

CHAPTER IV.

THE FEES OF THE HONOUR

It is an unfortunate circumstance that if Conan, earl of Richmond, made a return of his knights' fees in 1166 the return has not survived. But considerable information is available about the early tenants of the honour, the location of their holdings, and the amount of their knight-service. Apart from the names recorded in the Swavesey memorandum,¹ the earliest information is naturally to be found in the Domesday survey. The Yorkshire tenants of count Alan are the subject of a detailed account printed by Farrer in his introduction to the Yorkshire Domesday.² Several references to them will be found in the accounts of the fees in the ensuing chapter. In many cases a continuity of tenure can be traced. From Robert descended the family of Musters; from Picot that of Lascelles; from Wimar the family of Thornton, the tenants of Thornton Steward; from Ribald the lords of Middleham; and from Anschitil the family of Furneaux. Similarly, in Lincolnshire, Eudo, a tenant in 1086 and in the time of the Lindsey survey, was the ancestor of the family of Mumby. Most of the Yorkshire tenants had holdings of the honour in other counties—Robert in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, Picot in Lincolnshire, Wimar and Anschitil in Cambridgeshire and Norfolk, Ribald in Norfolk, Landric in Lincolnshire, and Odo the chamberlain in Cambridgeshire; and the evidence derived from the records of other counties often provides a link for the elucidation of the Yorkshire fees and the descent of their holders.

In addition to the charters of the lords of the honour themselves, which have been printed in Chapter I, there are two early twelfth-century charters which throw light on the tenants. The first is a charter of Osbern de Arches to the abbey of St. Mary, York, giving land in Poppleton and elsewhere, 1100-c. 1116; after Robert de Brus seven of the next eight witnesses can be identified as tenants or officials of count Stephen—Wimar the steward, Odo the chamberlain, Conan the chaplain, Ralph son of Ribald, Roger son of Pigot [de Lascelles], Alan de Munbi, and Alan the butler.³ The second is a charter of archbishop Thomas II to

¹ Charter no. 1 in part i.

² *V.C.H. Yorks.*, ii, pp. 156-60, where the descents of several of the fees are indicated. See also the notes by A. S. Ellis on the Domesday under-tenants in *Y.A.J.*, v, 289 *et seq.*

³ *E.Y.C.*, no. 527. Humphrey de Turp who witnessed before Alan the butler has not been identified. The date given above is that assigned by Farrer; but it is not impossible that the charter was issued during the lifetime of king William II, for the phrase *pro anima domini mei regis Willelmi* does not prove that he was dead, as Farrer may have assumed; see on this point part i, introd., p. xxviii. Some of these witnesses may have been the sons of tenants, and not yet tenants themselves.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05828-5 - Early Yorkshire Charters: Volume 5: The Honour of Richmond, Part II

Edited by William Farrer and Charles Travis Clay

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Herbert the chamberlain, 1108-14, which was witnessed among others by these men of count Stephen, namely, Hermer, Bernard *vicecomes* of Richmond and Piscis his nephew.¹

A useful list of thirteen of the principal tenants of count Stephen in Yorkshire is entered on the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I. This is printed in Table I below. Their fees can all be identified with the exception of that of Hasculf son of Ridiou.

The earliest return of the fees owing the service of castle-guard at Richmond is given in Table II. This includes fees from all parts of the honour, and shows the months during which the service of most of them was due. The year was divided into six periods of two months; and, so far as the details are provided, the number of knights for these periods are 32, 30, 26, 29, 27 and 30, suggesting some measure of equality throughout the year. The total number of knights given in this return is 187½. The Gant fee of four knights in Swaledale, which was created by count Stephen on the marriage of his daughter Maud with Walter de Gant, but which was exempt from the service of castle-guard, is not included; nor, apparently, is the knight's fee in Masham of which count Stephen enfeoffed Nigel d'Aubigny.² The list contains names of men who were living in the time of King Henry I, and no less than nine out of the thirteen Yorkshire tenants living in 1130, given in Table I, are included. But since, for instance, Brian son of Scolland had not succeeded his father in Jan. 1145-6, at which date Roger the steward, who also occurs in the list, had been succeeded by his son Ralph,³ the list must be regarded as a composite compilation, mainly based on the conditions existing in the early part of the twelfth century.

It is this return which forms the basis of Farrer's numbering of the fees from §1 to §59. In his manuscript for *Early Yorkshire Charters* he had begun to assign the charters to their appropriate sections so numbered, and this principle has been followed in the ensuing chapter. Generally speaking he adopted the same series of numbers for the sections of his manuscript for *Honors and Knights' Fees*; but after §59 he added a series of sections numbered §60 to §90, which deal principally with the demesne lands of the honour throughout England and the new feoffments. The available Yorkshire charters for the twelfth century, which relate to the subject-matter of these later sections, have been included for the most part among the charters of the lords of the honour and the charters of the demesne lands in Yorkshire, printed in Chapters I and III of the present work. The chief exceptions are the series of charters relating to the Gant fee of four knights in Swaledale, which is numbered §74 and printed at the end of Chapter V, and the charter relating to West Witton, which is numbered §72.

¹ *E.Y.C.*, no. 25. For Hermer see the Manfield fee, §1D. This is the only known reference to Bernard the sheriff.

² See charter no. 19. The Masham fee had possibly formed part of the 15 knights' fees at which the Steward's fee was originally assessed; see the introduction to §1 in Chapter V.

³ Charter no. 27.

FEES OF THE HONOUR

3

An analysis of the knight-service contained in this return shows that the more important tenants, that is to say, those who provided two knights or more, numbered thirty-three; and the holdings of twenty-one¹ of these included lands in Yorkshire. Sections relating to these twenty-one fees are therefore given in Chapter V, which also contains the smaller fees of any Yorkshire interest. Of the remainder of the larger fees that which constituted §10, six knights, lay in Suffolk, or at any rate the greater part of it, where five knights' fees came to be held by the Brumfeld, and later Meisy, families; the two knights, §13, constituted the Nettlestead fee in Suffolk, and the two knights, §14, the Bigod fee in the same county; the three knights' fees, §15, probably lay in Norfolk,² and the three knights' fees, §22, almost certainly in Wigtoft and Kirton [in Holland], co. Lincoln;³ no suggestion is available for the three knights' fees, §28; the three knights' fees of Aubrey de Vere, §33, lay in Essex and Cambridgeshire; the two knights' fees, §40, at Rigsby, co. Lincoln, and Rolleston, co. Nottingham; the four knights' fees, §43, at Redenhall and Thurning, Norfolk; and the two knights' fees, §54, as stated, in Lincolnshire. A difficulty is raised by the two knights' fees held by Hugh son of Eon, §49. Farrer, who took all his details for this return from the list printed by Gale,⁴ amends Gale's *Hugo filius Conani* to *Hugo filius Gernegan*, and supposed that the holding was the Tanfield fee in Yorkshire. To this solution there are certain objections. In the first place there is no reason to suppose that the name Eon, of which Eudo is the Latin form,⁵ is incorrect; it occurs earlier in the return, §31, where Alan son of Eon is clearly Alan son of Eudo [de Mumby]. In the second place the evidence, especially that which is shown by the later returns (Tables III and IV), the 2½ knights (not two knights), for which a later Hugh son of Gernegan was responsible, had originally formed part of the assessment of the Steward's fee, and like the Manfield fee had become a direct tenure of the honour; the holding was evidently included in the assessment of fifteen knights provided by Roger the steward in the earlier return.⁶ At the same time no alternative suggestion is available for the identification of the fee numbered §49, or of its tenant Hugh son of Eudo.

Chronologically the next collective details⁷ which give information about the tenants of the honour are the payments for sheriff's aid in Richmondshire compiled in 1184 when Conan de

¹ Twenty-two if §44 is included, which is doubtful.

² At Redenhall, as Farrer suggests; but he was uncertain.

³ In Table II they were held by Robert son of Grip, and at a later date by Hugh de Wigtoft in the places named, 'being heir of Grip' (*Cal. Inq. Misc.*, i, no. 521); the place 'Reddie' ('Redicg' in *Red Bk.*, p. 519, being identified in the index as possibly Quadring) is included.

⁴ He did not apparently use the return printed in *Cal. Inq. Misc.*, no. 519. ⁵ *Complete Peerage*, new ed., v, 114.

⁶ See the Tanfield fee, numbered §1A in Chapter V.

⁷ For particular tenants there is much information to be derived from the Pipe Rolls, which often show the date of succession to a tenancy.

Aske had charge of the wapentakes.¹ In most cases they give the payment due from a specified number of carucates in the various vills, and in a smaller number of cases payments from particular fees and tenants. The payments are said to be based on an assessment of 4s. 7d. yearly for each tenmantale unit of fourteen carucates, though in several of the items, especially the smaller ones, the arithmetic is difficult to follow. These details are not concerned with the amount of knight-service from the various fees. They are prefaced by a list of wapentake fines, partly on a geographical, and partly on a personal basis, but it is doubtful whether all the names are those of men actually in possession in 1184;² and they are followed by a list of vills with the carucage assessments, evidently taken from the Domesday survey.

The next return, from the Red Book of the Exchequer, (Table III), which gives the amount of knight-service for which each of the Yorkshire tenants was responsible, is said to have been compiled in 1211-12.³ But an examination of their names suggests that the details relate to a period some years earlier. Thus, Robert son of Ralph (lord of Middleham) was probably not living later than 1188; Alan the constable died in 1201; Richard de Rollos had been succeeded in 1195 by William de Rollos, who lost his English lands in 1204; and Alan son of Brian died between Michaelmas 1187 and 1188. And, as Roger de Lascelles was under age in 1182, and Hugh son of Jernegan succeeded to the Tanfield fee about that year, the return would appear to reproduce the conditions of the tenancies in the closing years of the reign of Henry II or early in that of Richard I.⁴ The total amount of service due from the tenants adds up to a trifle under 66 knights; and a note at the end shows that the service due to the king was 50 knights,⁵ the lord of the honour retaining in his own hand 12 knights of old feoffment, and 2½ of new.

This return may be compared with one compiled on the same basis which is entered in the Registrum.⁶ The latter introduces details of a later date, Roald the constable having succeeded his father Alan in 1201, and several other changes in tenancy having taken place, including Charles in succession to Ranulf de Gosberescherche [Gosberton] at Brignall, which did not occur until the reign of king John. There are certain additions which are not given in the Red Book return (Table III), including

¹ Printed from the Registrum in Gale, pp. 21 *et seq.*

² Thus Brian son of Alan and Alan son of Brian both appear; and Gernegan son of Hugh is included, whereas in the sheriff's aid payments the tenant is Hugh son of Gernegan. ³ *Red Bk.*, p. 575.

⁴ Evidence for these statements will be found in the introductions to their respective fees in Chapter V.

⁵ This *servicium debitum* of 50 knights in Yorkshire is the total in 1210-12 of the fees of the honour held in chief, when the earl of Chester held the bulk of the honour in that county (*Red Bk.*, p. 490).

⁶ Gale, p. 26: 'Feoda Militum in Richemondshire, secundum quod Scutagium debet solvi, tam de novo Feoffamento quam de veteri, secundum Pip. Schaccarii Regis.'

the fee of Hutton Longvillers,¹ $\frac{1}{4}$ fee, and that of Gilbert de Gant in Swaledale, four fees, and among the new feoffments the fee of Barningham, $\frac{1}{4}$ fee, that of Scargill, $\frac{1}{4}$ fee,² and that of Geoffrey de Hengham in Moulton, $\frac{1}{8}$ fee. The total number of fees is given as 68 $\frac{1}{2}$. The return has a further value in giving a much larger number of places where the fees were held, and this assists in checking their identification. With occasional variations the amount of knight-service due from the several fees corresponds closely with the details given in the Red Book return.

Comparing these two returns with the earlier return (Table II), it is possible to allocate the serial number to the majority of entries. The principal change in Yorkshire which had taken place during the twelfth century was the division of that part of the Steward's fee which lay in that county into separate portions, each held directly of the honour. An example of this is the Tanfield fee, already mentioned. As the seven units, as is clear from Table IV, originally formed part of the Steward's fee, and their assessment was included in the fifteen knights for which that fee was originally responsible, the symbols §1A—§1F have been assigned to the six portions newly held of the honour, and the symbol §1 restricted to the portion still held by the descendant of Wimar the steward. The seven sections will be separately considered in Chapter V. Another change was the division of the Constable's fee of thirteen knights, all of which lay in Yorkshire, into two moieties between the Roald and Rollos families; these moieties were to be reunited when William de Rollos lost his English lands in 1204 on the separation of Normandy from England. With regard to the bulk of the smaller fees the chief difficulty is the identification of the heirs of Hervey son of Morinus, who provided 1 $\frac{3}{8}$ knights. The corresponding entry in the Registrum return is 'de feodo Hervei, in Coverham et Aynderby, cum pertinent[ciis], one knight's fee. In both returns Warlaby, of the fee of Hervey³ de Sutton, provided only one knight, whereas in the castle-guard return (Table IV) Warlaby provided two knights. Moreover, Hervey de Sutton held 'Coueham' [Coverham] in 1178,⁴ and in the period 1284-87 Stephen de Coverham, the husband of Margery de Sutton, who held Warlaby of the earl of Richmond, also held most of Coverham of the earl.⁵ The evidence strongly suggests, therefore, that the holding of the heirs of Hervey son of Morinus formed part of the Sutton fee (although the fractional three-fifths in the Red Book return is not explained); and the number §21 has been assigned. The point will be further considered in the introduction to that fee.

¹ A Mowbray holding in addition to the knight's fee in Masham, which is given as 1 $\frac{1}{8}$ kts. in Table IV.

² These two new feoffments are numbered §§81, 82 in H. K. F. MS.

³ The Registrum return in Gale has Henry de Sutton, evidently in error.

⁴ *Pipe Roll 24 Hen. II*, p. 70.

⁵ *Feudal Aids*, vi, pp. 88, 100.

In addition to the return for Yorkshire the Red Book of the Exchequer contains returns for the service of the honour in other counties—for Lincolnshire,¹ Cambridgeshire,² Essex and Hertfordshire,³ and Norfolk and Suffolk.⁴ The first two of these are specially full in giving in the majority of cases the places where each tenant held his fee. In Lincolnshire there are several examples of minute assessments, such as a tenth, a twelfth, a fifteenth, a twenty-second, and even a thirty-seventh part of a knight.

The next return (Table IV) is that of the service of castle-guard due from the fees in Richmondshire. The details show the periods of the year when the service, which had been commuted on the basis of half a mark per fee, was due, corresponding with the periods given in the early twelfth-century return (Table II). These are of assistance in tracing the continuity and the identity of the fees. The first series of entries shows the precise division of the Yorkshire part of the original fee held by Wimar the steward, the Domesday tenant, into its component parts—already noticed in the Red Book return (Table III). The date of the return is difficult to determine. William de Rollos and Roald the constable appear in place of Richard de Rollos and Alan the constable. The date should, therefore, be not earlier than 1201 when Roald succeeded his father, and not later than 1204 when William de Rollos lost his English lands. But this period does not correspond with that suggested by other entries. Nigel son of the chamberlain was then dead; and Ralph son of Roger (of Thornton Steward), who appears in place of Wimar son of Ralph in the Red Book return, was actually Wimar's father and had been succeeded by him before October 1195, when Wimar was then dead, having been succeeded in turn by his brother Roger. It must be supposed, therefore, that the return does not reproduce the position in any one particular year, but that, generally speaking, the combined details refer to the latter part of the twelfth and the early years of the thirteenth century.

This return may be compared with another which is contained in the *Registrum*.⁵ Many of its details refer to a later date, as is shown, for example, by the names of Robert Marmion who had acquired Tanfield by marriage with the heir of Jernegan son of Hugh, of Roger de Aske who had succeeded his father Conan, of Alan de Mumby who had succeeded his father Eudo, of Picot de Lascelles who had succeeded his father Roger, of Charles who had acquired Brignall, and of Brian son of Alan who had succeeded his father Alan son of Brian. But several details refer to an earlier period, Torfin son of Robert being still given as the holder of Manfield. There are some useful details showing additional places where the fees lay. Thus the 2½ fees of Conan son of Ellis lay in Great Cowton, one fee, Holtby and Ainderby [Myers], one fee, and Hutton Hang and East Brompton, half a fee; and the

¹ *Red Bk.*, p. 519.

² *Ibid.*, p. 528, and further details on pp. 527, 531, 532.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 504.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

⁵ Gale, pp. 32, 33.

Furneaux fee of one knight lay in Ainderby [Steeple]. There is also the important note that Gilbert de Gant held four knights' fees in Swaledale, but that he did not render the service of castle-guard at Richmond; and a statement is included that castle-guard was paid for in money on the basis of half a mark per fee. The yield from each period of two months is given in cash, and the total, from which was deducted the yield from two fractional fees in dispute, amounted to 20*li.* 6*s.* 3½*d.*; the number of fees rendering castle-guard being slightly more than sixty in contrast with the 66½ given in Table IV. The difference can be traced in several variations in the amount of service due. Thus the service of the Constable's fee is given as 11½ knights, as compared with the normal thirteen; half a knight's fee of the Steward's fee was in dispute;¹ and only 1½ instead of 2½ knights' fees of the Chamberlain's fee were entered.

The Richmondshire return (Table IV) is followed by a similar return of the fees owing the service of castle-guard from other parts of the honour.² It is divided into two portions: the first relating to the parts which lay between 'Well Stream and the Norman Sea,' and including the fees in Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Hertfordshire and Essex; and the second including the fees in Holland and elsewhere in Lincolnshire, and in Nottinghamshire. Several of the Yorkshire tenants occur, such as are shown by the Lascelles holding of 2½ fees in Fulstow, Aylesby and Swallow, which together with the 2½ fees in Yorkshire make up the five fees held by Roger de Lascelles early in the twelfth century; or the six fees held in Norfolk by Randolf son of Robert, lord of Middleham; or the 2½ fees held by Conan son of Ellis in Holbeach and elsewhere in Lincolnshire, which together with his 2½ fees in Yorkshire make up the five fees originally held by Wigan son of Landric. Of Yorkshire interest is the entry relating to William de Grenesbi who held one knight's fee, whereof he answered for five-sixths in Grenesbi [Grainsby, co. Lincoln], and the remainder in Ruhoton³ [Little Hutton, par. Wycliffe] in Richmondshire.

Except for incidental references there are no details relating to the fees of the honour in Yorkshire to be found in *The Book of Fees*; but the records there printed give considerable information about the holdings in other counties during the first half of the thirteenth century—in Hertfordshire,⁴ Lincolnshire,⁵ Norfolk,⁶ Nottinghamshire,⁷ and in Hampshire, where in 1242-43 two fees were held by a member of the Furneaux family.⁸ The details

¹ This explains the difference in assessment of 2½ knights due from Wimar son of Ralph (Table III) and 2 knights due from Ralph son of Roger (Table IV).

² Pd. in translation in *Cal. Inq. Misc.*, i, no. 521, from C. Inq. Misc. File 21 (22); this is not reprinted in the present volume.

³ 'Riulf Hotun' in Table III, where its service is given as ¼ kt.

⁴ pp. 123, 124 (1212).

⁵ pp. 153 *et seq.* (1212); p. 362 (1226-28); p. 1473 (1238-41); pp. 1005 *et seq.* (1242-43).

⁶ pp. 1325, 1329 (1198-99), but none later.

⁷ p. 230 (1211-13); p. 287 (1219); p. 993 (1242-43).

⁸ p. 704.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05828-5 - Early Yorkshire Charters: Volume 5: The Honour of Richmond, Part II

Edited by William Farrer and Charles Travis Clay

Excerpt

[More information](#)

relating to Lincolnshire are particularly full, and can be compared with such earlier information as is given by the Domesday and Lindsey surveys and the twelfth-century returns already mentioned. They can also be compared with a list of knights' fees of the honour in Lincolnshire which was compiled as the result of a writ, dated 16 March 1217-8, and directed to the sheriff, ordering an inquisition to be made.¹ This writ was evidently concerned with the agreement between the King and Peter de Braine, duke of Brittany,² by which thirty fees of the honour south of the Humber were to be reserved to the King, the remainder being given to the duke. The itinerant justices made the selection of these thirty fees; and their choice, giving full details of the fees and their holders in the counties of Lincoln, Nottingham, Cambridge, Southampton, Norfolk and Suffolk appears on an Assize Roll recording pleas at Lincoln on 9 Dec. 1218.³

During the thirteenth century several inquisitions taken after the deaths of tenants of the honour give particulars of their holdings; and, relating to the Middleham fee, there is a valuable extent and partition made in 1270, when the lands of the fee were shared between the three daughters (one being the wife of Robert de Neville, another the wife of Robert de Tatesale, and the third unmarried) of Ralph son of Ranulf, the descendant of Ribald, the Domesday tenant.⁴

But for a detailed survey of the fees held throughout the greater part of the honour the inquisitions of 1280-82⁵ are of prime importance. These give extents of the lands which had been held by Peter of Savoy, lord of the honour between 1241 until his death in 1268. They include various demesne lands of the honour, and the knights' fees in the counties of Hertford, Lincoln, York, Nottingham, Cambridge and Norfolk.⁶ The rents paid by the free tenants are given; and, in the case of the knights' fees, usually the amounts paid for castle-guard with, in some instances, the term for which it was due. The commuted payments for castle-guard are seen to be half a mark per fee in Yorkshire, and 10s. per fee in the other counties, except in Norfolk where the rate varied. Two separate inquisitions were held for the Yorkshire portions of the honour, one apparently in 1280 and the other in 1282, the first giving the fees which owed castle-guard, and the second giving the value of each holding in addition to the

¹ *Cal. Inq. Misc.*, i, no. 518.

² Husband of Alice dau. of duchess Constance by her third husband Guy de Thouars (*Complete Peerage*, 1st ed., vi, 349).

³ Printed by Mrs. Stenton in *Rolls of the Justices in Eyre for Lincolnshire and Worcestershire*, Selden Soc., vol. liii, pp. 229 *et seq.*, which gives fuller details than the record relating thereto entered on the Close Roll, 16 Jan. 1218-9 (*Rot. Claus.*, i, 385b).

⁴ *Cal. Inq. p. m.*, i, no. 743; and *Yorks. Inq.* (Y.R.S.), i, 113 for the Yorkshire portion.

⁵ *Cal. Inq. p. m.*, ii, no. 381; and *Yorks. Inq.* (Y.R.S.), i, 222 for the Yorkshire extents, which are given in fuller detail, with annotations by Mr. William Brown.

⁶ There are apparently no returns for Essex, Suffolk and Hampshire.

FEES OF THE HONOUR

9

service due. The two returns should be read together, as in some details they give complementary information. Thus, in the second, dame Avice Marmion is given as holding $4\frac{1}{2}$ fees in Tanfield and Manfield, whereas in the first as holding $2\frac{1}{2}$ fees in Tanfield and, *jointly* with Henry [son of] Conan two fees in Manfield. The latter conforms with the facts relating to the Manfield fee, of which Avice had only inherited a portion.¹

With regard to the numbers of knights' fees which these returns disclose, in the Yorkshire portion of the honour the number was nearly 63 (in one return) or slightly over 64 (in the other),² but the latter included the four fees in Swaledale which were exempt from castle-guard; in Lincolnshire there were about 40 fees; in Nottinghamshire, 4; in Cambridgeshire, about 30; in Norfolk, $19\frac{1}{4}$; and in Hertfordshire, $2\frac{3}{4}$. These figures amount to about 160 fees; and, if there is added an estimated 20 fees³ in the counties for which there are no returns, the result is an approximate total of 180 fees for the whole of the honour. This compares with the $187\frac{1}{4}$ knights' fees owing the service of castle-guard in the early part of the twelfth century (Table II); and with the approximate 177 owing the service at the end of the century.⁴ It may be noted that in 1167 earl Conan accounted for $175\text{li. } 3\text{s. } 4\text{d.}$, for the expenses of the serjeants in the army of Wales,⁵ suggesting an amount based on $175\frac{1}{8}$ knights; and in 1172 Ranulf de Glanville, while stating that he had not yet ascertained the number of knights of the honour, collected the sum of $176\text{li. } 12\text{s. } 1\text{d.}$ for the scutage of Ireland,⁶ suggesting a quota of $176\frac{3}{8}$ knights. The fact that at Michaelmas 1194 duchess Constance rendered account of 140li. for the scutage of 140 knights' fees belonging to the honour⁷ suggests that she was not in possession of all the lands which had belonged to her father.

Finally, in tracing the descent of the Yorkshire fees, and in determining the geographical basis of their composition, the returns compiled during the years 1284-87, known as Kirkby's Inquest,⁸ are of particular value. For the wapentakes of Hang, Gilling West, Gilling East and Hallikeld the carucage assessments of the majority of the villis are given, with details of the links in the feudal chain, ending with the names of those who held directly of the honour. It is therefore very often possible, by making comparison with the relative Domesday entries, and having regard to the twelfth-century returns, to assign a particular place

¹ See Chapter V, §1D.

² In another extent, in 1285, the number of fees in Yorkshire is given as 63 (*Cal. Inq. p. m.*, ii, no. 579).

³ Say 2 fees for Essex and $17\frac{1}{2}$ for Suffolk as suggested in the Red Book returns.

⁴ Made up of $66\frac{3}{4}$ in Richmondshire (Table IV) and $109\frac{3}{8}$ elsewhere (*Cal. Inq. Misc.*, i, no. 521).

⁵ *Pipe Roll 13 Hen. II*, p. 80.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 13 Hen. II, p. 5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 6 Ric. I, p. 163; and see part i, pp. 112, 113.

⁸ *Feudal Aids*, vol. vi; and *Surtees Soc.*, vol. xlix (ed. Skaife).

