

The Family of De Urtiaco.

BY REV. E. H. BATES, M.A.

A LARGE portion of the materials for this paper had been collected before the appearance of vol. xli, containing Mr. John Batten's Notes on North Perrot. As the object of those notes was to trace the descent of the manor, held by a junior branch of the De Urtiacos, the elder line was dismissed in a footnote, and so there seemed room for another article dealing with the same family. But to the author of the Notes I am much indebted, and also to the Rev. F. W. Weaver, Mr. E. A. Fry, and Mr. B. W. Greenfield, particularly to the two last named gentlemen for supplying transcripts of the inquisitions and other original documents referred to, and extracts from the new series of the Calendars of Records.

In the early mediæval history of Somerset, few families can have held a higher position than that of De Urtiaco or de Lorty. In all probability descended in the female line from a follower of the Conqueror, the family, by a series of marriages, acquired the lands of St. Clare, Rivel, and Ashleigh. Qualified by his wide possessions and his military skill, one representative of the family married a near relation of the Sovereign, and was created a Peer of Parliament. Then, just when it might have been supposed that their name would become as well known in the annals of England as Nevile,

Montacute or De Vere, the recklessness or worse of his successor threw away all the advantages gained by his ancestors, and extinguished the family.

It is the object of this paper to trace back to their first appearance in the west as far as accessible records will allow, the four families mentioned above.

And first of ST. CLARE.

Among the many tenants of the earl of Mortain in Somerset and Dorset, mentioned in Domesday, appears the name of Bretel. He held in Somerset Asshe (brittle), Grindeham, Appellie, Welesford, an 'ablata de' Churi, Swelle, an 'ablata de' Bruton in Redlynch, other lands in Redlynch, Berrewene, Stoke, Cucklington, Perret, land in Montacute, all which was rated in Domesday at forty hides. For his Dorset property see *Som. Arch. Proceedings*, xli, ii, 75. This was a large holding for a sub-tenant, but the Exeter Domesday gives the clue to his good fortune, by adding his family name, St. Clare or St. Clair, which was that of a noble family in Normandy. Although the scribe does not add the surname to every entry, yet as the various estates mentioned above are afterwards found gathered into one holding, it may safely be set down that the Bretel of Somerset and Dorset Domesday is one and indivisible.

Bretel St. Clare was a son of Walderne, Earl of St. Clare,¹ in Normandy, and therefore first cousin of Eudo St. Clare the "Dapifer," Lord of Colchester. The only Somerset reference outside Domesday to Bretel is to be found in the Montacute Chartulary. As Britellus de Sancto Claro he witnesses the foundation charter of William, Count of Mortain, and another charter records that he gave one hide in Biscopeston, *i.e.*, Montacute, the exact size of his holding there, as recorded in Domesday.²

Where he lived and died, and if he left any family, are

(1). *The Sinclairs of England*, ch. v. A work to be used with great caution.

(2). *Montacute Chartulary*, S.R.S., viii, nos. 1, 9.

questions difficult of solution ; but as his fiefs remain in one holding in the same family, one son or other relation seems to have been made heir.

Bretel had two brothers—Richard, who may be the Richard de sencler, a Domesday tenant in Norfolk and Suffolk, and William. According to one authority quoted above, this William was the St. Clair who deserted the Conqueror for Edgar Atheling, and following Margaret to the Scottish Court became the founder of the family which still bears the name of Sinclair. After the accession of Henry I, he or his descendants would be able to return to England. The name of William de St. Clare appears in connection with lands in Wilts and Dorset at the end of the reign of Henry I.³ In the Pipe Roll of 5 Henry II is recorded a pardon to William de Sco. Claro of £20 ; and in the Roll for 11 Henry II, William de St. Clare is entered as rendering an account of 58 *sh.* and 4*d.* to the Exchequer. Where all is doubtful one may be allowed to hazard a speculation that these later Williams were heads of the family in two generations. About this date the main line seems to have come to an end, as the name of St. Clare does not occur again in the Pipe Rolls hitherto published, but in the eighteenth year of the same reign Walter de Eisselega (ASHLEIGH) renders an almost identical account of 58 *sh.* and 9*d.* for the scutage of his small fees in the same county. Coupling this with the fact that Walter de Ashleigh undoubtedly got possession of most of the St. Clare property (as will be shown later on), it seems very probable that in the interval between these two dates the property passed from one family to the other. That this transfer followed on a marriage is not unlikely, from an undated deed in the Bruton Chartulary,⁴ whereby Walter de Esselega confirms a grant of certain lands and tithes in Montacute, Bruton, Langport and Knolle in the parish of Shepton Montacute, made by Walter, his father, and

(3). Pipe Roll, 31 Hen. I.

(4). Bruton Chartulary, S.R.S., viii, no. 270..

Felicia, his mother, "all which pertained to the inheritance of the said Felicia." This is pretty conclusive evidence that she was an heiress. Her husband was a man of some property in Wilts and Gloucestershire. In the former county he held Ashley, near Malmesbury, and Sutton (Veny or Fenny), near Heytesbury; in the latter county, King's Charlton by a grant from Henry II, and a lease of Cheltenham by a rent of £14 and 1d. from 1160.⁵ Walter de Esseleigh (father and son) had a long litigation with another branch of the St. Clare family concerning these estates, which was certainly in being as early as 1194, and not finally settled till 1219 by a fine, for the terms of which see Mr. Batten's paper. The claimant, Ralph de Seincler, had succeeded to the paternal property and lawsuit in his father's lifetime, as in 1195-6 he owed forty marks for having recognizance of five-and-a-half knight's fees, of which his father was possessed on the day that he took the garb of religion, by the pledges of Herbert Fitzherbert and Henry de Alneto. This statement is taken from the "Sinclairs in England," but the only reference given is to "Old documents headed Somerset and Dorset."

Ralph de Saint Cler's title could not have been a very strong one, as he was only able to get one manor, that of Ashbittle with its advowson; and even here Walter de Ashleigh retained the overlordship, as appears by an entry in Testa de Neville, p. 162. In Kirby's Quest, 1284,⁶ Will. de Sancto Claro held the manor of Henry de Urtiaco for one knight's fee of Mortain of the Barony of Trusterestok (Stoke Trister); John Seynt . . . is entered in Nomina Villarum as lord of the manor, and in 1339 Will. de Seyncler presented to the Rectory.⁷ It eventually passed to the Sydenhams.

It will be noticed that only a part of the St. Clare manors are mentioned in the fine of 1219—those in Dorset and in the

(5). Pipe Rolls *passim*.

(6). Kirby's Quest, etc., S.R.S., vol. iii.

(7). Weaver's "Somerset Incumbents," p. 308.

western part of Somerset. The lands in East Somerset do not seem to have been in dispute, and Walter de Esseleigh is found dealing with them as the acknowledged owner. By a fine, 3 Hen. III, No. 10, he yields to Richard Luvel four knights' fees in Redlis (Redlynch) and Baruwe, and two hides of lands in Marcis, receiving in exchange twenty-five marcs in money, a palfrey, and two goshawks, and retaining some interest in South Barrow, as in an inquisition of 31 Ed. I, John Ponnard is said to hold one fee in Suth barwe of Henry de Urtiaco.⁸ Marcis, in Somerset, is a noun of multitude; it does not occur among the Domesday holdings of Bretel de St. Clare, but may have been Marsh, part of Wincanton parish, but adjacent to, and much nearer, Cucklington. Here in after times the Lovels had a house and private chapel.

Walter de Esseleigh had also to acknowledge the right of William de Schollo to hold of him three virgates of land in Cucklington,⁹ but his right to that manor and the adjoining one of Stoke Trister does not seem to have been called in question.

Collinson¹⁰ derives Trister from the surname del Estre, which was borne by William (de Lestra), another tenant of the Count of Moretain at Bickenhall and Poyntington. In the *Liber Niger*, Richard de Lestre has a barony of four knights' fees, but there is nothing in the record (except that they are lesser fees of Moretain) to connect it with the barony of "Trusterestok," which seems to have been created at a later time. Eyton¹¹ follows Collinson in his derivation, on the ground that "in the case of Stoke Trister and Cucklington we can find no symptom of a descent to De Esseleigh as happened to the other Domesday estates of Britel de St. Clair, and therefore it becomes the more probable that they passed to

(8). *Kirby's Quest*, S.R.S., vol. iii, p. 44.

(9). *Ped. Fin.*, 11 Hen. III, 127. S.R.S., vol. vi.

(10). *Collinson*, iii, 50.

(11). *Eyton*, "Dom. Studies in Somerset," i, 116, 117.

some other family, such as that of Del Estre." Whereas, in addition to the Fine of 11 Hen. III mentioned above, Testa de Nevil records that "Walter de Aslega holds of the King, Stocke and Cucklington of the fee of Morton;" and evidence to the same effect is given in the Hundred Rolls.

Trister seems to have been added to Stoke in the thirteenth century. Trusterestok, Kirby's Quest; Tritestok, Nomina Villar.; Stoke Tristres, Drokensford's Reg. A perambulation of Selwood Forest, made probably in the reign of Edw. I, begins "à Tristro de Stokes," and finishes "ad Tristam de Stokes." Ducange explains "Tristra" as the appointed place for a hunting-meet, a trysting-place for the lord and such tenants as are charged to bring dogs to the chase. This is the most likely derivation, as it agrees both with the position and history of the manor.

[For this information I am indebted to Bp. Hobhouse's note in S. & D. N. & Q., iii, No. 236; and to another note by Rev. F. W. Weaver, in the same volume, No. 292.]

Walter de Ashleigh probably lived a good deal at Stoke Trister (in one entry in the Hundred Rolls he is styled Walter de Estoke) as several of the Bruton charters have his name among the witnesses. On one occasion he acted as supreme arbitrator in a dispute between the Priory and Jordan de Clington, Knt., concerning certain rights in the parish of Brocton (Bratton St. Maur), A.D. 1228.¹² In 1221-2, he gave, by the wish of his wife Godeheath, *i.e.*, Godiva, the church of Swell to the canons of Bruton.¹³

In the lesser anarchy of Henry III, Walter contributed a share, as the jurors for the hundred of Norton under Selwood complain that "Walter de Asshleigh, lord of Cucklington, Stoke, and Boyford (Bayford) refused to go to the Hundred Court, nor would he permit his men to go to the sheriff's

(12). Bruton Cart., No. 100.

(13). Bruton Cart., No. 177.

tourn, nor to give 2 shillings to the sheriff's tourn, as they were wont to do."

Walter de Esseleigh, Thomas Briton', Will. fil. Walter, and Matthew Wak', in 1243, gave fealty to the king for six-and-a-half fees of Moretain, which they had inherited as cousins and heirs of Henry fil. Richard.¹⁴

This "noble man" lived at Charlton Adam, and among the Bruton charters¹⁵ are two concerning a grant from the Priory to him of a free chapel in his court at Charlton, and his grant in return of divers parcels of land in the same village; and a confirmation of this arrangement by Bishop Jocelin in the thirty-second year of his pontificate, 1237-8.

Mr. Batten¹⁶ gives the descent of Henry Fitz-Richard from Haimo, a Domesday tenant of the Earl of Moretain at Buckhorn Weston, co. Dorset, but does not shew how these four individuals came to be in luck's way. Anderson¹⁷ has a perfectly different tale. He makes Weston to be Weston-in-Gordano, and Henry Fitz-Richard to be a Lovel of the house of Yvery, and of Castle Cary, in Somerset. He then adds that Weston was given to the four sisters of Henry and so was parted among them. The one grain of truth here may be the mention of four sisters, who on this supposition married the four heirs mentioned above; and in those days a wife conveyed all her rights to her husband. The fact that this windfall caused no permanent addition to the family property also points to the conclusion that Walter de Ashleigh only claimed in right of his wife; otherwise his sister would have been entitled to one share in her own right, and to her brother's on his death, but there is no trace of any such increment.

Walter de Essheleigh died in 1245-6, childless;¹⁸ his executors had to obtain a mandate from the king before they

(14). Excerpt è Rot. Fin., 27 Hen. III.

(15). Bruton Cart., nos. 205, 206.

(16). Historical Notes on S. Somerset, p. 124.

(17). *Anderson's House of Yvery*, i, 230; *Collinson*, iii, 172.

(18). Inq. p.m., Walter de Esseleigh, 30 Hen. III, no. 19.

could have free administration of his effects.¹⁹ The writ to the sheriff of Somerset to hold an inquisition is dated 17th June, 30 Hen. III (1246). The jury, William Malerbe, Thomas de Cruket, Alan de fforneus, Nicholas Durevile, Osbert de Barinton, Nigell de Illebere, John de Effham, Robert Burnel, Adam de Lega, Hugo Bochar, Stephen de Stafford, and John Selftayn, found that Walter de Esselegh held in Somerset eight carucates of land worth £19 9s. and 1 farthing, by the service of the fees of Morteyn. "Mabel his sister is his heir, and is 60 years old and more."

The Gloucestershire Inquisition taken at the same time returns that he held land in Charlton, partly in demesne and partly in the tenure of his tenants.

His sister Mabel had married Richard RIVELL, Lord of Langport, but had been a widow since 1222. As her eldest great-grandson was now five years old, we may reasonably suppose that the "amplius" of the jury gives an addition of ten or fifteen years to her age; and this brings the time of her birth to the date at which her father first appears as a landowner in Somerset, a position which was inferred to have been gained by marriage.

Richard Rivell, sen., her father-in-law, is set down in the *Liber Niger* as holding Langport and Curry (now Curry Rivel) by the service of two knights. In the Hundred Rolls the jury find that the Burgh of Langport was given to Richard Revel by Henry II; though Collinson, on the strength of a charter in the Tower of London, would make the donor to be Richard I. This was probably a confirmation of the previous grant. This charter was produced by Henry de Urtiaco to the Commissioners of the Quo Warranto inquisition as his title deed of the advowson of Curry Rivel, but on examination there was found to be no mention of the advowson, and Henry put himself under the king's grace. He afterwards received it back.²⁰

(19). Excerpt è Rot. Fin., 30 Hen. III, m. 7.

(20). Patent Rolls, 8 Edw. I, in 49th Rep. D.-K. of Records, p. 110.

Together with Margaret, daughter of Ralph Tabuel, Richard Rivel, held Downhead in West or Abbot's Camel, the solitary fee pertaining to Muchelney Abbey. Richard Rivell was, in 1191, sheriff of Cornwall. Father and son were both dead by 1222, as in that year the sheriff was directed to find out how much land Richard de Rivell held *in capite* in his bailiwick, and to give seisin to Henry del ORTIAY and Sabina his wife, daughter and heiress of Richard Rivell.²¹ This surname seems first to appear in the reign of John, and, in the records of that reign, its holder is often mentioned. It is Latinized as de Urtiaco and then translated into a French form as de l'Orty or Lorty. On the older records it is frequently aspirated as Hort or Hortay and it has been suggested that this may be a genuine Anglo-Saxon surname.²² The first mention of Henry occurs in 1215, in the Close Rolls, when Henry de Hortyay is commanded to give the king's hawk to the men of the Earl Marshall.²³ As Pitney Lorty was held by the service of rendering a hawk yearly, it would seem to have been already granted to him. In the same year the keeper of the castle of Winchester is to let "our beloved and faithful" Henry de Ortyeye remain there, as he is to speak about getting ships ready at Southampton, and he has an order for "20 dolia vini" from the royal stores there.²⁴ In 1216 he is constable of Bedford and rewarded with the "tenseries" taken in Cambridgeshire. From these notices it appears that Henry was high in favour with King John, though this can hardly be to his credit.

The names of his five sons, Richard, Henry, John, Walter, and William are given in the list of witnesses to the foundation-deed of the chantry in Swelle church which their grandmother, Mabel Rivel, set up within the period 1245-1252.

(21). Excerpt è Rot. Fin., 6 Hen. III, m. 2.

(22). Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries ii, 29.

(23). Close Rolls, vol. i, 13 John.

(24). Close Rolls, vol. i, 1216.

This deed was confirmed by Walter de Urtiaco, lord of Swelle in 1273.²⁵ There was also one daughter, Petronilla, who married William le Mareschall, and was endowed by her mother with King's Charlton.²⁶ Richard, the eldest son, married a daughter of Nicholas de Moeles, and died in his mother's lifetime leaving an infant son, Henry.

The fortunes of the second son, Walter,²⁷ have been traced by Mr. J. Batten in his paper on N. Perrot. This manor he purchased from his next brother John,²⁸ whom I am rather inclined to identify with the John de Urtiaco who held the manor of Axford, near Ramsbury, co. Wilts, about this time, the reign of Edward I. He was a person of some position, having married Maud, daughter of John Lord Lovel, and his daughters married into good families. Sibyl the elder was the wife of Sir Laurence de St. Martin, and Margaret the younger wedded Henry de Esturmi; and so the arms of Urtiaco are quartered by several "noble and gentle" families of the West of England. Sir Harris Nicholas²⁹ and Bankes identify this John with another one, son and heir of Henry Baron de Urtiaco, and state that the title to the barony is in abeyance between the descendants of the two coheireses; but this is an error; and it may even be doubted whether the Urtiacos of Wilts have any connexion with those in Somerset, as the arms are quite different. The Wilts family bearing "per pale, az. and gules, a lion rampant or,"³⁰ and the Somerset family "az., a cross or."

William the youngest brother seems to have dropped out of sight, unless he is the William de Urtiaco who, in 1265, had to pay a fine of sixty marcs to Robert de Mellent for having married Elizabeth, widow of Nicholas de Meriet, without his

(25). Reg. Ralph de Salopia, S.R.S. ix, p. 384.

(26). Inq. p.m., 54 Hen. III, no. 47 (Roberts' Cal. Geneal.)

(27). Som. Arch. Soc. *Proc.*, xli, ii 77.

(28). Ped. Fin., 22 Edw. I, no. 17, S.R.S., vol. vi.

(29). Peerage Synopsis i, 389. *Bankes' Baronia* i, 292.

(30). Wilts Magazine, iv, 232.

leave.³¹ An individual of the same name was accused by the jurors of the Hundred of Hunesberge (Houndsborough) of taking strays without any warrant.

Henry de Urtiaco, in 1237, obtained licence of the king to impark his woods in Curry Rivel, in order to be exempt from the regard of the neighbouring forest of Neroche.³² He died 1242, and Sabina his widow did homage for all the lands held jointly with her late husband.³³ In 1252 she inherited the St. Clare and Esseleigh properties on the death of her mother.³⁴ The writ for the inquisition is dated 18th May, 1252, and the jury Richard de Bureton, Baudewyne de Wykes, Richard Coppe, Hugh de Pidele, Richard le Veil, Philip Bochard, Richard Wolward, Robert son of Thomas, Robert de Aula, William de Wedmoreslond, Alexander de Ruffegrey and Adam Russell returned that Mabel Rivel held of the king *in capite* the manors of Stokes, worth £20 4*sh.*; Swelle, worth £15 2*sh.*; and Paret (North Perret), worth £11 5*s.*; by the service of one knight of the fee of Moretain; also some smaller parcels of land in Swelle held of the Abbot of Athelney and Ralph Daubeney respectively. Her heir was Sabina de Ortiaco, aged 40 years "et magis."³⁵

After her succession to the property Sabina was summoned by Ralph Hose to supply the customs and services which she owed for her holding in Parva Benham and La Lade. These places may still be found in Knolle and Long Sutton. A duel was waged between them in the court, which Sabina's champion presumably lost, as she agreed to render the services regularly for the future.³⁶ The name of her seneschall, R. de Cammel, appears in "Bruton Chartulary, no. 271." By a deed sans date she gave all her lands in Long Load (but

(31). Abbrev. Placit., 51 Hen. III. Bruton Cart., no. 175.

(32). *Collinson* i, 26.

(33). Excerpt è Rot. Fin., 26 Hen. III, m. 3.

(34). Excerpt è Rot. Fin., 36 Hen. III.

(35). Inq. p.m., Mabel Rivell, 36 Hen. III, no. 77 (Roberts for date).

(36). Ped. Fin., 33 Hen. III, 74.

query if not Little Load, as Long Load is in Martock) to Robert Corbyn.³⁷ By a fine levied in the octave of S. Michael, 35 Hen. III (1251), Sybilla de Gundevill quit-claimed to Sabina del Ortiay the manors of Chory and Langeford.³⁸ A Hugh de Gundevill appears in the Pipe Roll of 2 Hen. II and onwards, as holding of the king Lāport and Curiet with the Hundred, by a rent of £40; and among the Wells MSS.³⁹ is a charter sans date whereby Hugh de Gundevill restores to the church of Cury all the lands called Hunniland, in North Cory, which he had subtracted, "malo consilio." What particular manor of, or in Curry was in dispute, I have not been able to discover; but Langeford may be a part of Swelle, where a manor house bearing that name was visited by the Society during the Langport Meeting.⁴⁰

Sabina de Urtiaco did not long survive her mother as an "Extent" of her lands after her death⁴¹ was taken on Tuesday, 12th of May, 1254, before the Abbot of Pershore and John de Aura the Escheator in Somerset. William Doylly, Richard de Bureton, John Gulofre, William del Atse, Ralph de Bradeway and John le Chill, returned that the manor of Curry Rivell contained a fishery, a mill, twelve free tenants, two Hundreds, and the ville of Langport which was worth *viii li viis. viid. ½*; the total value of the manor being £42 7s. 8d. A second jury, Philip 'Miles,' William 'Stabularius,' Adam de Berehull, Ralph de Marisco, Thomas le Drake, and John de Paris returned that Pitney with its pigeon-house, mill, gardens, rents of free tenants, labour dues of customary tenants (*consuetudinarium*), pleas of court and other perquisites was worth £18 17s. 3½d. The same jury returned that the ville of Cnolle (Knolle, in Long Sutton) with a reed bed and other sources of income was worth £13 12s. 8d. Also

(37). *Collinson* iii, 11, citing *Cart. Ant.*

(38). *Ped. Fin.*, 35 Hen. III, 82.

(39). *Wells Cath. MSS.*, 5, 157.

(40). *Som. Arch. Proc.*, xl, i, 26.

(41). *Inq. p.m.*, Sabina de Urtiaco, 38 Hen. III, 43.

that the manor of Stokes with its belongings was worth £22 12s. 9d.; making a grand total of £97 10s. 6½d., from which must be deducted 33s. 3d., due to several over-lords.

The manors of Curry Rivell and Stokes were held of the king *in capite* by military service, and the manor of Pitney by a yearly rent of 20s.; the ville of Knolle was held of the Abbot of Athelney and Ralph Hese by a rent of 13s. 4d. Further, that a son of the late Richard de Urtiaco was the nearest heir, but the jury did not know his age.

The heir, being under age, was committed to the charge of Ebulo de Montibus.⁴² Four years later it was found necessary to hold an inquiry into the conduct of the suitors of the Hundred courts of Abbedik and Bulston, for after the death of Sabina de Urtiaco they had refused to come to the Three-week court as they had been accustomed.⁴³

It has hitherto been considered that Henry (for such was the name of the infant heir) is the same person as Henry de Urtiaco who, with Walter his brother, in 1263, executed a cross settlement of lands in Swelle, with remainders over to John and William their younger brothers. In this case he must have been born in or before 1241. But an inquisition taken 1272, after death of Ralph Inweaus,⁴⁴ returned that he held half a knight's fee in Knole (parish of Shepton Montacute), reckoned for a manor, of Henry del Ortyay, heir of Richard del Ortyay, deceased, 'who is under age, and the king's ward'; and one can hardly suppose that the jurors could have returned as under age a young man of thirty. If Henry was still under age in 1272, he must have been an infant in 1252, perhaps not yet baptised, and this would account for the jurors' ignorance of his Christian name. It has also been noticed that Walter, owner of Swelle, who confirmed

(42). Som. Arch. *Proc.*, xli, ii 76.

(43). Chanc. Inq., p.m., 42 Hen. III, no. 22.

(44). Inq., p.m., Ralph Inweaus als. Ives, 56 Hen. III, no. 5. *Collinson* iii, 118, considered that this was Knowle S. Giles in S. Petherton Hundred, but *Kirby's Quest.*, p. 23, shows that it was Knole in Shepton Montague.

and augmented the endowment of the chantry at Swelle, refers to the foundress, Mabil Revel, as his grandmother, which would have been incorrect if he had been the son of Richard.

A possible solution of the difficulty may be that Sabina de Urtiaco in her lifetime enfeoffed her younger sons in some portions of the property; Swelle being divided between Henry and Walter, and Perrot falling to the share of John (these places are not mentioned in the Inquisition held after her death); that Henry and Walter levied the fine of 1263 to consolidate their respective holdings, and, in case of the death of either brother sans issue, to provide for the succession of the survivor; and that Henry may have so died before 1273, when Walter alone confirms and augments the grant of his grandmother, which is witnessed by William his brother, but not by Henry. Though this is avowedly an hypothesis, it may be allowed to remain at present.

In the Patent Roll for 1280⁴⁵ is recorded an exemption for life to Walter Urtiaco (? Hort), at instance of Robert Bishop of Bath and Wells, from serving on assizes, juries, or recognitions. This would imply that Walter was getting on in years.

Assuming then that Henry came of age in 1273, the year after the accession of the warlike Edward I, we will try to follow his fortunes as far as the "edax rerum" will permit. A tenant *in capite* by military service was bound to render his lord service, both in the council chamber and on the tented field; and we shall see that Henry was valued in either capacity, being apparently a prototype of Lord Marmion, "in close fight a champion grim, in camp a leader sage."

First of all he had to answer for divers encroachments made in the reign of the late king, and now brought to light by the jurors of the Hundreds. He was obliged to surrender, for a time, the advowson of Curry Rivel, but was more fortunate with his franchise of Abbideke and Bulston Hundreds, being

(45). 49th Report of Deputy Keeper, p. 178.

ordered to hold them without let and hindrance for the present, and his title was confirmed before the date of Kirby's Quest, 1285. His martial experiences began with the Welsh war,⁴⁶ 1277. Henry de Urtiaco, with five followers (the names of three are given—William de Trum, William de la Harboter, and Adam de Milverton), attended the general muster at Worcester within eight days of F. St. John Bapt.; and thence marched against Llewelyn's forces in Caermarthen and West Wales. On the renewal of the war in 1282, he served first at Rhuddlan and later in West Wales. As he was resummoned in the early spring of 1283, he apparently had gone home in the autumn, and so escaped the Crimean horrors of a winter campaign among the Welsh hills. That he did not escape scatheless is shown by a grant (recorded in the Patent Rolls) to cut wood in the royal forest of Neroche, on account of his services in Wales, and by a precept to levy scutage from all his tenants by military service.⁴⁷ He was summoned to the Parliament held at Shrewsbury, Michaelmas, 1283, where David, Llewelyn's successor, was sentenced to death as a traitor.

For some years after no writs are recorded, and he employed part of his leisure in getting into mischief. In 1292 he paid a fine of £150 for receiving a pardon for all his transgressions committed in the forests, chaces, and parks of the king and others down to the day of confession, with a further amercement for trying to suppress the fine, by not having it entered on the Rolls of Chancery.⁴⁸ It is likely that this refers to some unlawful hunting in the neighbourhood of Stoke Trister, which was adjacent to the royal forests of Selwood, Gillingham, and Blackmore.

About this period he married a lady whose Christian name

(46). These references are taken from Palgrave's Parliamentary Writs, Alphabetical Digest. Persons.

(47). *Collinson*, iii, 50.

(48). *Abbrev. Rot. Originalia*, 20 Ed. I, vol. i.

was Sibilla, and at present this is all that can be stated positively about her. The newly-issued Patent Rolls of 1 Ed. III, however, record a grant of the lands belonging to the heir of David Earl of Athol to Isabella de Bello Monte (Beaumont), Lady de Urtiaco, the king's kinswoman.⁴⁹ Isabella was the sister of Henry, first Baron Beaumont, of "noble though not clearly defined French descent,"⁵⁰ and her first husband was John de Vesci, of Alnwick, Northumberland, who died, s.p., 1286. The expression "domina" not of an estate, but of a surname or title, apparently implies a corresponding rank or position, and as there was only one Baron Urtiaco, on this supposition there could only be one "Lady" de Urtiaco. On the other hand, Sybil and Isabella are distinct names and not, as a rule, interchangeable;⁵¹ still, as such an instance does occur in the Register of Ralph de Salop,⁵² where we find Isabella de Moun and Sybil de Mohun, in 1334, referring to the same person, it is evident that this rule is not without exceptions. Little weight need be attached to the fact that Sybil de Urtiaco, before 1 Ed. III, had remarried John de Mohun, of Dunster, and should therefore appear as Sybil de Mohun, as a widow sometimes retained the name of her first husband after marriage to a second.

The names of three of Henry's children are known: John, his heir, Richard, and Elizabeth, wife of Ralph de Middeney, of Low Ham, near Langport.

In 1294, Henry was summoned to attend the king on an expedition into Gascony. Two years later he was required to attend the general muster at Newcastle-on-Tyne to perform military service against the Scots. As a reward for his services, at the next Parliament held at Salisbury, 1297, he was summoned among the peers. It was a busy year for him. He

(49). Pat. Rolls, 1327-30, p. 134.

(50). *Cokayne*, "New Peerage," p. 284.

(51). *Martin*, "Record Interpreter."

(52). S.R.S., ix, pp. 161, 172.

was certified (along with Walter de Urtiaco) to have £20 of land in Somerset and Dorset, and was summoned to attend a military council at Rochester and thence to pass into Flanders. This certificate was intended to stifle any remonstrance against the continual warfare, of which the whole nation began to complain. At one of these military councils the king and Bigod Earl of Norfolk exchanged rough threats and profane puns without moving the subject's determination to obtain some relaxation of the perpetual demands for personal service. The summons still arrived. In 1298 came another marching order for Flanders, and a fresh one for Scotland. The year after Henry again sat in Parliament among the barons, when Edward renewed the Great Charter. In 1300 he was returned as worth £40; and was summoned to march against the Scots. We find no more summons during the rest of Edw. I's reign, and Henry seems to have been looking after his property. He obtained a charter of free warren in all his demesne lands in Stoke Trister, 1304; also a market and a fair at Cucklington, and another market at Westover, by Langport.⁵³ Two years later he obtained for Broadway⁵⁴ a market and fair, to be held on the feast of St. Aldhelm, and to this date Mr. Pooley would refer the beautiful churchyard cross still standing.⁵⁵

After the accession of Edward II, Henry Urtiaco was summoned to the Scotch war in 1309. He was at home again in 1310, when he received a confirmation of the former grant of Hundreds of Abedich and Bolston. In this year he made a settlement of some lands upon himself and his wife Sybilla. As these were held of the king by military service, an Inquisition, "ad quod damnum,"⁵⁶ was held at Langport, 26th April, 1310. The jury (some of the names are now illegible) . . . Ruffgree, Walter Ysaakes, Richard ffraunkeleyn, John

(53). *Calend. Rot. Chart.*, 32 Ed. I, No. 3.

(54). *Collinson*, i, 18.

(55). *Old Crosses of Somerset*, 166.

(56). *Inq. ad quod damn.*, 3 Edw. II, no. 47.

de Pederton, Hugh atte Burgh, Nicholas Person, Robert Grey, . . . de Lodene, John Burgeys, Roger Lonechep, and William Baldewyne found that the king would suffer no loss if Henry de Urtiaco was allowed to grant his manors of Cury Ryvel and Langport, with advowson of Cury Ryvel to Geoffrey de Putteneve, clerk, in trust for himself and his wife Sibilla, with remainder to the heirs of the said Henry. Further, that he also held the manors of Pitney, Cucklington, Assheleigh, and Knolle, and two carucates of land in Fenny Sutton.

There is little more in print of Henry's doings for some years. He gave, about this period, to the Abbey of Bindon the suit of court with the homage of Stoke Tristere (Hutchins's "Dorset" i, 351, where the donor is called "Cyriaco vel Soliaco"—communicated by Canon Mayo).

In 1316, the Bishop of the Diocese issued a commission to the Dean and three Canons to enquire into a complaint against Henry de Urtiaco for violating ecclesiastical liberties at Huish (probably Huish Episcopi, near Langport).⁵⁷ The result of the enquiry into this somewhat vague charge is not on record.

At the same time the flood of writs to personal attendance in the Scotch war again set in, three being sent in 1316, two in 1317, and two in 1319. This reiteration seems to show that Henry no longer could mount his war horse; in fact, his years were rapidly approaching three score and ten, and he died 10th September, 1321.

The monument erected to this distinguished member of the Baronage may still be seen in the church of Curry Rivel. The east end of the north aisle appears to have been turned into a chantry chapel. In the north wall are five recesses, differing in size, but of the same design, though perhaps not all of the same age. A trefoil arch rests on capitals which are supported on pillars, at present not above nine inches in

(57). Drokenford S.R.S., i, p. 117.

length, owing to the level of the floor having been raised. Over each arch is a triangular headed canopy, and the wall surface between the arch and canopy is decorated with rosettes and long stalked flowers carved in low relief. In the central recess reposes the full length figure of an armed knight. He is clad in chain mail which fits closely round his head, leaving only the face bare: over the body armour is a loose garment cut well back at the shoulders as if to give the arms full play; the right arm, partly broken off, stretches across the breast to grasp the sword which is held up by the left arm; over the left arm is suspended the shield. As this is turned toward the walls, the arms are not seen, but they easily may be made out to be a plain cross. This, when emblazoned is *azure, a cross or*.⁵⁸ Although the legs have been broken off, enough remains to show that they were crossed, not that any symbolical meaning is to be attached to that attitude.

The recesses on either side, a size smaller than the central one, each contain the figure of a youth clad in a long garment leaving the feet visible; the hair round the face is curled in the fashion shown on the coins of the early Edwards. Of the two outside and smallest recesses, one only is visible at the present time; the eastern one being entirely hidden behind an enormous monument, intended to commemorate certain Jenningses, which is of the size and dimensions of a large cupboard of the Elizabethan period. The recess visible is empty, but on the sill of the window above rests an effigy which, from its size, was evidently intended to occupy the lowlier position. Of this figure the garment covers over the feet, which rest against a small animal, and the hair is less curly and flows down on the neck, which seems to mark this figure as that of a female. From the peculiar style of armour and other details, this interesting series of monumental effigies may well be assigned to the early part of the fourteenth century, and that

(58). *Collinson*, i, Intro. p. 4.

they are intended to commemorate the Lord of Curry Rivel, and those members of his family who had predeceased him.

Hitherto it has been supposed that Henry Dominus de Urtiaco was succeeded in the title and estates by another Henry, but the evidence of the Escheator's accounts is conclusive that the name of his son and heir was John. "The Escheator accounts for the rents and profits of Stoke Trister, Cucklington, Pitney, and Knolle from the 10th day of September, 15 Edw. II (1321), when Henry de Urtiaco died, down to the 18th day of October, when he delivered the said manors to John, son and heir of the said Henry, by virtue of the king's writ." Somehow or other the Inquisition p.m. of Henry, got placed among the similar records of the fifteenth year of Edward III, and as there was a Henry de Urtiaco alive at that time, living at Swelle, his various writs to military service and the single writ to Parliament were transferred to the supposed representative of the elder branch of the family, and he was reckoned as the second Baron de Urtiaco. If any further proof that no person of the name of Henry succeeded is required, it will be found in the Exchequer Lay Subsidy, 1327, where John is invariably given as the owner of the family manors.

We may now turn to the Inq. p.m. of Henry de Urtiaco. The writ to the Escheator was dated at Harwich, 15 Sept., 15 Ed. II, and the Inquisition was taken at Somerton, 5th day of October. The jury, John de Pelham, John Bisshop, John le Hare, Arnulph de Bakebere, Thomas de Spekyngton, John le Knight, Roger le Ware, John de Burton, William de Lulleghdon, William Baldewyne, William Trigel, and Walter Pry[ores] found that Henry de Urtiaco held of the king in chief the manors of Stoke Tristre and Coklyngton, with the advowson of the church of C. and of the chapel of S. T. by the service of one knight's fee, and that the said manors are worth "in omnibus exitibus," £15. Also the manor of Cory Ryvell, with the advowson of the church and the "villata" of

Langport, which, altogether, are worth £40. By a fine the said Henry had settled this manor, advowson, and villata on himself and his wife, Sibilla, for their lives, with remainder to John, his son and heir. Also the manor of Puttony, with the advowson of the chapel held by the service of delivering one ostricer rubeus (goshawk) or 20 sh. to the Exchequer: the manor is worth £7. Also the manor of Knolle, held of the Abbot of Athelney by the service of 10 sh.; which manor is worth 100 sh. And the jurors say that John de Urtiaco is son and heir of the said Henry, and is twenty-four years old and more.⁵⁹

The question of the dower of the widow formed the subject of another inquisition, taken at Langport, 8th June, 17 Ed. II (1324), when William Trigel, Roger le Warre, Robert Clerk of Bourton, Robert Coleman, Thomas of Backwell, Richard of Backwell, Nicholas Bocka, Henry Becke, Nicholas Parson of Drayton, Robert Page, William Tannere and Thomas Uppehull found that Sibilla, late the wife of Henry de Urtiaco, held in dowry the manor of Knolle, and other properties mentioned above, in settlement for her life. This inquisition is endorsed, "Let her have the royal licence to marry on payment of 12 marcs."⁶⁰

The inquisitions held to find out the particulars of Henry de Urtiaco's property in Dorset and Wilts are apparently not now to be found, but we learn from Canon Jackson's edition of "Aubrey's Wilts," that Ashley was part of Sibilla's settlement, and further, that she soon took advantage of the royal licence to marry John de Mohun, Lord of Dunster. He was patron of Ashley in 1325,⁶¹ and had an establishment of some kind at Curry Rivel, 1327, the patroness of which place, in 1335, was Sibilla de Mohun, "domina de Curry Ryvel." Although Mr. Maxwell Lyte has not found any positive statement

(59). Inq. p.m., Henry de Urtiaco, 15 Ed. III (really II), No. 35.

(60). Chan. Inq. p.m., 17 Ed. II, No. 3.

(61). *Jackson's "Aubrey's Wilts,"* p. 206.

among the records at Dunster, and so only gives the Christian name of John de Mohun's second wife, there can be no doubt of the marriage.

John de Urtiaco, the heir, was already married, at the date of his father's death, and had a daughter Sybilla, three years old. He was at once engaged in official business. In 1322, he and John de Say were ordered for certain reasons to seize and take the castle of Bridgwater.⁶² About the same time having been assigned to pursue and follow certain rebels (followers of the Earl of Lancaster?), he was commanded to appear before the king and shew how he had executed the orders—writ tested at Pontefract, 13th April, 15 Edw. II. In 1324, he was given instructions concerning certain archers raised in Somerset, and in the same year he was summoned by general proclamation to attend the great council at Westminster on 30th of May. This inclusion in a general summons shews that John de Urtiaco had lost the position granted to his father, to be one of the greater barons or Peers of Parliament, for the general summons was addressed to all the lesser barons or tenants in chief by military service, though falling into disuse. In 1325 he was summoned to pass into Guyenne under the command of the Earl of Warren; but after this date we do not find any notices of public employment, but only references to his financial and social difficulties. He obtained leave in 1325 to alienate part of his lands, and the inevitable Inquisition followed. It was taken at Langport on the 20th December, 19 Edw. II (1325), on the oath of John de Burton, Roger le Warre, Adam Buson, William Baldewyne, William Trigel, Robert le Clerk, William Person, Thomas ffayrwyth, Robert Coleman, Robert de Knappe, Robert Page, and Godfrey de Hambrugge, who found that it would not be to the king's damage to grant John de Urtiaco leave to sell one messuage, two bovates of land, two acres of meadow, and two

(62). Abbrev. Rot. Originalia, 15 Edw. II.

acres of wood in Curry Ryvel and Langport Westover to Thomas Atter Apse Bakere; so leave was granted on payment of 30 sh.⁶³ In the earlier part of this year a jury composed of Thomas de Spekeynton, Arnulph de Baggebere, John L—ges, Walter Isaakes, John Bossard, Ralph le Drapere, Adam Badebokes, John le Knyth, Nicholas Bekkes, Thomas Martyn, John le Lone, and John Parys, sitting at Ilchester, 3rd of July, had found that John de Urtiaco might lawfully grant four bovates of land in North Bere, parcel of his manor of Pitney, to Master Richard de Knolton for his life.⁶⁴ If Master Richard gave a *quid pro quo* in money, he must have profited greatly by that papal provision, which had enabled him four years before, a poor clerk and only sub-deacon, to obtain the Glastonbury living of Butleigh.⁶⁵

In the Tax Roll of 1327, "John de Urtiaco pays 10sh. on his personalty at Cucklington, and 3sh. & 5d. on that at Pitney."⁶⁶

From this time he seems to have been in perpetual collision with the Crown, and his neighbours, and from his breach of the moral law to have lost his position in the county

1327. William de Fauconberge lodged a complaint that John de Lorty and others had carried away his goods at Milton Fauconbridge, Lode, and elsewhere in Somerset.⁶⁷ In the next year John de Acton complained of similar outrages on his property at Aller and Bere.⁶⁸ These two complaints may of course be merely legal fictions to set the cases going, without implying any great moral delinquency; but in 1329 a more serious matter is recorded. William le Mareschall complained that John de Urtiaco, with many others, had broken

(63). Inq. ad quod damn., 19 Edw. II, no. 120.

(64). Inq. ad quod damn., 18 Edw. II, no. 158.

(65). Reg. Bishop John de Drokenford, S.R.S., i, pp. 133, 201.

(66). *Kirby's Quest.* etc., S.R.S. iii, pp. 98, 253.

(67). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 1327-30, p. 75.

(68). Pat. Rolls, N.S., p. 284.

into his house in the parish of St. Clement Danes without the bar of the New Temple, Middlesex, and had carried away his wife with his goods.⁶⁹ He amended his plea, and no doubt added greatly to its force, by adding that among the goods carried off was a sum of £30, received from the Treasury for buying food for the king's horses.⁷⁰ What it cost John de Urtiaco to make his peace with all concerned, I do not know, but in June, 1330, he obtained licence to leave the kingdom for three months in the king's service ;⁷¹ and in May, 1331, he sold to William de Montacute his reversionary interests in the manors of Curry Rivell, Langport Eastover and Westover, Hambridge, Broadway and Earnshill, the hundreds of Abdick and Bolestone, and the advowsons of Curry Rivell and Earnshill.⁷² William de Montacute, now Earl of Salisbury, had entered into possession by the date of his death, 1344, as he died seised of all these manors, parcell of the Barony of Urtiaco ; and also of the manor of Stoke Trister, with its members of Cucklington and Bayford, his title to which was more than doubtful.⁷³

This same year John de Lorty (as the name generally appears now) presented a petition to the king that he might recover the guardianship of the person and lands of John de Perham, son and heir of John de Perham, late of Wyke, in Curry Rivel, of which guardianship he had been deprived, "par la seignurie" of Roger de Mortymer, late Earl of March, on whose forfeiture the said guardianship had come into the king's hands. The jury, summoned to Somerton, 10th April, 5 Edw. III (1321), composed of Philip Corbyn, John Bisschop, Nicholas Bekke, Thomas Martyn, Henry Becke, Ralph le Drapere, John Caddoke, Adam Badcock, Walter Maundewar,

(69). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 3 Edw. III, pt. 2, m. 16 dorso. 1329, 20 Oct.

(70). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 1327-30 ; 1329, 26 Oct.

(71). Pat. Rolls, N.S., p. 530.

(72). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 1330-4, p. 116.

(73). Inq. p.m., W. de Montacute, E. of Salisbury, 18 Edw. III, No. 51.

Henry Tunderleigh, Richard Nyweman, and Walter Golde, found that the late John de Perham held one messuage and one carrucate of land in Cherleton Makerel of John de Urtiaco; 160 acres of arable and 24 acres of meadow in Cherleton Adam of the Prior of Bruton; 4 bovates of land in Wyke of the Abbot of Muchelney; and half a virgate of land in Langport Westover of John de Urtiaco; further, that John de Urtiaco had been wrongfully deprived of his guardianship over the heir who was twelve years old.⁷⁴ The family of Perham lived at Wyke Perham, near Langport, and Thomas de Perham, in 1250, obtained a bull from Pope Alexander to build a chapel because being “remotus ab ecclesia matrice, propter inundaciones aquarum hiemali tempore, non possit ad eam accedere.”⁷⁵

During the rest of his life John de Urtiaco and the soidisant wife of William le Mareschall seem to have lived at Stoke Trister. He and his neighbour Richard Lovell were on bad terms. In 1333 Richard Lovel lodged a complaint that John de Urtiaco, Richard de Urtiaco and others came to his manor at Wincanton, broke into a close, and drove away animals worth £20.⁷⁶ John de Urtiaco, in the autumn of the same year, lodged a complaint that Richard Lovel broke into his park at Stoke Trister, and hunted his game.⁷⁷ In 1337 he complained that William Gery and others broke into his house at Stoke Trister, and carried away his goods.⁷⁸

John de Urtiaco died in 1340. The exact day of his death is not known, but it must have been between the Monday after F. S. Gregory (12th March), when he executed the deed of feoffment of Pitney to Elizabeth his sister, and Ralph de Middleney her husband, and the Thursday before F. S.S. Peter and Paul (29th June), which was the date of the Inquisition “post mortem.” The jury summoned to Somerton by

(74). Chancery Inq. p.m., 5 Edw. III, 2nd. nos., no. 27.

(75). Reg. Ralph de Salopia, S.R.S., x, p. 489.

(76). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 1330-1334, p. 497.

(77). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 1330-1334, p. 507.

(78). Pat. Rolls, N.S., 1334-1338, p. 131.

Sir Ralph de Middleney, Escheator, their names being Henry de Lortye, John de Staunton, John Symayn, Will. Jurdan, Roger le Warre, John de Burton, Will. Baldewyne, Nicholas Aumbesas, John de Henton, Walter Corbyn, Walter Isaak, and John Bossard, found that John de Lorty held no lands in Somerset, because a long time before his death he had transferred his manors of Stoke Trister, Cucklington, and Bayford to Elizabeth Child of Stanford (Beds.), whom he shortly after married, and she survives. Also that the said John had a long time ago transferred the manors of Pitney, Knolle, Fenny Sutton, and Ashley, to Sir Ralph de Middleney, to him and his heirs for ever. Further, that Sibilla, daughter of the said John, is his nearest heir, and is 22 years and more.⁷⁹

Elizabeth, the widow, immediately got from the king a confirmation⁸⁰ of her late husband's gift, and then sold the manors to John de Molyns. He, to make doubly sure, obtained a judgement at the Somerset Assizes against John, son of Ralph (de Middleney), and Sibilla his wife, which was entered on the Patent Rolls, 14 Edw. III; ⁸¹ also a release from Ralph de Middleney, Will. de Marischall, and Richard de L'Orti, brother of John.⁸²

The connexion of the family with this group of manors was thus entirely destroyed. The old church at Stoke Trister was pulled down and rebuilt on another site in 1841, but as there is no record of any monument to John de Lorty, we may well suppose that none was ever erected. The manor house is still standing near the old graveyard, but no part of the building is older than the fifteenth century; in the fields below the house are some grass grown mounds making the site of the fishponds.

John de Lorty does not seem to have made the slightest

(79). Inq., p.m., John Lorty, 14 Edw. III, no. 3, 1st nos.

(80). Pat. Rolls, 14 Edw. III, no. 26.

(81). Pat. Rolls, 14 Edw. III, no. 31.

(82). *Collinson* iii, 50, citing Rot. Claus., 21 Edw. III.

provision for his daughter, Sybil, and if she had not married John de Middleney, her first cousin, it is not easy to imagine what would have happened to her.

Perhaps it is not sufficiently clear that John de Middleney was the child of her aunt Elizabeth : because John de Lorty's gift of Pitney, Knolle, etc., to his sister was not made till 14 Edw. III (the year of the marriage of John and Sybil), by a charter put in evidence in a law suit to be mentioned again. Against this may be set the words of the Inquisition p.m., that the feoffment had been made "diu ante mortem" of John Lorty, which could hardly mean the spring of the year in which he died. It may be that John de Lorty had given Pitney and the reversion of Knolle and Ashley to his sister on her marriage some time before ; but, as the latter manors were part of the dower of his mother, he may have been unable to make a formal feoffment of his gift until they fell into hand.

There was a good deal of worry about the title to Pitney, and as Thomas de Hungerford, a purchaser of some of the lands, in 9 Richard II, obtained letters patent reciting *inter alia* the lawsuit between the Crown and the various possessors, we are enabled to learn what took place. It seems that at the assizes at Wells held in Trinity term, 32 Edw. III, a presentment was made that Ralph de Middleney, late Escheator for Somerset, had entered on the manors of Pitney and Knolle, late the property of John de Urtiaco, "colore officii," and had held them until Sibilla, daughter and heiress of John aforesaid, had made a release to him, to the prejudice of the king, the said Sibilla then not being married, though afterwards she married John, son of the said Ralph ; the Crown being thereby defrauded of the profits of the said manors, a fee for licence to alienate, and the "maritagium" of the said Sibilla. Nothing more seems to have been done for five years, and then it having been reported that Ralph de Middleney was dead, the sheriff was ordered to find out who had succeeded.

Robert de Assheton being returned as tenant, was summoned, in Michaelmas term, 37 Edw. III, probably to his great astonishment, to answer the royal claim for feudal services due more than twenty years before. He, by his attorney William de Athelyngton, answered that Ralph de Middleney had only held the lands as husband of Elizabeth de Lorty, and that he as her second husband stood in the same position. The same year Elizabeth, who was (fuit) the wife of Ralph de Middleney, John, son of the said Ralph, and Sibilla, daughter of John de Lorty, paid £10 for acquiring the manor of Pitney without licence.⁸³ The suit, however, dragged on until the very end of the reign of Edward III, when Robert de Assheton obtained a verdict on all points in dispute.⁸⁴

Ralph de Middleney, Knt., was a person of considerable possessions in Somerset and Dorset ;⁸⁵ but since we are only concerned with him as husband of Elizabeth de Lorty, it must be sufficient to say that the jury summoned after his death, on Feast S. John Bapt. (24 June) 37 Edw. III (1363) found, *inter alia*, that he held the manors of Pitney Lorty and Knolle jointly with Elizabeth, remainder to John, son of said Ralph, and Sibilla, daughter of John de Urtiaco, and to John, son of the said Sibilla, remainder to the right heirs of the said Elizabeth. To all his other possessions, Alice atte Orchard, his sister, aged fifty years and more ; John atte Mere, son of Alice atte Putte, another sister, aged twenty-four years and more ; Cecilia Corbyn, daughter of Matilda atte Walle, his third sister, aged twenty-two years and more ; and Isabella Frye, his fourth sister, aged twenty-three years and more, were found to be his nearest heirs.⁸⁶ This would certainly imply that his son and grandson were already dead, but there is the

(83). Abbrev. Rotul. Originalia, vol. ii, sub 37 Edw. III. Also Fire Roll, 14 Edw. III, m. 20.

(84). Chancery Inq. p.m. 9 Richard II, no. 127.

(85). *Collinson*, iii, 445.

(86). Inq. p.m., Ralph de Middleney, 37 Edw. III, No. 48.

evidence in the Originalia Roll (see ante) that John had joined with the widow in paying a fine to the Crown; yet it may be that in noting the payment of the debt the clerk entered all three names as of those persons who were jointly liable; but at all events nothing more is heard of Sibilla, her husband, or her infant son.

Elizabeth Middeney had married Robert de Assheton by 41 Edw. III, when she settled Powerstock, the property of her first husband, on herself and her second husband for their lives, with remainder to John, son of Thomas de Berkeley, in free marriage with Alianora, daughter of the said Robert de Assheton⁸⁷ by his first wife, Elizabeth Gorges.⁸⁸ This was managed with the aid of Alice Perers, the mistress of Edward III in his dotage, who received for her trouble the reversion, after the deaths of Robert and Elizabeth Assheton, of the manors of Fenny Sutton and Knolle, and of some other property belonging to Robert.

Elizabeth Assheton died some years before her husband, and he married for the third time, Philippa,⁸⁹ daughter of Sir John Talbot, of Richard's Castle, and endowed her with the Hundred and Manor of Pitney. After his death, on January 9, 1384, the escheators of the western counties held eleven inquisitions to find out the property and heirs of Robert de Assheton.⁹⁰ The arrangement with Alice Perers turned up everywhere, and a further complication ensued, because after the disgrace of Alice and the forfeiture of her interests into the king's hand, some of them were regranted to her husband, William de Windsor. Eventually the Dorset property reverted to the heirs of his first wife, Elizabeth Gorges; that in

(87). For some account of this family see *Collinson* ii, 226, under Long Ashton.

(88). Inq. p.m. (really ad quod damn.), Robert de Assheton, 41 Edw. III, 2nd nos. 20.

(89). This young lady was only sixteen at the date of her first husband's death according to the Gournay pedigree in *Som. Arch. Soc. Proc.*, xl, ii, 270.

(90). Inq. p.m., Robert de Assheton, 7 Richard II, no. 5.

North Somerset and Gloucestershire to the representatives of his sisters, for Robert de Assheton was the last male of his family ; and Pitney, Manor and Hundred, went to his widow, Philippa. At this point the surviving members of the de Lorty family made a despairing effort to secure some part of the ancestral property, and an arrangement was come to by which Philippa Assheton should hold Pitney for her life without molestation, and that afterwards it was to be divided between Matilda, wife of John Langerych, and Elizabeth, wife of John Gounter, the sisters and heirs of Hugh Lorty. These were probably the children or grandchildren of Richard de Lorty, younger brother of John who died 1340, but the exact connexion has not yet been discovered. Philippa survived till 1417, having remarried twice : first, before 1389, that renowned warrior, Matthew de Gournay, who died in 1406 ; and secondly, in or before 1408, Sir John Tiptoft. The Inquisition taken at Taunton after her death, on the 2nd or 3rd May, 1417,⁹¹ recites the arrangement made between her and the sisters of Hugh de Lorty, which had been confirmed by a fine levied in the Octave of S. Hilary, 8 Rich. II, and adds that Matilda Langerych and her husband were both dead without issue, and that therefore Elizabeth, now the wife of John Andrew, had the sole right to Pitney Lorty, which, curiously enough, was perhaps the first possession of the founder of the family of De Urtiaco.

(91). Inq. p.m., Philippa, wife of Sir John Tiptoft, 5 Hen. V., no. 40.