| Feringes | Ferring | Sus. 112 |
| Ferlegha | Farley | Wilt. 1277 |
| Fernle | Farnley | York. 1851 |
| Fifhida |  | Sur. 1661 |
| Fileby | Filby | Norf. 1808 |
| Finemere | Fimmere | Ox. 1518 |
| Fineslegha | Filey | York. 494 |
| Finingham | Finningham | Suf. 396 |
| Fisinges | Rising (?) | Norf. 1663 |
| Fisseburnia |  | Kent, 1783 |
| Flaifordia | Playford (?) | Suf. 698 |
| Fleehe | Fletehampstead (?) | War. 20'3 |
| Fleckeneye | Fleekney | Leic. 1967 |
| Fleg | Flegg | Norf. 595 |
| Flemingtona | Flempton (?) | Suf. 1930 |
| Flete | Fleet | Dev. 979 |
| Flete | Fleet | Dors. 457 |
| Flete | Fleet | Linc. 978 |
| Flinfordia |  | Som. $45{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Flore | Flore | Northantp. 1455 |
| Folesham |  | Bucks. 1220 |
| Folmodestona | Fulmodeston | Norf. 64 |
| Forde | Ford | Som. 866 |
| Fordham |  | Dev. 290 |
| Fordham | Fordham | Ess. 885 |
| Forho | Fortho | Nortliamp. fi3 |
| Fornham | Fornham | Suf. 700, 1917 |
| Foterholin |  | York. 1858 |
| Frackeham | Freckenham | Suf. 616 |
| Frammesdena | Framsden | Suf. 1911, 1910, 1911 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Framptona | Frampton | Glone. 1152 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fransham | Fransham | Norf. 1006 |
| Fresentona | Freston | Suf. 1426 |
| Freskeneye | Friskney | Line. 733, 822, 1093, 1211 |
| Freskorie, sce Freskeneye |  |  |
| Frestona | Freston | Suf. 1520 |
| Fretham | Frettenham | Norf. 49 |
| Fretona | Fritton | Norf. 642, 1800 |
| Frilingestrete |  | Som. 454 |
| Frimareis |  | York. 771 |
| Frome | Frome | Dors. 702, 1008 |
| Frome | Frome | Som. 454 |
| Froume |  | Heref. 1471 |
| Frumthorle |  | York. 660 |
| Fugheldona | Foulden (\%) | Norf. 1531, 1703 |
| Fulebroc | Fulbrook | War. 203, 1355 |
| Fulefordia | Fulford | Staf. 1972 |
| Fuletorpe |  | York. 1882 |
| Fulmodestona | Fulmodeston | Norf. 111 |
| Funtel | Fonthill | Wilt. 941 |
| Gaham | Gotham | Not. 818 |
| Gaifle | Gazeley | Suf. 487 |
| Gaislegha | Giazeley | Suf. 1921 |
| Garefordia | Garford | Berk. 229, 794, 1616 |
| Garsintonit | Garston | Berk. 967 |
| Gattele | Gately | Norf, 124, 912,1804 |
| Gattesdena | Gaddesden | Herts. 413, 540 |
| Gelham |  | Ess. 45 |
| Gerbodesham | Garboldisham | Norf. 1175, 1181 |
| Gernesmue | Yarmouth | Suf. 314, 762, 1895, 1897 |
| Gersindona | Garsington | Ox. 1528 |
| Gersith' |  | Sur. 375 |
| Gertona |  | Norf. 1456 |
| Gestlingestorje | Gestlingthorpe | Ess. 887 |
| Geudefor lia | Guildford | Sur. 10, 1317, 1348 |
| Geytintona | Geddington | Nortliamp. 1053 |
| Gillingeham | Gillingham | Kent, 1604 |
| Gimundeham | Goodmanham (?) | York. 501 |
| (iinges Laundri | (inge Laundri | Ess. 671 |
| Giselham | (iisleham | Suf. 881 |
| (ilastonia | Glastonbury | Som. 1180 |
| (ilentham | Glentham | Linc. 251 |
| (iloseme |  | lient, 1371 |
| (inoucestria | Giloucester | (ilouc. 151t |

The numbers rejer to the cases not to the pages.

| Godhelminges | (ootalming | Sur. 212, 800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Godinestre | Good Easter | Ess. 1099 |
| Godmaresham | Godmersham | Kent, 17\% |
| (iodwinestona | Goodnestone | Kent, 104s |
| Gogeshale | Cogreshall | Ess. 1478 |
| (roldore | Golder | Ox. 566 |
| Gorkeby | Gautby (?) | Linc. 575 |
| Gorlestona | Gorleston | Suf. 58: |
| Gosenhale |  | Kent, 462, 597 |
| Gosseby | (iautly (?) | Linc. 572 |
| Gottele | Gately | Norf. 942 |
| Craueleya | Graveley | Herts. 706, 864 |
| Gremseuilla | Grimstone (?) | Norf. 917 |
| (irenche |  | Kent, 1604, 1789 |
| Grenwey |  | Line. 1019 |
| (iressingeham | Cressingham | Norf. 1822 |
| Gretingeham | Cretingham | Suf. 1558, 1626 |
| Grettoua | Groton | Suf. 33 |
| Grimesby | Grimsly | Linc. 1205 |
| Grimstona |  | 1153 |
| Griptorpe | Gristhorle (?) | York. 1184 |
| Griseroft |  | York. 771 |
| (irossus Mons | Grossmont, Mon. | Heref. 1330 |
| Grotingtuna | Crudgington (?) | Sal. 664 |
| Gryseby |  | York. 1223 |
| Gunetorpe |  | Rut. 1653 |
| ciunthorpe | Gunthorp | Nots. 403 |
| Gyluertoft |  | Northamp. 147 |
| Gypewicus | Ipswich | $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { Suf. } 396, & 578, & 1023, \\ 1618, & 1908, & 1940, \\ 1941 & & \end{array}$ |
| Gyuele |  | Som. 198 |
| Hackintona | Hackington | Kent, 1774 |
| Haffordely |  | Leic. 1682 |
| Hakedena |  | Staf. 1051 |
| Hakene | Hackney | Mid. 662 |
| Hakene | Hackness (?) | York. 1676 |
| Hakethorne | Hackthorn | Linc. 1356 |
| Haketorpe | Hackthorpe, Westm. (?) | Lanc. 1187 |
| Haldeneby | Haldenby | York. 1852 |
| Haldestana |  | Der. 1285 |
| Hales | Hailes | Salop. 292 |
| Halestowe | Halstow | Kent, 1163 |
| Halingedona | Hangleton (?) | Sus. 1320 |
| Hallebland |  | Norf. 1832 |
| Halsewicus |  | Herts. 1560 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Halletona
Hamele
Hamertona
Hamme
Hammes
Hamontona
Hamptona
Hamptona
Hamptona in Arderne
Hamstede
Hamtona
Hanestie
Hantona
Hanwurthe
Haregraue
Haremede.
Haresham
Harletona
Harpedena
Haspele, see Aspele
Hatfeud
Hathfeldia Regis
Hathfeldia
Hattona
Haunewole
Hauekescherche
Haneriete
Haueringe
Haufordia
Hautona
Heccle
Hecham
Hecham
Hecham
Hechardis
Hechhulla
Heclesse
Hedingtona
Helona
Hegham
Helkesle
Helmlay
IIelperthorpe
Hembyria
1 Iemduna
Hemeldena

Allerton (?)
Hamble
Hamerton

Hampton
Batl Hampton
Hampton
Hampton in Arclen
Hamstead
Anstey
Hatton (?)
Hanworth
Hargrave
Hardmead
Harnham (?)
Carlton (?)
Harpsden
Hatfield
Hatfield Broadoak
Hatfield
Hatton
Hawkehurch
Halvergate
Havering
Hatford (?)
Halton
Ickham
Heacham
Higham (?)
Hethel (?)
Eccles
Heddington
Hedon
Higham Ferrers
Elksley
Helmsley

Hendon
Ifelindon

York. 1875
Suf. 1123
Hunt. 681, 757
Dev. 1575
Sus. 806
War. 973
Som. 866
Kent, 1769
War. 1352
Berks. 512, 612
Herts. 1345
Wilt. (?) 1599
Linc. 20.
Norf. 695
Northamp. 319
Buck. 1576
Wilt. 1003
Leic. 1335
Ox. 68

York. 248
Ess. 1524
Herts. 144, 1476
Mid. 123, 715
Som. 1710
Dors. 131
Norf. 1036
Ess. 641, 834, 1018, 1119
Berks. 837
Linc. 1102
Kent, 597
Kent, 1781
Norf. 668, 1074, 1100
Suf. 1905
Kent, 1787
Norf. 1755
Norf. (?) 1933
Wilt. 463
York. 1459
Northamp. 1236
Not. 224
Y'ork. 254
Buck. 1055
Dev. 808
Mid. 334
Northanp. 203

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Hemelingtona | Hemblington | Norf. 185 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hemmingtona | Hemington | Leic. 1951 |
| Henegetona | Haunton | Staf. 602 |
| Henle | Henley | Ox. 1084 |
| Hentona | Hinton | Hants. 647, 1689 |
| Henred | Hendred | Berk. 469 |
| Herdewic |  | Bed. 580 |
| Herdewic | Hardwick | Norf. 642, 644 |
| Herdingtona | Harlington (?) | Mid. 792 |
| Herefordia | Hereford | Heref. 1473 |
| Heregrate |  | Sus. 526 |
| Herlawo | Harlow | Ess. 727 |
| Herletona | Harlington | York. 1871 |
| Herlingedona | Harlington | Bed. 1572 |
| Hermingesheye | Homingsea | Camb. 1582 |
| Hermingtona | Hemington | Som. 170 |
| Hersham |  | Ess. 458 |
| Hersthecote |  | Corn. 367 |
| Hertefordia | Hertford | Herts. 540, 870, 1126 |
| Herteshenede | Hartshead | York. 1846 |
| Hertherst |  | Suf. 1239 |
| Herthulla | Harthill | York. 1686 |
| Hertona | Horton (?) | Dors. 1536 |
| Herts' | Hurst | Kent, 263 |
| Hesel |  | Hercf. 946 |
| Heselbec |  | Not. 604 |
| Hesseburnia | Hurstbourne | Hants. 1237 |
| Hethfehlia | Hatfield | York. 1685 |
| Hethfeuldia | Hatfield | Heref. 371 |
| Hethilla | Hethel | Norf. 27, 56 |
| Heutona |  | York. 254 |
| Hiche |  | Heref. 1508 |
| Hiclingeham | Higham (?) | Suf. 1520 |
| Hikenham | Ickenham | Mid. 1559 |
| Hildestuna | Hillesdon | Buck. 633 |
| Hillingtona | Hillington | Norf. 1452 |
| Hinetle |  | Ox. 1493 |
| Hingelescomba | Englishcombe | Som. 317 |
| Hintelesham | Hintlesham | Suf. 418, 1902 |
| Hiperun | Hipperholme | York. 244 |
| Hirst |  | Not. 552 |
| Hiseuelestona |  | Suf. 1914 |
| Hispedena | Ipsden | Ox. 1688 |
| Histona | Histon | Camb. 291 |
| Ho | Hoo | Fint, 1163 |
| Ho | Hoe | Norf. 1821 |
| Hobrige | Hoborough | Ox. 1374 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Hochechota | IIolcot (?) | Northamp. 1592 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hoclintona |  | Northamp. 938 |
| Hoesike |  | Not. 433 |
| Hoetona | Houghton | York. 1547 |
| Hokefeld or Otheshelne | Oxhiill (?) | War. 1546 |
| Hokeringe | Hockering | Kent, 17 |
| Hokesore |  | Hants. 1039 |
| Hokyntona | Oakington | Camb. 175 |
| Holebeek | Holbeach | Linc. 301 |
| Holesle | Hollesley | Suf. 1241 |
| Holeweie | Holloway | Derb. 486 |
| Holkham |  | Norf. 55 |
| Homodona |  | Northamp. 1173 |
| Hoptona | Hopton | Staf. 1978 |
| Horeburnia | Harborne (?) | Staf. 362 |
| Horewiens | Horwich | Lane. 1547 |
| Horfordia |  | York. 849 |
| Horingefeldia | Hanningfield | Ess. 1760 |
| Hormodona | Horndon | Ess. 275 |
| Hornecastrum | Homeastle | Linc. 711 |
| Hornigefendia | Horning (?) | Norf. 1838 |
| Horningeshese | Horningsea | Camb. 299 |
| Horuingetona | Hornington | York, 1081 |
| Horsendona | Horsendon | Buck. 1677 |
| Horsie |  | Sus. 160 |
| Horspathe | Horsepath | Ox. 815 |
| Hortona | Horton | Buek. 161 |
| Hortona | Horton | Dors. 168 |
| Hortona |  | Sus. 709 |
| Hortona | Horton | Wilt. 1183 |
| Hothoft | Huttoft | Line. 689 |
| Houkegarth | Howarth (?) | York. 1884 |
| Houlegha |  | Norf. 1927 |
| Houtona | Holton | Suf. 788 |
| Houtona | Houghton | York. 1754, 1851 |
| Howes |  | Camb. 57 |
| Hucham | Ilongham | Kent, 811 |
| Hughele | Hngheley | Sal. 1741 |
| Itukelay |  | Rut. 80 |
| Ifulle | Itill | Wore. 1222 |
| Ifulm' | Hulme | Staf. 707, 1747 |
| Ifuhmun |  | Line. 1675 |
| Ifulmum | IIolm | Norf. 1792 |
| Hulrecumba |  | Wore. 680 |
| Humbrestona | llumberstone | Leic. 1301, 1966 |
| Humestuna | Hunston | Sus. 410 |
| Itundemaunely | llumannby | York, 491 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Humdingdona |  | Ox. 513 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hunestanestuna |  | War. 467 |
| Himestuna | Hunston | Sus. 421 |
| Hungerhalla |  | Herts. 200 |
| Hunstanestuna | Hunstanton | Norf. 591 |
| Huntewde | Hunworth (? ${ }^{\text {? }}$ | Norf. 1376, 1445 |
| Huntingefenld | Huntingfield | Suf. 1900 |
| Hupetona | Upton | Wilt. 1698 |
| Huphauene see Uphatuene |  |  |
| Hurdesduna |  | Buck. 633 |
| Hustona | Histon | Camb. 1672 |
| Inusum |  | York, 68.5 |
| Hwerelesdum | Whorwelsdown | Wilt. 1110 |
| Hyfordia | Iford | Sus. 1656 |
| Hyrteby |  | Hants. 241 |
| Hywis | Huish Episenpi | Som. 1436 |
| Iakele | Yasley | Suf. 415 |
| Icham | Jekenham | Mid. 59 |
| Iclintona | Itchington | Glone. 1449 |
| Ierdele | Yardley | Wore. 1387 |
| Ierdelegha | Tardley Gobion | Northamp. 485 |
| Iernemue see Gernesmue |  |  |
| Ikelegha |  | Northamp. 1186 |
| Ikelesham | Iekleshall | Sus. 872 |
| Ikenham | Iekenham | Mid. 339 |
| Illefordia | Ilford | Ess. 1694 |
| Illegha | Monks Eleigh | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Suf. 442, } 703,1023, \\ & 1922 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ilpene |  | Northamp. 1565 |
| Ingelesham | Inglesham | Berks. 65.5 |
| Ingewrthe | Ingworth | Norf. 1359 |
| Ingham | Ingham | Linc. 251 |
| Inglescumba | Englishoombe | Som. 1379 |
| Inglestona | Ingleton | York. 1845 |
| Ingoldeby | Ingoldsby | York. 538 |
| Intewode | Intwood | Norf. 1825 |
| Ircestria | Irehester | Northamp. 483 |
| Irnham | Imham | Line. 414 |
| Irtlingeburgum | Irthlingborough | Northamp. 162 |
| Iselhamstere | Ashampsteal ( ${ }^{\text {( })}$ | Bucks. 656 |
| Islepe | Islip, | Northamp. 625, 693 |
| Ispedena | Ipsden | Ox. 1717 |
| Itringeham | Itteringham | Norf. 1762 |
| Iudham | Lowdham | Not. 403 |
| Kailmers | Kelmarsh | Northamp. 725 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Kambes | Campsey (?) | Suf. 1924 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kanefordia | Canforl | Dors. 532 |
| Kanetona | Kenton | Suf. 1913 |
| Kanewedeua | Canewdon | Ess. 1275 |
| Kantertona |  | Wore. 1402 |
| Karletona | Carlton | Camb. 663 |
| Karletona | Carlton | Leic. 1305 |
| Karletona | Carlton | Norf. 1225 |
| Karletona | Carlton | Northamp. 344 |
| Karletona | Carlton | Not. 330 |
| Karletona | Carlton | Suf. 1901 |
| Karnarb' |  | Corn. 596, 991 |
| Karswelle | Carswell | Berks. 235 |
| Karwala |  | Corn. 596, 991 |
| Katelestona | Kettlestone, Norf. (?) | Linc. 1073 |
| Katerholme |  | York. 1083 |
| Kauereffuld | Caversfield | Buek. 803 |
| Kanstona | Cawston | Norf. 1061, 1069 |
| Kautona see Kaustona |  |  |
| Kayham | Keyliam | Leic. 1960 |
| Keburgum | Ickborough | Norf. 839 |
| Kedingdona | Kedingdon | Suf. 1923 |
| Kemeseia | Kempsey | Worc. 1588 |
| Kemeshey | Kemsing | Kent, 102 |
| Ken | Kenn | Som. 170, 1436 |
| Kenigtoua | Kennington | Sur. 1108, 1183 |
| Kensingtona | Kensington | Mid. 790, 1919 |
| Kentissetona | Kentishtown | Mid. 825, 826 |
| Kerebroc | Carbrook | Norf. 1009 |
| Kerkcherle | Kirk Harle | Northtmb. 1191 |
| Kersintona | Cassington (?) | Ox. 1373 |
| Ketelbernestona | Kettlebaston | Suf. 38, 353 |
| Ketelburgum | Kettleburgh | Suf. 1066 |
| Ketona | Ketton | Rut. 1310, 1327 |
| Keuele | Keevil | Wilt. 173 |
| Keystorpe | Caythorpe | Linc. 747 |
| Kideministrum | Kidderminster | Worc. 1580 |
| Kickel' | Cockhill (?) | York. 849 |
| Killeburi | Kilburn | York. 1197 |
| Kima | Kyme | Linc. 174 |
| Kinebautona | Kimbolton | IInut. 893, 126I |
| Kinemundecota |  | Leic. 1602 |
| Kingesbiria | Kingsbury, Mid, (?) | Herts. 1479 |
| Kingeshale |  | Wilt. 1183 |
| Kingestona | Kingston | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sur. } 84,1122,1138 \text {, } \\ & 1705 \end{aligned}$ |
| Kingestona | Kingston | Sus. 112 |

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Kippingescota |  | Dev. 114\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kirkeby | Kirkby | Linc. 1311 |
| Kinelestuna |  | Wilt. 463 |
| Kniuetona | Kniveton | Derb. 1712 |
| Knolle |  | Lanc. 1577 |
| Kokermue | Cockermouth | Cumb. 920 |
| Kotteringham | Ketteringham, Norf. (?) | Suf. 1919 |
| Kulinge | Kelling (?) | Suf. 805 |
| Kuluingtona | Kilvington | York. 759 |
| Kınnetona | Fniveton (?) | Derb. 1712 |
| Kyhauene |  | Hants. 866 |
| Kyneburle | Kimberley | Norf. 39 |
| Kyrkeby | Kirby | Norf. 423 |
| Fyrteby |  | York. 905 |
| liyrkestuna |  | York. 244 |
| Lachefordia | Latchford | Ox. 657 |
| Lafham | Lavenham (?) | Suf. 1936 |
| Laghefar | Lawford (?) | Ess. 181 |
| Langearse | Landeross (?) | Dev. 977 |
| Langeburgum | Longborough | Glouc. 1325 |
| Langedona | Langdon Hills | Ess. 58, 89 |
| Langedona | Langton | Leic. 1970 |
| Langefordia | Langford | Bed. 1182 |
| Langefordia |  | Dors. 1414 |
| Langefordia | Langford | Norf. 839 |
| Langehale | Langhale | Norf. 600 |
| Langeherste | Longhirst | Northumb. 361 |
| Langeho | Langenhoe | Ess. 1372 |
| Langelegha | Langley | Herts. 429,471 |
| Langestrede | Langstroth | York. 1881 |
| Langetre | Langtree | Lanc. 1386 |
| Lantilio | Llantilio, Mon. | Heref. 1330 |
| Lassendona | Lassington | Glouc. 1231 |
| Latebyria | Lathbury | Buck. 1613 |
| Latfordia |  | Suf. 1530 |
| Latheun | Latham | York. 82 |
| Lathum | Lathom | Lame. 1577 |
| Lauintona | Lavington | Sus. 81 |
| Lauintona | Lavington | Wilt. 1687 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Layintona } \\ \text { Laxintona }\end{array}\right\}$ | Laxton | Northamp. 148 |
| Lechtona | Letton | Norf. 1009 |
| Lectona | Leyton | Ess. 586 |
| Lectona | Leighton | Iunt. 411 |
| Ledecumba | Letcombe Bassett | Jerks. 287, .779 |
| Ledetuma | Letcombe Bassett (?) | Berks. 635 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Ledlinges |  | Hants. 116 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lee |  | York. 1680 |
| Leggesloy | Legsby | Linc. 720 |
| Legha |  | Corn. 348 |
| Legha |  | Bed. 216, 838 |
| Legha | Leigh | Ess. 1738 |
| Legla | Lea | Derb. 486 |
| Leircestria | Leicester | Leic. 989, 1188, 1946, 1952, 1954 |
| Leistuna | Leiston | Suf. 739 |
| Leitona | Leyton | Ess. 640 |
| Leke | Leake | Not. 818 |
| Lelbruge |  | Glouc. 1265 |
| Lellesheya |  | Suf. 703 |
| Lenne | Lynn | Norf. 669, 722, 1251 |
| Lerdingdona |  | Sus. 350 |
| Lertona | Leyton (?) | Ess. 738 |
| Lesnes | Lessness | Kent. 1044, 1764 |
| Leningtona |  | Cumb. 249 |
| Lewes | N. Lew | Dev. 920 |
| Lewes | Lew | Ox. 1107 |
| Lewes | Lewes | Sus. 546, 643, 1343 |
| Lexendene | Lexden | Ess. (9) 779 |
| Leyburne | Leyburn | York. 1198 |
| Lichfeld | Lichfield | Staf. 1981 |
| Lidefordia | Lydford | Som. 265, 407, 547, 610 |
| Lidiard | Lydeard | Som. 172 |
| Lincolnia | Lincoln | Linc. 20, 145̃, 278, 529, 661, 768, 952, 1087, $1206,1209,1280$ |
| Lincumba | Lyncombe | Som. 866 |
| Lindwale | Linwood | Linc. 720,909 |
| Linfordia | Linford | Buck. 940 |
| Lingestama | Lillingstone (?) | Ox. 519 |
| Lintona | Lynton | Dev. 197, 1732 |
| Lipstona | Lympston | Dev. 1759 |
| Lisduna | Ieysdown | Kent, 605 |
| Litletona | Littleton | Wiit. 1420 |
| Liutona | Luton | Bed. 102, 1012 |
| Lodnes | Loddon | Norf. 1799, 1814 |
| Londonia | London | Mid. 11, 73, 312, 314, 375, 489, 568, 588, 692, $748,912,1068$, 1227, 1429, 1435, 1461, 1498, 1503, 1564, 1723, 1725 |
| Longwathe | Langworth | Linc. 1579 |

The mumbres refer to the cases not to the pages.

Lonwath'
Loppene
Loures
Luddedima
Ludeford
Lue
Lunc
Limdr'
Lutona
Lutona
Luttoma
Luyha

Maidingtuna
Maiford
Makertona
Malmesbiria
Mamele
Mamstede
Maningfortia
Mapeltona
Mapertishale
Marehewrthe, see Merkwrthe
Marham
Marlefordia
Martona
Maulinges
Maxstuna
Meaudona
Meautona
Medburnia
Medham
Medefeldia
Medingeham
Melburnia
Meldreie
Meleeumba
Melecumba
Melefordia
Meleham
Melgeresbiria
Melkeleia
Melkesham
Mellinges
Mendham
Merchham
Mere

Landwade (?)
Lopen
Ludlestown
Ludford
Louth
Lund
Lound
Loughton (?)
Luton
Lutton
liver Lea

Maddington
Mayford
Markeaton
Malmesbury
Mamble

Manningford
Mappleton
Meppershall
Marham
Marlesford
Marton

Maidstone (?)
Maldon
Manton (? ${ }^{\text {P }}$ )
Medbourne
Medham
Metfield
Mettingham
Melbourn
Meldreth
Melcombe
Milcomb, Ox. (?)
Melford
Mileham

Melksham
Melling
Mendham
('amb) , sis
Som. 13:フ
Ess. 47
Kent, 6.71
Heref. 7
Linc. 1160
lork. fiti
Suf. 1509
Ess. 2s!
Bed. Ris 1
Linc. 511, 627
Mid. fl 9

Wilts. 402
Surr. 401
I) erb. 974

Wilts. 141, 101.5
Wore. 675
Berk. 431
Wilts. 163
York. 1671
Bel. 015

Norf. 1298
Suf. 1909
York. 22, 60, 118
Suf. 871
Kent, 811
Sur. 1077
Wilt. 732
Leic. 1219
Sus. 119
Suf. 915
Suf. (?) 781
Camb. 16t!
Camb. 1619
Dors. 77, 293
War. 17.97
Suf. 116:
Norf. 13!)0
Glouc. 3s6
Herts. 200
Wilts. 319
Lane. 1291
Suf. 639
Buck. 1139
Kent, 169
1.5

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Nereflet | Marfleet | Yerk. 859 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Merel |  | Kent, 1047 |
| Merelente | Moorlinch | Som. 454 |
| Merewella | Merevale | Leic. (?) 1172 |
| Merkedicha | Mark Ditch | Som. 1170 |
| Merleburgnm | Marlborough | Wilt. 992, 1109, 1282 |
| Merlefordia |  | Northamp. 972 |
| Merse | Marsh | Buck. 318, 354 |
| Merse |  | Ox. 1189 |
| Merstona | Marston | Buck. 734 |
| Merstona | Marston | Leic. 1462 |
| Merstona | Marston | Linc. 232 |
| Merstona | Marston Maisey | Wilt. 1749 |
| Mertherthiseny | Mevagissey (?) | Corn. 426 |
| Mertona | Marton | War. 196 |
| Mertona | Metton | Norf. 695 |
| Mertona | Merton | Sur. 1117 |
| Micham | Mitcham | Sur. 126, 1284 |
| Michefeldia | Mickfield | Suf. 1502 |
| Middellande | - | Corn. 367 |
| Middeltona | Milton Keynes (?) | Buck. 799 |
| Middeltona | Milton | Kent, 753 |
| Middeltona | Middleton | Suf. 91, 1392 |
| Mideltona | Milton | Som. 93 |
| Mikelfeld | Micklefield | York. 1868 |
| Milfordia | Milford | York, 1857 |
| Miurines |  | Heref. 358 |
| Mor |  | Norf. 181 |
| More, la |  | Ox. 1089, 1646, 1701 |
| Mordnna | Merden | Sur. 620 |
| Morewic |  | Leic. 814 |
| Mortena | Moreton Hampstead | Dev. 1190 |
| Mortona |  | Leic. 1963 |
| Mortona |  | Norf. 937 |
| Mortona | Morton Pinkney | Northamp. 938 |
| Mortona | Moreton | Staf. 1334 |
| Mucheldoura | Micheldever | Hants. 1727 |
| Mukelintona | Mickleton | Glouc. 1383 |
| Muluertona | Milverton | War. 569 |
| Mumby | Mumby | Linc. 409 |
| Mundham | Mondham | Norf. 1618 |
| Munketona | Monkton | York. 309, 515 |
| Musebiria | Musbury | Dev. 170 |
| Naburne | Naburn | York. 772 |
| Naketona | Nacton | Suf. 258, 268 |
| Naringe |  | Norf. 1815 |

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Necham
Nerefordia
Nererock
Netelstede
Neterlestede, see Netelstede
Neuport Paynelle
Neutona
Neutona
Neutona
Neutona
Neutona
Newebrigge
Newendona
Newentona
Newetona
Newetona
Newetoma
Newetona
Niwetona
Norfeudia
Norhilada
Norhamptona

Norhulla
Norigge
Normanton
Norselegha
Northeraye
Northicote
Northkyme
Northluffenham
Northona
Northona
Northona
Northona
Nortona
Nortona
Nortona
Norwicus
Norwicus
Notingeham
Nonesle
Noua Villa
Nouum Castellum
Nuntona

Narfore

Nottlestead

Newport Pagnell
Newton
Newington (?)
Neuton Pureell
Newton
Newton

Nevendon
Newtown
Newington (:)
Newton
Newton
Newton
Newington

Northampton

Normanton
N. Cray
N. Kyme
N. Luffenham

Norton

Norton
Norton
Norton
Bishop's Norton
Norton Disney
Norwich
Northwiek
Nottingham

Newton
Newcastle
Nunton

Hants. 126
Norf. 193, 1091
Sus. 44.
Kent, 76.5, 960, 1767

Buek. 144s
Cumb. 280
Kent, 7.3
Ox. 1131
Wilts. 463
York. 78.)
York. 1043
Ess. 176
Berks. 837
Kent, 1593
Leic. 1944
Suf. 193:
York, 1886
Ox. 772
Linc. 1721
Som. 1170
Northamp. 351, 372, $518,857,916,930$, 1031, 1213, 1266, 1273,1483
Norf. 1321
Wilt. 1486
Leic. 1965
Northumb. 517
Kent, 1776
Staf, 388
Linc. 1417
Rut. 80
Kent, 1780
Leic. 1915
Worc. 982
York. 1223
Bucks. 1220
Linc. (?) $120 t$
Line. 182
Norf. 1411, 1597, 1×31
Worc. 542
Not. 405, 459, 1188
Leic. 430
Heref. 877
Northumb. 361, 8.5
Northamp, 1736
1.5-2

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Nutelegha | Nutley | Hants. 1433 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nyweland |  | Kent, 1338 |
| Nywetona | Newton | Hunt. 948 |
| Nywenham | Newnham | Northamp. 1076 |
| Nywentona | Newton | Northamp. 924, 1053 |
| Obintinges | Oving | Sus. 44 |
| Oeumptona | Okehampton | Dev. 170 |
| Offele | Offley | Herts. 1475 |
| Ofham | Offlham | Sus. 189, 1595 |
| Ofspringe | Ospringe | Kent, 437, 964 |
| Olbernehy | Osbournby | Linc. 1093 |
| Oleby | Oadby (?) | Leic. 1057 |
| Olestorp | Ullesthorpe | War. 313 |
| Olstorpe | Ullesthorpe | Leic. 498 |
| Opilande |  | Kent, 1638 |
| Orehertona |  | Dev. 965 |
| Ordeshales | Ordsall | Lanc. 449 |
| Ore | Oare | Berks. 1078 |
| Oreby | Orby | Line. 638 |
| Ornely | Hornby | Lanc. 1291 |
| Ortona | Horton | Ox. 283 |
| Oselegha | Oxley | Staf. 388 |
| Oselewrthe | Ozleworth | Glone. 1438 |
| Ostallinges |  | York. 771 |
| Oswaldeskyrk | Oswaldkirk | York. 1199 |
| Otheshelue, see Hokfield |  |  |
| Ouerkudingtona | Cuddington | Ox. 688 |
| Ouertona | Overton | Leic. 739 |
| Ouertona | Overton | Wilt. 1114 |
| Oure | Mickleover | Derb. 914, 974 |
| Oustona | Owston | York. 1191 |
| Oweltona | Oulton | Norf. 106t |
| Oxecumba | Oxcombe | Line. 1751 |
| Oxne | Hoxme | Suf. 1934 |
| Oxonia | Oxford | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ox. } 577,589,939,1034, \\ & \quad 1160,1603 \end{aligned}$ |
| Oxon' | Oxney | Kent, 1785 |
| Packesdena |  | Bed. 38.5 |
| Padedene |  | Sur. 40 |
| Pakeham | Pakenham | Suf. 461, 527 |
| Pallinge | Palling | Norf. 1813, 1820 |
| Pallintona | P'ailton | War. 1355 |
| Panewrthe | Panxworth | Norf. 1041 |
| Pangeburnia | Pangbourne | Berk. 1176 |
| Parham | Parham | Suf. 1381 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Paston | Paston | Northamp. 39> |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Patcringtona |  | York. 771 |
| Pauntebiria | Pant (?) | Sial. 631 |
| Pausella |  | Dors. 1008 |
| Pecham | Peckham | Kent, 1114 |
| Pecham | reckham | Sur. 306 |
| Pendemore |  | Northumb. 361 |
| Penfentein |  | Corn. 367 |
| Penne | Penn | 13ucks. 203 |
| Persore | Pershore | Worc. 1628 |
| Pery | Potterspury (\%) | Northamp. 1214 |
| Pesehale | Peasenhall | Suf. 533, 593, f998 |
| Penenesse | Pevensey | Sus. 160 |
| Pidele | Piddle | I)ors. 1695 |
| Pikewilla | Pickwell | Leic. 712, 1700, 1744 |
| Pilardintona | Pillerton | War. 989 |
| Piltona | Pilton | Rut. 916, 1030, 1103 |
| Pincebek | Pinchbeek | Linc. 1209 |
| Pinpre | Pimperne | Dors. 1111 |
| Piperhargh' | Pepperharrow | Hants. 116 |
| Pirho | Pirnhow | Norf. 695 |
| Pleselcy | Pleasley | Not. 62 |
| Plessetum | Pleshey | Ess. 8, 797 |
| Plumstede | Plumstead | Norf. 1823 |
| Planstede | Plumstead | Kent, 376, 474 |
| Pokehulla | Poughill | Dev. 6 |
| Pokeste |  | Northamp. 311 |
| Polstede | Polstead | Suf. 295 |
| Pons Burgi | Boroughbridge | York. 1468 |
| Porteshened | Portishead | Som. 992 |
| Porteslope | Postlip | Glonc. 1439 |
| Portesmue | Portsmonth | Hants. 931 |
| Poyntona | Ponton | Linc. 1049 |
| Prestespidele | Piddle | Dors. Som. 1534 |
| Prestona | Preston | Kent, 1771 |
| Prestona | Preston | Suf. 639, 1916 |
| Prestona | Preston | Sus. 1609 |
| Prestona | Preston | York. 658 |
| Prikewella | Pickwell | Leic. 1700 |
| Pudingtona | Puddington | Bed. 216 |
| Pukering | Pickering | York, 251 |
| Puketorpe | Pockthorpe | York. 1191 |
| Pultona |  | War. 109 |
| Punninges |  | Norf. 672 |
| Putta, la |  | Staf. 142. |
| Puttelega | Putley | Heref. 227 |

The numbers rejer to the cases not to the pages.

| Quappelode | Whaplode | Linc. 780 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quedich' |  | Corn. 1015 |
| Quentona | Quinton | Glouc. 988 |
| Querendona | Quarrendon | Bucks. 8 |
| Querendona | Qua-rington | Linc. 1073 |
| Raddona |  | Corn. 143 |
| Radecliue | Ratcliffe Culey | Leic. 1305, 1335 |
| Radecliue | Radcliffe | Lanc. (?) 273 |
| Radefordia | Radford | War. 594 |
| Radewella |  | Ox. 1326 |
| Radinges | Reading | Berks. 201, 842, 1363 |
| Raghtona | Raughton | Cumb. 1155 |
| Ramescia | Tamsey | Hunt. 1716 |
| Ramsdena | Ramsden | Ess. 1485 |
| Randes | Raunds | Northamp. 1236 |
| Ranesholm |  | York. 1859 |
| Rasne | Market Rasen | Linc. 638 |
| Ratfordia | Radford | Not. 329 |
| Ranenestendale | Ravenstonedale | Westm. 995 |
| Rauenestorpe | Ravensthorpe | Northamp. 1662 |
| Raueningeham | Raveningham | Norf. 968 |
| Raytulphage |  | Norf. 1839 |
| Red | Tieed | Herts. 448 |
| Reddenhale | Redenhall | Norf. 1805 |
| Reimerstona | Reymerstone | Norf. 1256 |
| Rekesdona | Roxton (?) | Bed. 41 |
| Remmesbiria | Ramsbury | Wilt. 1282 |
| Renham | Rainham | Ess. 834 |
| Reples' | Ripple | Kent, 237 |
| Rethesheye | Rotherhithe | Sur. 802 |
| Rideware | Maresyn Ridware | Staf. 1976 |
| Riggeby | Wragsby | Linc. 909 |
| Rindham | Rendham | Suf. 1240, 1912 |
| Riple | Ripple | Kent, 237, 1333, 1659 |
| Rippelegha | Ripple | Worc. 536 |
| Riptona | Ripton Abbott | Hunt. 360 |
| Risebroc | lushbrook | Suf. 417 |
| Riscle | Riseley | Bed. 1741 |
| Riseuilla | Hisboro' | Buck. 1734 |
| Risinge | Castle Rising | Norf. 12.7, 1663 |
| Ristona | Riston | Norf. 672 |
| Rochamstede |  | 1Herts. or Heref. 653, 676 |
| Fivetona | Boughton (\%) | Kent, 1773 |
| Rodlinge | Iidangton (?) | Rut. 665 |
| Rotfa | liochester | Kent, 1763 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Rioinges, see Roynges
Rolleby
Romerstona
Rongeham
Roppes
Roneeby
Roullestona
loynges
Rucham
Rucherheye
Ruchtona
Ruchtona
Puetona
Rudham
Rugeleslegha
Rumballeswicus
Rumenal
Rumeseia
Russewrthe
Russoc
Ruswrthe
Rye Rye
Ryse Rise
Sabrictewrthe
Sacristona
Sadbergum
Sakelesfordia
Saldena
Salhurst
Salle
Salopesbiria
Sanetus Austellus
Sanctus Edmundus
Sanctus Ino
Sanctus Neotus
Sanctus Sithuinus
Sandestede
Sandewalle
Sanrigge
Santerdona
Sapertona
Sarchecroft
Sardesleya
Sarisbiria
Satcote
Stundfordia

Rollesby
Reymerston
Rougham (?)
Repps
Roxby
Rolleston
Roding
Rougham
Rotherhithe
Rushton
Rushton
lioxton
Roudham
Rugeley
Rumboldswyke
Rommey
Romsey
Rushton (?)
Rushock

Sawbridgeworth
Shackerstone
Sedbergh
Shackleford
Salden
Sall
Shrewsbury
St Austell
Bury st Edmunds
St Ives
St Neots
St Stithians
Sinderstead
Sandling (?)
Saunderton
Sapperton
Seacroft (?)
Salisbury
Sampford Courtenay

Norf. 37.1
Norf. 1925
Norf. 531
Norf. 1814
Linc. 1728
Not. 1454
Ess. 727, 1025, 1748
Norf. 100
Sur. 878
Norf. 1378
Northamp. 1053
Bed. 581
Norf. 12.92
Staf. 1678, 1973
Sus. 1058
Kent, 1778
Hants. 460
Northamp. 222
Worc. 250, 1266
Norf. 1826
Sus. 132
York. 1551
Hert. 1643
Leic. 195\%
York. 1865
Hants. 116
Buck. 1014
Sus. 1745
Norf. 1798
Sal. 1472, 1629
Corn. 596, 991
Suf. 1692, 1905
Hunt. 145, 291
Hunt. 1720
Corn. 40 s
Sur. 113
Ox. 156, 1519
Kent, 1271
Buck. 1389
Linc. 538
York. 1854
Ess. 1639
Wilt. 1235
York. 256
Dev. 170

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Saundres
Saxlingeham
Saxtona
Scales
scandefordia
Scandefordia
Scardeburgum
Scaudefordia
Seburgham
Sechefordia
Sefeldia
Seffordia
Segebroc
Sekehale
Semare
Serlcby
Seyle
Shaghe
Shaghebiria
Shamele
Sharentona
Sharnefordia
Sharpetoft
Sharpham
Shandewella
Shaustona
Sheltlinge
Shelford
Sheltona
Sheltona
Sheltona
Shelwude
Shencleffeldia
Shepe
Shepellena
Sheperigge
Shepertona
Sheppelegha
Shiptona
Shireduna
Shiringtona
Shitlinduna
Shornes
Shottona
Shukedena
Shyrewilla
Sibbefortia
Sunderstead (?)
Saxlingham
Sawston

Scarborough
Shalford
Sebergham
Sedgeford
shefford (?)
Shelford
Sedgebrook
Sykehouse
Seamer
Serlby
Over or Nether Seal
Shaw
Shawbury
Shamwell
Sharrington
Sharnford Leic. 1968
Shropham Norf. 1704
Showell (?)
Slawston (?)
Sweflling

Earshilton

|  | Sur. 1661 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shenfield | Ess. 1742 |
| Sheepy | Leic. 1958 |
| Shipdham | Norf. 1802 |
|  | Wilt. 1277 |
| Shepperton | Mid. 400 |
|  | Der. 422 |
| Shipton | Glone. 1101, 1651 Bed. 761 |
| Sherington | Berk. 867 |
| Shitlington | Bed. 385 |
| Shorne | Kent, 821, 1419 |
| Shotton | Sal. 737 |
|  | 1192 |
| Sherwill | Dev. 977 |
| Sibford (iower | Ox. 212 |

The numbers refer to the cares not to the parfer.

| Sichesgeliale | Sicklinghall | Ess. (York. ? 1 Les |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sikelingehale | Sicklinghall | Ess. (York, ?) 15 |
| Silkestona | Silkstone | York. 1169 |
| Silueho | Silpho | York. 184, |
| Singham | Shingham | Norf. 562 |
| Simplinges | Shimpling | Norf. 179\% |
| Sipeham |  | Luck. 12 |
| Siuena, aqua de | Seren | York. 251 |
| Siwefordia | Swerforl | Ox. 102\% |
| Skeelinge | Sheckling | Yorls. 964 |
| Skeleduna | Sheldon | Dev. 862 |
| Skenefrith | Skenfrith, Mon | Heref. 1330 |
| Skerringe' |  | Norf. Suf. 369 |
| Skynaunt | Skinnand | Line. 538 |
| Skyrebe | Skirbeck | Line. 659 |
| Slalegha | Sloley (\%) | Norf. 1378 |
| Slifeld |  | Sur. 134. |
| Smalebere | Smallburgh | Norf. 154 |
| Smalebroke |  | Wilt. 5\%0 |
| Smethwieus | Smethwiek | Staf. 362 |
| Smitham |  | Dev. 290 |
| Smithenecota |  | Dev. 1575, 1642 |
| Snitefeld | Snitterfield | War. 711 |
| Sockebroc |  | Corn. 143 |
| Sotislona | Soddington, Worc. (?) | Sal. 1288 |
| Soukadinton | S . Cuddington | Ox. 634 |
| Spaudlinge | Spalding | Linc. 1209 |
| Spauntona | Spaunton | York. 251 |
| Speingtorpe | Spennithorne (?) | York. 1200 |
| Spitelgate | Spittlegate | Linc. 1210 |
| Sproultona | Sproughton | Suf. 310 |
| Sproutona | Sproughton | Suf. 508, 795 |
| Sproxtona | Sproxton | York. 749 |
| Staffordia | Stafford | Staf. 479 |
| Standiche | Standish | Lane. 1386 |
| Stanefend | Stanfield | Suf. 66 |
| Stanes | Staines | Buck. 18 |
| Stanewella | Stanwell | Mid. 342 |
| Stanfordia, sce Staundfordia |  |  |
| Stanfordia | Stanford | Norf. 194 |
| Stanhale | Stonnall | Staf. 823 |
| Stanhale |  | Wilt. 382 |
| Stanlegha | Stoneleigh | War. 1063 |
| Stanmere | Stanmore | Mid. 391, 716. 1554 |
| Stanstedia | Stanstead | Ess. 11 Ra |
| Stantona |  | York. 1223 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Stanwella | Stanwell | Mid. 528 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stanwicus | Stanwick | Northamp. 971 |
| Stapelfordia | Stapleford | Leic. 1949 |
| Staples | Staple Fitzpaine | Som. 853 |
| Stauertona | Sta\%erton | Northamp. 31 |
| Stauertona | Staverton | Suf. 1443 |
| Stauertona | Staverton | Wilt. 463 |
| Staundfordia | Stamford | Northamp. 1214 |
| Stauntona | Long Stanton (?) | Hunt. 316 |
| Stauntona |  | Dev. 521, 603 |
| Stauntona |  | Norf. 937 |
| Stauwella | Stanwell | Mid. 1287 |
| Stebbeye, see Stibbeheye |  |  |
| Stepinges | Steeping | Linc. 944, 1102 |
| Sterstona | Sturstona | Norf. 1674 |
| Stibbeheye | Stepney | Mid. 150,383, 745, 1029 |
| Stinekeya corr. Stiuekeya | Stiffkey | Norf. 188, 1830 |
| Stinele | Stewkley (?) | Buck. 1318 |
| Stiuingtona | Steventon | Berk. 272, 393 |
| Stock | Stoke | Kent, 1302 |
| Stoclande | Stockland | Dors. 1312 |
| Stockingeford | Stockingford | War. 583 |
| Stoctona | Staughton | Hunt. 629 |
| Stoctona | Stoughton | Sus. 350 |
| Stodfoldia | Stotfold | Bed. 1607 |
| Stodhale | Stedham (?) | Sus. 1395 |
| Stoke | Stoke-Pogis | Buck. 1011 |
| Stoke | Stoke St Miilburgh | Sal. 590 |
| Stokely | Stokesby | Norf. 1794, 1841 |
| Stokes | Stoke | Hants. 395 |
| Stokingtham |  | Sur. 44 |
| Stortfordia | Bishop's Stortford | Herts. 275 |
| Stottesdona | Stottesdon | Sal. 1224 |
| Stowe |  | Suf. 1929 |
| Straby | Strubby | Linc. 1092 |
| Stratfordia | Stony Stratford | Buek. 619 |
| Stratfordia |  | Rut. 1501 |
| Stratfordia | Stratford | Suf. 125 |
| Stratle | Streatley | Berks. 8 |
| Strattona | Sturton (?) | Not. 433, 628 |
| Strattona | Stretton | Rut. 926 |
| Strationa | Stretton | War. 813 |
| Strediate | Stradsett | Norf. 1159 |
| Stredlegha | Streatley | Bed. 518 |
| Strestuna | Sturston | Norf. 642 |
| Strete |  | Kent, 1772 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Strettona | Strettou | War. 813 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strode |  | Sus. 52\% |
| Strodes | Strood | Kent, 821 |
| Stulbe |  | Hants. 87 |
| Sturemuwe | Stourmouth | Kent, $178,1596,1768$ |
| Sturminstre | Sturminster Marshall | Dors. 71, 1349 |
| Sturstona | Sturstou | Norf. 1673 |
| Sturstuna | Stuston | Suf. 612 |
| Sturtona | Stratton (?) | (ilone. 810 |
| Stybeney | Stepney | Mid. 701 |
| Styrston | Sturston | Norf. 968 |
| Suafham | Swaffham | Norf. 1837 |
| Suanescampus | Swanseombe | Kent, 983 |
| Subertona |  | Hants. 468 |
| Suchgmere |  | Bed. 1133 |
| Suckethorn | Dethick (?) | Derb. 486 |
| Sudbiri | Sudbury | Suf. 1162 |
| Sudeylue |  | Not. 959 |
| Sudecota | Sonthcot | Berk. 1537 |
| Suhamtona | Southampton | Hants. 67, 267, 324, 1123, 1405, 1580 |
| Suinesle | Swinley | Berks. 998 |
| Suinuertona | Swinnerton | Staf. 1300 |
| Sumerfordia | Somerford | Wilt. 1437 |
| Sumerlande |  | Som. 446 |
| Sumertona |  | Norf. 1816 |
| Sumertona | Somerton | Oxf. 450 |
| Sumertona | Somerton | Suf. 1095 |
| Sunninges | Somning | Berks. 1115 |
| Sunthetona |  | York. 1861 |
| Sutfellonde |  | York. 771 |
| Suthbrent | S. Brent | Som. 1170 |
| Suthingtona | Siddington (?) | Glone. 1134 |
| Suthlenn | South Lynn | Norf. 83 |
| Suthluffenham | S. Luffenham | Rut. 1020 |
| Suthpikeham | S. Piekenham | Norf. 188 |
| Suthstedia | Sustead | Norf. 937 |
| Suthwerk | Southwark | Sur. 1027, 1461 |
| Suthefeldia |  | War. 904 |
| Suttona | Sutton Courtney | Berk. 16t |
| Suttona | Sutton | Ess. 1566 |
| Suttona | Sutton | Kent, 102, 1581 |
| Suttona | Suttou | Leic. 1964 |
| Suttona | Sutton | Mid. 493 |
| Suttona | Sutton | Salop. 504 |
| Suttona | Sutton Montis | Som. 1635, 1722 |
| Suttona | Sutton Mandeville | Wilts. 941 |

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Sutwalesham | S. Walsham | Norf. 1817 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sutwick | Southwick | Northamp. 1206 |
| Suwelle | Soutliwell | Nots. 324 |
| Suwere, sce Suthwerk |  |  |
| Suwic | Southwick | Hants. 1556 |
| Swanitona | Swannington | Leic. 1947 |
| Swin | Swine | York. 256 |
| Syelmeston | Selmeston | Sus. 114 |
| Tainlande |  | Kent, 1218 |
| Tallewnrth | Talwerth | Sur. 115 |
| Tamlande |  | Kent, 1140 |
| Tasselegha | Tasley | Salop. 1590 |
| Tatecastrum | Tadeaster | York. 1081 |
| Tatestona | Tattingstone | Suf. 207 |
| Tatintona | Tattingstone | Suf. 984, 1892 |
| Tattesete | Tattersett | Norf. 1809 |
| Taystede | Thaxted | Ess. 1526 |
| Techeswella | Titchwell | Norf. 500 |
| Teffordia | Thetford | Norf. 650 |
| Tenderugge | Tendring | Ess. 559 |
| Tendringe | Tendring | Ess. 996 |
| Terling | Terling | Ess. 563 |
| Tettewrthe | Tetsworth | Ox. 1142, 1158 |
| Teuelby |  | Lanc. (?) 234 |
| Thama | Thame | Ox. 1142, 1711 |
| Thamhurst |  | Kent, 1756 |
| Thedmerse | Tidmarsh | Berk. 1573, 1649 |
| Theit | Thwaite | Norf. 159, 1525 |
| Thekene |  | Northamp. 1550 |
| Thetelthorp | Theddlethorpe | Line. 689 |
| Thetenduna | Thitenhall (?) | Buek. 633 |
| Thibertoft | Theberton (?) | Suf. 749 |
| Thichibrom |  | Suf. 698 |
| Thishou | Tysoe | War. 854 |
| Thopesfeld | Toppesfield | Ess. 45 |
| Thorendona | Thorndon | Suf. 1904 |
| Thoresby | Thornby | Northamp. 730 |
| Thoringe | Tarring | Sus. 142 |
| Thorlega |  | Ess. 1021 |
| Thorne |  | Som. (?) 1722 |
| Thornebiria | Thornbury | Dev. 902 |
| Thorneham, see Turneham |  |  |
| Thorpe | Thorp Langton | Leic. 955, 1957 |
| Thorpe | Thorpe | Nortlamp. 116, 377, 1518 |
| Thotintona | Tottington | Norf. 21 |

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pagtes.

Thudingdema
Thurlokesope
Thurmedestona
Thurneby
Thykeham
Tiderintona
Tikenhulla
Tilicota
Tillebiria
Tinemue
Tittona
Tinerscumba
Toftes
Tokwic
Tolleslund
Tollestona
Tong
Toppecroft
Toppefeld
Tostoke
Totenesse
Totham
Totingtona
Toulleshuthe, see Tolleslund
Treberned'
Tredeiset'
Treeng'
Tregar
Tregenegethwic'
Treisac'
Trelley
Trenches, Parua
Trengestona
Treuelgan
Trillawe
Trowbrugge
Trowlegha
Trumpingtona
Trykeby
Tudenham
Tudenbam
Tuderle
Tudingtona
Tukartona
Tullingtona
Tumbestona
Tumby

Toddington
Thurmaston
Thomby
Twickenham (?)
Titherington
Tiekhill
Tilbury
Tynemouth
Twiscomb (?)
Tofts
Todwick
Tolleshunt
Tong
Toperoft
Toppesfield, Ess. (?)
Tostock
Totnes
Tottenham
Tuttington

Bed. 399
Heref. 1314
Jeic. 1971
Northamp. 76
Mid. 966
Glouc. 1149
York. 127, 1206;
Herts. 1017
Ess. 2
Northumb. 226,
Linc. 659
Dev. 755
Norf. 781
York. 1877
Ess. 1304, 1371, 15.5.5
Sal. 30.5
Norf. 799, 874
Suf. 1898
Suf. 312
Des. 786,1117
Mid. 451
Norf. 1821
Corn. 1051
Corn. 1054
Hert. 192
Corn. 894
Corn. 596, 991
Heref. $147 \pm$
Corn. 1054
Herts. 1614
Leic. 1942
Corn. 16.5, 1512
Suf. 427
Wilt. 463
Dev. 1172
Camb. 288
Norf. 968
Norf. 1840
Suf. 312, 478, 698
Hants. 15
Bed. 607
Som. 1718
Heref. 802
Norf. 1072
Linc. 1579

The mumbers refir to the cases not to the pages.

| Tunbrugge |  | Glouc. 567 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunethorpe |  | Linc. 357 |
| Tunge | Tong | Sal. 305 |
| Tungerlande |  | York. 1876 |
| Tuppeholm | Turholme | Linc. 445 |
| Turkeleby | Thirkleby | York. 1197 |
| Turleby | Thurleby | Linc. 1203 |
| Turneham | Thornham (?) | Kent, 679, 1171, 1763 |
| Tutingdona |  | Buck. 1398 |
| Twinstede | Twinstead | Ess. 1317 |
| Twyfordia |  | Worc. 970 |
| Tylneye | Tilney | Norf. 1799 |
| Tyrintona |  | Linc. 1460 |
| Upfordia |  | Hunt. 1201 |
| Uphauene | Upavon | Wilt. 750 |
| Upministre | Upminster | Ess. 148, 1322 |
| Upsiteling |  | Dors. 328 |
| Uptona | Upton | Worc. 536 |
| Uptona | Upton | Linc. 1045 |
| Urchinefeldia | Archinfield | Heref. 1474 |
| Useby | Usselby | Linc. 1049 |
| Utcistona |  | Kent, 163 |
| Uttefordia |  | Dors. 831 |
| Vetus Vicus | Old Street | Mid. 686 |
| Wachefordia | Washford | Som. 956 |
| Wackinge | Woking | Sur. 416 |
| Wadbergum | Wadborough | Worc. 1588 |
| Waddona | Whaddon | Camb. 4 |
| Wadefordia |  | Som. 466 |
| Waderingfeuldia |  | Suf. 698 |
| Waffeldia | Washfield | Dev. 1367 |
| Waffordia | Watford | Herts. 1630 |
| Wainfleit | Wainfleet | Linc. 733, 822 |
| Wakebrigia |  | Derb. 486 |
| Wakerlega | Wakerley | Northamp. 43 |
| Waleby | Walesby | Linc. 917 |
| Waledena | Walden | Ess. 1007 |
| Walemere | Walmer | Kent, 1506 |
| Waleshale | Walsall | Staf. 1583, 1733 |
| Walctona | Wallington | Sur. 843, 1284 |
| Waletona | Walton | York. 1849 |
| Walewardia |  | War. 1052 |
| Walewrthe | Walworth | Sur. 1570 |
| Wallingfordia | Wallingford | Ox. 520, 827 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Walsingeham | Walsingham | Norf. 1238, 1810 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waltlintona | Watlington | Ox. 1363, 1589 |
| Wanetinge | Wantage | Berk. 1161, 1220 |
| Wanrugge | Windridge | Herts. 870 |
| Wappinges | Wapping | Mid. 482 |
| Wargely | Wragsby | Linc. 472 |
| Wassingelogha | Washingley | Hunt. 1079 |
| Waskerle | Waskerley | Northumb. 323 |
| Watele | Wheatley | Not. 1111 |
| Watercroft | Wheateroft (?) | Derb. 486 |
| Wathamstede | Walthamstead | Herts. 228, 891, 9.3 |
| Wathfordia | Watford | Herts. 713 |
| Wauertona | Waverton, War.(?) | Leic. 1305, 1335 |
| Wauteby |  | Sus. 546 |
| Wautham | Waltham, Great | Ess. 617, 663, 870 |
| Waybrigia | Weybridge | Sur. 99 |
| Wastunesham | Waxham | Norf. 5.7, 1793 |
| Wdestoke | Woodstock | Ox. 1153 |
| Webrugge | Weybridge | Norf. 835 |
| Wechefordia | Washford | Som. 1657 |
| Wedmora | Wedmore | Som. 1170 |
| Weduna | Weedon | Bucks. 510, 579 |
| Welintona | Wellington | Sal. 1226 |
| Well' | Wells | Norf. 883, 1835 |
| Welletona | Welton | Linc. 1035 |
| Welnetham | Whelnetham | Suf. 851 |
| Wendesle | Wensley | York. 1156 |
| Wendouere | Wendover | Bucks. 576, 626, 646, 1465 |
| Wengham | Wingham | Kent, 1790 |
| Wepstede | Whepstead | Suf. 1647 |
| Werckwrthe | Warkworth | Northumb. 895 |
| Weresdona | Whorwelsdown | Wilts. 775 |
| Werministrum | Warminster | Wilt. 1354 |
| Westanostige |  | Dev. 826 |
| Westbretona | W. Bretton | York. 1844 |
| Westdereby | West Derby | Lanc. 449 |
| Westecota | Wescott | Buck. 1390 |
| Westerham | Westerham | Kent, 262 |
| Westerlinna | West Lymn | Norf. 12.11 |
| Westhale |  | Sur. 1141 |
| Westham | Westham | Sus. 160, 539 |
| Westhamme | West Ham | Ess. 701, 1477 |
| Westharpetre | West Harptree | Som. 992 |
| Westmonasterium | Westminster | Mid. 726, 1568 |
| Westona | Weston Turville | Bncks. 879 |
| Westona | Alconbury Weston | Hont. 1121 |

The mombers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Westona | Weston Longville | Norf. 420, 18:33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Westona | Weston | Northamp. 202 |
| Westona | Weston | Ox. 105 |
| Westona | Edith Weston | Rut. 962 |
| Westona |  | Mid. 154 |
| Westrudham | W. Rudham | Norf. 1624 |
| Westtrasene | W. Rasen | Linc. 1415 |
| Wetherefeuld | Wethersfield | Ess. 387 |
| Wethulla | Wheathill | Sal. 590 |
| Wettesdena |  | Berks. 164 |
| Whytestuna | Whitestone | Dev. 755 |
| Wibbebyria | Wembury (?) | Dev. 1149 |
| Wicham |  | Hert. 1702 |
| Wicham |  | Kent, 893 |
| Wicham | Wickham | Sus. 709 |
| Wichehulla |  | Rut. 80 |
| Wickefordia | Wickford | Ess. 364 |
| Wicliue | Wyeliffe, York. (?) | Linc. 1418 |
| Wicumba | Wycombe | Buck. 1167 |
| Widehaye | Woodhay | Hants. 92 |
| Widekesho | Whisoe (?) | Suf. 1244 |
| Wigehale | Wiggenhall | Norf. 836 |
| Wigintona | Wigginton | Herts. 1336 |
| Wigornia | Worcester | Wore. 233, 1080, 1189, 1227 |
| Wika | Wick | Glouc. 1229 |
| Wike |  | Norf. 1834 |
| Wikes |  | Dev. 1121 |
| Wileby | Wilby | Norf. 1382 |
| Wilingham | Willingham | Camb. 663 |
| Willingtona | Wilmington (?) | Kent, 1766 |
| Willintona |  | Not. 901 |
| Wilne | Wilne | Not. 25 |
| Wiltingeham |  | Dors. 1540 |
| Wimbeldona | Wimbledon | Sur. 73 |
| Winchendon | Winchendon | Buck. 1500 |
| Windecarefflet |  | Linc. 174 |
| Windefordia |  | Linc. 174 |
| Windesore | Windsor | Berks. 684, 1431 |
| Windlesham | Windlesham | Surr. 416, 769 |
| Wincferling | Winfarthing | Norf. 890 |
| Winellega |  | Mid. 338 |
| Winestona |  | Heref. 990 |
| Winestuna |  | York. 685 |
| Winewic | Winwick | Northamp. 1297 |
| Winterburnia |  | Ox. 372 |
| Winterburnia Fercles |  | Dors. 363 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Wintonia | Winchester | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hants. } 50,201,234,324, \\ & 375,454,1170,1355 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wintonia | Winstone (?) | Gilouc. 116i; |
| Witelegha | Whitley | Northumb, 171.5 |
| Witenhoc |  | Corw. 1015 |
| Witham | Wytham | Berks. 183 |
| Witheringeskate | Wetheringsett | Suf. 1:90 |
| Withfeudia |  | Ess. 2.21 |
| Withintoua | Whittington | Northumb, 895 |
| Withoua | Wotton Abbas (?) | Dors. 1731 |
| Witnesse | Whitnasls | War. 162? |
| Wittingeshete | Whissonsett | Norf. 1812 |
| Wittona | Witton | York. 16, 0 |
| Wiuclingeham |  | Linc. 1629 |
| Wlenhale |  | War. 1683 |
| Wlfhens |  | Rut. 230 |
| Wlfretona |  | Hercf. 1232 |
| Wlingresty |  | Linc. 1093 |
| Wllingeham | Willingham | Suf. (9) 782 |
| Wlsintona | Woolston | Glouc. 1002 |
| Wltrope | Woolsthorpe | Linc. 1092, 1093 |
| Wlwardia |  | War. 1613 |
| Wockinges | Woking | Sur. 769 |
| Wodefordia | Woodford | Ess. 1681 |
| Wokindona |  | Ess. 370 |
| Wolauigtona | Wormleighton (?) | War. 934 |
| Wottesdona | Wotton (?) | Buck. 1396 |
| Wrengle | Wrangle | Linc. 107, 122 |
| Wretinges | Wratting | Suf. 1668 |
| Writele | Writtle | Ess. 1099 |
| Wrochinge | Wratting | Camb. 1258 |
| Wrokeshale | Wrasall | Som. (?) 560, 573 |
| Wrotham | Wortham | Suf. 12tis |
| Wrthe |  | Berks. 1034 |
| Wuburnia | Woburn | Bucks. 845 |
| Wudecroft |  | Northamp. 440 |
| Wudehus | Woodhouse | York (?) 1196 |
| Wudetona |  | Heref. 365 |
| Wulfrestuna | Woolston (?) | Lanc. 613 |
| Wultertona | Wolterton | Norf. Suf. 369 |
| Wultona |  | Wilt. 382 |
| Wuluelegha | Woolley (?) | York. 1863 |
| Wunhers | Wonersh | Sur. 913 |
| Wurle | Worle | Som. 86, 1541 |
| Wuttona | Wootton | Northamp. 648 |
| Wuuelestede | Wyverstone | Suf. (\%) 782 |
| Wycham | Wickham, West | Camb. 881 |
| M. I. |  | 16 |

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

| Wycumba | Wycombe | Bucks. 285, 520 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wygornia, see Wigornia |  |  |
| Wyka | Veek (?) | Corn. 1070, 1696 |
| Wyk | Wyke Regis | Dors. 1495 |
| Wyletona | Willington | Derb. 51 |
| Wylielega | Mid. 339 |  |
| Wylig | Willey | Heref. 271 |
| Wylingduna | Willingdon | Sus. 539 |
| Wyllinghale | Willingale | Ess. 841 |
| Wymbisse | Wimbish | Ess. 243 |
| Wymundeham | Wymondham | Leic. 1950, 1959 |
| Wymmmdesham | Wymondham | Norf. 321 |
| Wyndesores | Windsor | Berks. 295, 821 |
| Wyndlesham | Windlesham | Sur. 769 |
| Wynemundele | Wymondley | Herts. 816 |
| Wynepol | Wimpole | Camb. 1578 |
| Wynterburnia | Winterbounn | Berk. 1549 |
| Wynterburnia | Winterbourne | Wilts. 1174 |
| Wyntonia, see Wintonia |  |  |
| Wyrham | Wereham | Norf. 985 |
| Wythechurche | Whitchurch | Hants. 1237 |
| Wyuelestede | Wyverstone (?) | Suf. 782 |
|  |  |  |
| Yecham | Ickham | Kent, 499 |
| Yellestede | Elmsted (?) | Kent, 476 |
| Yrnam | Irnham | Linc. 1737 |

## INDEX OF PERSONA.

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Abbe, Beatricia uxor Galfridi le, 14.57
Galfridus le, 1457
Olinerus le, 1367
Robertus le, 1457
Willelmus le, 1367
Abbedestona, Willelmus de, 1082
Willelmus filins Willelmi de, 1032
Abbeduna, Abbas de, 794
Abbendona, Petrus de, 1020
Abbendonia ride Abingdonia.
Abbetot, Osbertus de, 250
Abbetota, Galfridus de, 1262
Abel, Magister, 1 221
Abetoft, Johamnes de, 904, 1757
Margeria uxor Johannes de, 1757
Abingdonia, Abbendonia, Abbas de, $209,967,1078,1139,1185,1537$
Achard', Robertus, 302
Acholt, Thomas de, 255
Acra, Prior del, 64
Acra, Willelmus del, 1243
Acre, Walterus del, 1838
Acstede, Rolandus de, 262, 546, 477
Actona, Agnes uxor Roberti de, 1564
Robertus de, 1564
Advocatus, Alicia uxor Baldewini, 1220
Baldewinus, 1220
Robertus, 1220
Aeincurt, Olinerus de, 1045
Acte, Ayete, Willelmus de, 758
Aeyncanc vide Aeyncurt.
Afyncurt, Aeyncanc, Johannes de, 62

Affrica, Rannulfns de, 763
Robertus filius Rannulfi de, $76: 3$
Agathe, S., Abbas, 1865
Age, Willelmus de, 1820
Agnes, Hugo, 20
Aguilhn, Agwillun, Johamna nxor Willelmi, 1302
Reginaldus, 189
Ricardus, 189
Willelmus, 1302
Willelmus filius Ricardi, 189
Agwillun vide Aguillun.
Aignaus, Robertus de, 255
Ailer, Alicia uxor Johanmis le, $7 \pm 8$
Isabella filia Johannis le, 748
Johannes le, 748
Aimers, Robertus de, 431
Aisho vide Ayssa.
Akelegha, Henricus de, 1145
Alason, Herbertus de, 1921
Albamarlia cide Albemarlia.
Alba Marlia, Robertus de, 7..)
Albani, S., Abbas, $102,226,394$, $485,561,713,997,1554,1715$
Albaniaco, Albiniaco, Alboniaco, Hemricus de, 532
Hugo de, 1127
Willelmus de, 102, 307, 772
Albano, S., Nicholaus de, 177
Albe, Elias, 31
Albemar', Rannulfus de, 958
Albemarl', Randulfus de, 624
Albemarla, Reginaldus de, \%it
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Albemarlia, Albamarlia, Abbas de, 1061, 1874
Willelmas de, 1367
Albemarlic, Comes, 926, 964, 1060, 1061, 1273, 1637, 1671
Engelr' de, $96 \pm$
Albeniaco, Philippus de, 1117
Albetoft, Johannes, 714
Albenilla ride Anlenilla.
Albingeswurthe, Gilebertus de, 40, 126

Albiniaco vide Albaniaco.
Albo Monasterio, Alicia uxor Reginaldi de, 1549, App. $\overline{5}$
Matillis de, 59, 1559
Reginaldus de, 68, 1239, 1549, App. 5
Thomas de, 1482
Willelmus de, 1559
Alboniaco vide Albaniaco.
Albricus, Comes, $848,881,1488$
Albyniaco, Hugo de, 1213
Aldeford, Alrefordia, Bartholomeus de, 481
Aldegate, Terricus de, 383, 482
Aldemanebyria vide Aldermannebiria.
Aldemannestona, Robertus de, 812
Aldermannebiria, Aldemanebyria, Andemanebiria, Alanus de, 692
Jeruasins de, 550, 692
Willelmus de, 692
Aldham, Adam de, 465
Johanna de, 465
Johannes filius Ade de, 465
Aldilegha vile Aldithelegha.
Aldithelega, Henricus de, 94, 95, 1024
Aldithelegha, Aldilegha, Hemricus de, 1059, 1225
Aldreby, Alanus de, 689
Aldremanebiria, Agnes uxor Geruasii de, 1001
Geruasius de, 1001
Aldrethe, S., Godefridns balliuus, 20
Godefridus seneseallus, 28
Aleman, Johannes le, 309
Alemannie, Imperator, 1095

Alencestria, Abbas de, 1387
Alencon, Alenton', Herbertus de, 968
Alencun, Alnen', Herbertus de, 644, 731, 1212, 1706
Alenton' virle Alencon.
Alenzun, Herbertus de, 1240
Ricardus de, 1187
Alexander, Papa, 109.5
Alicia, Comitissa, 1658, 1745
Alionara, Comitissa, 1164
Alis, Rogerus, 1013
Alkeby, Pobertus de, 783
Alkereby vide Ascheby.
Allegate, Edrieus de, 581
Willelmus de, 584
Almchechurehe, Emma de, 1234
Alnen' ride Alencun.
Alnestowe, Abbatissa de, 1608
Alneto, Amney, Henricus de, 965
Jordanus de, 922, 1050
Simon de, 45
Alre, Radulfus de, 667, 1537
Alrefordia vide Aldeford.
Alta Ripa, Adam de, 338, 1286
Alto Bosco, Petrus de, 102
Aluertona, Robertus de, 1153
Aluitelegha, Laurencins de, 1233
Amando, S., Almarieus de, 1117, $1157,1161,1580$
Isolda uxor Almariei de, 1580
Ambrebiria, Willelmus de, 1228
Ambresbiria, Prior de, 1561
Priorissa de, 1139
Amundauilla vide Amundenilla.
Amundenilla, Amundauilla, Elia de, 615
Nigallus de, 269, 658
Robertus de, 251
Andemanebiria vide Aldermannebiria.
Andrea, S., Matillis uxor Saheri de, 818
Nicholaus de, 945
Saherus de, 818
Andree, S., Prior, 1033
Anes, Sarra de, 1452
Anestay, Willelmus de, 1848
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Aneuilla, Jordanus de, 344
Anglieus, Gilebertus, 22:5
Stephanus, 40, 1360
Anguill', Reginaldus, 776
Anguillun, Johannes, 1118
Robertus, 1182
Anguilyn, Willehnus, 1120
Anhope, Johannes de, 243
Antrenon, Nicholaa uxor Rogeri de, 436
Rogerus de, 426
Anuilers, Robertus de, 486
Apelfordia, Johannes de, 299
Apostoles, Philippus des, 278
Appeldreffeud, Willelmus de, 262
Appelgar, licartus de, 404
Aquila, Gilebertus de, 44, 242, 539, 561, 1429
Araz, Margeria nxor Willelmi de, 701
Willelmus de, 701
Areeueske, Dionisia uxor Phillippi le, 321
Isemania uxor Philippi le, 324
Phillippus le, 324
Archer, Alditha ux. Johamnis le, 1112
Johannes le, 1112
Ricardus le, 760
Sarra filia Jolıamnis le, 1112
Simeon le, 119
Arehes, Radulfus de, 370
Arehicliaconus, Robertus, 287, 1842
Willehmus, 287, 983
Ardern' vide Arderne.
Arderna, Philippus de, 1680
Thomas de, 1609, 1613
Arderne, Ardern', Alina uxor Radulfi de, 1372
Eustachia de, 801
Eustachia uxor Thome de, 581
Lucia uxor Thome de, 738
Radulfus de, 738, 1372
Rogerus de, 1352
Thomas de, 281, 591, 738
Willelmus de, 1352
Ardulph, Willelmus, 1686
Argenteinn vide Argentham.
Argenten, Johannes de, 290

Argenten, Ricardus de, 1117
Argentham, Argenteinn, Agnes uxor Rogeri de, 1090
Rieardus de, 29.5
Rogerus de, 1090
Arsie, Arsye, Anna uxor Osberti, 638
Osbertus, 251, 638, 935
Radulfus, 638
liobertus, 605, 935
Sibilla uxor Roberti, 605
Arsit', Robertus de, 1373
Arsye vide Arsie.
Arthele, Willemus de, 15:5
Arundel, Johames filius Nieholai de, 908
Nicholans de, 908
Thomas de, 90s
Willemus de, s.93, 105t
Arundel' ride Arundele.
Arundele, Arundel', Comes, 384, 893, 997, 1273
Ascheby, Askereby, Alkereby, Robertus de, 1509
Asegareby, Beatricia uxor Hemrici de, 1843
Hemricus de, 1843
Askereby vide Ascheby.
Aslakestan, Anselmus filius Petri de, 1399
Petrus de, 1399
Aspele, Alicia uxor Johannis de, 317
Johannes de, 317
Attebergh', Duleia uxor Willelmi, 767
Michael filius Willelmi, 767
Willelmus, 767
Willehmus filius Willelmi, 767
Attegate, Alicia uxor Willelmi, 768
Willelmus, 768
Attehasse, Mrargareta filia Roberti, 1822
Robertus, 182
Umfridus filus Roberti, $1 \times 22$
Atteponde, Ademundus, 310
Attewalle, Ilwinus, 1489
Philippus filius Ilwini, 1 \&s?
Willelmus filius llwini, 1489
Attewell', Emma uxor Willelmi, 491
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Attewell', Willelmus, 491
Auberuilla, Hugo de, 1506
Robertus de, 11
Willelmus de, 333, 631, 1506
Auder', liogerus de, App. 2
Audingtona, Matillis uxor Stephani de, 1768
Stephanus de, 1768
Auen', Rogerus le, 897
Auenant, Johannes, 1312
Aueneurt, Oliuerus de, 845
Auenel, Nicholaus, 1354
Oliuerus, 54
Auenestowe vide Arunestowe.
Auerintona, Dauid filius Thome de, 1157, 1161
Thomas de, 1157, 1161
Auerenches, Auerenges, Cecilia de, 1566
Hawisia filia Matillidis de, 170, 1569
Matillis de, 170,1569
Matillis uxor Willelmi de, 12
Willelmus de, 12, 333, 1571
Auerenges vide Auerenches.
Auge vide Augy.
Auges, Willelmus de, 1813
Augo vide Angy.
Angustini, S., Bristollii, Abbas, 1166
Cantuarie, Abbas, 474
Augy, Auge, Augo, Comitissa de, 127, 403, 549, 1110, 1658, 1745
Willelmus de, 841
Aula, Willelmus de, 777
Auleuilla, Albeuilla, Ricardus de, 314
Aultona, Willelmus de, 923
Aumari, Robertus de, 318
Aumbely, Eudo de, 460
Aumbresbiria, Priorissa de, 553
Auners, Ada de, 489
Robertus de, 512
Auney vide Alneto.
Aunfeillus, Aunfeill, Fuillus, Wassallus de, 1501
Aungele, Edwardus le, 1421
Aumnestowe, Auenestowe, Abbatissa de, 816, 918

Auntrenon, Nicholaa uxor Rogeri de, 408
Rogerus de, 408
Aurabel vide Mirabel.
Aure, Aurre, Johannes filius Petri de, 67
Petrus de, 67
Radulfus de, 67, 922, 1050
Aurifaber, Alexander, 686
Bartholomeus, 1480
Eborardus, 451
Euerardus, App. 6
Galfridus, 10
Henrieus, 84, 1533
Isabella uxor Eborardi, 451
Johanues, 895
Johannes filius Willelmi, 341
Robertus, 652
Seilda uxor Walteri, 359
Walterus, 359
Willelmus, 341
Aurre ride Aure.
Auteyn, Theobaldus, 1730
Auuertona, Robertus de, 1155
Auuilla, Amabilis uxor Gileberti de, 1507
Gilebertus de, 1507
Axstede, Rolandus de, 1375
Ayete vide Aete.
Ayffede, Rollandus de, 40
Ayncurt, Nieholaa uxor Oliueri de, 503
Oliuerus de, 503
Ayssa, Aisho, Alienora uxor Willelmi de, 948
Willelmus de, 948
Ayuilla, Robertus de, 439
Baalun, Jollanus de, 731
Bacheler, Rogerus le, 1735
Bacheswurthe, Agnes filia Hugonis de, 1480
Hugo de, 1480
Backeham, Hugo de, 473
Baene, Johannes filius Simonis, 237
Simon, 237
Thomas filius Simonis, 237
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Bacun, Radulphus, 1641
Rogerus, 1721
Baddelegha, Augnstinus de, 240
Galfridus de, 240
Badelegha, Galfridus de, $1 \pm 26$
Robertus filius Galfridi de, $\mathbf{1 4 2 6}$
Badelekin, Serlo de, $\mathbf{1 7 4 9}$
Badelesmara, Egidius de, 1333
Badhegh, Ernaldus, 1912
Gunuilda usor Ernaldi, 1912
Hugo filins Ernaldi, 1912
Badialtona, Agnes uxor Alexandri de, 1008
Alexander de, 1008
Margeria nxor Reginaldi de, 1008
Reginaldus de, 1008
Bagetor', Rogerus de, 920
Bagresh' vide Baggeshec.
Baggeshec, Baggesh', Rieardus de, 10
Baggetorr', Ricardus de, 85
Baghot, Johannes, 95
Bagingedena, Alicia uxor Ricardi de, 365
Rieardus de, 365
Bagod, Dagod, 1975, 1980
Bagot, Herniens, 1043
Margareta, 1043
Bagshote, Galfridus filins Henrici de, 998
Henricus de, 998
Baillas, Galfridus de, 127
Baillol, Hugo de, 432
Johannes de, 432
Baillol' Heuricus de, 1123
Lora uxor Henriei de, 1128
Bailul, Joscelinus de, 636
Bainnard', Fuleo, 303
Bainnard, Robertus, 1380
Baintona, Walterus de, 1040
Baiocis, Adam de, 720, 909
Agnes filia Johannis de, 761
Anicia uxor Willelmi de, 455
Elena uxor Thome de, 1267
Emma filia Johannis de, 761
Johannes de, $720,761,909,1263$
Robertus filius Johaunis de, 1263
Thomas de, 1267

Baiocis, Willelmus de, 455, 720, 900
Balam, Walterus, 1613
Baldresby, Ingo de, 735
Balun. Johannes de, 1450
Balde, Henricus filius Walteri, 1670 Walterus, 1670
Baldewinns, Comes, 102
Balistona, Baldewinus de, 976
Balistarius, Margeria uxor Simonis, 541,627
Semannus, 1514, 1969
Simon, 541, 627
Balk, Wymmendus, 1361
Balle, Adam, 40
Balliolo, Denorguilla uxor Johannis de, 1227
Hemricus de, 1221
Johannes de, 1227, 1273
Banham, Radulphus de, 473
Baningewrthe, Gilbertus de, 16.57
Willelmus filins Gilberti de, 16.57
Bannebiria, Walterus de, 1265
Barbara, S., Robertus de, 1170
Barbere, Ricardus filius Siwardi le, 993
Siwardus in, 993
Bardenay, Abbas de, 445, 534, 535
Bardolf, Robertus, 1163
Willelmus, 1117
Bardulf, Thomas, 44
Bardulphe, Thomas, 1819
Bares, Reginaldus de, 1234
Baret, Agues uxor Galfridi, 1041
Aluredus, 961
Galfridus, 1041
Gumulla uxor Aluredi, 961
Rogerus, 961
Baribus, lannulfus de, 13
Baringtona, Galfridus de, 603
Barneby, Alicia uxor logeri de, 98
Johannes de, 1847
Juliana uxor Rogeri de, 98
Ricardus filius liogeri de, 98
Rogerus de, 98
Barre, Gerardus, 45\%
Barringtona, Galfridus de, 521
Bars, Beatricia nxer Roberti de, 19.56
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Bars, Brianus de, 1716
Robertus de, 1956
Bart, Alexander. 1910
Barthingtona, Walterus de, 1850
Bartona, Emma uxor Willelmi de, 1199
Ricardus de, 1613
Willelmus de, 1199
Bascot, Thomas, 1640
Basinge, Basingh, Robertus de, 10, 1.467

Basingeham, Johannes de, 1182
Basingh vide Basinge.
Baskereuilla, S. Georgii de, Abbas, 80, 962
Walterus de, 1622
Baskervilla, Thomas de, 732
Basset, Agnes uxor Reginaldi, 1109, 1493
Alanus, 520, 1129
Dauid, 1263
Fulco, 1551
Gena, 388, 1094
Gilebertus, 750, 857, 1129, 1167, 1273
Johanna filia Thurstani, 635
Johannes, 1688
Katerina uxor Warini, 354
Osemundus, 1688
Philippus, 8.57
Radulfus, 781
Reginaldus, 1109, 1493, 1944
Rieardus, 72
Hobertus, 439
Thomas, 101, 230, 513
Thurstanus, 635
Warinns, 354
Willelmus, 165, 196, 234, 751, 1109, 1303. 1512, 1688

Bassingburnia, Alanus de, 1578
Alexander de, 1578, 1817
Tolannes de, 696
Warinus de, 731
Warinus filius Warini de, 731
Bassingeburnia, Albreda uxor Warini de, 1831
Nicholaus de, 948

Bassingeburnia, Warinus de, 1693, 1831
Bastard, Robertus, 764, 987
Bastlestuna, Galfridus de, 551
Idonea uxor Galfridi de, 551
Dat, Alexander, 1940
Battaill', Robertus, 18
Bath', Hugo de, 512
Bathonia, Hugo de, 179, 612, 1310, 1406,1623
Osbertus de, ${ }^{\text {a }}$
Petrus de, 1036
Willelmus de, 1410, 1544
Bathonie, Archidiaconus, 1200
Bathoniensis Prior, 866
Bathonienses Episcopi, 67, 141, 252, 407, 853, 866, 1117, 1170, 1354, 1379, 1436, 1615, 1752
Bauelingeham, Johannes de, 800
Mabilia uxor Thome de, 1410, 1765
Thomas de, 1410, 1765
Banent, Michael de, 564, 1271
Bantesy, Matillis uxor Rogeri de, 364
Rogerus de, 364
Bauzan, Johannes, 319
Beauchamp ride Bello Campo.
Beannes, Michael de, 1254
Willelmus de, 305
Beaupelle, Biaupelle, Reginaldus de, 1147
Ricardus de, 1147
Beautoft, Byautoft, Petronilla uxor Rogeri de, 1510
logerus de, 1510
Bec, Robertus de, 1978
Vincensius de, 799
Beceles, Willelmus de, 1729
Becco, Abbas de, 1004, 1164, 1220
Beceo, Burn', Eustachius de, 704
Willelmus de, 704
Becham, Thomas de, 1806
Beehe vill Pecche.
Beck, Willelmus, 1429
Beckerwella, Herinerus de, 1298
Beekles, Vincensius de, 874
Becunte, Henricus, 1697
Bedeford, Auicia filia Willelmi de, 611
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Bedeford, Willelmus de, 611
Bedefordie, Arehidiaconus, 722
Bedel, Bedellus, Alanus, 1230
Gilebertus le, 1209
Ricardus, 85
Willelmus, 85
Dedellins ride Bedel.
Bedingefeuld, Adam de, 428
Bedingfeuld, Adam de, 1913
Constancia uxor Ade de, 1913
Begeleby, Elyas de, 1200
Beggeham, Abbas de, 525, 1274
Beieudehe, Galfridus, 1025
Beientlet, Brianus de, 47
Beingewrthe ride Benigwrd.
Beingtona, Decanus de, 847
Bekeneffeldia, Benedictus de, 1167
Belegraue, Ricardus de, 1301
Belet, Johannes, 1107
Margeria, 920
Robertus, 1107
Walterus filius Willelmi, 1427
Willelmus, 1427
Beletona, Elias de, 1947
Delewe, Alicia de, 734
Bellias, Ricardus de, 1485
Belinhal', Hugo de, 305
Bella Fago, Emma de, 245, 261, 493
Gyla uxor Martini de, 917
Martinus de, 917
Bello, Abbas de, 5, 253, 427, 1005, 1598, 1667
Bello Campo, Beanchamp, Elias de, $86,1391,1469,1491,1515$
Eudo de, 350, 680
Gunnora uxor Willelmi de, 681, 682, 757
Isabella de, 1071
Johannes de, 681, 691, 7.57
Matillis uxor Willelmi de, 1764
Oto filius Willelmi de, 681
Philippus de, 458
Ricardus de, 648
Robertus de, 400
Sarra usor Ricardi de, 648
Simon de, 1607
W. de, 1553

Bello Campo, Walterus de, 2.0, 1328
Willelmus de, 250, Cis1, 682, 757, 1055, 1071, 1133, 1448, 1612, 176.4

Bello Loco, Albas de, 468, 6.55, 728, 817
Bello Monte, Alicia de, 977
Philippus de, 197, 56f6, !177
Roesia uxor Thome de, 197
Thomas de, 197, 566
Bello, Pontis de, Abbas, if
Bello Queren, Henricus de, 1670
Beltoft, Petronilla uxor Rogeri de, 959
Bendenge vide Bendenges.
Bendenges, Bendenge, Radinges, Adam de, 1410
Alicia de, 156, 800, 880, 1519
Alicia uxor Ade de, 1410
Gunnora de, 1120, 1176, 1649
Juliana filia Gumnore de, 1176
Petrus filius Alicia de, 156
Stephanus de, 241
Bendeuilla, Alicia de, 77
Aluredus de, 93
Benedicti, S., de Holma, Abbas, 1451
Beneit, Willelmus, 879
Benette, Matillis de, 15
Benham, Bartholomeus de, 1813
Benigwrl, Beingewrthe, Gilebertus de, 1546
Sarra uxor Gileberti de, 1546
Benigewrthe, Willelmus de, 1093
Benigwrthe vide Beningworthe.
Beningeburgo, Wialterus de, 22
Beningesworthe, Willelmus de, 956
Beuingworthe, Benigwrthe, Gilebertus de, 944, 1102, 1211
Sarra uxor Gileberti de, 1102
Willelmus de, 1211
Willelmus filius Crileberti de, 944, 1102
Bentlega, Willelmus de, 51
Bercamstede, Hugo de Bathonia de, 179
Berchamstede, Henricus de, 1389
Berchanestona, Alicia filia Auicic de, 19.5
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Berchanestona, Auicia de, 1958
Berchestona, Adam de, 1897
Ricardus de, 212
Simon de, 212, 1022
Berdefeuld, Galfridus Capellanus de, 617
Berdeslia, Abbas de, 1024
Bere, Alicia uxor Johannis de la, 1019
Alicia uxor Ricardi de la, 1438
Andreas filius licardi de la, 1438
Benedictus de, 831
Johannes de la, 1019
Ricardus de la, 288, 1438
Berefordia, Beatricia nxor Johannis de, 1824
Elias de, 1873
Johannes de, 1824
Juliana uxor Roberti de, 1873
Radulphus de, 1278
Ricardus de, 1873
Ricardus filius Roberti de, 220
Robertus de, 220, 1873
Sireda uxor Ricardi de, 1873
Berefray, Willelmus, 206
Bereneestria, Prior de, 570, 1396
Bereuilla, Adanı de, 76, 799
Claricia de, 385
Ela filia Johannis de, 799
Johannes de, 729
Ricardus de, 76
Bergh', Nicholans de, 1832
Bergham, Hugo de la, 1436
Berham vide Rerham.
Beriehe, Elena de, 1925
Berk', Nicholaus de, 275
Berkel' vide Berkele.
Berkelay, Robertus de, $157 t$
Thomas de, 1574
Berkele, Berkel', Berl', Robertus de, 1428
Willelmus de, 553
Berkelegha, Thomas de, 1166
Berkeley, Breckel, Breckl', Thomas de, 850, 860
Berkinge, Abbatissa de, 758
Ricardus de, 929
Berkinges, Aluredus de, 1564

Berkinges, Gilebertus de, 222
Isabella uxor Aluredi de, 1564
Radulfus de, 222
Ricardus de, 1516
Berl' ride Berkele.
Berlay, Hemrieus de, 1867
Nieholaus de, 1867
Berlingeham, Adam de, 1652
Bermicoste, Gerardus, 310
Bermundseia, Prior de, 853, 1379
Bernage, Johamnes filius Radulfi, 831
Radulfus, 831
Bernake, Ricardus de, 514
Bernard vide Burnard.
Bernardcote, Robertus de, 51
Berne, Emma uxor Eustachii de, 1650
Eustachius de, 1650
Berneres, Galfridus filius Matillidis de, 1176
Johames de, 1719
Juliana filia Matillidis de, 1176
Matillis de, 1176, 1573
Radulfus de, 1719
Berners, Isabella de, 327
Matillis de, 1120
Rogerus de, 1937
Bernenal, Helewisa uxor Hugonis de, 526
Hugo de, 526
Bernenilla, Prior de, 999
Bernewella, Prior de, 103, 104
Bernham, Alicia uxor Walteri de, 110
Walterus de, 110
Beruingeham, Burlingeham, Eustachius de, 355, 1928
Rogerus de, 355, 1928
Berningham, Eustachius de, 1932
Sarra de, 1932
Bernobus, Willelmus, 539
Bertona, Alanus de, 34, 1353
Petrus de, 1961
Roesia uxor Alani de, 34
Bertram, Adam, 895
Oliua nxor Philippi, 1313
Philippus, 1313
Ricardus, 361
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Berwe, Henricus de, 1225
Besacra, Johannes de, 1869
Petrus de, 1869
Besebro, Johanna uxor Walteri d $\stackrel{\text {, }}{ }$ 924
Walterus de, 924
Bescwilla, Ricardus de, 248
Besill', Mathias, 1136
Besilla, Mathias, 1141
Bestener', Bestenor', ride Bestenora.
Bestenora, Bestener', Bestenor', Martinus de, 70, 88
Bestfordia, Walterus de, 950
Besuilla ride Bosuilla.
Bethona, Baldewinus de, 1220
Bethuna, Comes de, 302
Bethune, Baldewinus de, 102
Beuercote, Fulco de, 224
Rogerns filius Fulconis de, 224
Simon filius Fulconis de, 224
Beuerlaco, Helewisa uxor Rieardi de, 1097
Ricardus de, 1097
Beuerlegha, Precentor de, 722
Beuilla ride Bouilla.
Beynin, Thomas, 221
Beythorp, Mathens de, 212
Bezil, Matheus, 1109
Biaupelle vide Beaupelle.
Bieunt vide Buchoint.
Bidestale, Bideshale, Bildesdale, Willelmus de, 1199
Bideshale vide Bidesdale.
Bidona, Amabilis de, 1612
Bidun, Amicabilis filia Johannis de, 648
Amicia filia Johannis de, 648
Ermiceda de, 648
Johannes de, 648, 1072
Sarra de, 1072
Sarra filia Johamnis de, 648
Walterus de, 648
Bigod, Comes, 1674, 1755, 1813, 1827, 1828
Hugo le, 695, 1036, 1827, 1828
Isabella uxor Rogeri le, 533, 599
Margeria la, 1279

Bigod, Rogerus, 1242, 1271, 1 228
Rogerns filius Hugonis le, 1827
Rogerus le, 303, 533,598, 694, 695,
$754,835,1426,1520,1755,1813$
Simon le, 373, 1813
Thomas le, 1755
Willelmus le, 89, 1279
Bigot, Isabella uxor logeri le, 698
Rogerus, 22
Rogerus le, 698
Bikelegha, Huwardus de, I638
Orgoillusa uxor Hawardi de, 1638
Likestorpe, Matheus de, 651, 1130
Bikestrope, Mathens de, 764
Bil, Robertus, 373, 59.5
Logerus, 373
Willelmus, 373
Bildesdale ride Bidesdale.
Billingeburgo, Johannes de, 441
Billingeh', Henricus de, 1092
Willelmas de, 1092
Bilneya, Robertus de, 762
Binetr', liobertus de, 1075, 1709
Thomas de, 1709
Bingham, Johannes de, 1784
Binham, Dinham, Prior de, 1238
Biatewrthe, Willelmus, 913
Biricholt, Alexander de, 1777
Johannes de, 1777
Rogerus de, 1777
Birketorpe, Walterus de, 211
Birkin, Birkyn, Agnes uxor Johannis le, 22,60
Johannes le, 22, 60
Birkyn vide Birkin.
Birlawe, Adam de, 432
Albreda uxor Ade de, 432
Birlingham, Robertus filius Willelmi de, 1801
Willelmus de, 1801
Birstona, Johannes de, 1423
Biscoync, Byscoyne, Galfridus, 402
Biseche, Bisiche, Gilebertus de, 955
Biset, Avieia uxor Willehmi, 1550
Henricas, 1831
Isolda, 1320
1solda uxor Willelmi, 1580
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Biset, Johamnes, 1580
Willelmus, 1550, 1580
Bisiche vide Biseche.
Bisseye, Galfridus de, 713
Bisshete, Thurstanus de, 498
Bissopegate, Prior de, 1523
Bissopesgate, hospitalis extra, Prior, 375
novi hospitalis de, Prior, 1594
Bissopestona, Fraricus de, 1229
Bissopestuna, Willelmus de, 281
Bisteche, Thurstanus de, 313
Bitaller, Ricardus le, 100
Dlacarfot, Alicia uxor Radulfi, 726
Radulfus, 726
Blacbarfot, Alicia uxor Radulfi, 575
Radulfus, 575
Bladeworthe, Elyas de, 1193
Willelmus de, 1193
Bladewrthe, Adam de, 1196
Blake, Editha uxor Willelmi de, 1080
Willelmus de, 1080
Blakedona, Nicholaus de, 678
Blakeham, Thomas de, 700,875
Blakelake, Hemricus de, 1368
Blakeman, Walterus, 1254
Blaketoft, Phillippus de, 1852
Blakeuilla, Thomas filius Willelmi de, 1014
Willelmus de, 1014
Blakewella, IIerbertus de, 780
Johannes filius Thome de, 789
Rannulfus de, 780
Thomas de, 780
Blancard, Ricardus, 251
Blecche, Lucas le, 1533
Blecehestena, Ricardus de, 1168
Bler', Agnes filia Roberti de, 955
Alicia filia Roberti de, 955
Galfridus filius Roberti de, 955
Matillis filia Roberti de, 955
Robertus de, 955
Blochesduna, Ricardus de, 567
Bloilıen vide Bloyn.
Bloinuill' vide Blumuill'.
Blom, Michael le, 1583
Bloyen ride Bloyn.

Bloyn, Bloiheu, Bloyeu, Geruasius, 894
Blumenhilla, Herbertus de, 1980
Blumuill', Bloinuill', 'Thomas, 376
Blund, Blundus, Adam, 1539
Agnes uxor Nicholai, 951, 1400
Andreas, 1679
Baldewinus, 1095
Cecilia uxor Willelmi, 1919
Heremannus filius Ricardi, 61
Hugo, 1961
Iuetta uxor Radulfi, 1383
Johannes, 339, 340, 1967
Johames filius Johannis, 1967
Lecia uxor Willelmi le, 419
Matillis uxor Ricardi, 61
Nicholaus, 951, 987, 1400
Odo filius Baldewini, 1095
Radulfus, 1383
Peginaldus, 270
Picardus, 61
Robertus, 1041
Simon, 674, 1029
Thomas, 1277
Willelmus, 210, 285, 419, 1687, 1919
Blundus vide Blund.
Bluntesduna, Walerandus de, 789
Blunuilla, Thomas de, 1238
Bockemere, Pogerus de, 285
Bocklonde, Hemricus de, 812
Boclande, Galfridus de, 1069, 1445, 1821, 1825, 1908
Matillis de, 1570
Willelmus de, 1571
Bocloude, Willelmus de, 12
Boclondo, Galfridus de, 243
Boctona, Auelina filia Roberti de, 1760
Henricus de, 1760
Isabella filia Roberti de, 1760
Robertus de, 1760
Bodeham, Philippus de, 1489
Willelmus de, 1489
Bodekelham, Galfridus de, 805
Bodekesham, Henricus de, 1259
Bodenho, Alicia tilia Ricardi de, 256
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Bodenho, Margeria filia Rieardi de, 256
Ricardus de, 256
Bodewe, Walterus de, 1401
Bodmine, Andreas de, 214
Prior de, 214
Boeles, Ricardus de, 1261
Boeseuilla, Elias de, 1685
Bograne, Prior de, 421
Bohun, Bon', Samaricus de, 217
Boistard, Warinus, 299
Bokerel, Andreas, 825
Bolebee, Cristina de, 233
Walterus de, 233, 633
Bolescota, Ascelina uxor Willelmi de, 931
Willelmus de, 934
Bolestrode, Nicholaus de, 410
Bomine, Prior de, 894, 1539
Bon' vide Bohun.
Bonastre, Emma uxor Willelmi, 737
Willelmus, 737
Boncrestien, Stephanus, 19
Bonde, Galfridus le, 898
Ricardus le, 898
Sibilla uxor Ricardi le, 898
Bonet, Johannes, 301
Boneneye, Buneneye, Willelmus de, 1750
Boneuilla, Auicia uxor Nicholai de, 128.)

Nicholaus de, 1285
Radulfus de, 997
Boningeswurthe, Gilebertus de, 307
Sarra uxor Gileberti de, 309
Bononia, Beatricia uxor Stephani de, 1929
Faramus de, 452
Juliana filia Walteri de, 1931
Mabilia filia Walteri de, 1931
Stephanus de, 1929
Walterus de, 1931
Bononie, Comes, 262
Bonpas, Clemens, 1313
Roana uxor Clementis, 1313
Boqueynt, Henricus, 235

Bor, Rogerns le, 1904
Borard, Simon de, $40{ }^{6}$
Bordlega, Abbas de, 1
Borlega, Hugo de, 1242
Borray, Berengerus de, 1578
Gerardus filius Berengeri de, 1578
Bortona, Edwardus de, 20
Bosant, Pieardus, 701
Boscard, Johames, 1028
Boseo, Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 487, 968,1921
Beatricia uxor Unfridi de, $3 \pm 7$
Claricia uxor Rogeri de, 1802
Gilebertus filius Ruberti de, $\mathbf{1 6 7 3}$
Johama de, 487
Johanna filia Willelmi de, 968
Mabilia uxor Roberti de, 1673
Matillis de, $968,1673,1674$
Philippus de, 176
Robertus de, 968, 1673, 1674
Rogerus de, 1802
Roysia uxor Willelmi de, 795
S. Trinitatis de, Prior, 1319

Thomas de, 10, 250
Unfridus de, 347
Willelmus de, 487, 795, 968, 1673, 1921
Willelmus filius Robertus de, 1673, 1674
Bose, Willelmus filius Wlmeri, 1041
W'lmerus, 1041
Bosebroc, Johama uxor Walteri, 10.33

Walterus, 1053
Boseuilla, Thomas de, 975
Bostar' ride Bostard.
Bostard, Bostar', Bostarde, Galfridus, 873
Mabilia uxor Galfridi, 873
Warinus, 1616
Bostarde vide Bostard.
Bosuilla, Besuilla, Johanna uxor Ricardi de, 1662
Ricardus de, 1513, 1662
Thomas de, 205
Boterelle, Albrela nxor Willelmi, 1793
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Boterelle, Willelmus, 1793
Boterfeuldia, Philippus de, 524
Ricardus de, 524
Bothorp, Robertus filius Willelmi de, 1943
Willelmus de, 1943
Botindona, Ricardus de, $1 \pm 7$
Bouel, Willelmus, 269
Bouen', Agnes uxor Willelmi de, App. 5
Willelmus de, App. 5
Bouilla, Beuilla, Alexander de, 1653
Hawissia uxor Johannis de, 12
Henricus de, 1653
Johannes de, 12, 1055, 1571
Boullers, Bulers, Baldewinus de, 109
liobertus de, 109
Wenteliena de, 109
Boultona, Henricus de, 130, 1547
Prior de, 1862
Boun, Matillis de, 855
Unfridus de, 463, 1168
Boutona, Henricus de, 20
Boxe, Petrus de la, 1714
Boxle, Abbas de, 1409
Boye, Emma filia Reginaldi, 1959
Jordanus, 1959
Reginaldus, 1959
Willelmus, 1959
Boytona, Willelmus de, 1509
Bozun, Willelmus, 976
Bracebragg', Amicia uxor Willelmi de, 430
Willelmus de, 430
Brackel', Robertus de, 1012
Bracur, Osmarus le, 281
Bracey, Braey, Robertus de, 318
Braddena, Walterus de, 366
Bradebroc, Dionisia filia Reginaldi de, 794
Emma uxor Reginaldi de, 79.4
Reginaldus de, 794
Bradefeuldia, Alicia uxor Geruasii de, 369
Geruasius de, 369
Bradefordia, Willelmus, 1424
Bradehus, Joelanus de, 1209

Bradekere, Willelmus de, 1704
Bradele, Radulfus de, 1870
Bradelegha, Bradeleia, Prior de, 512, 612
Bradeleia ride Bradelegha.
Brademere, Johanna uxor Willelmi de, 1523
Willelmus de, 1523
Bradenestoke, Prior de, 219, 585
Bradeshulla, Andreas de, 601
Braey ride Bracy.
Braham, Agnes uxor Willelmi de, 1520
Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 1520
Isabella filia Willelmi de, 1892
Randulphus de, 694
Rannulfus de, 1827
Willelmus de, $1426,1520,1892$
Brake vide Lake.
Bramfordia, Alicia uxor Geruasii de, 493
Geruasius de, 493
Johannes filius Willelmi de, 508
Robertus filius Willelmi de, 508
Willelmus de, 508
Bramhop, Alicia filia Roberti de, 1851
Robertus de, 1851
Brampdona, Gilebertus de, 1778
Willelmus de, 1778
Bramptona, Bramton', Diamanda uxor Gileberti de, 1048
Gilebertus de, 1048
Bramton' vide Bramptona.
Brancestria, Robertus de, 1321
Branche, Johanna uxor Johamnis, 800
Johames, 800
Branctona, Gilebertus de, 1505
Brantestona, Adam filius Iuonis de, 1602
Ino de, 1602
Brauncewell', Willelmus de, 293
Bray, Agnes filia Milonis de, 1608
Alicia uxor Radulphi de, 968, 1673, 1921
Matillis de, 1201
Matillis uxor Theobaldi de, 1592
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Bray, Milo de, 1608
Philippus de, 1681
Radulphus de, 137, 487, 968, 1012, 1201, 1673, 1736, 1931
Theobaldus de, 1592
Viuianus de, $\mathfrak{y} 13$
Braybroc, Braybroke, Cristina uxor Henrici de, 1675
Henricus de, 427, 829, 1391, 1:22, $1529,1675,1677,1825$, App. 1
Johannes de, 1513
Robertus de, 1677
Braybrok, Clemencia uxor Hemrici de, 116
Henricus de, 116, 1293
Braybroke ride Braybroe.
Braytona ride Draitona.
Braz de Fer, Ricardus, 1773
Breause ride Brensa.
Breaute, Colinus de, 1219
Falco de, 1872
Falkesius de, 102, 513, 854, 1108, $1131,1133,1607,1623,1643$
Fulco de, 1012
Johannes de, 1131
Margeria nxor Falkesii de, 1643
Ricardus de, 1391
Willelmus de, 1171
Breckel, Breekl' ride Berkeley.
Breitoft, Johannes de, 445
Breiusa vide Brensa.
Bremele, Abbas de, 773
Brentungeherste, Reginaldus de, 306
Bret, Martinus le, 72
Simon le, 107, 123
Thoraldus le, 1863
Willelmus le, 320
Bretel, Johannes, 1772
Brethenham, Alexander de, 809
Bretona, Johaunes de, 1738
Bretone, Juliana uxor Willelmi le, 1245
Martinus le, 1245
Willelmus le, 1245
Bretun, Custancia uxor Hugonis le, 129
Hugo le, 129

Breusa, Breause, Breiusa, Eua de, 786
Johannes de, 46, 167, 390, 1302
Reginaldus de, $\ddagger 0,46,167,195$, $250,1328,1330,1362$
Rogerus de, 46
Willelmus de, 46, 250, 709, 786, 1362
Breute, Ricardus de, 1469
Brewere vide Briwerre.
Brewerre vide Briwerre.
Breyles, Isabella uxor Jordani de, 934
Jordanus de, 934
Brian, Gilebertus, 584
Briann', Willelmus de, 1164
Briche, Basilia filia Johannis de, 617
Johannes de, 617
Brichworthe, Reginaldus de, 1890
Brickeseta, Prior de, 1248
Brid, Robertus, 1830
Willelmus, 371,930
Bridlingtona, Prior de, 480
Briffeldia, Philippus de, 72
Brigida. S., Adam de, 205
Brikeuilla, Willelmus de, 760
Brimhurst, Robertus de, 1457
Brimtona, Brimstona, Henricus de, 1423
Johaunes de, 1975, 1980
Brimstona vide Brimtona.
Bringwurthe, Gilebertus de, 515
Sarra 11 xor Gileberti de, 515
Brintona, Gumnora de, 42
Rieardus de, 42
Bristoll', Abbas, 425
Bristollii, Judeus, 1179
S. Augustini, Abbas, 1166

Britannie, Comes, 108, 623, 731
Britewella, Prior de, 1275
Brithasehe, Johannes, 447
Brito vide Briton.
Briton, Brito, Alanus, 81;
Hugo, 1299
Radulfus, 813
Ranulfus, $368,437,519,524,870$
Ricardus, 21.5
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Briton, Robertus, 584
Willelmus, 323, 503, 598, 778, 1323, 1550
Briwere ride Briwerre.
Briwerre, Brewere, Brewerre, Briware, Bruwere, Alanus le, 1311
Willelmus, 5, 6, 202, 363, 367, 630, $796,894,1593,1687$
Briwes, Johannes de, 67, 853, 1436
Robertus de, 853
Broc, Adam del, 821
Clemencia filia Edeline de, 116
Edelina de, 116, 1347, 1410
Ena del, 1336
Prior del, 1366
Rannulfus de, 1347
Brochamtona, Alicia de, 196
Matillis de, 196
Brok, Dauid del, 1167
Eustachius del, 1223
Brokebrod, Galfridus, 357
Brokedis', Gerardus, 424
Brokeleia, Robertus de, 1757
Brom, Anketillus de, 1934
Maria de, 1893
Ricardus de, 770, 1808
Ricardus filius Marie de, 1893
Bromlegha, Brumlegha, Willelmus de, 388
Bromwico, Willelmus de, 1091
Bronfordia, Robertus filius Willelmi de, 795
Willelmus de, 795
Broud, Mabilia uxor Willehni, 1243
Willelmus, 1243
Brud, Michael del, 1543
Druera, Abbas de, 1613
Juliana uxor Walteri de la, 1011
Radulphus de la, 1675
Walterus de la, 1011
Willelmus de la, 976
Bruere, Abbas de la, 1527
Willelmus, 1098
Bruges, Decanus de, 187
Brugfeldia, Hugo de, 1982
Brumartona, Willelmus de, 970
Brumlegha vide Bromlegha.

Brun, Alina uxor Johannis le, 635
Johannes le, 397, 579, 635
Martinus, 825
Radulphus, $10 \not 11$
Ricardus le, 1260
Willelmus, 21, 77, 451, 1129
Bruafordia, Rogerus filius Willelmi de, 795
Roysia de, 615
Willelmus de, 79 \%
Brunger, Richerus, 1833
Bruming, Simon, 825
Brus, Petrus de, 1199
Bruwere ride Briwerre.
Bubbe, Petrus, 168
Buchard, Ernulfus, 1791
Buchoint, Bicunt, Henricus de, 394, 716
Buckeuilla, Ernaldus de, 615
Buckingeham, Archidiaconi de, 576, 626, 646
Willelmus de, 619
Bucministre, Rogerus de, 441
Bucuinte, Henricus, 1554
Bucunt, Henricus, 936
Budenho, Ricardus de, 61
Buelers, Henricus de, 41
Bueles, Matillis uxor Nicholai de, 1497
Nicholaus de, 1497
Bugle, Margeria uxor Walteri, 1695
Walterus, 1695
Buhard, Thomas, 1812
Bukerel, Andreas, 477
Bukesworthe, Henricus de, 1620
Bule, Adam le, 1247
Buleha vide Buleheya.
Buleheya, Buleha, Alicia filia Nicholai de, 68
Mainfel de, 68
Nicholaus de, 68
Nicholans filius Mainfel de, 68
Buleheye, Agnes uxor Nicholai de, 1340, App. 5
Alicia filia Nicholai de, App. 5
Margeria filia Nicholai de, App. 5
Nicholaus de, 1340, App. 5
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Bulers vide Boullers.
Bulintona, Prior de, 1356
Buikintona, Isabella axor Nicholai de, 133
Nicholaus de, 133
Bullingtona, Prior de, 472
Bulloc, Peginaldus, 1799
Bully, Radulfus de, 1859
Willelmus de, 1859
Bulwine, Willelmus, 370
Buntinclona, Willelmus de, 976
Burdeleis, Willelmus de, 175
Burdeles, Rogerus de, 1932
Burdet, Idonea uxor Nicholai, 279
Nieholaus, 279
Willelmus, 279
Burdun, Buchardus, 91, 1392
Egelina uxor Ricardi, 579, 635
Reginaldus, 1392
Reginaldus filius Buehardi, 91
Licardus, 579, 635, 713, 1405
Burel, Galfridus, 270
Burgate, Robertus de, 1245
Burgeis, Petrus le, 1152
Burgestede, Bewedictus de, 374
Burgham, Nieholaus de, 1368
Burgho, Johannes de, 1784
Sabina uxor Johannis le, 1784
Burghulla, Johannes de, 802
Deeanus de, 802
Burginlun, Willelmus le, 1815
Burgo, Abbas de, 117, 514, 971
Alicia de, 888
Alicia uxor Philippi de, 623
Bartholomeus de, 751
Beatricia uxor Huberti de, 16s6
Berleta uxor Roberti de, 1468
Galfridus de, 722, 1716
Hawisia uxor Johannis de, 681, 682, 757
Hubertus de, 43, 66, 213, 354, 376, $403,563,750,827,857,885,956$, $1046,1064,1108,1111,1136$, 1111, 1221, 1233, 1330, 1686
Hugo de, 1657
Johanmes de, 384, 681, 6s. , 757, 779

Burgo, Philippus de, fies
Reinerus de, 45t, 59.5
Robertus de, $162,146 \times$
Rogerus de, 1296
Simon de, 1812
Thomas de, 210, 1681
Walterus de, 1716
Burlega, Johames de, 1
Willemus de, 1
Willemus filius Willelní de, 1
Burn' vide Beeco.
Burnard, Burnarde, Dernard, Rogerus de, 899, 933
Burnarde ride Burnard.
Burne, Beatricia uxor Johannis de la, 1218
Johannes de la, 1218
Burnebu, Johanna uxor Roberti de la, 579, 635
Johannes de la, 579
Robertus de la, 579, 635
Burnehan, Burnham, P'hilippus de, 1836
Radulfus de, 1836
Robertus de, 75
Burnel, Burnelle, Alicia uxor Dauid, 99
Dauid, 99
Margeria uxor Roberti, 1150
liobertus, 1098, 1150
Sarra uxor Willelmi, 10gs
Willelmus, 1098
Burnelle vide Burnel.
Burnham vide Burneham.
Buro, H. de, 1762
Burs, Rogerus de, 917
Burstal, Gilebertus de, 1971
Burton', Willelmus, 932
Burtona, Abbas de, 911, 97t
Johannes de, 652
Laureneius de, 78.)
Matillis de, 621
Petrus de, 621
Radulfus de, 628
liobertus de, 231, 926, 16:37
hogerus ile, 628
Burwimman, Mabilia Ie, 15.52
II. I.
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Busey ride Bussy.
Bussel, Herbertus, 617
Bussex, Thomas de, 279
Bussey, Bartholomeus filius Willemi de, 108:
Johanna filia Matillidis de, 1085
Lambertus de, 1093
Matillis de, 1085
Willelmus de, 1085
Bussy, Busey, Olinerus, 759
Robertus de, 546
Bustard, Allam, 1474
Busum, Willelmus, 977
Buterwico, Robertus de, 1676
Buteuileyn, Agnes uxor Roberti, 1471
Robertus, 1471
Buteuilla, Oliuerus de, 1950
Butiller, Buttiller, Butyller, Adam le, $645,1131,1702$
Hugo le, 1407
Johannes le, 729
Matillis uxor Ricardi le, 1212
Nigellus, 309
Petrus le, 1713
Ricardus le, 375, 1212
Robertus le, 79, 214, 308, 848, 926, 949
Willelmus le, 949, 972, 1702
Buttelegha, Prior de, 740, 788
Butter', Lucia uxor Willemmi de, 66
Willemus de, 66
Buttiller vide Butiller.
Buttyler, Thomas de, 679
Butyller vide Butiller.
Buuencye ville Boneueye.
Buzun, Margeria uxor Willelmi, 798 Willelmas, 798
Byantoft ride Beantoft.
Byrlawe, Adam de, 1096
Albreda uxor Ade de, 1006
Byscoyne ride Biscoyne.
Byset, Alicia uxor Johamis, 158 t
Joliannes, 15st

Caamu ride Caynes.
C'abaum vide Cahaum.
Cabbus, Johames, 1132

Cabus, Hamon, 87
Johannes, 339
Reginaldus, 87
Cadamo, Maria uxor Walteri de, 423
Matillis de, 1502
Walterus de, 423, 559
Cahannes, Kahanneys, Ricardus de, 1580
Sarra uxor Ricardi de, 1580
Cahaum, Cabaum, Cahaun, Chabaum', Clıaun', Kabaum, Hugo filius Radulfi de, 34
Johannes, 262
Osmundus filius Ricardi de, 114
Radulfus de, 34
Ricardus de, 114
Willelmus de, 34, 114
Willelmus filius Radulfi de, 34
Cahaun vide Cahaum.
Calceto, Rogerus de, 302
Caldicot', Ricardus de, 110 5
Caldicote, Alicia uxor Mauricii de, 919
Mamicius de, 919
Ricardus de, 919
Callon, Jordanus de, 45
Mabilia uxor Jortani de, 45
Caluus, le Cauf, Willelmus, 296
Cam, Galfridus de, 1112
Camberlanus, Adam, 1034
Cecilia filia Ade, 1034
Camera, Lecia uxor Willelmi de, 40.5
liobertus de, 346,1051
Willelmus de, 405
Camerarius, Radulfus, 750
Ricardus, $162,597,1477$
Willelmus, 850, 860
Camerlan', Robertus, 232
Cammeys, Fammers, Radulfus de, 158
Campectena, Estrilita uxor Willelmi de, 1613
Willelmus de, 1613
Campeny, Johannes de, 206
Campese, Priorissa de, 21
Campescia, Priorissa de, 745, 710
Campesse, Priorisstu de, 1381
Campo Ernulfi, Willeluus de, 979
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Campuilla, Bertram de, 11 tit
Camuilla, Cummulla, Kamuilla, Kanmuilla, Kanmuilla, Crivina uxor Itugronis cle, 262
Egelina uxor Tieardi de, 3:38
Eustachia usor Fieardi de, 601
(ialfridus de, 94, 95
Cerardus de, 503, 565
Hngo de, 202
Leuea de, 602
Nicholaa uxor Gerardi de, 503, 56.)
Jicardus de, 33\&, 601, 602
Thomas de, 1712
Willelmus de, 392
Canard, IIugo, 1791
Canauae ride Caneuaz.
Cancellis, Audreas de, 31s
Candel ride Canndel.
Cancuac rile Caneuaz.
Cancuaz, Canauac, Canenac, Hemiens, 1 f3
Fobertus, 1434
Cant', Cristiana uxor Gregorii de, 1781
Gregorius de, 1781
Cantelnigia, S. Marie Magdalene de, leprosi, 57
Cantebrigie, Caneellarius, 722
Cantele, Willelmus de, 135
Cantelupo, Cantilupo, Mazilia uxor Willemi de, 8 ij
Petrus de, 903, 943
Rogerus de, 839
Willelmus de, 86, 96, 208, 711, $1117,1273,1306,1.941$
Cantiley, Adam de, 179 I
Rogerus de, 1791
Cantilupo ride Cantclupo.
Cantuaria, Radulfas de, 1723
S. Augustini de, Abbas, 14, 376, 474

Cantuaric, Prior, 70.3
Cantuarienses, Archiepiscopi, 81, 178, $263,277,336,391,462,597,1923$, 636, 617, 66f, $798,857,1070,1108$, $1117,1218,1238,1273,1387,1115$, 1596, 1664, 1677, 1699, 1785, 1928, App. 7
('apel, Johannes, 1771
Juliana dilia Johannis, 1771
Cajella, (ialfridus de, 1916
Capellanus, Adam, 1300, 1:977
Fabianus, ses
Galfridus, (i17
(iregorius, 910
Henrieus, 13:
Hugo, 71, 631
Joliames, 338
Jordanus, 1357
Nathens, 1791
Osbertus, Apl. 7
Petrus, 1762
Ricardus, 114:
Simon, 237
Capelonde, Sampson, 251
Carbonel, Carbonelle. Carbunel, Nieholaus filius Warini, 80
Hululfu*, 194, 8(5)
Ratulfus filius Warini, 90
Sabina, 90
Thomas, 110, 73
Warinus, 90
Warinas filius Sabine, 90
Willelmas filius Warini, 90
Carbonelle vide Carboncl.
Cirbunel ride Carbonel.
Cardun, Petrus, 1297
Tiadulfus, 1297
Willelmus, 1297
Cardumailla, Alicia nxor dacobi de, 18969
Jacobus de, 1669
Coreetarins, Alanus, 1.517
Aluredus, 460
Clemencia uxor Alureni, 160
Willemms, 1311
Caretarius, Willelmus, 219
Carleolo, Fobertus de, 17.5
Fogerus de, st
Carpentarins, (ialfriduc, 18:3
Fewinaldus, 119
Simmon, 1913
Wilheluns filius (idfricli, 17: 2
Wallemmes filius Simonis, 1913
C'insuilla. Craswell', Prior de, ait
17-2
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Cartorpe, Alicia uxor WilleImi de, 1744
Willelmus de, 1744
Casingtona vide Cusingtona.
Castelacra, Prior de, 111
Castellionis, S. Petri, monachi, 1
Castello, Osmundus de, 1180
Castre, Robertus de, 1796
Caterham, Godardus de, 1490
Cateriz, Ricardus de, 1156
Cato, Adam, 270
Cattel' vide Cattelegh'.
Cattele, Prior de, 173
Cattelegh', Cattel', Gattel', Prior de, 1417
Cattona, Adam de, 185
Ricardus de, 185
Cauerelingewurthe, Willelmus de, 813
Cauereswella, Kaueres, Kanereswella, Robertus de, 1978
Cauf, le, vide Caluus.
Caumuilla vide Camuilla.
CaundeI, Caudel, Muriel de, 923, 927
Cause, Willelmus, 952, 1087
Causton', Kaustr', Hugo de, 1454
Cauz, Alesia uxor Jami de, 432
Alina uxor Johannis de, 432
Jamus de, 432
Johannes de, 432
Rogerus de, 231
Willelmus de, 519
Caxtona, Galfridus de, 1672
Cayllard, Radulfus, 1103
Robertus, 285
Caynes, Caamu, Leticia uxor Willelmi de, 198
Willelmus de, 198
Cecilia, Comitissa, 671, 983
Celario, Juliana de, 1062
Cementarius, Ricardus, 1348
Ceresi vide Cresey.
Cerhulla, Thomas de, 250
Ceringtona, Willelmus de, 333
Cerne, Abbas de, 131, 1495
Henricas de, 206, 223
Certeseia ville Certesey.

Certesey, Certeseia, Abbas de, 201, 282, 1562
Henricus filius Johannis de, 282
Johannes de, 282
Cesterhunt, Philippus de, 475
Cestrensis Episcopus, 544
Cestreton, Bardulfus de, 1052
Cestria, Galfridus de, 204
Johannes de, 739
Matillis uxor Galfridi de, 204
Cestrie, Arehidiaconus, 544
Comes, 95, 167, 199, 247, 272, 393, $449,505,708,944,1102,1117$, $1127,1213,1294,1227,1273$, 1309, 1558, 1721, 1730
Constabularius, 869,1847
Chabaum' vide Cahaum.
Chabbewour', Margeria de, 1590
Chacumba, Chancumba, Hugo de, $196,205,975,1950$
Prior de, 196, 205, 975, 1950
Robertus de, 196, 566, 1592
Chaggefordia, Hugo de, 1121, 1285
Isabella uxor Hugonis de, 1285
Cham, Johannes le, 846
Katerina uxor Johannis le, 846
Radulfus de, 1800
Chamberlane vide Chamberleyn.
Chamberlein, Willelmus le, 1553
Chamberleyn, Chamberlane, Wal-
terus le, 1870
Chambres, Nicholaus de, 51
Champenas vide Champenays.
Champenays, Champenas, Rogerus le, 1675
Willelmus le, 400, 1436
Willelmus filins Rogeri le, $\mathbf{1 6 7 5}$
Champeneis, Ricardus de, 173
Champiun, Hugo le, 524
Reginaldus, 1955
Simon filius Reginaldi, 1955
Chancy, Alicia uxor Simonis de, $9 \not 47$
Simon de, 947
Chandos, Radulfus de, 1432
Chansy, Nieholatus de, 512
Chantemerle, Robertur, 1312
Chapeleyn, Robertus le, 896
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Charefeuld, Radulfus de, 1-92
Charentin, Willelmus de, 85:3
Charteray, Simon de, 976
Chartray, Rieardus de, 1146
Chastelein, Joscelinus le, 1395
Chaucumba vide Chaeumba.
Chaucy, Rogerus, 501
Chatel, Logerus, 821
Chatuelegha, Radulfus de, 1259
Cham' vide Cabaum.
Chaundos, Ricartus de, 349
liobertus filius Rieardi de, 349
Channge, Hugo de la, 593
Chaunterel, Johannes de, 821
Chaur' vide Chaure.
Chaure, Chanr', Alicia uxor Mogeri de, 891, 953
Rogerus de, 891, 953
Chautona, Willelmus de, 1369
Chaunin, Chauyyn, Hugo, 814
Matillis uxor IIugonis, 814
Robertus, 81 .
Chanuyn vide Chanuin.
Chauwen vide Chebenhoure.
Chawrtes ride Chawrtesteford'.
Chawrtesteford', Chawrtes, Paganus de, 3
Patricius de, 3
Sibilla filia Patricii de, 3
Chebenhoure, Chauwen, Margeria de, 1740
Chedlewrthe, Emma de, 1265
Chednay, Clemencia filia Willemide, 1639
Margeria de, 1585
Margeria filia Willelmi de, 1639
Sarra filia Willelmi de, 1639
Willelmus de, 1639
Cheggewella, Chiggewell', Willelmus de, 584, 598
Cheindedut, Cheyndedut, Matillis de, 429
Radulfus de, 429, 471
Roysa filia Radulti de, 429
Vlianus de, 499
Cheldefordia, Alicia uxor Armulti de 1746

Cheldefordia, Armulfus de, 17 ti
Sauia filia Armulfi de, 1746
Chelefeuldia, Simou de, 619
Cheles, Robertus, 1976
Rogerus, 1976
Cheleseya, Warinus de, 36
Chelewurthe, Jacolus de, 359
Chelleslegh', Chesel', Hamon de, 1535
Chelmerefordia, Deeanus de, 1453
Cheltues', Robertus de, 1300
Cheluestona, Cheuestona, Joseeus de, 971
Rogerus de, 1460
Chemnonere, Simon de, 1126
Chere, Eadmundus de, 237
Chereburgo, Johannes de, 1019
Cherlecota, Matillis uxor Willelmi de, 1757
Willetmus de, 1757
Cherleseote, Galfridus de, 283
Cherletona, Ceeilia uxor Roberti de, 510
Robertus de, 510
Chese, Agnes uxor Johannis, 589
Clemens, 1479
Johannes, 589
Chesel' vide Chelleslegh.
Chesewic ride Cheswico.
Chesneto, Clemencia filia Willelmi de, 181
Eua uxor Walteri de, 1336
Margeria filia Willelmi de, 181
Sarra filia Willelmi de, 181
Walterus de, 1336
Willelmus de, 181
Chessebech', leginaldus, 285
Cheswieo, Chesewie, Elyas de, 1825
Chetwnde, liobertus de, 318
Chetwule, Robertus de, App. 7
Cheueleslegha, Willelmus de, 1616
Cheneleswella, Willehnus de, 1616
Cheueleswelle, Leticia de, e29
Willclmus filius Letieie de, 229
Chenere, ITamon, 191:
Jordanus, 1244
Iobertus, 1244
Thomas, 1244
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Cheucreuilla, Rogerus de, $5(92,858$
Walterus de, 1191
Cheuestona vide Cheluestona.
Cheure, Agnes filia Roberti, 1743
Ascelina uxor Roberti, 1743
Hamon, 1743, 1812
Mabilia filia Roberti, 1743
Robertus, 17 43
Cheyndedut vide Cheindedut.
Chichesaunt, Elias de, 1125
Simon filius Elie de, 1125
Chielueleslegha, Leticia uxor Ricardi de, 1616
Ricardus de, 1616
Willelmus filius Ricardi de, 1616
Chiggewell' vide Cheggewella.
Child, Alicia filia Galfridi, 1167
Galfridus, 1167
Lucia filia Galfridi, 1167
Thomas, 1343
Chileham, Rovertus de, 259
Chiltona, Bartholomeus de, 1038
Chimineye, Albinus de, 262
Chiptona, Willelmus de, 450
Chiualer, Robertus le, 813
Chounre, Hugo de, 274
Robertus filius Hagonis de, 274
Chuere, Hamon, 788
Chumise, Willelmus, 265
Cicestrenses Episcopi, 112, 114, 350, 438, 1117, 1273
Cicestria, Jacobus de, 421
Cigoingny, Engelardus de, 684
Cirisy, Willelmus de, 415
Claipol, Laurencius de, 1430
Ricardus de, 1430
Clamuilla vide Glaunuilla.
Clanuilla vide Glamuilla.
Clara, Comes de, 45, 52, 303
liicarlus de, 52
Clare, Alicia uxor Rogeri de, 574
Comes de, 1238
G. de, 15157, 1582

Gilebertus de, 173.
Ricardus de, 1162,1238
Robertus de, 166s
R ageres de, 571

Claris Vallibus, Claus Vallibus, Ricardus de, 237
Willelmus de, 938
Clariuallibus, Willelmus de, 125)
Claro Beeco, Henricus de, 33
Ida uxor Henrici de, 33
Claro, S., Cristina de, 18
Gilebertus de, 18, 302
Hugo de, 18
Johannes de, 18
Willelmus de, 896
Clauer, Hemricus le, 642, 723
Johanna uxor Henrici le, $6 \pm 2$
Walterus le, 1727
Willelmus le, 417
Claus Vallibus vide Claris Vallibus.
Clausy, Nicholaus de, 763
Clautona, Hugo de, 1142
Leticia uxor Hugonis de, 1142
Clemdona, Clendona, Galfridus de, 29, 1487
Ricardus de, 1513
Clement, Hemricus, 1132
Clendona vide Clemdona.
Clenchewatona, Johannes de, 1251
Clere, Thomas le, 1190
Clere, Johama uxor Martini de, 470
Martinus de, 470
Matillis uxor Rogeri de, 525, 679
Radulfus de, 468
Rogerus de, 525, 679
Clericus, Adam, 834,879
Auicia uxor Laurencii, 1850
Bartholomeus, 1825
Basilia uxor Picardi, 1374
Benedictus, 1436, 1785
Galfridus, 387,1029
Henricus filius Ade, 879
Herbertus, 253
Isabella uxor Radulfi, 1711
Johannes, 619
Lanrencius, 1850
Lescelina filia Laureucii, 1850
Milo, 798
Radulfus, 17.41
Ricardus, 215, 1374
Robertus, 507, 812
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Clericus, logerus, 907
Thomas, 1955
Walterus, 1191
Willehmu: 216,1948
Clerkenwilla, l'riorissa de, 1311
Clifford, Cliffordia, Ricardins de, 1152
Pogerus de, 102, 172, 352
Walterus de, 319
Cliffordia ride Clifford.
Cliftona, Alam de, 2.52
Agnes tilia Elic de, 252
Elias de, 252
Rogerus de, 252
Clinetona, (ralfridus de, 322
Clingtona, Amicia de, 618
Clintona, Amicia de, 202
Amicia uxor Henrici de, 131s
IIenricus de, 1318, 1493
Hugo de, 115:8
Isabella de, 1373
Leticia uxor Hugonis de, 115 я
Willelmus de, 283, 1373
Clipesby ride Clippesby.
Clippesby, Clipesby, Hugo de, 18
Ricardus de, 186
Clipstona, Robertus de, 72.5
Clipstun, Clpton', Margeria filia Roberti de, 819
Robertus de, 819
Cliue, Hugo de, 677
Robertus de, 1664
Cliuedena, Cliuedona, Johannes de, 1436
Matheus de, 121, $1436,1635,1722$
Matillis filia Mathei de, 1635, 1722
Stephanus de, 298
Willelmis de, 1436
Willelmus filius Mathei de, 1722
Clinedona vide Clinedena.
Clino, Hugo de, 1505
Matillis uxor Hugonis de, 1505
Clokes, Ricardus de, 1726
Cloptona, Robertus de, 40, 161, 1436
Stephanus de, 736
Clpton' vide Clipstun.
Cluny, Abbas de, 1164, 1395
Cnolle, Rieardus de la, $8.2 \times$

Cnoushale, Johames de, 1627
Cnoweshale, Juhannes de, 1:977
Cnul, Galfridus, 481
Cobbehan, Hemricus de, 821, 1593
Johammes de, 821
Cobhan, Henricus de, 262
Coburg, Anxellus de, 1118
Coe, Johannes, 1790
Osbertus, 1011
Walterus, 1790
Cocham, Cokham, Willelmus de, 185, 293
Coche, Hemriens, 291
Cockefeldia, Cokefeldia, Adam de, 1100,1393
Robertus de, 1100
Cokefeuldia, Isabella uxor simonis de, 49 t
Simon de, 491
Cocus, Coqus, Agnes uxor Hugonis, 311
Alieia uxor Nieholai, 1463
Editha filia Rogeri, 678
Emma filia Willelmi, 1650
IIugo, 311
Juliana uxor Rogeri, 146 t
Matillis uxor Roberti, 6äの
Nicholaus, 1463
Ricardus, 331
Robertus, 123, 656
Rogerus, 678, 146!
Willelmus, 1650
Codeham, Coteham, Johannes de, 1246
Codenham, Armulphus filius Rieardi de, 1746
Ricardus de, 1716
Codham, Decanus de, 42t
Codintona, Henricus te, $\mathbf{y} 1$
Codray, Ricarlus de, 243
Coges, Prior de, 793
Cogeshal, Crogeshale, Radulfus de, 1478
Robertus filius Tiadulfi de, 1478
Coggeshal', Gogyeshale, Abbas de, 255, 448
Coham, Henricus de, 31 t
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Coher, Goher, Isabella, 212
Thomas, 212
Coigne, Thomas, 707, 1747
Walterus, 707, 1747
Coigners vide Coisners.
Coisneres vide Coisners.
Coisners, Coigners, Coisneres, Cosneres, Commers, Galfridus de, 1470
Matillis de, 1470
Cokefeldia vide Cockefeldia.
Cokham vide Cocham.
Cokin, Henricus, 47
Cole, Alanus, 48.1
Rogerus, 920
Colecestrensis, Archidiaconus, 766
Colecestria, Abbas de, 778, 1404
Coleham, Hugo de, 336
Colekyn, Hamon, 1782
Colestrode, Golestrode, Mauricius de, 40
Colet, Adam, 1652
Willelmus, 1652
Coleuile, Rogerus de, 514
Colenilla, Agnes uxor Arn' de, 1558
Agnes uxor Luce de, 972
Arn' de, 1558
Gilebertus de, 1212, 1381
Henriens de, 217
Isabella de, 1919
Lucas de, 972
Mabilia de, 972
Ricardus de, 1736
Robertus de, 561, 1626, 1733, 1901
Rogerus de, 1208
Willelmus de, 15, 414, 1.208, 1637
Colewrthe, Willelmus de, 72
Colingcham, Radulfus de, 330
Colre, Philippus de, 241
Coltona, Gerardus de, 1082
Cohm, Prior de, 1488
Colmmbariis, Philippus de, 255, 636
Columbeyn, Thomas, 357
Comblamptona, Adam de, 113
Conhulla, IIcmicus de, 1021
Constabularius, Petrus, 637
Constaneiis, Walterus de, 357

Constantin, Rogerus, 319
Willelmus filius Rogeri, 319
Conuentrenses Episcopi vide Couentrenses Episcopi.
Coplande, Willelmus de, $1 \pm 36$
Copsy, Robertus, 1946
Coqus vide Cocus.
Corbet, Emma uxor Ricardi, 1419
Ricardus, 1449
Rogerus, 1449
Thomas, 44, 651, 882
Corbicu' vide Corbicmu.
Corbicun, Corbicu', Beatricia, 586
Beatricia uxor Ricardi, 284
Galfridus, 586
Ricardus, 284
Corcumba, Galfridus de, 553
Corluanarins, Ailricus, 294
Cristiana uxor Ailrici, 294
Galfridus filius Ailrici, 294
Cormailles, Alicia uxor Thome de, 1486
Thomas de, 1486
Cornchurch, Corners, Angodus de, 1526
Corndebof, Hubertus, 1907
Jordanus, 1903
Corneres vide Coisners.
Corners vide Cornchurch.
Corneuilla, Cornilla, Ricardus de, 620
Robertus de, 1304, 1371, 1555
Robertus filius Roberti de, 1555
Cornhulla, Josceus de, 829
Regimaldus de, 16, 704, 1048
Willelmus de, 412
Cornilla vide Cornenilla.
Cornub', Odo, 328
Cornubie, Comes, 883, 1117, 1121, 1172
Isabella uxor Comitis, 883
Corpe, Aluredus, 1839
Editha uxor Aluredi, 1839
Cortenay ride Curtenay.
Cortes, Radulfus, 1122
Cortona vide Curtona.
Cosyn, Radulfus, 279
Cotele, Leticia uxor Ricardi, 140
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Cotele, Ricardus, 140
Robertus, $\mathbf{1 4 0}$
Coteham vide Codeham.
Cotes, Johammes de, 687
Walterus de, 1004, 1216
Wydo de, 999
Cotinges, Agnes uxor Simonis de, 178.

Simon de, 1784
Coudray, Mathias de, 1157, 1161
Conele, Johannes de, 123
Walterus de, 123
Couclegha, Johannes de, 867
Scolastica uxor Johannis de, S67
Couelindena, Gilebertus de, 1661
Conentre, Radulfus Molendinarius de, 581
Couentrenses, Commentrenses Episcopi, 305, 362, 412, 444, 552, 671, 944, 1051, 1286, 1300, 1352, 1810
Couintria, Adam de, 1690
Archidiaconus de, 1416
Mabilia uxor Ade de, 1690
Petrus de, 1416
Couling, Robertus de, 592
Coumers vide Coisners.
Coweham, Willelmus de, 1165
Coyners, Basilia uxor Rogeri de, 1223
Johannes de, 1223
Mabilia uxor Roberti de, 1223
Robertus de, 1223
Rogerus de, 1223
Crabbedena, Alicia uxor Petri de, 1682
Petrus de, 1682
Craffte, Cecilia uxor Rogeri de, 879
Rogerus de, 879
Crakemere, Henricus de, 1979
Cramfordia, Gilebertus de, 1350
Rogerus de, 1350
Crampe, Willelmus, 589
Crane, Adam, 783
Brianus filins Jordani, 47
Henricus, 47
Jordanus, 47
Crassus, Willelmus, 108
Craswell' ridc Carsmilla.

Crauwecumba, Godefridus de, 624
Craweumba, Godefridus de, 1117
Crawestoke, Elias de, 465
Willelmus de, 465
Willelmus filius Elie de, 465
Cree, Creck, Crek, Creke, Agnes uxor lioberti de, 724
Bartholomeus de, 303, 724, 754
Isabella filia lioberti de, 1378
Petrus de, 754
Robertus de, 303, 724, 754, 1378
Creck vide Crec.
Crede, Osbertus, 411
Crediho, Philippus de, 15
Crek ride Crec.
Creke vide Crec.
Crempesham, Rogerus de, 985
Theodorus de, 985
Crescy, Ceresi, Cressi, Cyresi, Hugo de, 1639
Margeria de, 1639
Willelmus de, 1931
Crespin, Thomas, 1208
Willelmus, 605, 1144
Crespinges, Alanus de, 1631
Walterus de, 1631
Cressi vide Cresey.
Cressone, Gregorius de, 308
Cressy, Isabella uxor Rogeri de, 204
Margeria de, 181, 193
Rogerus de, 110, 177, 204
Cretinges, Johannes de, 1931
Cretling', Adam, 552
Cretona, Eua de, 1726
Ricardus de, 514
Sarra filia Willelmi de, 1726
Willelmus de, 1726
Crenequeor, Hamon de, 178
Robertus de, 1019, 1687, 1897
Creuequer, Nicholaus, 607
Creultona, Petronilla uxor Simonis de, 203
Simon de, 203
Crewe ride Crowe.
Crewebar vide Crewebarwe.
Crewebarwe, Crewebar, Willelmus de, 1539
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Creytona, Milo de, 1979
Crikecot, Willelmus.de, 1920
Crimes, Crunes, Cruues, Galfridus de, 170
Hawisia filia Galfricli de, 170
Matillis nxor Galfridi de, $\mathbf{1 7 0}$
Criol, Bartholomeus, 11
Cristechurehe, Prior de, 1534
Cristeselurehe, Prior de, 979, 1414
Cristi Eeclesia, Prior de, 457
Criur, Galfridus le, 1675
Croberst vide Croherst.
Croe, Robertus, 962
Croft, Ceeilia uxor Rogeri de, 203
Rogerns de, 203
Croherst, Croberst, Odo de, 477
Stephanus de, 477
Croiland, Abbas, 538
Crok, Ricardus, 31
Thomas, 438
Crondona, Galfridus de, 1896
Hawisia uxor Galfridi de, 1896
Crosholmia, Elena de, 1204
Crowe, Crewe, Thomas, 1478
Croxtona, Abbas de, 949
Cruc, Rogerus, $6 \tilde{g}_{2}$
Crue', Osbertus de, 1225
Cruce, Galfridus de, 843, 868
Reginaldus de, $40,843,868$
Cruell', Kullo, Margeria uxor Walteri de, 195
Walterus de, 195
Crues, Ricardus de, 976
Crunes vide Crimes.
Crupet, Willelmus, 1265
Crustwye, Emma de, 841
Cruteuilla, Willelmus de, 250
Crunes vide Crimes.
Cublicota, ladulfus de, 1614
Cudehan, Gilebertus de, 1246
Sarra uxor Gileberti de, 1246
Cudintona, Petrus de, 1650
Cugenlo, Cungeho, Lucia uxor Willelmi de, 1399
Willelmus de, 1399
Cuillur, Nicholaus le, 835
Cuilly, Iugo filius Johamis de, 1305

Cuilly, Johannes de, 1305
Mabilia uxor Walteri de, 1305
Walterus de, 1305
Culindona, Walterus de, 969
Culinge, Robertus de, 592
Cultura, Abbas de, 296, 399, 1398
Culum, Prior de, 387
Cumba, Abbas de, 1586
Alexander de, 513
Editha uxor licardi de, 1705
Elias de, 860
Ricardus de, 113, 454, 1143, 1705
Willelmus filius Elie de, 860
Cumbremere, Abbas de, 1622
Cumerse, Juliana uxor Petri de, 1034
Petrus de, 1034
Cumin, Eua uxor Willelmi, 714, 904, 941
Willelmus, 714, 904, 941
Cumpeigne, Willelmus de, 1764
Cundstan, Willelmus de, 53
Cungeho vide Cugenho.
Cuni, Ricardus de, 127
Cunquest, Galfridus, 1782
Cunuers, Philippus le, 1825
Curey, Matillis uxor Willelmi de, 1569 Willelmus de, 1569
Curiel, Kuriel, Bertramus de, 1117, 1273
Curnub', Odo, 1754
Cursun, Isabella de, 1703
Curtell, Waundrieus de, 116
Curtenay, Cortenay, Ada uxor Willelmi de, 96
Adam de, 1322
Hawisia de, 516
Henrieus de, 516
Matillis de, $170,1396,1569$
Reginaldus de, 164, 170, 1331, 1396, 1569
liobertus de, 16t, 170, 516, 1331, 1569
Willelmus de, 86, 96, 109
Curteys, Bartholomeus filius Roberti le, 4 s 9
Riearcus filius Walteri le, 1927
liobertus le, 489
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Curteys, Walterus le, 1927
Willelmus filius Walteri le, 1927
Curtona, Cortona, Alina uxor Ogeri de, 936
Ogerus de, 996
Thomas de, 1073
Willelmus de, 559, 996
Curtpeil, Ela uxor Hugonis, 413 Hugo, 413
Cuserigge, Rogerus de, 842
Cuseruge, Rogerus de, 1078
Cusin, Amicia filia Simonis, 934
Ascelina filia Simonis, 934
Cecilia filia Simonis, 934
Eleonora fili: Simonis, 934
Hawisia axor Roberti, 1427, 1494
Isabella tilia Simonis, 984
Margeria filia Simonis, 931
Robertus, 1427, 1493
Simon, 934
Willelmus, 345
Cusingtona, Casingtona, Johanma uxor Willelmi de, 1770
Stepliams de, 262
Willelmus de, 1770
Custances, Willelmus de, 913
Cut, Walterus, 896
Cunere, Mabilia 1a, 1908
Cunert, Willelmus le, 776
Cuwye, Prior de, 516
Cuylli, Johannes de, 1335
Mabilia uxor Walteri de, 1335
Walterus de, 1335
Cuylly, Johannes de, 273
Cygoingny, Engelardus de, 1109
Cygony, Engelardus de, 1117
Cyr, Johannes le, 286
Cyrencestria, Abbas de, $16 j 1$
Thomas de, 1172
Cyresi vide Cresey.
Cyrry vide Tyrry.
Cyry, Fulco de, 978
Dacus, le Daneys, Johannes, 1201
Walterus, $532,1910,1910$
Dagod ville Bagod.
Dakeham, Agnes uxor Henrici de, 752

Dakeham, Memricus de, Fin
Dalling', l'etrus de, (il4
Dames, hadulfus de, 3al
Danchy, Johames de, 1\$17
Prnecastive, S. Nicholai de, Magister, 1169
Danes', Petrus de, 488
Thomas de, 4os
Daneys, le, vide Dacus.
Danmartin, Daumartin, Muntmertin, S. Martino, Godefridus de, 1698
Johamma uxor Jordani de, 160:
Johannes de, 1275
Jordanus de, $906,1605,1698$
Odo de, 185. 574
Petronilla uxor Willelmi de, 777
Peginaldus de, 777
logerus de, 251
Willelurus de, 185, 777, 906
Willelmus filius Jordaui de, 906 , 1698
Danteseye, Daunteseia, Dauntesye, Matillis uxor Rogeri de, 297, 375, 690, 797, 830
Rogerus de, 297, 375, 690, 797, 830
Dauid, Comes, 451, 572, 708, 1124
S., Walterus de, 113

Dauid, Abbas, 64s
Dauinar vide Dauintr'.
Daningtona, Priorissa de, 767
Dauintr', Dauinar, Willehmis de, 1067, 1076
Dauintre, Prior de, 31, 308
Daummartin vide Dammartin.
Dauntescia vide Danteseye.
Damntesye vide Danteseye.
Daur', le, vide Pour.
Daye, Auicia le, 514
Deingtona, Bartholomens de, 1769
Simon de, 1769
Delce, Willelmus de, 1490
Dena, Floreneia uxor Willemi de. 1630
Thomas de, s7e
Willemmes de, 1630
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Denchelwrthe, Duncheswurthe, Warinus de, 922
Denchewrthe, Warinus de, 1050
Dene, Gilebertus de la, 1433
Radulfus filius Willelmi de la, 608
Roeysia de la, 1165
Simon le, 1661
Willelmus de la, 608
Willelmus le, 1661
Deneband, Denebond, Eneband, Eudo, 93, 560, 573
Mabilia uxor Eudonis, 560,573
Philippus, 560, 573
Radulfus de, 93
Robertus de, 93
Denebond vide Deneband.
Denemede, Hugelina filia Willemi de, 844
Matillis filia Willelmi de, 844
Willelmus de, 844
Denstede, Thomas de, 163
Dentona, Galfridus de, 917
Walterus de, 220
Dentorp, Alicia usor Willelmi de, 1874
Willelmus de, 1874
Depeford, Stephanus de, 1172
Derby, Comes, 1236
Derebienses Archidiaconi, 51, 480, 552
Dereburgo, Amicia uxor Ricardi de, 319
Ricardus de, 319
Dereby, Agues filia Thome de, 1382
Alicia filia Thome de, 1382
Beatricia filia Thome de, 1382
Katerina filia Thome de, 1382
Thomas de, 1382
Derefield, Alicia usor Hugonis de, 1853

Hugo de, 1853
Derefordia, Elias de, 1873
Derh', Prior de, 1089
Derham, Abbas de, 1238
Agnes uxor Roberti de, 1774
Floria filia Roberti de, 1774
Liobertus de, 1774

Derherst, Prior de, 1646, 1701
Derl', Robertus de, 1019
Derlintona, Elena de, 1463
Desebing', Ricartus de, 319
Deseburgo, Galfridus de, 571
Juliana uxor Galfridi de, 571
Despenser, Adam le, 150
Agatha filia Ricardi le, 1964
Albreda uxor Ricardi le, 1964
Alicia filia Ricardi le, 1964
Elizabeth filia Ricardi le, 1964
Isolda filia Ricardi le, 1964
Katerina uxor Ade le, 150
Ricardus le, 196.
Rogerus le, 271
Thurstanus le, 967
Willelmus le, 1930
Deuilla, Robertus de, 1197
Deuon, Johannes, 736
Walterus, 422, 862
Deuonie, Comes, 1172
Dibenham, Didenham, Johannes de, 1277
Rogerus de, 1277
Dichefordia, Beatricia uxor Galfridi de, 1116
Galfridus de, 1116
Dichtona, Thomas de, 1517
Dickewrthe, Ricardus de, $22 \boldsymbol{2}$
Dictona, Henricus de, 1863
Didenham vide Dibenham.
Dinant, Robertus, 1811
Dinas, Dynas, Johannes, 358
Ricardus, 358
Willelmus, 358
Dinham vide Binham.
Dionisio, S., Robertus de, 425
Rogerus de, 378, 1376, 1445, 1833
Sarra uxor Rogeri de, 378, 1376, 1445
Dirinel, Willelmus, 1481
Disei, Thomas de, 1354
Dispensarius, Alanus, 1312
Dispensator, Hugo, 1117
Dispenser, Baldewinus le, 1731
Diua, Diue, Agnes uxor Willehni de, 313

The numbers refer to the catses not to the patges.

Diua, Hugo de, 887
Johannes de, 811
Margeria uxor Radulfi de, 1042
Matillis de, 1045
Philippus de, 811
ladulfus de, 1042
Simon de, 313
Willelmus de, 313
Ditue vide Diua.
Do, Willelmus, 841
Dockinge, Henricus de, 1797
Richerus de, 844
Dod, Hugo, 298, 683
Doddenesse, Prior de, 766
Dodenes, Thomas de, 1918
Doissel', Willelmus, 1710
Dol, Ricardus de, 10
Dolfin, Rogerus, 436
Dompit, Emma uxor Walteri de, 1048
Walterus de, 1048
Doneslande ride Duneslaude.
Dontona ride Duntona.
Dorcestria, Abbas de, 1088
Dorkecestria, Abbas de, 719
Dornapetona, Adam de, 54
Dorset', Alexander, 464
Dorsete, Alexander de, 257, 416
Dorsetia, Alexander de, 1422, 1467, App. 2
Elyas de, 1825
Dorsingtona, Johannes de, 840
Douera, Robertus de, 1764
Roysia de, 1764
Douere, Foheysia de, 1593
Douore', Prior, 163
Draicote, Johames de, 196
Willelmus filius Johannis de, 196
Draitona, Braytona, Agnes filia Willelmi de, 631
Alicia filia Willelmi de, 631
Rogerus de, 1055
Willelmus de, 631
Drautona, Henricus de, 625
Draytona, Alexander de, 1800
Henricus de, 693
Drengho, Helewisia filia Thome de, 1097

Drengho, Mazilia filia Thome de, 1097
Thomas de, 1097
Dreytona, Thomas de, 1370
Driftield, Fraerieus de, 1052
Driwe, Walterus, 1420
Druffeuldia, Walterus de, 373
Drutal, Hugo, 566
Mabilia uxor Mugonis, 566
Drybi, Simon de, 1579
Dublinensis Archiepiscopus, 857
Due, Rogerus le, 489
Dudelegha, Prior de, 1758
Dudenosse, Prior de, 559
Dudintona, Robertus de, 1288
Willelmus de, 1756
Duffeldia, Emma uxor liad' de, 1153
Rad' de, 1153
Dugun, Philippus, 652
Duket, Johannes, 620
Maria uxor Nicholai, 73
Matillis uxor Johannis, (620
Nicholaus, 73
Ricardus, 873, 1716, 1909
Dullingeham, Nicholaus, 1260
Dun, Emma uxor Nicholai, 371
Gregorius de la, 1129
Nicholaus, 371
Willelmus, 29, 834
Willelmus de la, 1129
Dun', Willelmus de, 792
Duncheswurthe vide Denchelwrthe.
Dunckarde, Willelmus, 132
Dunekeswella, Abbas de, 1575
Dumeslande, Doneslande, Johannes de, 8.56
Dunestora, Hago de, 1172
Dunewico, Josceus filius Ricardi de, 1421
Nicholaus de, 1429
Ricardus de, 1421
Dunhan, Johannes de, 83, 369
Ficardus de, 1255
Dunholmenses Episcopi,35,817,1096, 1117, 1213, 1223, 1238, 1852, 18s
Dunholmensis Arehidiaconus, 433
Prior, 847

The mumbers refit to the cases not to the pages.

Dumingtona, Margeria uxor Roberti de, 507
Robertus de, 507
Dunitona, Walterus de, 307
Dummarz vide Dunuar.
Dunmawe, Dunrawe, Ricardus filius
Simonis de, 1037
Simon de, 1037
Dumawe ride Dummawe.
Dunstanuilla, Alanus de, 165, 1512
Galfridus de, 390, 856
Sibilla uxor Walteri de, 101
Walterus de, 101, 1601
Dunstaplia, Prior de, 1572, 1607
Dunstauilla, Walterus de, 1584
Dunstona vide Duntona.
Duntona, Dontona, Dunstona, Isabella uxor Thome de, 882
Johannes filius Thome de, 882
Tadulfus de, 236
Robertus de, 221
Theodorus de, 309
Thomas de, S82
Willelmus de, 77
Dunuar, Dunmarz, Agnes uxor Ricardi de, 924
Ricardus de, $92 t$
Durantestorpe, Petrus de, 1976
Duredent, Emma, 339
Darnefordia, Ricardus de, 1019
Dusing', Willelmus, 291
Dustona, Maria uxor Willelmide, 1390
Willelmus de, 205, 707, 994, 1390, 1747
Dwygun, Johannes, 1287
Dynas ride Dinas.
Dyne, Robertus de, 1289
Willelmus filins Roberti de, 1289
Dysey, Thomas de, 515
Eadmundi, S., Abbas, $13,38,417,511$, $592,616,700,851,945,1162,1443$
Senescallus, 38, 1632
Eadmundo, S., Beatricia nxor Salomonis de, 1086
Cristiana uxor Radulfi de, 852
Radulfus ile, 852

Eadmundo, S., Salomon de, 1086
Eatona, Prior de, 1250
Priorissa de, 12.50
Eboracenses Archiepiscopi, 321, 329,
515, 537, 759, 959, 1117, 1273, 1339,
$1463,1680,1686,1730$
Eboracensis Canonicus, 628
Eboraci, Prepositus, 16
Thesaurarius, 171
Eboraco, Abbas de, 911, 995, 1339, 1871
Ineta uxor Petri Hund de, 138
Petrus Hund de, 138
S. Leonardi de, Magister, 22
S. Leonardi de, Prior, 60
S. Marie de, Abbas, 254
S. Trinitatis de, Prior, 19, 97, 515, 1415,1877
W. de, 1197

Willehmus de, $148,697,1285$
Eboryey, Cantor, 262
Ebreicis, Cecilia de, 227
Rogerus de, 227
Ebroycis, Isabella uxor Stephani de, 288
Stephanus de, 288
Echefeldia, Picardus de, 1762
Echingham, Simon, 561
Eeleshale, Tadulfus de, 26
Edenham, Hemricus de, 231
Edgarus Rex, 1628
Edmundo, S., Beatricia uxor Salomonis de, 1905
Salomon de, 1905
Edwardo, S., Abbatissa de, 173, 1713
Eschina uxor Petri de, 658
Leticia uxor Rogeri de, 1695
Petrus de, 658
Rogerus de, 1695
Eんwardus Rex, 145,1716
Sanctus, 1628
Egewrthe, Willelmus de, 1687
Egidii, S., Hospitalis, Prior, 1349
Eintona, Eudo de, 1329)
Idonea uxor Eudonis de, 1329
Ela, Comitissa, 3, 363, 463, 532, 775, 1110,1698

The numbers refer to the cases not the the peltes.

Elande, Elonde, Hugo de, 24t
Walterus de, 24
Eldencia, Elteneia, Gilebertus de, 717
Maria filiu Walteri de, 717
Walterus de, 717
Eldingtona, Margeria uxor Willelmi de, 48.5
Willehmus de, 455
Elena, S., Adam de, 325, 640, 738.
Adam filins Henrici de, 281
Henricus de, 2st, 325
Elene, S., Londonie, Priorissa, 419, 1085
Elianora, Comitissa, $3,363,463,532$, 775, 1110, 1698
Elingeham, Ricardus de, 1555
Elinges, Ricardus de, 689
Elingtona, Galfridus ile, 558
Ellerton', Elretona, Prior de, 82, 911
Elmeduna, Juliana uxor Simonis de, 813
Simon de, 813
Elmham, Ricardus de, 1304, 1371, 1666
Elonde ride Elande.
Elretona cide Ellerton'.
Elteham, Jacobus de, 1788
Elteneia vide Eldencia.
Eltesdma, Agnes uxor Willelmi de. 332
Willelmus de, 332
Eltindona, Willelmos de, 76
Eluedena, Emma filia Roberti de, 1917
Robertus de, 1917
Ely, Willelmus de, 805
Elyenses Episcopi, 299, 715, 722, $1117,1368,1381,1541,1582,1716$, 1719, 1762, 1925
Eneband vide Deneband.
Enfant, Johannes le, 1576
Engaigne, Engaine, Engainne, Engaun', Engonn', Vitalis, 86, 11s. 181, 427, 1322
Walterus, 445
Engaine, Engainne vide Engaigne.
Enganne, Vitalis, 1639

Engaun' vide Engaign.
Eugaune ride Engayne.
Engayne, Engitune, Vitalis, 1.511, 1634
Warnerns, 12et
Engleffeuldia, Willelmus de, 390
Engonn' vide Eugaigne.
Enueise vide Enneyse.
Enueys' vide Enueyse.
Enueyse, Enucise, Fnucys', Lomuesse, Agnes uxor Willehmi le, 631
Hamon le, 56
Jacobus le, 600
Matillis nxor Hamon le, yb
Robertus le, 12s, 10×6
Willelmus le, 369, 600, 631, 1212
Eproill, Johamnes de, 35
Erect, Willelmus de, 361
Erdingtona vide Erdintona.
Erdintona, Erdingtona, Herdingtona, Egiclius de, 412, 167, 12:26, 1357, $165!$
Henricus de, 112
Roeisia uxor Thome de, 103
Thomas de, 108, 412, 1226, 1387
Ernaldus, Willelmus, 390
Ersham, Alicia de, 561
Escota, Estcota, Robertus de, 1293
Escotingny, Thomas de, 251
Esham, Alicia de, 643
Eskeling ride Eskelling.
Eslielling, Eskeling, Juhannes, 35
Robertus, 35
Espercer, Floria uxor Galfridi le, 1774
Galfriclus le, 1774
Espirurnel, Celestria uxor Walteri, 569
Walterus, 569
Espoe, Walterus, 1055
Esputel, Willelmus, 270
Esquieler, liogerus le, 19:3
Esquicr, Geua uxor Simunis le, 19.1) Simon le, 1970
Ess', Ricardus, 166
Essartis, Iandulfus de, 213
Esse, Ilese, Aluredus de, 5y
Esseby, Adam de, 1311

The numbers refer to ? ${ }^{2}$ e case: not to the pages.

Esseby, Elena uxor Ade de, $13 \not 41$
Jordanus de, 1730
Prior de, 216
Robertus de, 146, 208
Thomas de, 1968
Esserugge, Matillis de, 471
Vlianus filius Matillidis de, 471
Essewilla, Elias de, 1125
Essexia, Ernaldus de, 551
Johammes de, 1205
Henricus de, 1275
Robertus de, 1275
Thomas filius Ernaldi de, 551
Essexie, Comes, 297, 301, 375, 1397, 1487, 1570
Estauetona, Auicia uxor Radulfi de, 1707
Juliana de, 1707
Radulfus de, 1707
Estaumfordia, Priorissa de, 406
Estaunfordia, Willelmus de, 332
Estcota vide Escota.
Estcote, Robertus de, App. 1
Eston', Alanus, 514
Estona, Willelmus de, 922, 923
Estr', Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 1223
Willelmus de, 1223
Estradlegha vide Stralegha.
Estraunge, Johannes, 591
Estraunges, Benedictus le, 369
Estre, Ricardus de, 853
Willelmus de, 378
Estrifordia, Michael de, 282
Esturmuwe, Alanus de, 1771
Dionisia uxor Alani de, 1771
Esturmy, Adam, 1266
Galfridus, 250, 1266
Thomas, 250
Willelmus, 13
Estutenilla, Elewysa de, 1871
Eustachius de, 1106
Nicholaus de, 251, 599, 110 ${ }^{\circ}$
Estwye, Rogerus de, 731
Rogerus filius Rogeri de, $73 \pm$
Ethingeham, Simon de, 1745
Etona, Osbertus de, 1431
Priorissa de, 276, 300, 188,583

Etona, Rogerus de, 1115
Willelmus de, 276
Ettona, Priorissa de, 1492
Euere vide Enre.
Eucringeham, Isabella nxor Roberti de, 819
Robertus de, 849
Euermue, Euermuwe, Walterus de, 48, 456, 531, 595, 638, 1812
Euermuwe vide Enermue.
Euertona, Robertus de, 899, 933
Euesham, Abbas de, 645
Willelmus de, 1116
Euesk, Henricus le, 1619 Osbertus le, 1619
Eure, Euere, Hawisia filia Walteri de, 1770
Hugo de, 1505
Jacobus de, 1770
Johanna filia Willelmi de, 1770
Johannes de, 455
Matillis uxor Hugonis de, 15̃05
Radulfus de, 1770
Ricardus de, 1770
Robertus de, 1770
Walterus de, 1770
Willelmus de, 1770
Eustachius, Comes, 262
Exonia, S. Nicholai de, Prior, 5, 6
Exonic, Decanus, 348
Precentor, 920
Exonienses Episcopi, 143, 426, 516, 808, 894, 1070, 1117, 1145, 1172, 1666
Eydona, Thomas de, 933
Eye, Prior de, 415
Eyneffordia vide Eynefordia.
Eynefordia, Eyneffordia, Willelmus de, 376,474
Eynesham, Abbas de, 291, 1603, 1672
Eyr, Willelmus le, 644
Eyuilla, Johannes de, 1366
Eywas, Robertus de, 172
Robertus filius Roberti de, 172

Faber, Actam de, 135
Agnes uxor Hemriei, 6:31

The numbers refien to the cases not to the peties.

Fraber, Agnes uxor Joscei, 1:3:3
Alicia uxor Ricardi, 7.51
Auicia uxor Radulfi, 1707
Hemricns, 631, 688
Hugo, 285, 416
Joscens, 1531
Paganus, 200
Radulfus, 1531, 1707
Ricardus, 751
Robertus, 43
Robertus filius Roberti, 43
Rogerus, 1464, 1911, 1941
Stephanus, 1140
Thomas, 1910, 1940
Willelmus, 1041,1949
Willelmus filius Rogeri, 1941
Fabiants, Magister, 125
Fader, Willelmus, 1226
Fairfay, Willelmus, 697
Fakeham, Wihelmus de, 1812
Faleisa, Willelmus de, 81
Falkeburgo, Galfridus de, 1546
Fallide, Johannes, 907
Fambridge, Faunbrig', Decanusde, $2 \boldsymbol{2} 1$
Fancillun, Helton, 563
Johannes, 503
Faran, Gilebertus. 1630
Fardingestona, Matillis de, 1522
Ricardus de, 1522
Farmamuilla, Furnamuilla, Basilia de, 310
Robertus de, 310
Farnburnia, Agnes uxor Rogeri de, 1847
Rogerus de, 1817
Fauconer, Robertus le, 2 fis
Willelmus le, 1188
Fancumbergo, Eustachins de, 1411
Petrus de, 1551
Faucunberge, Eustachius de, App. 8
Faucuner, Willelmus le, 1960
Fanersham, Abbas de, 192
Faukebergo, Philippus de, 256
Faukenbergho, Willelmus de, 599
Faunbrig' vide Fambridge.
Fay, Beatricia uxor Radulfi de, 1410 , 1765

Fay, Beatrix de, 915
Johannes de, 5.25, 5.5.3, 547, 679, 111s
Matillis uxor Radulfi de, 52:
Radulfus de, 525, 553, 679, 913, 1410,1765
Feld, Rogerus de la, 134.:
Felebrigge, Ricardus de, 937
Walterns filius Ricardi de, 937
Feleintona, (ialfridus tilius łIngonis de, 142
Hngo de, 142
Femmes, Willelmus de, 116.
Fenderne, Hugo de, 51
Fer, Braz de, Ricardas, 177.3
Ferariis vide Ferrariis.
Fercles, (ialfridus de, 143:
Hugo de, 363
Ferebrigg, Ricardus de, 261
Ferenbergo, Stephanus de, 4.:3
Ferendma, Abbas de, 6.55
Ferers, Comes, 1117
Feritate, Margeria de, 57J, 796
Ferlegha, Prior de, 1714
Ferlege, Henricus de, 19
Fern', Hugo de la, 1007
Ferne, Ricardus de, 606, 673
Fernelegha, Prior de, $17 t!$
Ferrant, Ricardus, 514
Ferrariis, Ferariis, Agnes uxor Comitis de, 1127, 1213
Comes de, 696, 1127, 1211, 121\%, $1214,1216,1236,1273,1758$. 1949
Johanma uxor Roberti de, 12, 1571
Robertus de, 1』, 1.571
Thomas de, 85
Willelmus de, 674, 676, 752, 1125, $1127,1214,1236,1273$
Ferun, Clemens filius Rogeri le, bite
Galfridus filius Rogeri le, fife
Rogerus le, 662
Fesaunt, Johannes filius liogeri. :57
Rogerus, 577
Feneresham, Ricarlus de, 7:7
Fich, Basilia uxor Toccelini, 1:207
Joscelinus, 1807
M. 1.
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Fichet, Ricardus, 1764
Ficil, Fithil, Hugo, 208
Fidis, S., Prior, 518
Fietenglace, Futenglat', Sarra uxor
Walteri, 1751
Walterus, 1751
Fifhide, Robertus de, 957
Filia-
Absolonis, Mabilia, 104
Ade, Alicia, 1034
Cecilia, 1034
Agathe, Beatricia, 190.5
Alani, Alicia, 959
Oliua, 1811
Petronilla, 959
Aldithe, Sarra, 1112
Alexandri, Emma, 841
Algari, Estrilda, 662
Alicie, Alditha, 676
Anelina, 1834
Hersenta, 653, 676
Johanna, 487
Juliana, 1034
Matillis, 676
Aline, Alina, 512
Almari, Semara, 147
Aluredi, Alina, 512
Amicie, Alicia, 1958
Andree, Agatha, 1905
Basilia, 1095
Egidia, 1905
Elena, 1905
Elizabeth, 1905
Matillis, 1905
Oliua, 1905
Anketilli, Matillis, 1293, App. 1
Arnaldi, Alicia, 1139
Asceline, Alicia, 317
Auicie, Agnes, 1475
Briani, Agnes, 892
Cristiane, Beatricia, 1877
Emma, 702
Isabella, 702
Suniua, 1877
Danid, Auicia, 639
Derewini, Gunilda, 1287
Eatmmudi, Matillis, 1477

Fiiia-
Elie, Margeria, 271
Matillis, 34
Roheisia, 34
Emme, Beatricia, 1203
Enwici, Alicia, 1018
Editha, 1018
Isabella, 1018
Ernaldi, Alicia, 1185
Eutropi, Alicia, 1520
Felicie, Maria, 717
Florencie, Alicia, 12:59
Galfridi, Matillis, 797, 1026
Roesia, 1044
Georgii, Alicia, 185
Godehonde, Eustachia, 1058
Godeline, Thurilda, 993
Godwini, Mabilia, 1906
Goldingi, Agnes, $1 \not 119$
Cecilia, 1419
Goselini, Auicia, 556
Gunnore, Cristiana, 1128
Haldeni, Emma, 1799
Hawisie, Eua, 1379
Helye, Auicia, 225
Claricia, 225
Milisantia, 225
Roheisia, 225
Henrici, Agnes, 758
Alicia, 403, 575
Cecilia, 1670
Celestria, 569
Dynamia, 758
Johanna, 758, 774
Saluea, $80 t$
Howardi, Emma, 1842
Huberti, Cristiana, 1830
Hugonis, Alicia, 528, 1004
Gunilila, 1004
Milisantia, 1004
Hyldredi, Matillis, 1040
Sominna, 1040
Truyta, 1040
Isabelle, Alicia, 1774
Isabella, 1774
Johanne, Agnes, 470
Isabella, 1754

The numbers reier to the sases not to the petaps.

Filia-
Johamnis, Alicia, 18:3!
Annora, 1039
Auicia, 1839, 19.)
Berta, 19.54
(iunnilda, 1839, 195:
Juliana, 1120
Katerina, 3.!
Sara, 1112
Tuliane, Margeria, s1.
Laurencii, Juliana, 1011
Lence, Agnes, 260
Leweline, Elena, 16.5.)
Luce, Johamna, 1909
Mabilia, 1909
Sucie, Katerina, 1761
Mabilie, Dionisia, 168.7
Margeria, 1906
Margerie, Amicia, 1740
Cristina, 167.5
Margeria, 9.50
Matillidis, Agnes, 1672
Alesia, 1773
Auicia, 19.54
Berta, 19.)
Elia, 1708
Cmma, 177:
Gunnilda, 195.
Juliana, 1336
Wymarca, 1773
Mayne, Juliana, 81.5
Matillis, 815
Milisantie, Agnes, 1001
Nicholai, Sabina, 90
Normann', Juliana, sti;
Osberti, Cecilia, 530
Margeria, 507
Osmundi, Agnes, 9.51
Cristiana, 951
Matillis, 951
Petri, Cristiana, 1877
Juliana, 211
Matillis, 522
Philippi, Margeria, 32.
Quenil', Matillis, 1026
Radulfi, Agatha, 190.;
Agnes, 1 s0

Filia-
Fadulfi, Alicia, 1:17
Margeria, 152t
Mirabella, 179:3
Ramnulti, Agnes, 1048
Alicia, 1018, 181;
Diamandal, 104s
(Godelina, 15.57
Inetta, 17:9
Mabilia, 17! 2
Reginaldi, Matillis, sf;
Ricarli, Agnes, $1 \times 76$
Alina, 140
Auclina, 1764
Eimma, 174s
Idonea, .5 .5
Iueta, 959
Mabilia, st
Margareta, 1040
Margeria, 86, 966, 1675, 1744
Matillis, 460, 476, 1764, 1876
Roysia, 476, 1044
Roberti, Alicia, 7.51, 146
Beatricia, 8.51, 1174
Florencia, 1630
(rumnosa, 1]こき
Isolda, 19.5
Joscea, 1420
Mabilia, 7.1.
Margeria, 1420
Marsilia, 15.54
Roysia, 1044
Rogeri, Agnes. 917
Alicia, 1.4:37
Cristina, 10ts
Ela, 1437
Fimma, 937, 104 s
Felicia, 1042
Hilda, 16s.
[neta, 889
-Towetta, $52 \geq$
Juliana, 104s
Milisanta, 1 \& 40
Roysie, Faterina, sti
Salomonis, Matillis, 1672
Sigari, Alicia, 175\%
Simonis, Margeria, 1!0!;
$1 S-2$
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Filia-
Simonis, Matillis, 11
Petronilla, 973
Sirec, Anna, 1357
Margeria, 1357
Matillis, 1357
Stephani, Emma, 1769
Mabilia, 45
Matillis, 45
Thome, Alicia, 1958
Lucia, 66
Thurgis', Ilda, 335
Thurkilli, Matillis, 1905
Umfridi, Alicia, 1100
Usudi, Helewysa, 237
Walerandi, Margareta, 1057
Walteri, Hawisia, 1427
Suanilla, 30
Warini, Alicia, 1311
Warlingi, Elena, 1167
Willelmi, Agnes, 311, 833, 834, 1857
Alicia, 311
Auelina, 1705
Constancia, 702
Cristiana, 702
Dionisia, 833, 834
Ela, 1235
Emma, 90, 774, 1858, 1957
Helewisia, 659
Isolda, 1295
Johanna, 1010, 1674
Juliaua, 100, 1068, 1563
Licoriza, 1857
Mabilia, 1685
Margeria, 950, 1382
Muriella, 425
Roisia, 1858
Sibilla, 1010
Wulnofi, Matillis, 1773
Filias-
Absolonis, Hugo, 103, 104
Walterus, 523
Willelmus, 103, 104, 523
Ade, Adam, 249, 428
Aunselinus, 1023
Aunselias, 703

Filius-
Ade, Brianus, 892
Hugo, 1416
Johannes, 703, 1023
Nicholaus, 1887
Osbertus, 795
Ricardus, 249
Robertus, 1341, 1939
Rogerus, 50, 252, 892, 1241
Simon, 864
Thomas, 281, 537
Walterus, 596, 991
Willelmus, 386, 404, 492, 592, 1836
Adgari, Picardus, 55
Agathe, Henricus, 1259
Agnetis, Adam, 1181
Graalandus, 1048
Johannes, 1169
Petrus, 1041
Radulfus, 955
Ricardus, 411, 1849
Rogerus, 892
Walterus, 1795
Willelmus, 947
Ailbini, Willelmus, 200
Ailmari, Rannulfus, 1935
Safridus, 1935
Willelmus, 1935
Ailmeri, Adam, 1936
Alani, Adam, 771
Brianus, 20, 28, 1458
Danid, 1167
Galfridus, 1167, 1840
Hamon, 1930
Johannes, 173, 1288, 1390
Petrus, 554
Ricardus, 215, 240, 1135
Robertus, 1189
Rogerus, 554
Ruwaldus, 1276
Stephanus, 1933
Thomas, 1747, 1933
Walterus, 147
Warinus, 1933
Willelmus, 147, 215, 554, 1251, 1288, 1590, 1933

The numbers refer to the cases not to the payes.

## Filius-

Albani, Johannes, 1207
Alberti, Philippus, 328
Guido, 1877
Albrede, Alexander, 370
Warinus, 373
Walterus, 1793
Albrichi, (iregorius, 132
Aldithe, Azo, 676
Aldrichi, Gilebertus, 84
Alexaudri, Alanus, $959,1510,1578$
Alexander, 851, 1187
Ennulfus, 20
Godefridus, 959
Henricus, 959
Johannes, 1206, 1321
Laurencius, 959
Ricardus, 551
Alicie, Adam, 1157, 1161
Dauid, 1167
Galfridus, 343
Haco, 185
Johannes, 381, 1437, 1917
Mauricins, 929
Rogerus, 1784
Thomas, 653
Walterus, 377, 1070
Willelmus, 440, 938
Alieuore, Wakelinus, 496
Aliesie, Ricardus, 1044
Aline, Thomas, 512
Almari, Willelmus, 235
Alnathi, Alina, 612
Willelmus, 612
Alofi, Petrus, 715
Aluine, Willelmus, 528
Aluredi, Johannes, 1005
Martinus, 70, 86
Robertus, 1729
Willelmus, 370
Alurici, Andreas, 1005
Radulfus, 31
Alwini, Johannes, 1954
Philippus, 1062
Ricardus, 80
Amabilis, Henricus, 331
Willehmus, 812

Filius-
Amauri, Alanus, 1882 Galfridus, 1882
Andree, Johannes, 16:0
Manicins, 1095
Petrus, 30
Walterus, 1888
Willelunus, 1005
Anfridi, Serlo, 118
Arnaldi, Ricardus, 1749
Arnuldi, Willelmus, 1779
Arturi, Petrus, 324
Asceline, Rogerus, 1045
Aselack', Rogerus, 1936
Atheline, Ordgarius, 1041
Aucheri, Henricus, 144, 533, 1119, 1476
Ricardus, 742
Audoeni, Alexander, 1007
Willelmus, 1750
Aueline, Radulfus, 183 t
Ricardus, 1764
Aufredi, Willelmus, 1017
Augustini, Ricardus, 1785
Willelmus, 1368
Auicie, Ricardus, 1169
Aylardi, Aluredus, 1005
Aluricus, 1005
Aylmari, Hugo, 228
Baldewini, Galfridus, 192, 562
Henricus, 1966
Johannes, 833, 1968
Radulfus, 616
Reginaldus, 45
Thomas, 369
Willelmus, 192, 459
Basilie, Joudewinus, 1095
Beatricie, Galifridus, 8, 586
Henrieus, 403
Johannes, 88, 851, 965
Tobertus, 1457
Benedicti, Benedictus, 30
Thomas, 66
Willelmus, 126, 1421
Bernardi, Johannes, 1704, 1932
Lambertus, 655
Osbertus, 186

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Filius-
Bernardi, Radulfus, 116, 1410, 169.'
Willelmus, 286
Bertini, Adam, 1779
Briani, Henricus, 47
Radulfus, 1278
Robertus, 54, 1189
Bricii, Johanues, 1560
Iuo, 1560
Brini, Micardus, 107
Buchardi, Reginaldus, 91
Camell', Reginaldus, 1850
Cecilie, Galfridus, 1504, 1645
Henricus, 1670
Reginaldus, 1034
Celestrie, Robertus, 1011
Clerici, liobertus, 1900
Comitis, Briemnius, 1688
Henricus, 85, 1512, 1660, 166ti, 1732
Cristine, Ricardus, 1041
Willelmus, 1717
Custanc', Nicholaus, 1517
Danielis, Laurencius, 663
Robertus, 90
Thomas, 1759
Dauid, Ricardus, 982
Robertus, 1000
Johannes, 1194
Deodati, Adam, 72.2
Dere, Walterus, 523
Willelmus, 523
Dionisie, Adam, 1685
Godefridus, 787
Dionisii, Radulfus, 179
Drogonis, Willelmus, 121, 25I, 1543, 1722
Eadmundi, Reginaldus, 1834
Edgari, Patricius, 226
Edine, Hermaunus, 228
Edithe, Reginaldus, 1011
Ricardus, 824
Willelmus, 1324
Eilmeri, Rogerus, 1783
Edrici, Durandus, 1072
Sictridus, 1072
Edwardi, Galfridus, 1287

Filius-
Edwini, Adam, 233
Radulfus, 1905
Eilnod, Rogerus, 499
Eilnolf, Bartholomeus, 499
Ele, Ricardus, 1437
Willelmus, 1235, 1277
Elie, Clemens, 287
Conanus, 301
Geargius, 252
Joscelinus, 287
Philippus, 271
Radulfus, 287
lieginaldus, 287
Ricardus, 878, 1193
Rogerus, 252
Tristram, 1240
Willelmus, 212, 675, 850, 860
Eluene, Siwacus, 1167
Emeline, Robertus, 386
Emme, Radulfus, 1917
Rogerus, 1783
Engelr', Henricus, 262
Engelranni, Willelmus, 570
Engelron', Stephanus, 499
Ernisii, Philippus, 1090
Ernulfi, Wakelinus, 496
Eruisii, Johannes, 641
Estrangie, Robertus, 1075
Estrilde, Edwinus, 1907
Radulfus, 662
Rogerus, 662
Thurkildus, 1905
Eudonis, Alanus, 1418
Michael, 1893
Nicholaus, 1473
Robertus, 145
Walterus, 1827
Ene, Robertus, 1379, 1733, 1942
luerwini, Ricardus, 385
Eufemie, Simon, 1007
Eustachii, Bartholomeus, 916, 1103
Eustachius, 895, 1030
(ralfridus, 837
Willelnus, 964,1915
Eutropi, Willelmus, 1426, 1520
Florie, Gilebertuc, 517

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Filius-
Fretesante, Andreas, 7.17
lromundi, Robertus, 831
Fulcheri, Heuricus, 176
Warinus, 176, 1581
Fulconis, Radulfus, 153, 1511, 1838
Rogerus, 947
Walterus, 840
Willelmus, 1234
Galfridi, Alanns, 804
Baldewinus, 1660
Clemens, 1830
Galfridus, App. 2
(iilebertus, 387
Herebertus, 1014
Hubertus, 1516
Johannes, 585, 652, 797, 1190, 1214, 1241, 1273
Petrus, 1676
Ricardus, 476, 848, 1044, 1369
Robertus, 398, 648
Rogerus, 1437, 1472
Thomas, 734, 1690
Warinus, 425
Willelmus, 1748, 1868
Generose, Gerardus, 357
Georgii, Hugo, 185
Gerardi, Robertus, 984
Warinus, $98 t$
Germani, Danid, 1299
Johannes, 1167
Geroldi, Henricus, 1749
Warinus, 1643
Geruasii, Euerwinus, 348
Robertus, 138, 348
Gile, Johannes, 716
Gileberti, Alanus, 1972
Galfridus, 1435
Gilebertus, 41, 451
Henrieus, 84
Herbertus, 617
Hugo, 980
Johannes, App. 7
Martinus, 783
Matheus, 1749
Osbertus, App. 7
Robertus, 1427

Filius-
Gileberti, Willelmus, 314, 584, 1526
Gippe, Willelmus, 1207
Godefridi, Gilebertus, 1081
Matheus, 1224
Petrus, 107 f
Reynerus, 1074
Ricardus, 227
Thomas, 718
Willelınus, 906
Whiridus, 1041
Godeline, Ricardus, 993
Godman, Willelmus, 1192
Godrici, Robertus, App. 3
Godstani, Alanus, 1062
Godwini, Alauts, 1062
Hubertus, 110.5
Mauricius, 110.5
Nicholaus, 1062
Petrus, 924
Ricardus, 36
Robertus, 704, 1105
Walterus, 704
Willelmus, 1893
Goselini, Robertus, 556
Gote, Thomas, 938
Gregorii, Johannes, 144, 1476
Gudmundi, Eadmundus, 887
Gundrede, Robertus, 705
Gunilde, Willelmus, 1115
Gividonis, Simon, 1203
Gyle, Hugo, 917
Gyue, Galtridus, 16.54
Haconis, Ricarlus, 185
Haldani, Alanus, 1135
Halnaei, Johanmes, 648
Hamonis, Gerardus, 1782
Hamon, 550
Radulfus, 715, 1533
Thomas, 550
Walterus, 10
Willelmus, 530,$1 ; 14$
Hanesgod, Robertus, 999
Wydo, 999
Harding', Elias, sibu
Robertus, 860
Hawisie', Johames, S67, 156\%

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.
rilius-
Hawisie, Radulfus, 1565
Robertus, 1565, 1569
Helewisie, Anselmus, 1382
Robertus, 526
Helye, Willelmus, 1303
Henrici, Adam, 660
Alanus, 1738
Geruasius, 976
(iilebertus, 281, 758, 1067
Hamon, 161
Henricus, 665
Hugo, 1629
James, 1009
Johannes, 282, 403, 1009, 1103
Josceus, 1531
Nicholaus, 176, 1099
Philippus, 1026
Radulfus, 1865
Rannulfus, 148, 231, 323, 1845
Ricardus, 1009
Robertus, 1011
Rogerus, 1149, 1952
Saherus, 1568
Simon, 1009
Thomas, 758, 1476
Willelmus, 265, 696, 702, 884, 916, 1030, 1103
Hereberti, Adam, 1023
Alexander, 622
Bartholomeus, 1023
Matheus, 54
Petrus, 181, 235, 651, 764, 943, $1176,1273,1363,1573,1589$
Hereuici, Gilebertus, 1000
Herlewyni, Aylmarus, 228
Hermannus, 228
Hersante, Thomas, 676
Heruei, Adam, 1120, 1176
Rogerus, 396
IIerwardi, Willelmus, 1749
Howardi, Joscelinus, 1509
Huberti, Hubertus, 1507, App. 4
Milo, 298
Willelmas, 1105
Hugonis, Alanus, 192 i
lemardis, 1 s 42

Filius-
Hugonis, Ernisius, 1174
Eutropus, 1426
(iilebertus, 1576
Henricus, 72, 237
Hugo, 578, App. 8
Johannes, 432, 832, 1120, 1176, $1412,1573,1649,1924$
Nicholaus, 1252
Radulfus, 1870
Ranulfus, 272, 393
Ricardus, 1117
Robertus, 490, 1186, 1870
Rogerus, 695
Simon, 1842
Thomas, 467
Walterus, 402, 1335
Warinus, 490
Willelmus, 34, 207, 311, 663, 1756
Humfridi, Thomas, 1759
Hurewardi, Willelmus, 343
Ingeron, Ricardus, 499
Isabelle, Oliuerus, 596, 991
Robertus, 644
Thomas, 1157, 1161, 1821
Willelmus, 343,985
Isaunti, Johanues, 523
Isilie, Henricus, 379
Ricardus, 379
Robertus, 315, 379
Rogerus, 315
Sampson, 315
Isolde, Hugo, 1951
Iuonis, Robertus, 1517, 1735, 1963
Thomas, 1400
Iwani, Johannes, 1811
Joeli, Warinus, 908
Johanne, Willelmus, 774
Johannis, Alanus, 63
Andreas, 868
Dauid, 1167
Galfridus, 832, 1120, 1176
Johannes, 35, 400, 708, 1603, 1954
Henricus, 309, 403
Matheus. 1436

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Filius-
Johannis, Nicholaus, 510
Radulfus, 831
Ricardus, 400, 815
Robertus, 35, 853, 1811
Rogerus, 1801, 1954
Simon, 846
Thomas, 802
Walterus, 307
Willelmus, 200, 608, 1082, 1104, $1427,1870,1903,1944,1954$
Johelis, Warinus, 1285, 1657
Jollani, Jollanus, 947
Walterus, 531
Jordani, Alanus, 1811
Brianus, 47
Jordanus, 889
Petrus, 889
Ricardus, 1229
Robertus, 1851
Willelmus, 979
Joscei, Nicholaus, 692
Joscelini, Bartholomeus, 1793
Hugo, 1793
Petrus, 1793
Willelmus, 1509, 1793
Joudelini, Willelmus, 1091
Jondewini, Willelmus, 1095
Jowette, Ricardus, 484
Juelis, Willelmus, 1367
Juette, Brianus, 1074
Reynerus, 1074
Hugo, 1074
Juliane, Mauricius, 241
Juwette, Brianus, 668
Hugo, 668
Kecel, Hugo, 1671
Lamberti, Lambertus, 1209
Laurencii, Johannes, 1011
Willelmus, 194
Lene, Robertus, 836
Leofwini, Hugo, 16
Leonardi, Ricardus, 316
Robertus, 316
Leticie, Robertus, 1899
Willelnus, 737
Lucie, Johannes, 716

Filius-
Lucie, Eustachius, 1167
Willelmus, 1792
Mabilie, Adam, 104
Dauid, 1099
Gilebertus, 955, 1673
Johannes, 103
Rogerus, 86, 1891
Willelmus, 1673, 1908
Majoris, Alanus, 1302
Malgeri, Arnuldus, 1779
Marciani, Ricardus, 779
Margarete, Jacobus, 30
Margerie, Andreas, 815
Hugo, 950, 1565
Radulfus, 845
Marie, Alanus, 1811
Ricardus, 1893
Robertus, 1965
Martini, Heruicus, 1393
Simon, 779
Mathei, Herbertus, 1117, 1273
Thomas, 871
Matillidis, Andreas, 86
Elias, 86
Galfridus, 1026
Hamon, 1773
Henricus, 855
Johannes, 86
Joudelinus, 1091
Matillis, 476
Petrus, 1091
Radulfus, 1216, 1773
Reginaldus, 1834
Ricardus, 134, 1040, 1477, 1522
Iobertus, 1044, 1216, 1764
Rogerus, 661
Simon, 11, 855, 1905
Walterus, 676
Willelmus, 86, 146, 815, 1671
Mauricii, Stephanus, 241
Heruicus, 1155
Mayne, Walterus, 815
Ricardus, 815
Michaelis, Thomas, 417
Ricardus, 657
Vnfridus, 5.5

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Filius-
Milonis, Hugo, 807
Nicholaus, 298
Ricardus, 32
Rogerus, 68
Mosse, Ricardus, 479
Nicholai, Johanues, 908, 1447
Milo, 298
Nicholaus, 1085
Osbertus, 663
Radulfus, 300 , $657,1117,1163$, 1492
Reginaldus, 596,991
'Thomas, 197t
Warinus, 1532
Willelmus, 609, 1867
Nigasie, Henricus, 77t
Nigelli, Johannes, 230, 1678
Jordanus, 1851
Osbertus, 538
Rannulfus, 230
Ricardus, 321,1674
Robertus, 1311
Willelmus, 652
Normanni, Ricardus, 571
Robertus, 1928
Odonis, Willelmus, 502
Thomas, 1590
Ogeri, Petrus, 143
Rogerus, 1249
Ordmer, Hamon, 593
Orenge, Radulfus, 227
Willelmus, 227
Osberti, Elyas, 1899
Helyas, 225
Hewricus, 1619
Olinerus, 564
P'etrus, 507
Radulfus, 564
Ricardus, 1056
Robertus, 582, 1621
Rogerus, 564, 788, 105゙5, 1838, 1891
Thomas, 1896
Walterus, 335
Willelmus, 507
Osmundi, Elias, 34

Filius-
Osmundi, Rogerus, 348
Umfridus, 1759
Othonis, Willehmus, 887
1'agani, Gilebertus, 1663
Thomas, 281
Walterus, 87
Warinus, 1663
Willelmus, 215
Patricii, Johannes, 226, 239
Petri, Adam, 537, 849
Alanus, 554
Brianus, 668, 1074
Galfridus, 241, 758, 797, 858, $1190,1334,1487,1570$
(iilebertus, 833
Godardus, 1490
Hugo, 668, 1074
Humfridus, 1041
Johannes, 833, 868
Joudelinus, 1091
Petrus, 637, 1403
Radulfus, 330
Reginaldus, 1024, 1041
Reyncrus, 1074
Ilicardus, 771, 1051, 1087
Robertus, 1570, 1942
Simon, 833, 1799
Willelmus, 82, 484, 1381, 1488
Philippi, Adam, 104
Alexander, 1033
Johannes, 187, 1768
Tadulfus, 1836
Ricardus, 609
Robertus, 778, 885, 980
Willelmus, 1128, 1489, 1768
Picot', Andreas, 211
Porteman, Edwardus, 1903
Johannes, 1903
Prepositi, Hugo, 72
Presbiteri, Wimerus, 1823
Punchardi, Robertus, 634
Quenil', Alanus, 1026
Radulfi, Adam, 185
Alanus, 1631
Alexander, 90
Brizmus, 1917

The numbers refer to the catses not to the pages.

## Filitus-

Radulfi, Caufridus, 1041
Hamelinus, 1411, Apm 8
Hamon, 71.5
Henricus, 100:3
Hubertus, $18 \%$
Hugo, 167, 480
Johannes, 667, 686, 831, 1521, 1631
Laurencius, 686
Mauricius, 1095
Michael, 1151, 1809
Petrus, 994
Radulfus, 227, 955, 1029, 1437, 1445
Ricardus, 467, 945, 1957
Robertus, 949, 1029, 1174, 19.57
Rogerus, $404,848,1543,1558$
Thomas, 284
Viuianus, 629, 939
Walterus, $92,384,467$
Willelmus, 20, 156, 227, 394, $565,726,752,1241,1554$, 1797, 1883
Ranene, Willelmus, 1685
Rannulfi, Alanus, 1861
Hago, 272, 393
Johamnes, 214
Philippus, 1048
Reginaldus, 1041
Ricardus, 230, 1806
Rogerus, 1018
Thomas, 1935
Willelmus, 59, 1280
Ranwe, Euerardus, 1909
Reginaldi, Adam, 357
Johannes, 973
Jordon, 774
Radulfus, 278, 344
Ricardus, $476,650,811,1014$, 1764
Robertus, 1678, 1899
Willehmus, 318, 774
Regis, Robertus, 1569
Reinbaldi, Willelmus, 59
Reinfridi, Rogerus, 913
Renn', Henricus, 991

Filius -
Revneri, Hugo, 18.is
Willelmus, 15cs
Ricardi, Bartholomens, 30:3
Brianus, 1816
Fulco, 215
Galfridus, 476,1761
Hemricus, 1455, 1979
Herbertus, 476
Hernicus, 1800
H14go, 838
Ino, 1967
Jacobus, 1816
Johannes, 243, 367, 656, 815, 894, 94.5, 1521, 1638, 1663. 1951
Jordanus, 843
Nicholaus, 1260
Osbertus, 303, 671
Philippus, 343,977
Radulfus, 455, 1876
Randulfus, 867
Reginaldus, 86
Ricardus, 114, 1040, 1260
Robertus, $303,316,319,601,836$, 1539,1585
Fogerus, 123
Simon, 139, 1849
Thomas, 138, 392
Vitalis, 1639
Walterus, 1663
Willelmus, $186,358,663,867$, $1105,1351,1360,1545,1722$, 1806
Richeri, Adam, 249
Roberti, Adam, 1100
Alants, 201
Alexander, 1069
Andreas, 601, 1711
Augustinus, 142!
Bartholomeus, 75 t
Fray, 634

Gilcbertus, 316, 1268
(iolefridus, 88!)
Hamon, 49.5
Huge, 758, 1565, 1.571

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Filius-
Iioberti, Johannes, 35, 75, 190, 280, 634, 694, 853, 982, 1668, 1680
Mauricius, 860
Petrus, 754, 1970
Radulfus, 125, 604, 939, 1558
Rannulfus, 1280,1618
Reginaldus, 31, 1427
Ricardus, 125, 220, 582, 992, $1105,1185,1477,1675$
Robertus, 43, 125, 315, 379, 1032, $1569,1966,1981$
Simon, 739
Thomas, 982, 1013, 1952
Whalterus, 490, 777, 855, 885, 1040, 1128, 1828
Willelmus, 147, 498, 802, 949, 1557, 1799
Rogeri, Alexander, 1777
Elias, 252
Gilebertus, 1682
Henricus, 1867
Herewardus, 1068
Hugo, 695, 1712
Johannes, 1565
Milo, 1001
Nicholaus, 1802
Osbertus, 564, 1055
Petrus, 554, 1926
Radulfus, 848, 1006, 1048, 1054
Randulfus, 275
Iicardus, 892, $994,1048,1678$, 1766
Robertus, $75,224,292,910,1048$, 1223

Rogerus, 1223
Stephanus, 1459
Thomas, 1521, 1592, 1974
Walterus, 591
Willelmus, 319, 663, 697, 947, 1054, 1352, 1814, 1911, 1941, 1952
Wymerus, 848
Rollondi, Johannes, 307
Roscelini, Johannes, 632
Willelluus, 614, 632, 1900

## Filius-

Roysie, Fobertus, 476
Robertus, 1044
Thomas, 1858
Sabine, Adam, 1100
Umfridus, 1100
Warinus, 90
Willelmus, 1100
Saheri, Nicholaus, 683
Salomonis, Thomas, 1647
Samcle, Walterus, 366
Samuel, Nicholaus, 773
Sarre, Vitalis, 1639
Sauarici, Eborardus, 34, 1353
Saxini, Petrus, 771
Sconardi, Willelmus, 1960
Sefridi, Willelmus, 1935
Selote, Henricus, 1247
Semare, Alanus, 147
Willelmus, 702
Seywini, Nicholaus, 1902
Sibille, Godefridus, 227
Willelmus, 366
Sictridi, Osbertus, 1072
Sigar, Eudo, 659
Simeonis, Ricardus, 1394, App. 1
Thomas, 676
Simonis, Hugo, 161
Johannes, 1016
Martinus, 1279
Petrus, 1799
Philippus, 232
Reginaldus, 76,1293 , App. 1
Ricardus, 42, 139, 188, 427, 1293, 1529, 1658
Robertus, 285, 644
Rogerus, 1394, 1529
Roges, 1660
Simon, 11, 212, 756, 887, 1861
Thomas, 653, 1049, 1730
Walterus, 224, 855
Willelmus, 1036
Siredi, Radulfus, 1631
Siwaci, Galfridus, 1167
Siwardi, Galfridus, 1025
Sominne, Robertus, 1040
Sowar', Johannes, 1603

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Filius-
Stephani, Hubertus, 1443
Petrus, 1860
Radulfus, 1214, 1694
Ricardus, 786
Simon, 940
Thomas, 1694
Steyn', Ricardus, 1981
Suanille, Simon, 30
Suetini, Aldenus, 1799
Swaim, Robertus, 1275
Swenild', Hugo, 1798
Theobaldi, Alanus, 153, 1511
Fulco, 1511
Willelmus, 740
Thome, Adam, 1475
Dauid, 1161
Gilebertus, 517, 600
Henricus, 144
Herbertus, 780
Jacolus, 1543
Johannes, 171, 237, 780, 1563, 1659, 1958
Matheus, 1912
Petrus, 488, 1206
Philippus, 1665
Radulfus, 433
Rannulfus, 780
Reginaldus, 1382
Ricardus, 504
Robertus, 982, 1083, 1704
Rogerus, 1703, 1767
Simon, 42
Thomas, 1013
Walterus, 992, 1202
Warinus, 183
Willelmus, 467, 18:57, 1858
Thorphini, Odo, 1878
Radulfus, 1878
Thurgoti, Magnus, 107
Thurilli, Ricardus, 1041, 110.5
Thurstani, Gilebertus, 980
Henricus, 945
Ricardus, 1455, 1792
Willelmus, 493, 1268
Thurstini, Osbertus, 80
Truyte, Ricardus, 1010

Filius-
Turgis', Robertus, 1 106
Tyrry, lieardus, 147
Uifí, Petrus, 1927
Umfridi, (iilebertus, 736;
Robertus, 1100
Thomas, 1759
Umfridus, 736
Walterus, 45
Ursw, Ieginaldus, 8f, 96 Ricardus, 86
Vitalis, Walterus, 1011
Viuine, Walterus, 141!!
Vliani, Vlianus, 429
Wakelini, Robertus, 752
Willelmus, 994
Wale, Ricartus, 72
Walmari, Hugo, 125
Martinus, 1252
Walouis, Ricardus, 72
Walteri, Benedictus, 190 t
Gilebertus, 1068
Heruicus, 1837
Hugo, 1643, 1870
Niilo, 116s
Nieholaus, 1904
Petrus, 1062
Philippus, 1731
Radulfus, 1498
Ricardus, 335, 489, 1498
Robertus, 315, 355, 379, 1044, 1764, 1838
Rogerus, 315, 379, 1068
Sampson, 31.5, 379
Thomas, 100t, I157, 1161
Walterus, 1901
Willemus, 63, 303, 1069, 1360
Wandef', Adam, $\check{z 20}$
Warini, Alanus, 1161
Fuleo, 102, 764, 1161, 1220
Gilebertus, 1311
Walterus, 1149
Warinus, 1581
Willelmus, $371,11 s 2,1408,1603$
Wankelini, Henrieus, 1996
Werlingi, Germauns, 1167
Widonis, Galfridus, 921

The numbers refer to the cases not to the payes.

Filius-
Widomis, Milo, 371
Willelmi, Adam, 386, 706, $86 \ddagger$, 1181, 1918
Alexander, 809, 1207, 189.
Andreas, 815
Baldewinus, 192
Drogo, 1722
Eborardus, 57
Elias, 34, 860
Fabiamus, 828
Gerardus, 1
Godefridus, 906,1224
Hamon, 481
Hemricus, 214, 611, 659, 686, 905, 1824
Hugo, 133, 1813
Johannes, 508, 706, 733, 822, 1201, 1243, 1351, 1443, 1917, 1973
Martinus, 918, 1245, 1252
Nicholaus, 502
Nigellus, 1090
Osbertus, 67, 1436
Otho, 32.5, 681, 887
Petrus, 156
Radultus, 608, 706, 1486
Reginaldus, 1808
Ricardus, 388, 652, 680, 867, 966, 989, 1024, 1094, 1319, $1360,1792,1748,1757,1808$, 1857
Robertus, $146,158,214,251$, $315,508,795, \quad 809,815$, $894,1070,1808,1811,192$ ค, 1043
Rogerus, 319, 659, 795, 1803
Serlo, 809
Simon, 251, 508, 857, 1036, 1697
Thomas, 231, 234, 461, 527, 947, 1871
Thurillus, $10 \not \ddagger 1$
Warinus, 1435
Walterus, 367, 562, 1360, 1758, 1957
Willelmus, 43, 46, 59, 50s, 6.59.

Filius-
$860,906,966,992,1054,1064$, 1082, 1629, 1734, 1747
Whfridi, Ricardus, 1041
Wluine, Adam, 1823
Wlwini, Hamon, 1812
W1rrici, Henricus, 1812
Wor', Willelmus, 301
Wulwardi, Godefridus, 343
Herewardus, 343
Wulwini, Henricus, 575
Wymarce, Reginaldus, 1959
Wymeri, Rogerus, 848
Yuonis, Thomas, 951, 988
Findere, Hugo de, 51
Johannes filius Hugonis de, 51
Fine, Rogerus, 1914
Wimarea uxor Rogeri, 1914
Finemere, Gilebertus de, 1518
Petronilla de, 1518
Petronilla filia Rosanne de, 1960
Rosanna de, 1960
Fisiuges vide Risinges.
Fislake, Robertus de, 1196
Fissacr', Henricus de, 75.5
Martinus de, 755
Fisseburnia, Thomas filius Willelmi de, 1783
Willelmus de, 1783
Fissinges ride Risinges.
Fithil vide Ficil.
Fiton, Ricardus, 220
Fizsamere, Willelmus le, 702
Flamauilla, Flamnamuilla, Agnes de, 22
Natillis de, 1016, 1968
Flammeuilla, Hugo de, 1223
Flamnamnilla vide Flamauilla.
Flamuilla, Willelmus te, 95;
Flandr', Archeb', 976
Hemricus, 687
Stephanus, 976
Flaxflet, Isolda uxor Rammulfi de, 1889
Rannulfus de, 1889
Fleskenere, Lucas de, 10177
Fleg, Johanmes le, isez
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Fleg', Simon de, 531
Flemeburgo, ladulfus filius Willelmi de, 118
Willelmus de, 118
Flemenlis, Judeus, 18
Flemtona, Hamo de, 1930
Flexlegha, Flixle, Abbas de, 381, 567, 969
Flitwye, Dauid de, 727
Dauid filius Dauid de, 727
Flixle vide Flexlegha.
Fokeworth', Johannes de, 286
Fol, Hamon le, 1892
Folebrigge, Johannes de, 1441
Folenfant, Willelmus, 841
Folet, Reginaldus, 1423
Robertus, 1428
Folifeat, Alanus de, 21
Foliot, Elias, 1675
Gilebertus, 18, 1029, 1374
Henricus, 69
Hugo, 675
Jordanus, 1859
Ricardus, 513, 1326
Robertus, 521,603
Rogerus, 69
Fonte Ebroldi, Abbatissa de, 587
Fontenay, Abbas de, 883
Fontibus, Abbas de, 900, 1880, 1881
Johannes de, 1716 n .
VII., Willelmus de, 389

Ford' vide Forda.
Forda, Ford', Forde, Abbas de, 197, 808, 1150, 1732
Forde ride Forda.
Foresta, Hugo de, 1739
Forestarius, Alexander, 286
Jordanus, 201, 1562
Philippus, 806
Robertus filius Thurstani, 1971
Thurstanus, 1971
Foristarius, Werreys, 216
Forter, Radulfus le, 1962
Fortibus, Christiana uxor Willemi de, 1273
Willelmus de, 926, 964, 1060, 1227. 1273, 1637
lose, Willelmus, 1017
Ysolda uxor Willelmi, 1017
Fossarde, Robertus, 1339
Wiltelmus, 1339
Foun, hadulfus le, 1216
Frakeham, Abbas de, 1016
Framptona, logerus de, 11.52
Franceheymi, Milo de, 13 s
lranceys, Fraunceys, Alicia uxor Salomonis le, 33:;
Cristiana filia Salomonis le, 33.5
Emma uxor Rannulphi le, 1815
Galtridus le, 1160
Juliana uxor Willelmi le, 790
Rannulphus le, 1818
Robertus le, 647, 1943
Salomon le, 33.J
Willelmus le, 623, 790
Wimarea filia Salomonis le, 335
Francie Regis Cancellarius, 3.57
Francie Rex, 39, 71, 110, 1163, 139f;
lranchenei, Franchesnei, Hemricas de, 1190
Franchesnei ride Franehenei.
Francheuilla, Willelmus de, 188, 8:39, 890
Franckeines, Henricus de, 8.5
Frankelayn, Henricus, 270
Radulfus, 810
Frankeleye, Roysa uxor Simonis le, 429, 471
Simon le, 429, 471
Frankeuilla, Rogerus de, $10 \mathrm{~s}^{2}$
Fraunceys vide Franceys.
Fraxineto, Willelmus de, 871
Fraxino, Alicia uxor Enger' de. 1311
Enger' de, 131!
Hugo de, 250, 702
Freceose, Walterus, 1436
Freehingefeldia, Rieardus de, 1800
Fredeswyda ride Fredewithe.
Fredewithe, Fredeswyda, Pridewithe, Frideswitila, S., F'rior, 719, 83:, 1088, 154.5
Frere, Walterus le, 161:3
Fresehenuilla, Radulfus de, ISt
Frestona. Agres de, 1.no
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Frestona, Philippus filius Agnetis de, 1520
Fretewella, Stephanus de, 397
Frid, Ela del, 669
Johannes del, 849, 1833
Johannes filius Johannis del, 1833
Walterus del, 669
Frideswitda vide Fredewithe.
Fridewithe vide Fredewithe.
Friuilla, Isabella de, 671
Frochingeham, Alexander de, 783
Froill', Herebertus de, 15
Frome, Isabella de, 702
Fromundo, S., Prior de, 626
Fromundus, Abbas, 112
Frost, Juliana filia Roberti, 1821
Henrieus filius Roberti, 1821
Margareta filia Roberti, 1821
Matillis filia Roberti, 1821
Robertus, 1821
Rogerus filius Roberti, 1821
Sarra filia Roberti, 1821
Frowe, Alicia la, 381
Frowie, Johannes de, 686
Laurencius de, 686
Fughebir' vide Fugheler.
Fugheler, le, Fughebir', Hewrieus, 1068
Juliana uxor Henriei, 1068
Fughelestona, Isobella uxor Thome de, 1703
Tuliana uxor Thome de, 1703
Rogerus filius Thome de, 1703
Thomas de, 1703
Willchmus de, 1703
Fuillus ride Aunfeillus.
Fulekyn, W'illelmus, 1907
Fulemora, Alicia uxor Roberti de, 1311
Robertus de, 1311
Fuleuilla, Johannes de, 1637
Fulfordia, Henriens de, 1972
Fulgfordehag', Robertus de, 912
Fullus, Radulfus le, 20
Fully, Robertus de, 1095
Julton, Godefridus, 227
Iicardus filius Godefridi, 227

Fulton, Willelmus, 795
Furmamuilla vide Farmamuilla.
Furneaus, Galfridus de, 902
Simon de, 1006
Futenglat' vide Fietenglace.
Gahou, Willelmus de, 1306
Galfridus, Comes, 1570
Galia', Robertus de, 1981
Gallieus, Johannes, 1848
Gamages, Galfridus de, 1224
Godefridus de, 1224
Matheus de, 1288
Gambun, Stephanus, 980
Gamel, Ricardus, 1242
Ganges, Robertus de, 824
Gapewico, S. Trinitatis de, Prior, 945
Garbodesham vide Gerbodesham.
Gardino, Beatricia de, 546
Henrieus de, 107
Willelmus de, 1446, 1508
Gargate, Isabella, 803
Garinges, Priorissa de, 765
Garschurche, Andreas de, 1723
Garsintona, Walterus de, 967
Gastineys, Nicholaa uxor Thome de, 1609
Gatesdena vide Gattesdena.
Gattedena vide Gattesdena.
Gattele vide Catteleg'.
Gattelegha, Radulfus de, 1804
Gattesdena, Gatesdena, Gattedena, Johannes de, 465, 776, 1171
Matillis de, 443, 540
Ranulfus de, 443, 540
(Gattona, Hamon de, 495, 1171
Johannes de, 495
Mabilia de, 1171
Gauleya vide Cauleya.
Gaunt, Gilebertus de, 148, 231, 494, $954,1440,1675,1737$
Henricus de, 1026
Juliana uxor Henrici de, 1026
Matillis uxor Maurieii de, 10.5
Mauricius de, 105, 414, 1737
Philippus de, 1026
Gaunt', Alanus le, 622
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Gaunt', Letieia uxor Alani le. 6ie2
Gay, Galfridus le, 1021
Philippas de, 532
Gaylham, Rogerus de, 758
Gaymer, Gumnilda uxor Johamis, 1287
Johannes, 1287
Juliana filia Johannis, 1287
Margareta filia Johammis, 1287
Gecham, Ailwrnus de, 199
Amisius de, 409
Martinus de, 499
Walterus de, 499
Geddingeham, Johannes de, App. 4
Gelham, Thomas de, $5.57,1: 25$
Gell', Felicia uxor Willelmi de, 364
Willelmus de, 364
Gelram, Johannes de, 12.56
Georgio, S., Agatha de, 1183
Agatha filia Alani de, 543
Alanus de, 168, 543, 1536
Galfridus de, 168
Ricardus de, 16*
Gerard, Adam, 12จ1
Gerardeuilla, Fobertus de, 1233
Geraruilla, Willelmus de, 13
Gerauilla, Eustaehius de, 1173
Gerbodesham, Garbodesham, Maria uxor Thome de, 1647, 164s
Thomas de, 1647, 1648
Germani, S., Prior, 408, 1015
Germano, S., Radulfus de, 1494
Willelmus de, 188
Gernemue, Alieia uxor haxoli de, 722
Karolus de, 722
Gernemuwe, Alieia uxor Radulfi de, 1457
Radulfus de, 1457
Gernesmue, Emma filia Joscelini de, 1895
Joseelinus de, 1895
Margareta filia Joseelini de, 1895
Gernet, Gilebertus filius Willelmi, 1336
Ricardus filius Willelmi, 1336
Rogerus, 86, 1541
Willelmus, 1336;

Gernun, Johannes, 279
Radulfus, 564
Rogerus, 564, 1687
Willelmus, 355, 1928
Gersindona, Walterus de, 152s
Gertona, Johannes de, 14.6
Gerwedona, Abbas de, 10.57
Gery, Philippus, 278
Gessinges, Rogerus de, 179 J
Geudeffordia, Johannes de, 918
Geytona, Edmundus de, 1831
lieginaldus filius Edmundi de, $18: 3$
Gibewico, Prior de, 1\%.js
Gihewin', Galfridus, 3:38
Gibewinus, Galfridus, 1189
Giffard, Giffarde, Elias, 1717
Matillis, 618. 671
Osbertus, $222,363,1306,1717$
Rieardus, 1717
Robertus, 1306
Walterus, 1734
Giffard', Mabilia filia Ricardi, $1 ; 71$
Rieardus, 671
Pogerus, 17.5
Giffarde vide Giffard.
Giffardus, Comes, 1500
Gikeleswico, Elias de, 15.)
Gildeliaulle, Gilhale, Willehnus de, 1115
Gilebertus, Comes, 1037, 1117, 1132
Gilebertus, Mariseallus, 8.57
Gillate vide Gildehaulle.
Gimoges, W'illelmus de, $36 ;$
Gimundeham, Rogerus de, 501
Ginges, Juliana uxor Rogeri de, bit
Rogerus de, 6it
Gingos, Raudulfus de, 27.
Gipewieo, S. Trinitatis de, Prior, 12:39
Girunde, Philippus de, 106
Rosamunda uxor Philippi de, 106
Giselham, Alanus de, xst
Juliana uxor Alani de, 884
Gisneto, Jacobus de. 1900
Gladefen, Olinerus de, aff
Osbertus de, 564
Radulfus tilius Osberti de, itit

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Gladefen, Rogerus filius Osbertide,564
Gladwine, Rogerus, 1210
Glannuilla vide Glaunuilla.
Glanuilla vide Glaunuilla.
Glanwilla vide Glannuilla.
Glastonia, Abbas de, 141, 157, 223, $667,1391,1469,1615$
Glaucestria vide Gloucestria.
Glaunuilla, Clamuilla, Clanuilla, Glannuilla, Glanuilla, Glanwilla, Glonuilla, Bartholomeus de, 1516
Henricus de, 180, 265, 385, 1377, 1625
Isabella nxor Bartholomei de, 1516
Osbertus de, 1920
Ricardus de, 180
Willelmus de, 246
Glen, Gregorius, 428
Glentham, Aluredus de, 251
Glonuilla vide Glaunuilla.
Glorius, Robertus le, 285, 963, 998
Glotingham, Robertus de, 1505
Glotinham, Robertus de, 495
Gloucestria, Glaucestria, Hugo de, 1961
Isabella uxor Willelmi de, 1821
Johannes filius Rogeri de, 1898
Jordanus de, 692
Radulfus de, 687
Ricardus de, 1052
Robertus de, 687
Rogerus de, 1898
Willelmus de, 1821
Gloucestrie, Abbas, 172, 900, 1152
Archidiaconus, 687
Comes, 102, 167, 232, 447, 1037, $1045,1133,1162,1238,1436$, $1526,1567,1582,1734$
Comitissa, 35
Prior, 172
Gloucewrthe, Robertus de, 1206
Godarduilla vide Godaruilla.
Godaruilla, Godarduilla, Walterus de, 857, 893, 1133
Grodchep, Estrangia uxor Johannis, 1075

Godchep, Johannes, 1075
Godebout, Alexander, 423
Godefeuldia, Matillis uxor Roberti de, 756
Robertus de, 75 5 6
Godeherte, Johannes, 1552
Godelinestona vide Godstanetona.
Godestowe, Ricardus de, 1537
Godingeham, Gondingeham, Hugo de, 903,943
Johannes de, 1443, 1507
Willelmus de, 1443
Godintona, Petrus de, 1186
Godman, Willelmus, 135
Godstanetona, Godelinestona, Robertus de, 1779
Goer vide Coher.
Gog, Johannes, 1705
Gogeshale vide Coggeshal'.
Goggeshale vide Coggeshal'.
Goher, Daniel le, 799
Gol, Ricardus le, 1695
Goldingtona, Petrus de, 492
Goldintona, Petrus de, 1662
Gomages, Willelmus de, 1059
Gorges, Radulfus de, 1267
Gosebirdkirk, Willelmus de, 1736
Gosenhale, Ranulfus de, 462
Gosethorp, Robertus de, 920
Gosewilla, Stephanus de, 1311
Goudingeham vide Godingeham.
Goniz, Rogerus de, 447
Gowiz, Johannes le, 1620
Grancort vide Grauncurt.
Grandin vide Graundin.
Grangia, Gilebertus de, 824
Grant, Johannes le, 1852
Ricardus le, 278
Rogerus le, 1525
Gras, Hugo le, 1087
Johannes le, 1083, 1444
Grana, Graue, Ricardus de, 394, 1554
Willelmus de la, 52 s
Willelmus filius Ricardi de, 394
Grane vide Grana.
Graued vide Graundin.
Graucherst, Radulfus de, 1125
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Grauele, Robertus de, sije
Unfridus de, 83:
Grauenel, Isabella de, 1338
Johanna uxor Thome de, 1085, 1418
Thomas de, 1085, 1418
Grauncurt, Grancort, Walterus de, 64, 111, 413
Willelmus filius Walteri de, 413
Graundi' vide Graundin.
Graundin, Grandin, Graued, Graundi', Hugo, 180, 385, 1377, 1625
Graundun, Hugo, 829
Gray, Johannes de, 391, 1238
Gredere, Henricus le, 863
Greinuilla vide Grenuilla,
Gremeston' vide Grenestona.
Grendale, Alesia uxor Radulfi de, 345 Radulfus de, 345
Grenduna, Robertus de, 823
Willelmus de, 752
Greneherste vide Grenestede.
Grenestede, Greneherste, Ricardus de, 128, 189
Thomas de, 1595
Grenestona, Gremeston', Durandus de, 1597
Emma uxor Radulfi de, 1769
Radulfus de, 1769
Grenewye, Reginaldus de la, 270
Grenilla vide Grenuilla.
Grentingham, Agnes de, 1626
Grenuilla, Greinuilla, Grenilla, Eustachius de, 97, 605, 798
Johanna uxor Eustachii de, 605, 798
Ricardus de, 1149
Willelmus de, 1052, 1606
Gresle, Robertus de, 1547
Gresley, Robertus, 1440
Robertus de, 130
Gresten, Grestenn, Abbas de, 318, 354, 561
Grestenn vide Gresten.
Gretingeham, Agnes de, 1558
Grettona, Sarra de, 33
Walterus de, 33

Grey, Agnes uxor Johannis de, 838
Johannes de, 83 s
Ricardus de, 1274
Grifin, Bertramus, 129.)
Thomas, 1219
Grim, Willelmus, 1914
Grimesly, Major de, 120.5
Prior de, 103:5
Grisele, Willehnus de. 1334
Gros, (iilebertus le. 37.5
Radulfus le, 1906
Grossetete, Robertus, 8is
Grubbehenede, Simon, 1577
Grumb', Walterus de, 536
Grumbant, Robertus, 378
Grym, Simon, 1041
Guluant, Alanus, 778
Johames, 733, 824
Gubiun, Henricus, 485, 676
Willelmus, 676
Gubun, Floria uxor Willelmi, 517
Hugo, 517
Katerina uxor Ricardi, 518
Hicardus, 518, 1483, 1513
Willelmus, 517
Guer, Isabella, 1022
Willelmus, 1022
Guindona, Matheus de, 1308
Guines, Baldewinus de, 1339
Gulaffre, Johannes, 846
Gulastre, Alina uxor Rogeri, 361
Rogerus, 361
Gulofre, Rogerus, 1088, 1089, 1701
Gumeges, Thomas de, 1019
Gundeuilla, Hugo de, 1095, 1411, Alp. 8
Gunetona, Isabella uxor Mathei de, 1796
Matheus de, 373, 1451, 1796
Gurnay, Canonici de, 1791
Eua de, 1379
Hawisia de, 1379
Hugo de, 1162, 116
Hugo filius Hingonis de, 146.5
Ricardus de, 376
Robertus de, 137!
Guniz, Mogerus de, 153s

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Gymingeham, Willelnus de, 177
Gyneges, Willelmus, 286
Gyppewico, Prior de, 310

Hachardis vide Hechardis.
Hackebeche, Adam de, 1915
Haddam, Philippus de, 493
Haia, Willelmus de, 260
Haket, Gundreda de, 1458
Margareta uxor Walteri, 590
Margeria uxor Willelmi, 509
Walterus, 590
Willelmus, 509
Hal ride Hales.
Hale, Radulfus de la, App. 3
Simon de, 615, 1854
Halefend vide Haltfeuld.
Halegate, Theodoricus de, 1029
Hales, Hal, Abbas de, 292, 362, 1024
Robertus de, 821
Robertus filins Rogeri de, 292
Rogerus de, 245,292
Simon de, 1016, 1083, 1671, 1691, 1716, 1874, 1909, 1928
Halesby, Ricardus, 907
Halletona, Nicholaus de. 1875
Hallorus, Radulfus filius Willelmi, 1510
Willelmus, 1510
Hals, Marsilia filia Willelmi, 1508
Willelmus, 1508
Haltfeuld, Halefend, Prior de, 442
Hamberd, Radulfus, 636
Hameldona, liobertus de, 1544
Hamerwic, Henricus de, 95
Hamet, Warimus de, 1591
Hanuewella, Randulfus de, 1187
Hamme, Auelina uxor Edwardi de, 84
Edwardus de, 84
Hamtona, Willelmus de, 1352
Handena, Agnes de, 1318
Hanekshale, Walterus de, 4.5
Hanetone, Warinus, 1619
Hanewrthe, Hugo de, 1384
Harang, lelicia, 1104
Harang' vide Harange.

Harange, Harang', Cristiana uxor
Gernagani, 774
Gernagan, 774
Walterus, 265
Harangod vide Haringod.
Hardecota, Thomas de, 1486
Hardes, Rogerus de, 1209
Harecurt, Ricardus de, 708
Robertus de, 712, 1700, 1744
Willelmus de, 708
Harencort, Willelmus de, 102
Hareng, Hareng' vide Harenge.
Harenge, Hareng, Hareng', Radulfus, 137, 201, 215, 901, 1309
Harengod vide Haringod.
Harested' vide Sharsted'.
Harewcduna, Simon de, 819
Harewode, Priorissa de, 1699
Haric, Adam, 1909
Alicia uxor Ade, 1909
Haringeve, Willelmus de, 595
Haringod, Harangod, Harengod, Johannes filius Nicholai, 437
Nicholaus, 437, 568, 879
Sibilla, 537, 568
Sibilla uxor Nicholai, 872
Stephanus, 1738
Harpedena, Harpedona, Robertus de, 68
S., Johanne de, Robertus de, 68

Harpedona vide Harpedena.
Harpetre, Johannes de, 992
Willelmus filius Johannis de, 992
Harpur, Adam le, 1281
Annora uxor Ade le, 1281
Emma uxor Ricardi le, 761
Ricardus le, 761
Harre, Herre, Antigania uxor Ricardi le, 61
Ricardus le, 61
Hartesheued, Hertesheuede, Hugo de, 1846
Margeria uxor Hugonis de, 1846
Haselbergo, Ricardus de, 1543
Thomas de, 1150
Haseleye, Johannes filius Walteri de, 990
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Ha eleve, Matillisuxor Walteride, 990 Walterus de, 990
Hasting' vide Hastinges.
Hastingel', Gilebertus de, 1689
Hantinges, Hasting', Barbota uxor Manasseri de, 1604, 1789
Emoltus de, 173
Galfridus de, 111
Henricus de, 1614
Manasserus de, 1604, 1789
Matillis de, 203
Robertus de, 718, 795, 848, 1604 , 1789
Thomas de, 1878
Willehmus de, 1953
Hateerist, Willelmus, 1079
Haterel, Alicia uxor Johannis, 959
Johannes, 959, 1510
Hatfeldia, Willelmus de. 1476
Hatfeuld, Matillis uxor Walteri de, 1908
Prior de, 751
Walterus de, 1894, 1908
Hatfeuldia, Johannes de, 812
Hathelakestan ride Aslakestan.
Hathemus, Aticia, 50
Hatheringtona, Hugo de, 1563
Hathfeldia, Willehmus de, 144
Hattona, Robertus de, 504, 509
Hanekescherche, Philippus de, 131
Ricardus de, 131
Haueleshirst, Johannes de, 1169
Hanerhalm, Prior de, 849
Hauerhulla, Willelmus de, 1249
Haueringe vide Haueringes.
Haueringes, Haueringe, Johannes de, 834
Willelmus de, 1036
Wydo de, 834
Hauersham, Hugo de, 1399
Haueryate, Robertus de, 314
Hanfordia, Robertus de, 837
Hauing, Ricardus, 779
Haukestona, Nigellus de, 779
Haultona, Willelmus de, 80\%
Haunselin, Alexander, 752
Lescelina filia Alexandri, 752

Haustede, Radulfus de, 1045
Robertus de, 109.5
Hautayn, Autein, Theobaldus, 1547
Hautein, Hautun, Theobalitus, sisg
Hauteyn, Theobaldus, 1728,1874
Hantona, Hemricus de, 120!
Sarta uxor simonis de, 515, 1092, 1093,1102
Simon de, $515,1092,1093,1102$
Hautun cide Hautein.
Hamuitla, Henricus de, 9to
Hawisia Comitissa, ! 164,1213
May, lingerus, 421
logerus filius Thome, 410, 421
Thomas, 68, 410, 4:21
Haya ville Haye.
Haye, Haya, Alexandra nxor Thome de la, 60:5, 798
Alienora nxor Roberti de, 1301
Elizabet uxor Rogeri de la, 1314
Isabella filia Ricardi de, 503,565
Julia tilia Ricardi de, 503, 565
Jnlianus de la, 55x
Manrieins de la, 558
Nicholaa de, 503
Nicholaa tilia Ricardi de, 503, 54.5
Petronilla nxor Saeri de la, sis
Plilippa uxor Roherti de, 513
Radulfus de la, 864
Robertus de, 513, 864, 1301, 1966
Robertus filius Roberti de, 1966
Rogerus de la, 1314
saerus de la, 55s
Sanienla uxor Manricii de la, mos
Stephanus de, $8 \leqslant 1$
Thomas de, 60.5, 601, 798
Thomas filius Rogeri de la, 1314
Hayrun vide Heyrun.
Hayward, Walterus Ie, 18:37
Hecehe ride Hethe.
Hecham, Dionisius de, $17 \times 1$
Elena de, 12s:3
Henricus filins Elene de, 1283
Hugo de, 190.5
Matillis de, 10.31
Oliua de. 10a6
Robertus ile, 17R1
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Hecham, Willelmns de, 6,93
Hechardis, Hachardis, Constancia uxor Roberti de, 1787
Robertus de, 1787
Selekin de, 1787
Heche, Robertus de, 19
Heddenesora, Willelmus de, 1571
Hegetona vide Regetona.
Heies, Petrus de, 1268
Heintona, Idonea de, 140 )
Hekintona, Robertus de, 705
Hele, Emma uxor Rogeri de, 290
Rogerus de, 290
Helena, S., Johannes de, 164
Heliun, Robertus de, 422
Hellebeck, Matillis uxor Roberti de, 729
Robertus de, 799
Hemdun', Gilebertus de, 334
Hemegraue, Thomas de, 1930
Willelmus de, 1930
Hemelingtona, Galfridus de, 1817
Hemmedeua, Walterus de, 1139
Hendernesse, Margeria de, 1356
Henepeneberd', Willelmus, 740
Henred, Johannes de, 469, 1139
Walterus de, 1185
Henricus Comes, 152, 1584
Philippa uxor Comitis, 1584
Henricus filius Hemrici II. Reris Anglie, 199
Henricus I. Rex Anglie, 97, 173, 272, 775, 842, 847, 1238, 1688
Henricus II. Rex Anglie, 49, 80, 97, $145,173,199,272,305,582,775$, $842,1064,1188,1235,1238,1365$, 1684, 1688, 1790, 1733, 1734
Henricus III. Rex Anglie, 16, 40, 56, $110,144,168,173,187,199,272$, $277,283,449,519,561,582,695$, $743,750,775,776,778,785,7 \times 6$, $792,806,821,824,857,907,908$, $913,914,930,1063,1066,110 \mathrm{~s}$, 1111, 1117, 1121, 1133, 1136, 1141, $1162,1164,1181,1183,1217,1224$, $1226,1235,1288,1306,14 \times 7,1639$, $1651,1716,1717,1720,1730,1973$

Hentona, Radulfus de, 1034
Herce, Johamnes de la, 913
Herchiecesham, Herkenbaud de, 1763
Herdeberghe, Hugo de, 950
Herdeuico, Willelmus de, 919
Herdewico, Willelmus de, 1105
Herdingtona vide Erdingtona.
Herdres, Milisanta uxor Philippi de, 1787
Philippus de, 1787
Hereforde, Ricardus, 856
Herefordenses Episcopi, 304, 675, 802, $946,1117,1229$
Herefordia, Cecilia de, 593
Comitissa de, 671
Danid de, 1472
Imbertus de, 899
Petrus de, 1041
Ricardus filius Dauid de, 1472
Herefordie, Comes, 463, 1117, 1168, 1261, 1273
Decanus, 250, 30 t, 990
Heriet, Heryet, Johannes de, 92
Ricardus de, 70, 1437
Heringod vide Haringod.
Herlegha, Warinus de, 766
Herlestoma, Alicia de, 312
Rogerus de, 1513
Willelmas filius Alicie de, 312
Herlicun, Willemus, 790
Herlingefeuld, Osbertus de, 1895
Herseneske, Ismania uxor Philippi de, 267
Philippus de, 267
Herst, Leticia uxor Rogeri de, 1926
Petrus filius Rogeri de, 1926
Rogerus de, 1926
Sabina filia Willelmi de, 1775
Willelmus de, 1775
Hersy, Maunesinus de, 329
Theophania uxor Maunesini de, 329
Hert, Heyr', Amicia uxor Reginaldi le, 491
Auicia uxor Hugonis le, 1576
Hugo le, 1576
Radulfus le, 491
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Hert, Reginaldus le, 191
Herting' vide Hertring'.
1Iertring', Herting', Hertrug', Alanus de, 431
Ricardus de, 431, 512, 612
Thomas filius Alani de, 431
Hertrug' ride Hertring'.
Herui, Willelmus, 1542
Herwintona, Eruwiens de, 136
Johannes filius Ernwiei de, 136
Heryet vide Heriet.
Hethe, Hecche, Alexander de, 1447
Alicia uxor Alexandri de, 1447
Hethfeldia, Hugo de, 1685
Heye, Willehmus, 1:22
Willelmus de, 1424
Heyntona, Radulfus de, 238
Heyr, Hugo le, 980
Heyr' vide Hert.
Heyrun, Hayrun, Jordanus, App. 2
Hiche vide Niche.
Hieheham, Joscelina, 1757
Hiekefordia, Johannes de, 570
Hida, Abbas de, 113, 1695, 1727
Alanus de, 1611
Auicia uxor Rogeri de, 137
logerus de, 137
Walterus de la, 1232
Willelmus filius Walteri de la, 1232
Hide, Gilebertus de la, 1189
Hidona, Ricardus de, 603
Hiduna, Rieardus de, 521
Hikelinge, Prior de, 1796
Hildelath, Robertus de, 1749
Hille, Johannes de la, 1681
Hiltingtona, Whichington, Rogerus de, 581
Hiltoft, Johaunes de, 1135
Hiltona, Adam de, 1169
Alexander de, 782
Ricardus de, 449
Robertus de, 449
Hindele, Isabella uxor Willelmi de, 1192
Willelmus de, $119^{2}$
Hiugham, Walterus de, 1820

Hintelesham, Johannes filius Seywini de, 1902
Nicholaus filius Seywini de, 1902
Seywinus de, 1902
Thomas filius Seywini de, 1902
Hintona, Rieardus de, 1513
Hipping', Matillis uxor Ricardi, 374
Rieardus, 374
Hirtlintona, Willelmus de, 155
Hiseuelestona, Adam filius Sewalli de, 1914
Sewallus de, 1914
Ho, How, Domini de, 1163
Frost de, Hemrieus tilius Roberti, 1 $\mathrm{N}: 1$
Frost de, Juliana filia Roberti, 1821
Frost de, Margarita filia Roberti, 1821
Frost de, Matillis filia Poberti, 1821
Frost de, Robertus, 1821
Frost de, Rogerus, 1821
Frost de, Sarra filia Roberti, 1821
Gilebertus de, 1242
ladulfus del, 1122
Ricardus del, 854
Willelmus de, 1315
Hoberge, Willelmus de, 2.43
Hobrige, Willelmus de, 1374
Hoc, Thomas de, 891
Hoeham, Ocham, WaIterus de, $\mathbf{1 0}$
Hock, Ricardus de, $8 \mathbf{2} 4$
Hocliutona, Dauid de, 938
Hoctona, Bartholomens de, 1296
Johannes de, 1013
Nicholaus filius IVoberti de, 1822
Robertus de, 1822
Hoder, Ailwardus le, 1479
Alieia filia Ailwardi le, 1479
Hof, Lieardus de, 280
Hogeling', Johamnes de, 259
Hoget, Berengarius, 117
Hogh, Thomas de, 8
Hoilye, Joscelinus de, 10
Hokeseur', Erneburga uxor Willelmi de, 1039
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Hokescur', Willelmus de, 1039
Holebech', Simon filius Willelmi de, 975
Willelmus de, 978
Holebut, Isabella uxor Roberti, 342
Robertus, 342
Holendale, Willelmus de, 932
Holma, S. Benedicti de, Abbas, 1451
Hoper, Adam le, 1281
Horbiria, Willelmus de, 1853
Hordena, Johanna uxor Willelmi de, 1010
Willelmus de, 1010
Hordona, liobertus de, 1163
Horepol, Vitalis de, 1409
Hornigefeudia, Willelmus de, 1838
Horsendona, Alicia uxor Johammis de, 1677
Ernerburga uxor Johannis de, 1677
Johannes de, 1677
Hortuna, Margeria uxor Thome de, 1083
Prior de, 1769
Robertus filius Thome de, 1083
Thomas de, 1083
Willelmus de, 709
Hose, Bartholomeus de la, 655
Henricus, 1310
Hothum, Thomas de, 1444
Hotoft, Isabella de, 1782
Petrus de, 774
liobertus de, 816
How, Thomas de, 953
Honedale, Willelmus de, 1412
Houkegarthe, Reginaldus de, 1884
Willelmus de, 1884
How vide Ho.
Howbrigge, Willelmus de, 255
Hoxne, Oxn', Prior de, 1934
Hoylande, Petrus de, 1672
Hucham, lsabella uxor Roberti de, 1760
Robertus de, 743, 1760
Ituchendena, Gernasius de, 285
Hughorsam, Rubertus de, 1306
Hugrelegha, Elyas de, 675
Hughel', Sibilla filia Willelmide, 1740

Hnghel', Willelmus de, 1740
Hugo, Comes, 835, 1827, 1828
Rogerus filius Comitis, 1827, 1828
Huithande, Agnes filia Ricardi, 1862
Hicardus, 18.92
Hul, Licardus del, 6弓̆0
Huland, Henricus, 1369
Hulecota, Philippus de, 1470
Hulle, Osbertus de, 142t
Hulm', Maria uxor Roberti de, 66
Robertus de, 66
Hulmo, Robertus de, 1530
S. Benedicti de, Abbas, 1817
S. Benedicti de, Prior, 548

Hulrecumba, Ricardus de, 680
Hunat' vide Humaz.
Humaz, Humat', Engelarius de, 1734
Julia uxor Ricardi de, 503
Ricardus de, 503, $173 \pm$
Willelmus de, j65
Willelmus filius Engelardi de, 173 4
Humby, Hugo de, 445
Humelbeby, Katerina uxor Radulfi de, 356
Radulfus de, 356
Humet, Willelmus de, 1500
Humframuilla vide Unframuilla.
Hund, Iueta uxor Petri, 138
Petrus, 138
Huneby, Hugo de, 1730
Huntercumba, Willelmus de, 1717
Huntingdona, Johannes filius Thome de, 1927
Thomas de, 1927
Huntingdone, Comes, 563, 1124, 1213
Comitissa, 572
Huntingdunie, Archidiaconus, 629
Huntingefeldia, Rogerus de, 1156
Huntingteldia, Willelmus de, 1309
Hurlegha, Ranulfus de, 347
Hurleia, Prior de, 1178
Huscard, Thomas, 229
Huscarl, Rogerns, 383
Willehmus, 383
Huscarle, Agnes, 1284
Rogerus, 15.7
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Huscarle，Willelmus，1284
Huse，Bartholomeus de la， 728
Johannes de la， 147
Margeria uxor Willelmi， 840
Ricardus de la， 147
Walterns， 1679
Willelmus，840， 1003
Husseburnia，Willelmus de， 1359
Hustingefenld，Rogrerus de， 1900
Hustona，Agnes de，1672
Hyfordia，Ricardus de， 1650
Robertus de， 1656
Icumb，Adam de． 645
Ifeldia，Gilebertus de， 376
Ifeuldia，Gilebertus de， 481
lgoltesuilla，Alanus de， 1135
Ricardus filius Alani de， 1135
Willelmus de， 1135
Ikelesham，Sibilla de， 872
Ikelinge，Prior de， 1813
Ilegha cide Illegha．
Ilesby，Willelmas de， 1563
Illefordia，Leprosorum de，Custos， 1694
Illegha，Ilegha，Alicia filia Anselini de，1922
Anselinus de，442，1922
Hugo de， 1836
Ricardus de， 1922
Immewrthe，Radulfus de， 1122
Inge，Adam，576， 626
Ingeham，Ingham，Albreda uxor
Johannis de， 1793
Johannes de， 1793
Walterus de， 1793
Ingelistona，Sibilla uxor Thome de， 1298
Thomas de， 1298
Ingewrthe，Johannes de，1359， 183：
Willelmus de， 1359
Ingham vide Ingeham．
Ingoldeby，Willelmus de， 357
Ingoldesby，Rogerus de， 1156
Willelmus de， 1156
Inkewrthe，Johannes de，1064

Insula，Brianus de，543，638， 930. 118：3，1205，119！；
Gracia uxor Briani de， 1496
Grecia de， 120.5
Ricardus de，ふが
Tobertus de， $803,1189,1408,1578$
Willelmus de， $503, .514,819$
Irecestria，Petrus de，4＊3
lreys，Henricus le，1724
Isaae，Iudeus， 18
Isabella，Comitissa， 1919
Reqina，1121，1327，1406
Isegny，Inny，Adam de，18：
Johamnes de，1s2
Iselhamstede，Robertus filius Walteri de， 656
Walterus de， 6.50
Islepe，Isleppe，Jeruasins de，62：， 693
Isleppe ride Islepe．
Isny ride Isecny．
Itringeham，Willelmus de， 1762
Jacobi，S．，de Norhamtona，Abbas， 344
Jarpenuilla，Albreda de， 302
Alicia de， 302
Johannes de，1175， 1181
Willelmus de， 302
Jaws ride Jowas．
Jermano，S．，Willelmus de， $8: 39$
Jerusalem in Anglia，Hospitalis， Fratres， 76
Prior， $263,308,319,666,836,1336$ ， 1401，1581， 1599
Joel，Thoraldus， 1158
Johanne，S．，Agatha filia Willelmi de，410，421
Robertus de，342，1350
Willelmus de， $247,410,421,474$
Johannes Comes， $279,992,994,1117$ ， $1124,1127,1221,1273$
Johannes Rex Anglie，16，17，35，39， $45,49,62,76,102,145,199,272$, $283,513,728,750,506,812,944$ ， $1063,1076,1107,1114,112: 3,1124$ ． $1172,11 \times 8,120 \%, 1217,12 \div 6,125 \%$ ，
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$1274,1306,1329,1365,1429,1500$, $1512,1567,1570,1583,1665,1666$, $1684,1688,1720,1732,1795,1854$, 1950
Johaunis, S., de Norhamtona, Hospitalis, Magister, 1032
Joscelin, Johannes, 205, 975
Jowas, Jaws, Radulfus, 1131
Judas, Willelmus, 566
Judeus, Bonauita, $155 \pm$
Isaac, 1376, 1445
Jurnetus, 1445
Jukel, Emma uxor Thome, $92 \pm$
Thomas, 924
Juvenis, Johannes, 1712

Kabaum vide Cahaum.
Kafiu vide Rafyn.
Kahanneys vide Cahannes.
Kailli vide Kailly.
Kailly, Kailli, Kaylli, Kaylly, Adam
de, 671, 672, 1717, 1838
Mabilia uxor Ade de, 671, 1717
Rogerus filius Ade de, 839
Kalethorpe, Eudo de, 730
Kalmundesdena, Agnes uxor Reginaldi de, 320
Reginaldus de, 320
Kammeys vide Cammeys.
Kane', Reginaldus de, 270
Kancie, Comes, 403, 1108, 1111, 1117,
1136, 1141, 1221, 1233
Kantia, Heuricus de, 1269
Karleolenses Episcopi, 1117, 1153, $1155,1175,1181,1273$
Karleolensis Prior, 1153
Karleolo, Eudo de, 1040
Karletona, Heuricus de, 925
Ricardus de, 925
Simon de, 1388
Kartorpe, Alicia uxor Willelmi, 712, 1700
Willelmus, 712, 1700
Karuilla, Radulfus de, 269
Karun, Amicia (le, 580
Elizabet filia Hugonis de, 580
Hugo de, 580

Karun, Johannes de, 580, 867
Lucia filia Hugonis de, 580
Margeria filia Hugonis de, 580
Randulfus filius Ricardi de, 867
Ricardus de, 867
Willelmus de, 867
Kassingetorpe, Willelmus de, 1289
Katerne, Johannes, 1029
Kaue, Willelmus de, 399
Kaueres vide Cauereswella.
Kauereswella vide Cauereswella.
Kanerswell' vide Kenereswella.
Kaume, Felicia uxor Henrici de, 1096
Henricus de, 1096
Sibilla de, 448
Kaumuilla vide Camuilla.
Kaunuilla vide Camuilla.
Kaustr' vide Causton'.
Kauz, Rogerus de, 1240
Kay, Johannes de, 381
Kaylli vide Kailly.
Kaylly vide Kailly.
Kayu, Willelmus de, 1274
Kebbel, Willelmus, 773
Keche, Hugo, App. 3
Fedingtona, Robertus de, 1923
Willelmus de, 1923
Kelling, Ricardus, 1973
Kellinges, Hubertus de, 404
Kemeseck, Henricus de, 797
Kemesinge, Henricus de, 630
Ken, Hago de, 1436
Johannes de, 1436
Ricardus filius Johannis de, 1436
Kenebell vide Kenewell'.
Kenereswelle, Kauerswell', Alicia uxor Roberti de, 199
Filomena filia Walteri de, 199
Robertus de, 199
Walterus de, 199
Kenct, Nicholaus de, 984, 1071, 1274
Keneuilla, Adam de, 1193
Kenewell', Kenebell, Willelmus de, 1623
Kenillewrthe vide Kenilwurthe.
Kenillewurthe vide Kenilwurthe.
Kenilwurthe, Kenillewrthe, Kenille-
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wurthe, Prior de, 195, 569, 1300, Kirkestal, Abhas de, 849 1352
Kenintona, Geruasius de, 142
Margeria uxor Geruasii de, 1442
Kenteuilla, Gilebertus de, 1632
Kentewella, Gilebertus de, 1939
Willelmus de, $1: 239$
Kerebroe, James de, 1009
Keret, Adam, 1310
Adam de, 1327
Kerinol, Swanus de, 1868
Kerkestede vide Kirkestede.
Kernee, Robertus de, 1320
Kersewella, Robertus de, 1192
Kersimere, Agnes de la, 1321
Johannes de la, 1321
Kesneto, Lueia uxor Petri de, 1337
Petrus de, 1337
Radulfus de, 1337
Ketelberne, Henricus, 1753
Keymes, Rogerus de, 1436
Keynesham, Abbas de, 1788
Kicel', Ada uxor Theobaldi de, 148
Theobaldus de, 148
Kidewar', Walterus de, 38
Kim' vide Kima.
Kima, Kim', Kime, Philippus de, 232, 251
Philippus filius Simonis de, 174
Roheisia uxor Simonis de, 24, 37
Simou de, 24, 37, 174, 232
Kime vide Kima.
Kinbrigia, Alieia uxor Milonis de, 15 Milo de, 15
Kinelingeswrthe, Rogerus de, 44
King, Radulfus le, 1852
Walterus le, 1852
Kingeswde vide Kingeswude.
Kingeswade, Kiugeswde, Kyngeswude, Abbas de, 850, 860, 961
Kingtona vide Kintona.
Kintham, Prior de, 685
Kintona, Kingtona, Henricus de, 40
Henricus filius Nicholai de, 401
Nicholaus de, 401
Kirewella, Simon de, 1242
Kirkeby, Johannes de, 658

Kirkestede, Kerkestede, Ǩyrkestedia,
Abbas ile, 741, 770, 751, 986, 157!
Kiuilly, Thuroldus de, 1374
Willelmus de, 1374
Kiully, Isabella uxor Nicholai de, 931
Nieholaus de, 931
Knapetona, Alanus de, 24
Focham, Osbertus de, 2. 55
Jriekelade, Andreas de, 35!
Kritur, Willelmus de, 965
Kuekewel, Willelmus, 791
Kudingtona, Willelmus de, 752
Kudintona, Fray de, 6:34
Kiuilly, Robertus de, 1095
Kuling vide Culinge.
Kulle vide Cruell'.
Kullinges, Robertus de, 511
Kully, Rieardus de, 1453
Kunnetona, Letieia de, 1712
Kuper, Andreas le, 270
Kuriel vide Curiel.
Kyde, Laurencius, 1799
Kyluingeholmia, Walterus de, 1174
Kyma, Philippus de, 1417
Kyme, Philippus de, 472, 1211
Robertus de, 613
Willelmus de, 472
Kynchtona, Willelmus de, 1089
Kyneburle, Willelmus de, 39
Kyngeswilla, Henricus de, 1056
Matillis de, 1056
Kyngeswude vide Kingeswnde.
Kyntona, Willelmus de, 196
Kyriel, Thomas, 115
Kyrkeby, Alanus de, 905
Petrus de, $\mathbf{1 6 3 6}$
Kyrkestedia vide Kirkestede.
Laey, Gilebertus de, 877
Johannes de, 869
Walterus de, 877
Lade, Ricarius de la, 1238
Laf, Adam, 1517
Lafaleisa ride Faleisa.
Lafford', Decanus de, 293
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Lafham, Ailmerus de, 1936
Lagard, Alda uxor Rogeri, 426
Galfridus, 505
logerus, $4: 26$
I aghefar, Rogerus de, 184
Lairtuna, Willelmus de, 595
Lake, Brake, Rogerus de la, 1259
Lambert, Petrus, 1361
Lambrict, Jordanus, 699
Lamore, Rogerus de, 304
Lamy, Laun', Lanny, Willelmus de, 433
Lan’, Osbertus de la, 10
Lancastria, Willelmus de, 613
Lanceleuce, Johannes le, 764
Lanceleue, Johannes, 1331
Lande, Prior de la, 1365
Langebergo, Philippus de, 1325
Langedona, Abbas de, 1506
Galfridus de, 955
Langeduna, Galfridus de, 634
Langeford, Langefordia, Langeport, Rogerus de, 1285
Walterus de, 401
Langefordia ride Langeford.
Langele, Priorissa de, 1295
Langelega, Langelegha, Langeleia,
Abbas de, 75, 559, 874
Beatricia de, 52
Galfridus de, 1263
Prior de, 559
Thomas de, 1107
Langelegha vide Langelega.
Langeleia vide Langelega.
Langeport vide Langeford.
Langetoft, Godefridus de, 1075, 1709
Langetona, Henricus de, 251
Robertus de, 414
Stephanus de, 691
Langetre, Ricardus filius Sywardi de, 138
Sywardus de, 138
Jangewade, Hugo de, 420
Langlegha, Galfridus de, 1134
Lanmale vide Lanualey.
Lanmaley vide Lanualey.
Lann' vide Lamy.

Lannalay, Gunnora de, 682
Hawisia de, 682
Willelmus de, 682
Lanny vide Lamy.
Lanualey, Lanmale, Lanmaley, Hawisia filia Willelmi de, 43
Matillis de, 43
Willelmus de, 43
Laringel, Robertus, 1854
Lasceles, Ada uxor Theobaldi de, 96
Johannes de, 301
Theobaldus de, 96
Willelmus de, 301
Lascy, Johannes de, 705
Matillis de, 204
Walterus de, 227
Latebur', Aunfelisa uxor Johamis de, 867
Johannes de, 867
Latfordia, Gilebertus de, 1530
Lathum, Ricardus de, 1577
Ricardus filius Ricardi de, I577
Lattona, Willelmus de, App. 2
Laudo, S., Adam de, 1341
Lauendena, Abbas de, 648, 107:2, 1201
Lauerstoke, Alexander de, 923
Lauiutona vide Lauittona.
Lauittona, Lauintona, Willelmus de, 81
Launde, Matillis uxor Ricardi de la, 370
Ricardus de la, 370
Launn, Willelmus de, 628
Laurencio, S., Johannes de, 692
Lay, Hugo de, 24
Robertus de, 1851
Lazari, S., Hospitalis, Magister, 1535
Leaume, Galfridus, 440
Lecche vide Lecohe.
Lech vide Lock.
Lecke, Theobaldus de, 286
Lecohe, Lecche, Johanues de, 792
Lectona, Cristiana uxor Roberti de, 652
Hugo de, 1641
Hobertus de, 276, 6.92
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Lectona, Willelmus de, 411
Ledecumb', Radulfus de, 287
Ledena, Willemus de, 250
Ledes, Abbas de, 102
Cristiana uxor Walteri de, 1307
Prior de, 1760
Walterus de, 1307
Ledet, Walterus, 1481
Ledues, Ledyes, Prior de, 481
Ledyes vide Ledues.
Lee, Johannes de, 1247
Ricardus de, 1972
Lefaunt, Robertus, 7.53
Legha, Alanus de, 1122
Andreas de la, $83 \times$
Bartholomeus de, 246
Flandr' uxor Roberti de la, 74
Henricus de, 1370
Hugo de, 246
Johama uxor Alani de, 1122
Mauricius de la, 499
Nicholaa uxor Bartholomei de, 246,
Prior de, 504
Robertus de la, 74, 1388
Stephanus de la, 1741
Leiburne, Leiburnia, Leyburnia, Elias de, 1198
Matillis uxor Walteri de, 1137
Ricardus de, 1380
Rogerus de, 169, 929, 1410
Walterus de, 1137
Wymarus de, 1193
Leiburnia vide Leiburne.
Leic', Robertus de, 351
Leicestrie, Abbas, 72, 583
Comes, 1117, 1953
Leidet, Margeria uxor Wiscardi, 1466
Wiseardus, 1466
Leireestria, Leyrcestria, Asea de, 1948
Petrus de, 1188
Simon de, 1188
Walterus de, 1948
Willelmus filius Asce de, 1948
Leirtona, Willelmus de, 456
Leistuna, Abbas de, 740
Lek, Theoballus de, 1344

Lelay, Hugo de, 37
Lelbrug', Simon de, 1206.5
Lenlam, Johannes de, 295
Hogerus de, 1595
Lemn' vide Lomn'.
Lemna, Mabilia uxor Wymundi de, 1361
Wymundus de, 1361
Lentona, P'rior de, 62, 915, 1236
Leodegario, S., Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 184
Galiridus de, 127
Johannes de, 704
Whllelmus de, 184
Leofordia, Alicia de, 1346
Lethertona, Willelmus de, 595
Lettres, Nieholaus de, 1111
Leualence, Alicia uxor Rogeri, 1052
Rogerus, 1052
Leuckenora, Simon de, App. 5
Leucriehe, Walterus tilius Willelmi, 710
Willelmus, 710
Leueriz, Willelmus de, 1670
Leuesesham, Mabilia uxor Sampsonis de, 17 s !
Sampson de, 1789
Leuingtona, Ricarlus de, 249
Lewe, Reginaldus de, 910
Lewes, Archidiaconus de, 318
Azo de, 1107
Prior de, 142, 248, 350, 539, 1074, 1395, 1663, 1685, 1686
S. Paneracii de, Prior, 350

Lexendena, Willelmus de, 779
Lexetona vide Lexingtona.
Lexingtona, Lexetona, Rohertus de. 281, 466, 760, 831,901, 1012, 111s. 1171
Leyburnia vide Leiburne.
Leyreestria cide Leircestria.
Lichefeldensis Episcopus, 12.36
Lichefeldia, Wiliehmus de, 227
Lichefeldie, Decanus, 16 m 4
Licio, S., Simon de, 926, 1060, 1273, 1501
Lidefordia, Capellanus de, 610
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Lidefordia, Margeria de, 265
Lidiard, Radulfus de, 1436
Lidingtona, Dionisia uxor Roberti de, 787
Godefridus filins Roberti de, 787
Robertus de, 787
Lillebon', Johannes de, 267
Lilleburnia, Henrieus de, 279, 583
Lilleshulla, Wenteliena de, 109
Limesia, Lumesia, Beatrieia filia Galfridi de, 86
Galfridus de, 86, 1387
Johannes de, 1387
Margeria uxor Nicholai de, 1450
Matillis filia Galfridi de, 86
Nieholaus de, 1450
Radulfus de, 1387
Walterus filius Galfridi de, 86
Linant, Robertus, 1185
Lineolnia, Thomas de, 955
Lincolnie, Cancellarius, 278, 1280
Canonicus, 411
Comes, 272, 393, 708, 725, 869, 944, 1102, 1117, 1721
Comitissa, 1027, 1213
Deeanus, 768, 1073
S. Marie, Precentor, 152

Lincolnienses Episcopi, 79, 205, 211, $289,296,357,366,406,492,519$,
$529,576,625,741,798,820,864$,
$1126,1142,1219,1273,1389,1415$,
1475, 1607, 1669
Linde, Willelmus de, 705
Lindeseia, Willelmus de, 1221
Lindewoude, Abbas de, 781
Linduna, Alanus filius Simonis de, 514
Alina filia Simonis de, 514
Rollandus filius Simonis de, 514
Simon de, 514
Lingwode, Ida de, 652
Linholt, Godefridus de, 1608
Liseres, Agnes uxor Jeremie de, 1876
Jeremias de, 1876
Lisiors, Willelmus de, 302
Lisures, Alieia uxor Willelmi de, 689 Hugo de, 948

Lisures, Willelmus de, 689
Liteletona, Cecilia filia Simonis de, 510
Lueia filia Simonis de, 510
Simon de, 510
Litlebiria, Warinus de, 497
Litlemora, Prior de, 183
Littelebiria, Johannes de, 497
Liuekenora, Henrieus de, 1549
Liueknora, Rogerus de, 1340
Liulingtona, Johannes de, 279
Locard, Anketillus, 572
Loek, Leeh, Radulfus de, 792
Lodnes, Emma de, 1729
Willelmus de, 1729
Lodues, Johannes de, 314
Lond', Adam, 1595
Matillis uxor Ade, 1595
London, Benedietus de, 126
Willelmus filius Benedieti de, 126
London', Gilebertus de, App. 7
Johannes filius Gileberti de, App. 7
Osbertus filius Gileberti de, App. 7
Londonia, Alexandra de, 1888
Benedictus de, 1633
Emma uxor Maurieii de, 290
Henricus de, 1456
Johannes de, 901
Joseeus de, 458
Maurieius de, 290
Rieardus filius Johannis de, 901
Robertus de, 290
Samson de, 1640
S. Martini de, Decanus, 1555
S. Pauli de, Decanus, 78, 482, 493, $654,692,886$
Willelmus de, 401, 804, 1118
Willelmus filius Benedieti de, 1633
Londonie, Archidiaconus, 1599
Decanus, 1599
Major, 489
S. Bartholomei, Magister, 966
S. Bartholomei, Prior, 912
S. Elene, Priorissa, 419, 1085

Londonienses Episcopi, 18, 58, 243, $270,275,551,766,797,912,929$, $1029,1117,1453,1564$, App. 7

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Longa Villa, Prior de, 420
Thomas de, 559
Longespei vide Lungespeye.
Longeuilla, Henricus de, 286
Longo Campo, Nunchamp, Willelmus de, 1542, 1545
Longus, Alieia filia Warini, 1311
Matheus, 132
Warinus, 1311
Lonn', Lenn', Robertus de, 314
Lonueyse vide Enueyse.
Lorimerius, Laurencius, 314
Louennie, Dux, 1706
Lowis, Radulfus, 1666
Lucet, Dyamanda uxor Ricardi, 253
Ricardus, 253, 1667
Luciel, Willelmus, 1929
Luere, Willelmus le, 563
Lucy, Galfridus de, 708, 753, 807, 1117, 1336,1556,1570, 1593, 1764
Galfridus filius Rieardi, 1044
Godefridus de, 938, 1689, 1764
Herbertus de, 1117
Juliana uxor Galiridi de, 1336
Margeria de, 447, 1538
Matillis de, 476
Ricardus de, 427, 476, 1044, 1095, 1593, 1764
Roheysia filia Galfridi de, 1593, 1764
Willelmus de, 1527
Luddingtona, Willelmus de, 467
Ludeford, Ascelena de, 7
Cecilia de, 7
Ludesdona, Ludeston', Alexander de, 188
Ludesduna, Agnes de, 821
Margeria de, 821
Ludeston' vide Ludesdona.
Ludingtona, Willelmus de, 281
Ludowicus, Rex Francie, 1163
Luffeham, Luffenham, Hugo de, 962
Matillis uxor Rannulfi de, 962
Rannulfus de, 962
Lumbarde, Martinus le, 820
Lumbres, Hugo de, 363
Lumesia vide Limesia.

Lund, Willelmus de, tifi
Lundreis, Gilebertus de, App. 7
Johannes filius Gileberti de, App. 7
Lundres, Nieholaus de, 995
Lungespeie cide Lungespeye.
Lungespey ride Lungespeye.
Lungespeyc, Itungespic ie, Lungespey, Ela uxor Willelni, 16,
Idonea uxor Willelmi, 362, 503, 541, 627
Willelmus, 362, 363, 503, 541, 627, 1064, 1235, 1277, 1574, 1693
Lunguilers, Clemencia de, 869
Johaunes de, 1294
Lup, Robertus, 1052
Lupus, Isobella uxor Willelmi, 1927
Stephanus, 629
Willelmus, 1927
Lustehulla, Lusteshulla, Willelmus de, 1360
Luterel, Andreas, 747
Galfridus, 1854
Luuam, Matheus de, 875
Luuel, Petrus, 545
Robertus, 798
Willelmus, 327
Luuell, Willelmus, 1159
Luuenathon', Iieardus de, 1857
Lauethot, Nigellus de, 1297
Luw, Robertus le, 1186
Macun, Hugo le, 816
Mader, Bernardus, 836
Magnus, Johaunes, 215
Mahaut vide Monte Alto.
Mainers ride Mesners.
Makeblithe, Gilebertus, 215
Malebis', Hugo, 1380
Malesmains, Deatricia, 342
Nicholaus, 606, 673
Ragenilda filia Beatricic, 342
Serlo, 342
Malesoures, Cristiaua uxor Walteri, 377
Walterus, 351, 377
Malet, Alicia, 1, 84
Robertus, 593

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Malherbe, Hugo, 1752
Ricardus, 1410
Mallinges, Willelmus de, 1372
Mallore, Anketillus, 1136, 1233
Malmesbiria, Malmesburia, Manmes-
biria, Abbas de, 141, 157, 773, 1615
Malmesburia vide Malmesbiria.
Malo Lacu, Isabella uxor Petri de, $525,1329,1339,144,1754$, 1869
Petrus de, 247, 525, 750, 810, 847, 857, 1066, 1273, 1329, 1339, $1444,1754,1869$
Malueto, S., Rogerus de, 1487
Mandeuilla, Maundeuilla, Cristiana de, 1128
Galfridus de, 35, 1570
Hawisa uxor Galfridi de, 35
Robertus de, 941
Willelmus de, $8,29,176,297,301$, $375,1397,1487$
Manekeseya, Robertus de, 1171
Manerio, Robertus de, 764
Manetona, Georgius filius Roberti de, 1591
Ricardus de, 1591
Mauquency, Gerrardus de, 74
Mansel, Maunscl, Warinus, 1619
Willelmus, 515
Mant Virun vile Monte Vironis.
Mapeldureham, Amabilis uxor Roberti de, 734
Robertus de, 734
Mapertishale vide Maupertishale.
Mapertona, Elias de, 923
Mar, Ena uxor Johannis de, 714, 941
Johannes de, 714, 941
Mar' vide Mariscallus.
Mara vide Mare.
Marc, Mat, Eua uxor Johannis de, 904
Johannes de, 904
Philippus, 1854
Marcel, Rogerus, 1043, 160:
Marcham, Nicholaus de, 314, 1308
Warinus de, 373
Willelmus de, 224

Narcham, Willelmus filius Willelmi de, 224
Marchant, Willelmus, 1900
Marchaunt, Willelmus le, 807
Marck, Alicia uxor Egidii de, 269
Egridius de, 269
Marco, S., Rogerus de, 102
Mare, Mara, Mora, Adam de, 283
Anfridus de la, 40
Emma uxor Osberti de la, 1764
Godwinus de la, 1764
Henricus de la, 1230, 1277
Hugo de la, 1441
Johannes de, 1317, 1679
Mabilia filia Willelmi de, 1883
Matillis uxor Wigani de la, 146, 208
Osbertus de la, 1621
Ricardus de, 1317
Robertus de la, 1621
Thomas de, 854
Wiganus de la, 146, 208, 271
Willelmus de la, 649, 967, 1528, 1691, 1883
Marenny, Johannes de, 103
Mabilia de, 104
Marescallus ride Mariscallus.
Marewico, Hugo de, 1700
Marham, Walterus de, 858
Maria, S., Alicia uxor Jordani de, 14.58

Jordanus de, 1458
Marinis, Hugo dc, 266, 1231
Johannes de, 1264
Marinus, Robertus, 1497
Mariscallus, Mar', Marescallus, Cecilia uxor Gileberti, 1611
Comes, 183, 247, 288, 354, 567, $763,857,1113,1117,1132,1213$, $1220,1306,1309,1567,1574$
Dauid, 1040
Gilebertus, 1220,1611
Gunnora uxor Wyoti, 779
Johannes, 247, 382, 1049, 1117, $1220,1395,1730$
Leticia uxor Roberti, 845
Margareta uxor Unfridi, 475

The mumbers refer to the corsoss not to the paties.

Mariseallus, Mathens filins Willelui, 1602
Ricardus, $763,952,1040,1057,1113$
Robertus, 84.5
Stephanus, 475
Unfridus, 475
Walterus filius Willehmi, 71
Willelmus, 71, 102, 108, 297, 567, $854,1220,1305,1349,1405,1567$, 1574, 1576, 1602, 1611
Willelmus filias Willelmi, 102
Wyotus, 779
Mariseis, Agnes uxor Willelmi de, 266
Ricardus de, 25
Thomas de, 2.5
Willelmus de, 266
Marisco, Marsa, Adam de, 1228
Henrieus de, 1666
Radulfus de, 1819
Ricardus de, 1238, 1445
Rogerus de, 1132
Thomas de, 1170, 1281
Willelmus de, 2s5. 1132
Mariseie, Rogerus de, 627
Mark, Hugo filius Philippi, 51
Philippus, 51
Marke, Philippas, 1969
Markeby, Prior de, 409, 660, 1418
Markele, Robertus de, 555
Marlborough, Thomas, 645
Marminm ride Marmiun.
Marmiun, Marmium, Albreda de, 94, 9.5

Johannes de, 164
Robertus, 986, 987, 1882
Marsa vide Mariseo.
Marse', Willelmus le, !006
Marteiny, Nicholaus de, 139
Martel, Gilebertus, 372, 434
Radulfus, 519
Martini de Messendena, Abbas, 368
S., de Londonia, Decanus, 1.5

Martino, S. vide Dammartin.
Martiwall', Willelmus de, $1: 30$
Martona, Armaldus tle. 11s
Matillis de, 17.71

Martona, Walterus de, 11s
Massay, Johames de, 1350
Massenilena, Abbas de, zol
Mastak, Willehmus de, $110 ;$
Mat ride Mare.
Matresdona, Alicia uxor Johmmis de. $10(0.5$
Joliannes de, 120.5
Matun cide Motun.
Maubant, Lucia uxor Willelmi, 13 is Willelmus, 13 ts
Maubaut, Willelmus, 70.t
Mauberant, liobertus, 10
Mauclere, Hugo, 766
Willelmus, 1791
Matulona, Maria de, 717
Maudut, Agnes filia Johamis, 71
Auicia filia Johamis, 74
Flandr' filia Johannis, 74
Johamnes, 71
Ricardus, 427, 1914
liobertus, 530, 1324
Thomas, 530, 13.74
Willelmus, 579, 6i3:
Manfe, Reginaldus ti'ins: Willelmi, 53
Thomas, 1945
Willelmus, 932
Mauleurer, Johannes, 1 s77
Maulhuges vide Maulinges.
Manlinges, Manlhnges, Mathens du, 871
Thomas de, s71
Maumesbiria ride Malmesbiria.
Mauscel, Matheas, 640,1617
Maundeuilla vide Mandeuilla.
Maunsel ride Mansel.
Maunselle, Walterus, 1:5i1
Maupertesale, Johannes de, 2x:
Maupertishale, Mapertislale, (ribe bertus de, !17
Johannes de, 915
Matueward, Galfridus, f2.5
Mauro, S., Simon de, it
Sanslenerer, Henricus filins Rarlulfi, 00.5

Tialulfus, 90.5

## The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Mautona, Constabularius de, 637
Mautrauers, Alicia uxor Johannis, 77,191
Hawisia uxor Johannis, 191
Johannes, 77, 191, 532, 1437, 1534
Thomas, 77
Willelmus, 77, 191, 153!
Maunaysin vide Mauneysin.
Maunerne, Cristina uxor Roberti de, 232
Robertus de, 232
Manuesin vide Mamueysin.
Mauney ride Manueysin.
Mauneyseyn ride Mameysin.
Mauneysin, Manuaysin, Maumesin, Mauuey, Manueyseyn, Walterus, 511, 592
Willelmus, 592
Willelmus filins Walteri, 511
Mawertin, Philippus de, 787
Mawrthin, Walterus de, 1471
May, Willelmus, 436
Maydewella, Hugo de, 795
Meaudona, Mendon, Abbas de, 58, 89
Meandre, Isolda uxor Reginaldi de, 1163
Reginaldus de, 1163
Meautona, Edwinus de, 51
Galfridus de, 51
Muriel uxor Willelmi de, 1503
Petrus de, 1503, 1829
Robertus de, 1829
Willelmus de, $\mathbf{1 5 0 3}$
Merham, Alicia de, 119
Mediens, Henriens, 215
Willelmus, 542
Mednil, Stephanus de, 1197
Meinne, Walterus de, 671
Meinnild Garin, Willelmus de, 762
Meisuilla, Willelmus de, 1096
Meklegh' vide Melkeleia.
Melceumba, Henrieus de, 223
Melepais, Jordanus de, 1536
Melepas, Melepeis, Johannes, 16 is
Jordanns, 168
Melepeis ride Melepas.

Melkeleia, Meklegh', Ricardus de, 200
Ricardus filius Rieardi de, 200
Melreie, Henricus de, 1619
Melsa, Abbas de, 1096
Hugo de, 1501
Mazelina uxor Thome de, 1096
Petrus de, 1880
Thomas de, 1096
Memuilla, Moneuilla, Petrus de, 1604
Mendham, Nieholaus de, 639, 945
Mentemora, Enma de, 180
Matillis filia Willelmi de, 180
Willelmus de, 180
Mere, Egidius, 1746
Egidius de, 1920
Simon del, 139
Mercator, Johannes, 1034
Simon, 1029
Mercennarius, Alexander, 790
Nereer, Anxellus le, 1774
Mercke, Egidius de, 286
Mereflet, Adam de, 859
Merel, Egidia de, 1047
Galfridus de, 1047
Meretona, Prior de, 1353
Merkwrthe, Thomas de, 914
Merlawe, Ricartus de, 646
Merlay, Rieardus de, 1452
Rogerus de, 764
Merle, Willelmus cle, 1540
Merleforlia, Atam de, 972
Alieia uxor Ade de, 972
Merse, Willelmus de la, 18
Merstona, Galfridus de, 1462
Hugo de, 1462
Susama filia Galfridi de, 1462
Merstuma, Isabella filia Willelmi de, 485
Johanna filia Willelmi de, 485
Margenia filia Willelmi de, 485
Margeria uxor Willelmi de, 485
Matillis filia Willelmi de, 485
Willelmus de, 485
Mertona, Prior de, 34, 359, 654, 1284, 1317, 1594, 1661
Willelmus de, 469

The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Mesendena, Messeudena, Abbas de, $368,626,1064$
Mesners, Mainers, Rieardus de, 191
Messendena ride Mesendena.
Messer, Thomas le, 291
Metingeham, Willelmus de, foon
Mendon vide Meandona.
Mendona, Emma nxor Stephani de, 1138
Stephanus de, 11:3s
Meysi, Grecia de, 1177
Michant, Rogerus de, 1940, 1941
Middeford, Rogerus de, 20
Middeldona, Abbas de, 1312
Middelhope, Amicia uxor Ricardi de, 1740
Ricardus de, 1740
Middeltona, Abbas de, $32 \Omega$
Midhop, Johannes de, 1844
Midhope, Johannes de, 1864
Mikelfeud, Galfridus de, 1868
Walterus de, 186 s
Miles, Robertus, 125
Milieie Templi, Fratres, 821
Millers, Agnes de, 1839
Minketona, Priorissa de, 23
Mirabel, Anrabel, Rogerus, 422, 862
Mitlefeld, Galfridus de, 120
Walterns de, 120
Mobray, Mubray, Nigellns de, 1815
Willelmus de, 184.)
Mocles, Hugo de, 170 s
Mohun, Alicia de, 699
Moinge ride Moyne.
Moiz, Morz, Moyz, Henrieus filias Willelmi de, 379
Isilia uxor Willelmi de, 315, :579
Ricardus de, 379
Ricardus filius Willelmi de, 379
Robertus de, 315, 379, 604
Robertus filius Willelmi de, 379
Willelmus de, 315, 379
Molbraio, Rogerus de, 135\%
Molendinarius, Hugo, 136
Johannes, 773
Jordanus, 82:
Petrus, 1431

Molentinarins, liadultus, 581, SH1
liobertus, 16s;
Robertus filius Jordani, se.
Molemdino, l'etrus de, 15N, 164.
Moletona, Thomas de, 97 s
Molintona, luo de, 20.5
Monasterio, Robertus de, 1167
Monemue, Rogerus de, 1 I71
Moneuilla ride Memevilla.
Monte, Montibus, Anna uxor fileberti de, 436
(ribebertus de, 431;
Umfridus filius Gileberti de, 436
Monte Aeuto, Drogo de, $660,1633^{5}$
Drogo filius Willelmi de, 17:2
,Tohames de, $70,88,217,318,3.4$, 902, 132.5, 1761
Katerina filia Johannis de, 247, 354
Lutia nxor Johannis de, 247, 1761
Ricardus de, 121, 1722
Robertus de, 1722
Willelmus de, 121, 247, 163.5, 1722. 1761
Willelmus filias Drogonis de, 16:35
Willelmus tilius Ricardi de, 1722
Willelmus filins Roberti de, 1722
Willelmus filins Willelmi de, 121, 1729
Monte Alto, Mahaut, Mohant, Lenca filia Rogeri de, 260
Radulfus de, 15.5s
Randulfus de, 260
Robertus filins Radulfi de, 1mos
Rogerus de, 260, 505, 155s, 1626
Montebecon' vide Monte Begonis.
Monte Begon' vide Monte Begonis.
Monte Begonis, Montebecon', Monte Begon', Jerlo de, 7is
Oliua de, $403,51!$
Rogerus de, 234, 947, 1241
Thomas de, 23t
Monte Canisio, Monte Caniso, Montechanesy, Alicia uxor Hugonis de, 1022
Hubertus de, 1413
Hugo de, $412,1922,1930, A_{1} 11.1$

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Monte Canisio, Monte Caniso, Montechanesy, Stephanns de, 1443
Wirinus de, 373, 618, 671, 743, $8: 0,893,983,1072$
Willelmus de, :387, 893
Monte Caniso ride Monte Canisio.
Montechanesy ride Monte Canisio.
Monte Ficheti, Radulfus de, 346,1761
Ricardus de, 1764
Monte Ficheto, Ricardus de, 1044
Monte Forti, Simon de, 1117, 1137, 1164, 1188
Monte Kaneso, Warinus de, 275
Monte Pinzun, Egidius de, 12.53
Monte Sorelli, Jacobns de, 1543
Montesorelli, Hngo de, 1371
Monte Vironis, Mant Virm, Juhannes de, 1520
Montibus ride Monte.
Mora vide Mare.
More, Alexander de la, 1119
Gilebertus de la, 470
Henricus de la, 824
Robertus de la, 95, 560, 573
Walterus de la, 57!
Willelmus de la, 858
Morel, Mathens, 8i)
Walterus, 316
Moreslegha, Simon de, 821
Moretoign, Willehmus de, 853
Moretoign', Comes, $5 ; 1$
Moretoinie, Comes, 994
Moretuna, Comes de, 992
Morewico, Hugo de, 361
Morewye vide Moruye.
Morin, Agnes uxor Roberti, $7 t$
Radulfus, 1699
Regiualdus, 2:38, 957, 1031
Robertus, 74, 1388
Morlee, Morlegh, Matheus de, 18:
Morlegh ride Morlee.
Mortoin', Mortom, Comes, 42.5
Mortom vide Mortoin'.
Morton', Willelmus, 8.5
Mortona, Radulfus de, $\mathbf{1 9 6 3}$
Rogerus filius liadulfi de, 1963
Walterus de, 118!), 1461

Mortona, Willelmus de, 26
Mortum, Eustachius de, 51
Mortuo Mari, Rarlulfus de, 251
Robertus de, 21
Willelmus de, 21, 1243
Moruico, Hugo de, 712
Moruilla, Elena filia Eudonis de, 1267
Endo de, 1267
Moruye, Morewye, Hugo de, S1t
Morwico, Hugo de, 1744
Morz vide Moiz.
Motun, Matun, Amistera uxor Bonemie, 918
Benedictus filius Bonemic, 918
Bonemie, 918
Josephus filius Bonemie, 918
Moubray, Nigellus filius Willelmi de, 1090
Willelmus de, 1090
Moullent, Comes de, 71
Matillis uxor Comitis de, 71
Moun, Alicia de, 796
Reginaldus de, 363
Mowine, Willelmus de, 1540
Mown, Mowun, Willelmus de, 630
Mowan riale Mown.
Moyn, Willelmus, 954
Moyne, Moinge, Moynge, Moyme, Adam le, 833
Agues nxor Ade le, 833
Galfridus le, 402
Henricus le, 1209
Hugo le, 826
Johanna uxor Hugonis le, 826
Oliuerus le, 954,1191
Petrus le, 1938
Radulíus le, 402, 1051, 1702
Reginalkus le, 1836
Ricardus le, 1950
Rogerus le, 826
Moynge ride Moyne.
Moynne vide Moyne.
Mubray vide Mobray.
Mue vide Mueh.
Mneegros, Musegroz, Alieia uxor Ioberti de, 1si

The mumbers refire to the casess not to the puters．

Mucegros，Musegros，Milo de，116s， $1 \because 31$
Robertus de，1s1， 1117
Walterus de，1168，1231
Much，Muc，Hugo，702
Willelmus， 702
Muchelnye，Abbas de， 1370
Prior de， 1379
Muchet，Muschet，Henricus， 299
Ricardus， 299
Wilelmus， 39 ！
Mudefeldia，Laurencius de， 1598
Muhatut，Alicia uxor Willelmi de， 187.2

Rogerus de，1910． 1911
Simon， 1872
Willelmus de，1s：2
Mukelintona，Germanus de， 1383
Iuetta uxor Germani de， 1383
Nicholaus tilius Germani de， 1383
Walterus de，1：3s：3
Walterus filius Walteri de， 1383
Muletona，Lambertus de，I：
Thomas de，511，6：27，986，1155， 118\％
Munceaus，Robertus de， 37
Muncr，Ratulfus de，564
Mundeby，Alanus de，141s
Eudo de，141s
Mundeford＇，Simon de， 180.5
Mundeuilla，Johames de， 230
Nigellus de，230， 1297
Ricardus de， 230
Mundham，Alanus de， 1618
Tunelin＇，Simon，215
Munewedena，Henricus de， 1294
Muntefordia，Thurstanus de， $136 ;$
Muntfichet，Ricardus de，1041，133：2
Muntmertin vide Danmartin．
Munt Piuzun，Padulfus de，183s
Murdac，Matillis uxor Rogeri，1592
Rogerus， 1592
Thomas， 1592
Muriweder，Robertus，215
Muro，sub， 1 sabella uxor licardi，sth Ricardus， 861
Musache，Ricardus de．：33：3

Musard，1sabella，46：， $5: 17$
liadulfus， $1+1$ ；
Hicamus， $3133,4102,597$
lobertus，11：3！
Willehmus， $1 \%$ O． 597
Muscampo，Willehums de，it
Muschat，liogerus，4it
Munchammp，Robertus de，tan
Muschaunt．Willelmus de，sen
Muschet rible Muchet．
Musegros ride Mucergros．
Mustel，Thomas， 1460
Naffordia，Henricus de，INO，\＆゙っ！， 1377,1625
Matillis uxor Hemriti de，180，ses！， $1: 377$
Walterus de，1312
Napertonia，Adam de，10．je
Naptona，Adam de，11s6
Agnes uxor Ade de，11s6；
Neflincumild，Willelmus de，sゅ2
Neir，Walter us le， 1966
Nel，lobertros，！00
Neoto，S．，Priur de，102s，133：， 1720
Neouilla cide Neuilla．
Neowilla，Willelmus de， $14!15$
Nerefordia，Hubertus de， 193
Petrus de， $1091,1.002,193$
Willelmus de，1091， 1410
Nesse，Godwinus de，59．5
Nessefend，Petrus tilius Stephani de． 1860
Stephanus de， 1860
Nessendona，Alicia uxor Thome de， 1641
Thomas de，164t
Netebech vide Netebeht．
Nctebeht，Netebech，Willehmas，Ne：I
Ňeubet，Neuborl，Abhas de，18：31
Neubod rible Neubet．
Neuburg，Gatridus de＇． $17: 36$
Matillis uxor Galfridi de， 173 B
Radulfus．filitus（ialtridi de，1a3；
Neucumba，liobertus de，diन0
Neuilla，Neouillil，Albertus de． 27. 54

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Neuilla, Neouilla, Alexander de, 1187
Alicia de, 534
Beatricia uxor Hugonis de, 525, 679, 800
Clemencia filia Alexandri de, i187
Ernisins de, 1174
Floria filia Hugonis de, 517
G. de, 1517

Galfridus de, 102, 534, 810, 869, 1883
Galfridus filius Galfridi de, 1883
Heuricus de, 534, 1875
Hugo de, 251, 517, 525, 679, 800, 1087, 1174, 1365, 1670, 1679
Johamues de, 516, 1273
Jollanus de, $821,947,1280$
Mabilia uxor Galfridi de, 869, 1883
Nicholaus de, 1125
Ta lulfus de, 33,494
Robertus de, 25, 1045
Rogerus de, 398
Neuou vide Nenu.
Neuport, Prior de, 1387
I'ainel, Prior de, 412
Neutona, Homines de, $\mathbf{4 6 3}$
Picatus de, 735
Sewale de, 731
Nenu, Neuou, Noun, Willelmus le, 136,243
Neweham, Ricardus de, 185
Neweman, Aelesia uxor Ricardi le, 124
Ricardus le, 124
Rogerus le, 124
Willelmus le, 124
Newenham, Nywenam, Nywenham, Johannes de, 185
Petrus de, 1886
Pior de, 1133, 1607
Ricardus de, 400, 551
Niehe, Hiche, Ailwartus de, 1508
Idonea tilia Ailwardi de, 1508
Nicholai, S., Danecastrie, Magister, 1169
Lxonic, lrior, : ${ }^{2}$,
Nicholaus Legatus, 112
Niger, Hugn, 1si

Niwetona, Walterus de, 286
Nodariis, Nuers, Almarus de, 202, 302
Milo de, 1762
Simon de, 793, 1762, 1836
Noel, Ricardus, 17
Noke, logerus, 433
Norel, Alicia filia Siwati, 1823
Hughelina filia Siwati, 1823
Mabilia filia Siwati, 1823
Siwatus, 1823
Norenuit, Radulfus, 32
Noreys, Galfridus le, 220
Hamo le, 1778
Robertus le, 1778
Willelmus le, 1778
Norf' vide Norfolcia.
Norfeu, Homines de, 1721
Norfokia, Willelmus de, 1226
Norfolcia, Norf', Agnes uxor Roverti de, 291
Alicia uxor Radulti de, $1 \check{5} 9$
Gilebertus de, 261
Radulfus de, 159
Robertus de, 5, 991
Robertus filius Radulfi de, 159
Norfoleie, Comes, 605, 1036
Norfolkia, Alicia uxor Radulfi de, 1525
Radulfus de, 152.5
Robertus filius Radulfi de, 1525
Norham, Acrnes de, 749
Norhamtona, Abraham filius Samuelis de, 581
Samuel de, 581
S. Jacobi de, Abbas, 344
S. Johanuis de, Hospitalis, Magrister, 1032
Norhamtone, Arehidiacous, 72,820
Decanus, 351
Major, 351
Norm', Radulfus de, 846
Roysia uxor Radulfi de, 816
Normanie, Senescallus, 752
Normanuilla, Margeria uxor Nicholai de, $4 \times 3$
Nicholaus de, 483

The mumbers refer to the colses not to the payes.

Normanuilla, Radulfus de, 6if1, 955
Normaunt, Willelmus le, 677
Northburgo, Earmmudus de, $\mathbf{1 6 5 9}$
Northie, Thomas de, 1409
Northilada, Henricus de, 1170
Northona, Nortona, Alicia uxor Radulti de, 1728
Eustachius de, 215
Philippus de, 2 s 9
Radulfus de, 1728
Radulfus filius Radulti de, 1728
Robertus de, e15
Willelmus de, 1436
Nortona ride Northona.
Norwicenses Episcopi, 39, 100, 310, $355,391,424,427,490,548,575$, $642,722,793,801,865,883,942$, $1064,1095,1117,1238,1273,1618$, 1928
Norwicensis Arehidiacomus, 1762
Prior, 632, 721
Norwico, Isaac de, 1376
Norwude, Feidena uxor Stephani de, Ap1. 7
Stephanus de, App. 7
Norwse, Willelmus de, 835
Notingeham, P'repositus de, 459
Nouo Loco, Prior de, 416, 769, 928
Nouo Mereato, Adam de, 248, 1685
Dionisia uxor Henrici de, 1685
Henricus de, 1685
Willelmus de, 583
Nouu ride Neun.
Nuers vide Nodariis.
Numet, Mabilia de, 1145
Nunancurt, Mabilia de, 1393
Numant, Hugo de, $1 \not 416$
Nunchamp ride Longo Campo.
Nuny, Henrieus de, 1360
Nutach, Nutebec, Nutebet, Willelmus, 8.4
Nutebee vide Nutach.
Nutebet vide Nutach.
Nutelegha, Abbas de, 1500,1535
Nutrix, Matillis, 343
Nyweburgo, Edmundus de, 237
Nywelande, Walterus de la, $13: 38$

Nywenam viale Newenhan.
Nywenham ride Newenhan.
Nywentona, Petrus de, 10.\%3
Nuweport, I'rior de, ! ft
Nywetona, Juhame tilia Petri de, 921
1'etrus de, 924
Ocham ride IIochan.
Odewilla, Margareta uxor Simonis de, 1s90
Simon de, 1890
Offaton ride Uninton'.
Offrecherche, Decanus de, 1683
Oilly ride $\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{yll}$.
Okeburnia, l'rior de, 273, 274, 326
Oldierde, Simon, 10st
Olestorp', liobertus de, 313
Simon filius Roberti de, 313
Oligant, Rogerus, $10: 1$
Oliuer, Jordanus, 1436
Oliueri, Jordanus, 1172
Olinerus, Petrus, 118!
Omnibus, Alauss de, 109
Ommibus Simetis, Alexander de, 1815
Optona, Willelmus de, 29
Orbatur, Agnes uxor Thome le, 1885
Thomas le, 1 sss
Orehertona, Alina uxor Johannis de, 96.5

Johannes de, 96.;
Ore, Abbas de, 1078
Ormesby, 1'rior de, 10:35, 1ə11
Orreby, Philipput de, 260
Orre, Alanus, 127.5
Magister, 1275
Osen' vide Oseneia.
Oseneia, Osen', Abbas de, s2:3, 11s:
Useuilla, Willelmus de, $51!$
Ossoriensis Episeopus, 1173
Osuluestona, Abbas de, 79, 121!!
Otheringebinia, (rilebertus de, 2tiz
Ottel', Thomas de, 871
Ouerlande, Vitalis de, 1755
Ouertona, Acelinus de, 2s:;
Reginaldus filizs Acelini de, 2si
Ouinges, Johannes de, 110 t

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Ouinges, Willelmus de, 1104
Oure, Prior de, 914
Ouninges, Willelmus de, 774
Oxeaye, Nicholaus de, 1178
Oxeeumba, Sarra de, 1751
Oxn' vide Hoxne.
Oxonia, Johannes de, 1238
Oxonic, Archidiaeonus, 817
Comes, $790,848,1117,1485$
Comitissa, 619, 633, 827, 881, 1919
Oye, Joseelinus de, 1766
Oylli, Oilly, Henrieus de, 1589, 1688
Henrieus filius Hemriei de, 1685
Matillis de, 1688
Robertus de, 1688
Oylly, Henricus de, 105, 855, 1363
Margeria filia Roberti de, 855
Matillis filia Henrici de, 10;
Natillis uxor Henrici de, 8.5.

Pabbeham, Hugo de, 819
Paeheshulla, Simon de, 75 s
Packere, Robertus le, 470
Pagaham, Osbertus, 1348
Paganellus vicle Paynel.
Paganus, Alanus, 503
Page, Willelmus, 135
Pagraue, Cecilia usor Henriei de, 1824
Henricus de, 1824
Paide, Rieardus, 1898
Painel vide Paynel.
Pakeham, Alicia de, 461,527
Thomas filius Willelmi de, 461
Willehmus de, 461
Pakintona, Rieardus de, 919, 1105
Pamforer, Geruasius filius Henrici, 1780
Henrieus, 1780
Rieardus, 1780
Rogerus, 1780
Pancracii, S'., de Lewes, Prior, 350
Pandulfus Legatus, 1760
P'antolfus, Hugo, 12.4
L'apa, Dominus, 53ti, 103!, 1095, 133:, 1357, 13s8, 1599, 192s
I'ijerdi, Matillis, 1184

Papillu', Alnathus, 820
Parearius, Hugo, 940
Reinerus, 343
Parchimener, Alicia uxor Galfridi le, 1293, App. 1
Galfridus le, 1293, 1394, 1529, App. 1
Matillis uxor Galfridile, 1394, 1529
Pareo, Petrus de, 507
Parent, Alexander, 1119
Isabella uxor Alexandri, 1119
Parker, Gerardus le, 984
Ricardus le, 981
Robertus filius Gerarli le, 984
Warinus filius Gerarli le, $98 \frac{1}{2}$
Parleben', Gilebertus, 293
Parles, Perles, Henrieus de, 1982
Willemus de, 10.52
Parlet, Margareta uxor Walteri, 1821
Walterus, 1821
Parmarius, Johannes, 36
Parmentarius, Adam, 1801
Henricus filius Roberti, 568
Robertus, 568
Parmenter, Odierna uxor Radulfi le, 389
Radulfus le, 389
Paruus, Elias, 248
Simon, 1712
1’asselewe vide Passelwe.
Passelwe, Passelewe, Gilebertus, 506, 924, 105:
Robertus, 106, 1108, 1904
Sarra uxor Gileberti, 924,1053
Simon, 506
Patay, Hugo de, 926
Pateriz, Comes, 363
Ela uxor Comitis, 363
WilleImus, 615
Pateshill' cide Pateshulla.
Patesholl' vide Pateshulla.
Pateshalla, Pateshill', Patesholl', Patteshmlla, Hemricus de, 12si
Martinus de, 278, 58:5, 983, 1030, 1081, 1279, 1294, 1618, 1691, $18.27,1881$
Simon de, 1358, 1411, App. 8

The numb re reficr to the cases not to the pethes.

Patheshulla, Martinus de, 669, 870
Patrie, Anelina uxor Radulti, 1764
Radulfus, 1764
Patricius, Comes, 12:35
Willelmas tilias Comitis, 1235
Patteshulla ride l’ateshulla.
Pattona, liobertus de, 279
Patuilly, Johamnes de, 1 tis
Radulfus de, 12.93
Rogerus filius Walteri de, 732
Wralterus de, 530, 732, 1110
Pauleshost, Rieardus de, 791
Pauli, S., de Londonia, Decanus, 7*, 481, $493,654,692$, s.5:
Thesaurarius, 599
Paulo, S., Thomas de, 119 t
Paumer, Auicia tilia Johamnis le, $1!1.54$
Berta filia Johannis le, 1954
Elyas le, 1.514
Gunnilda filia Johanmis le, 1954
Herbertus le, 312
Isabella filia Ricardi le, 342
Johames le, 19\%t
Matillis uxor Johamis le, 1954
Ricardus le, $215,34 \div, 1177$
Thomas le, 16
Panneefot, lieardus, 365,507, 946
P'aunte, Godign', 20
Pamntona, Baldewinus de, 810,1117
Pauntulf, Isoleda, 1295
Willelmus, 1295
Willelmus filius Willelmi, 123.7
Paynel, Paganellus, l'ainel, Payntlle, Alexander, 97
Ascuillus, 97
Dionysia, 19
Frechesanta filia Willelmi, 97
Fulco, 97, 565, 1415
Hugo, 97, 747, 1415
Radulfus, 97, 747
Willelmus, $97,166,1575,1559$, 1642
Paynelle vide Paynel.
Pebbenesse, Randulfus tilius Willelmi de, $2 \pm 3$
Willemus de, 243
lecehe, Beche, Agnes, 1130
Bartholomeus, $116 \mathrm{~s}, 117 \mathrm{~s}, 12: 31$, 1:30
Pecham, Jacolnts de, 960
Johames filius Monasseri de, 114
Mar" uxor Almasseri de, 1018
Monasserus de. 101s, 1114
Feche, 1lamon, 197
licareluc, 8\%.
Peck, I wabella tilia Ricumidi dr, seo
Matillis uxor licardi de, No
Ricardus de, No 0
J'ecoe ride l'ecock.
Peeock, leeoe, Isabella uxor Willelmi, 1018
N. uxor Ricardi, 101s

Ricardus, 101 -
Willelmus, 101s
Pecot, Rogerus, 20
Peirer, Thomas le, 1.56s
Peiteuin, Johanues le, 12.57
Peimre, liure, Paulims, 296, :399
Petrus, 607
logerus, 296, 399
Pele, Willehuus de, ご12
P'elton', P'iatona, Rogerus de, 1:37!
Pembrocio, Pembrok, Jenbrochio, Comes de, 102, 2!17, 1161, 140.5 , 1611
Comitissa de, s51, 1161
Pembrok vide l'embrocio.
Iempol, Serlo de, 1015
Warmms de, 101.)
Penbrigre, l'enebrigg', Henritus de, 2.50, 301
l'enbrochio viale Pembrocio.
Tendeford, liobertus de, 9\%
l'enebrig's' vide Peubrigge.
lenhert vide Penhurst.
P'enlurst, l'enliert, Maria uxor Willelmi te, 1770
Willelmus de. 1770
1'enitenciarins, (rolardus, 1 fl 3
Pemma, Walterus de lar, 1061
Willelmus de la, 106is
l'enne, Colinus de la, 1ton
Nieholaus de la, 1600

## The mumbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Pentecoste, Willelmus, 16:50
Peppewella, Abbas de, 665
Percehale, Galfridus de, 1632
Percehaye vide Perchaye.
Perehaye, Percehaye, Cristina illia
Willelmi, 1717
Willemmus, 1717
Perchie, Comes, 666
Percy, Cristiana uxor Galfridi de, 1414
Galfridus de, 1414
Ricardus de, 660, 907, 1083, 1090, 1395
Lobertus de, 1061, 1081
Simon de, 1414
Walterus de, 22, 23, 60
Wiltelmus de, 23, 158, 660, 796, 1081, 1881
Perer, Thomas, 1544
Perham, Thomas de, 1115
l'erles vide Parles.
l'erpund, Johannes de, 279
I'ersona, Petrus, 1768
Persore, Abbas de, 1628
l'ert, Nicholaus de, 606, 673
Pertehale, Galfridus de, 1369
Ricardus de, 1369
Pertock, Radulfus, 652
Pertona, Robertus de, 401
Pesehale, Radulfus de, $533,593,598$, 698
Pesinges, Felicia de, 1048
Pestelega, Willelmus de, 40
Pestur, Henricus le, 237
Petit, Isolda uxor Willehmi, 83
Radulfas le, 51
Willelmus, 83
Petraponte, Simon de, 1272
Petro, S., Johannes de, 692
Petyt, Willelmus le, $\mathbf{1 5 5 2}$
P'enerel, Andreas, 258, 268
Galfridus, 1058
Hugo, 946, 1190, 1331, 1967
Petrus, 1970
liobertus, 1013, 1967
Thomas, 758, 1013
I'eutrelle, Willelmus, 12:3t

Peyure, Rogerus, 1398
Philiberto, S., Willelmus de, 140.5
Piantona ride Pelton'.
l'ichard, Milo, 1232
l'ichelesthorna, Galfridus de, 1614
l'icher, Robertus, 793
Thomas, 784
1'icoc, Pikoc, Willelmus, 1269
Picot, Hugo, 1341
Juliana uxor Willelmi, 1026
Willelmus, 1026
Pictauensis, Padulfus, 1259
Pictania, Willelmus de, 671
1'ictanie, Comes, 765, 883, 1117, 1121, 1172
Isabella uxor Comitis, 765, 883
Pictor, Robertus, 1879
Willelmus, 1696
l'igun, Johannes, 886
Willelmas, 1226
Pikeman, Robertus, 1969
Simon filius Roberti, 1969
Pikeringe, Hugo de, 186
Pikerun, Robertus, 889
Pikeuot, Willelmus, 211
Pikewella, Lodowicus de, 814
Pikoc vide l'icoc.
Pilesdona, Sampson de, 1732
Simon de, 1732
Werresius de, 1732
Pilkintona, Rogerus de, 130
Pin, Dionisia uxor Johannis, 1089, 1701
Johannes, 1089, 1701
Pincerna, Auelina uxor Elie, 1760
Elias, 1760
Ricardus, 1169
l'incerne, Cristina filia Jordani, 1606
Jordanus, 1606
l'inkeneye, ladulfus de, 1437
Willelmus de, 1809
Pinkeniny, Simon de, 938
l'inkeny vide linkingny.
Pinkingny, Pinkeny, Robertus de, 868
Pino, Herbertus de, 214
l'inu, Herbertus de, 367

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Pinzebek, Thomas de, 1207
Pinzun, Munt, Radulfus de, 1838
Piou ride l'rion.
Pipant, Willelmus, 1969
Pipard, Henricus, 657
Rieardus, 6.57
Robertus, 259, 618
Rogerus, 6.57
Willelmus, 657
Pipaund, Jacobusfilius Willelmi, 1948
Willelmus, 1948
Pipere, Walterus, 1311
Pipestran, Iuo, $5 \geq 3$
Pirar', Michael de, 1718
Stephanus de, 1718
Pirie, Johannes de, 1337
Philippus de, 1660
Ricardus de, 1707
Robertus de, 1427, 1499
Sarra uxor Ricardi de, 1707
Piritona, Johannes de, 250
Piro, Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 1557
Willelmus de, 1.5.7 7
Pirot, Radulfus, 870,1572
Ricardus, 870, 1573
Piselegha, Amabilis uxor Nieholai de, 782
Nicholaus de, 782
Pistor, Cristiana uxor Nicholai, 265
Dionisia uxor Ricardi, 435
Galfridus, 1029
Matheus, 1897
Nicholaus, 265
Ricardus, 435, 1479
Thomas, 767
Willelmus, 411, 1711
Pitona, Adam de, 1192
Pitte, Leticia uxor Roberti de la, 1425
Robertus de la, 140.5
Piuere ride Peiure.
Planez, Johannes de, 298
Plantefolie, Johannes, 1724
Robertus, 1692
Pleministro, Prior de, 1370
Plesetto, Johames de, 1666
Plesingeham, Eustachius de, 96,

Plessetto, Johannes de, 1028
Plugeneye, lugo de, 513
l'hagenhay, Alaus de, 116
l'lumberge, Cristiana uxor 'lhome de, 1279
Thomas de, 1979
Poddehale, Petrus de, 36
Poer, Alexander le, 1619
Walterus le, 1Is4
Poher, Iugo le, 1:36
Johannes le, 847
Otewicus le, 40
Pointona, Alexander de, 182, 946, 1049, 1207
Pokelunlla, Julianus de, 6
Pokeslegha, Elias de, 164!
Matillis uxor Elie de, 1649
Pokintona, Willelmos de, 250
Polfeld', Michael de, 1.2s7
Pollard, Rogerus, 907
Willelmus, 166.5
Polsted, Hugro de, 1287
Michael de, 12 s 7
Polstede, Hugo de, 29.5, 871
Poltona, Nicholaus de, 1785
Orabla uxor Nicholai de, 1785
Robertus de, 401
Pomerar, Go lefridus de la, 367
Pomeray, Galfridus de la, $891,114 \mathrm{~s}$
Hemrieus de la, 1148
Willelmus de la, 1148
Ponte, Rolertus de, 1343
Pontefracto, Hemrieus de, 1764
Ponte Fracto, Prior de, 1169, 1850
Ponte Roberti, Abbas de, 156t;
Pontis de Bello, Abbas, 6
Popham, Gilebertus de, 1268
Port, Adam de, 1136
Porta, Alicia uxor Reginaldi de, 1:こ9
Nicholaus de, 1147
Reginaldus de, 1259
Porter, Auelina uxor lieginaldi le, 1705
Celestria nxor Henrici le, 343
Henrieus le, 343
lieginaldus le, 1705
fortes, Walterus de. 1266
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Porteseia, Adam de, 15
Portu, Adam de, 16st
Johannes de, 326
Sibilla uxor Ade de, 1684
Thomas de, 326
Poterna, Jacobus de, 201
Pottot, Ermengarda de, 1513
Johames filius Ermengarde de, 1.513

Ponere, Herbertus le, 483
Pounesse, Hemricns de, 1283
Philippus de, 1282
Pour' vide Poure.
Poure, Daur', Pour', Alina uxor Egidii
le, 1142, 1158
Egidius le, 1142, 1158
Herbertus le, 16.3
Isabella uxor Walhamet le, 203
Johannes le, 1809
Rogerus le, 49
Walhamet le, 203
Poydras, Willelmus, 316
Prat, Galfridus, 1818
Margeria uxor Galfridi, 1818
Pratellis, Engelardus de, 1601
Engelramus de, 35, 101
Sibilla uxor Engelardi de, 1601
Sibilla uxor Engelrami de, 101
Pratis, Prior de, 27e, 393
S. Marie de, Custos, 870

Prato, Godefridus de, s16;
Muriella uxor Godefridi de, 816
S. Marie de, monachi, 272, 393

Praule, Alma uxor Willehmi de, 965
Willemus de, 905
Iredes, Willelmus de, 1906
Prepositus, Adam, 446
Almerus, 85
Hubertus, 418
Hugo, 1169
Rogerus, 85
Roysa uxor Huberti, 418
I'resbyter, I'lilippus filius Radulfi, 1961
Radulfus, 196i
I'rest, Hughelina uxor Willelmi, $1 \times 23$
W'illemus, $182: 3$

Prestelegha, Unfridus de, 544
Prestona, Albredus de, 1916
Hawisia uxor Albredi de, 1916
Johames de, 85!
Walterus de, 410
Prestwude, Henricus de, 388
Margeria uxor Heuriei de, 388
Pridias, Beatricia uxor Reginaldi de, 965
Galfridus de, 965
Isabella uxor Galfridi de, 965
Reginaldus de, 965
Iobertus de, 596, 991
Prion, Piou, Hugo, 1412
Prior, Simon, 8:32
Produmme, Johannes, 843
Promus, Promys, Alicia filia Willelmi de, 1563
Emma filia Willelmi de, 1563
Sarra filia Willelmi de, 1563
Willehmus de, 1563
Promys vide Promms.
Prute, Thomas le, 1348
Pruz, Willelmus le, 1285
Pucot vide Putot.
Puddindene, Gilebertus de, 20
Pudding, Margeria, 852
Pudindena, Gilebertus de, 1490
Pudlesdona, Custancia filia Willelmi de, 195
Margeria uxor Willelmi de, 195
Willelmus de, 19\%
Puketorpe, Stephanus de, 1192
Pulein, Galficius, 705
Pulham, Rieardus de, 1931
Punehard, Fray, 688
Punchardun, Reginaldus de, 1642
Punninges, Margeria de, 672
Puntfeldia, Willelmus de, 1779
I'urcel, Enstachius, 156, 1519
Radulfus, 150, 1519
Robertus, 15ti, 1519
Purcele, Isabella, 863
Purle, Nicholaus de, 113
Willemus de, 356
Purtepol, Jordanus de, 8:25
Rogerus filius Jordani de, 825
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Puteo, Reginalus filius Willelmi de, 1678
Ricardus de, 1678
Ricardus filius Willelmi de, 1678
Robertus de, 1678
Rogerus filius Willelmi de, 1678
Puteum, Augustimus arl, 1773
Emma uxor Augustini ad, 1773
Putot, Pacot, Willelmus de, 556, 1772
Putrel, Henricus, 1942
Pyn, Herbertus de, 128.5
Pyrefrict, Petrus de, 40
Pyrho, Willelmus de, 695
Quency, Hawisia de, 999, 1127
Rogerus de, 1126
Querendona, Galfridus de, 29, 310, 845, 1487
Radulfus filius Galfridi de, 845
Quneyfe, Hamon le, 27
Matillis uxor Hamonis le, 27
Raddona, Radduna, Baldewinus de, 143, 8.t 6
Radduna vide Raddona.
Radecline, Engenia de, 1846
Radeforlia, Simon de, bs 4
Radelegha vide Ralegha.
Radham, Prior de, 16et
Radinges, Abbas de, 842
Radinges cide Bendenges.
Raffyn, Kafin, Bertram, 251
Willelmus, 251
Raggeholf, Willelmus, 1788
Raghtona, Alexander de, 1155
Teginaldus de, 1155
Rakelf', Ricardus, 282
Rakingtona, Bartholomeus, 579
Matillis, 579
Ral', Robertus de, 1189
Ralegha, Radelegha, Elyas de, ISsi
Willelmus de, 348, 401, 427, 471, $503,514,755,886,1143,1146$, $1186,1193,1215,1482$
Rallesby vide Rolleslyy.
Rameseia, Abbas de, $322,360,1716$

Rameseia, Alicia de, 1701
Editha de, 1646
Tuliana nxor Thome de, 1701
Stephamus de, 1701
Thomas de, 1701
Tannulfus Comes, 272, 1102, 1127. $1213,1 \because 21,1273,1721$
Tappendona, l'rior de, 51
liessele, Cierarlus, $1: 34$
Katerina uxor (ierardi, 1:314
Pauelingham, Mabilia nxor Thome de, 1171
Thomas de, 1171
Rayndona, Galfridus de, 1836
Raytulphage, Alicia filia Edithe de, 1839
Auicia filia Edithe re, 1839
Editha de, INB:9
Gunnilda filia Eilithe de, 1839
Ree, Walterus, 445
Reldenhale, (ialfridus de, 180:
Willelmus de, 180 .
Fedham, Willehmus de, 18.11
Regetona, JIegetona, Ricardus filins Roberti de, 185
Robertus de, 155
Regimaldus Comes, 1666
Regny, Reygni, Reygny, Thomas de, 407
Walterus de, 1146
Willelmus de, 1147
Teing' ride lioing'.
leingnes, Willelmus de, 1760
Reingny, Johannes de, eso
Robertus de, 2n0
Thomas de, ${ }^{6} 10$
Reinig', Johannes filins Jieardi, Ift
Ricarius, 474
Remg', Ricardus, 127
Fenard, Willelmus, 111R
Rengny, licygn, Johannes de, gos
Renlam, Gilebertus de, s31
Johannes de, : 834
Renigny, Thomas de, 5. 17
Reples', Johammes de, 237, 16.9?
Rerefordia, Alboas de, $526 ;$
Rerlam, Borham, Manricius de, (929)

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Reuel, Hugo, 311
Robertus, 311
Rewel, Henricus de, 1977
Reygat, Johames de, 102;
Reygn' vide Rengny.
Reygni vide Regny.
Reygny ride Regny.
Ricardus, Comes, 354, 702, 734, 857, $883,1117,1121,1172,1220,1238$, 1280
Ricardus Rex Anglie, 16, 17, 75, 78, $102,173,199,283,663,821,915$, 994, 1123, 1129, 1148, 1188, 1219, 1234, 1236, 1306, 1487, 1651, 1729
Richerfeuldia, Willelmus de, 1887
Rideware, Matillis uxor Walteri de, 353
Walterus de, 353, 1758
Riggeby, Prior de, 909
Rikingehale, Hugo de, 917
Rikot', Robertus de, 815
Rindham, Tristram de, 1240
Ringesdona, Hugo de, 1416
Ringestede, Cecilia uxor Gileberti de, 721
Gilebertus de, 721
Matillis de, 721
Ripariis, Hawisia de, 979
Margeria de, 362, $727,549,1283$
Tipple, Matillis uxor Thome de, 1333
Thomas de, 1333
Riptona, liicardus de, 360
Risele, Robertus filius Walteri de, 1741
Walterus de, 1741
Rising', Robertus de, 1257
liogerus de, 1257
Risinges, Fisinges, Fissinges, Rogerus de, 1663
Walterus de, 1663
Rissepe vide Rissleppe.
Rissleppe, Rissepe, Stiffleppe, Prior de, 272
Risus, Agnes uxor Roberti, 1937
Robertus, 1937
Riuallibus, Abbas de, 749
limallis, Petrus de, 776

Riuere, Walterus de la, 1307
Rineres, Willelmus de, 1172
Ro, Margeria, 907
Robertus, Comes, 71, 765, 1769, 1953
Isabella uxor Comitis, 765
Matillis uxor Comitis, 71
Roc, Johannes filius Roberti, 1772
Robertus, 1772
Willelmus filius Roberti, 1772
Roehagh', Alanus de, 369
Roche, Abbas de la, 1708
Radulfus de la, 1708
Rochefordia, Matillis de, 1072
Robertus de, 1438
Rodes, Radulfus de, 770
Roffa, Prior de, 1644
Ricardus de, 74, 1388
Roffenses Episcopi, 88, 262, 350, 376, 474, 481, 616, 983, 1117, 1163, 1283,1644
Rogerns, Comes, 314, 695, 754, 835, 1242, 1271, 1426, 1520, 1813
Roin, Henrieus de, 932
Roing', Reing', Quenilda uxor Ricardi de, 748
Ricardus, 748
Roinges, Johamnes de, 1025
Robertus filins Simonis de, 727, 809
Simon de, 727, 809
Rokeshale, Hamon de, 715
Rokewyla, Willelmus de, 2.51
Rollesby, Rallesby, Agnes uxor Warini de, 373
Warinus de, 373
Romanns, Johannes, 1463
Romenel, Dauid, 302
Romesye, Abbatissa, 775
Walterus de, 77.
Roppelegha, Simon de, 1209
Ros, Hugo de, 382
Muriella nxor Willelmi de, 382
lobertus de, 82,685
Sibilla de, 685
Wakelinus de, 1835
Willelmus de, 134, 376, 382, 474, (685, 894, 1199, 1898
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Ros, Willelmus filus Willemi de. 1898
Rossell, W'illelmus, Ss1
Rothomagi, Heeanus, 857
Rothomago, Willelmus de, 36i7
Roullestona, Heurieus de, 145 t
Rowe, Almedus, 1893
Roxhenede, Hamon de, 71.5
Rozholm, hoysia uxor Thome de, 1858
Thomas de, 18.58
Thomas filius Thome de, 1858
Fude, Juliana uxor Warini, 863
Warinus, 863
Rudingtona, licardus de, 433, 528
Rue, Elizabeth uxor Willelmi de, 1470
Willelmus de, 1470
Ruffordia, Galfridus de, 1184
Ruffus, Adam, 1778
Amabilis uxor Roberti, 331
Augustinus, 1533
Henricus, 304
Herbertus, 1733
Hugo, 578, 64.5
Isabella nxor Willelmi, 329
Robertus, 331
Thomas, 102
Willelmus, 329, 1383
Ruffyn, Philippus, 262
Rufus, Willelınus, 1733
Rugham, Walterus filins Willemi de, 461
Willelmus de, 461
Rughedona, Johanna uxor Willelmi de, 219
Willelmus de, 219
Rughenheye, Priorissa de, 200
Rughenora, Radulfus de, 179
Ruilla, Alexander filius Rogeri de, 252
Rogerus de, 252
Ruines, Walterus de, 530
Rullond, Adam, 1222
Ricardus, 1222
Rullos, Isabella nxor Willelmi de, 503

Rumbalde, Henricus, 1601
Romely, Alames tilins Mathed de, 1173
Mathens de, 1173
Rumenal, Thomas filius Umfridi de, 1140
Rumeseia, Albatissa de, $35.5,1110$
Rumesye, Abbatissa de, 1316
Rumally, Emma nxor llenriei de, 1745
llenricus de, 174s
Imeray, Willelmus de, 71
Runingham, luningheham, Capellanus de, 237
Johammes de, 237
Simon de, 237
liupe, Supe, Abbas de, $1 \times 76$.
Agnes de, 2:31, 954
Fadulfus de, 1339)
Thomas de, 166it
Piupella, Godefridus de, 841
Rophus, hicardus, 924
Tus, Adam le, 1778
Alicia nxor Galfridi le, 981
Galfridus le, 981
Ruscel, liobertus, 893
Russel, Alicia uxor Willelmi, 30.5
Hugo, 436
Isabella uxor Roberti, 1774
Ricardus, 1256,1925
Robertus, 1774
Thomas, 1866
Walterus, 307
Willelmus, 365, 593
linssell', Petras de, 20.t
linssok, Alicia de, 1266
liusteng', Willelmus, 777
Tinswrthe, Adam de, 18.6 ,
Rumenhaehe, Ricardus de, 179
Ruwedona, Willelmus de, 1109
Rye, Capellanus de, 132
Rytona, Regin' filia licardi de, 1548
Ricardus de, 1548
Sabestona, Willemus de, 180:
Sacheeroft, Adam de, 18.it
Safeid', Hemriens de, 30 t
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Safeubse, Saffuble, Safuble, Georgius, 252
Gregorius de, 252
Willelmus de, 252
Saffuble vide Safeubse.
Safuble vide Safeubse.
Saham, Robertus filius Simonis de, 611
Simon de, 644
Sahre, Eborardus de, 369
Salceto vide Sauceye.
Salefordia, Rogerus de, 1607
Salfleteby, Ricardus dc, 1751
Salicibus, Willelmus de, 186
Salle, Agnes de, 1798
Saln' vide Salne.
Salne, Saln', Willelmus de, 411
Salopesbirie, Abbas, 305
Comes, 30.5
Salopesira, Editha de, 1725
Salseto ride Sanceye.
Sanctichesmar', Galfridus de, 178
Sanctis, Omnibus, Alexander de, 1815
Sanctona, Robertus de, 47
Sinctus, Johannes, 1474
Sandwico, Henricus de, 237, 711, 1333,1659
Johames filius Hemrici de, 1383
Juliana uxor Simonis de, 1771
Simon de, 1771
Simon filius Henrici de, 711
Sanfordia, Cecilia de, 1617
Hugo de, 16fit
Johannes de, 1617
Osbertus de, 13世:)
Rogerus de, 13s!
Santesmar' ride Santichesmar.
Santichemar' ride Santichesmar.
Sautichesmar, Santesmar', Santi-
chemar', Galfridus de, 1417
Sanum, Willelmus, 15
Sanzan', Hugo, 119)
Sapertona, Matillis de, s.s1
Sar' ride' Sarrisbiric.
Sarisbiria, Edwardus de, 1608
Sarisbiric vide Sarrisbiric.

Sarrisbirie, Sarisbirie, Sar', Sur', Comes, 3, 906, 1235, 1574, 1698 Comitissa, 363, 463, 532, 775, 1110, 1277
Ela uxor Comitis, 3, 1235, 1698
Precentor, 1388
Thesauraritas, 1388
Sarrisbirienses Episcopi, 109, 114, $173,242,256,636,800,906,1115$, 1282, 1312, 1354, 1698, 1731
Satcote, Galfridus de, 256
Sauage, Galfridus le, 1003, 1605
Mabilia uxor Galfridi le, 1003
Walterus le, 1878
Sauceye, Salceto, Sauseyc, Radulfus de, 624,688
Robertus de, 1186
Walterus de la, 739
Sauila, Grauel, Hugo de, 248
Saune, Walterus, 1084
Saundale, Matillis uxor Thome de, 170.8

Thomas de, 1708
Saunderlande, Radulfus de, $7 \boldsymbol{2 3}$
Saunders, Andreas de, 151
Saunford, Saunfordia, Hugo de, 178, 183
Johanna uxor Hugonis de, 178
Ricardus de, $18: 3$
Robertus de, 183
Thomas de, 183
Warinus filius Thome de, 183
Saunfordia vide Saunford.
Saunreuilla, Danid de, 1099
Sauser, Aluredus le, 142. ;
Athelina uxor Aluredi le, 112.5
Santemarevs, Petrus de, 536, 60:
Santereyc, Abbas de, 948
Saunage, Auicia uxor Thome lc, 74
Hemricus le, 116
Jacobus le, 983, 16.53
Robertus le, 483, 1310
Thomas le, 7t, 1388
Willelmus le, 4.50
Saxlingeham, Robertus filius Rogeri de, 793
Rogerus de, 793
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Saxlingeham, Richerus de, 1836
Saxtona, Johannes de, 1259
Say, Beatricia de, 1765
Beatricia filia Willelmi de, s
Galfridus de, 506, 57f, 1765, 1782
Gilebertus de, 1635,1722
Margeria uxor Galfridi de, $57 \pm$
Matillis de, 8,12
Matillis filia Willelmi de, 8
Matillis uxor Gileberti de, 1635 , 1722
WilleImus de, $8,806,1117,1165$
Scaccario, Henricus de, 229, 318, 431, 1465, 1616
Rogerus de, 1276
Willelmus filius Henrici de, 1616
Scalariis, Ala uxor Fingonis de, 4
Henricus de, 4
Hugo de, 4
Scales, Ricardus de, 1122
Scallariis, Andreas de, 765
Scardecline, Hubertus filius Radulfi de, 930
Radulfus de, 930
Schanelingewrthe, Willelmus de, 1325
Schengham ride Suenham.
Schuche vide Suche.
Scileduna, Skeleduna, Dauid de, 862
Robertus de, 862
Rogerus filius Dauid de, 862
Scissor, Durandus, 1598
Emma uxor Humeden, 577
Humeden, 577
Petrus, 1261
Willelmus, 1131, 1814
Scoctegni, Thomas de, 947
Scode, Scotere, Emma uxor Walteri de, 888
Walterus de, 888
Scolde, Walterns, 1539
Sconard, Rosanna uxor Willelmi, 1960
Willelmus, 1960
Scot, Dunecanus, 328, 400
Johannes le, 955
Radulfus, 291
Ricardus le, 1461
M. I.

Seot, Robertus le, 1487
Scoteny, Thomas de, 231
Scotere ride Scode.
Scotie Riox, 97, 618, 695, 901, 1221
Scottus, Ricardus, 1.102
Scotus, Johannes, 58*
Osbertus, 575
Screppe, Galfrilus, 821
Scriptor, liobertus, 962
Seculer, Nicholaus le, 7, 1328
Sellham, Nicholans de, 6s
Segraue, Emma uxor Johannis do, 331
Gilebertus de, 1113
Johannes de, 331
Stephanus de, 4, 10, 307, 3.51, 372, $465,750,778,983,1057,1113$, $1124,1273,1309,1592,1950$
Scinges, Natillis uxor Ricardi de, 1618
Ricardus de, 1618
Willelmus filius Ricardi de, 1618
Seingnes, Ricartus de, 1069
Seingues, Hemriens de, 1896
Seinte, Robertus le, 110
Sekole, Riobertus, 861
Seleby, Hugo de, 1889
Seler, Geruasius le, 1080
Seleuin, Willelmns, 1326
Sellar, Gilebertus, 1179
Isabella filius Gileberti, 1179
Seltona, Alexander de, 1807
Robertus filius Alexandri de, 1807
Selue, Rakulfus filius Willemi de, 1786
Willelmus de, 1786
Senecurt, Willelmus de, 1616
Senescal, Willelmus le, 37,906
Senescallus, Oliwerus, 1237
Willelmus, 37
Sonewalle, Walterus de, 166
Senewella, Willelmus de, t999
Senzauer, Ena uxor Hugronis, x2s
Hago, s2s
Sepeshee, liobertus, 20
Stptem Fontibus, Willehmss de, 3se9
Seriant, Willelmus le, 1207
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Seriaunt, Lucas le, 699
Sessons ride Sexan'.
Set, Robertus, 25:
Senero, S., Abbas de, 1710
Seuilla, Johames de, 1169
Sexan', Sessons, Riolfus de, 75
Seyle vide Seyles.
Seyles, Seyle, Radulfus de, 1758
Shanke, Radnlfus, 1416
Sharpetoft, Nicholaus filius Roberti de, 1855
Robertus de, 1855
Sharsted', Harested', Simon de, 262
Shatingdona, Thomas de, 1773
Shelfordia, Johannes de, 394
Reinıundus de, 1404
Sheltona, Ranumlfus de, 1407, 1618
Sheneffeldia, Thomas de, 1742
Shepele, Matheus de, 26
Shepen', Alicia uxor Vincensii de, 1185
Vincensius de, 1185
Sherdelawe, Ricardus de, 466
Sherlecota, Rogerus de, 1
Shiclingtona, Robertus filius Thome de, 1844
Thomas de, 1844
Shifrewast, Ricardus, 1621
Robertus de, 1621
Shin, Johannes filius Rogeri, 340
Rogerus, 340
Shinelesho, Holdiarda uxor Willelmi de, 1033
Willelmus de, 1033
Shireburnia, Shyreburnia, Abbas de, 923, 927
Prior de, 416, 769
Shirefordia, Thomas de, 412
Shirewode, Cecilia uxor Willelmi, 1586
Willelmus, 1586
Shiringtona, Geruasius de, 867
Shirlok, Willelmus, 1287
Shoffordia, Willelmus de, 481
Shoghebiria, Ricardus de, 1226
Shoreuilla, Shorewella, Willchuus de, 906

Shorewella vide Shoreuilla.
Shudham, Studham, Robertus de, 858
Shupestona, Margeria uxor Ricardi de, 934
Ricardus de, 934
Shurefordia, Robertus de, 1305
Shyreburnia vide Shireburnia.
Siffrawall' vide Siffrewall'.
Siffrewall', Siffrawall', Sufrewall', Sụffrewast, Galfridus de, 773
Ricardus de, 773
Willelmus de, 431, 512, 612
Sike, Beatricia uxor Hugonis de la, 1046,1069
Hugo de la, 1046, 1069
Siluetona, Matillis uxor Radulfi de, 1313
Radulfus de, 1313
Simill' vide Similly.
Similly, Simill', Willelmus de, 1734
Simily vide Symilly.
Simplingeham, Prior de, 182, 211
Simplinges, Agnes uxor Elie de, 1795
Elias de, 1795
Walterns filius Elie de, 1795
Simplingham, Magister de, 1356
Siwac, Galfridus, 1167
Siward, Ricardus, 1117
Sixle, Prior de, 720,509
Skeleduna vide scileduna.
Skeringe, Simon de, 1006
Skotere, Alicia usor Simonis, 888
Simon, 888
Smalbere, Clemens de, 154
Henricus de, 154
Johannes de, $\mathbf{1 5 4}$
Matillis uxor Henrici de, 154
Robertus de, 154
Snane, Johannes de, 1140
Snones, Robertus de, 14
Solariis, Jacobus de, 1229
Johanna uxor Rogeri de, 1229
Margeria uxor Jacobi de, 1229
Rogerus de, 1229
Solers, Roevsia uxor Rogeri de, 1439
Rogerus de, 1439
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Solers, Willelmus de, 1439
Sonewella, Robertus de, 1575
Robertus filins Walteri de, 1642
Walterns de, 1575, 1642
Sorel, Robertus, 1137
Sotfordia, Thomas de, 723
Sowy, Willelmus de, 1689
Sparham, Stephanus de, 193
Willelmus de, 193, 1120
Spark, Robertus, 265
Spaudling', Prior de, 1209
Spigurnel, Isabella uxor Roberti, 1946
Robertus, 1946
Spistona, Alicia uxor Johannis de, 1700
Johannes de, 1700, 1744
Sproxtona, Johamnes de, 708, 712
Johannes filius Johannis de, 708
Robertus de, 749
Simon de, 749
Squieler, Robertus le, 1483
Stactona vide Stoctona.
Staffordia, Henricus de, 1692
Nilisanta de, 1043
Staffordiensis Arehidiaconns, 187
Stagno, Adam de, 784
Stainwath vide Steinwath.
Stake, WilleImus, 1955
Stampes, Cressant de, 1179
Stane, Robertus de, 530
Rogerus de la, App. 5
Stanedisse, Alexander filius Radulfi de, 1386
Radulfus de, 1386
Stanelesby, Johannes de, 1563
Stanes, Elias de, 670
Johannes de, 282
Willelmus de, 1012, 1702
Stanewella, Margeria uxor Thome de, 342
Thomas de, 342
Stanfordia, Hugo de, 1596
Johanna uxor Hugonis de, 1596
Stanham, Ascelina uxor Johannis de, 317
Johannes de, 317

Stanham, Osbertus de, 1931
Stanho, Herueus de, $006,841,1812$, 18:36
StanLus, JoheLus de, 1759
Margeria uxor Joheli de, 175!
Stanlegha, Abbas de, 1063
Stammere, Johannes filins Roberti de, 1054
Marsilia uxor Roberti de, 15nt
Radulfus filius Roberti de, 1554
Robertus de, 15054
Robertus filius Serlonis de, 1551
Serlo de, 1554
Simon filins Roberti de, 15.51
Willemus filius Serlonis de, 1551
St:mwico, Abbas de, 971
Stapelford' vide Stapelfordia.
Stapelfordia, Stapelford', Ricardus de, 758, 1898
Willelmus de, 1919
Stapeltona, Nieholaus de, 220
Robertus de, 1169
Stapinges, Stepinges, Albinus de, 1563
Elena uxor Roberti de, 911
Eliena uxor Walteri de, 1657
Emma uxor Albini de, 1563
Gila uxor Johannis de, 716, 936
Helena de, 1102
Helena uxor Walteri de, 950
Johames de, 716, 936
Robertus de, 944
Walterus de, 944, 956, 1657
Starki, Elena uxor Ramnulfi, 1901
RamnuIfus, 1901
Starky, Randulfus, 876
Ricardus filius Ranlulfi, s76
Stanella, Stinella, Adam de, 1st.
Alanus de, 1845
Alicia filia Ade de, 1815
Stanely, Adam de, 1865
Alicia filia Ade de, 1sfis
Stanertona, Galfridus de, 106:3
Staundfordia, Adam de, 332
Matillis uxor Ade de, 332
Stanntona, Gilebertus de, 316
liobertus de, 316
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Steinwath, Stainwath', Johannes de, 213
Stella, Agatha uxor Ricardi de, $5 \pm 7$
Picardus de, 547
Stepinges ride Stapinges.
Stialey vide Straley.
Stibbcheie vide Stibbeheye.
Stibbeheye, Stibbeheie, Bricins de, 150
Daniel de, 150
Stiffleppe vide Rissleppe.
Stifordia vide Stortfordia.
Stikeman, Warinus, 1935
Stillard, Rogerus le, 705
Salomon filius Rogeri le, 705
Stinekeya, Bartholomeus de, 188
Stiteuilla, Sturteuilla, Stuteuilla, Eidm' uxor Nicholai de, 39
Johannes de, 745, 746
Margeria uxor Willelmi de, 195, 1606
Nicholaus de, 39
Willelmus de, 195, 1606
Stitteuilla, Willelmus de, 16
Stiueheya, Adelstanus de, 1830
Robertus filius Adelstani de, 1830
Stinekeye, Bartholomeus de, 1817, 1836
Stiuella vide Stauella.
Stiuingtona, Miranda filius Walteri de, 680
Prior de, 272
Walterus de, 680
Stiward, Gote, 1041
Stocke, Henricus de, 1810
Willelmus de, 1810
Stockeby, Reginaldus de, 595
Stoctona, Stactona, Eborardus de, 629
Herbertus de, 1561
Petrus filius Willelmi de, 151
Ricardus de, 10
liogerus de, 423
Willelmus de, 151
Stoges, Hugo de, 950
Stolie, Adam de la, 845
Cristina de la, 446

Stoke, Henricus de, 524
Johannes de la, 446
Radulfus de, 1156
Ricardus de, 868
Robertus de, 286, 446
Stephanus de, 858
Walkelinus de, 1115
Stokeby, Alanus de, 595, 1794
Alexander de, 1841
Stokely, Robertus de, 1257
Stokes, Johanna de, 1683
Johames de, 554
Petrus de, 1898
Radulfus de, 1339, 1800
Thomas de, 1683
Walkelinus de, 10
Willelmus de, 173
Stokesby, Robertus de, 731
Stolke vide Stowe.
Stoubrug', Robertus de, 795
Stonore, Radulfus de, 36
Stopham, Brianus de, 1183
Radulfus de, 1484
Radulfus filius Briani de, 1183
Stortfordia, Stifordia, Michael de, 275
Stotefordia, Johannes de, App. 7
Stowe, Stolke, Johammes de, $19 \pm$
Stracy, Walterus, 45
Stradena, Hugo de, 1786
Stradeset', Cecilia de, 836
Strafforilia, Abbas de, 284
Stralegha, Estradlegha, Stradlegha, Isilia uxor Walteri de, 315, 379
Robertus de, 379, 604
Robertus filius Walteri de, 315, 379
Rogerus filius Walteri de, 315,379
Sampson filius Walteri de, 315, 379
Walterus de, 315, 379
Straley, Stialey, Philippus de, 315
Strange, Galfridus, 678
Johannes le, 21, 1309
Stratfordia, Strattfordia, Abbas de, $270,586,963,998,1323,1477$
Willelmus de, 1477
Strathefede, Thomas de, 19
Stratte, Alwimus de, 1018
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Strattfordia vide Stratfordia.
Strattona, Beatricia uxor Richeri de, 1843
Richerus de, 1813
Steplianus de, 19
Strettona, Hugo de, 433
Strode, Jowetta de la, 545
Strumeshale, Willelmus de, 637
Studham vide Shudham.
Stuetona, Walterns de, 1460
Stunhus, Joel de, 958
Margeria uxor Joelis de, 958
Sturmuwe, Willelmus de, 1768
Sturteuilla vide Stiteuilla.
Stuteuilla vide Stiteuilla.
Suche, Schuche, Rogerus de la, 53, 305, 1043, 1149
Rogerus le, 247
Suckele, Johannes de, 352
Suenham, Schengham, Walterus de, 858
Suerde, Simon, 10
Sueuenetona, Philippus de, 1358
Suffolchie, Archidiaconus, 788
Suffordia, Reginaldus de, 1814
Willelmus de, 1814
Sufrewall' vide Siffrewall'.
Suilguarin, Willelmus de, 1489
Suinestorpe, Cecilia de, 1708
Suleby, Abbas de, 820
Hugo de, 633
Suleuny, Aluredus de, 51
Sulingny, Randulfus de, 265
Sulplicii, S. Abbatissa, 1163
Sumerdeby, Thomas de, 1210
Sumertona, Brianus de, 1816
Jacobus de, 595, 1816
Mauricius de, 1095
Sumeruilla, Margeria de, 1861
Sumery, Agnes filia Rogeri de, 550
Elias de, 10
Margeria de, 40
Milo de, 1001
Rogerus de, 550
Simon de, 718
Thomas filius Rogeri de, 5.50
Sumine, Summie, Martinus de, 439

Sunbiria, Thomas de, 1317
Sunderlande, Johanna uxor Radulfi te, 6t?
Fadulfus de, 6.42
Sundernisse, Galfridus de, $\mathbf{1 5 0 5}$
Sunninges, Serlo de, 1583
Sunre, Radulfus de la, 1938
Supe vide Rupe.
Sur' viale Sarrisbirie.
Surdendale, Elizabetha uxor Willelmi de, 1470
Willelmus de, 1470
Surningezheyt, Priorissa de, 22
Surreie, Comes, 1243
Suthamptone, Maior, 1123
Suthurste, Willelmus de, 10
Suthwerk, Joliannes de, 1027
Matillis uxor Johamnis de, 1027
Sutingtona, Heuricus de, 250
Suttona, Gilebertus de, 756
Mabilia uxor Willelmi de, 566
Margeria filia Roberti de, 1279
Robertus de, 58, 89, 1279, 1611
Saherus de, 256
Willelmus de, 256,566
Suward, Ricardus, 513
Suwella vide Suwilla.
Suwere, Johannes de, 90
Prior de, 983
Suwic, Prior de, 1570
Suwilla, Suwella, Hugo de, 551
Suwore', Decanus de, 550
Suwye, Willelmus de, 1286
Swafham, Odo de, ©e3
Swalecliue, Galfridus de, 1202
Swanetona, Bowy de, 1316
Swaringes, Galfridus de, $18: 36$
Philippus de, 1836
Swayn, Cristiana uxor Johamnis, 1139
Johanues, 1139
Swift, Nicholans, 639
Swin', Moniales de, 2.56
Swinuertona, lobertus de, 1300
Swithuni, S., Prior, 111, 1037, 119.5
Swynecumba, Randulfus de, 271
Wymundus de, 271
Syffrewast vide Siffrewall'.

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Symilly, Simily, Emma uxor Henrici de, 594
Galfridus de, 594
Henricus de, 594
Willelmus de, 594
Sywarde, Ricardus, 857
Taidene vide Taydene.
Taillur, Beatricia uxor Radulfi le, 59
Lucia uxor Willelmi le, 87
Radulfus le, 59
Robertus le, 478
Willelmus le, 87
Taiulande, Radulfus de, 1218
Willelmus filius Radulfi de, 1218
Talebat, Emma filia Willelmi, 270
Willelmus, 270
Talebot, Adam, 1947
Galfridus, 54
Willelmus, 752
Talemaseh, Hugo, 13, 871
Talemasche, Alicia uxor Willelmi, 1100
Petrus, 137
Willelmus, 1100
Talewrthe, Petrus de, 1594
Tallewurth, Maria de, 115
Tamlande, liobertus de, 1140
Tancre, Johannes, 1787
Rogerus, 1787
Taner, Alicia uxor Galfridi le, 418
Galfridus le, 418
Tamn, Radulfus de, 51
Tamator, le Tanur, Gregorius, 1131
Tanur vide Tannator.
Tarente, Fromundus de, 1622
Tart Curteys, Adam, 709
Tateshale, Robertus de, 1248
Tauncar, Prior de, 143
Taunkaruilla, ladulfus de, 7.50
Taydene, Henricus de, 126
Tayllur, Beatricia uxor Radulfi le, 1059
Radulfus le, 15.59
Techewella, Hamon de, 500
Herlewinus de, 500
Matillis uxor Hamonis de, 500

Tefiordia, Gilebertus de, 650
Isabella uxor Gileberti de, 650
Margareta filia Gileberti de, 650
Prior de, 210
Tegula, Gilebertus de, 824
Teintona, Drago de, 902
Teler, Reginaldus le, 1080
Templarius, Galfridus, 1124
Templer, Petronilla uxor Roberti le, 1960
Robertus le, 1960
Templi Milites, 486, 821, 852, 1022, 1101, 1160, 1752
Tenderugge, Decanus de, 766
Terri vide Terry.
Terry, Willelmus, 411
Testard, Willelmus, 1347
Testepin, Thomas, 508
Willelmus, 1902
Willelmus filius Willelmi, 1902
Tethelby, Robertus de, 689
Teutonicus, Baldewinus, 1169
Eborardus, 1228
Henricus, 1121
Tewere vide Thewyere.
Textor, Jordanus, 821
Teyl, Galfridus de, 41
Thama, Adam filius Eue de, 1142, 1158
Eua de, 1142, 1158
Theggewella, Willelmus de, 584
Thein, Alieia filia Thome le, 159
Thomas le, 159
Thelnetham, Matillis uxor Petri de, 1920
Petrus de, 1920
Theofordia, Prior de, 222
Theokesburia, Abbas de, 112
Thewyere, Tewere, Twere, Alanus filius Osberti de la, 771
Osbertus de la, 771
Petrus de la, 771
Saxinus filius Osberti de la, 771
Thirn', Basilia uxor Thome de, 557
Thomas de, 557
Thoine, Willelmus de, 1482
Tholy, Dionisia uxor Roberti, 1712
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Tholy, Robertus, 1712
Robertus filius Roberti, 1712
Thomas, Comes, 855, 1117
Thoringtona, Wymerus de, 848
Thorintona, Wyemarus de, 1380
Thorneia, Matillis uxor Ricardi de, 128
Ricardus de, 128
Thornholmia, Prior de, 1361
Thornoure, Adam de, 515
Willelmus de, 515
Thorpe, Alexander de, App. 3
Audreas filius Radulfi de, 1548
Radulfus de, 1548
Willelmus de, 117
Thorpelle, Rogerus de, 1736
Thudeham, Edmundus de, 1931
Thurgantona vide Thurgarstona.
Thurgarstona, Thurgantona, Prior de, 1851
Thurneham, Mabilia filia Stephani de, 1765
Stephanus de, 1765
Thurstona, Matheus de, 1939
Matillis uxor Mathei de, 1939
Thwee, Rogerus de, 423
Tibbetet vide Tybbeat.
Tibbetot vide Tybbeat.
Tibetoft, Henricus de, 1959
Tichewella, Thomas de, 500
Tideham, Hugo de, 763
Tidelementona, Eleonora uxor Thome de, 934
Thomas de, 934
Tilemanestona, Gilebertus de, 1596
Johanna uxor Gileberti de, 1596
Tillebiria, Jacobus de, 2
Tillebroe, Willelmus de, 1460
Tinctor, Hugo, 1908
Mabilia nxor Hugonis, 1908
Radulfus, 555
Willelmus filius Hugonis, 1908
Tinemino vide Tynemue.
Tinemue vide Tynemue.
Tintagel, Turtegol', Geruasius filius Roberti de, 1660
Nicholaus de, 213

Tintagel, 'Turtegol', Rohertus de, 1060
Tisho, Jolanness de, 10.52
Tiuilla, Tyuilla, Matillis uxor liaduldi de, 1376, 1415
Radulfus de, $385,829,1376,1445$, 1825
Ricarlas de, fl
Robertus de, 8. 99
Toche, Walterus, $119 \%$
Toftes, Simon de, 78t
Willelmus de, 1827
Torgesd vide Togyesden.
Togyesden, Toggesd', Gilebertus de, 1385
Tohulla, Alditha uxor Jacobi de, 1627 Jacobus de, 1927
Toke, liobertus de, 818
Toky, Stephanns, 6si6
Tony, Radulfus de, 1006, 1071, 1117
Torel, Robertus, 47
Willelmus, 47, 1399
Toreny, Radulfus de, 922
Torintona, Toritona, Abbas de, 1236
Auicia uxor Willelmi de, 1045
Natheus de, 1065
Willehmus de, 1065
Toritona ville Torintona.
Torpel, Rogerus, 406
Rogerus de, 1012, 1045
Torpoll', Ricardus de, 217
Tothulla, Walterus de, 1287
Tottone, Arehidiaconus, 678, 1113
Tournestona, Robertus de, 1704
Traey, Henricus de, 1146, 1732
Willelmus de, 1732
Traffordia, Galfridus de, 72
Trally, Nicholaus de, 1085
Trassel vide Trussel.
Trauers, Robertus, 270
Willelmus, 1116
Traxtona, Johannes de, 15n2
Traylli, Johannes de, 1133
Tregoz, Tresgoz, Galfridus de, 1372, 1738
Willelmus de, $1110,173 \mathrm{~s}$
Tremehale, Tremeshale, Prior de, $4 \not{ }^{2}$
Tremeshale vide Tremehale.
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Tresgot, Henricus de, 169
Johannes de, 169
Tresgoz vide Tregoz.
Trespas, Andreas, 270
Treuerby, Walterus de, 596, 991
Treuergan, Jordanus de, 214
Trenet, Thomas, 431, 512, 612
Tribot, Margeria uxor Roberti, 1357
Robertus, 1357
Trigesyre, Decanus de, 143
Trillegha, Willelmus de, 773
Trilly, Osbertus, 962
Trinitatis, S., de Bosco, Prior, 1319
de Eboraeo, Prior, 19, 97, 515̆, 1415
de Gapewico, Prior, 945
de Gipewieo, Prior, 1239
Prior, 711
Trocard, Johannes, 684
Mabilia uxor Johannis, 684
Trocmaretona, Adam de, 250, 609
Trokemereton, Henricus de, 1222
Trono, S., Matheus de, 1323
Roeysia uxor Mathei de, 1323
Tropinel, Hawisia nxor Willelmi, 1916
Willelmus, 1916
Trotecline, Willelmus de, 1047
Trublenilla, Alicia de, 799
Alicia uxor Radulfi de, 799
Radulfus de, 874
Trumpintona, Agnes uxor Johannis de, 966, 15599
Johannes de, 966, 1559
Trumpitona, Eborardus de, 57
Trune, Rogeras filius Willelmi, 662 Willelmus, 662
Trussel, Trassel, Matillis, 146, 208
Willelmus, 196
Tryl, Johames, 1148
Tudeham, Tudeuham, Eadmundus de, 521, 603
Osbertus de, 1891
Reinerus de, 478
licardus de, 478, 1891
Rogerus tilius Osberti de, 1891
Suma de, 1264

Tudenham vide Tudeham.
'Tueng', Marmaduc de, 1883
Tumbestona, Durandus de, 1072
Robertus de, 1072
Tunberhangre, Walterus de, 220
Tunder, Ascelinus, 398
Tuneire vide Tunere.
Tunere, Tuneire, Tuneyre, Henricus, 223
Tunestona, Robertus de, 710
Tuneyre vide Tunere.
Tungelonde, Thomas de, 958
Tupeholm vide Tupholm.
Tupholm, Tupeholm, Tupholme,
Tuppeholm, Abbas de, 445, 535, 810
Tupholme vide Tupholm.
Tuppeholm vide Tupholm.
Tur, Jordanus de la, 1397
Turberuilla, Alicia uxor Walteri de, 77
Johannes de, 1414
Walterus de, 77, 1401, 1599
Turet, Bartholomeus, 1458
Tureuilla, Thureuilla, Armaldus de, 368
Ernaldus de, 524
Isabella uxor Willelmi de, 203, 1355
Matillis uxor Willelmi de, 203, 1355
Radulfus de, 524
Ricardus de, 524
Simon de, 368
Willelmus de, 203, 1355
Turgarton' vide Turgeretona.
Turgeretona, Turgarton', Prior de, 1454
Turgis, Alina uxor Roberti, 460
Robertus, 460
Turneham, Isabella filia Roberti de, 1869
Robertus de, 1869
Turnham, Edelina uxor Stephani de, 1410
Johauma uxor Roberti de, 1754
Robertus de, 1339, 1754
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Turnham, Stephanus de, 1410
Turold vide Turolle.
Turolde, Turold. Claricia uxor Ricardi, 135 I
Hugo, 1351
Ricardus, 1351
Turrenilla, Henricus de, 879
Johannes filius Ricardi de, 879
Petrouilla uxor Simonis de, 879
Ricardus de, 879
Simon de, 879
Turri, Emma uxor Gregorii de, 702
Gregorius de, 702
Jordanus de, 1306
Ricardus de, $27 \pm$
Turry, Robertus de, 1610
Turs, Agnes uxor Ricardi de, 137
Auicia filia Ricardi de, 137
Beatricia uxor lioberti de, 1418
Ricardus de, 137
Robertus de, $1 \not 418$
Turtegol' vide Tintagel.
Tus, Beatricia uxor Lioberti le, 409
Robertus le, 409
Tuscat, Thomas, 914
Tuschet, Henricus, 279
Thomas, 974, 1712
Tuzseinz, Rogerus de, 45
Willelmus de, 45
Tweinge, Marmaduc de, 661
Twere vide Thewyere.
Twyfordia, Alina uxor Henrici de, 970
Hemricus de, 970
Willelmus filius Henrici de, 970
Tybbeat, Tibbetet, Tibbetot, Henricus, 864
Tyd, Adam de, 134
Reginaldus filius Ade de, 134
Tydeby, Dionisia de, 324
Tye, Robertus, 285
Tyes, Henricus le, 1532
Isabella uxor Henrici le, 1532
Waleranus le, 1406
Tyeys, Waleranus le, 1310
Tykambreche, Isabella filia Radulfi de, 11.51

Tykambreche, ladulfin de, 1151
Tylle ride Tylli.
Tylli, Tylle, Mabilia de, 1685
Odo de, 1685
Willelmus, 1032
Willehuns de, 10.5t
Tyllol, Petrus de, 219
Tynemue, Tinemino, Tinemue, Prior de, 226,1715
Tynemuwe, Johannes de, 817
Tyrẹl, Rogerus, 570
Tyrelle, Clemencia uxor ladulfi, 1320
Dionisia uxor Ricardi, 1101
Radulfus, 1320
Ricardus, 1101
Tysun, Alam, 1375
Alicia uxor Ade, 1375
Tyuilla ride Tiuilla.
Tywarday, Prior de, 1070
Tywe, Walterus de, 1107
Uffinton', Offaton, Johannes de, 1416
Ulmis, Johanna uxor Stephani de, 178, 1596
Stephanus de, 178,1596
Ulmo, Rogerus de, 1041
Uluescroft, Prior de, 19.57
Umframuilla, Humframuilla, Ricardus de, 1044
Umfrauilla, Ricardus de, 1764
Undel', Decanus de, 62:5
Underdun, Mauricius, 507
Uniet, Ricardus, 1965
Uparhide, Geruasius, 1718
Mabilia uxor (ieruasii, 1718
Uppetona, Galfridus de, 259
Upsale, Galfridus de, 759
Uptona, Florida uxor Nicholai de 1052
Nicholaus de, 1052
Stephanus de, 10:2
Uptone, Adam filins Galfridi de, $185^{\circ}$
Galfridus de, 1 na
Utdeners, Agnes filia I'hilippi, 804
Alicia filia Philippi, sot
Philippus, 80:4, 1633
Utewrthe, Helyas de, Sus
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Utewrthe, Walterus de, 928
Utlaghe, Simon, 907
Utscistona, Sibilla uxor Willelmi de, 163
Willelmus de, 163
Uxor-
Ade, Alicia, 1334
Juliana, 1120, 1176
Alani, Alicia, 1510
Matania, 1972
Alexandri, Matillis, 622
Andree, Lucia, 198
Anselmi, Margeria, 1382
Anenelli, Mabilia, 566
Baldrici, Isabella, 345
Briani, Grecia, 1205
Drienni, Matillis, 1688
Clementis, Cristiana, 1830
Danid, Galiena, 1299
Edmeri, Emma, 1783
Elie, Mabilia, 751
Ernulfi, Alienora, 496
Enstachii, Johanna, 605
Galfridi, Agnes, 1654
Editha, 1840
Emma, 1858
Odierna, 389
Petronilla, 921
Georgii, Sibilla, 1887
Geruasii, Alicia, 976
Gileberti, Agnes, 1000
Albreda, 41
Guidonis, Beatricia, 1877
Haldeni, Goda, 1729
Hamonis, Agnes, 550
Helye, Beatricia, 225
Henrici, Celestria, 1011
Gunilla, 1455
Hawisia, 611
Johanna, 994
Herlewini, Edina, 228
Heruici, Eua, 1800
Theda, 1837
Huberti, Matillis, 1507, App. 4
IIugonis, Alicia, 1853
Emma, 1842
Ilde, Alicia, 335
U.sor-

Johanuis, Albreda, 591
Alicia, 1638
Auicia, 833
Cristiana, 1603
Editha, 1839
Feidina, App. 7
Gunnora, 1120, 1573, 1649
Matillis, 694, 1120, 1954
Jollani, Alicia, 531
Jordani, Alicia, 1034, 1851
Eua, 1229
Martini, Barbota, 1279
Mathei, Johanna, 54
Mauricii, Alicia, 1105
Michaelis, Katerina, 1151
Nicholai, Agnes, 502
Osberti, Anna, 638
Mabilia, 1891
Petri, Alicia, 181, 994
Anicia, 833
Editha, 1041
Gundreda, 1128
Ingeleysia, 1258
Juetta, 1074
Margareta, 30
Matillis, 1676
Phillippi, Alicia, 730, 1033
Johanna, 392
Radulfi, Alicia, 939, 1865, 1866
Alienora, 116, 1410
Margeria, 467
Maria, 1278
Orenga, 227
Rannulfi, Alicia, 1866
Reginaldi, Alexandria, 91
Beatricia, 86, 96, 1832
Leticia, 1899
Reymeri, Theda, 1837
Ricardi, Alicia, 365
Amabilis, 331
Elena, 878
Emma, 1981
Gena, 1024
Iuetta, 1792
Lucia, 66
Mabilia, 331
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## U.ror-

Ricardi, Roysa, 476
Roysia, 1764
Sarra, 1639
Siritha, 220
Roberti, Cecilia, 1919
Juliana, 778, 885
Margeria, 752, 1565
Matillis, 1477, 1569, 1673, 1674
Oliua, 1811
Rogeri, Alicia, 1394
Auelina, 1241
Cristiana, 1784
Hawisia, 1565
Matillis, 1936
Simonis, Juliana, 1563
Sarra, 1093
Stephani, Juliana, 1459
Swani, Geua, 1690
Thome, Alieia, 93s
Amicia, 1958
Dionisia, 1974
Floria, 517
Isabella, 1703
Margeria, 1590, 1952
Matillis, 1759
Toraldi, Eua, 1142, 1158
Unfridi, Maria, 736
Wakelini, Alicia, 994
Walteri, Alicia, 1004
Cauleya, 92
Emma, 937
Isilia, 315
Matillis, 351, 1764
Warini, Benedicta, 425
Custancia, 129
Willelmi, Agnes, 1181, 1182, 1241, 1608
Albreda, 696
Alina, 459
Alpesia, 740
Amicia, 319
Clemencia, 1187
Constancia, 1870
Emma, 1798
Eua, 1360
Ida, 1834
U.ror-

Willelmi, Isilia, 315
Isolda, 83
Inoria, 726
Johanna, 54
Lecia, 611, 632
Mabilia, 566, 1792, 1890
Margareta, 1 , 6
Margeria, 840, 1279, 1351
Maria, 1390
Matillis, 59, 905
Rosanna, 1960
Susanna, 1017
Yuonis, Matillis, 951
Tabadun, Ricardus de, 1077
Valaines vide Valeines.
Valeines, Valaines, Valenn', Walenn', Thomas de, 1378, 1351
Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 1100
Willelmus de, 1100
Valenn' vide Valeines.
Valerieo vide Walerico.
Valeynes, Matheus de, 1912
Valle, Willelmus de, 1923
Valle Dei, Abbas de, 411, 1737
Valle Torta, Vantort, Walletorta, Johanna uxor Reginaldi de, 1584, 1601
Johannes de, 400
Johel de, 521, 603
Reginaldus de, $965,1581,1601$
Ricardus filius Johamnis de, 400
Vallibus, Adam de, 1900
Alexander de, 1843
Alicia de, 190
Hugo de, 532, 893
Oliuerus de, 1824
Robertus filius Hugonis de, 893
Willelmus de, 1813
Valoines, Robertus de, 318
Valoinis, Hamon de, 550
Maria de, 380
Valoniis, Rogerus de, 1238
Valoynes, Willelmus de, 112s
Vasto, l'rior de, 262
Vinuasur, Robertus le, 1855, 1850
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Vautort vide Valle Torta.
Vautre vide Veutre.
Veigeley vide Vergelay.
Veill', Willclmus le, 1693
Veilly, Robertus de, 1194
Venator, Johanna uxor Willelmi, 1432
Willehmus, 440, 1432
Willelmus filius Willelmi, 1432
Venuz, Bartholomeus de, 337
Constancia de, 1433
Johannes de, 1433
Johannes filius Roberti de, 1494
Robertus de, 1494
Ver, Albricus de, $633,848,881,1488$
Baldewinus de, 286
Gilebertus filius Widonis de, 1364
Henricus de, 925, 1117, 1597
Hugo de, 633, 848, 1916, 1919
Isabella uxor Albrici de, 633
Isabella uxor Roberti de, 1919
Robertus de, 790, 1485, 1769, 1919
Simon de, 1364
Walterus de, 1364
Wido de, 1364
Wido filius Widonis de, 1364
Verby, Radulfus de, 1041
Verdum vide Verdun.
Verdun, Verdum, Werdun, Wordum, Alicia uxor Widonis de, 1100
Amabilis uxor Milonis de, 1979
Bertramus de, 601
Gwydo de, 473
Hawisia uxor Henrici de, 1747
Henricus de, 1747
Milo de, 1979
Nicholaus de, 209, 601
Thomas de, 601
Walterus de, 58,89
Wido de, 1100
Willelmus de, 261
Vergelay, Veigeley, Willelmus de, $46 \cdot 1$
Verly, Hugo de, 782
Vernay ride Wernay.
Vernon, Vernun, Galfridus de, 236
Hemricus filiu* Radulfi de, 236

Vernon, Vernun, Heuerardus de, $\mathbf{2} 36$
Katerina uxor Gaifridi de, 236
Radulfus de, 236
Radulfus filius Galfridi de, 236
Walterus de, 1126
Willelmus de, 505
Vernun vide Vernon.
Veronny, Radulfus de, 72
Vesey, Warinus de, 129
Warinus filius Warini de, 129
Willelmus de, 1184
Veteri Ponte, Johanna uxor Roberti de, 1085
Rubertus de, 127, 1085
Ydonea uxor Poberti de, 127
Veutre, Vautre, Willelmus le, 1836
Viane, Ceeilia uxor Radulfi de, 1756
Radulfus de, 1756
Victona, Hubertus de, 1815
Vileis, Rogerus de, 760
Vilers, Rogerus de, 264
Villy, Rannulfus de, 1739
Vinaz, Ricardus de, 624
Willelmus de, 624
Vincent, Dawe, 1067
Vinetarius, Baldewinus, 1705
Matheus, 1711
Vineter, Alicia uxor Aruulfi le, 1027
Arnulfus le, 1027
Vinitarius, Amma uxor Henrici, 787
Henricus, 787
Vinuu, Hugo de, 897
Vitdeners, Philippus, App. 6
Wac, Cristiana, 1605
Hugo, 488
Johanues, 1555
Wac', Cristina, 87
Wace, Agnes, 1500
Willelmus, 512
Wacelin, Johannes, 1316
Willelmus, 1316
Wachefordia, Edita de, 82.1
Wack, Hugo, 796, 1106 Wyto, 406
Wadberg' vide Waldelegh.
Wadefordia, Ricardus de, 466
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Wadehulla, Warinus filius Wihlelmi de, 1668
Willelmus de, 1668
Wadenhale, Johannes de, 1338
Thomas de, 133s, 1776
Wadingefeuldia, Alicia uxor Willemi de, 490
Willelmus de, $\mathbf{4} 90$
Wadingefordia, Wadingfel, Willelmus de, 404
Wadingfel vide Wadingefordia.
Waggehastr', Robertus, 496
Wahulla, Agnes de, 1182
Henricus de, 1608
Johannes de, 1408, 1608
Johanues filius Agnetis de, 1182
Margeria filia Miehaelis de, 1107
Michael de, 765, 1107
Simon de, 765, 920, 960, 1767
Wainflet, Cristianus de, 733,822
Edelina uxor Cristiani de, 733 , 892
Willemus filins Cristiani de, 822
Wakeruilla, Jordanus de, 468
Waklelegh, Walberg', Homines de, 1588
Walebreus, Willelmus de, 1151
Waledena, Hawisia uxor Reginaldi de, 343
Idonea uxor Simonis de, 1007
Reginaldus de, 343
Simon de, 1007
Waledona, Willelmus de, 65
Waleis, Rannulfus le, 1392
Walemund, Abbas de, 39
Walenn' vide Valeines.
Walensis vide Waleys.
Walepol, Alexander de, 1668
Greeia uxor Alexandri de, 1668
Johannes de, 1:258
Walerico, S., Valerico, S., Albreda uxor Widonis de, 1607
Hemricus de, 1587
Regimaldus de, 1108
Wido de, 1607
Walerand', Johannes, 716, 936
Walerande, Johannes, 1697
Waleranen, Willehus, 699

Waleshale, Eua filia Warini de, 1733
Warinus de, 1733
Willelmus de, 1733
Walesham, Prior de, I810
Sadulfus de, 1159, 16e6
Willemus de, 639
Waletona, Agnes de, 1819
Paganus de, $!23$
Ricardus filius Agnetis de, $1 \times 19$
Waleys, le, Walensis, Adam, 834
Agnes uxor Aile, 83!
Johannes, 150. 1:311
Mabilia nxor Walteri, 1130
Nicholatus, 644
Reinerus, 80
Robertus filius Willelmi, 1630
Rorerus, 644
Walterus, 1130, 1940
Willemmac, I36, 1630
Walletorta ride Valle Torta.
Wallingfordia, Prior de, 1126
Wallinham, Prior de, 75s
Wallop', Matheus de, 1315
Walsingeham, Prior de, 1238
Waltham ride Watham.
Wanetinge, Nieholaus filius Roberti de, 491
Robertus de, 491
Wantona, Johannes de, 39, 126
Wiara, Alicia uxor Ricardi de, 52s
Ricardus de, 528
Waranua, Gundreda de, 112s
Waranne, Contes, 1272
Warehilla, Margareta uxor Roberti de, 1040
Robertus de, 1040
Warda, Willehmus ie, 1962
Wardena, Abbas de, 141, 10sis
Warderoba, Joscelinus de la, 29, 14~7
Wardona, Abbas de, gst
Walterus de, 1606
Ware, Dauid la, 42.5
Johannes la, 425
Jordanus la, 4.2.5
Rogerns de, $49^{2}$
Waredona, Abbas de, 12ix
Warenna, Beatricia filia Willelmi de, 168i;

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Warenna, Reginaldus de, 1686
Willemus de, 1243, 1686
Warenne, Comes, $10,26,194,222$, $244,245,248,261,694,695,806$, 1025, 1117, 1220, 1561, 1685, 1686, 1755, 1838
Matillis uxor Comitis, 261, 694, 695, 1755
Warennie, Comes, 1395
Warewici, Warewyc, Warrewici, Warwici, Comes, 152, 212, 855, 1117, 1584
Comitissa, 513, 1324
Philippa uxor Comitis, 1584
Warewyc vide Warewici.
Warham, Eustachia usor Huberti de, 1058
Hubertus de, 1058
Thomas de, 1312
Warnecham, Thomas de, 1385
Warrewici vide Warewici.
Warwel, Fulky, 34
Hugo filius de Fulky, $3 \pm$
Warwici vide Warewici.
Wascelin, Rogerus, 395
Waspail, Heuricus, 530
Osbertus, 530
Robertus, 530
Wassinglegha, Robertus de, 1079
Wastineis, Johannes de, 1636
Waswilla, Robertus de, 1460
Waterdena, Bartholomeus de, 1803
Rogerus filius Bartholomei de, 1803
Waterletere, Galfrilus de, 383
Waterlotere, Alexander, 713
Wateruilla, Hamon de, 1077
Hugo de, 820
Johannes filius Roberti de, 1788
Ricardus de, 772, 820
Robertus de, 1788
Wido de, 117, 286
Willelmus de, 1077
Watfordia, Hugo de, 857
Watham, Waltham, Wautham, Abbas de, 78, 107, 192, 1681
Henricus de, 19
l'rior de, 144

Watham, Waltham, Wautham, Simon de, 366
Wattona, Galfridus de, 256
Johannes de, 821
Prior de, 995
Waude, Ricardus de, 641
Robertus de la, 646
Wanerleia, Abbas de, 1484
Waur', Godefridus de, 20
Waure, Godefridus de, 1706
Wauteby, Philippus de, 546
Wautham vide Watham.
Wautona, Geruasius de, 1324
Willelmus de, 126, 633
Waxtonesham, Alanus de, 1106
Warnerius de, 373
Willelmus de, 1793
Waybrigia, Simon de, 99
Wayte, Jacobus la, 713
Waytescath', Willelmus, 514
Wecheham, Egidius de, 1212
Wedona, Radulfus de, 8, 44
Weduna, Laurencia uxor Radulfi de, 579, 635
Radulfus de, 579, 635
Wehitlegha, Gilebertus de, 242
Weice, Cecilia uxor Ricardi le, 1419
Ricardus le, 1419
Well', Petrus de, 1345
Wellenses Archidiaconi, 407, 411
Wellensis Decanus, 1170
Welles, Robertus de, 243
Walterus de, 1475, 1508
Welletona, Conauus de, 1035
Weltona, Isabella uxor Johannis de, 1076
Johannes de, 1076
Wemge, Eua uxor Ricardi de, 729
Ricardus de, 729
Wendouere, Decanus de, 576
Wendourc, Decanus de, 626
Wenelok vide Wenloc.
Wenhale, Wlenhale, Galfridus de, $168: 3$
Galfridus filius Galfridi de, 1683
Ricardus de, 1683
Wenlac, Prior de, 1758

The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Wenloe, Wenelok, Prior de, 504, 509, 590
Wepstede, Whepstede, Johames de, 1648
Maria filia Johannis de, 1618
Salomon de, 1648
Werdun vide Verdun.
Wermale, Ricardus de, 1435
Werministre, Ricardus de, 742
Wernay, Vernay, Johannes de, 734
Westacra, Prior de, 100
Westacre, Prior de, 83
Westlande, Sibilla de la, 1610
Westmanecota, Walterus de, 970
Westmonasterio, Abbas de, 162 s
Westmund, Willelmus de, 279
Westona, Westuna, Alicia uxor Willelmi de, 1519
Emma filia Swani de, 257
Emma uxor Philippi de, 371
Grecia filia Swani de, 257
Gunilda filia Swani de, 257
Johannes de, 1365
Juliana de, 114!
Matillis tilia Swani de, 257
Petrus filius Willelmi de, 1519
Philippus de, 371
Swanus de, 257
Willelmus de, 1519
Westuna vide Westona.
Westwico, Serlo de, 309
Westwike, Isabella uxor Serlonis de, 1875
Serlo de, 1875
Westwyke, Johannes de, 243
Wetherefeuld, Gilebertus de, 387
Whepstede vide Wepstede.
Whichington vide Hillingtona.
Whilkingtona, Rogerus de, 801
Whitamora, Radulfus de, 95
Whitewurthe, Baldewinus de, 510
Lueia uxor Baldewini de, 510
Whitheued, Johanues, 79
Whithulla, Hugo de, 69
Isabella uxor Hugonis de, 69
Whytestona, Petrus de, 755
Wibitona, Nicholaus de, 901

Wicham, Wiklam, Emma de, 90
Wichacra, Jordanus de, 1319
Wiche vinle Wick.
Wichfordia, Theodorus de, 1516
Wiehtona, Ilugo de, 1726;
Sarra uxor Hugonis de, 1720
Wick, Wiche, Cristina uxor Petri de, $23: 3$
Johanmes de, 23:3
Petrus de, 23:3
Widewurthe, Willelmus de, 307
Wifaude, lobertus de la, 12:30
Wigaunt, Alditha uxor Willelni, G17
Willelmus, 617
Wigchale, Johannes de, 16 z
Wigenhale, Adam de, 11s1
Agnes de, $11 \$ 1$
Alanus de, 11s1
Nicholaus tilius Alani de, 1181
Willelmus de, 1175
Wigentona, Odardus de, 1270
Wigge, Randulfus, 428
Wiggemore, Abbas de, 075
Wigornenses Episcopi, 20!, 412, 813, $1027,1273,13 \div 7,1402$
Wigornensis Archidiacouls, 39
Wigornia, Willelmus cie, Јょ
Wika vide Wyka.
Wike vide Wyka.
Wikelawe, Ricarlus de, 20
Wikes, Robertus de, 1920
Wikham vide Wicham.
Wilde, Ricardus le, 616
Wildeker, Walterns de, tis.
Wileford, Ricardus de, 20z
Wileghby, liadulfus de, fiz
Wilegheby, Maria nxur Iingeri de, 1418
logerus de, 1418
Wilelegha, Cristiaua de, 1113
Wiletona, Wyletona, Nicholaus de, 51
Wililegha, Amicia uxor Willchmi de, 1113
Willelmus de, 1413
Wilintona, liadulfus de, 112 , Mi9
Willefordia, Emelina de, 742

## The numbers refer to the cases not to the pages.

Willefordia, Johannes de, 742
Willega, Willeye, Wylegha, Johanna de, 392
Johanna uxor Roberti de, 224
Ricardus de, 392
Robertus de, 224
Willelmus, Comes, 363, 375, 567, $752,854,964,1127,1235,1273$, $1306,1349,1405,1561,1567$, 1574, 1685, 1686, 1755
Ela uxor Comitis, 363, 1235
Willelmus, Rex Anglie, 102, 145
Willeye vide Willegha.
Willingtona, Radulfus de, 857
Robertus de, 1766
Wilmecota, Galfridus de, 1324
Radulfus de, 1324
Willelmus filius Radulfi de, 1324
Wilne, Alanus filius Thome de, 25
Thomas de, 25
Wilt', Walterus de, 1145
Wiltona, Abbatissa de, 906, 1698
Wimbeldona, Cristina uxor Ricardi de, 73
Ricardus de, 73
Wimberuilla, Eustachia uxor Rogeri de, 450
Rogerus de, 450, 856
Winchelese, Paulinus de, 397
Wimundeleia, Prior de, 1665
Winde, Adain, App. 3
Alicia uxor Ade, App. 3
Windesore, Willelmus de, 161
Windesores, Wyndesores, Andreas filius Johannis de, 868
Constabularius de, 824
Hugo de, 106, 437
Johannes de, 868
Ricardus de, 294
Willelmus de, 528, 1038
Winelegha, Walterus de, 1314
Winellega, Johannes de, 3:38
Wingham, Hugo de, 151
Winterburnia, (iilebertus de, 372,434
Jacobus de, 1134
Nicholaa uxor Gilcberti de, 372, 431

Wintercumba, Beatricia uxor Willelmi de, 586
Willelmus de, 586
Wintereshulla, Henricus de, 679
Winteringeham, Galfridus de, 1785
Wintertona, Beatricia uxor Willelmi de, 640
Willelmus de, 640
Winteshulle, Henricus de, 25 6
Wintewurthe, Robertus de, 26
Wintonia, Walterus de, 136
Wintonie, Comitissa, 492, 529
Wintonienses Episcopi, 15, 92, 247, $276,324,395,647,699,715,928$, $1570,1594,1689,1761,1764$
Wintoniensis Archidiaconus, 276
Wintringborn' vide Wyteringburn.
Wirmecota, Willelmus de, 1324
Wircsop, Prior de, 552
Wischarde, Hugo, 1442
Wistenestona, Johannes de, 526
Witeby, Abbas de, 1676
Witefeldia, Henricus de, 1303
Witelegha, Radulfus de, 1715
Witenesse, Amicia uxor Henrici de, 1629
Henricus de, 1629
Witherdale, Alanus de, 698
Withewrthe ride Wythewrthe.
Withrenwike, Amicia de, 1879
Nicholaus filius Amicie de, 1879
Witintona, Henricus de, 915
Wittona, Prior de, I
Wlenhale ride Wenhale.
Wlfrid', Amicia uxor Ricardi de, 934
Ricardus de, 934
Whie, Philippus de, 1665
Wlsintona, Felicia uxor Ricardi de, 1002
Ricartus de, 1002
Simon de, 1002
Wlurichestona, Stephanus de, 1587
Wlwico, Dauid de, 1776
Wor, Hobbe, 514
Wodefordia, Thomas de, 1681
Wodetona, Galfridus de, 1473

The numbers refier to the cases mot to the pate's.

Wolautona, Cecilia uxor Walteri de. ! 34

Walterus de, 931
Wordum ride Verdun.
Wrachesham, Osbertus de, 207
Wridewella, Alexander de, $\mathrm{N}: 1$
Wrockeshale, Priorissa de, 594
Wroteham, Willelmus de, !31, 133:!
Wrthe, Henricus de, 9.77, 1034
Wuburnia, Abbas de, 633
Wude' urg, Prior de, 578
Wudecota, Heuricus de, 15
Wudetona, Robertus de, 675
Wulewardia, Wtulward, Robertus de, 1052
Wultertona, Walterus de, $1 \times 18$
Willelmus de, 181 s
Wuluelegha, Isabella de, 18t3, 1864
Wulward ride Wulewardia.
Wuttona, Amicabilis de, lith
Wyauilla, Godehut uxor Ricardi de, 452
Ricardus de, 452
Wydiho, Agnes uxor Ricardi de, 466
Ricardus de, 466
Wydingdona, Radulfus de, 285
Wygge, Robertus, 478
Wyk, Agnes filia Nicholai de la, 643
Matillis uxor Nicholai de la, $6 \pm 3$
Muriella filia Nicholai de la, 643
Nicholaus de la, 643
Wyka, Wika, Wike, Alicia filia Ricardj de, 1070
Johannes de la, 174!
Petronilla nxor Johannis de la, 1749
Ricardus de, 1070, 1229
Robertus de la, 662
Thomas de, 1749

Wyka, Wika, Wikt, Waltorus du. 1070
Wyke, Willelmus de, 7bit
Wrkenhale, Alam de, 117 ;
Wylburlam, lobertus de, 167:
Wylebs, Robertus de, 1416
Wyleghar ride Willegha.
Wyletona ride Wiletona.
Wylingtona, Nicholaus de, gen
Wymbisst, Robertus de, $2 \mathrm{l}: 3$
Wymer, Willehmus, 479
Wymund; Petrus, 755
Wymumdeham, Wymundeshan, I'rior de, 321, !997
Wymundesham vide Wymunteham.
Wyndeby, Philippus de, 273
Wyndeham, Alam de, 843
Wyndeshores, Willehmus de, $12 \times 7$
Wyndesores ride Windesores.
Wyuelegha, I'etronilla de, 6if
Wyredebrria, Alicia uxor Willehmi de, 52 s
Willelmus de, 52s
Wyrham, Walterus de, !s,
Wyteby, Abbas de, 1ssif
Wyteri, Rogerus, 514
Wyteringburn', Wintringborn', Willehmus te, 262
Wythewrthe, Withewrthe, Fulco de, 1234
Willelmus de, 123.t

Yellestede, Robertus, 476
Yep, Alicia filia Roberti, 19.5 ;
liobertus, 19.56

Zuche, Hogerus la, 11s.3
Zusche, lagenus de la, bitit
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$\therefore$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The numbers in the first column of this Tatle show the chronulogical order of the l'leas in the Betuch.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Editor of the Athenacum has very kindly consented to this letter being here reprinted.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ sce below, p. 53.
    2 Not a Patent Foll, but a Roll of Exchequer Memoranda; see below, p. $\%$.

[^3]:    1 This happens but once and only one new case is copied (Case 1293). I do not think it probable that all the cases cited by Bracton were once in this book. Sce below, pp. 77-s0.
    $\because$ See below, p. 89. ${ }^{3}$ see below. p. 8!.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See below, p. 91. The year is compared to a snake, not to a bird.
    2 This refers to Case 1290, in which some hypothetical pleadings in a mort d'ancestor are discussed. Bracton does not deal with the exact point which they raise. See below, p. 91.
    ${ }^{3}$ Sce below, p. 100.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ See below, p. 102. 2 See below, p. 101.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Corr. 1257. See below, p. 38, note 7.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Glanvill, Prologus.
    $\because$ Br. f. 107.
    : Br. f. J b.
    4 Wright, Political Songs (Camden Society), 1. 100 .

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. Chron. Maj. (ed. Luard) ${ }^{2}$ Co. Lit, 89 a vol. 3, 1. 190.

[^9]:    1 Br. f. 438 b.
    2 The Old Natura Brevium (f. 122 b) ascribes to him the Quare riecit infra terminum as to which see $\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{r}}$. f. i2en. See also the contry in liot. ('l. vol. 1, p. 3: b, which makes the wit of cutry sur disseixil a writ

[^10]:    of course. The whole system of writs of entry was rapidly developed wihout legrislation.
    ${ }^{3}$ Mat. Par. vol. 6, p. 363; Ann. Buton. (Ann. Monast. vol. 1), 1). 414.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Browning. The Fitug and the Book.

[^12]:    1 When I wrote the above I had not rat read Mr Scrutton's carefinl estinate of Bracton's debt to the
    civilians (Roman Letc in England, pp. $79-121$ ), which seems to me ver: just.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ It will be necessary to deal in dates and, as the original documents usually refer to the regnal years, it will be well to remember that Henry III. was crowned on 28 Oct. 1216. Thus Easter Term A. R. $3=$ Easter Term 1219, and a case de Termino s. Michaelis A. R. $10^{\circ}$ incipiente $11^{\circ}$ is a case from Michaelmas Term A.D. 1226.
    ${ }^{2}$ I must acknowledge in a general

[^14]:    1 See the aecount of Minehead in Murray's Guide to Somersetshire; Collinson, History of Somersetshire, vol. 2, p. 31; Notes and Queries, 3rd Series, vol. 9, p. 298.
    ${ }^{2}$ Monasticon, vol. 6, p. 1097.
    ${ }^{3}$ Twiss, vol. 2, p. lxviii.

[^15]:    ${ }^{4}$ liot. Parl. vol. 1, p. 3.
    ${ }^{5}$ By the kindness of Mr Hampshire the Librarian of the Cathedral I have been allowed a copy of the conveyance whieh is still among the title deeds of the Chapter.
    ${ }_{6} \mathrm{Br}$. i. 2, 1116.

[^16]:    i See Bracton's two Assize Rolls, known as Coram Rege Rolls, No. 90 and 96.
    ${ }^{2}$ Le Neve's Fasti, ed. Hardy, vol. 1, p. 414.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ibid. p. 417, 409.
    ${ }^{4}$ Ibid. p. 405.
    ${ }^{5}$ Ihid. p. 417.
    ${ }^{6}$ Ibid. p. 417; Twiss, vol. 2, 11.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ Out of several thousand fines 1 have seen less than a dozen levied coram ipso rege.
    ${ }^{2}$ Rot. Cl. 29 H. 3, m. 8 d; Rot. Cl. 30 H. 3, m. 8 d; Feet of Fines for Derbyshire; Feet of Fines for Yorkshire, 25 to 30 Hen. 3, No. 251 ; see also Tower Assize Roll, No. 10.
    ${ }^{3}$ Rot. Cl. 44 H. 3, m. 18 d.
    ${ }^{4}$ 'The first entry that I have seen is dated 12 Feb. 1248, Rot. I'at. 32

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ MS. Harl. 391, f. 71.
    ${ }^{2}$ Feet of Fines, Divers Counties, No. 208. A hole after the word tricesimo makes the exact date doubtful.
    ${ }^{3}$ Divers Counties, No. 339.
    ${ }^{4}$ Issue Rolls of the Excherquer (Fecord Commission), p. B3.

[^19]:    ${ }^{5}$ Placitorum Abbreviatio, p. 131.
    ${ }^{6}$ Rot. Pat. 39 Hen. 3, m. 3 d; Foed. vol. 1, p. 320.
    ${ }^{7}$ Rot. Pat. 38 H. 3, m. 2. (MS. Ind.)
    ${ }^{8}$ Rot. Cl. 37 H. 3, m. 3; Rot. Cl. 40 H. 3, m. 6. (MS. Ind.)
    ${ }^{9}$ Mat. Par. (ed. Luard), vol. 6, pp. $330,331,317,318$.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rot. Cl. 51 H. 3, m. 10 d. Isti assignati sunt ad querelas exheredatormm audiendas. Bishop of St Davids, Heury of Bratton, Riehard of Middleton, Abbot of Tintern, Robert Neville, Eustace Baliol, Roger Sumery, Alan de la Zouche, William of S. Adomar, Adam of Gesemuth, Simon of Crey.
    ${ }^{2}$ It has been thought that he may have borne the title of chief justice during the interval between the death of the Barons' Justiejar Hugh le Despenser at the lattle of Evesham, 4 Aug. 1265, and the appointment, 8 March, 12tS (Rot. Pat. 5: H. 3, m.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rot. Fin. 19 H. 3. in. 7. (Excerpta, vol. 2, pp. $421-2$. )

    - Rishamer's Chronicle (Rolls Series), p. 28.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 5, pp. 211, 317.
    ${ }^{2}$ Rot. Cl. 44 H. 3, m. 18 d. 28 th Nov. This commission is enrolled very near the cclebrated Provisions. It is for an eyre of a very special character and gives valuable information as to the causes of the great crisis. Rishanger (Rolls Series, p. 5) reports that in 1260 the justices in cyre were repulsed from Hereford, because, according to the great men of the county, the eyre was contrary to the Provisions of Oxford. This

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ See above p. 22.
    ${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 108.
    ${ }^{3}$ Hist. Exch. vol. 2, p. 257.
    ${ }^{4}$ Exchequer Memoranda, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, 42 Hen.

[^24]:    1 The most elaborately annotated versions that I have seen are the two Cambridge MSS. CA, CB.
    2 MH and OC are good specimens of MSS. which show Addiciones; but

[^25]:    1 Observe that the judges are not to pronounce the king's charter void. This seems directed against the use of the non obstante clause, one of the great grievances of the time. The text which hitherto has been very submissive to the king, allowing him to say that his charter means anything or nothing, now begins to turn agrinst him. 'Ther following sentence

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ MS. Dd. vii. 6, folio 4 dors. according to a pencil pagination of the liracton. This is the Ms. used by

    Mr Nichols in his edition of Britton and described hy him, vol. 1, p. lx. fol.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ MA (the Royal MS.), MI, MM, MN, CC, and the Chomely MS. at Lincoln's Inn.

    2 MB.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{OC}$.
    ${ }^{4}$ In MF, MH, MK, OC, CA, and the Hobhouse at Lincoln's Inn the passage De cartis vero regiis et factis regum non debent.........procedatur ad judicium, comes after Item nec factum regis......stridor dentium.
    ${ }^{5}$ Fleta, f. 17.
    ${ }_{7}^{6}$ Nichols, Britton, vol. 1, p. xxvj.
    ${ }^{7}$ Attention may here be called to
    Case 1108. A strong statement of the principle that the king cannot be sued is enrolled as part of the judgment of the court; Dominus Rex non potest summoneri nec preceptum sumere $a b$ aliquo cum non habeat superiorem se in regoo sno. This is very contrary to the old fable, as Bacon called it (Works, ed. Spedding, vol. 7, p. 694), about Praecipe Hemrico Regi, in which perhaps some still believe. See Allen, Royal Prerogative, Authorities, p. xxxij and Stubbs, Const. Hist. vol. 2, p. 238.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 141 b ; et est ratio assignata infra de civilibus actionibus de duello vadiando pro terra. See also f. 331; sicut infra de duellis.
    ${ }_{2}$ Br. f. 7 ; infra plus de hac materia de placito de nativis et fugitivis, qualiter revocantur in servitutem qui sunt extra potestatem dominorum et in fuga.
    ${ }^{3}$ br. f. 60 ; sed quia sucemritur

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br.f. 412 b.
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. 49.
    $=$ Br. f. 18 b .

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br.f.34. $\quad 2$ Br. f. jb, je, 107. $171 \mathrm{~b}, 36 \mathrm{sb}, 412$.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 413. Some MSS. give A.r. 31), and ascribe it to an eyre of William Raleigh; this must be wrong; many other MSS. cite from the eyre of Thurkelby in A.r. 29 ; Bracton was with him on this eyre. A few, in particular OA, have not the citation. It may be an interpolation.
    ${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 414, Ablot of Glastonbury and Bishop of Tiath, some MSS. give A.k. 30 some 31 ; Br. 114, 41.1 b , Reter of Saroy and Abbot of Rieranlx, some MSS. rive A.r. 30, some 31.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .234 \mathrm{~b}$, Simon of Vendenge aud Jorden de LiIsle. This is in 0 A.
    ${ }^{4}$ Ibr. f. 241. IV. Bardolf. This is in 0 A .
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. 3t8. R. Sigutorl. This is in O. 1 .
    ${ }^{6}$ Hr. f. 33! b) A case to which.

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ Reyne v. Shute, Br. f. 49 b ; Coram Rege Roll, No. 96, m. 3.

    2 Thus the ease of Godfrey of Crawcombe, Br. f. 29, is omittel in many MSS.; the case before Lexington at Clarendon, Br. f. 4., is not in OA or MI ; Henry Tracy's case, Br. f. ss b , is in the margin of OA and OB and is not in MI; the case of the man of Cookham, Br. f. 114 b , is in the margin of OA and is not in MF or Ml ; the case of Thomas de Vipont, Br. f. $19 \pm \mathrm{b}$, is omitted in several MSS.; so is the case of S. Mary,

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ Coram Rege Roll, No. 96, m. 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ Ibid. m. 10.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ego talis animum erexi ad retera judicia justorum perscrutanda diligenter non sine vigilis et labore, Br .

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 367.
    ${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 298,415 b, 427 b, 428 b.
    ${ }^{3}$ Thus Prov. West. c. 14, prohibiting gifts in mortmain without the lord's consent is inconsistent with much that Bracton says; see es.

[^35]:    pecially f. 169 b . Prov. West. c. 15 declaring that the essoinee need not warrant the essoin by oath is contrary to what is said on f. 352.

    + Br. f. 13.\%.

[^36]:    1 Prov. West. e. 22.
    2 Prov. West. e. ! 10.
    ${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 285.
    ${ }^{4}$ This is of interest as showing some sympathy with the smaller landowners who procured the Provisions. The same leaning is betated by the vigrorous argument in

[^37]:    favour of free alienation without the lord's consent; see f. 45 b.
    ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .359-60$; see also f. 344 b .
    ${ }^{6}$ Note Book, Case 1291.
    7 The Statutum de Bissextili in the common editions of the Statutes.

[^38]:    1 Statutes of the Realm, vol. 1 , 1. 7.
    $\because$ Rot. Cl. 10 H. 3, m. 12 a.
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. 47.
    ${ }^{4}$ Mat. Par. vol. 5, P. t01, (j40: vol. 6, 1. 311.

[^39]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 5, pp. 111, 112.
    2 Ibid. p. 201.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ibid. pp. 347, 432, 457.
    4 As before noted (p. 27) the great
    mass of MS. is descended from one into whieh an interpolation had been made after 1275.

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hardy's Le Neve, vol. 2, pp. 308, 482.

    2 Royal Letters, Henry III. vol. 1, p. 342 .
    ${ }^{3}$ That he died in 1229 is beyond all doubt. It is a fact attested by several first-rate chronicles. See

    Mat. Par. Chron. Maj. vol. 3, p. 190 ; Annales Monastici, vol. 1, p. 73 (Tewkesbury) ; vol. 3, p. 115 (Dunstaple) ; vol. 4, p. 421 (Worcester); Annales Londonienses, vol. 1, p. 28. But Sir Travers Twiss (vol. 1, pp. sir-xv) has attempted to keep, him

[^41]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 3, p. 494.
    ${ }^{2}$ Mat. Par. vol. 4, pp. 359, 360.
    ${ }^{3}$ Mat. Par. vol. 4, p: 362 ; Stubbs, Const. Hist. vol. 2, p. 62.
    ${ }^{4}$ Mat. Par. vol. 4, p. 590 ; vol. 5, pp. 1,58, 94.
    $\overline{\text { à Mat. Par. vol. 5, pp. } 96,117,179 .}$

[^42]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mat. Par. vol. 3, p. 617.
    ${ }^{2}$ For an estimate of Raleigh's character, see Stubbs, Const. Hist. vol. 2, p. 302.
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. $42 \mathscr{2}$ b.
    ${ }^{4}$ Br. f. 50. Most MSS. have here Simonis or S. but M. occasionally appears and may be the right reading.

[^43]:    date is wrong.
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. 286 b, 418.
    4 1ir. f. 45.
    ${ }^{5}$ Br. f. 292 b.
    ${ }^{6}$ Br. f. 293 b . As to Engelard's adventures see Pleas of the Croum, Gloucester, 1221, Introduction, p. xiij. 7 Mat. l'ar. vol. 3, p. 187.

[^44]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .35 \mathrm{~b}$; about petty serjeanty; the passage seems to be an interpolation, and the author's own opinion is left in much doubt.
    ${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 438; curtesy of second husband. Sce Case 1182.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Br}$. f. 130 b ; forfeiture of wife's inheritance by husband's felony.
    ${ }^{4}$ On f. 16 b a case is cited from an eyre of Segrave in Kent, but the judgment was given at Westminster,

[^45]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 413 ; as to this case from an eyre of Thurkelby see above p. 49 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Rot. Cl. vol. I, p. 380 b.
    $:$ Iiot. Cl. vol. 2, p. 205 b, 213.

[^46]:    

[^47]:    $\qquad$

[^48]:    $\qquad$

[^49]:    $\qquad$

[^50]:    $\qquad$

[^51]:    ${ }^{1}$ It may be also that a case begun before the king might be sent before the Bench and vice versa, see Cases 1107, 1116.
    ${ }^{2}$ See especially Br. f. 108. Also Abbrev. Placit. p. 107 (Surrey), p.

[^52]:    119 (Kent), cases stayed because the king was not present; also Case 1182.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Cases 1108, 1133, 1172, 1189, $1190,1220,1221,1227,1235,1273$.

    + See Cases 1117, 1215, 1217.

[^53]:    ${ }^{1}$ The printed text, f. 241 b , has one such ease from A. r. 16 ; but I have seen thirteen MSS. whieh give A. R. 18 , not one which gives any other date.
    ${ }^{2}$ Sce Cases 12, 67, 73, 81, 167, $354,741,743,857,1306$.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Cases 258, 268, 339, 393, 986, 1551.

    4 Already in 1226 he ordered that

[^54]:    ${ }^{1}$ I find that, without knowing it, I have come to the same conclusion as Dugdale, who about this time begins to divide the judges into two classes. Mr Foss (vol. 2, p. 182), who does not appear to have looked at any plea rolls, dissents, and rightly if he only means to deny that there were two permanently constituted
    bodies of judges with different titles. But from this time at latest there were pleas before the king and pleas in the Bench, judges with the king and judges at the Bench, and the same judge was not in two places at once.
    ${ }^{2}$ Note Book, Case 836.
    ${ }_{3}$ Br. f. 230 b.

[^55]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Mr}$ Foss (Judges, vol. 2, p. 449) says that there is no evidence of Raleigh having acted as a judge after A. R. 19 (A. D. 1234-5). This is a mistake due I think to the fact that, as Raleigh was going about with the king, he did not usually sit on the Bench or take part in the ordinary assize work. But see Br. f. 169 b ; a case before Raleigh in A. 12. 23. See also this Note Book vol. 2, 1p. 165, 167, 208, 228, 255.

[^56]:    He seems to have been doing justice until very shortly before his consecration in Septr. 1239. Bracton cites but a single case from A. r. 24. Raleigh's consecration took place just before the beginning of that regnal rear. But some at least of these Coram Rege Rolls do not exactly cover a regnal year; they begin some months earlier. The roll for A. r. 24 I have not found.

[^57]:    1 John Holmes of East Retford published at intervals between 1828 and 1840 a catalogue of his large collection of printed books; but this

[^58]:    does not comprise MSS. His library was, as I gather from his Preface, the outcome of purchases made by him.

[^59]:    ${ }^{1}$ Dr. f. 352 b : Cases, 70. 149, 1411, 1455.

[^60]:    ${ }^{1}$ In many cases the milde of the line springs out of what seems a rudely drawn capital N. standing perhaps for Nota. Marks of a similar kind are, I believe, often found in MSS. from which transcripts have been made, and are the work of the

[^61]:    ${ }^{1}$ Case 1661.
    : Some cases are markcd with the

[^62]:    word Volo ; but I have not been able to connect this with the Note Book.

[^63]:    ${ }^{1}$ Appendix to rol. 3. C'ase 8; $\quad$ Assize Folls, M. 6, 31. 1. Case 1111.

[^64]:    ${ }^{1}$ Tower Poll, No. 1. See Br. f. egs: this case is on the roll.

[^65]:    ${ }^{1}$ See the letters of 26 th Jan. 19 in Fondera, vol. l. p. 154.

    Pleas of the Crown for the County of
    a I have spoken of this eyre in

[^66]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rot. Cl. vol. 2, p. 151.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ibid. p. 219.
    2 Note Book, vol. 1, r. 193.
    ${ }^{4}$ Fot. Cl. vol. 2, 1. 213.

[^67]:    ${ }^{1}$ For details see the Table of Bracton's eitations at the end of this

[^68]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cases 1291, 1292.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ann. Monast. vol. 1, p. 375.
    2 Se above 1. 42 .

[^69]:    ${ }^{1}$ See above p. 64.
    $\because$ Cases 1409, 1881, 1975.

[^70]:    ${ }^{1}$ In my note rol. 1, p. 159 I have called him Brewer. I must beg his pardon. He was of Norman fumily and the lull form of his name was

[^71]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 205.
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. 199 b.
    2 Case 530 .
    ${ }^{4}$ Cases 70, 88.

[^72]:    ${ }^{1}$ Case 360.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Er} . \mathrm{f} .382$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Br. f. 226, 226 b.

[^73]:    ${ }^{1}$ Case 748. The Alicia de Warr Aller. The mistake is one easy to of Bracton's text should be flicia le make.

[^74]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Holmes, Common Lav, p. 394 and the cases there cited, viz. Y. B. 20. Ed. i. 360 ; Y. B. 32 and 33. Ed. i. 516. See also Fitz. Voucher, 292 (28 Ed. i.) and Co. Lit. 102 b: "If a ". man give lands in fee and bind " certaine lands specially to warranty,

[^75]:    "the person of the feoffor is hereby "bount, and not the land, unlesse "he lath it at the time of the "voncher."
    " Br. f. 96.
    ${ }^{3}$ Case 1409.

[^76]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. f. 359 ; Case 1291 ; see also = Case 1290 . Lx.f. 314 b .

[^77]:    that the Hokesham family held the hundred of Budleigh; see also ibid. p. 86, 91.
    ${ }^{3}$ See above p. 16.
    ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .88 \mathrm{~b}$. It is in the margin of OA and OB .
    ${ }^{5}$ Coram Rege Roll No. 96.
    ${ }^{6}$ Rot. Pat. 42 Hen. 3. m. 17 d. (MS. Ind.)
    ? Coram Rege Ioll No. 90. m. 11 d.

[^78]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rot. Pat. 46. Hen. 3. m. 5 d. (MS. Ind.)
    $\because$ Excerpt. Rot. Fin. vol. 2. p. 458.
    3 The demurrer of the parol for

[^79]:    ${ }^{1}$ The passage begins on f. 269 b., line 24 , with 'Et iden cum per talem' and ends on f. 270 , line 2 , with
    'Rogerum de warantiu.'
    ${ }^{2}$ Rot. Pat. 14 Hen. 3, n. 12 d. (MS. Ind.)

[^80]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ibid. m. 10 d .
    2 This same Richard Corbyn, or perhaps it was another, seems about this time to hold a good deal of land in Devonshire, the manors of Lampford, Uppacot, Parliham and Belstone, Feet of Fines, Devon, No. 613. A.1. 5t (MS. Ind.) In 1253 Bracton heard an assize for common of pasture at Litlemore in Somerset in

[^81]:    ${ }^{1}$ Lysons, vol. 3, p. csix.
    ${ }_{2}$ Feet of Fines, Cornwall, 44 Hen. 3, No, 2; 46 Hen. 3, No. 5.
    ${ }^{3}$ Coram Rege Roll, No. 96, m. 1 ; Rot. Pat. 41 Hen. 3, m. $7 \mathrm{~d} ., 42$ Hen. 3, m. 2 d. (MS. Ind.)

[^82]:    ${ }^{4}$ MS. Digby, 292, f. 98. This folio begins at talis in the last line of f. 206 b . of the printed book, and ends with liberum in the first line of f .208 .
    ${ }^{5}$ f. 129 b.
    ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .29 \%$ b.

[^83]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Maclean, History of Trigg Minor, vol. 1, p. 189 , vol. 2, p. 15世, and the index of that valuable book.
    2 Case 316.
    3 Cases 1203, 1267.
    ${ }^{4}$ Excerpta e Rot. Fin. vol. 2, p. 577.
    ${ }^{5}$ liot. Pat. 42 Hen. 3, m. 15 d; 46 Hen. 3, m. 16 d. (Nis. Ind.)
    ${ }^{6}$ Case 269.

[^84]:    ${ }^{1}$ Feet of Fines, Cornwall, 22 Hen. 3, No. 3 and 7.
    ${ }^{2}$ Coram Rege Roll, No. 96, m. 8.
    ${ }^{3}$ Coram Rege lioll, No. 90, m. 5 d.
    ${ }^{4}$ Rot. Pat. 46 Hen. 3, m. 12 d . (MS. Ind.)
    ${ }_{5}$ Case 1904.
    ${ }^{6}$ Polwhele, Deconshire, vol. 2, p. 409 note.
    © Risdon, Heronshire, vol. 1, p. 117.
    ${ }^{8}$ Exeerpt. Rot. Fin. vol. 2, p. 83.
    ${ }^{9}$ Case 833 .
    ${ }^{10}$ Lysons, vol. B, p. 246.
    ${ }^{11}$ Coran Rege Foll, No. 96, m. 1d,
    $6,10 \mathrm{~d}, 13 \mathrm{~d}$.
    1: Coram liege Roll, No. $90, \mathrm{~m} .10 \mathrm{~d}$. ${ }^{13}$ Cuse 1881 .

[^85]:    ${ }^{1}$ Feet of Fines, Devon, Hen. 3, 423. No. 492.
    ${ }^{2}$ Rot. Pat. 43 Hen. 3, m. 13 d. (MS. Index.)

    * See above p. 16.
    ${ }^{5}$ Case 1237.
    ${ }^{3}$ Excerpt. Fot. Fin. vol. 2, p.

[^86]:    ${ }^{1}$ Statutes of the Fiealm, vol. 1, p. 1.

[^87]:    1 Statutes of the Realm, vol. 1, - Mat. Par. vol. 3, p. 341 p. 4, from Rot. Cl. 20 Hen. 3, m. 18 d .

    2 Mat. Pir. vol. 3, p. 341.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ann. Mon. vol. 1, p. 249.

[^88]:    1 Stututes of the Realm, vol. 1, p. $\quad$ p. 252. 4, from Rot. Pat. 21 Hen. 3, m. IO. ${ }^{3}$ Case I2I7.

[^89]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Grosseteste's Letters, (ed. Luard), 1p. xxxvii. ciit. civ. 76-97, 104.

[^90]:    ${ }^{\text {I }} \mathrm{Br} . \mathrm{f} .96$. I have not found the right date A.n. 20 in any single MS.,

[^91]:    ${ }^{1}$ Printed, it is said, by Pynson in 1514 , then by Wynkyn de Worde (?) in 1516 , then by Tottell in 1565 . I have used the edition of 1565 .
    ${ }^{2}$ I afterwards found that some one

[^92]:    ${ }^{1}$ See above p. 50.

[^93]:    1 The writer of the Cambridge MS. Dd. vi. 39 has observed this. In the cases from Hemry's reign no counsel are named because the cases come

    ## from the record and not from a lear

    Book.? See e.g. the titles Douter. Droyt. Essanti.

[^94]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ser above p. 6is.

[^95]:    ${ }^{1}$ Co. Lit. f. : 00 b .

[^96]:    ' Blackstone believed that pleas were enrolled in French until the reign of Edward the Third. Clearer
    proof that he never saw a plea roll of earlier date there could not be. Bl. Com, vol. 3 , pp. $317,319$.

[^97]:    ${ }^{1}$ See the questionable story in Hallam, Hist. Lit. vol. 1, ch. 1. § 75.

    - Dom. Hyacinthus de Archangelis,
    in Browning, The Ring and the Book, lines 150 -3.

[^98]:    ${ }^{1}$ Case $857 . \quad 4$ Case 1221.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cases 741, 750, 770, 1108, 1111, 1113, 1124, 1136, 1141.
    ${ }^{3}$ Case 1219: compare Stubbs, Const. Hist. vol. 2, p. 31, note 1.

[^99]:    ${ }^{1}$ Case 1235 ; see Mat. Par. vol. 4, p. 630. A striking application of the rule, that without words of inheritance no fee can be created.
    $\because$ Cases 85, 1512, 1663.
    ${ }^{3}$ Case 102.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cases $1492-3-5$ ete.

[^100]:    dred, etc.
    ${ }^{5}$ Charters of 1215 , sec. $18 ; 1216$, sec. $13 ; 1217$, sec. $13,14,15$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Index, Nisi Prius.

[^101]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is plain that for one reason and another, many assizes of novel disseisin and mort d'ancestor were taken at Westminster, despite the charter; see Case 1478.

    2 Case 1115.
    ${ }^{3}$ Case 824.
    ${ }^{4}$ Index, Lau. I'arfer of.
    s Index, siuit.
    "As to "trial by witnerses" see

[^102]:    Blackstone, Com. vol. B, p. 336, and the valuable remarks in Brunner, Entstehung dor Sichurgerichte, ple. 432-3.
    ${ }^{7}$ Index, Parol, Nude. The cases, as it seems to me, go far to support the theory of Mr Justice Holmes as to the origin of the doetrine of 'consideration'. The Common Lare, 1. 257 lol.

[^103]:    ${ }^{1}$ Index, Scals, Collation of. $\quad$ Case 753.
    ${ }^{2}$ Case 1847.
    ${ }^{3}$ Co. Lit. 304 a.
    ${ }^{5}$ Case 147.4

[^104]:    ${ }^{1}$ Case 1338.
    ${ }^{2}$ Case 1644.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Dr Kenny's Essay on Primogeniture, p. 28 fol.
    ${ }^{4}$ So far as I can discover Coke (and when one has said Coke one need not mention later lawyers), had no authority for anything that he
    said about conditional fees older than the statute which changed them into 'estates tail', except only the case which I here print as 61 and which he had from Fitzherbert, Formedon, 64.
    ${ }^{5}$ Index Marriage portion. Estates, Fec conditional. I do not speak of

[^105]:    frank-marriage because not every maritagium is liberum. This tern frank-marriage has been used so as to confuse (as we should now say) the nature of a tenure with the nature of an estate. As to grammar, tenere in maritagium, in dotem etc. are far more common than tenere in maritagio, in dote etc.
    ${ }^{1}$ Glanvill, Lib. 7. c. 1.

    - Case 1054.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{t}, 15 \mathrm{~b}$.
    4 Charter of 1217 , sce. 39. Sce Casp 12 f , the only case which shows

[^106]:    1 The notion that an action is 'real' simply because land can be obtained by it, is not of Bracton's day. He calls the novel disseisin a personal attion: Br. f. 14b b: so tor the groud promillat for common, is

[^107]:    persomal, lir. f. $2 x+b$.
    2 (harters of 1215 , see. :34; 1216 , sec. 27 ; 1217, see. 30 .
    $\therefore$ (ave 101.).
    4 Br.f. 2 ar .
    

[^108]:    1 The whole history of the real actions must be utterly unintelligible to any one who believes with Blackstone (Comm. vol. 3, p. 184) that the writs of entry were older than the assizes. See Brunner, pp. 40. - 7 . Also the Placitorum Abbreviatio.

[^109]:    ${ }^{2}$ Br.f. 306, 306 b. Cases 642, 1142, 1597, 1703.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cases 1683, 1851. See the Article on Early English Equity by Mr Justice Holmes in L. Q. R., vol. 1, p. 162.
    ${ }^{3}$ Br. f. 31.

[^110]:    1 have not observed any fines for this term ; Pateshull began an cyre in the western counties on the morrow of Trinity.

[^111]:    ${ }^{1}$ I have found no tines in the Beneh of these terms. A sreat eyre was going on.

[^112]:    ${ }^{1}$ The case on f． 226 apparently of this term hehors to Trin．A．k．13．

[^113]:    1 I have seen no tines of this term.

[^114]:     cited from a.k. viij, but in some Msis from A.k. xlij. The citatinn on f. $2+1 \mathrm{~b}$ is to prebendal churches is in the printed bork from A.k. Avj, but in all Msis that I have sem from a.r. x viij.

[^115]:    ${ }^{1}$ The ease is cited without any year heing mentioned. I can mot timl that l'atoshull visitel Sorfolk in A. R. 9, but the commissions of that yat are the only zemoral commissions of assize and gat delivery that 1 can find. Bractom's mote of citimg implies that the case is not from an eyread onmia nacita.

    2 Cited from Leicester, but this must be a mistake.

[^116]:    1 Wrongly attributed to A.r. 12.
    2 Wrongly attributed to A.s. 16.
    3 Attributed to A.R. 13.

[^117]:    1 The combty namel is that of the marginal venue. In consulting this Index it should he remembered that the bommaries of connties have in many cases been changed. I have attempted to give in the secome colum the modern names when this could be done without much risk.

