

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

ADAM DE PESHALE

Eleventh in Ancestry

Section 1, Adam de Peshale—Section 2, Ancestry of Joan de Eyton—Section 3, Hugh de Peshale—Section 4, John de Peshale—Section 5, Richard, who married Margery Knighton—Section 6, Ancestry of Aline de Mowbray—Section 7, Ancestry of Margery de Knighton.

SECTION 1.

*11. ADAM DE PESHALE, son of Adam de Peshale, Chapter 16, Section 1; married Joan de Eyton, daughter of John de Eyton of the Wildmoors, co. Salop and relict of Sir Henry de Cresswell of Creswell and Bishops Offley, Staff. Chapter 17, Section 2. Children:—

1. *10 SIR RICHARD DE PESHALE, Chapter 18, Section 1.
2. Sir Hamo de Peshall, Chapter 18, Section 5.
3. Sir Adam de Peshall, Chapter 18, Section 3.
4. John de Peshall, Chapter 18, Section 6.
5. Isabella de Peshall, married Thomas Gech of Newport, and second Sir Robert Franceys, knt. This Thomas Gech de Newport, who married Isabel, sister of Sir Adam de Peshale, was lord of High Ercall and direct ancestor of the Newport, afterwards Earl of Bradford; his widow Isabel was afterwards married to Sir Robert Francyes, knight. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 2, page 115.]
6. Catherine de Peshall, married Robert Costliffe. They had a daughter Christine who married John Mowlesley. John Mowlesley married Christine, daughter and heir of Robert Costliffe and Catharine his wife, sister of Sir Adam de Peshall. They had the Mosley of Bilston. [*Ibid.*, vol. 5, part 2, page 218 & vol. 1, page 353.]

Erdeswick says this Adam married one of the daughters and heirs of John Caverswall, and had Bishop's Offley by reason thereof; for whose better advancement, his father gave him Horseley, to make him a marriage fit for an heiress. The distinguished author of the History of the Manor and Parish of Blymhill says it was not the daughter and heir of John de Caverswall by whom Adam de Peshale obtained Bishop's Offley. This manor was acquired by his marriage with Joan, the daughter of John de Eyton and relict of Sir Henry de Creswalle or Kerswell (which is an altogether different family from Caverswall, though it has often been confounded with it), which Henry had held it of John de Eyton, of Eyton on the Wyldmore, by military service, Wyldmoor being part of the Pantulf's Barony of Wemme. On the death of Sir Henry de Cresswalls, John de Eyton took the manor into his own hands to hold till the lawful age of Joan and Elizabeth the daughters and heirs of Sir Henry, and held it until Adam de Peshale

married Joan, the relict of Sir Henry and daughter of the said John de Eyton, at which time John permitted Adam to enter upon the said manor for the help and maintenance of the said Joan his wife, and of Joan and Elizabeth, the daughters and heirs of Henry, to hold at the will of the said John de Eyton; and Adam held the said manor all his life, and after his death Simon de Rugeley the Sheriff took it into the King's hands together with all the other lands of the said Adam. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 2, n.s. page 99-100; Erdeswick's Antiquities of Shropshire, Harwood's edition, page 128-129; & Placita co. Staff., No. 27, being a Chancery Inquisition taken at Brelanghton on Tuesday the Feast of St. John Baptist 20 Ed. III. 29 August 1346.]

The History of Pirehill Hundred by Walter Chetwynd contains the following additional information concerning Cresswell. The Patent Rolls show (20 Ed. III.) that the rights of the heirs of Henry de Cresswell were investigated after Adam's death; and 34 Ed. III. gives John de Legh, and Joan his wife, Sir Henry de Cresswell's eldest daughter and coheir, suing Joan her mother, now Adam de Peshall's widow, for land here; the mother replied that Sir Henry's bequest was for a term not yet expired, and that she held it in dower and by assignment of Richard de Peshale, to whom the reversion belonged; and that she cannot answer without Richard. 16 Ed. III. one Robert, son of Agnes, widow of William le Clerk of Chatculne, sued William Trumwyn of Cannock for 8 messuages, 4s. rent, and a carucate of land in Bishop's Offley, as the gift of Ralph de Longford to Agnes his mother with her husband William le Clerk—and proved his right. The Peshalls, however, retained their hold on the Manor, as later we find Humfrey Peshall, Esq., charging men for breaking into his close here and stealing 2 colts. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1914, page 109; vol. 13, page 9; vol. 12, page 18.]

Cresswall, anciently Cressevale, so-called "a crassa valle" from ye rich and fertile vale that surrounds it, was formerly a village of some note, being mentioned in that record called *Nomina villarum* 9 Ed. II., though now there is nothing of it remaining but the Manor House. By the Conqueror's Survey it was rated at one hide of land, containing 6 carucates, 40 acres of meadow, and a mill of 5s., the whole being valued at 20s.; and then held by William Pantulf, of Roger de Montgomery.

And in the foot-note it is further explained concerning Cresswell that, in Henry II.'s time, 1166, Robert de Eyton held it, besides other Salop manors, under Ivo Pantulf of Wem, by service of a Kts. fee, and under Robert, Thomas de Cresswell, the Sheriff for Staffs. in 1189 A.D. was the resident owner. In 1284 Henry de Cresswell was holding it of Peter de Eyton, of Wildmoor, and Peter of Walter de Hopton, who had married Matilda Pantulf heiress of the Wem barony. In 1310 Sir Henry settled the manor on Henry de Cresswell, his son and his heirs—failing them then on Thomas de Cresswell, the second son and his heirs, for a Rose yearly.

The father of the first baron of Wem was brother of Ligulph, the grandfather of Ormunda, who married Robert de Peshall. With the marriage of this Adam de Peshall, Junior, to Joan de Eyton this branch of the Peshall family became again firmly seated in Staffordshire. Another interesting fact is that during these many generations they were also connected with Edgmond Church and we

shall find that this association continued for several generations later than this. Adam de Peshall, Junior, as has been said, married the daughter of John de Eyton of the wildmoor in Shropshire, and while it would seem likely that Adam, Junior, would continue to dwell in Shropshire, nevertheless as Joan de Eyton was the widow of Sir Henry de Cresswell of Cresswell in Staffordshire, there was every reason why Adam should reside in the manor belonging to his wife. In fact Adam seems to have in some way been allied with Joan's first husband, and to have espoused his cause, and thereby the lady, as we shall presently see, was to be twice widowed by the violent death of an outlawed husband.

The descendants of Adam de Peshale and of his brothers, are numbered among the leading families of Staffordshire, so much so that the searchers after genealogical information have assumed that he and his ancestors always resided there. An assumption which would seem to have been fully warranted by the fact that the de Peshales had a purely Staffordshire name, having assumed that of the manor of Peshall in this county. But, as has been shown, this branch was descended from William, son of John de Peshall, and grandson of Robert de Peshall, the first of the name; and William de Peshall was primarily of Shropshire as shown by the fact that he served in the wars under his cousin Ivo Pantulf, the Baron of Wem. As a result the genealogists for a long time overlooked so vital a fact as that Adam de Peshall, Junior, was son of Adam de Peshall, senior, although the Plea Rolls Coram Rege 17 Ed. II. Staff. (1324) disclose that the Jury of the liberty of the Bishop of Chester presented: That Adam, son of Adam de Peshale, and Geoffrey, formerly Beadle of Eccleshale, about the Feast of the Annunciation, 16 Ed. II., had come to the house of Thomas le Walkere in Offel-eye and had broken open a chest and taken away goods to the value of ten marks. [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 10, page 46.]

Having once gone astray, the historians do not seem to be able to wipe out the erroneous statement heretofore made and therefore we hear as to him in the local history all sorts of contrary, confusing, inharmonious and erroneous conclusions. Adam de Peshall, junior, was a fighter and a soldier. The same chain of circumstances which brought his brother Richard a prisoner in the Tower of London, made Adam de Peshall, junior, a party to the lawlessness and rioting warfare in Staffordshire. At this time the courts belonged to the Barons' party, so the records are filled with accounts of criminal charges against the king's supporters.

In the days when men who disagreed as to political policies each maintained his personal views by the power of his sword, we see the Barons under Montfort waging actual and successful war against their king and afterwards acting as though they had all the time been faithful law-abiding subjects. According to the views of the time right made might, for if one was true in his views and correct in his opinions and judgments then while possibly he might not annihilate his adversary, nevertheless, the champion of truth would not be killed. This view had extended to the courts of justice, where the trial of causes by wage of actual battle was one of the means used by which a determination might be made of a legal controversy. There were not half a dozen of the nobility in Staffordshire-Shropshire on the side of the king and one can well understand how absolutely

miserable must have been their lives at this time. That our ancestor survived until he had sons, and that we are in existence, is simply because he and his were warriors of unusual prowess; brave, true and efficient. The Barons not only fought the king's friends as soldiers do, but having the courts they used all the machinery of the law to aid in punishing the king's supporters, charging them with crimes which really never existed. For example there would be a battle and the Barons' forces would be beaten, as a result some of the Barons' supporters would be killed, or they would be despoiled of some article of wealth which perhaps they dropped in their efforts to run away. After this there would be a criminal charge preferred in the county court against the king's supporters and the sheriff would be sent after them armed with all the power of the king to punish his own friends, while his enemies escaped because they held the county offices for the administration of justice. As a result we find the court records at this time filled with the most scandalous charges against the king's supporters, whereas the Barons did as much and more, but they went free as they held the king's local judicial office. A more connected story will be found related under section 5 of this chapter which tells the story of Richard de Peshale, brother of our ancestor Adam. It will be sufficient to supplement the account there given by repeating a few of the charges the Barons specially made against Adam de Peshale.

Coram Rege 17 Edward II. 1324 Staff. The Jury of the Hundred of Pirehill presented: That Adam de Peshale, Geoffrey le Bedel of Eccleshale, Philip le Barker of Eccleshale, William le Bedel of Eccleshale, Henry de Sugenhulle Barkere, Alan de Cherleton, John de Cherleton Barkere, on the Vigil of St. Ceade, 16 Ed. II., feloniously broke into the house of Thomas le Walker of Offeleye, at Offeleye, and carried away linen, twelve silver spoons, five mazers, 40s. in money and other goods to the value of 20 pounds. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 10, page 45.]

The sudden change in the political control of the courts of Staffordshire produced many interesting, even if half truthful, statements. Unfortunately this distress against Le Walkere was not returned when the enemies of Adam secured the control of the local machinery of justice. As a result what before was perfectly legal became most monstrously unlawful in the eyes of his enemies. But even these were forced to admit that he was guiltless. The best they could do was to hold him to keep the peace, which is a well-known refuge of protection for the officer who has made an illegal arrest, as afterwards at the same term, viz., Easter, 17 Ed. II., Adam de Peshale surrendered himself, and as Richard Damory, and the others testified that he was of good fame, William de Sharesull, William de Charles, John de Blorton, Walter de Mokynton, Robert de Sharesull, and William de Okley came and stood bail for him, and he had a writ, &c., as before.

Assize Roll 17 Ed. II. 1324 Staff. The Jury of the Hundreds of Offelowe and Totmonslowe presented that Geoffrey le Bedel of Eccleshale and Adam de Peshale had plundered Thomas le Warre and had broken into his house and taken and carried away 10 pounds in money and jewels, viz., a cup and vestments and girdles of silk to the value of 100s. and the said Adam had extorted from Hugh

de Knytton and Thomas his brother, 20s. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 9, part 1, page 100.]

Both the above charges really relate to the same offense although they were committed at different times and places. The Barons' party meeting up with and attempting to kill Adam de Peshale and others of the King's forces, were in turn beaten so badly that they took refuge in the house of Thomas le Warre or le Walkere, from which they were afterwards compelled to escape. When Thomas returned to his house he said these articles could not be accounted for. It may most likely be that the soldiers helped themselves after they had thoroughly beaten their enemies and driven them away from their stronghold. At least that is what would happen today and one can only wonder that the losses were so small.

Banco Rolls, Trinity 17 Ed. II. 1324 Staff. John de Kynardesle sued Adam de Peshale and Adam Swetekynes of Coldines for taking by force a horse belonging to him of the value of 20 pounds from Joneston and other goods and chattels belonging to him of the value of 100s. The defendants did not appear and the Sheriff was ordered to arrest and produce them at the Octaves of St. Michael. Kynardesle and Joneston met Adam de Peshale and Adam Swetekynes and being evenly matched as to numbers and being on opposite sides of the political division of the day, they of course could not pass each other on the road without resorting to a trial of arms. The King's friends were victorious, as the record discloses. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 9, part 1, page 102.]

The following record shows that Adam de Peshall was associated with the Eyton faction in Staffordshire, which was to be expected, his wife being Joan de Eyton. Coram Rege 17 Ed. III. Staff. 1324. The jury of the Hundred of Pirehill presented that Peter de Eyton, William de Eyton, and Brother Roger de Eyton, the Canon of Wombridge, are common malefactors and disturbers of the King's peace, and that when Richard de Sideway in 16 Ed. II. was driving 16 oxen and his cows to Whitemor from fear of the King's enemies, the said Peter and others unknown took the oxen and cows, vi et armis, and detained them until the said Richard paid them 2s., and that the said William de Eyton in the same year took by force a quarter of wheat from Roger the Chaplain of Wolstanton at Kel, and that Thomas de Aston, Robert his son, and Richard de Aston are common malefactors, and they beat William del Pek at Aston on the day of St. James, 14 E II., and that Adam de Pesehale is a common malefactor and beat John de Haketon at Eccleshale on the Nundines of the day of St. Mary Magdalene, 12 Ed. II. The sheriff was therefore ordered to attach them. A postscript states that afterwards the said Peter de Eyton, William de Eyton, and Brother Roger de Eyton appeared and admitted the said transgressions and were committed to the custody of the Marshal. And the said Peter, William and Roger afterwards made fine with the King at 1 mark each, for which John de Perton, William de Waleye, John de Virleye (Wirley), and Adam de Morton were sureties, who also stood bail for their good behavior in future both towards the King, and any others, under pain of forfeiture, &c. And the said Richard de Aston made fine as appears elsewhere, and with regard to the others the Sheriff returned they could not be found and held nothing within his bailiwick. He was therefore

ordered to attach them for the morrow of the Purification, and Thomas de Aston and Robert his son afterwards appeared and made fine with the King as appears on the Roll of Fines of Easter term, 18 Ed. II. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 10, page 51.]

In 1333, when King Edward was raising forces for the endless wars against Scotland, the greater part of the 1,000 foot soldiers to be raised from Salop and Staffordshire were to be archers, and it was by the bowmen's shafts that the battle of Halidon Hill was won and Bannockburn avenged. Edward III. had profited by the tactical ability and experience of his grandfather, the first great encourager of the use of the long bow. [Victoria Hist. of Staff. by Wm. Page.]

Among those summoned to appear from Staffordshire to Rockesburgh by the Feast of Purification, in the war between Bruce and Balliol, 1334, was Adam de Peshale and his brother Richard. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 8, part 1, page 53.]

Gaol Delivery 8 Edward III. 1335 Staffordshire. Adam de Peshall who had been indicted before his brother Richard de Peshall, Sheriff, Co. Stafford for feloniously killing Peter de Furoo, the proctor of the dean of Lichfield at Stafford and for feloniously abducting Alice, the lady of Knightly, with goods and chattels to the value of 20 marks from Knightly, was brought before the Justices and pleaded not guilty and put himself upon the county. A jury acquitted him of both charges. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 16, page 6.]

This records one of the numerous abductions of heiresses. They were really elopements as they were usually with the consent and connivance of the lady herself. It was of course unfortunate that there should be any one foolish enough to defend the Bishop against such abduction, so that the cleric lord of the manor should not be robbed of his fine for the marriage of this heiress. But young people had no money to waste for such permission so they arranged an unwilling taking away. It was more usually a widow who was married in this way as thereby she did not lose her dower interest in her first husband's estate. The Reverend John Peshale in his notes says that this Alice was the second wife of Adam de Peshall. This cannot be true for Joan de Eyton undoubtedly survived her husband. But as Henry de Cresswell her first husband did not die until 1335, and this abduction of Alice de Knightley took place in 1334 or early in 1335, it may be that Alice de Knightly was Adam de Peshall's first wife and that she died very shortly afterwards, leaving no child to survive her. But all this is the merest conjecture, based upon the facts stated.

In these days warfare was largely a matter of personal combat, and the warriors resorted to all sorts of protectional armour to ward off the blows of their adversary. A writ summoning sixty hobelars or light horsemen from the county in 1335 shows that the light cavalryman of the day was somewhat heavily armed. He was to have a horse, an aketone, or heavily-plated doublet, a bacinet, a pisam or a colarettum, steel gloves, sword, dagger and lance, or other arms. They differed from the pauncenars in not having a habergeon or sleeveless coat of chain mail, and as a rule the hobelars did not carry lances. The heavy cavalry of the time was composed of the men-at-arms, so-called because they were covered with defensive armour from head to foot, while their horses after 1298 were also heavily protected. These men at arms were all squires and knights. [Victoria History of Staff. by William Page.]

In 1336 the military equipment of the time is further illustrated in the arms demanded from the 2,000 men arrayed by Staffordshire in that year. Those having land or rent between £40 and £20 were to be provided with competent arms and horses according to the late proclamation of the king; those having £15 of land, or chattels to the value of 40 marks, with a hauberk, steel cap, sword, dagger, and horse; those with £10 of land or chattels to the value of 20 marks with hauberk, steel cap, sword, and dagger; those having 100s. of land with a steel cap, sword, and dagger, and lastly those having land between 40s. and 100s. with sword, bow, arrows, and dagger.

By writ dated Dec. 24th, 1338, William de Chetelton, chivaler, Roger de Greseley and Adam de Peshale were appointed to select 100 archers from Co. Stafford and to take them to the King, in France. These were to assist Edward III. in his fruitless campaign of 1339, the first year of what was afterwards known as the Hundred Years' War. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 8, part 1, page 63 & Parshall Book, page 72.]

At the commencement of the great war with France the English armies were raised by commissioners of array, who chose from each county a certain number of men-at-arms, archers, and other soldiers, and from the muster rolls of thirty-seven counties in February, 1339, fewer and possibly better men were picked in that year than in the year of Bannockburn, Staffordshire furnishing 55 men-at-arms, 220 archers, and 220 other armed infantry. During the course of the war the system of indenture came into use by which the king bargained with his baron or knight, as the case might be, for the production of a certain number of men, in return for payments on the part of the sovereign. The men were freely enlisted, and better soldiers than the pressed men, and were largely recruited from the old soldiers who pursued the trade of war because they liked it. [Victoria Hist. of Co. Staff. by William Page.]

The sinews of war were provided by the Parliament, which in 1338 granted Edward half the wool in the kingdom, amounting to 20,000 sacks. The commissioners appointed to collect the share of Staffordshire were two knights, Sir Robert Malveisin, and Malcolm de Wasteneys (who was also a member of the county in that year), as well as five merchants, Roger Bride, Henry de Tytnesoure, Nicholas Ryener, Thomas the Goldsmith, and John le roter. Many of the men of Staffordshire concealed their wool, and the king appointed William de Myners his sergent-at-arms to inquire into the matter and seize the wool which had been hidden and send it to the ports named to receive it. As a result new commissioners were appointed to collect what the searches of William de Myners revealed as still due to the king.

Alamin Roll, 14 Edward III. 1340 Staff. In 1340 John de Stafford, Robert Mauveisin, Adam de Pesschale, Richard de Venables, Roger Wyrde, and John Rotour of Stafford were appointed Commissioners to take 400 sacks of wool for the King's use in Staffordshire, a part of 20,000 which had been granted to the King by Parliament. Dated by the Custos at Westminster, 28th July. [Parshall Book, page 72.]

Notwithstanding that Edward III. was now king of England the old feuds and quarrels continued among the nobility of Staffordshire and Shropshire. Per-

sonal encounters were frequent and sometimes they resulted in the death of one of the parties. But now the King's friends controlled the courts.

Gaol Delivery 12 Edward III. 1339 Staffordshire. Adam de Peshale, Roger Marin and William, son of Philip le Barke of Eccleshale, indicted before John Gentile the steward of the Bishop's Liberty of the Manor of Eccleshal for feloniously killing John de Uselwalle de Swinnerton at Eccleshale on the Saturday before the Feast of St. Michael, 11 Edward III., were acquitted. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 16, page 7.]

Anno 1340, Joannes Peeleshall (Peshall) gives land to Abbey of Halesowen as is set out in *Calendarium Rotulorum Chartarum et Inquisitionum ad quod Dominum*. [Bibliography and Chronology of Halesowen by Henry T. Roth, London 1816, reprint 1887. Fol. London 1803, British Museum Mss. p 320.]

Adam de Peshale was Sheriff of Staffordshire and Shropshire in 1341. Pipe Roll 15 Edward III. 1341 Stafford. Account of Adam de Peshale, sheriff of Salop and Stafford, of the expenses by him laid out about the purchase, provision, and carrying of arrows for the King's use, in the 15th year, by the King's writ dated 18th April in the same year, 1341, whereby the King commanded the said sheriff, firmly enjoining, that 1,000 sheaves of arrows be brought and provided within the bailiwick of that sheriffdom, from the issues of the same bailiwick. The same accounts for 576 sheaves of arrows with steel heads, the work of each sheaf 12d., so bought at the towns of Shrewsbury and Stafford in the said 15th year, 28 pounds 16d., by the aforesaid writ, and as is contained in a certain schedule of particulars which he delivered into the treasury. [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 2, n.s., page 102. Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 1912, page 232.]

And in two waggons brought for carrying the said arrows from the said towns of Salop and Stafford to the King's Tower of London, by the space of 230 leagues, with the wages of one clerk going with the same waggons for 13 days in August in the said 15th year, viz., going and returning, to wit, with each wagon with horses 14d. a day, and for the said clerk 6d. a day—36s. 3d., by the same writ. whiche said arrows the same sheriff delivered to John de Flete, clerk by the King's Writ. Sum of the expenses—£30, 12s. 3d. which are allowed to the said sheriff in the roll following.

1342. A writ to Robert de Grisele, Adam de Peshale, Roger Trumwyn and Simon de Ruggele commissioners of array for County of Stafford, orders them to send the archers who had not yet joined the King to Portsmouth on the first of March for embarkation and to send fifty additional archers who were to be clothed uniformly. Dated December 20th. [*Ibid.* vol. 8, part 1, page 69.]

French Rolls 19 Edward III. 1345 Staff. By writ dated 25th February, 1345, James de Stafford, John de Stafford, Adam de Peshale, and William Trumwyne were ordered to select 128 of the best and strongest archers of County Stafford and to equip them with bows and arrows and other suitable arms so that they might be ready by the Quindene of Easter to accompany Henry de Lancaster, Earl of Derby, on the King's service and in his pay. [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 8, part 1, page 75.]

July 4th, 1345, Writs of Military summons were sent by the Custos to a number of Baronets, knights, and Esquires of all counties. Among the number

from County of Stafford was Adam de Peshale. The writ directed them to prepare themselves with horses and arms by the Feast of St. Lawrence to embark with the king at his wages. [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 8, part 1, page 77.]

At Crecy in 1346 Staffordshire was well represented. Ralph de Stafford, who had been made seneschal of Aquitaine in the previous year, and at the siege of Aiguillon filled the breaches in the walls with wine casks full of stones, had an eminent command in the van of the army under the Black Prince, and was one of those who made the famous report on the number of the French slain; eleven great princes, eighty bannerets, 1,200 knights, and 30,000 common soldiers. Beside him served a great number of the foremost men in the county. In addition to the usual writs to the commissioners of array writs were sent to the mayors of the towns, and while London was ordered to supply 100 men-at-arms, and 500 armed men, Lichfield provided fifteen men, Stafford eight, Tamworth four, and Newcastle under Lyme three. The pay of the men who fought at Crecy seems very high allowing for the difference in the value of money; an earl received 6s. 8d., a knight 3s., an esquire 1s., a mounted archer, a paucenar, and a hobelar 6d., a foot archer 3d., per day, the Welsh spearman coming at the bottom of the list with 2d. [Victoria Hist. of the Co. of Stafford, by Wm. Page.]

The return of the triumphant king and his nobles from their conquest at Crecy and Calais was naturally celebrated after the fashion of that age by jousts, tournaments, and other chivalrous festivities, and in April, 1348, Lichfield was selected as the scene of one of these rejoicings, which were celebrated with great splendor.

The prevailing dress for both ladies and gentlemen was a blue cloak with a white hood presented by the king, and the ladies wore various masks or visors. Among those who were thus clothed from the royal wardrobe were Sir Walter Manny, John de L'Isle, Hugh Courtenay, John Grey, Robert de Ferrers, Philip de Spenser, Roger de Beauchamp, Miles de Stapleton, Ralph de Ferrers, and the Earl of Lancaster, while among the lady recipients were the king's daughter Isabella, the ladies Ulster, Juliers, Wake and Segrave, and Darcy. These ladies, with others of high rank, watched the king and seventeen knights joust with the Earl of Lancaster and thirteen knights, and it is not unlikely that here the incident took place which suggested to the chivalrous king the founding of the Order of the Garter.

Adam de Peshall and Richard his brother were among the most powerful and proficient of the knights attached to the Earl of Lancaster and there is every reason to believe that one or both of them were of the party that in this tournament supported Lancaster. In 1345 Adam de Peshall nominated his son Richard to Parliament. [Staffordshire Hist. Col., vol. 1912, page 278.]

At this time by one of those sudden changes of royal likes and dislikes Adam de Peshall, junior, ceased to be a favorite with the king and his enemy de Ferrars came into power, and before Adam de Peshale could set himself right with the king, de Ferrars was enabled to bring about the legal taking off of his opponent Adam de Peshall, junior. These were lawless and turbulent times, and Adam de Peshall was, like many others of his family, a man of force and war and lived in a locality very much like the western frontier in American during the days when

the Indians were formidable foes to the advance of civilization. In England the Welsh furnished many bands of highwaymen, against whom the English were united, but no sooner did peace prevail than they were divided into factions arrayed against each other. One faction owned the courts, whose machinery they used against their rivals. Changes in political power were as rapid as elsewhere; hence the man of authority today may be exhibited by the records as the outlaw of tomorrow. In the early part of the reign of Edward III. the enemies of Adam de Peshall reached the ears of the king with the most malicious lies concerning his loyalty to his sovereign. As a result charges of felony were preferred against Adam de Peshall, charging him with having caused the death of some of the king's loyal subjects, overlooking the fact that Adam had already been tried and acquitted of feloniously causing the final taking off of these parties. The usual writ was issued wherein several knights and others of the county of Stafford were commissioned to arrest him and bring him in dead or alive. Unfortunately the parties named were all of them enemies of Adam de Peshall. Most of them he had badly beaten in personal encounter, but as a band they felt safe against this one man who dared not set up his own armed force in opposition without giving support to the malicious lies of his enemies, among which lies it was stated that he was not loyal to the king's authority. So the pack followed him from place to place and at length he was taken at Caynton in Shropshire and beheaded. Adam was of course not guilty until tried and convicted. Nevertheless this was too good an opportunity to be lost by his enemies, and they took advantage of the directions of the writ, to bring him dead or alive, to kill him. There is not the slightest evidence to support the view that when cornered he resisted arrest, although they so reported. His captors well knew this to be true so they had recourse to the usual pardon of the king obtained by paying a fine. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1912, page 279.]

The record of the county court simply reads,—January 8, 1346, Adam de Peshale of Horsely, bailiff of the Bishop, Member of Parliament, slain resisting arrest. Thereupon a writ of pardon, dated from Porchester on 27 May, 20 Ed. III. (1346), was issued stating that whereas we lately assigned our trusty and well beloved Robert de Ferrars to arrest Adam de Peshale, a common malefactor, notoriously accused of various homicides and other felonies, and to bring him in dead or alive, and with power to depute others in his place to perform and execute the same, and the said Adam having broken his attachment, '*et lagen regni nostri diffugiens noluit stare juri*' we have pardoned &c John de Isptanes, William Trumwyn, Thomas de Creswall, William Trumwyn bastard, John Immer of Whitegrove, John de Chestershire, John de Breydeshale, William Williamson Tromwyn, John son of William Rowe of Norton, and Thomas Williams 1, chamberleyn tromwyn, who had been deputed by the said Robert, and who, pursuing the said Adam as a felon, took him at Kaynton in co. Salop, '*attachiamentumque fugientem et legi dicti regni nostri obedire renuentem attachiando, sicut eis de jure licuit, decollaverunt,*' etc. Apparently this pardon was not considered full enough; for on 7 July another pardon was issued by the Custos, Lionel the King's son, which, using the same words as the other, pardoned the following persons for the same act, viz.: John de Ipstones,

William Tromewyne, Thomas de Kerswell, John de Breydeshale, John de Ches-treshyre, John de Whytegrave, John de Norton, Thomas Chamberlein, Ralph de Ipstanes, William de Somerford, Alexander de Whytington, William de Whyt-ington, Adam Galpyn and Thomas Rousleigh. [*Ibid.* vol. 1912, page 278.]

By another writ, dated 16 July and issued by the Custos, Henry de Greystok and John de Okovere were deputed to make enquiry into the value and extent of the goods and chattels of Adam de Peshale "nuper rebellis nostri" which had been forfeited by his rebellion and which had been concealed and removed. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 3, n.s. page 101-102.]

Another writ, issued by the Custos and dated from Windsor 20 July, is ad-dressed to Thomas de Halghton, Henry de Graystoke, and John de Okore, and states that, whereas John de Eyton of Wydemores had shown to us that he had taken possession of the manor of Creswalle after the death of Henry de Cresse-walle, chivaler, who had held it of him by military service, and the custody of which belonged to him till the lawful age of the daughters and heirs of the said Henry, and he had demised it to Joan, formerly wife of the said Henry, to be held by her at will until the full age of the said daughters and heirs, and the said manor had been taken into the King's hand for certain causes amongst other lands and tenements lately belonging to Adam de Peshale, late husband of the said Joan; the King wishing to be certified of the facts, the said Thomas, Henry and John were required to return whether the said manor was held of the said John de Eyton by military service or not, and if the custody of it belonged to the said John or not, and if the said John after the death of Henry had demised it to the said Joan, and if the heirs are of full age, and if the said Henry held elsewhere of us in capite.

When the lands of Adam de Peshale were taken into the King's hand, in 1347, owing to a forfeiture incurred by him, they were handed to John de Okeore to be reserved for the King's household. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 7, n.s. page 125.]

But Adam de Peshale's lands, though taken into the hands of the King on his death, were afterwards restored to his family. The matter appears to have been discussed in Parliament, and decided before the Council that Adam not having been convicted of any felony, the Sheriff should deliver all his lands, &c., to Richard his son and heir. This officially discloses that the taking off of Adam de Peshale was the result of cold-blooded murder done by a cowardly mob, acting under a writ of arrest. Of course the man who lives by the sword must expect to die by the sword, but it seems sad that so fine a warrior should have been the victim of such cowardly opponents. The result of this killing of Adam de Peshale was far reaching in its relation to the fortune of our family and it also had a marked effect upon the history of the royal family of England, as thereby our branch of the Peshale family became unchangeably connected with the house of Lancaster, to which, as we shall see, the grandson of Adam de Peshale played an important part in the events which placed Henry IV. of Lancaster upon the Eng-lish throne. Still later by following the fortunes of the house of Lancaster we suffered the indignities and penalties inflicted for opposition to the house of York when it ruled. Later we gave such signal service to the house of Lancaster that our ancestor was knighted on Bosworth Field for service to Richmond, who

there became King Henry VII. of England; and later we were party with those who aided King James I. of Scotland, of the house of Fitz Alan and Stuart, to succeed to the English throne.

Adam de Peshale's wife Joan survived him, and was still living in 1377. Petition of Joan, who was the wife of Adam de Peshale, and of Richard his son and heir, that the former may have her dower, and the latter his heritage of the lands and tenements of Adam, whose lands, &c., were seized into the King's hands, although he had never been attainted of any felony. Anno 1350, 23 Edward III. No. 34, Joannes de Pecheshall (Peshall) and others gave land at Hales, Warley and Oldbury to the Abbey of Halesowen. [Ancient Petitions, File 172, No. 8580. Bibliography & Chronology of Halesowen by Henry Ling Roth, London 1816, reprint 1887.]

Banco Michaelmas 30 Edward III. Staff. Joan, formerly wife of Adam de Peshal, sued Thomas de Hakedone for a third of 2 messuages and a carucate of land in Horseley which she claimed as dower. Thomas prayed a view and the suit was adjourned to the Quindene of St. Hilary. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 12, page 145.]

De Banco Michaelmas 39 Edward III. Staff. Joan, formerly wife of Adam de Peshal, sued Richard de Duddeleye chivaler and Isabella his wife for a third of the manor of Humeleye which she claimed as dower. The defendants called to warranty Nicholas, parson of the church of Kyngeswynford who appeared in court and warranted the manor to them and called John son and heir of John de Sutton of Duddeleye, knight, who was to be summoned for the morrow of All Souls. A postscript states that on that day the sheriff made no return to the writ and he was ordered to summon the said John for the Octaves of St. Hilary. The case was adjourned from time to time up to 40 Edward III. [*Ibid.* vol. 13, page 57.]

In a certain suit De Banco, Staffordshire, 20 Edward III. (1347) it appears that one John, son of Robert, answered as tenant, and stated the tenement in question contained only forty acres of land, eight acres of meadow, and six of pasture, and that they were formerly in seisin of one Adam de Peshale, who had demised them to him for a term of years, and Adam afterwards died, and after his death the King had ordered Simon de Ruggeleye, the Sheriff of Staffordshire, by a close writ to take all the lands and tenements of the said Adam into the King's hands, owing to certain causes, and the said Simon had by virtue of this writ taken the tenements in question into the King's hand, and still held them, and he prayed judgement, whether under such circumstances he ought to be called upon to answer to the assize. [*Ibid.* vol. 12, page 1, page 52-53.]

And Agnes stated she ought not to be precluded from the assize on this account, because at the time of the death of the said Adam, and before it, the said John, son of Robert, was tenant by a disseisin, and was still tenant, and that the said Adam never held anything in the tenements, and she put herself on the assize on this point, and John, son of Robert likewise. The jury stated that the said William le Hewestere, of Lychefeld, was formerly seised of the tenements and had enfeoffed in them William, his son, and William, son of William, had enfeoffed one Roger de Aston in them, who had granted them to the said William,

son of William, and Margaret, his wife, to be held by them and their lawful issue, and Agnes, the plaintiff, was their daughter and heir. And William, son of William, held the tenements all his life, and the said Margaret held them for thirteen years until she fell ill at Lychefeld, where she languished for a long time, having lost her senses, and power, and while she was in this state, the said William le Hewestere, who held nothing in the tenements, because he had previously demised them to his son, made a deed of feoffment giving them to Adam de Peshale, and delivered seisin of the tenements to him, the said Margaret knowing nothing about it, and the said Adam never received any profit from the tenements, Margaret retaining the seisin of them, and she died seised of them, and after her death the said Agnes had entered and was seised of the tenements, until the said Adam and John, son of Robert, and the other defendants, had disseised her. They said also, that on the day when Adam died, and long before, and after his death, the said John, son of Robert, was tenant by the demise of Adam. They said also that after the death of Adam, the said Agnes being then under age, had entered into the tenement, and John, son of Robert, had ejected her, and they assessed the damages of Agnes at 40s. and they said that the tenements had been formerly taken into the King's hand. It was therefore considered that the said Agnes should recover seisin of the tenements and her damages, and John, son of Robert, and the other defendants were in misericordia.

Staff. An assize, &c., if Agnes, daughter of William, son of William le Hewestere, Geoffrey le Cok, and Robert Bruys, had unjustly disseised William le Hewestere, of Lychefield of four messuages, a shop, and ten acres of land, in Lychefeld. Agnes appeared by William de Elyngton, her custos, and answered as tenant, and stated that the said William, the plaintiff, was formerly seised of the tenements, and under the name of William de Monyash, Butcher (carnifex) of Lychefeld, had enfeoffed in them William, his son, the father of Agnes, whose heir she is, by virtue of which feoffment the said William, son of William, being seised of the tenements had demised them to William, his father, for his life, with reversion to himself and to his heirs, and the said William, son of William died, and after his death, the reversion of the said tenements descended to her as his daughter and heirs, and afterwards, the said William who held no status in the tenements except for his life, had alienated them in fee simple to one Adam de Peshale, and the said Adam had demised them to the said William le Hewestere for his life, saving to himself the reversion of them. And the said Agnes fearing to be disinherited by the alienation of the tenements to Adam de Peshale, had entered and removed the said William as was lawful. William stated that at the time he enfeoffed the said Adam, he held a fee simple in the tenements, and not for the term of his life, and he put himself on the assize, and Agnes likewise. The recognitors, elected and sworn by consent of the parties, stated that at the time William le Hewestere enfeoffed the said Adam of the tenements, he held them only for his life, of the inheritance of the said Agnes, and the reversion of them belonged to her. The suit was therefore dismissed, and William was in misericordia for a false claim.

Adam de Peshall having been killed before he had been tried, convicted and sentenced to death, the interests of his heirs were not barred by his summary

death. This resulted in many inquisitions being held to determine the rights of the King and of Adam de Peshall's heirs and others in his property. The records make very interesting reading. A few are here reproduced in full as follows:

Writ to the Sheriff of Staffordshire, reciting that whereas the King for certain causes had seized into his hands all the lands and tenements which belonged to Adam de Peshale, and had, by his Royal Commission, delivered them into the custody of John de Okere to answer to the King for the issues and profits thereof, in the King's chamber; and now the King having been given to understand that Roger Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and John de Melbourn, clerk, and several others entered unlawfully, and without warrant, into certain lands and tenements which belonged to the same Adam, now in the King's hands, and took possession of the issues of the said lands, and would not answer therefore to the King's officer aforesaid, &c.—Windsor, 16 February, 21 Edw. III. (1347). Indorsed.—The answer of Simon de Ruggelege, Sheriff:—I have not found, by the Inquisition, nor in any other manner, that Roger, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and John de Melbourn, clerk, or any other person daringly and without warrant, with force or arms, intruded into any lands or tenements which belonged to Adam de Peshale, which were seized into the King's hands and reserved for the King's private chamber, as appears in the Inquisition to this writ annexed. [*Ibid.* vol. 1913, page 116-117.]

An Inquisition made before Simon de Ruggeleye, Sheriff of Staffordshire, at Stafford, on Friday next after the close of Easter, in the 21 Edw. III.: by the oath of Thomas del Hide, William de Chauldon, Henry son of Walter de Tunstall, Hugh Atte Pirie, Hugh le Newemon, John de Penyngton, John de Styvynton, John Iwynet, Henry de Walton, William de Onyleye, Henry del Hawe and Henry de Mehay; who say upon their oath that there are no intruders in the lands and tenements which belonged to Adam de Peshale, and which were seized into the King's hands and placed in the custody of John de Okovre; and that no one did collect and carry away the profits and issues of the aforesaid land, except the aforesaid John de Okovre himself after he became custos of the land in question, by virtue of the King's commission; but they say that the Lord the King did grant to one Richard de Eccleshale, clerk, all the lands and tenements which belonged to Richard de Eccleshale, his father, which said grant Roger, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, did ratify and by his charter confirm, at the request of the King. And they say upon their oath that the aforesaid Bishop and John de Melbourn, clerk, did not intrude themselves in any of the lands and tenements which belonged to Adam de Peshale, and which were seized into the King's hands, and are in the custody of John de Okovre, by virtue of the King's commission and reserved in the King's chamber. [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 1913, page 116-117.]

Mandate directed to Roger Hillary, John de Freford, and John de la Lee, reciting that John de Melburne, Prebendary of the Prebend of Eccleshale in the Church of St. Chad at Lichfield, has petitioned the King that whereas Adam de Peshale had disseised the same John of two plots, whereof one is called Heldemor and the other Horsleyeruding, and one acre of meadow and two acres of wood with appurtenances in Eccleshale, which of right belong and appertain to his pre-

bend aforesaid and which John de Kynardeseye, late prebendary of the prebend, recovered by a judgment as belonging to the same prebend, against Robert de Horseleye, Peter de Joneston, Roger de Brokhurst, William Parent, and Robert son of Elias de Horseleye, unjustly occupying the same, and had so occupied the said plots, meadow and wood until his death; and that the same plots, meadow and wood had been taken into the King's hand together with the other lands and tenements of the aforesaid Adam forfeited to the King, and taken into the King's hands, and still remain in the King's hands; and he (John de Melburne) prays that the King will command the same to be restored to him, together with the issues taken from the same. The King wishing to be certified of all the above matters, and also whether the aforesaid John de Melburn or the said John de Kynardeseye, or any predecessor of the same John de Melburn, had given the above premises to Adam de Peshale, or had remitted or quitclaimed the right he had in the same to Adam de Peshale, assigns Roger Hillary, John de Freford, and John de la Lee to inquire, &c. Gloucester, 5 September 21 Edw. III. (1347). [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1913, page 121-122.]

Mandate from Roger Hillary, John de Freford, and John de la Lee to the sheriff of Stafford, desiring the Sheriff to cause to come before them at Lichfield on Thursday next before the Feast of St. Michael, 24 knights as well as other lawful and good men of the view of Eccleshale, by whom the truth of the above matters may be inquired into. And also to warn the custos of the lands and tenements above mentioned that he may have an opportunity of being present at the inquiry.—Salop, on Tuesday next after the Feast of the Exaltation of Holy Cross, 21 Ed. III.

Inquisition taken at Lichfield, before John de Freford and John de la Lee, Justices of the King, on Monday next before the Feast of St. Michael, 21 Edw. III.: by the oath of James de Stafford, Chivaler, John de Aston, Chivaler, Malcolm de Wasteneys, Chivaler, Robert de Aston, Ralph del Wak, William de Aston, John de Redeswell, Robert de Joneston, Roger de Abbenhale, John de Stoke, John de Horseleye, and Ralph de Thikkebrom. Who say upon their oath that Heldemor and Horsleyrudying, 1 acre of meadow and 2 acres of wood in Eccleshale, of right belong and appertain to the Prebend of John de Melburne, Prebendary of the Prebend of Eccleshale in the Church of St. Chad at Lichfield, and were so from the time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. And that Adam de Peshale disseised the same John of the same tenements, viz., on Monday next after the Feast of St. Michael in the 9 Edw. III. (1335) and so occupied the same tenements by his disseisin until his death, viz., until the Feast of the Epiphany of our Lord, 20 Edw. III. (1346). And they say that the same tenements, together with the other lands and tenements of the same Adam, were taken into the hands of the King by reason of the forfeiture of the same Adam, and not for any other reason. And that neither John de Melburn nor John de Kynardeseye, nor any predecessors of the same John de Melburn gave those tenements to Adam, nor made any deed, writing or quitclaim thereof to Adam. And they say that the tenements are holden in pure and perpetual alms without any service, and that the same tenements are worth by the year 19s. They say also that the aforesaid plot, which is called Heldemore, contains 6 acrs.

And the aforesaid plot, which is called Horseleyerudyng, contains nine acres of pasture. In witness, &c. [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 1913, page 122-123.]

(On the back.) John de Okore (Okeover), custos of the lands and tenements within mentioned, was warned by Roger Hillary and likewise by the Sheriff to be present at the taking of the Inquisition within written, which same John was at that time there present, and was unable to say anything that might postpone the taking of the Inquisition aforesaid.

A Commission from King Edward the Third addressed to Roger Hillary, Simon de Ruggeleye, Sheriff of Staffordshire, and John de Okore, reciting that John de Horsle has shown to the King that Adam de Peshale held, during his life, forty acres of land in Horsley of the inheritance of the same John, for the term of the life of Robert de Horsle, father of the same John, whose heir he is, of the demise of the same Robert, which forty acres, among other lands, which belonged to the same Adam, were taken into the King's hands, on account of the forfeiture of the same Adam. Whereupon he has petitioned that the King will be pleased to deliver to him the said forty acres of land. The King being desirous of doing what is right, wishes to be fully certified whether or not, &c. The King has thereupon assigned the aforesaid Roger, Simon, and John to inquire by the oath of a Staffordshire jury concerning the truth of the premises, &c.—Westminster, 6 July, 22 Edw. III. (1348). [Staff. Hist. Col., vol. 1913, page 126-128.]

Panel. Thomas de la Hyde mainperned by Richard Scot and Robert Foyl. John de Burghton mainperned by John la Warde and Robert la Warde. Robert de Sogenhull (sworn) mainperned by Ralph Michel and Roger Michel. John de Stoke (sworn) mainperned by John atte Noche and Richard Strup. Robert le Budel (sworn) mainperned by John Tochet and Richard Tochet. Adam de Ocle (sworn) mainperned by Roger Ridel and John Ridel. Edmund de Prestbury (sworn) mainperned by John atte Pipe and Hugh atte Pipe. William de Offeleye mainperned by John Bole and Richard Bole. Roger le Mareschal (sworn) mainperned by John Colle and Walter Colle. William de Huntetache (sworn) mainperned by Richard Tiwe and John Tiwe. Philip de Frankevyle mainperned by Robert Fowe and William Fowe. Henry de Huntetache (sworn) mainperned by Henry Dobbe and William Dobbe. Robert son of Ely (sworn) mainperned by Roger Foyl and John Foyl. Robert le Serjaunt (sworn) mainperned by William Fox and Richard Coleman. Richard le Taylour (sworn) mainperned by Ralph Gibbe and Richard Gibbe. Adam le Warde mainperned by Roger Moyl and Richard Moyl. John le Parker mainperned by John Mille and Richard Pipejay. John de Badenhal mainperned by John Folke and Roger Mille. William Bamevyle mainperned by Henry Foy and John Foy. Mainperned means that the party named became surety for the appearance of the Juror at the time fixed for the inquisition.

An Inquisition taken at Pencrych, before Roger Hillary, and Simon de Ruggeleye, Sheriff of Staffordshire, Justices, assigned by the King to take an Inquisition in the aforesaid County, by virtue of a Commission annexed to this Inquisition and directed to the same Roger and Simon, on Saturday the Eve of St. Laurence (9 Aug. 1348): by the oath of Robert de Soggenhulle, John de Stoke, John de Horsleye, Robert le Budel, Adam de Ocle, Edmund de Prestbury, Roger

le Mareschal, William de Huntebache, Henry de Huntebache, Robert son of Ely, Robert le Serjaunt, and Richard le Taillour, who say upon their oath that Robert de Horsle, father of John de Horsle, did demise to Adam de Peshale forty acres of land in Horsle to hold for the term of the life of the same Robert, and that the aforesaid Adam, on the day that he died, was seized of the aforesaid land, by virtue of the demise of the aforesaid Robert—whereof 26 acres are holden of the Lord Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, by the service of 23s. 6d. yearly, and the residue of the same land is holden of John de Melbourne, prebendary of one portion of the prebend of Eccleshale, by the service of 2s. yearly, and the forty acres are worth yearly 6s. 8d. beyond the service aforesaid, and Robert on the day of his death (something omitted) and the same John is next heir of the same Robert and that the same land together with other lands and tenements, were taken into the King's hands on account of the forfeiture of the aforesaid Adam. In witness &c.

Mandate directed to William de Shareshull, Richard de Stafford, Roger de Aston, and Hugh de Aston. Stating that Roger, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, has prayed the King by his petition exhibited before the King and his Council, that whereas Adam de Peshale, deceased, held on the day of his death of the same Bishop certain lands and tenements within the Manor of Eccleshale belonging to the same Bishop as of the right of his church of St. Chad at Lichfield, by the service of four pounds, nineteen shillings and sixpence by the year, and by certain other services; and the said rent from the time of the death of the aforesaid Adam, on the day of his death, for certain reasons were taken and are kept in the King's hands; remaineth until now in arrear to the same Bishop; he (the same Bishop) prayed that the King would command the same rent, together with the arrears of the same, from the time aforesaid, to be paid to the same Bishop. The King, in order that he may cause to be done that which is just, wishes to be certified what lands and what tenements Adam so held of the Bishop, on the day of his death; and he assigns the above William de Shareshull and the others to inquire by the oath of good and lawful men of the County of Stafford, in the presence of the Custos of the lands and tenements, to be warned by them, if he shall wish to be present.—Westminster, 4 February, 25 Edw. III. (1351).

William de Shareshull and his associates assigned by Commission of the King to take a certain Inquisition between the King and Roger, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, in the County of Stafford, to the Sheriff of the same County; Greeting:—on behalf of the King we command thee that thou do cause to come before us at Brewode on Wednesday in the fifth week of Lent, 18 free and lawful men of the view of Eccleshale, by whom the truth of the matter may be better ascertained, to acknowledge upon their oath what lands and what tenements Adam de Peshale, deceased, held of the aforesaid Bishop in thy County, on the day of his death, and by what service, &c. And thou shalt have there the writ Close of the Lord the King, which hath come to thee concerning the same, the names of the Jurors, and of those through whom thou shalt have sent the warning aforesaid and this mandate.—Westminster, 16 February, 25 Edw. III.

(On the back.) The answer of Thomas Adam, Sheriff. The execution of this Mandate is carried out, as appears in the writ of the Lord the King, and in

the inquisition to this mandate served. And as to causing the Custos of the lands and tenements mentioned in the writ to be warned, I, Thomas Adam, Sheriff, am the Custos of the lands and tenements aforesaid: and because I cannot be personally present before you on the day and at the place mentioned in the writ, on account of other business of the King, I sent you in my name as Sheriff and Custos of the lands and tenements aforesaid, Richard de Engleton, to give evidence at the same Inquisition for the Lord the King, and to do all things which I should do, if I were personally present.

Inquisition taken at Brewode, before William de Shareshull, and Hugh de Aston, by virtue of the writ patent of the King to this Inquisition served; on Wednesday in the fifth week of Lent, 25 Edw. III.: In the presence of Richard de Engleton, the deputy of Thomas Adam, Sheriff of the County of Stafford, and Custos of the lands and tenements which were of Adam de Peshale in the County of Stafford; by the oath of John atte Brok, John de Chebbeseye, Stephen de Aspeleye, John atte Grove, Robert Elys of Horsleye, Thomas de Hakedon (Acton), Thomas de Sardon, Thomas Dalowe, Richard de Kemesheye, Richard Banastre, Roger le Smyth, and John le Budel. Who say upon their oath that the aforesaid Adam de Peshale, on the day of his death, held of Roger, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, the lands and tenements underwritten within the Manor of Eccleshale, viz., two messuages and the third part of nine virgates of land in Bishops Offeleye within the Manor aforesaid, by the service of the twelfth part of one knight's fee, and by the service of finding the third part of the ploughing with two ploughs in the demesne lands of the Bishop of his manor aforesaid for four days in every year; viz., for two days at the time of the winter seed, and for two days at the time of the Lenton seed at his own proper costs, and the day's work of each ploughing is worth entirely 4d.; and by the service of finding at his own proper costs the third part of the expenses for eight men for the Chase of the Bishop at his park of Blore for three days in every year, and for eight other men to reap the corn within the aforesaid Manor of the Bishop likewise for three days in the autumn of every year, when he (Adam de Peshale) and the other tenants of the remainder of the nine virgates of land charged with the aforesaid services shall be warned thereto by the Bishop. And each day's work of each of the aforesaid men for the Chase, &c. is worth $\frac{1}{2}$ d. And each day's work of each of the aforesaid men for reaping, &c., is worth $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. And for the messuages and third part of nine virgates of land Adam is bound to do suit at the court of the Bishop of Eccleshale every three weeks. He held also one messuage and the fourth part of two virgates of land in Wotton, within the aforesaid Manor, late of Robert le Frank, by fealty and service of twelve pence by the year. The moiety of one virgate of land in Hertesshalgh, heretofore of Peter de Hadedon (Acton), 12d.; one burgage in Le Marketstede, heretofore of John le Bedel, 12d. The moiety of one burgage there, heretofore of John de Medbourne, 6d. The moiety of one burgage there, heretofore of William the Wheeler, 6d. The moiety of one burgage there, heretofore of Adam le Gurdelere, 6d. The moiety of one burgage in Donkesfordelane, heretofore of Richard le Barkere, 6d. The moiety of one burgage there heretofore of Henry le Mason, 6d. The sixth part of one burgage with a certain increment, viz., one small plot of land annexed to the same, here-

tofore of the aforesaid Adam le Gurdelere, 2½d. The moiety of one burgage in a certain place within the Manor aforesaid called Byyondence, heretofore of Roger le Mareschall, 6d. The moiety of one burgage with appurtenances in Edianescroft, heretofore of the same Roger le Mareschal, 6d. The third part of one burgage near Piereswall, heretofore of John de Haliok, 4d. The fourth part and the twelfth part of one burgage near the Cross, heretofore of Warin le Blount, 4d. The moiety of one burgage in le Barre Medewe, heretofore of Thomas le Bedel, 6d. The moiety of one burgage in le Markestede, heretofore of the same Thomas, 6d. One burgage and a half in le Polcroft, heretofore of the same Thomas 18d. One burgage near le Sperte, heretofore of the same Thomas, 12d. The moiety of one burgage in le Sperte, heretofore of the same Thomas, 6½d. Two cottages upon the heath ground, heretofore of the same Thomas, 2s. The ninth part of a certain field called Donkesford, 14s. Six acres of land and a half in the ancient park, heretofore of the aforesaid Thomas le Bedel, 6s. 6d. The moiety of one acre of land there, heretofore of John Wyther, 6d. One field which is called le Prestesfeld, heretofore of Robert de Horseleye, 8s. 3½d. Two acres and two parts of one rood of land in le Boolebruch, heretofore of the same Robert, 13d. Seventeen acres and one rood and a half of land, heretofore of the same Robert, lying separately at Cassebruch and Hulleforde, 14s. 6½d., &c. Ten acres of land and a half at le Foxholes and la Casse, heretofore of Stephen de Horsleye, 8s. 9½d. One rood of meadow near Hulleford, heretofore of the same Stephen, 3d. One rood of meadow there, heretofore of Editha de Coton, 3d. One plot of land and pasture there, heretofore of William Fraunceys, 12d. Three roods of meadow near Hullefordheye, and the moiety of one acre of meadow at Lyghthurst, heretofore of William Parent, 1s. 3d. Two plots of land enclosed in Arleyes. Ten acres of land in Lythewode and Westwode. One plot of land enclosed upon le Rowehull, heretofore of Robert le Cotes, 4s. One acre and a half of land upon le Rowehull, heretofore of Adam de Aspeleye. The moiety of one acre of land there heretofore of Thomas le Wodeward, 2s. One acre and one rood of land in Gratewode, heretofore of John Drewery, 15d. One acre of land near the Cemetery, heretofore of Thomas de Cestre, 12d. Three roods of land and a half at Brokholebruche, heretofore of Nicholas de Horsleye, 10½d. One acre of land, Royal, in the new field, 2s. 3d. And one acre of land called le Newebruche near Hullefordehaye, 12d. And three roods of land near the garden of the same Adam at Offeleye, 9d. And they say that all the aforesaid lands and tenements, and no more, the aforesaid Adam held of the aforesaid Bishop within the Manor of the same Bishop of Eccleshale, by the services aforesaid. And he died seised of the same lands and tenements in his demesne as of fee. In witness, &c.

SECTION 2.

The Ancestry of JOAN DE EYTON, daughter of John de Eyton on the Wealdmoors. She married first, Henry de Cresswell, who was outlawed and killed for felony; second, Adam de Peshale. It is remarkable that this lady should have two husbands who both were outlawed and killed as felons. It gives a good glimpse of the politics of the times that such should have been the case.

Mandate to the Sheriff of Stafford, directing him to inquire by the oath of a Jury of the County of Stafford, whether or not the Manor of Crassewell, with appurtenances, which Thomas, son of Henry de Crassewell, held, who was outlawed for the felony which he committed, has been in the King's hands for a year and a day; and of what person or persons he held the same Manor and who now holds the same, and who has had the King's year, day, and waste, and ought to answer to the King therefor.—Berwick-upon-Tweed, 8 January, 9 Edw. III. (1336). [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1913.]

Inquisition taken before John de Hinkeleye, Sheriff of Stafford, at Stafford on Saturday on the morrow of the Purification of the Blessed Mary (3 Feb., 1336): by the oath of John de H——, Thomas de Dutton, Hugh de Haveyate (Hobbergate), Thomas de Hampton, David de Peulesden, Roger de Pichford, Roger de Levedale, William de Caverswall, William de Stretton, Robert de Lynhull, John de Bykefore, and Richard del Bet——me. Who say that the manor of Crassewell with appurtenances, which Thomas son of Henry de Crassewell held, who was outlawed for the felony which he committed, has been in the King's hands for a year and a day. And that the same Thomas held the Manor aforesaid of John de Eyton upon Wildemor of the County of Salop, and not of any other person. And that Thomas de Swynnerton now holds the same Manor by grant of the King. And that the same Thomas de Swynnerton has had the King's year, day, and waste and ought to answer to the Lord the King therefore. In witness, &c. Her second husband, Adam de Peshale, met a like fate in 1346. Her family obtained their name from Eyton on the Wealdmoors in Shropshire. Domesday describes this Manor among those held by William Pantulf under the Norman Earl. Pantulf will be recalled as brother of Ligulph. The Domesday Record says:—The same William holds Etone, and Warin holds it of him. Wighe and Ouiet held it in Saxon times for two Manors. Here are 111 hides, geldable. In demesne there are 11 ox-teams, and there are 111 Neat-herds, 11 Villains, and 1 Boor with half a team; and yet there might be a team-and-a-half additional here. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 23s. (per annum). Now it is worth 20s. [Antiquities of Shropshire Church, vol. 8, page 27-28.]

Thus Adam de Peshale and Joan de Eyton were cousins, which marriage marks another intermarriage between the great colony of Northumbrian cousins in Staffordshire and Shropshire. And as marriage is largely a case of environment, hence of association, this marriage indicates the fact that both families were near neighbors in Shropshire.

Warin was William Pantulf's chief Feoffee in Shropshire. Besides Eyton he held Bratton and Horton under the same Baron. The next known Lord of these three Manors was Robert de Eyton, living in the reign of Henry II. The probability that Robert de Eyton was Warin's direct descendant and heir is not the mere average probability that the Tenant of three distinct Manors a century after Domesday was the lineal representative of the Tenant of those same Manors at Domesday. Pantulf's Barony was exempt from all probability of being disturbed as to its constituents by that great Shropshire catastrophe, the fall of Earl Robert de Belesme. We know in short that it was then or afterwards enlarged rather than diminished, and we may fairly presume that this was in

reward of the loyalty of its Chief, and his services at the siege of Bridgnorth. Warin was himself a Cadet of the House of Pantulf, for the Descendants of Robert de Eyton, his presumed heir, have uniformly quartered the Arms of Pantulf. It has been suggested that this quartering of the Arms of a Suzerain might have been merely in token of feudal dependence. The alternate theory seems to be that, when a vassal is found bearing the Arms of his Suzerain, as a quarter and without any difference, he was his Suzerain's relation by blood as well as tenure. This is a very interesting as the arms of Pantulf, Baron of Wem, are Gu. two bars erm., while those of Eyton of the Wildmoors are a fret or. with a brodure ar. This shows quite conclusively that the Eyton family is a production of a marriage between Pantulf and Audley. The Audleys were descended from Adam, son of Ligulph, Chapter 11, Section 3, while the Pantulfs are descended from William, Chapter 11, Section 3, Division 7, the brother of Ligulph, and by the marriage of Joan de Eyton with Adam de Peshall, Junior, we have another intermarriage as he was descended from Ligulph through his son Osbert, whose daughter Ormunda married Robert de Peshall, Chapter 11, Section 1. The important part of this is that W. de Eyton, related both to the Staffords and the family of Peshall, witnesses the deed of confirmation for the Manor of Peshall to Robert Fitz Gilbert de Corbeil by the second Robert de Stafford.

The Lords of Eyton obtained feoffment from the Barons of Wem in four Manors, in which Domesday does not state that Warin or any other Tenant had as yet acquired investiture. That this change was soon after Domesday is clear, for the whole Fief held by De Eyton under Pantulf was of old Feoffment. The four Manors in question were Buttery, Half-Lawley, and Sutton, all in Shropshire, and Cresswell, in Staffordshire.

It is with respect to Buttery, and Robert de Eyton's disposal thereof in the reign of Henry II., that the history of this family recommences, about half a century after Domesday. Robert de Eyton gave Buttery to Shrewsbury Abbey, with the consent of Ivo Pantulf his Suzerain. As usual in such early grants, the confirming Deed of the Suzerain is the only one preserved, perhaps the only one executed at the time. Ivo Pantulf addressing his sons, acquaints them that he has conceded in almoign to the Monks of Shrewsbury a certain estate which is called Buttereia, which Robert de Eiton had given to the said Monks. Witnesses, Alured Abbot of Hageman, Ivo Chaplain, Ralph Pantulf, Walter Meverel, Roger de Bethesloua John de Eppeleia, Helias de Jai, Robert Christian, &c. The above deed probably passed about 1135, and so was coeval with the close of Robert de Eyton's life. Ivo de Pantulf (1102) was contemporary with his cousin Ormunda who married Robert de Peshall. Robert de Eyton married Edelina de Stafford and his son William de Eyton witnessed the deed of confirmation made by Robert de Stafford to Robert Fitz Gilbert de Corbeil, circa 1160, for the manor of Peshall, which quite clearly fixes the date of the execution of this deed.

Peter de Eyton, his successor and son, is known chiefly by his attestations of the earlier Charters of Wombridge Priory. The Benefactions of Madoc ap Gervase, Lord of Sutton, of Walter de Dunstanvill, Lord of Idsall, of John de Cambrai Lord of Lee-Gomery and of Alan de Hadley Lord of Hadley, range

between the years 1180 and 1194, and they are nearly all attested by Peter de Eyton. In 1191 a suit about land in Creswell was decided by verdict of twelve Recognizors. Peter de Eiton was one of them, and the matter having been reopened in June 1200, he attended at Westminster with six other Recognizors to certify what had taken place in 1191. In 1207 a number of amercements (probably inflicted at a recent Forest-Assize) are entered on the Shropshire Pipe-Roll. One of half a merk is charged on Peter de Eaton. The Pipe-Roll of 1212 contains a fine of 100s. which Peter de Hetton had proffered and paid for having the land of his Father (pro habendi terra patris sui). It is not known that the Eytons were Tenants-in-capite, nor was the Barony of Wem likely at this period to have been in custody of the Crown. Still this Fine indicates the succession of an Eyton of Eyton to his Father. If so, both father and son were named Peter.

Peter de Eyton II. About the year 1220 Peter de Eyton, calling himself son of Peter de Eyton, made a concession to Lilleshall Abbey. His Charter is entitled in the Chartulary of that House as Carta Petri de Eyton de stagno de Lubersty et molendino ibidem firmando. He concedes for the souls'-health of himself, his ancestors and successors, and in pure alms, a stank for the Abbot's Vivary on the rivulet called Holebroch in the Moor of Hardbur', and allows that the Canons may establish such stank on his land, and that the water may thus be made to backpound on his land.

A similar and contemporary concession by the Tenants-in-fee of the adjoining Manor of Preston was sanctioned by the Deed of their Suzerain, viz., Baldwin de Hodnet, who died in December 1224. This gives the probable date of the transaction. Some local peculiarities are worth observation. The spot where the Abbot of Lilleshall intended to establish a Vivary, or Mill, or both is still known as Lubstree Park. The Brook, then called Holebrook, but now Humber-Brook, here divided the Abbot's Grange of Honington on the East, from Peter de Eyton's Manor of Horton and Baldwin de Hodnet's Manor of Preston on the West. Such a brook could not be dammed up or impounded without the consent of the landholders on the opposite bank. Hence the above concessions to Lilleshall.

About the same date Peter de Eyton appears as witness to a chart preserved in the British Museum (9326) concerning land in Wem, co. Salop, which provides that the men of Sleaf, co. Salop, are to repair the mill of Fran de Slepe. Know by these presents and future that I Hugo Panton give and concede by this my charta and confirm to Ric. de Slepe of the village of Slepe with pertinences &c. Testibus: Robt. Cort. Viniano de Roshal, Robt. de Sej, Hugo Cort, Robt. de Wudecote, Willo. Panton and Robt. Panton & Iuone & Alano & Hugo Sutz, Petro de Eitona, Iuone de Becelawe & Mag'ro Willo Iuone fresno, Reginaldo de He, Petro de Herton, Robt de Logedon and many others. On the back in old handwriting: Hugo Panton to Richard Sleaf. (Without date. 13th century.)

In Trinity Term 1222 and again in Easter Term 1226, Peter de Eyton and Thomas de Constantine were the only two Recognizors who attended at Westminster, in a great cause between Giled de Erdington and Elena Princess of Wales, concerning the Manor of Wellington.

Between the years 1216 and 1224, Peter de Eyton attested a deed of Alan, Abbot of Lilleshall. This conjunction of names may serve to date an agreement

which resulted after some dispute between the said Abbot Alan and Peter de Eyton relative to the right of common in their respective woods. The Canons and their men were now to have the same entire common-right in Peter's Wood as they had enjoyed of old. Peter was to have similar right in the Canons' wood, except in the Park called Gubald's Haye and in other places enclosed with ditch or fence. Moreover Peter's men of Buterey were to have housebote and haybote in the Canons' moor of The Wildmoor, without question or view of the Canons' Foresters, but they were to give or sell nothing of the said easements, nor indeed to use them themselves, except when Peter's own land could not fully supply their needs. And the said men of Buterey were to make oath to keep faith with the Church of Lilleshall both with respect to that moor and other places. Each Party sealed a counterpart of this agreement and the Writings were exchanged.

The above agreement affords some presumption that Peter de Eyton had not as yet recognized his Ancestor's grant of Buttery to Shrewsbury Abbey. This he did subsequently. The years 1225 and 1227 are the certain limits of a Deed whereby Peter de Eyton gives to the said Abbey the whole land of Butherey and acquits it of all services to himself. This purports to have been done for a nominal sum of 2s. paid by the Monks, and the Deed was attested by Sir John le Strange, William Pantulf, Ralph de Picheford, John Boneth, then Sheriff of Salopesire, William Thaleboth, Hugh fitz Robert, Hugh de Hedlega, John de Chetewind, Roger Sprengnose, William Chaplain of Wrocestre, Thomas de Eston, Wido de Glesseg (Glazeley), Ralph Marescall (of Boreton) and Hugh de Kynsedeleg. The Pipe-Roll of 1231 has Peter de Eytun as amerced 20s. for not producing one, for whom he was Surety, at a recent Forest-Assize.

An agreement between the Abbot to Shrewsbury and William de Ercalwe bears date May 13, 1234, and is attested by Peter de Eyton as second, and by William de Eyton as fifth witness. Peter and William were, perhaps, father and son, though Peter had a brother named William. The latest notice of Peter de Eyton as he is called, bears date October 13, 1237, when with twelve other Recognizors of knightly degree, he attended a great Trial concerning Shawbury, taken before the King himself at Worcester. At his death, which must have taken place within three years after this, Peter de Eyton left his wife Alice surviving. On February 3, 1249, the said Alice quitclaimed to Adam, Abbot of Shrewsbury, all her right in Botereye, in the way of dower, the Abbot undertaking to pay her an annuity of half a merk. Witnesses, Richard de Preston, and Robert de Rodinton. In or about January 1250, Geoffrey de Langley set an arrentation of 9d on an acre at Eyton, taken from the Forest by Alice, Relict of Peter de Eyton. William de Eyton, the brother of Peter, already mentioned, was seated at Eaton upon Tern. He occurs as a Juror or a Surety in June 1220 and August 1226, his name being written Eton or Ethon; but in a grant which about 1223 he made of a meadow at Eaton, he calls himself William son of Peter de Eton, son that is of Peter de Eyton (1). Peter de Eyton II. was succeeded at Eyton by his son and heir,—

William de Eyton, whom the Feodaries of 1240 enter as holding one fee in Eyton, and one fee in Kereswal (Cresswell), of the Barony of Wem. Though so

great a Feoffee, it does not appear that this William ever obtained the honor of knighthood. There is double proof that in November 1240 he married an heiress or coheiress, Matilda by name. Her interest at Leanards-Lee seems to have been in part sold, while that at Rochull (near Wall-Town) was established against certain disputants.

It is probable that William de Eyton was for a time contemporary with his uncle of the same name, and it is certain that a third William de Eyton was resident near the Wrekin about this period. It is hard to distinguish the Lord of Eyton and these contemporaries, by their position in certain testing-clauses and jury-lists.

Between the years 1242 and 1248 William de Etton was the third of twelve Recognizors who attended the Sheriff, Forester, and Verderers of Shropshire to decide what were the Abbot of Lilleshall's rights in a question of forest-law. In 1248 William de Etun was fourth juror on a Withyford Inquest. Again William de Eton was Foreman of the Jury which about February 1249 attended at Shrewsbury to make inquest as to the estate of Hugh Fitz Robert, late Forester of Shropshire. This William was surely the individual now under notice. As William de Ethon he again sat Foreman of a Jury which on January 30, 1251, decided a dispute between the Abbeys of Buildwas and Lilleshall. In 1255 he was deceased, his widow Matilda surviving him, his son and heir, Peter, being an infant, probably under ten years of age. Hence the Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says as follows:—Peter de Eiton is Lord of Eiton and is in ward to Peter Peverel by gift of Ralph le Butiler (then Baron of Wem). And he (Peter de Eiton) holds the said Manor by service of one knight at Wemme, in time of war, for 40 days, at his own charges. And the Manor used to so suit to County and Hundred, but it has been withdrawn these ten years; and the said suit is worth 2s. yearly.

Matilda, widow of William de Eyton, remarried to Walter de Pedwardine and took with her in dower one-third of two parts of the estate of Eyton. The remaining part had never come to William de Eyton's hands, for it was held at the time of his death by his mother Alice, who survived him. Alice however died before 1256, and at the Assizes of January in that year a curious point in the Law of Dower had its solution. Walter de Pedwardine and Matilda his wife, having already one-third of two-thirds of two carucates in Eyton in Wydemore as Matilda's dower, sued Peter Peverel and Ralph de Kent for a third of that remaining third which had now lapsed to the general estate by death of Alice. The Plaintiffs asserted that William de Eyton had given dower to Matilda out of this remaining third. This the Defendants denied, saying that William had never been seized of the said third except in tenancy and during the period between his father Peter's death and the allotment of the said third as his mother's dower. The facts were not in dispute. They were, that Peter de Eyton died seized of the whole estate, that William his son and heir instantly afterwards gave one-third to his mother Alice in dower, and had never been otherwise in seizin of such third:—obviously because his mother survived him. The question was one of law, viz., whether Walter de Pedwardine and Matilda could demand dower out of dower, i.e., take thirds in such part of William de Eyton's estate as had reverted

since his death. The Court decided in the negative, dismissed Peverel and Kent, sine die, and pronounced the Plaintiffs in misericordia for a false claim.

Walter de Pedwardine, Lord of Ingwardine in 1255 and 1284, has already been noticed. His distinctive career rather belongs to the localities now under notice, where he was resident for years. As early as 1253, he was foreman of a jury which made Inquest as to estates in Uppington and Newport. He took the Royalist side during the civil wars of 1264-5, and it was probably for some measures against a political opponent that he was impleaded in 1266 and 1268 as before noticed. We must remember however that the scene of his alleged trespass was Rochull, a place where he had an interest in right of his wife. A Patent of June 24, 1267, makes him Fermor for life of the King's Hundred of Bradford. This was in reward of his faithful services; but the rent of 8 marks which was retained by the Crown is known to have been a full and fair value of the office. He died apparently in 1297, but without any recorded interest remaining in North Shropshire. He was succeeded by a son Roger, of full age at his decease and who was perhaps his son by Matilda de Eyton. Meantime this Peter de Eyton (III.) had arrived at man's estate. The first mention of his name, otherwise than as an infant, is early in 1272, when Hugh Burnell had a Writ against him for disseizing the said Hugh of common-pasture in Eyton, and John de Appelle had a Writ against him for disseizing the said John of a tenement in Eyton. At the Assizes of September 1272 Peter de Eyton was third Juror for Bradford Hundred. His position on a Jury of March 1276 is not among the knights who composed it, but in an Inquest of December 2, 1277, he takes precedence of several known to have been knights at the time. In July, 1278, he appears as one of the Verderers of the Shropshire Forests, and in January, 1283, he is expressly styled a knight on a Newport Inquest. From this period till his death his occurrences as a Verderer, a Juror, or a Witness, are very frequent. The Feodaries of 1284-5, when collated show that Peter de Eyton was then holding two knights'-fees under Walter de Honton and his wife Matilda (Baroness of Wem). The Manors named as constituting this Fief are Eyton, Brochetone (Bratton), Sutton and half Lawley, in Shropshire, and Cresswell in Staffordshire. The latter was held under him by Henry de Cresswell. At the Assizes of 1292 he was one of the two Elisors, sworn to elect the Jury for Bradford Hundred. In the same year he was one of the Knights who tried several Pleas of Quo Waranto. He was returned for Salop as a knight of the Shire to the Parliament held at York on May 25, 1298, and again to the Parliament held at Lincolnshire in January, 1301. The latter he attended, and obtained his Writ of expenses for so doing. His Manucaptors were Roger le Wodeward of Eyton, and Richard his Brother. Meanwhile, on June 5, 1300, as one of the Verderers of Shropshire, he attended the great Perambulation then made, and afterwards ratified by Edward I.

Peter de Eyton (III.) had settled his estate, or at least the Manor of Eyton, by a Fine levied at Westminster on January 27, 1292. He first gives it to his son Peter (the Plaintiff), who returns it to his father, to hold for life, under the Lords of the Fee, with remainder to Peter, junior, and the heirs of his body, or in default of such heirs to Margery, sister of Peter, junior, and the heirs of her

body, with remainder to the right heirs of Peter, senior, quit of any other heirs of Margery.

Peter de Eyton (IV.), who in October, 1302, March 1303, January 1305, and March and May 1308, occurs as a prominent witness of Wombridge Charters, is in no instance styled a knight. Peter de Eyton had a brother John de Eyton who was the father of Joan, the wife of Adam de Peshall, and through her the Manor of Himley came to the Peshalls. 20 Edward I. Knights Fees. Dudley Barony 1292. John de Etone held of Roger de Semery on the day of his death the manor of Himley by the service of one knight's fee and it is worth yearly 10 pounds. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1911, page 205.]

Inquisition as to the extent of the Estate of Roger de Somerly deceased, October 11, 1291, as to the Manor of Seggesley inter alia. John de Eton and William de Baylott hold by one Knight's fee. John de Cresswelle and John de Eyton on jury of Inquisition as to estate of Richard de Harecourt. 21 Edward I. (1293). Staff. 25 Edward I. John de Eyton with others charged with cutting the wheat of Richard de Soudbache at Legh near Tene. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1911, page 202 and page 213, vol. 7, page 41.]

Peter de Eyton had a son John. He was the son of Peter (III.), now in possession of his estate. On May 21, 1311, he is styled Lord of Eyton and either under that style or as merely Peter de Eyton, he is a frequent witness of Wombridge Charters, the latest of which bears date January 20, 1324. A charter in 1320 speaks of him as Peter son of Sir Peter de Eyton and as having granted to the Canons of Wombridge a right of road through his land of Lega. This estate at Leonards Lee, whatever its extent, came to him in right of his grandmother, Matilda. On April 28, 1325, he was appointed a Commissioner for the purpose of raising Hobelers and Archers in Shropshire and Staffordshire, in place of Alan de Cherleton. Three Writs of the same year, the latest dated Sept. 20, instruct him concerning the marching and inspection of these levies;—but nothing further is learned certainly of him. 23 Edward I. (1295) Peter de Eyton on inquisition concerning the boundary between the land of John Tresel in co. Stafford and the Manors of the King in his Manor of Claverley in co. Salop. 28 Edward I. (1300) Peter de Eyton tenant of King's wastes in the Royal Forests. 34 Edward I. (1306) Staff. Peter de Eyton surety for Michael de Morton arrested and fined for conspiracy and trespass. 33 Edward I. (1305) Peter de Eyton called to Warranty their lands in the manors of Arneleye excepting the mers of the seven and the manor of La Bures in Co. Stafford. [Antiquities of Shropshire Church vol. 8, by Eyton. Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 7, page 29; vol. 1911, page 266; vol. 7, pages 142 and 169.]

John de Eyton, son and heir of Peter de Eyton (IV.), occurs as John de Eyton on August 13, 1328, and as John, Lord of Eyton, on Sept. 21, 1331, and as John de Eyton on Jan. 6, 1333;—and from thence till July 25, 1344, when he is styled Dominus Johannes de Eyton super le Wildmore, but it is evident from the context of this Deed that he was not a knight, and that neither he nor his father, nor yet his son, ever attained that dignity. On May 7, 1339, a Fine was levied whereby Richard de Tatenhall and Margery his wife (Deforciant) quitclaim for themselves, and the heirs of Margery, to John de Eyton (Plaintiff)

100s. rent in Eyton super le Wyldmore. For this, John de Eyton paid 60 merks.

Peter de Eyton (V.), son and heir of John, occurs as a witness on March 25 and May 3, 1354. On April 2, 1366, he presented to Eyton Church, and on May 21, 1377, he occurs again as witness of a Deed already quoted, but not as a knight. Peter de Eyton (V.) was succeeded by his son and heir,—

John de Eyton (II.), who served the office of Sheriff of Shropshire in 1394, and also by a son Peter. 18 Edward II. (1325) Staff. Banco Roll. Robert Tochet sued Roger Corbet, chivaler, Peter de Eyton and Roger Charles of Albright for a debt of 100 pounds. [Eyton's Antiquities of Shropshire Church, vol. 8. Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 9, page 105.]

SECTION 3.

HUGH DE PESHALL, son of Adam Peshall I., Chapter 16, Section 1.

Assize at Wolverhampton in Co. Stafford. 31 Edward I. (1303). An Assize if Richard, son of Hugh Galpyn of Dulverne, Richard de Caverswell, William de Caverswell, clerk, William Cort of Caverswell and Hugh de Peshale of Dulverne had unjustly deseized Robert Galpin of Chedel of a toft and a half a virgate and two acres of land and three acres of meadow in Delhon. Richard de Caverswell answered as tenant and stated he entered by the said Richard, son of Hugh, and Richard son of Hugh stated his father died seized of the tenements and he had entered into them as his son and heir. Verdict for the defendant. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 7, part 1, page 132.]

Coram Rege Michaelmas 10 Edward II. Staff. John de Rossenton appeared against Richard de Cressewell, and Richard his son, Ralph le Mareschal and Hugh de Peshall in a plea of trespass. The defendants did not appear and the Sheriff returned that Richard de Cressewell had been attached by Robert de Modewale and Ralph de Cressewal and Richard son of Richard by Elias de Flams-tide, and John his brother, and Hugh de Peshale by his brother and William de Aderdele. They are therefore in misericordia and the Sheriff returned that Ralph le Mareschal could not be found. He was therefore ordered to arrest him and to distrain the others and to produce them at the Morrow of the Purification. [*Ibid.* vol. 10, part 1, page 22.]

Banco Roll Easter 11 Edward II. Staff. 1318. Elena, formerly wife of Robert le Clerk of Bradeleye sued Hugh de Peshale for a third of twenty-four acres of land in Chedle as her dower. Hugh called to warranty Robert, son of Robert le Clerk of Bradeleye who is to be summoned for the Quindene of St. Michael. [*Ibid.* vol. 9, part 1, page 72.]

Ego Radus Basset de Parkhall dedi fil Nico. Rado homagin &c. de Hugon de Pessall &c. terras quas Drus Hugo de Pessall tenet me in Bradley, dat apud Bradley 11 Ed. II. Translation:—I, Radus Basset of Parkhall, have given to the son of Nicholas Radus, homager, &c., from Hugo de Pessall, &c. the land which Lord Hugo de Pessall holds from me in Bradley. Dated at Bradley 11 Edward II. Plea Rolls 1327. The Dean and Chapel of Lichfield sued Robert Tene and Hugh de Peshale for debt. [Rev. John Persall; 818 in Harl. MSS. page 76; *Id.* Vis

Cestr. No. 2119 in Harl. MSS. Le Neve d. Dedes of Seve Fam. Vist. Cestr. No. 2022 in Harl. MSS. Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 11, page 1-2.]

The Subsidy Roll of A.D. 1327 Fosbrook. Hugone de Peshale 11s. 6d. [*Ibid.* vol. 7, page 1, page 218.]

The Tax List (Subsidy Roll. 6 Edward III. 1333, Dulverne & Forsbrook, Hugo de Peshale. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 10, part 1, page 117.]

Mandate to Roger de Chaundos, the King's Escheator in the County of Stafford, &c.; reciting that William de Kaverswall has besought the King to grant that he and his heirs for ever may have view of Frankpledge, with all things to the same view belonging, from all their men and tenants within their Manors of Kaveswell and Dulverne, in the County of Stafford, and also the chattels, which are called Waif, found within the same Manors. The King wishing to be certified if he can, without damage or prejudice to himself or to others, or diminution of his farm of the County of Stafford, grant to the same William the liberties aforesaid; to have to the same William and his heirs as is aforesaid for ever, &c. &c.—Wodestok, 20 July, 6 Edw. III. (1332). [*Ibid.* vol. 1913, page 40.]

Inquisition made at Stone, before Roger de Chaundos, the King's Escheator in the Counties of Stafford, &c., in the presence of the Sheriff of Stafford, on the 12th of September, 6 Edw. III., viz., by the oath of Ralph Basset, William de Chetewynd, Ralph Burgyloun, Richard son of William, Henry de Wynleye, William de Lee, Richard de Wythhurste, Philip de Lee, Nicholas de Bagenholte, Hugh de Pessale, Hugh, son of Robert de Somerleye, and Alexander de Fowelle, who say upon their oath that the King can, without damage, grant, &c.

And they say that the Manor of Kareswelle is holden of Thomas de Fornival, Lord of Alveton, as of inheritance of his wife, by the service of 10s. by the year for everything. And they say that the Manor of Dulverne is holden of William de Stafford, by the service of one Knight's fee. And they say that the view aforesaid by itself may be worth by the year in all issues, according to the true value of the same, 3 shillings. And they say that the chattels aforesaid by themselves as a certainty may be worth nothing; but by chance they may be worth by the year 12 pence. In witness, &c.

Nov. 29, 1336, 10 Edw. III. Extent of the knights' fees and advowsons of Churches which did belong to Theobald de Verdun, deceased, who held in capite of the Lord the King; made before Adam de Wyleby, the King's Escheator in the Counties of Stafford, &c.; at Stafford on the 16th October, 9 Edw. III.: by the oath of Richard de Verney, Robert de Onyley, Ralph Burgiloun, Richard de Bromleye, Richard Smalrys, William de Huggeford, William Moykok, Richard de Whithurst, Robert de Cumbrugge, Hugh de Peshale, Richard de Gretwicke, and William Shirard. Who say upon their oath that John de Verdun held the moiety of a knight's fee with appurtenances in Fornwerk (Formark, Co. Derby), of Theobald de Verdun, which is extended at 100s. by the year. And that John de Sherthales and the heirs of Robert de Farnham hold a knight's fee with appurtenances in Herteshorn, of the inheritance of the aforesaid Theobald, at £6 13s. 4d. The heirs of Robert Warde hold the moiety of one knight's fee with appurtenances in Neuhall, at £6 13s. 4d. Walter de Verdon and Philip de Baryngton held one knight's fee with appurtenances in Crakesmersh and Creyng-

thon, at £13 6s. 8d. And that there is one knight's fee with appurtenances in Northovere, of the inheritance of the aforesaid Theobald, which is extended at £6 13s. 4d. by the year. And they say upon their oath that there are no advowsons of Churches in the aforesaid County of Stafford, by the inheritance aforesaid. In witness, &c. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 1913, page 58.]

It appears that the year 1322 had been a bad one for the farmers in Staffordshire, so the tax collectors compounded or reduced the taxes which resulted in their getting themselves into difficulty with the officers of the King's exchequer. This they got out of by suffering a fine or penalty which is only another way of saying that the King accepted the taxes from them at the same rate they had collected from the tax payers. While possibly such a system might be open to fraud, yet this instance discloses the close and friendly relations existing in England between the ruler and his nobility.

Assize Roll of Divers Counties. Presentments made at Tuttebury in Co. Stafford on the Wednesday the Morrow of St. Nicholas, 17 E. II (7th Dec. 1323) before John de Stonore and his fellow justices. Staffordshire:—The Juries of divers Hundreds presented that Thomas de Pipe, Kt., and Philip de Lutteleye, lately principal Taxers and Collectors of the 10th and 6th in co. Stafford, under color of their office had taken a great sum of money from various vills, to their own use. They were summoned to appear before the Justices, and being questioned did not deny the fact, and prayed that they might be admitted to make a fine with the King for their transgressions, and the said Thomas was fined £40, for which John de Aston, Roger de Somerford, Henry de Heywode, Adam Henri of Stretton, John de Ipstanes, and William de Wolseleye were his sureties. And the said Philip was fined 50 marks for which John de Ipstanes, John de Benteleye, William de Perton, and Robert de Wyndoppe were his sureties. And at the same time Richard de Podemore and William de Thicknesse, Subtaxers of the 10th in the vill of Audeley and all the other subtaxers of the 10th and 6th in the county appeared and with one voice prayed that they might be admitted to make fine with the King for their transgressions in levying the said taxation, and the said Richard and William were fined 40s; whereby the King and his tax collectors were brought into accord. [Staff. Hist. Col. vol. 9, page 93-19.]

Among the other Subtaxers who were fined were William Elot and William son of William de Weston, Subtaxers of Kavereswall, 2 marks for which Hugh de Peshale and Henry del Wall are sureties; and Hugh de Peshall and Henry del Wall, Subtaxers of Dulverne, 2 marks, for which William Elot and William Wille are sureties. The principal Taxers and Collectors of the 20th, 18th and 16th lately granted to the King,—the juries presented that they misconducted themselves by taking a great sum of money by extortion from the various vills so that the vills might be spared in the taxation, and not be taxed according to the true value of their chattels. The Sheriff was therefore ordered to summon all the principal taxers &c. Among the subtaxers who were fined was Hugh de Pessale of Dulverne.

1347. Writ to summon a jury concerning some common lands in Magnfield, on the back of the writ is the name among others of Hugo de Pessale. [*Ibid.* vol. 11, n.s. page 62.]

SECTION 4.

SIR JOHN PESHALE, son of Adam Peshall, Chapter 16, Section 1, resided in Shropshire; died without male heirs.

May 1, 1313, Edmund, Earl of Arundel, then at Castle Isabel, quit claims to the Abbey of Haughmond a disputed parcel of wood between the Abbey wood and Upton wood. He also grants a place of waste land to the Abbey near Upton Mill. Witnesses:—Sir John Peshel, Sir John Blauymoster, knights, Sir Roger de Keynlet, Clerk, Roger Cheney, and Roger Careless. [Eyton's Antiquities of Shropshire, vol. 7, page 296.]

The Abbott's lands in Aston were exempted by John and Richard Fitz Alans Charter from all terrene demands, customs, works, tallages, and suits of court at Oswestry. The said charters were inspected, sealed and confirmed by Edmund Earl of Arundel in a great charter at Haghmon on December 27, 1318, and attested by Sir Fulk le Strange, John Peschel, and Thomas de Roshale, knights and by Richard Hard, Roger le Chenney, John de Lee and Robert de Preston. [*Ibid.* vol. 9, page 19.]


Here we have another instance of a de Peshall witnessing a deed of a Fitz Alan. Edmund Fitz Alan, Earl of Arundel, born 1285, was beheaded 1326. Richard Fitz Alan his son succeeded him as earl of Arundel and John Fitz Alan his brother was marshal of England. The Fitz Alans were in some way connected by marriage with the Ligulphs, the Lumleys having at least intermarried, and possibly there was a Peshall marriage as well. There would be every reason to believe that Sir John Peshall had married a daughter of Fitz Alan as on both the above instances he signs in the place usually reserved for near kinsmen. Hugh Pantulf had married a Fitz Alan, and William de Peshall, the ancestor of Sir John Peshall, had married a Pantulf, so we see there would be every likelihood that Sir John was married to a Fitz Alan. This record gives only a glimpse into the history of the family while it was domiciled in Shropshire. Nevertheless it indicates the continued high social position of our ancestors, that they matched with families of the rank of the Fitz Alans. In this generation the family rose to that knightly rank which gave it a place in Staffordshire-Shropshire affairs that it retained until beyond the time when our ancestor came to America, in connection with the monopoly of the tobacco trade. Sir John died without heirs and the rank fell to his brother Sir Richard, who married Margery Knighton.

SECTION 5.

*1. SIR RICHARD DE PESHALL son of Adam de Peshale, Chapter 16, Section 1, married first Alina de Mowbray, daughter and heir of John de Mowbray and his wife Alice, who was the daughter of William de Brewer, Lord of Cowerland. The family of de Bruce were descended from Eynor, Earl of Orkney, the son of Rognvald. He married, second, Margery Knighton, daughter of Hugh, Lord of Knighton. Child of first marriage:—

1. Maud de Peshall.

Child of second marriage:—



Engraved by J. Smith from a Drawing by J. C. ...

Printed by J. Smith at the ...

ST. GEORGE'S ABBEY,
Shropshire.

Engraved by J. Smith from a Drawing by J. C. ...



SEAL OF SIR JOHN PESCHALE

