

Dr. J. J. Howard

with the author's compliments

Connected Annals of the Manor and Family

OF

✓
Perton of Perton Co., Stafford

FROM THE EARLIEST RECORDED TIMES

BY

✓
EDWARD A. HARDWICKE,
L. R. C. P., F. I. INST., F. R. C. I., MEM. HARL. SOC., &C.,
Author of 'Epidemic Cerebro Spinal Fever,'
'The Religion of Agnostic Philosophy,'
'The Decalogue as a Code of Morality,' &c.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

Calcutta.

PRINTED BY CONES & Co.

1897.

CS439
P5

15734
'02

Y8A9011 781
22390800 70

DEC 6-11-09



MANOR AND FAMILY OF PERTON OF PERTON Co., STAFFORD.



PREFACE.

WITH apologies to the reader for the inevitable shortcomings of the amateur genealogist this epitome of the information I have been able to collect anent a family, once well known during the martial and stirring times of the third Henry and the Edwards though now nearly extinct, is dedicated to the memory of William Hardwicke of Bridgnorth and to his biographer Hubert Smith, Esquire, who for so many years ^{passed} figured as a leading figure in the same ancient town, and who is also well known as an author and antiquary.

EDWARD ARTHUR HARDWICKE.

BARON'S COURT ; }
Kensington, June 1896. }

MANOR AND FAMILY OF PERTON.

PARISH OF TETTENHALL, COUNTY OF STAFFORD.

THE very pleasantly situated village of Tettenhall with its quaint and ancient church, was in the time of the three first Edwards, the capital, if not the central figure in an extensive parish, comprising a round dozen of important manors. It was not then, as now, simply a rural suburb of a manufacturing smoke generator, where it stands sentry commanding, and as it were, defending the quiet and rustic tract of picturesque beauty behind it from the more vulgar utilitarian aggressiveness of the smoky black country, and completely shutting off the rural charms of the one from the murkiness and squalor of the other. The stranger journeying from Birmingham through Wolverhampton to Tettenhall by horse, carriage or cycle cannot fail to be struck with the change from bleared cinder heaps, sulphurous air, and begrimed brick hovels to purity and beauty, health and rural bliss.

Tettenhall is said to date the foundation of its ancient college from Edgar the Saxon king, who is popularly but erroneously said to have exterminated the British wolf, and with whose name, in this neighborhood, we naturally associate the ancient though subordinate Manor of Wytherges (Wergs), or the home of the wolves; although on the other hand the name of the old and large town near has no connection with this subject, having derived it from a celebrated Saxon chief named Wolfere who has left several remains of his name in this once very important and powerful district of that race; one of these is the now Manor of Wyken which has for ages been dependant on that of Worfield, though formerly, and as late as Domesday called Wolferesford, in the adjoining County of Shropshire. Tettenhall Manor was at one time composed of two distinct manors,—Tettenhall Regis, and and Tettenhall Clericorum, the first comprising two-and-a-half and the latter two hides of land. The other ten manors in the parish were Perton which is the subject of our enquiry and was supplemented by Trescote, together comprising three hides; Wrottesley two hides; Pendeford two hides; Wightwick which with Compton and the Wergs were subject to Tettenhall of the Canons; Bilbrook; Aldersley; and Bovenhull now Barnhurst, which was manorially subject to Tettenhall Regis: The first five and the last were manors of "ancient demesne of the Crown of England," and as such were implied to have been in *pre* or *proto* Norman days, the property of the Sovereign and by virtue of which they possessed many privileges; such as each manor being entitled to have its own court, and view of frankpledge, &c. These privileges were originally conferred by reason of their being situate in close contiguity to the ancient royal hunting grounds and forests, and thereby more or less game preserving communities. These villis were separately geldable for the war tax, or ancient Danegeld, and some other taxes; and they were also represented at the hundred and county courts by a Provost and four tenants. All these twelve manors were definitely named in the Domesday Survey, except Trescote, the Wergs, Aldersley, and Barnhurst or Bovenhull.

The resident family of the Manor of Perton, which we now attempt to detail is one which, in common with so many others, in our now rich abundance of what are considered more important literary treasures, has its annals

utterly neglected ; and with the exception of the fine collection in the library of the cultured owner of Wrottesley, relegated to the numerous piles of so called effete and obsolete documents, or dispersed into various directions and looked upon as little better than the mould and dust which their peaceful and undisturbed condition encourages. A large amount of documentary evidence has of course long ago perished or been destroyed by the orders or carelessness of their custodians. Yet at the dates, when the events they recorded, occurred, they placed upon record and depicted, in the quaint and concise language of those times absolute proof of events that in no small degree combined to form the History of England of to-day ; and in themselves, as originally written, they give us a true idea of the inner life and customs of our ancestors of that day, that is more or less lost when transcribed into the dry details of the modern history. It is for this reason that I have in the great majority of instances, preserved the original diction of the records herein transcribed.

It has, for ages, been a favorite legend with topographers who have touched upon the history of this Manor, or Family, that the name of Perton was originally derived from the specially excellent variety of pears, still known as Tettenhalls, that by a curious co-incidence, grew formerly and I believe still grow, in abundance in this neighborhood. The idea was plausible, and did some credit to the original suggester, if he happened to have been more or less of a stranger, and unacquainted with this part of the country ; but unfortunately for the permanent survival of his ingenious idea there existed a much more simple and natural origin for the name of Perton which was, I believe, first pointed out by William Hardwicke of Bridgnorth. There can be little doubt that the name of Perton was, in far off Saxon days, Uppertown, in contradistinction to Nethertown, or Netherton, a hamlet in the same Manor of Tettenhall, and about half a mile nearer to the capital place of the mother manor ; this idea being further strengthened by the fact that Perton has an elevation of 425 feet whereas Netherton has only 320. Netherton is also the more accessible to Tettenhall Home from being situate upon the main road between the two important centres of Bridgnorth and Wolverhampton, though the former of these two only dates as far as is known, from the time of William Rufus. Erdeswicke in his 'Survey' appears to have approached the true origin of the name of Perton, hinting that it might be a corruption of Upper Town, in contradistinction to the adjoining hamlet of Nurton or Nethertown, which is in Pattingham manor and parish, and derived its name from the relative position with regard to the Castle that formerly existed at Great Moor. Nurton has, however, never within history been designated Netherton, whilst Netherton in Tettenhall parish is, in the same records always noted as with the less contracted name, and never as Nurton. The probability is also very strong that for ages after this name had been in use, the pears in question were absolutely unknown, and that their germs were still lying dormant in the pips of the parent quince. But this mythical origin of the name was a splendid catch for that enterprising herald, who in the reign of the Tudors, in his anxiety to give an illustration of '*armes parlantes*' bethought himself that he could further the pomological idea by adding three red roundlets or apples on a chevron between the hereditary golden pears of the family : this I believe was done by Robert Glover as late as 1583. We have however, no evidence to indicate to us when the name of Upperton became Perton, for the earliest record in which it is mentioned, now in Westminster Abbey archives, calls it Fortune ; but this

point is not material, having satisfied ourselves that Perton had no more to do with pears than Netherton had with apples.

The privileges of ancient demesne, that we have already stated appertained to the Manor of Perton, do not appear to have been very highly appreciated by its apparently apathetic inhabitants; for while the neighboring Manor of Worfield across the Shropshire border, but at one time in Staffordshire, as also its next neighbor Claverley or Clareley Home, exerted extraordinary means to assert their ancient demesne privileges, the former obtaining a charter from King Edward the first, and afterwards spending considerable sums of money and much energy to get the same recognized even down to the time of Queen Elizabeth; Perton has few records that even mention their substantial rights in this respect. Those notices that exist are only during the course of litigation chiefly against the lords of the manor. Perhaps the small number of the tenants is the most ostensible reason that can be assigned for this apparent negligence. As just mentioned, however, we shall presently see that when protesting against the oppressive rapacity and extortion of their lords, they made mention of their ancient demesne inheritance, and from this mention we gather that the Ancient Demesne of Perton was derived from its having been formerly part of the original royal manor of Tettenhall Regis which was evidently of considerable extent.

Saxon Perton is to us almost a sealed book, and the only points we can fix at that remote age are the tenure of the Westminster monks succeeding that of King Edgar. To this king's possession was handed down, most probably from the long line of the Kings and Earls of Mercia, the whole of the extensive tract extending from the Severn bank, which in those times was the boundary of Staffordshire, down to Areley Kings and Kington in the south part of Worcestershire, across by King's Norton and Birmingham, by Rowley Regis in the west; Newton Regis, King's Bromley including Needwood Forest, Kingston, Kanok Chase, Brewood, and Kingswood at the Shropshire borders. This territory included the forests of Kanok, Needwood, Brewood, Kingswood, Morfe and Kinver; and in point of fact, at that period, nearly the whole of the County of Stafford, was a sort of grand centre of the royal shooting and hunting ground, and surrounded by and more or less in connection with other forests of even larger extent, such as Arden, Sherwood, Dean, Wyre and Shirlet; the whole forming a truly royal chase. From Edgar, probably the whole of these crown possessions came down to Edward the Confessor almost intact, but this crowned votary of superstition made sad havoc with their integrity, bestowing manors and meres, woodlands and wastes, on the different monastic bodies that were increasing at this period with such alarming strides. In fact two or three such kings would have put England irretrievably under the entire rule of the priesthood and rendered it a more complete waste than Italy was some years ago; a country of paupers and slaves, looked down upon everywhere by the frowning walls of ecclesiastic strongholds and palaces. The Manor of Perton did not escape the ruthless dissipation of this royal priest in disguise, for he bestowed it, by a deed or letter, one of the earliest in existence, in the Anglo-Saxon tongue, still extant amongst the archives of Westminster Abbey, upon the abbot and brethren of that establishment, shortly before his own death, in 1066. Although this deed or royal letter has appeared in print at least thrice previously, viz., in the 'Codex Diplomaticus' of Kemble; in a volume published by the Record Office in 1883, entitled 'Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts'; and in James P. Jones' 'History of Tettenhall' in 1894; its great age and immense

historic interest entitle it to the honor once more, and it is therefore given in full, forthwith.

“Eadward cyngre gret Leofwine bishop and Eadwine eorl and ealle mine theignes on Steffordscire freondlice. And ic kythe eow theat ic habbe gegifan Criste and Sancte Peter into Westminstre thaet land aet Pertune and aelle thera thinga thaes the thaer inn to herthon wuda and on felda mid saca and mid socna swa full and swa forth swa hit me sy fan on handa stod on eallen thingam than abbute to bigleofan and tham gebrothran the binnan than mynstre wouniath and ic nane men gethafian that thaer gentige aenig thaera thinga thaes the thaer into hyrth. God eow ealle ge heulde.”

Translation :—“Edward the King greets Leofwine, Bishop and Edwine Earl and all my thanes in Staffordshire in friendship. And I tell you, that I have given to Christ and Saint Peter at Westminster the land at Perton, and all those things that thereunto belong, in forest and field, saccage and soccage, as fully and as free, as it stood to my own hand, in all things, to sustain the abbot and brethren, who dwell within the minster; and I will permit no man to disturb anything that thereunto belongs. God preserve you all.”

This Leofwine was the last to bear the title of Bishop of Lichfield and the first abbot of Coventry. The see had formerly been called Chester, and more lately promiscuously Chester or Lichfield, but after the death of Leofwine the latter became the see of Lichfield and Coventry, and so remained until 1836; after having been separated previously into the two diocese of Chester and Lichfield.

Speaking of this grant, Robt. W. Eyton, the leviathan antiquary of Shropshire, says, in his *Domesday Studies of Staffordshire*,—“Westminster Abbey had one estate in Staffordshire, viz., Perton. Domesday says nothing as to the ownership of Perton in Saxon times. It was King Edward's and was probably a member of the King's Manor of Tettenhall. The charter whereby the king gave Perton to the Abbey is extant. Inasmuch as it is addressed to Edwin as Earl of Mercia, it will have passed in the last four years of the king's life 1062-1065.” Some authorities have assigned the date of 1053 but in the absence of a good reason for this, I prefer to accept the date indicated by the above unusually careful and correct antiquary. J. P. Jones in his “*History of Tettenhall*” very pertinently remarks, “one cannot but admire the terse directness of this Anglo-Saxon King's language, as contrasted with the ambiguity and needless pomposity of later Latin deeds. His meaning is so clear, that one would imagine there could be no mistaking it.” Its clearness, however did not prevent litigation of a very protracted nature from taking place, for a period of nearly three hundred years. The violent political events and changes that convulsed the kingdom after the death of this pious king, chiefly owing to the demoralizing influences of his sacerdotal reign, very naturally led the crafty and astute monks of Westminster to surmise that their title to Perton was of a very insecure description, and they lost no time in taking advantage of the evident desire of Norman William to propitiate the priesthood, and thereby to get a confirmation of their title to this property. Accordingly we find that in the first year after the disaster at Hastings, the king issued a writ, early in 1067, that confirmed the grant of his monkish predecessor. Eyton says; “within the first three months of the year 1067, if we could trust to dates supplied by monastic chronicles, but at all events, before the summer of 1068 was ended, King William issued a writ, which, while it shows much of the contemporary order of things in Staffordshire, clears and corrects many points of more general history. The writ is in

support of the Abbot of Westminster's title to the Staffordshire Manor of Perton, which had been bestowed upon his house by Edward the Confessor." This action of the conqueror had the desired effect, and the abbots of Westminster remained in peaceable possession of the sub-manor of Perton for a period of well nigh one hundred years. Not only had the monks the authority of William's confirmation to their title, but when the great survey book of Domesday was compiled in 1078, Perton was cited in its pages thus:—*Terra sancti Petri Westmonasterii. Abbatia Sancti Petri Westmonasterii tenet Perton Ibi iij hidae Tra ē vi carle In dñio ē una et xiiij villi et ij bord. et un. lib. ho. cum v caŕti. Ibi viij ac. p̄a. Silva dimid. leūū l̄g. et m̄d. lat. Valuit et valet 40 solid.*"

Translation:—"The lands of Saint Peter of Westminster. The Abbot of Saint Peter of Westminster holds Perton. There are three hides. Six Carucates of arable land. In the demesne is one Carucate. And thirteen villans and two bordars and one freeman with five Carucates. There are eight acres of pasture. There is a wood, half a mile long, and the same broad. It was formerly and is now valued at forty shillings."

This of course was as good as a confirmatory charter of the lands of Perton, and one would have imagined sufficient to protect the owners against any odds in litigation, but as we shall find later, such was not the case.

In the above important record we find that instead of being located under its own Hundred of Niesdon, and along with its mother Manor of Tettenhall, Perton is set apart as the land of the chief monk of Westminster. We are also led to opine from this same account that the manor consisted of about two thousand acres reckoning 700 acres to the hide; of which territory more than half was plough-land, and nearly half this arable land being the property of the freeman who in all probability was the ancestor of John de Perton, the first king's serjeant here. The woodland was called Harewood and was situated on the north side of the hamlet, where it existed until the end of the 17th century, and having been enclosed by a fence in 1330, was still delineated on the map of the county at the period of Stebbing Shaw's "History of Staffordshire." The fact that the Perton of Domesday was of equal value with the Confessor's Perton, leads us to conclude that it was one of those happy spots, so rare about here, at that time, that had not been devastated by civil war during the interval. We must not however draw the inference that Perton had, for countless ages been free from military devastation; for away back in the good old Saxon days of wooden platters and wooden brains, of pork and strong beer, when the land was still in possession of its lawful inheritors, a most sanguinary battle had taken place at Theotenhale, between the Saxon and Danes, in which the latter received a most salutary lesson, which virtually was the end of the internecine struggle in these parts, and together with battles at Winborne (Wombourn) and Wodensfeld (Wednesfield), 'more bloody and dreadful than had ever been witnessed in the earlier ages,' as the Saxon chronicles record, served, permanently to keep that piratical horde of warriors in complete check. However, whatever may have been the misfortunes that befel Perton in the Saxon Danish struggle, the Manor had evidently recovered, and was in a most flourishing condition at the period of Domesday.

Shaw says, "the Pertons had a castle here before the Norman Conquest," for which statement, however, he gives no authority, though he was probably more correct than his actual information justified him in assuming. The original Pertons, whether the Freeman of Domesday was one or not, must

undoubtedly have required some substantial defence against the wandering hordes of Danes, that so long infested the midlands, on the east side, and equally so against the incursions on the west side of the half savage and skin clad little Welshmen on the west. William Hardwicke writing on this subject remarks, "Hence the necessity for these castellated erections, which seem to have been at no great distance from one another, reaching from the western banks of the Severn across the Counties of Salop, Stafford, Worcester, Warwick, etc., and which, though usually built upon a hill, were also well moated, and which defence in the case of Perton, no doubt accounted in a great measure, for the valuable condition of the estate. No doubt many of these fortified houses were to serve the double purpose of intimidating the Danes on the one side, and the Welsh on the other. Those to be enumerated from the old British frontiers, through this neighborhood, were the Castles of Oldbury near Bridgnorth; at Quatford, on the Morffe; at Chelmarsh; upon Hallon Hill near Worfield; and at Cheswardine Lane End in Stockton: all these were in the heavy castellated style and would be considered as first class fortalices at that period. Others, less massive, but simply fortified and moated granges, existed at Eardington; the Hay par. Quatford; Poole Hall in Alveley; the Mere; Euville; Higford; Badger; Ackleton; Catstree; Ludstone; old Patteshull or Nore Hill; Luttele; Aper's Castle over Ludstone; Great Moor in Patingham; Astley Abbots; Apley Park and Perton." It may likewise be noted that, though probably having had no connection with Perton Castle, there is a portion of land nearly three quarters of a mile from the last place, still known as Castle Croft, and a small bridge over Smestall Water bearing the name of Castle Bridge close to the croft, where probably yet another of these fortified edifices stood, situate in the once important Manor of Penn and possibly later the residence of the Buffarys and Penns. But it is quite probable, that, at this early period, all the more important residences on the western edge of middle England were fortified in one or other of the systems then in vogue. The sub-manor of Perton with its Castle was of course, at all times, totally independent of the larger Castle that formely existed close by, at Great Moor, and which must have been demolished at a very early date. The population of this small manor appears to have been by no means small at the great survey, for if we reckon as many women for the men enumerated and the same number of children we shall have a total of forty-eight souls, a large census for so small a hamlet in those days. This is of course again accounted for by the protected and peaceful conditions under which it existed.

The successors of bastard William, doubtless, finding themselves firmly established on the new throne, and therefore no longer so desirous of propitiating the church to the same extent as before, now began to look around for tempting morsels of income giving lands, on which they could lay their hands, and either Stephen or the second Henry, deciding to ignore the foolish generosity of the superstitious Confessor, and the politic confirmation of William, enfeoffed a favorite and successful soldier named Perton, probably partly for heavy arrears of pay due to him, in the Manor of Perton; which was possibly already in his occupancy as a tenant of the abbot of Westminster, and he a descendant of the Freeman of Domesday. It was to be held *in capite* of the king and by the service of *grand serjeantry*, with however a chief rent also, payable to the abbey of Westminster, of five pounds yearly. This last item was probably the result of a final concord

in litigation between the king and the abbot, which remained like a millstone tied to the necks of the successive lords of Perton.

So by a Pipe Roll record of 1166, we find that the Manor of Perton was held by one John de Perton, as one of the King's Serjeants, by what was known as a tenure of grand serjeantry. The title of King's Serjeant was bestowed upon him in relation to his tenancy of the Manor of Perton, and it entailed upon its owner the following services. He was to hold his own "Castle of Perton" as one of the defences of the Welsh Marches or borders; and he was liable to be summoned to attend the king, in time of war, in Wales, at his own cost, for eight days, with, in addition to his own horse and armor, fully equipped, another horse and rider without caparisons, but the rider to carry lance, sword, and hanbergeon; and if detained longer than eight days, he was to be maintained at the king's cost, and to receive eight pence a day as wage. Over and above this Welsh service, he was liable to be called upon to attend the king, in his wars beyond the seas, but in this case at the expense of the king. The Pipe Roll records the fact that John Pertona had paid in a composition of half a mark to the treasury; this was probably for a fine under the forest laws; Perton having been one of the villis fined, and the entry is as follows:—'*Johan. Pertona reddit compotum de dimid. marc. in thesaurio.*' His name does not occur again until the Pipe Roll of 1187, when he was fined one pound for trespassing in the Royal Forest of Kinver with greyhounds, without a warrant. In the latter part of his life he was engaged in litigation with the abbot and monks of Combe Abbey in Warwickshire, respecting the latter's rights to water in a cut or millstream from the Smestow River in Trescote, which formed part of the Perton fee. Now these lands and mill had been given to the monks of Combe Abbey by William Fitz Wido and the gift had been further confirmed by the chief land-lord Gervase Paganel baron of Dudley: the lands given are variously styled two hides and two carucates; but it can hardly have been the former, as this was the full extent of Trescote Manor, so the word hide must have been a mistake of the transcriber of the record. A portion of Trescote had been acquired shortly before by John de Perton, in addition to that appurtenant to Perton, and hence the above litigation. The initial letter of John de Perton's wife's christian name appears as A on the above deed, but its following letters are now illegible, appearing like Amice, but there does not appear any further notice of her. He undoubtedly died on 1192-3, for in the latter year we find his son and successor taking up his relief.

Sir Ralph de Perton, knight, son and heir of John according to the Pipe Roll of 1193-4, succeeded to his deceased father, as tenant *in capite* of the Manor of Perton. "*Ranulphus de Peritona reddit compotum de ij marc pro relievo suo. In thesauro j marc. et debet j marc.*" And again, "*Ranulphus de Peritona reddit compotum de j marc. pro relievo suo. In thesauro liberavit.*" Ralph de Perton renders a fine of two marks, for the relief. He has paid into the treasury one mark and he owes one mark." Ralph de Perton has rendered his fine of one mark (the balance) for his relief, and he has received an acquittance from the treasury." This Ralph was, like his father, a king's serjeant, holding Perton by the service of eight day's attendance with the king's army in Wales in time of war, at his own cost, with a horse without caparisons, that is unarmored; the rider to carry lance, and sword, and hanbergeon. And if detained beyond eight days, he was to receive wages, and be maintained at the cost of the king. In 1194-97

the litigation was continued between the abbot and monks of Combe and Ralph de Perton, which eventually resulted in a concession to the former from Ralph de Perton, son and heir of John de Perton, of free issue of water, from Smestow River, to their mill, in the same manner as they formerly had it, in the reign of King Henry the second. In this record we should note two points; first a further confirmation of the supposition that Perton was granted to this family by Henry the second; and secondly, that John de Perton acquired his new property in Trescote after 1154. General Wrotlesley describes the resulting deed "as of some intrinsic interest as an illustration of judicial history. The litigation had taken place in the county court, in which the Sheriff presided, and we have the result drawn up in the form of a chirograph in full county." At the assizes held at Lichfield at Michaelmas (October) 1 John (1199) "the jury of the Hundred of Seisdon presented that Ralph de Perton held a serjeantry of the value of thirty shillings, and that he had fined half a mark at one time, and at another, one mark for his *passagium*"; that is, for him to be excused from crossing the sea, in the king's service. "*De Ranulpho de Perton dimid. marc. de serjentia sua.*" At the assizes of 1203 he essoigned his attendance, by Robert Atte Fonte, one of his tenants. And now probably occurred a somewhat important event in the history of this manor; which is the confirmation of the title of Ralph de Perton in his serjeantry, for though the original document is not in evidence, and there is no direct evidence of the transaction in any hitherto discovered record, there is indirect evidence that it took place. It is well known that King John exacted sums of money wherever he could, from the tenants of crown lands, for the confirmation of their charters of possession or title deeds, under his sign manual, and on reference to the Pipe Roll of 1205-6 it is found that Ralph de Perton is debited with a fine of three marks for which he has an acquittance at the treasury, and this some years after his relief had been assessed and defrayed. In the same year, the seventh scutage of King John was put in charge, at the rate of one pound *per fee*, and Ralph de Perton appears on the Pipe Roll for this year, as having paid the fine. In 1207 he was mulcted in the sum of twenty shillings; unusually extortionate in amount, by reason of his avoidance of personal service, most probably on account of ill health. In the same year he appears as a witness to the deed by which Isabel lady of the Manor of Patingham, gives to the convent of Black Ladies or Benedictine Nuns of saint Mary in Brewood, an assart in Chillington, in exchange for half a virgate of land in her Manor of Patingham. At the assizes of 1227 there was an inquisition of "*quo warranto*," and the Seisdon jurors stated that "Ralph de Perton holds by serjeantry of the king, in Perton, and the property is worth forty shillings; and his service is due to attend in the king's army, with two horses, and with a hauberk; and he receives eight pence a day from the king's purse." J. P. Jones remarks that "this Ralph must have lived to a great age, for he was head of his house for a period of forty-eight years. He died 1241, according to the Fine Roll of that year." In the absence of further evidence than we possess as yet, it is very difficult to assign the actual date of Sir Ralph's death, for the Fine Roll referred to, does not imply definitely that he was lately dead, and William Hardwicke, who was particularly careful as to his dates, assigns 1228-9 for this event, though he specifies no reason for so doing. There is no reason why his son and heir may not have been either under age, or absent on foreign service, and the manor left in the king's hands until his return. At any rate Ralph de Perton was dead in 1241 and had left two sons, Roger

to whom his father gave a virgate of land, and of whom little or no further evidence is forthcoming and John his heir and successor, together with a daughter Idonea, who had become the wife of his next neighbor Sir Hugh de Wrottesley Knight, who died about 1276, and by whom she was ancestress of the present Lord Wrottesley.

John de Perton, noticed in 1230, as heir to the estates of Perton and Trescote, did not, however have livery of his estates until September 26th 1241. By the king's writ of that date, in which he accepts the homage of John the son of Ralph de Perton, for a fine of five marks, the Sheriff is ordered to give him seizin of his lands, after taking security for the payment of the above fine. It is curious to notice what apparently small sums were unable to be paid down in those days, for we have already seen that the father Ralph had to pay the trifling amount of two marks in installments. Shortly after his succession to the Manor, we find this John de Perton involved in an important litigation with Ralph Bassett, Baron of Drayton Bassett, and lord of the neighboring Manors of Patteshull and Pattingham, respecting common of pasture for their respective tenants, and there is a highly interesting deed now preserved at Wrottesley, dated 32 of Henry the third (1248), by which John de Perton compromised this dispute with his neighbor. It had been, and was still usual at this period, before common lands were enclosed, for contiguous manors to have mutual interchange of common rights, and this had been the case between Perton and Pattingham, where at that time there was much uncultivated waste land. John de Perton had brought an 'Assize of novel disseizin' against Ralph lord Bassett, respecting common of pasture in Pattingham, appurtenant to his free tenement in Perton. This probably arose from Bassett having, in accordance with the growing custom of the time fenced in some portions of the common land, within his Manor of Pattingham, in response to the increasing demand on all sides for more cultivated land, wherewith to feed the rapidly increasing population. The dispute however was eventually settled, as was very usual in those days, in a manner probably highly satisfactory to both litigants, but very much to the prejudice of the unfortunate tenants of both Manors. It was agreed that Ralph Bassett should hold in peace all arable lands and meadows approved, (that is, enclosed) and reduced to cultivation, within the territory of Pattingham, up to the date of this convention, and John de Perton, in the same way, shall approve (enclose) as much lands within the territory of Perton, without hindrance from Sir Ralph Bassett, and Ralph shall have power to close his wood of Passetcliffe, between the feasts of saint Michael and saint Martin, which was the time of pannage, when the swine fattened for Yuletide killing, by feeding on the mast of trees, such as acorns, beechnuts, chestnuts, &c., so that the swine agisted in the wood of Harewood, in Perton, should not be able to enter it. And if the cattle and swine of John, or of his men, should enter through defect of the enclosure, they shall be delivered up without loss or damage. Ralph and his men to have common of pasture in all the land of John (to be newly approved,) after the corn and hay had been gathered, as they used to have before the approvment, excepting within the wood of Harewood, where they shall not have right of common, between the feasts of saint Michael and saint Martin; and for this convention Sir Ralph retracted his writ of right against Roger de Marefort, and Robert de Wodewell, and John withdrew his writ of *novel disseizin*. This convention was made at Lichfield, 12th February 1248, before Roger de Turkebi, and the other king's justices itinerant there. The witnesses being Sir Robert de Grendon; Sir Nicholas Meverel; Sir Nicholas

son of Ralph ; Hugh prior of Kanewell (Canewell) ; Jordan de Budifort ; Thomas de Tresel ; Hugh de Wrottesley ; Walter de Overton ; Robert de Wicklakisford ; and William de Hagley. Between the years 1247 and 1250 Robert de Passelowe, archdeacon of Lewes and treasurer of England, visited the midland counties, for the purpose of making enquiry into the alienations of serjeantries, and to impose fines for the same. His return for Staffordshire is printed in the "Testa de Nevill ;" it states, amongst others, that the serjeantry of John de Perton, for which he should provide for the king, a "servions ad arma," mounted for eight days, at his own cost, had been, in part, alienated. Namely, by two virgates of land, held by Roger de Perton, Hugh de Wrottesley, and Michael de Trescote. His fine for this appears to have been eight marks ; for the Pipe Roll of 1248 returns him as owing that sum "pro transgressionem." The virgate of land in possession of Hugh de Wrottesley, had been given to him as the dowry of Idonea, sister of this John de Perton. The royal rights appear to have been well looked after, and defended in the reign of the third Henry, for we find another inquisition of titles in 1255, and amongst others, it is again recorded that "John de Perton held three hides of land in Perton, of the king's majesty, by service of serjeantry in Wales, with horses and arms, for eight days at his own cost, and if he stays longer, he has eight pence from the purse of his majesty the king ; and he has a free court, and does suit at two general hundred courts, on requisition, etc., and he gives three shillings for frankpledge." It also appears, upon their enquiry, that the king's escheator, Henry de Wengham, and his coadjutor Robert de Passelowe, had found that John's father, Ralph de Perton, had alienated two and a half virgates of land or about 150 acres, without a license from the king, for which the king receives annually five shillings and nine pence, as a fine imposed by the said inquisitors. However if John's father had alienated a portion of his patrimony, his son Ralph about this time acquired a fresh domain of land at Stirchley in Shropshire, and I cannot do better than quote from R. W. Eyton's incomparable "Antiquities of Shropshire." "An outlying Berewick of the Domesday Manor of Longford, though eight miles distant from it, and close on the east of Great Dawley, Stirchley was dependant on Longford for nearly two centuries after Domesday ; and was held by a family of the same name, as tenants in fee, who sold half the hide of which it consisted to the abbot of Buildwas in 1255, who subinfeudated a virgate to the abbot of Lilleshull, a virgate to Ranulph de Perton, and one nook to the prior of Wenlock. Afterwards the abbot bought all the vill, except a half hide held by Ranulph de Coleham. In 1284 the abbot of Buildwas holds the vill of Stirchley of Robert Corbet, and he of Adam de Brinton, and he of the king. Walter de Stirchley died in 1232, and Matilda his widow claimed one third of a hide in Stirchley as her dower ; and the fine by which she obtained for life, the half virgate held by Robert Partridge dates July 1st 1232. On July 1st 1247 Osbert de Stirchley gives to Nicholas, abbot of Buildwas, two virgates in Stirchley, and other property. Also 36 acres with the bosc growing thereon, namely whatever lay between John de Perton's bosc, and the bosc of the monks. He also gives the homages and services of John de Perton and his heirs ; of Ralph de Coleham and his heirs ; of Julian son of Walter de Stirchley and his heirs, etc. The charter describes 'half the great garden, an orchard, already divided, between the grantor and John de Perton. The Perton Fee.—This estate though small, requires a distinct notice. The family of Perton, in Staffordshire, held lands there by serjeantry. The lord of Perton and Trescote was bound to attend the king in any Welsh expedition, with two horses, for eight days, at his own cost, and if

he remained longer, at the king's cost. Ranulph de Perton, of Perton held Perton 1211 and was deceased, 26th September 1241, when John his son and heir had livery at Perton (Fine Roll) His services at Stirchley were assigned, about 1247-8 by Osbert Fitz William to Buildwas Abbey." This last fact, noted by Eyton, no doubt fixes the date of the purchase of this property by Ralph de Perton. John de Perton was twice married, first to a lady supposed to have been a daughter of the Stirchley family, who died after becoming mother of four sons, Ralph, the next heir; William, heir of Ralph; Roger; and John, a monk at Wenlock Abbey. He married again in 1238 Juliana the fascinating young widow of Guy the son of Sir Alan de Glazeley, and daughter and heiress of Alan de Pierrepoint, by whom he does not appear to have had any offspring. He died in 1257-8, leaving his widow Juliana surviving.

Sir Ralph de Perton, the next heir of his father John, became lord of Perton with Trescote, and of the Perton Fee in Stirchley, having received livery of his lands on 27th January, 1258, Sir Ralph was speedily engaged in litigation with his step-mother and her family; she resided at Perton where she had her dowry, while he took up his residence at Stirchley. In 1258 he was prosecuting Juliana de Glazeley, a name that in modern times would be an incorrect description; Alan, Lawrence, and Henry, her sons; Hugh de Blades; Roger de Arden; William de Glazeley, (brother of Juliana's late husband); and three others named; for entering *vi et armis*, his free haye, in the Manor of Perton, which is called Harawood, and forms part of the serjeantry, which the said Ralph held of the king *in capite*, and cutting down, and carrying away two oak trees. The defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to produce them at fifteen days from Hillary. Juliana's first husband Sir Guy de Glazeley of Glazeley Co. Salop died about 1238, after which she had married Sir John de Perton, whose widow she now was and the Harawood bosc, or haye was the one mentioned in Domesday, as being half a mile square. The career of this Ralph as owner of Perton was indeed short, for the year following his release he is reported to be dead, and in the opinion of General Wrottesley he fell in an ambuscade in Wales, that occurred about that period, according to the chronicles, and in which many other knights and men-at-arms were killed. "My reason for this supposition," he says "is the unusual form of the king's writ to the escheator; the ordinary term for signifying the death of a tenant *in capite*, is, "*diem clausit extremum*;" the writ in question runs "*Quia Ranulphus de Perton qui de nobis tenuit in capite, nuper infata decessit, tibi precipimus, etc.*" Ralph had evidently come to an untimely death, in some way, which was a matter of notoriety, and he was only 25 or 26 years of age at the time." The inquisition took place on the Thursday after the feast of the Virgin Mary, 11th September 1259, before Philip de Lega Lee or Leigh, the escheator, and a jury composed of Perton's late neighbors, Hugh de Wrottesley; Walter de Overton; Roger Buffary; William Fitz Warine; Clement of Wolverhampton; Gervase of Wolverhampton; Roger de Mareford; Michael de Trescote; and five others, stated the usual particulars respecting the tenure of Perton, and added that he paid five shillings annually to the king, for land alienated from his serjeantry, and that Perton was worth five marks annually. William his brother was his next heir, and 22 years of age. They also stated that Juliana de Glazeley, formerly wife of John de Perton, father of the said William, held one third of Perton in

dower, and that Margâret the widow of Ralph lately deceased, was now suing for her dower. Thus we see that young as he was, although he left no issue, he had left his brother and successor a comparatively poor man.

William de Perton brother and heir of Sir Ralph thus became lord of Perton and Trescot and of the Storchley fee, and by a writ, dated 19th September 1259, the king accept the homage of the new tenant *in capite*, and the Sheriff of Staffordshire is commanded to take security for the payment of five marks, for his relief, as on previous occasions. But the two widows' dowers, to be paid out of the estates, together with the fines, etc., for his relief, must have seriously crippled his finances. The wording of the inquisition is as follows:—"43 *Henr. ij* (1259) *Ranulphus de Perton Inq. p. m. Dicunt (juratores) quod Guillelmus, frater dicti Ranulphi, est suis proximus hæres, quia dictus Guillelmus sine hærede sui corporis decessit. Item; dicunt dictus Guillelmus est viginti duorum annorum ætatis et amplius. Unde dicunt quod Juliana de Glaseleye quondam uxor Johannis de Perton, fratris dicti Guillelmi, habet tertiam partem totius dicti tenementi nomine dotis et Margareta uxor dicti Ranulphi fratris dicti Guillelmi est petenda suam dotem. Stafford.*" Very shortly after this young man's succession to the reduced patrimony of Perton, litigation was proceeding between himself and his neighbor at Wrottesley, respecting the boundaries of their respective manors; and on the Close Roll of 1261, there is a writ addressed to the Sheriff of Staffordshire, commanding him to go in person to the land of Hugh de Wrottesley, in Wrottesley, and the land of William de Perton, in Perton, and to take with him twelve discreet and lawful knights of his county, and upon their oath, to make a perambulation by metes and bounds between the land of the said Hugh de Wrottesley, and the land of the said William de Perton. In addition to this suit respecting the boundaries between the manors, which was probably instigated by Wrottesley, William de Perton retaliated by attempting to recover the virgate of land in Perton, that had been alienated by his grandfather Ralph de Perton on the marriage of Ralph's daughter Idonea, with Hugh who was thus the uncle of the present Ralph de Perton. In this last suit, on the Patent Roll of 1262, Martin de Littlebury the justiciary, is appointed to take the assize of *novel disseizin* that William de Perton arraigned against Hugh de Wrottesley, concerning the tenement in Perton. But, by a deed of about this time, William son of John de Perton releases to Hugh son of William de Wrottesley, and his heirs, all his claim to lands and tenements which the said Hugh held in frank marriage, by the gift of Ralph the grandfather of William. The witnesses to this deed are Robert de Pendeford, Robert de Bushbury, William de Perton, William Alleyn, Alan de Overton and Roger de Buffury. The second witness Robert de Bushbury died between 1267 and 1271; and this deed bears the appearance of a compromise after the suit. On the Bench Roll of Easter (April) 1263 John de Boteler and Margaret his wife, widow of Ralph de Perton, late brother of William, sue William de Perton for £10 of arrears of an annual rent of one hundred shillings, owing to them. William did not appear and the Sheriff is commanded to attach him, by his goods and chattels, to appear at the next Trinity sittings. The result of this suit is given further on, and will give an idea of the manner in which the local juries understated the value of an inheritance, in an inquisition. Perton is stated to be worth five marks yearly by all the juries on *post mortem* inquisitions, and at the assizes up to date and even later; and yet here we find the widow's jointure, which was one third of the value of the

freehold, to be £5 annually, after deducting the jointure of Julianna, the widow of John de Perton, who was still alive at this date. The real value of Perton, on this computation would be about £25 a year. An inquest subsequent to that, when William had his release, reports the value of Perton Manor as £8-6 4½ per annum. The Forest Rolls for 1271 relating to Kinver and Kanok contain many entries of transgression against the forest laws by this William de Perton, and his poaching gang of friends. It was presented that William de Perton, and William son of Allan de Overton took a hind and a doe in Kinver Forest on the Wednesday before the purification 1266 without warrant, and carried the venison to the house of the said William, who, being convicted of the same was committed to prison. And the said William de Overton appeared, as is shown above; and William de Perton was eventually fined twenty shillings, for which William de Faunt and John de Pendeford were his sureties. He was afterwards pardoned, at the instance of William Child. It is represented, etc., that William Thoulouse, who was with the bishop of Chester, Henry de Anmary, Colin the huntsman of Roger de Anmary, Jordan de Rewel, William Chansfelitte, William de Perton, John de Perton his brother, William son of Allan de Overton, Ralph de Bushbury, Roger Bushbury his brother, and John de Bruneford, who were residing at that time in Lichfield and Stafford, in 1264 were customary malefactors of the king's venison in Kanok Forest, with greyhounds, bows and arrows. And they had sheltered themselves under the name of Ralph Bassett so that no forester dared to attack them. And the said Jordan and Walter appeared, and being convicted were committed to prison. And the said William Chansfelitte, William de Perton and William de Overton, came as is shown, respecting venison trespass in Kinver. And John son (should be brother) of William de Perton is now a monk at Wenlock Abbey; the Sheriff is therefore ordered to distrain the prior of that place to produce him before the justices on the morrow of All Souls. And the said John de Bruneford could not be found; he is therefore *exigatur* and outlawed. And the said Ralph bailed his brother Roger de Bushbury, to have him before the justices on the feast of saint Dionisius; which Jordan de Rewel, being brought out of prison, was fined twenty shillings, by the pledge of John Again Robert Cheney; William de Haggford; Nicholas de Haggford his brother; William de Perton; William son of Alan de Overton; and John de Bruneford, took in Kanok Forest on the Saturday before the feast of exaltation of the Holy Cross 1266, three bucks, a doe, and a fecon without warrant, and carried the venison to Chylynton, which was then in the hands of Robert Cheney. William de Perton and William de Overton appeared as shown above. And the Sheriff had orders respecting William de Haggford and Robert and Nicholas, as shown above. And the said John de Bruneford is to be put in the exigend, as shown above. Again it is presented that William de Perton; William son of Alan de Overton; William son of Hugh de Bosco of Trimpeley; Ralph de Bushbury; Roger de Bushbury his brother; William son of Hugh de Wrottesley; William de Penne; John Selwyn and John de Bruneford are customary malefactors of venison, in the bailiwicks of Bentley and Oxleye, in Kanok Chase, and that they took three does without warrant, in the bailiwick of Bentley, on the Friday before Pentecost 1272, and carried them to the house of the said Ralph Bushbury, and there divided them between them. The said William Wrottesley now appeared, and being convicted was detained in prison; and the said William de Perton, William Overton, Ralph de Bushbury, and Roger de Bushbury, appeared as shown above, and the Sheriff was ordered to arrest the said William

de Penne. John Selwyn and John de Bruneford, are in the exigend, as appears above; and the said William son of Hugh de Trympley held nothing by which he could be distrained; he is therefore to be put in the exigend. William de Penne afterwards appeared and being convicted was put into prison, and afterwards released for a fine of twenty shillings, for which William de Bentley and John de Penderford were his sureties. And the said William de Wrottesley was released for a fine of twenty shillings, for which Hugh his father was surety. The above records give us a good insight to the customs and inner life of this period, whereby we see that members of respectable county families were habitual poachers. William de Perton appears to scintillate as a bright meteor in this constellation of stars of the fashionable vice of that day, being evidently the most inveterate poacher of the gang. All this, in spite of the extremely severe penalties which were incurred and frequently enforced against them. The prompt disappearance of some of the gang, to avoid the clutch of the law is not to be wondered at if, as was probably the case, they ranked as more villains, for the penalty in their case, was death by the gallows. The record of the assizes held at Stafford in 1272, shows that William de Perton was one of the jurors for the Hundred of Seisdon which jurors made the usual presentment respecting Perton. "Of serjeantries, William de Perton holds the manor of Perton, by serjeantry; and when the king goes into Wales to make war, the said William must follow him, with himself and a horse armed, for eight days, at his own cost, and if detained more than eight days, he receives for each day eight pence from the king for his wages; and his land is worth five marks yearly. The said William renders to the king five shillings for a virgate and a half of land, formerly alienated by an ancestor of the said William, and the said rent was accounted for at the Exchequer. William de Perton, as has been already noted, and like his brother, resided principally at Stirchley on his property there and his name appears on deeds at Broseley about four miles from Stirchley between 1259 and 1271. In 1272 an assize was held as to whether Michael de Trescote, the uncle of Alice, the daughter of Julia de Trescote was seized, etc., of a messuage, and half a virgate of land in Trescote when he died, etc., which William de Overton and Joan his wife now hold, the two last appeared, and called to warranty William de Perton who came and warranted the tenement to them, and stated that Michael had not died seized of it, for long before his death, he had enfeoffed him, the said William de Perton of the tenement, and he produced a deed of Michael to that effect. Verdict was accordingly given for William de Perton, who had married Joan de Trescote probably a sister of the above Michael, and thus became the owner of nearly the whole of the manor of Trescote. In 1272 Robert son of Roger Buffary sued Philip abbot of Combe, for a messuage and six virgates of land in Trescote, of the fee of Penn Buffary, and stated that William his ancestor was seized as of fee, of the land in the reign of King Henry the second. The abbot answered that a writ, *de ingressu*, could not go further back than the reign of king John, and the suit was adjourned. The inquisition on the death of Ralph de Perton stated that he held Perton and Trescote, and a suit on the Staffordshire Assize Roll of 1272 gives us the extent of the Perton interest in Trescote. In 1274 William de Perton was appointed assessor for the Counties of Northampton and Rutland. In 1276 December 12th William de Perton acknowledges the services due from him, in the usual form, and again at Worcester in 1277. In 1279-80 Philip de Saye, and Roesia his wife, sued Henry de Perton and Alice his wife, for one third of a virgate of land, in Oyer Penn, which they claimed as

the right of Boscain. This was adjourned. In 1280 Margaret the widow of John de Boteler and of Ralph de Perton appeared against William de Perton, in a plea that he should hold to a convention made between the father of the said William de Perton and themselves, respecting the third part of two carucates of land in Strohley and Perton. William is to be attached for the Trinity term, as he did not put in an appearance, probably for the excellent reason that he was dead or dying, at the time, for he died in this year. By his wife Joan he left a daughter Isabel who became the wife of William de Bentley Lord of Bentley, and two sons, John his successor, and William of whom next.

A few lines here relative to William the second son of William de Perton will be appropriate and of some interest, as he was lucklessly connected with one of the unfortunate episodes of English history of that period. On December 12th 1276, under the power of victory King Edward the first had exacted from Llewellyn, Prince of North Wales, a most unjust and extortionate treaty, by which the latter agreed to hold his dominions as a feudatory of the English king; but the Welsh chieftains having neglected some of its provisions, especially in neglecting to appear at the English Court, and even refusing to do so when summoned, the pretext that Edward required was thus obtained, and offensive operations were speedily commenced. The first act was the seizure of Eleanor de Montford, who was on her way from France to become the bride of Llewellyn. At Easter 1277, Edward, who never lost much time in these matters, marched towards North Wales *via* Chester, while his ships invested the Isle of Anglesea. Llewellyn was forced to submit, and Edward's terms were now more arbitrary and unreasonable than ever, for he demanded no less than £50,000 and the cession of all North Wales, except Anglesea, which also was to revert to the English Crown, in case Llewellyn died without heir male, and in the meantime Edward was apparently endeavoring to make him do so by the capture and detention of his intended bride. In addition to this, Llewellyn was to pay a yearly rental for Anglesea of one thousand pounds. No one knew better than Edward that these terms were impossible to Llewellyn and the real object was to break down and terminate the royal dynasty of Wales, for probably there was not as much money as that demanded in all Llewellyn's dominion. But, as an apparent act of grace, Edward now agreed to remit the enormous ransom, and also promised to release the bride. The former had gained his point, and could now afford to bid for popularity amongst the undersized, shaggy and dusky-skinned mountaineers; he therefore knighted Llewellyn's brother David, and gave him the hand of the daughter of Earl Ferrers. Other chieftains were also treated liberally; but the previous high handed policy of the king, and the tyranny of his followers, took off the sheen from the English gold, and soon wiped out all the kindly feeling that had been produced. The prophecies of Merlin increased the disaffection of the half savage tribes of the Welsh hills; one of which was that when English money should become round, the Prince of Wales should be crowned in London, and Edward had just decreed that pennies should no longer be quartered, and had issued a new round coinage. The disaffection was soon lighted up into active flame and the first act of offence was committed by Prince David who surprised Hawarden Castle in Flintshire (between Mold and Chester) on March 22nd 1282, where he took Roger Clifford prisoner in his bed; and Llewellyn followed up this action, by leading his men against Flint and Ruddlan Castles. At first Edward refused to believe the news, but when it was fully realised, he was instantly on the war-path with an army, and quickly beat

the wretched Welshmen back upon Snowdon. The desperation of the half clad and ignorant savages caused the successes to be alternated frequently, but the English fleet was in possession of Anglesea, and a bridge of boats was commenced across the straits of Menai. The Welsh had entrenchments on the mainland, and with their customary cunning, awaited an attack, which soon occurred; for during Edward's temporary absence on November 6th 1282, a body of troops crossed the uncompleted bridge, and reached the shore by wading through the half-tide water. When the rising tide had made it impossible for them to regain their boats the wily and exasperated hillmen saw their chance and making a desperate and dashing charge in large and over-powering members, drove the English into the sea, where all were either drowned or speared to death: thus perished the flower of Edward's garrison, hundreds of men at arms with thirteen knights and seventeen esquires. Amongst these unfortunate and foolhardy warriors was William de Perton, who by a writ of Welsh Roll of 1281, had been summoned to attend and had been appointed *custos garderobae regis*, (keeper of the king's wardrobe), under the designation of Master William de Perton. He had probably only just arrived at camp, for he had lately returned from a journey to Chester; having been appointed by the king "to receive the five hundred marks from Llewellyn sone of Griffin Prince of Wales, which the said prince was to pay into the treasury at Chester, Michaelmas, for the land of Anglesea." This journey to Chester, however, was the last he was destined to perform, before the fatal one that took him to his doom at Anglesea. He does not appear to have been married, and though evidence shows him to have been the eldest son, neither does he appear to have inherited his paternal domain, this probably because he was engaged in his military pursuits at the time of his father's death and until his own. But it is as well he did not marry, for already two thirds of the estate was being absorbed by widows, and nothing would have been left for the heir. William de Perton, the elder, must have died in 1280, for the Pipe Roll of that year for Staffordshire, states that Master Walter de Haselshawe, had the custody of the lands of William de Perton until the full age of the said William. In 1280, at the King's Bench Court, Joan widow of William de Perton, who is presumed to have been a daughter of.....de Trescote; and sister of Michael de Trescote, sued John de Overton, for a third part of six acres of land, and two acres of meadow, in Perton; and Adam son of John de Alverton for a third of seven acres of land, and two acres of meadow, in the same vill; and she sued John son of John de Overton, for a third of four acres of land, and two acres of meadow; and Richard Malobe, for a third of seven acres of land, and one acre of meadow; and Henry Franceys, for a third of four acres of land; and Robert O'th'hull, for a third of two acres of land, and two acres of meadow; and Richard Golightly, for a third of five acres of waste; and Richard Wyldy, for a third of seven acres of waste, and half an acre of meadow; and Henry de Bronthall, for a third of five acres of land, and two acres of meadow; and Adam le Newman, for a third of five acres of land; and Walter le Mouner (Miller), for a third of five acres land, and William de Woodwall, for a third of five acres of land; and Adam de Shiston, for a third of six acres of land; and Robert Cabeles (Careless), for a third of two acres of land; and William Meydews, for a third of six acres in the same vill, as her dower. None of the defendants, who were merely tenants, appeared, and the Sheriff is ordered to summon them again for the octaves of Trinity; and the dower claimed, is to be paid into the king's hand. The *post mortem* inquisition took place, and the jurors

stated that William had held the vill of Perton of the king, *in capite*, by the service of following the king into Wales, etc. John his son is his next heir, and is 17 and three quarters years of age and upwards. The writ of *diem clausit extremum* on William the father's death, dates 4th February 1280, and a subsequent inquest, as before stated, reported the value of Perton Manor to be £8-6-4½ *per annum*: he had held a messuage and 59 acres of land in Stirchley, under the abbot of Buildwas, at a rent of 32 pence *per annum*, and the whole of this last property was said to be of twenty shillings value to the deceased. As there is no mention of William Perton, the eldest son, being the rightful heir, it is probable that the custom of Borough English prevailed here, as in many other manors of ancient demesne of the crown, in which case John would be the real heir of William the father. A second inquest held, 8th July 1282, after the heir had come of age, and to give him livery of his estates, calls Stirchley property a carucate of land, and values it at forty shillings *per annum*, making the abbot's rent three shillings a year. In 1281-82 *coram rege* at Michaelmas, a record relating to warrior William, drowned at Menai, relates that Robert, vicar of the church of Asthall, was sued by William de Perton, for taking his corn and hay at Asthall, to the value of sixty shillings. Robert appeared, and stated that he had taken no corn belonging to William, because it belonged to his vicariate of Asthall or Westhall, and he appealed to a jury. The Sheriff is ordered to summon a jury for the octaves of Hillary. At the same court, Joan de Perton, widow, and John de Tresel, executors of the will of William de Perton, were sued by Margaret, widow of John de Boteler, for nine marks of money; and she stated that the said William was bound to her, for £10, on the day he died, for certain lands, which she had demised to him for a term; and the said executors after the death of William, had rendered to her six marks of the said debt, and refused to pay the residue. Joan and John appeared, and Joan stated that she was not an executrix of the will and appealed to a jury. The Sheriff was ordered to summon a jury for the morrow of the Purification. And John de Tresel stated that one Henry Dicken, of Tattenhall, was his co-executor, and he cannot answer the plea without him. Henry is therefore to be summoned for the same day. On the Bench Roll of 1282-3 Idonea, widow of Hugh de Wrottesley, sued John de Boteler for a messuage and half a virgate of land in Perton; and William del Hulle of Lapley, for half a messuage, and the fourth of a virgate, in the same vill, as her right and dowry, and in which the said John, William, and Robert had no entry, except by Amice, daughter of Hugh de Wrottesley, to whom Hugh, formerly her husband had demised it for his life. The defendants appeared, and John called to warranty William son of Hugh de Wrottesley, who stated that he holds the tenement in question, by a demise of the said John le Boteler, son and heir of the said Amice, and called him to warranty the said John, son of Amice, and he also said that the tenement was the right and dowry of the said Amice, and that Amice, together with her husband had demised the tenement to him, and for this he called to warranty the said John likewise, as her son and heir. The case was adjourned. The said Idonea, married to Hugh de Wrottesley, was a daughter of Ralph de Perton. In the same year of 1282, *coram rege*, the before mentioned Margaret le Boteler, who now styles herself widow of Ralph de Perton, remits to Master Walter de Haselshawe of Shropshire, all her dower in Perton and Stirchley, until the full age of John son and heir of William de Perton, for eight marks, of which half was to be paid her at the quindenē of Michaelmas, and the other half at the quindenē of Lady day.

Sir John de Perton, knight, of Perton, Trescote and part of Stirchley had been, as we have seen, under the guardianship of Master Walter de Haselshawe during his minority, and the final inquisition upon the death of William de Perton the elder, did not take place until 1284-5. It was held at Stafford, on the Friday before the feast of Saint Denis 12th Edward the first, on the Oath of William de Wrottesley ; William de Overton, John de Tresel ; William de Tettenhall ; Roger Buffary and seven others, who stated that William had held the vill of Perton of the king *in capite*, by the service of following him into Wales, in time of war, with a horse without armor, and armed himself with an aketun, purpoint and lance, for eight days, at his own cost and if detained longer, then at the cost of the king, Perton being supplied from the king's table, or else to receive eight pence daily, and the vill of Perton is worth yearly £10. He also held at Stirchley in Shropshire, a carucate of land, of the abbot of Buildwas worth forty shillings. John de Perton his son, is his next heir, and is 21 years of age and upwards. This John who had now succeeded to his patrimony was a somewhat important personage of the period through which he survived. His career was an eventful one, and during his long life he occupied many positions of trust and importance, under the first and second Edwards. In 1291, the Staffordshire Assize Roll shows that John de Perton was summoned to show by what right and title he claimed and made use of certain privileges. Again in 1293, Hugh de Louther was the king's attorney in this district, and as such, was very active in challenging all the privileges claimed by the various tenants of the crown, and in thoroughly investigating their validity. Amongst others, John de Perton received his particular attention, and was called upon to show his title to hold pleas of the crown, and to have free warren ; fair and market, etc., in his Manor of Perton. John, however, stated that he only claimed view of frankpledge and wayf, in the said manor. Louther disputed the verdict as to wayf, on a technical point ; that was a *grossum coronae* or special prerogative of the crown. At the same time John de Perton put in a claim for assize of bread and beer, in his Manor of Perton. The case was adjourned to be heard before the king's bench. The same jury found that Margaret formerly wife of Ralph de Perton holds in Perton £4-6-8 worth of land, and that she is at the king's disposal and is *maritanda*. The trusteeship of John de Tresel and Henry Dicken or Deacon of Tettenhall, during John's minority, probably was the cause of the alliance, that he formed by marrying Felicia the daughter of the said John de Tresel's son Thomas prior to 1310, when he was appointed to the verderership of the Forest of Kynver. In 1307 he obtained from the new king a charter of free warren, for all his demesne lands at Perton, the original document being now in the Wrottesley collection. Prior to 1310 John de Perton's wife Felicia had died, and he married again a wife named Margaret who survived him. In 1301, on a Bench Roll, John de Perton and Margaret his wife, sued John de Stirchley, in a plea, that he should warrant to them a messuage and a carucate and two virgates of land, ten acres of meadow, and ten acres of wood, which they held, and claimed to hold of him. John de Stirchley did not appear, and the Sheriff returned that he held nothing, within his bailiwick, by which he could be attached, and it was testified that he held sufficient in the County of Lincoln. The Sheriff of Lincolnshire was therefore ordered to attach him for the quindene of Hillary. In 1306 William de Perton (son of John de Perton and nephew of William lord of Perton) forester of Kyngesley Wood, or Kingswood was presented to have feloniously killed William Vapournent, in the aforesaid wood. At another

court, in the same year, William de Perton, forester, was inhibited for the death of William Vapourment, feloniously killed in the wood of Kyngesley; whereupon William de Perton aforesaid, produced a pardon from the king, dated from the town of saint John of Perth on June 27th 1303. This year of 1306 is famous for the murder of Comyn, by Robert the Bruce, who thereupon assumed the Crown of Scotland. Aylmer de Valence was made king's lieutenant for the Marches, and writs were issued to all Sheriffs, that all who were not knights, and who wished to be, were to be in London before the day of Pentecost, to receive from the king's wardrobe suitable apparel, of the king's gift.—What a chance would this not have been for some of our modern aspirants after knightly honors? Exhibitions, Imperial Institutes, and Bridge Openings would not be in it! This was to add splendor to the knighthood of Edward of Carnarvon, Prince of Wales, who was now to be shortly crowned in London, in fulfilment of Merlin's prophecy, though not exactly by the method expected by the credulous and superstitious people of the Principality. Amongst the 267 knights dubbed on the present occasion, the following belonged to Staffordshire;—William de Bermingham, John de Weston, Ralph Bagot, Peter de Gresley, Roger de Somerville, Henry de Erdington, John de Harecourt, Ralph Bassett, William de Handsacre, John de Somery, William de Wrottesley and William Tresel. John de Perton's name is conspicuous by absence, but he was already on the list of those bound to be up and ready in horse and harness, hand and halbert, at his own expense; and he was by virtue of the tenure of his estate also bound to 'be dight in his arms' as a knight, and most probably had been dubbed some years previously. By the Fine Roll of 1311 the king at the requisition of his beloved clerk, Engelard de Warle, Custos guardarobae Regis, (successor of the late William de Perton, drowned in 1282), commits to his beloved valet William de Perton, the Manor of Tettenhall, in the County of Stafford, rendering to the exchequer the same sum annually, as John de Perton, the father of William now renders. Dated from Berwick on Tweed on April 15th. This entry must modify our ideas as to the marriage date of Sir John de Perton and Felicia de Trysul, which has been assigned to 1300. But it must have been earlier, and probably soon after the former obtained livery in 1284-5, as this date would only make the son William 25 at the time of this important grant, probably obtained for distinguished service in the Scotch wars. The record is rather puzzling, for it implies that Sir John de Perton, the father, had likewise held Tettenhall Regis up to this date from some uncertain period; but James P. Jones hesitates to place him on his list of lords of Tettenhall Manor. A little light however is thrown upon the subject by reference to a record of 1314 in which king Edward the second grants Tettenhall Co., Stafford, Claverley Co., Salop, and two other manors named, to Richard de Arundell, to hold for his life, for his support in the king's service. On the Court Rolls of the adjoining Manor of Pittingham is a record in 1312, that Walter the servant of Sir John de Perton was fined in the Manor Court, for trespass committed by two bullocks in a meadow in the lord of Pittingham. In 1313 we find that this Perton was appointed one of the assessors and collectors for the County of Stafford of the 20th and 15th aids granted by the Westminster parliament, and in connection with this office, there was an appeal to the king and council (s. d.) from the homagers and tenants of John de Perton, in the Manor of Tettenhall, which is of ancient demesne of the king, and when they also sued the said John in a plea that

he exacted from them, and from Thomas Atte Nayssche, John Alayne, Richard le Couperre ; and John Nicholes, homagers and tenants of the said John, in the same Manor, other customs and services, than they and their ancestors, tenants of the Manor, had been used to render, in the times when the said manor was in the hands of the king's progenitors. John de Perton did not appear. The action had been already postponed and adjourned for some time, and the Sheriff was ordered now to distrain on his goods and produce him at three weeks from Easter. A postscript states that at Easter the Sheriff sent no return, and he was ordered to produce John at the octaves of Trinity, upon which the said William and Robert appeared in court and complained that whereas they had delivered to the said John, the king's writ *de prohibitione*, to the effect that, *pendente placito* he should not distrain his tenants, etc., he had distrained them as before, and detained in prison the said John Alayne, Richard le Couperre, John Nicholes, and Thomas Atte Nayssche, so that they could not prosecute their suit against him ; to the grave contempt of the king and damage of the said tenants. The Sheriff was therefore ordered to summon the said John de Perton to answer for his trespass and contempt at the above date, and if the said tenants were detained in prison, to set them free without delay. In a deed of this period, (s. d.) is a record that John, Lord of Tresel, gave to Philip, the son of Philip de Lutteley, in frank marriage with Idonea daughter of John de Perton, the homage and services of Edward de Haggeley in Lutteley, and therein this John de Tresel calls Idonea his kinswoman. She was, in fact, his niece, the daughter of his sister Felicia. This John de Tresel was poisoned by his neighbour William Buffary in 1336, after the latter had abducted his wife ; and Philip de Lutteley also met with a violent death at the hand and instigation of Sir Hugh de Wrottesley. Another deed of this time shows that things were not too rosy for the unfortunate and struggling tenants of Perton, as is before mentioned ; and they were taking further proceedings against him in the matter, with a result not too satisfactory, but that throws considerable discredit upon the Justice of the time. But of this case more anon. John de Perton was a knight of Parliament for the county in 1315. In the Scotch Roll of 1317 are writs to array footmen for the war, when Roger Baskervyle, Ralph de Rolleston, and John de Perton were appointed Commissioners of Array for Shropshire and Staffordshire, and they were to select two thousand men, to be led by Roger de Baskervyle, and be at Newcastle on Tyne at three weeks from the nativity of John the Baptist, dated 15th July 1317. The total number to be arrayed was twelve thousand, in addition to the Welsh contingent, which was to consist of about four thousand. In 1317-18 the king had intended to invade Scotland again, and Ralph de Rolleston, Walter Halket, and John de Perton were appointed Commissioners to array one thousand men from Shropshire and Staffordshire, to be led by Walter Halket, and to be at Newcastle on Tyne on September 15th 1317, but the intestinal broils in England, at that time, caused its abandonment. In the year 1317 John de Cave of Northburgh sued John de Perton, for the wardship of Robert, son and heir of Robert de Essington, which belonged to him, in as much as the said Robert held his lands of him by knight's service. John de Perton did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to attach him, for the quindene of Hillary. In 1319 William de Perton was appointed—one of the collectors of the sentage due in 1315, for this county.

By a deed (s. d.) John de Perton granted to William his son, and Maud his wife and their heirs, all the lands he inherited, after the death of

William his father. His other five sons and a daughter were. 2. John de Perton escheator for Shropshire and Staffordshire with the Marches of Wales, in 1321, murdered by Sir Hugh Wrottesley in 1337 at Tettenhall Home and who left by his wife Margaret, two sons Adam de Perton and William de Perton, forester of Kingsleywood, in the Scotch wars 1336, escheator of Shropshire, Staffordshire and the Marches of Wales to 1341. 3. Henry de Perton of Over Penn in 1333, who married Agatha daughter of Thomas de Penne and left three sons Richard of Penne, Stephen of Penne and Walter. 4. Leonard de Perton of Wightwick, regarderer of Kinver Forest, *pannetarius regis* and escheator of Worcestershire to 1368. 5. Walter de Perton rector of Sturchley 1310, prebendary of Perton in Tettenhall church 1329; who was charged with the murder of John de Derley of Derbyshire in 1331. He died on Sunday, February 22nd 1349. 6. Hugh de Perton living 1330 and died issueless. Idonea the daughter of Sir John de Perton was married to Philip son of Philip de Lutteley. In 1317 Edward de Somerville granted the Manor of Bentley, and the bailiwick of the Hays of Bentley to John de Bentley, and the heirs of his body, remainder, failing such issue to John de Perton, and the heirs of his body, remainder to his own right heirs. Bentley is on the confines of Kanok Chase or Forest, and was held *in capite*, of the keeping of that portion of the Forest called Bentley Hays. John de Perton's sister Isabel was married to William de Bentley, who was probably father of the above John de Bentley, and Isabel his nearest relative. At Easter 1319 Hugh the parson of the church of Bushbury, sued Simon de Dumbleton, clerk; John de Weston; Geoffrey de Wasteneys, of Tixhall; Robert de Ovyotshay (Ivetsey); and John de Perton, to render to him six marks that were in arrear. Defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to attach them. In 1316 John de Tresel was lord of Trysul, and in the next year a deed states that William son of John, lord of Perton, grants to John de Rugge of Seisdon, liberty of common for 120 sheep in the lordship of Trysul; and again in 1331 William de Perton is recorded as lord of Trysul, when he granted to John Rugge of Seisdon, a piece of land, in Cranmere, par. Worfield, at a yearly rent of six pence. In 1317 John de Perton was a witness to the deed from Hugh de Hephham, lord of Bobbington, to John de Prees of Bobbington and Agnes his wife, granting twelve royal acres of land in the fee of Bobbington lying near Lutteley. By a deed (s. d.) and probably confirmatory of a previous one and which must have been executed between 1318 and 1320 John lord of Perton grants to William his son and Matilda his wife, and the heirs of their bodies, all the land which fell to him by hereditary right, after the death of William his father, in the vill of Sturchley, together with a place in Sturchley called Perton Croft, to enable him to build a house on it. He also granted to them and their issue forty shillings of rent in the vill of Trescote of his fee of Perton, proceeding from the tenements held by Robert Parnel, John Margery, Edith Aleyn, Richard Margery, Philip Ochet, and Ralph son of Hugh de Trescote. The witnesses to this deed are Sir William de Wrottesley, knight, John Giffard of Chillington, Henry de Morf, Ralph de Evenfeld, Philip de Lutteley, Robert Buffary, and John de Lappeley, clerk; the original deed is at Wrottesley. In the Pattingham Manor Court Rolls of 1313 William son of Felicia de Perton, the father at the time, being probably away on service, was presented to have fought a duel with William Buchart and to have drawn blood from him for which he was amerced in six pence; pretty cheap at the price! In 1324 John de Perton was surety, to the extent of a mark each, for three of the Elytons, in connection with the great Church Eaton church presentation riots; during which John de

Pitchford and Richard de Pitchford were killed. In 1326 John de Perton had to find sureties, in the matter of the same riotous disturbances. This great quarrel, that for a length of time, convulsed the whole of west Staffordshire and north east Shropshire, and terrified the peaceable inhabitants by the violence of its episodes, was a kind of family feud, relative to the advowson of the Church Eaton living, and it would appear that almost every family of importance in this neighborhood was drawn into the vortex of its turmoil, and more or less mixed up in the embroilment. The fatal result to John de Pitchford of Blumenhull (Blymhill), at last brought the affair under the notice and active interference of the authorities. This extensive and intricate emeute, for a long time dragged its weary course and occupied the judicial mind for a number of years, leading to many complications in its course. Its origin was in the death of John Bagod who had been lord of Blymhill Manor and patron of Church Eaton living, when he left the latter right equally to his four daughters, who married, respectively William de Iptanes, Ralph de Covene, Richard de Pitchford and Geoffrey de Bromley. Their second daughter Margaret Covene, left three daughters and co-heiresses, who had equal division of their mother's share in this advowson, and duly married husbands, all the four daughters of John Bagod, in fact leaving heirs. Thus the advowson rights were divided up into many shares, which resulted in this deplorable county convulsion. At Easter 1329 Adam Gilbert of Codsall, executor of the will of William de Codsall, sued Walter Perton, a prebendary of Tettenhall church of saint Michael, for a debt of nine marks, and the bishop had been ordered to produce the said Walter at this date, and had done nothing. Another mandate was therefore sent to the bishop to produce the said Walter, at the quindene of saint Michael. One other of the many cases that proved the loop hole of escape for sainted scoundrels, called 'benefit of clergy,' this was simply a legalized fraud, devised by priestcraft, by which the sanctified defaulter and criminal too often escaped from the stern hand of justice. A most disreputable case of public swindling on a wholesale scale, in connection with the county tax farm, cropped up, previous to this period in 1324, when Sir Thomas Pipe knight and Philip de Lutteley, late principal taxers and collectors of the 10th and 6th in the County of Stafford were found to have appropriated much money from the villis, to their own use, and its details are as bad as those of any modern Irish ring, and worse in the fact that they emanated from men of supposed integrity and respectability. The investigation into the matter took place at Tutbury in December 1323 before John de Stonore and his fellow justices, when the jury presented that "under color of their office, they had taken a great sum of money from various villis, to their own use." Richard Oxyete shaye (Ivetsey) clerk of Sir Thomas Pipe, and Philip de Lutteley, being summoned, could not deny that he had been badly conducted in his office, and was fined twenty marks. "The juries presented, that the accused misconducted themselves, by taking a great sum of money, by extortion from the various villis, so that the same villis 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, to be at Tutbury on the Monday before the feast of saint Lucy the virgin." William de Stafford and John de Perton, had been the chief taxers for the 20th; William de Mere, and John de Perton for the 18th; and John Giffard and John de Perton for the 16th, William de Mere was dead and John de Perton appeared for himself, and the other chief taxers and Simon Francis, for the sub-taxers. They stated that they did not tax the men of the villis in the county, accord-

ing to the true value of their chattels ; that they always trusted to the general interest of the whole county ; that many of the sub-taxers were dead, and those now surviving were of lesser importance ; and they prayed they might be allowed to make fine with the king, for all transgressions in the said taxation respect being had to their *status*, and the late unproductive years. They all collectively offered 340 marks, and for this they were all conjointly and individually debtors of his Majesty the king. John de Perton appears to have been badly in this scrape, but one cannot help thinking that the right man was selected to represent and defend this apparently forlorn hope, and that the defence was cunningly devised. The taxers for Seisdon were Philip de Lutteley, John de Perton, Robert Buffary, John de Molesley, Richard de Oldington (Patteshull), John Gerrard, William atte Whorwood, William de Perton, William atte Lowe, Richard de Ovyeteshaye (Ivetsey), William de Fynchenfeld (Finchfield), William Baternon, Thomas de Overton, Thomas de Bradeley, John the clerk of Bobbington, and William Cocus of Pelshall. Sir Thomas de Pipe Knight was fined £40, and Philip de Lutteley fifty marks for which John de Ipstaues, John de Bently, Willam de Perton and Robert de Wyndoppe were sureties. At the same time, all the sub-taxers were fined, and amongst them were the following from the neighborhood of Perton :—

- William Richard and William Hawys for Nether Penn fined two shillings.
- Walter Wheelhouse and William le Reve for Perton fined two shillings.
- William Gamel and William le Wright for Oaken fined half a mark.
- Simon Aylwyn and Henry Benigen for Wrottesley fined one mark.
- Roger Stevens and Adam le Bonde were sureties for the above.
- John Richards and William le Bradley for Pendeford fined ten shillings.
- Richard de Beckbury and John atte Nore for Patteshull fined one mark.
- Geoffrey Leveson and William le Neweman for Wolverhampton fined six pounds.
- Thomas Crey and Henry Godwyn for Tettenhall fined two marks.

The Subsidy Roll of 1327 records the Vill of Perton as follows :—

John de Perton	4 0	William atte Nayse	0 12	William de Mareford	0 18
John in the Hale	0 12	Richard Henrys	0 10	William King	2 0
Richard atte Nayse	2 0	Nicholas de Stirchley	2 0	Thomas de Mareford	0 12
William O'th' Green	0 12	Adam atte Yate	0 18	William de Northwood	2 6
Robert O'th' Green	0 20	Nicholas de Netherton	2 2	Walter Wyllys	0 12
John Nicholes	0 12	Elizabeth in the Lane	0 20	William le Tynkere	0 12

Total thirty shillings and ten pence. In 1323 Sir John de Perton had been a colleague with Sir Henry de Bushbury knight at an inquest held before them respecting thirty acres of land *assarted* in the Forest of Morfe, and in 1325 he attested the deed of grant from Sir John Bottetourt, lord of that Manor to the freeholders of Bobbington. On a Bench Roll of Trinity 1324, William de Weston, sued John de Perton, William son of John de Perton, and John de Lappeley for a debt of £26 ; and he sued William de Leversete (the lessee of Stirchley), for a debt of £293-5-10. None of the defendant appeared and the Sheriff was ordered to attach them for the octaves of Martin. At the King's bench 1326, John de Ruycroft appeared against Robert de Essington, John de Huggford, Adam son of Richard de Ruycroft, and Emma his wife, Thomas de Benham, William de Buckingham, Walter son of William de Perton, and two others, for entering by force his house at Hulton, and breaking open a chest, and taking from it six deeds, and two quit claims with other muniments. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain, and produce

them at three weeks from Easter. At Easter 1330 Hugh son of John de Perton, sued Thomas de Tefford for £15, the arrears of an annual rent of thirty shillings, which he owed to him. Thomas did not appear, and the Sheriff returned that he was a clerk, and as it was testified that he held a benefice within the see of Lincoln, a mandate was sent to the said bishop to produce him at the octaves of Michael. W. Hardwicke states that John de Perton died in 1330, though the writ of *diem clausit extremum* on his death is not dated until July 9th 1332, when the usual particulars anent the Manor are given. It states that William de Perton is his eldest son and heir, and is 34 years of age and upwards. He had enjoyed the estate for a period of 45 years, and was about 69 years of age at death; his children from Felicia his wife have been already enumerated, and by his second wife Margaret he does not appear to have had any. By his opportune death he must have escaped much obliquy in consequence of the tax swindle case, though his son and heir, when called upon, would probably have to pay the fine incurred, in full. He was almost certainly dead in 1330, for about Michaelmas of that year, Ralph Bassett of Drayton, granted permission to William de Perton to enclose the wood of Harewood, within the fee of Perton, and to maintain it as a park in future. This deed which is in Norman French is dated from Patingham, on Monday after the feast of saint Michael 1331, and is witnessed by Sir Philip de Somerville and Sir Thomas le Rous, knights, Roger Hillary, Roger de Wodenham, and John de Bentley; and previous to this release, the tenants of Patingham had rights of common, except during pannage and crop seasons, within the wood in question.

William de Perton the son and heir was accepted in homage, by the king, in a writ of 31st July following the *post mortem* inquisition. This William is already a prominent figure in records prior to his father's death in 1330. He does not appear ever to have been knighted, and probably never bore arms personally, though his name is of frequent occurrence in judicial proceedings as a justice of assize, and this so much as to make it highly probable that he had been educated for the law as a profession, possibly having originally had an elder brother who died prematurely. His name occurs as a justice assigned to take assizes in Staffordshire in 1334, 35, 38, 39 and 40. The Subsidy Roll of 1327 gives him as the principal land owner of Trysul, and in a deed now at Wrottesley, dated 1340 he styles himself lord of Tresel as well as of Perton. This would be as heir to his mother Felicia, and of her nephew John who died without issue in 1447; but the Stirchley property and part of that at Trescote had already been conveyed to himself and his wife by deed of gift, from the father, probably in order to avoid the succession duty which would otherwise have been payable. In 1331 a plea roll records that the Sheriff of Staffordshire had been ordered to arrest Walter de Perton in Shropshire (this was William's uncle parson Walter, rector of Stirchley in 1310 and prebendary of Perton in Tottenhall collegiate church of saint Michael in 1329, who died February 22nd, 1349) and to produce him before the King's bench court, to answer for the death of John de Derleye, of which he had been appealed in Derbyshire by Matilda, widow of the said John, and who had withdrawn from her appeal; and likewise to arrest Roger de Wednesleye the younger, Thomas Ithel of Staffordshire, William de Perton of Shropshire, William Pare of Fossbrook in Staffordshire, Ralph de Spencer, and Robert Buttok of Wednesleye, for aiding and abetting the said Walter. And a precept was sent to the Sheriff and the coroners of Derbyshire, to return the day, year and place, where the felony had been committed. The Derbyshire Sheriff

however, up to now made no return to the writ; he was therefore ordered as before; and to make the return on the octaves of Hillary. At Easter 1332 Henry, son of William de Perton, William de Fynchenfeld and several others were charged by Henry de Bushbury's attorney, for entering, by night, his close at Over Penne, and burning his trees, and taking goods and chattels to the value of £10. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff was ordered to arrest Clement son of Walter de Cotene, and to distrain the others, to appear at the octaves of Trinity.

The Subsidy Roll of 1333 give the assessment of the moveable goods of the free tenants of the Vill of Perton as follows:—

	s.	d.		s.	d.		
William de Perton	...	6	8	William de Norwode	...	0	20
Richard atte Nashe	...	2	0	William de Mareford	...	0	18
Thomas atte Nashe	...	2	6	Adam le Harper	...	2	0
John en le Hule	...	2	2	John atte Wynde	...	2	6
William atte Hulle	...	0	16	Robert O'th' Greene	...	3	0
Richard Sweyn	...	2	9	John son of Nicholes	...	2	1
Nicholas le Sweyn	...	0	12	William Lovekys	...	2	4
Thomas Lovekys	...	0	18	Walter Willes	...	3	0

About 1335 John de Perton, the brother of William, was attacked in at dastardly and murderous fashion by a band of ruffians headed by his neighbor Sir Hugh de Wrottesley, together with Roger de Wrottesley his brother Adam de Hockley, William de Gatacre, etc., whilst at Tettenhall Home and they beat and maltreated him so badly that the old man died, after having laid a legal charge against them. What the immediate cause of the bitter quarrel that had arisen between the two families was, does not appear, but it is evident that for some time many of the neighboring families had been divided into factions with the Wrottesleys on the one side and the Pertons on the other. After the death of the said John de Perton, we find by Patent Roll of 7th October 1337, at Westminster, William de Shareshull, Roger de Swynnerton, and Roger Hillary were appointed justiciars to try this important case. They were, to hear and determine the complaint of John de Perton that Hugh de Wrottesley chevalier, Roger his brother, William son of Geoffrey atte Gatacre, Thomas Crey of Compton, John Lega (Lee), Richard Kemp, John Russel, Thomas son of Thomas Crey, William his brother, Roger Stevenes of Wrottesley, Stephen atte Townsend of Wrottesley, and certain other malefactors and disturbers of the king's peace, had attacked the said John de Perton, at Tettenhall Home, and had so severely beaten him, and wounded him that his life was despaired of." The old man died shortly after, when, of course, the count against the prisoners became one of murder. In 1335 William de Perton passed a fine of £10 for his relief of this Manor, though his homage had been accepted nearly three years previously, rendering the transaction puzzling. However the record of this relief calls him "son and heir of John" who held of the king *in capite*, by grand serjeantry, of finding one man armed with a coat of mail, and a lance, with two horses uncovered, for the space of eight days, in the king's service in Wales. On 28th October 1336 Ralph de Stafford had letters of protection at Berwick-on-Tweed, including amongst others John de Perton (son of William). Up to 1341 William de Perton had been escheator for the Counties of Salop and Stafford, and for the Marches of Wales, for on May 19th 1341 Thomas de Swinnerton was appointed Sheriff of the Counties of Salop and Stafford, *vice* Adam de Peshale and on 19th November of the same year, he was appointed escheator in the same Counties and Marches, and John de Perton was commanded to deliver up to him, all things pertaining to the said office. On 20th April 1342 Thomas de

Swinerton, Sheriff of the two counties, Robert Mauveysiu, chivaler John de Aston, chivaler, William de Perton and Ralph Bassett of Cheadle, were appointed to assess the inhabitants of the County of Stafford, for 125 sacks 5½ lbs. of wool, as their proportion of the 30,000 sacks of wool granted to the king by the parliament at Westminster. The roll of 1343 records an assize as to whether Henry de Perton and Agatha his wife, Richard de Perton and William de Perton, had unjustly disseized Hugh de Penne, of a messuage, and twelve acres of land, in Over Penne. William stated that he held nothing in the tenement, and had done no injury to the plaintiff; and Henry de Perton, Agatha and Richard, answered as tenants, by their bailiff, John de Walshale, and stated that they had entered by the deed and feoffment of Thomas de Penne, and they put themselves on the assize. The jury found that the defendant, except William de Perton, had unjustly disseized the said Hugh de Penne and assessed his damages at ten shillings. In 1337 Alianora (Eleanor) formerly wife of William de Weston, John son of William de Weston, and William de Wootenhull, executors of the will of William de Weston, sued William son of John de Perton, and John de Lappeley of Wolverhampton, for a debt of £26. Defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain. They also sued Simon de Congreve for a debt of £8-16-4. At Easter 1335 Robert atte Wood of Kidderminster sued William Wolrych, William Bold, Thomas atte Mulne, and William de Perton, executors of the will of John de Perton, for a debt of sixty-three shillings, and he sued William de Perton, together with Margery de Perton, his co-executrix, for a debt of five marks. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned certain sums into court, as proceeds of distress levied against them. He was therefore ordered to distrain again, and produce them at the quindene of Michaelmas. This case is noticed again in 1337, when the Sheriff returned that Margaret had been distrained up to twenty pence, and that Adam de Perton, Richard de Perton, Walter de Perton and Richard Horn were her sureties; and that the said William de Perton, had been distrained up to twenty pence, and his sureties were Adam Stet, Richard Mouny, Roger Douse, and Adam the Smith. They were therefore declared *in misericordia*, and as regards the others, the Sheriff returned that they held nothing within his bailiwick; and it was testified that they held sufficient. He was therefore ordered to distrain again, and to produce the defendants at the octave of Hillary. A postscript states that at the latter date, the Sheriff made no return, and he was ordered to produce them at the octave of Trinity. At Hillary 1336 William de Perton sued William de Morton, clerk, for causing waste and destruction in the houses, woods and gardens in Stirchley and Malynleye, which the said William de Morton held for the life of William de Leversete, by a demise of the said William de Leversete, to whom John de Perton, father of the said William, and whose heir he is, had demised it for the said term. Defendant did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to attach him. In the same year another record says, that in the suit of William de Perton against William de Morton, clerk for causing waste and destruction in Stirchley and Malynleye, William de Perton stated that the defendant had pulled down and sold a room worth 100 shillings; and two chambers each worth £10, a kitchen worth 10 marks; a stable worth ten marks; a grange worth ten marks; an oxstall worth 100 shillings; and had cut down and sold forty oaks, each worth three shillings; sixty ash-trees, each worth two shillings; twenty pear-trees, each worth two shillings; and twelve apple-trees, each worth twelve pence, and for which he claimed £60 as damages. William de Morton denied waste and destruction, and

appealed to a jury. The jury sat in 1340, before William de Shreshull, and Henry de Mortimer, and the result was a verdict for William de Perton and William the parson had to pay him £36 7s. 6d. At Michaelmas 1343 Alianora formerly wife of William de Weston, John son of William de Weston and William de Wettenhull, executors of the Will of William de Weston again sued William son of John de Perton for a debt of £26. Defendant still did not appear and the Sheriff returned that he held nothing within his bailiwick, by which he could be attached; but it was testified that he held sufficient. The Sheriff was therefore ordered to distrain and produce him at Hillary. At Easter, 1337 the Sheriff, Simon de Ruggeley, had been commanded, to take with him four discreet and lawful knights of his county, and to proceed himself to the court of Tettenhall, and in full court there, cause to be recorded, the suit which was before the court, by the King's lesser writ of right, between Roger son of Roger de Blackeley, near to Wrottesley, plaintiff, and Walter son of John de Perton, prebendary of Tettenhall, tenant of a messuage, sixteen acres of land, and an acre of meadow, in Tettenhall; and to return the record, under his seal, into court, at this term, and summon the parties for the same date. And the said Walter appeared by attorney; but Roger did not appear; and the Sheriff now returned that he had gone in person, to the said court, and had taken with him four discreet and lawful knights, and the suitors of the court had refused to make a record. The Sheriff was fined half a mark, for not mentioning, in his return, that he had summoned the parties. At Trinity Walter appeared by attorney, but Roger did not appear so the suit was dismissed. The bailiffs of the court, were ordered, in case of attempted injury to the said Walter, that the said Walter should be restored and compensated. At the same court the essoin of Leon de Perton sued John de Fulford and Ralph his brother, and John the bailiff of the abbot of Dore, in Derhysire, in a plea that they, together with William son of William de Pyletenhale, John de Levynton, Thomas de Pyletenhale, John of the Hall of Newport, and John de Honton, had forcibly reaped his growing corn at Wyghtwyck, and carried it off to the value of £10. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned that they held nothing, by which they could be attached. He was therefore ordered to arrest and produce them at the quindene of Hillary. The case came on again for hearing in 1338, when none of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned certain sums into court as proceeds of distrains made against them. He was therefore ordered to distrain again, and to arrest John de Fulford and Ralph, who could not be found, and to produce them at the quindene of Hillary. On 12th December 1338, an assize took place, as to whether William son of Hugh de Wrottesley, (a younger brother of William who died 1313, and not Hugh de Wrottesley, the family head); Thomas Grey; Richard de Ovyoteshaye; Thomas his son; Ralph de Fulford; and John his brother had unjustly disseized Walter son of John de Perton of thirty acres of land, two acres of meadow, three acres of wood, and four acres of pasture in Tettenhall, William appeared by William de Hampton, his attorney, who also answered for the others, as their bailiff, and denied the disseizin, and stated that the tenements were a parcel of the Manor of Tettenhall, which is of ancient demesne of the crown, and in which no writ would run, except the lesser writ of right, and he prayed for judgment on this point. Walter did not deny that the Manor of Tettenhall was of ancient demesne of the crown, nor that the tenements were a parcel of the Manor, but he pleaded that the said tenements, in the time of Edward the first, formed part of the demesne lands of the Manor, in

the hand of the king, and not of inferior tenure, in the hands of the tenants, and thus the tenements were a free fee, and sneable at common law. William denied this and appealed to jury. The jury found that the tenements were in the seizin of King Edward the first, grandfather of the present king, as part of his demesne lands of the said Manor, and not of inferior tenure, and that the said William and Thomas Crey had unjustly disseized the said Walter of them. Damages to be paid to Walter de Pertou twenty shillings, and the said Walter to recover seizin; but he is *in misericordia* for a false claim against the others. In 1339 William de Pertou was appointed one of the justices to hear and determine the complaint of John son of John de Sutton on Trent, that Hugh son of John de Prestwood, and John brother of said Hugh had robbed him of goods and chattels to the value of £60 and of money in coin to the value of £100. At Michaelmas 1340, Richard de la Lone and Margaret his wife, sued William de Pertou of Trysul, for a debt of £10 10s. owing to the said Margaret, as arrears of an annual rent of ten shillings. William did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain and produce him. Richard son of Henry de Pertou, who brought an assize of *novel disseizin* against Matilda formerly wife of Nicholas, son of Roger de Lee, and Roger son of Walter Millson, in the matter of tenements in Over Penne, did not appear, so that he and his sureties Adam de Swyneshed and Henry de Swyneshed are *in misericordia*. At Easter 1341 Margaret formerly wife of John de Pertou, executrix of the will of John de Pertou was still being sued by Robert atte Wood of Kidderminster, in a plea that she, together with her co-executor William de Pertou, should render to him five marks, which they unjustly detained. Margaret appeared, and pleaded that she never had administered to the goods and chattels of John de Pertou, in Pertou and Tresel, as stated by Robert, and she appealed to jury. William de Pertou did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain and produce him. Same year 1341 William de Pertou lord of Trysul grants to Richard of the Hill of Wytemere, two acres of his waste in Tresel, for life, remainder to the son of the said Richard in tail, remainder to William his brother in tail, remainder to Robert his brother, and the heirs of his body for ever. In 1345 Leo de Pertou had a grant from the king of one hundred acres of waste in the Forest of Kinfare, at Oldford, near Staplehall, while he was holding the appointments of *pannetarius regis* or king's napperer and later in front 1348 to 1366 of escheator for Worcestershire. He lived at Wightwick and was the uncle of Sir John. In 1345, Henry de Pertou, who brought an assize of *novel disseizin* against Henry son of Richard de Flechewere, and others *re* tenements in Over Penne, did not appear to prosecute it; so he and his sureties William son of Hugh, and John Buffary were *in misericordia*. In 1346 William de Pertou appeared by essoin against William de Kynges, William son of John Lovekyn, Richard Gilbard, William de Wolmere, Admyn son of Walter Devey, Adam de Ellwalle, Roger Baroun, Robert Malot, Robert atte Yate, John son of John Lovekyn, Richard Bungay, and several others named, all tenants of Pertou and Pattingham Manors, for forcibly breaking into his close at Pertou, and burning his gates and fences, to the value of a hundred shillings. Defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff returned that they held nothing in his bailiwick, by which he could attach them. He was therefore ordered to arrest them, and produce them at the quindens of Trinity. A postscript shows that the suit was adjourned to the following Hilary. In the same year, John son of William de Pertou, sued Philip de Lutteley, for a debt of £20. Philip did not appear, and the Sheriff is ordered

to attach him, for the quindene of Trinity. Sir John de Aston was then Sheriff of Staffordshire. In 1345 William de Perton was appointed, by letters patent, to be commissioner with John Giffard of Chillington, to return the value of the land held by every person in Staffordshire, of the value of £100 and upwards; and two years later in 1347, he was one of the justices assigned to hear and determine the complaint of Ralph, Baron Stafford, that Thomas the prior of saint Thomas near Stafford, John de Barahurst (son-in-law of William de Perton), and others named, had forcibly broken into and hunted in his park, whilst he was abroad, in the king's service. In 1347 a final concord was enrolled, between Leon de Perton complainant, and William son of John de Tresel, deforciant, of a messuage, fifty acres of land, and four acres of meadow, in Womborne and Tresel, which Richard in the Lone and Margaret his wife, held for the life of Margaret. William granted the reversion to Leon and his heirs, for which Leon gave forty marks of silver. At Michaelmas same year, Nicholas de Sharesull, sued William de Perton, for taking and unjustly detaining his cattle. William did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain and produce him on the quindene of Hillary. At Hillary 1348 William de Perton sued Roger le Mason, John le Hunte, William Genesone, and Ralph son of Henry le Grate, of Overton, for forcibly breaking into his close at Overton, and cutting down his trees, to the value of sixty shillings. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain the said Roger, who had found bail, and to arrest the others, and produce them, at three weeks from Easter. At the same court the adjourned case of William de Perton *versus* William le Kynge, Stephen Saresone, John Dole, William son of John Lovekyn, Richard Gilberd, William de Wollmere, Roger Baron, Robert, Malot, John son of John Lovekyn, Richard Bungay, Robert atte Yate, William Bungay, and ten others named; for forcibly breaking into his close at Perton, and burning his gates and fences, and taking his goods and chattels to the value of one hundred shillings, came on again. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned that they could not be found. He was ordered to arrest and produce them at the quindene of Easter. At Easter 1349 William de Perton sued Henry Prysse of Ruggley, John de Hodynet, Bertram de Baggenholt, Robert le Saye, William Bythewater, Nicholas de Huntingdon, and John de Huntingdon, in a plea that each of them, should render a reasonable account, for the time they were the receivers of his money: the defendants did not appear and the Sheriff was ordered to attach them, for the quindene of Hillary. A day was given to William son of John Prees of Bobbington, and Ermendrea daughter of William de Perton, plaintiff; and Richard de la Lone of Hampton, and Margaret his wife, in a plea of covenant, on the quindene of Hillary. *prece partium et sine essoniis*. At the lenten assizes 1346, there was a judicial enquiry as to whether Nicholas de Trescote, chaplain, Robert Beket, chaplain, William de Perton and John his son and William brother of the said John, and Roger son of Richard de Ovyoteshaye had unjustly disseized William son of John de Tresel of a messuage, two carucates of land, a hundred acres of pasture, and two hundred acres of heath in Trysul and Seisdon. William Pratt appeared for Nicholas and Roger, and denied the disseizin, and appealed to a jury; while Richard Beket, William de Perton, John his son, and William brother of John appeared and answered as tenants, pleading that an assize would not lie, because when the tenements in question were in seizin of Thomas son of Richard de Ovyoteshaye, whose status they now held, the said William son of John de Tresel had released and quit

claimed to him, all his right and claim to them, and they produced the deed of William de Tresel to that effect, dated from Wollemere, in the county of Stafford on Monday after the feast of saint Michael 1348. William son of John de Tresel denied that the deed was his act, and appealed to a jury; the witnesses named on the deed being Philip de Lutteley, Richard de Evenefeld; William le Synter, and John de Rugge le Piere (probably meant for le Pere). The Sheriff was therefore ordered to Summon a jury together with the above mentioned witnesses for Monday after the feast of saint Peter *ad vinculas*, at Lichfield. A postscript of the adjourned case says that Richard Beket, Richard de Evenefeld, and William le Synter, together with John de Rugge and Philip de Lutteley, who were dead, did not appear. The Sheriff was accordingly ordered to distrain and to produce the absentees at Stafford on Wednesday (date illegible); the deed said to be forged, to remain in the custody of Roger Hillary. The Sheriff had been ordered to produce in court Richard in the Lane and Margaret his wife, to acknowledge what right they claimed in a messuage and fifty acres of land and four acres of meadow in Womborne and Trysull, which William son of John de Tresel, had granted by fine to Leon de Perton. In 1347 John de Aston, knight, sued William de Perton, Philip de Lutteley, John Buffary, and William de Bobbington in a plea that they should each render a reasonable account for the time they were the receivers of his money. Before his father's death, as early as 1327, the Subsidy Roll makes William de Perton the principal land owner of Trysull, and in a deed of the Wrottesley collection, dated 1340, he styles himself lord of Perton and Trysul or Tresel. In another deed in the same collection, and dated 1357, there are mentioned besides himself, a son John, a son William and a daughter Ermentrea or Ermentrude, who had become the wife of William de Prees of Bobbington, son of John and Agnes, and already mentioned in these details. He had however other children Henry de Perton living 1332 O. S. P., Walter de Perton of Stirchley, 2nd son, 1339 and 1343 who married Margaret de Stirchley living 1343 and his widow in 1388, the parents of John de Perton who had two sons, 1. William de Perton of Stirchley father of John who sold his interest in Perton 1389 and O. S. P., and of Thomas who also O. S. P. having sold his interest in Perton in 1396; 2. Leo de Perton who married Cecilia daughter of.....Corbet of Leigh and had a son William who sold the reversion of Perton and Trescote in 1396, was living in 1426 and died 1426, leaving a son Henry Perton of Oldington parish of Worfield, which his father purchased, and who died aged about 60 in 1459, being the ancestor of the Pertons of Chesterton, etc., in Worfield parish. There was also another son of Walter and Margaret, Richard de Perton who O. S. P. and a daughter Matilda wife of.....del Crouch of Solihull, parents of Thomas del Crouch of Solihull who O. S. P. A second daughter of William and Matilda was Joan wife of John de Barnhurst 1347 parents of John de Barnhurst born in 1359 who sold his interest in Perton and is supposed to have died issueless. In 1350 we find Sir John Perton, chivaler, the heir of his father William, by Giles Carles his attorney, sued Thomas de la Hyde, and Margaret his wife, to carry out an agreement and covenant, made between them, respecting a carucate of land and a messuage, in Ideshale (Shiffnal Co., Salop): defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to attach them, for the octaves of Michaelmas. In 1355 John de Perton, chivaler, was in the retinue of Henry, Earl of Lancaster. At Easter 1354, Roger de Aston, Richard de Hamplon, and John de Saintpierre, executors of the will of John de Aston, chivaler, sued William de Perton, and John Buffary, in a plea that they should render a reasonable

account for the time they were the receivers of the monies of the said John de Aston: defendants did not appear, and the sheriff was ordered to attach them for the quindene of Trinity. It is evident that for some reason, before his death, John de Aston, knight was not in control of his own property, which had been managed by trustees as above. If it was on account of lunacy, he must have been *compos mentis* in 1347. In the same year as above (1354) William de Perton was a witness to a deed from Ralph, Earl of Stafford to John de Sutton of Dudley and Isabella his wife, granting them the Manor of Over Penne. At Michaelmas, 1357 Simon the abbot of Westminster, once more brought up the old claim of his abbey, and sued William de Perton for the Manor of Perton, as the right of his church of the blessed Peter of Westminster, by a writ of entry, William prayed a view, and the suit was adjourned until five weeks from Easter, the view to be made in the interim. At Michaelmas 1358 Simon, abbot of Westminster, again sued William de Perton, for the Manor of Perton, in which William had no entry, except by Hugh, formerly bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, to whom Walter, formerly abbot of Westminster, had demised it for a term, which had expired; and he stated that the said Walter was seized of the manor in Henry the third's reign, etc. William defended his right, and stated that John de Perton his father, and whose heir he is, had died seized of the manor as of fee, and after his death, he had entered as son and heir, and not by the said Hugh, as stated by the abbot in his writ. As the abbot could not deny this the suit was dismissed, and the abbot was *in misericordia* for a false claim. And now comes more trouble from the oppressed tenantry of Perton, for at Michaelmas 1358, Thomas o'th' Green of Perton, William Nicholes of Perton, and Henry atte Yate of Trescote, tenants of the king, in the Manor of Perton, which is a member of the Manor of Tettenhall, which was said to be of the ancient demesne of the crown of England, appeared by their attorney Richard de Fynchenfeld, against William de Perton, and John his son, in a plea that they exacted from them, other customs and services than they and their ancestors were wont to render in the time that the Manor was in the hands of king's progenitors. The defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain, and produce them on the quindene of Hillary. A postscript states that the Sheriff made no return, and he was ordered, again, to produce them, at three weeks from Easter. It is humiliating to see, in these records of our ancestors how frequently the action of the Sheriff, and others, depended upon the position and power of the relative parties in a suit; and the clap trap modern formula of 'one law for the rich, and another for the poor,' was in those days, a real factor. It is also remarkable to observe, how small a control seems to have been exercised by the judicial and higher authorities over the Sheriffs of those days, On Monday after the feast of saint Lawrence 1354, we find that Leo de Perton was one of a jury appointed by the Sheriff to draw up an extent of the goods and chattels that were held by Thomas de Gataore on April 11th, when he should have appeared to answer the charge made against him for the death of Philip de Lutteley. About this time the bitter feud, was in active progress between the friends of Sir William de Shareshull, the lord chief justice, on the one hand, and the friends of Sir Hugh de Wrottesley, K. G., on the other hand, amongst the former were the Pertons and Lutteleys, and for the latter were the Gataores, Tetteburys, etc. This had resulted in several violent deaths including those of John de Perton, Philip de Lutteley and Philip de Whittemers, opponents of the Wrottesley faction, and the two former related to Shareshull. It does not appear that

the chief justice's party ever got so far as to murder. These crimes naturally led to a considerable amount of judicial enquiry. Sir Hugh de Wrottesley, the prime mover and responsible agent in these murders, was a military filibusterer of unscrupulous character, and was first indicted for the murder of John de Perton, but on the strength of his military renown, and his high position as a Knight of the Garter he managed to obtain from King Edward a letter of pardon for this crime, dated from Westminster, May 27th 1354. "The king of his special grace, and for the good services which Hugh de Wrottesley, knight, has performed in parts beyond the seas, has pardoned him for the death of John de Perton, who has been killed; it was stated, before the 28th of November 1339." He had previously had a royal pardon for this offence, and the above was a renewal of the same under the great seal. Having been indicted for other serious crimes, amongst which were the murders of Philip de Lutteley, and Philip de Whittemere, he had been arrested, and committed to the king's prison of the Marshalsea at Kingston-on-Thames, along with his fellow criminal William de Tettebury junior: thence they both having broken prison bounds, escaped, with the evident connivance, if not assistance of the Marshall Robert Bolour, who was afterwards fined ten pounds for this remissness of duty and vigilance, though he was probably only a tool of his superior Sir Walter de Manney, under whom Sir Hugh de Wrottesley had served in France. The homicidal knight was now an outlaw, and found it high time to apply for further royal protection, as by a recent law, he could be now summarily convicted after a trial without jury and sentenced to death forthwith. So on the Friday after the three weeks following the feast of saint Michael 1356 the said Sir Hugh de Wrottesley, knight, appeared before the justices of Staffordshire stating that he had been indicted for the death of John de Perton, and he produced King Edward's letter patent, dated from Westminster, October 13th of that year, by which the king "of his special grace pardoned Hugh de Wrottesley, chevaler, for the deaths of Philip de Lutteley, and Philip de Whittemere, and for breaking out of his prison of the Marshalsea, and likewise for the reception of John de Tettebury, William de Tettebury, and Walter de Tettebury, indicted for the same deaths, and likewise for the death of Thomas de Stretton, and for any transgressions of vert and venison, perpetrated by the said Hugh, within the king's forests, and likewise for any outlawries, which had been promulgated against him on the same occasions." This action was not taken by Wrottesley a day too soon, for as an outlaw, he was now not entitled to a jury; and the opposite faction were taking steps to push the matter to its ultimate rope yarn noose of the county town. Katherine the widow of the murdered Lutteley, was praying that execution of outlawry might be put in, and Hugh de Wrottesley and William de Tettebury, junior, be taken as outlaws, to be adjudicated on by a relative of the victim of the outrage. On March 8th, 1356, Sir Hugh de Wrottesley had to enter into a recognizance with the king, not to molest in future, Katherine de Lutteley, Philip de Lutteley, William de Perton, John de Perton, or Leo de Perton, under a penalty of £2000. At Michaelmas 1355 William de Perton and John his son were attached at the suit of John de Sutton of Dudley knight, in a plea that they had conspired at Perton, with one William son of Richard de la Lone of Hampton, to accuse him of aiding and abetting Robert le Rydere of Dudley, William le Rydere of Dudley, and Nicholas Jobinel, whom Robert Dogmersfeld had appealed of a robbery, and in consequence of which, he had been taken and detained in the king's prison, until the said Robert Dogmersfeld had withdrawn his appeal, and he stated that, in consequence of their malicious conspiracy,

he had been arrested on the Monday after quindene of Easter 1243, and detained in prison till the quindene of saint John the Baptist, in the same year, and for which he claimed £1000 as damages. The defendants denied their guilt, and appealed to the county: a jury was therefore to be summoned. At Trinity 1259, Ralph, Earl of Stafford, sued John de Perton chivaler, for the sum of £20. The defendant put in no appearance, and the Sheriff returned that he held nothing within his bailiwick, that could be distrained. His residence, at this time was probably Sturchley in the next county, where he would have all his goods and chattels. The Sheriff as in the usual course, was ordered to arrest him, and produce him at the octaves of saint Michael. This record suggests that old William de Perton was still alive, and is the last recorded here during his life, for he must have died very soon afterwards. We may deduce from other evidence, the fact that when his death did occur, his son and heir, Sir John was absent, probably on some military business, and in the meantime his brother William appears to have put himself in possession of the patrimony, either with or without the consent of the heir. He left his widow Matilda surviving with two sons and one daughter, the remaining children having probably died before their parent. I have not been so far able to meet with any record of an inquisition *post mortem* for the deceased William de Perton, and it is a noteworthy fact that his son and heir took possession without paying the usual fine for his livery. In fact extreme trickiness is suggested on the part of these later Pertons, in the family records, and probably the taking possession of the patrimony by the younger brother was a conspiracy to defraud the revenue by avoiding the usual relief fees and fines.

Sir John de Perton, knight, son and heir of William now succeeded to the manor as lord of Trysil, Sturchley and Trescote, he had been knighted in 1346 at the siege of Calais by Edward the third, and occupied a conspicuous position in the military career of this warlike monarch. In 1336-37 he was in Scotland, in the retinue of Ralph, earl of Stafford, and took part in the battle of Halidoun Hill, he was present at Crecy, in the retinue of William de Clinton, Earl of Huntingdon, and in many minor engagements, and in 1355 was in the retinue of Henry, Earl of Lancaster. In 1341 the king appointed him to the office of escheator for the five Counties of Worcester, Gloucester, Salop, Stafford, and Hereford together with the Marches of Wales, for which he received £10 annually. In 1356, he was with Lancaster at the battle of Poictier, and in 1361 he was appointed commissioner to array and arm men for the defence of the kingdom, during the king's absence. He took possession of his estates without the usual necessary formalities attendant on his succession, and two years later, in 1363, he had to pay "a fine of five marks for pardon for a transgression of which he and others had been guilty in taking possession of the Manor of Perton without license, which was held *in capite* of the king." He was also Sheriff of Staffordshire for 1365, 1371, and 1372. Sir John had married Elizabeth the second daughter of Sir William de Sharesnull knight, lord chief justice of the king's bench, and the effect of this marriage was the production much of the ill-feeling that subsequently existed between himself and his neighbors, who naturally considered this alliance as calculated to affect the course of the administration of justice in the district, and we infer from the recorded proceedings that such was actually the case. Sharesnull was the owner of Patteshull which he had purchased from the Bagot family; and he had also purchased the two Sarrons, Sharesnull and other places in Staffordshire. This of course intensi-

fied the family feud that had for some time disgraced the two allied families of Wrottesley and Perton, until it culminated as we have seen in the murder of John de Perton, the uncle of Sir John, in what General Wrottesley is pleased to call an affray, in 1339. At the Lenten assizes of 1361 there was a judicial enquiry as to whether William de Perton had unjustly disseized John de Perton, chivaler, of the Manor of Perton. William did not appear, but one Robert Balle answered for him as bailiff, and denied the disseizin. The recognitors stated that the said John was seized of the Manor, as of his freehold until disseized by the said William, and they assessed the damages of John at one hundred shillings. John was therefore to recover seizin and the above damages. At the Hillary term 1362 William son of John de Tresel, came into court, on Ash-Wednesday of this year and acknowledged his deeds in court and prayed that they might be enrolled. Here follows a deed by which William son of John de Tresel, granted to John son of William lord of Perton knight, all the lands, tenements and services, etc., which he held in the fee of Overton, Womborne, and Nether Penn, excepting a messuage and three acres of land in Nether Penn, which he held by the gift and feoffment of William son of Hugh de Penne, together with all reversions, which might fall to him by the death of anybody within the said fee, to be held by the said John, his heirs and assigns for ever. Witnessed by Richard lord of Evenefeld (Enville), Philip de Lutteley, Philip de Bobbington, Thomas de la Lowe, Richard de Everdon, Thomas Buffary, and John atte Lee and dated from Styrcleseye (Stirchley Co., Salop), on Monday the feast of Pentecost 1357. By a second deed, William, son of John de Tresel releases to William lord of Perton, and to John the son of the said William, knight, and to his heirs and assigns, all his right and claim, which he had, or might have in future, in the Manor of Trysul, and in the rents and services of all the tenants of the said Manor, and in Seisdon and Wollemere, and in all hamlets or wastes, and pastures of the said Manor, and in a waste in the fee of Overton, which extended from Bekkemonesburyness to Smethstalleforde. Witnessed by Richard lord of Evenefeld, Philip de Lutteley, Richard de Everdon, and Philip de Bobbington, and dated at Enville on Tuesday the feast of the invention of the cross 1357. And a third deed by which the said William son of John de Tresel, acknowledged that he had received from the hands of William lord of Perton, and John son of said William, knight, forty marks of good and legal money in full payment of forty marks in which the said William and John were bound to him by the ordinance and consideration of six honest and legal men, namely, Thomas atte Lowe, Richard de Everdon, Thomas Buffary, Philip de Bobbington, John atte Lee, and John atte Nulhouse. Witnessed by Richard Leveson, Philip de Bobbington and Thomas Buffary. Dated from Perton on Tuesday the feast of Pentecost 1357. General Wrottesley remarks that, "These deeds denote the extinction of the old knightly family of Tresel, lords of Trysul and Seisdon in Staffordshire; and of Frankley and Willingwich in Worcestershire, who derived from Baldwin the Domesday tenant of the same manors. Frankley appears to have been given to a Littelton in marriage with a daughter of the house." William de Tresel, who seems to have died unmarried, was nephew of Sir John de Perton, who was probably his heir at law. There is a notice in a plea roll of Michaelmas 1362, of Alice daughter of Robert de Perton, but these two have not been identified and it is impossible to do so in the absence of further evidence respecting them. In July 1362 a plea roll records that the abbot of Westminster was summoned at the suit of John de Perton chivaler, for

taking and unlawfully detaining his cattle. The said John de Perton stated that on the Monday before the feast of All Saints 1361, the abbot had taken in a certain place called Harewood, within the Manor of Perton, four cows belonging to him, and for which he claimed £40 as damages. The abbot appeared by attorney, and defended his action in the taking of the cows, stating that the said John, under the name of John de Perton, eldest son of William de Perton, by his deed reciting that, whereas the Manor of Perton, in the county of Stafford, which was held of the king, *in capite*, and which was claimed by the abbot and convent of Westminster, as the right of his church of saint Peter, had come into his hands, that he, for the sake of peace, and for remission of the claim made by the said abbot and convent, the license of the king being first obtained, by his deed now granted for himself and his heirs for ever, an annual rent of one hundred shillings from the manor, to be paid and received by equal portions at the feast of saint Michael and at Easter; and if it should happen that the said rent of one hundred shillings, should be in arrear, in part or in whole, for a month, that it should then be lawful for the said abbot and his successors by himself or by his deputy, to distrain in the said Manor, and to drive the animals so distrained, to the Manor of Knoll, in the county of Warwick, or elsewhere, in the county of Stafford, and to retain them, until the arrears had been paid. And so, because, fifty shillings of the annual rent due at the previous Michaelmas was in arrear, he had taken the said cattle from the place called Harewood, which was a parcel of the Manor. The abbot here produced the deed of the said John, which was dated from Perton on September the first 1361; together with letters patent from the king, dated on July 1st of the same year, by which permission was given to the said John to burden the manor with the said rent, and license to the said abbot and his successors to receive the said rent; into whatever hands the Manor might fall. John de Perton stated in reply that he could not deny that the deed produced was his act, nor that fifty shillings of the said annual rent was in arrear. Upon this evidence the suit was accordingly dismissed, and John de Perton was in *misericordia* for bringing forward a false claim. The abbot was to retain the cattle until his claim was satisfied. In 1363 John de Perton, chivaler, sued William Hawardyn for forcibly entering his houses at Trysul, and carrying away timber from them, and for cutting his growing trees to the value of £10. William did not appear and the Sheriff was ordered to arrest and produce him on the octaves of saint Michael. In the same year a Perton tenant was prosecuted amongst several others, by Sir Hugh Wrottesley for breaking by force into his mill at Wightwick, and taking his timber therefrom, and other goods and chattels belonging to him at Wrottesley, to the value of £12, and for treading down and consuming his grass at Wodnesfield to the value of forty shillings, with their cattle. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain Adam Thomkyes of Oldesfaling, who had found bail, and to arrest William de Muleward of Perton Mulne, along with the others, and to produce them on the octaves of Martin. John de Perton, knight, occurs as a witness to a deed at Penkridge, along with Sir Hugh Wrottesley, knight, and others in 1365. In 1366 John Perton chivaler again sues William Hawardyn for forcibly breaking into his houses at Trysul and taking timber valued at £10 from them. William did not appear and the Sheriff returned that he held nothing in his bailiwick. He was therefore ordered to arrest him, and produce him on the quindene of Trinity. In 1364 John de Perton was anxious to enlarge and improve his Manor house at Perton, and an *inquisitio ad quod damnum*

took place at that date, to return whether it would be to the detriment of the king, or any other person, if John de Perton, knight, enclosed a certain road, leading from the village of Pattingham, under the manor house of the said John to the mill of Tottenhall, for the purpose of enlarging his said manor house. The enquiry was held at Perton, on the Friday after the feast of saint Clement the Pope 1264, on the oath of Thomas Buffary, Adam Waring, John de Wightwick and others, who say, that the new road will be more convenient for travellers; and the road to be enclosed contained 106 perches of land in length, and 26 in breadth. In the originalia of 1265, under the head of *grossae fines*, it states that John de Perton, knight, paid half a mark for a license to enclose this road. In 1267, John de Perton chivaler, is named in the Kinver Forest proceedings as a verderer of the forest, and Leo de Perton his cousin as a regarderer of the said forest, and in the same year the former sued William son of Peter Tandy and Joan his wife for four acres of land in Seisdon, which he claimed by writ of *quare cessavit per biennium*; the defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to take the tenements into the king's hand, and to summon them for a month from Michaelmas. In the following court, Sir John de Perton recovered the four acres from William son of Peter Tandy, and Joan his wife through the defendants making default. In 1268 we find a remarkable record where a prisoner surrendered to a charge preferred against him thirty-two years after the commission of the crime and which General Wrottesley considers to be an evidence of the general corruption and unjust extortion connected with the administration of justice at this period. William Buffary son of Hugh Buffary of Penn, had a very serious charge preferred against him in 1236, and which was no less than the abduction of Margaret the wife of John de Tresel, together with goods and chattels belonging to the said John valued at twenty shillings, which latter probably represented the wearing apparel and jewelry upon her person at the time. This occurred on Monday after the feast of All Saints, and was followed on Monday after the feast of saint Michael, ten months later, by the poisoning of John de Tresel, the husband himself, probably in order to obtain for the said Margaret her dower of one-third of the husband's property. For these crimes, after a protracted trial and repeated adjournments, without the arrest of the accused, a process of outlawry was eventually promulgated against him, by the hundred of Seisdon in 1265, or twenty-nine years after the commission of the first crime, and things were thereby made so unpleasant for him that in this year of 1268, he surrendered himself at Michaelmas term, and was admitted to bail. General Wrottesley remarks, that this leniency is probably explained by a suit that follows, when William Buffary was opposed to Sir John de Perton, the grand nephew of the victim, and as we have seen, the son-in-law of the lord chief justice. A writ was produced which stated that the king has been informed that whereas William son of Hugh Buffary, of Penn, was bound by a statute merchant at Shrewsbury, to John de Perton knight, in a sum of £26-13-0, to be repaid at a certain date named, and the same John de Perton under the name of John son of William de Perton, chivaler, had afterwards by an indenture made between the said John son of William, and William son of Hugh, granted that if the said William Buffary would stand to the award of William de Sharesull, and John de Newenham, respecting certain debts which had been moved between the said John de Perton and William son of Hugh Buffary, that then the said recognizance of £26-13-0 should be held as null. And whereas the said William son of Hugh from the date of indenture, had been always prepared, and is still prepared

to stand to the arbitrament of the said William de Sharehull and John de Newenham respecting the said debates; nevertheless John de Perton was unjustly suing the said William son of Hugh Buffary, for execution of the recognizance, to the great damage and cost of the said William son of Hugh. The king therefore commanded them, after hearing the complaint of the said William son of Hugh, and having seen the indenture, to proceed according to right, law, and custom of the kingdom. Dated from Westminster 18th June 41st Edward the third. In the same year 1368, Lionel de Perton sued Thomas de Gatacre and Alice his wife, and also Philip son of said Thomas, and Thomas brother of said Philip, for taking *vi et armis*, livestock belonging to him at Morffe near Enville. At the next court, the adjourned case was again postponed to a further date. The offence had been committed as far back as 1357 and the stock is described as a horse, two boars, two sows, and six pigs, valued in all at £40. The case appears to have been connected with ecclesiastical affairs; and the Sheriff had returned that the defendants held nothing in his bailiwick, Gatacre being over the border in the Shropshire parish of Claverley. He was therefore ordered to arrest them and to produce them on the quindene of Martin. The 1369 the defendants were attached for the stock, when they appeared by attorney, and denied the trespass and injury, and appealed to a jury, which was to be summoned for the morrow of saint John the Baptist. At Michaelmas of this year is the continuation of the suit of William son of Hugh Buffary of Nether Penn against Sir John de Perton respecting a bond for forty marks. John de Perton appeared to his summons, and being shown the indenture which had been produced by William son of Hugh, stated that it was not his act. The indenture was handed to John Mowbray the justice at the coming assize, at which John son of William de Perton appeared by attorney, but William son of Hugh did not appear, and John Mowbray handed the deed back to Robert de Isham. John de Perton now claimed execution on the original bond, which was granted. The Sheriff sent no return until Michaelmas 1371, when he returned that William son of Hugh was dead. The Sheriff was therefore ordered to deliver to John de Perton all the lands and tenements of the said William to be held by him, according to the statute. The original bond was produced in court by Sir John de Perton and ran as follows:—*Noverint universi me Gullielmum filium Hugonis Buffry de Penne, teneri pro me et heredibus et executoribus meis domino Johanni de Perton, militi, heredibus et executoribus suis in viginti et sex libris et tres decim solidis sterlingorum ex causa mutui. Solvendum dictam pecuniam in festi sancti Michaelis archiangeli proximo futuro post consecrationem presentium. Et nisi fecero, concedo quod currant super me, heredes et executores meos, pena et districtio provisa in statuto domini regis Edwardi de recognitione debitorum mercatorum apud Acton Burnel, edito Datum Salop die martis proximo post festum sancti Barnabas apostolici 39 Edward, iij (1366)*” Wrottesley thinks the bond was to save William son of Hugh Buffary from the consequences of the indictment made against him in 1365: there is a mysterious element of crookedness throughout the transaction, which I think, might possibly be the result of dyspepsia: on the part of Buffary and unscrupulous over-reaching on the part of Perton. In 1365 John de Perton was witness to the deed by which Edmund Giffard of Chillington, granted his Manor of Waken near Chebbesaye to Philip de Lutteley. By another deed the said Philip de Lutteley afterwards granted the Manor to Thomas de Lowe of Whittington, and Philip de Bobbington; and Thomas and Philip afterwards demised the Manor to John de Perton, knight, and William son of William Calem of

Walsall, and to their heirs and assigns by a deed which was put in evidence, and is copied in the record, and dated from Walton, on the Friday before the feast of Epiphany 1371. And whilst it was in their possession, John brother and heir of Philip de Lutteley, released to the same feoffees all his right and claim in the Manor, and in Wollaston, Old Swynsford and Clent, held by Philip de Lutteley from the Lord of Welgh in Co. Worcester, by a deed, put in evidence, excepting the third part of the same which Matilda formerly wife of the said Philip de Lutteley held in dower. Dated from Lutteley on the Friday before the feast of the Nativity of saint John the Baptist 1371. Witnessed by John de Perton, chivaler, Richard de Aston, and Roger le Power. And afterwards the said John de Perton, and William son of William Coleson remitted and quit claimed to John Purcell all their right and claim in the said Manor, by a deed, dated at Perton on Tuesday after the feast of the blessed Mary. In 1370 the suit of Lionel de Perton *versus* Simon Malstang, parson of the Church of Evenefeld (Enville), was respited till the quindene of Michael, unless the justices of assize, should first come to Lichfield, on the Saturday after the feast of saint Michael. In the same year it is recorded that the Sheriff had been ordered to arrest William son of Hugh de Penne Buffary (or Nether Penn), and produce him at this term, to account to John de Perton, chivaler, for a sum of eight marks, which he had received from the said John, and for which he had been required to account by the verdict of a jury at Lichfield at Easter 1366; and the Sheriff returned that he could not be found. He was therefore ordered to put him into *exigend*, and if he did not appear, to outlaw him, and if he appeared to arrest him and produce him on the octaves of Martin. We have seen before that William de Buffary was dead at Michaelmas 1371. The Staffordshire Plea Roll of 1371 has a supplementary deed, by which John de Cokeslone granted to John Salisbury all his status in the beforementioned Manor of Walton, excepting the wardship and marriage of Felicia daughter and one of the heirs of Thomas de Chatoulne. This deed is in French and is dated from London, on the Sunday after the feast of Chandelewe 1382; and John de Cokeslone was still alive, and by virtue of this grant John Salisbury was seized of the Manor until the said John, son of Edmund Ward had unjustly disseized him: they assessed his damages at £10. John Salisbury was therefore to recover seizin of the Manor and his damages; but he was *in misericordia* for a false claim against John Ward and the other defendants. The early part of this suit is evidently omitted. In 1372, a Worcestershire Roll records that John Bottetourt, chivaler, of Hagley, sued Henry de Hagley, Leon de Perton, son of Leon, and William brother of Leon de Perton, Henry son of John Wyrley and four others named, for forcibly breaking into his park at Hagley, and taking game from it, together with six oxen and six cows, worth £10. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned that they held nothing within his balliwick by which they could be attached. He was therefore ordered to arrest and produce them on the octaves of Hillary. In the same year, 1372, the Sheriff of Shropshire had been ordered to arrest John de Perton, knight, of the county of Stafford, and to keep him in safe custody in the King's prison, until he had paid to Robert de Thornes of Shrewsbury £60, which he had acknowledged to owe to him on April 23, 1358, before Henry Pycard, the mayor of London, and Thomas de Brise-worth, clerk, deputed to take acknowledgments of debts in London; and to deliver to the same Robert all the land and goods and chattels of the said John, according to a reasonable value and extent, until the said debt

with damages and costs had been levied from them. And the Sheriff had returned an inquisition taken upon the oath of a jury at Michaelmas term 1373, which stated that the said John held in the County of Salop, a capital messuage and two carucates of land at Stichele (Stirchley), which were worth one hundred shillings annually, and they had appraised all the goods and chattels of the said John within the bailiwick, namely, six oxen at six marks, two sows with three pigs at five shillings, corn at sixty one shillings, and hay at fifty shillings, which had been delivered to the said Robert. And whereas the said debt and the costs had been now defrayed; and Robert refused to deliver up the lands and tenements to the said John, a writ had been issued on the complaint of John, calling upon the said Robert to show cause why the said lands and tenements should not be delivered up to John de Perton, returnable at this date. And John now appeared by attorney, and the said Robert being solemnly called up to the fourth day of the plea, did not appear. John was therefore to recover his lands and tenements as before the execution. In 1375 Richard son of John de Perton, knight, sued Henry Kemmeson, for beating, wounding, and ill-treating him at Tettenhall; Henry did not appear, and the Sheriff returned that he held nothing in his Bailiwick. He was therefore ordered to arrest him, and produce him on the quindene of John the Baptist: a postscript states that the suit was adjourned repeatedly up to the octaves of Hillary. In 1375 Humphrey Swinnerton sued William de Cowleye, Adam Trumwyne, Adam Adamson of Marshton, John Cook of Marshton, Adam Flemyng, James de Perton, Thomas Bagot, and Richard de Halghton, for beating down and consuming his growing grass and corn at Blymhill, with their cattle. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain, and produce them on the octaves of Hillary. In the same year, John de Perton, knight, King's escheator for the County of Salop was fined one hundred shillings, for an insufficient valuation; he had valued three carucates in Hodnet and other places at five shillings annually, which Richard Hodnet paid annually to the king for them. In the second week of Lent 1377 John son of John de Puryton, knight, was charged with the murder of John Walsh, the parson of the church of Styroheleye in Shropshire, on Wednesday before the feast of Purification, and the case was brought before Nicholas Burnell, and others at Shrewsbury. King Richard for certain reasons commanded that the said indictment should be returned into Court. When the case came up for hearing, John Perton surrendered, and was committed to the Marshalsea prison, whence the Marshal produced him for trial before the Court. When questioned, the said John stated that the King had pardoned him for the said death of the parson, and he produced the King's letter patent, dated 19th February, 2nd Ricd. ij. (1378), which stated that the King, at the request of the Earl of Stafford, had pardoned John son of John de Perton, chivaler, for the death of John le Walsh, the parson of the church of Stirchley, and he prayed that he might be released; and the King's letter patent, having been inspected, he was discharged. Some time soon after 1377, that part of Trescote Manor known as Trescote Grange was acquired by a branch of the Wollaston family, which formerly resided at Wollaston, and now took up their residence at Trescote Grange; presently giving off another offshoot that took up residence at the Hollies in Perton. Thomas Wollaston is the first noticed as settled here, and is stated to have been "a person of rank and influence in the reign of the seventh Henry, who appointed him by grant to the office of keeper of the outwoods of Lyndridge, which he held until 1523." H

was succeeded by his eldest son John, who lived at Perton, while his younger son William resided at Trescote Grange. Thomas Wollaston son of the above John founded the Walsall branch of this family, and appears in several deeds at Walsall between 1565 and 1570; his son Thomas being appointed trustee of the Curtis Charity at Walsall in 1618. Thomas Wollaston the elder resided at Bentley Haye, and in 1578 he laid a bill of complaint against certain persons for "unlawful assembly and riotous behavior at Bentley Haye" (Walsall corporation deeds). The above mentioned William Wollaston of Trescote Grange, died January 7th 1603 seized of Trescote Grange and the mill in Over Penn, Caldwell's land in Overton, Oathill in Trysull, etc., which he left to Hugh Wollaston his son, aged 50, who died seven years later, leaving a son Edward Wollaston, aged 12, who afterwards sold Trescote Grange to Chapman. Edward Wollaston had a younger brother Henry, who became an alderman of London; he died in 1617, and left charities for the poor of Tettenhall parish. He had a son William also of Perton and London, who was Sheriff of Staffordshire in 1631 and Lord Mayor of London in 1643 when he received the honor of knighthood he also left charities to the poor of Tettenhall parish, and his memorial brass with its quaint doggrel epitaph is still preserved in Tettenhall church, though his monumental inscription is in Codsall church. He had a son William whose daughter Judith was married first to Thomas Bach of Oaken, and secondly to John Traunter of Oaken; she died December, 10th, 1706, and was buried at Codsall. Sir William Wollaston seems to have been the last of his race at Perton, for the family afterwards migrated elsewhere, and their lands passed by purchase to the Wrottesleys along with the Manor of Perton. This digression is thought necessary to avoid any confusion in consequence of the Wollastons having been resident in Perton. At Easter 1381, Joan widow of Thomas Buffary of Penne, in her own person, appealed Philip son of Warine de Penne, William son of John de Perton, chivaler, John de Perton, chivaler, John son of John de Perton, chivaler, Richard son of John de Perton, chivaler and Warine de Penne, for the death of her husband, the said Thomas Buffary of Penne; the said Philip de Penne and William de Perton, as principals in the felony, and the others as accessories. None of the defendants appeared and the Sheriff had been ordered to attach them, by their bodies; and he now returned that none of them could be found, except John de Perton, chivaler. He was therefore ordered to put the said Philip and William in *exigent* and if they did not appear, to outlaw them; and if they appeared to arrest them and produce them on the morrow of saint Martin, and likewise to arrest the said John son of John de Perton, chivaler, Richard son of John de Perton, chivaler, and Warine de Penne and to produce them on the quindene of Trinity. And respecting the said John de Perton, chivaler, the Sheriff returned that he was decrepit and detained by such infirmity that he could not produce him before the court, without danger to his life. He was therefore ordered to produce him *coram rege* on the quindene of Trinity. In this same year of 1381, the abbot of Burton upon Trent sued John de Perton, late Sheriff of Staffordshire, for a debt of £20; John did not appear, and the Sheriff returned twenty shillings as proceeds of a distraint upon him. He was therefore ordered to distrain again and to produce him on the octaves of Trinity. In 1385 Humphry de Halughton sued in person William de Bleecheley of Offeley, Richard Mercer, Roger Taillour, Roger Bertram, William Iremonger, Adam Belle, and William Perton of Offeley, for cutting down *vi et armis* his trees and underwood, at High Offeley near Eccleshall to the value of £20. Not appearing, the

defendants were ordered to be arrested. Sir John de Perton appears to have been twice married, first to Elizabeth second daughter of Sir William de Shareshull, the lord chief justice of the king's bench, who however died issueless; and secondly to Margaret who survived him, but likewise without issue. He had outside the sanctity of the marital blanket, four sons 1. Leo who died without issue 1381, William, who became rector of Blymhill; Richard, noticed in the 1375 and 1382; and John who got himself into trouble for disposing of one Walsh the parson of Stirchley in 1377, but eventually secured a king's pardon for the crime through the Earl of Stafford. Sir John died in the end of 1388, and the *post mortem* inquisition took place at Eccleshall before Robert de Lee, the king's escheator for Staffordshire, on Wednesday after the feast of saint Lawrence, 12th Richard 2nd (389): it states that Simon de Malstange, and Richard Beket, Chaplains, were seized of the Manor of Perton Co., Stafford, by the gift and feoffment of John son of William de Perton, and gave it to John, who is named in the writ, and Elizabeth daughter of Sir William de Shareshull, and the heirs male of John, and if John should die without male issue, then after the death of John and Elizabeth, the Manor was to revert to John son of Margaret de Stirchley, and his male issue, and if he should die without male issue, then to Richard his brother, and male issue, and if Richard should die without male issue, then to Thomas son of Matilda del Cronch of Solihull and his male issue, and if Thomas should die without male issue, then to Leo de Perton, and his male issue, and if Leo should die without having male issue, then to the right heirs of John de Perton; and the jurors stated that the said Elizabeth was dead, and the said John de Perton died seized of the Manor, as of fee tail by virtue of the said entail, and he died without leaving male issue, and the reversion of the Manor therefore lies with John son of Margaret, who is now living; and the Manor is held of the king, *in capite*, by the service of *grand serjeantry*. (The original says *petit serjeantry*, but this is evidently an error). There is an annual fine payable for alienation, that is five shillings and a farthing, and it is worth twenty marks annually beyond reprisals. And they say that the said John died also seized of the Manor of Trysull, together with Matilda his wife, who now survives, to hold to the said John and Matilda and to the heirs of John; and it is worth twenty marks annually beyond reprisals. He also died seized of a carucate of land in Seisdon near Trysull conjointly with Matilda his wife, who now survives, to hold to the said John and Matilda, and the heirs of the said John. And Trysull and the carucate of land in question are held of the lord of Dudley, but they are ignorant by what service. And John died on Friday before the feast of the translation of saint Thomas the martyr; and John de Barnhurst is his nearest of kin, being the son of John, sister of John, and he is 30 years of age and upwards. Thus according to this inquisition John de Perton son of Walter Perton of Stirchley (brother of Sir John), became the heir to Perton and Trescote, and undoubtedly succeeded thereto; while the widow of Sir John succeeded to Trysull and the land in Seisdon which she probably enjoyed for her life, and it would appear that her heir would be John de Barnhurst, who though not so described, is called nearest kin: However this last person the nephew of Sir John and according to Jones and Wrottesley, his heir at law, had disposed of his interest in the property as early as 1370 long before the death of Sir John, and he does not appear to shine as a model of integrity, for ignoring this sale to Leo de Perton, which he probably knew would not be a legal transaction in a property held *in capite*, immediately after

his uncle's death in 1389 he resold Perton to Sir Humphrey Stafford, for 240 marks, by a deed, at present in the Wrottesley collection. By the escheator's accounts and from an inquisition taken in 1425 John de Perton son of Walter is found to have been in possession of Perton and Trysull, when the widow Margaret must have been dead; and it is stated that John de Perton had alienated the Manor of Perton, without the necessary royal license to Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick and his bailiff and their heirs and assigns for ever.

Henceforth the history of this Manor is a tangled skein of heterogeneous threads that cannot clearly be untwisted. First Stebbing Shaw, who had evidently never seen the *post mortem* inquisition on Sir John de Perton's death, mixes up his wrong side of the blanket children with the offspring of his brother Walter Perton of Stirchley, and Margaret his wife, in the most hopeless fashion and he has been followed by William Hardwicke of Bridgnorth, who, at any rate, should have learned how undependable the former was in his facts and dates. In 1389, we find by a deed in the Wrottesley collection, that John de Perton of Stirchley, father of Leo, quits all claim to Perton in trust to John Swinnerton, John Hampton, and Richard Leveson, who in turn conveyed it to Sir Humphrey Stafford, knight, of Hook, and Elizabeth his wife; witnesses, Ralph de Stafford, Giles de Hyde and Richard Leveson. In 1396 Thomas de Perton of Stirchley, brother of the last named John of Stirchley, quits all his claim and interest in Perton, to the aforesaid trustees, who in like manner conveyed it to Sir Humphrey Stafford; and in 1420 the Manor of Perton was conveyed to the attornies of Sir Humphrey by William de Perton, son of Lionel, who, as we have seen already, had acquired the Barnhurst interest in 1370. In the face of all this we find in 1425, as before mentioned, that the same William de Perton resold the Manor of Perton, without license, to the Earl of Warwick, and a parson relative or bailiff and to their heirs and assigns. Thenceforth follows a muddle of complication from the litigation of opposing claimants; amongst which the one fact is clear that the patrimony of Perton, Trescote and Trysull, had passed for ever from its ancient line of owners who had been in possession uninterruptedly for a period of over 350 years.

A writ from Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, custos of the kingdom during the king's absence, dated from Westminster, 16th February 1425, states that "divers dissensions and strifes have arisen between Humphrey Stafford knight, and John Throckmorton (Steward of the Earl of Warwick) and John Baysham, (Beauchamp), clerk, in consequence of John Throckmorton and John Baysham shortly after the king's passage into Normandy, having ejected the said Humphrey de Stafford from the Manor of Perton." The said John de Baysham, having been summoned before the council and examined, it appeared that William de Perton being seized as of fee of the manor, held of the king *in capite*, had alienated it without license to Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, and to John Baysham, clerk. Sir Humphrey de Stafford having produced Sir William Clinton, knight, and Sir Thomas Carren, knight, as sureties for the profits of the Manor, in the event of William Perton's title being proved to be good, the escheator is ordered to remove his hand. The Staffords thus recovered the manor and we may thereby assume that William de Perton, son of Leo, son of John, son of William de Perton of Stirchley and Margaret was the last of his name that was even nominal owner of the manor, and he who was apparently living in 1425, is said to have

died in the following year : his descendants will be noticed later on. Sir John Stafford died seized of the Manor of Perton in 1428 according to his *inquisitio post mortem*, when Humphrey Stafford was returned as his son and nearest of kin. At Michaelmas 1475 in the king's bench court, Humphrey Stafford sues Sir John Colshull, knight, late of Bouamy Co., Devon, and Elizabeth his wife, Sir John Willoughby, knight, late of Broke Co., Wilts, and Anne his wife, and Thomas Strangeways, esquire, late of Lopton Co., Wilts for unlawfully entering his Manors of Penkrige, Perton, Littlewood, Hyde, Coppenhall, and others in Staffordshire. The defendants appeared by attorney, and stated, as regards the Manors of Perton and Littlewood, that a certain William Smyth, clerk, and John Boeff were seized of the above Manors, and fine was levied in 1421, by which the said William and John gave them to Sir Humphrey Stafford of Hook and Elizabeth his wife, to hold for their joint lives, to revert after their deaths to John Stafford, son of Humphrey and Elizabeth, and the heirs of his body, and failing issue to revert to William Stafford, and his issue, failing which to Thomas Stafford and his issue and failing which to Sir Humphrey Stafford, knight, and his issue; sons of the said Humphrey and Elizabeth, and failing issue of Sir Humphrey, then to Richard Stafford and his issue ; and failing which, to the right heirs of Humphrey Stafford of Hook. The sons John, Thomas, and Sir Humphrey all died issueless, and Humphrey Earl of Devon only son of William also died without issue, so that the inheritance fell to the daughters of Alice, only daughter of Sir Humphrey Stafford of Hook and Elizabeth. Elizabeth the eldest daughter was wife of Sir John Colshull, Anne was wife of Sir John Willoughby de Broke, and Alianora or Eleanor was wife of Thomas Strangeways, the defendants in the above suit. The Manor of Perton eventually fell to the share of the second daughter Anne Willoughby ; her son Sir Robert Willoughby lord de Broke, appears to have been reduced to such straits that he had to mortgage this property for £560 about 1505 and executed in 1509, to Edmund Dudley ; this included the Manors of Penkrige, and Rodbaston : a previous mortgage, however, existed to one Owen Watson. In 1540 there was litigation between Edmund Dudley's son Sir John Dudley knight, and James Leveson of Wolverhampton respecting this manor, for by a Wrottesley deed, Sir John Dudley and Joan his wife release to James Leveson all their claim in the Manor of Perton, and lands in Trescote, which formerly belonged to Robert Willoughby lord de Broke, by an award made by Sir John Porte, knight, justice and serjeant at law, and William Whorwood, esquire, solicitor-general to the king, and William Coningsby, attorney of the Duchy of Lancaster, for the said sovereign; arbitrators between James Leveson and Sir John Dudley ; the sum of £220 to be paid by James Leveson to Sir John Dudley. This deed is dated February 18th 1540, and on the 9th June previous to this, Sir John Dudley had appointed his attornies, Richard Whorwood, and George Colbran, to take possession of Perton and Trescote, formerly his father's, and to expel all others. More light is thrown on this transaction by a deed of July 23rd 1539 which cites how James Leveson, merchant of the staple of Calais, appoints William Norwood of Wolverhampton, his attorney, to receive the Manor of Perton and lands in Trescote, from William Cave of Newcastle-on-Tyne, merchant, (son and heir of Agnes Cave, sister and heiress of Owen Watson), and George Cambye, son and heir of Isabella Cambye (another sister and heiress of Owen Watson), who had released to James Leveson all their claims to the same lands : deed also at Wrottesley. In 1547 Edward Leveson of Shipley Co., Salop, (son and heir of James Leveson); and Elizabeth his wife, grant five marks of annual

rent to Margaret, the widow of James Leveson, in lieu of dower in half of Perton and Trescote ; by which it would appear as though James Leveson held only half of Perton Manor. On the Memoranda Roll of 1553 is a writ to enquire by what title Edward Leveson, esquire, held the Manor of Perton. The manor remained in the possession of the Leveson family, through the reigns of Elizabeth, James the first, and Charles the first, when Sir Richard Leveson, the well known royalist general possessed it, and from whom it passed to the Earl of Dorset, whose wife Margaret was daughter of Mary wife of Sir George Curzon, and sister and heiress of Sir William Leveson of Lilleshull Co., Salop. In 1662 Sir Walter Wrottesley purchased Perton Manor from Richard Sackville Earl of Dorset, son of Edward Earl of Dorset and the said Margaret only daughter and heiress of Sir George and Mary Curzon. Having now traced the manor to its present owning family it may be well to say a few words as to the residence of Perton.

The present mansion of Perton, though of modern, is yet of somewhat imposing aspect, and is mentioned by Stebbing Shaw as having over the door, in his time, a coat of arms and though he does not state whether it was the chevron and pears of the Pertons the golden leaves of the Levesons, or the sable pile of the Wrottesleys, we may take it to have been the first of these on the authority of William Hardwicke, writing in 1820 : who also states that much of the previous mansion was then remaining, including two octagonal turrets of stone, which faced the road. This edifice, with the relics of the old hall doubtless stood upon the identical site of the fortification noted as Perton Castle, which is said to have existed there before and after the Norman conquest, for though we find no record of demolition and re-building, there are notices as to the enlargement of the existing edifice of the family. The solid horse-trough mentioned by S. Shaw as formerly standing near the kitchen door, was cut out of an immense squared stone that possessed unusual interest from having been found in the remains of the ancient British City of Wrottesley, a little over two miles from here. This stone was first drawn to Wrottesley Hall by 36 yoke of oxen where it was made into a great cistern, in the malt house, and from which the horse trough was cut out and conveyed to Perton, and though left very thick at the bottom and sides, was yet so capacious, that it would wet 37 strikes of barley at one time, "for anything I know to the contrary," says Shaw, "it is still remaining at Wrottesley, and measures five feet two inches in length, three feet ten and a quarter inches in breadth, and two feet four inches in depth. The horse trough taken from the above cistern was still at Perton in 1794," and in all probability has thus returned to the locality whence it was removed in far off British times ; for there are evidences of much stone having been removed from near this spot, and according to Plott, there was in his time, an excellent quarry at Perton, from which the new church at Wolverhampton was built. The manor is well supplied with water from the shed of Smestall or Smestow Water, coming from its source beyond Tettenhall, and fed before it reaches this spot, by two affluents, the one coming from the race-course at Wolverhampton, and the other from Grazeley, and through Finchfield, debouching just above Wightwick into the Smester which flows thence past Perton Mill, Seisdon, Trescote and Tresull. It leaves Perton about half a mile from its south east side, after dividing the parishes of the Tettenhall and Penn, and watering all the western portion of Seisdon hundred, pours its waters into the Stour just above Stourton Castle.

Perton was one of the five prebends of the deanery of Stafford, in connection with the ancient College of Tettenhall, Totnall or Theotenhale, and
L. of C.

at the dissolution of the monasteries in and after 1550, which carried along with it all the ancient ecclesiastical colleges of minor importance, it was granted with the house and site, and all edifices, orchards, gardens, etc., and all the profits and emoluments pertaining to the said college, also the five prebends of Penford, Robenhull (Barnhurst), Perton, Wrottesley, and Codsall, founded in the said college, also all the demesne and mansion of the vicars choral, and presbitery of the said college and all messuages, lands, glebes, tithes, services, court-leets, view of frankpledge, free warren, and all other rights, jurisdictions, privileges, both spiritual and temporal, or of whatever nature, pertaining to the said college, as fully and freely as any dean, master or warden or prebendary, or any other officer of the college or prebends ever held them, to Walter Wrottesley of Wrottesley by King Edward the sixth. Thus the head of the Wrottesley family became, in the future, the secular dean of the royal peculiar and exempt jurisdiction of the deanery of Tottenhall, and all wills were proved and registered in their court, until the abolition of the *peculiaris*. The original letters patent of this transaction are now in the Wrottesley collection. The north and south chancels of the church of saint Michael of Tottenhall, are now known respectively as the Wrottesley and the Pendeford chapels, and are replete with the memorials and heraldic emblems of the families of these estates. The south or Pendeford chapel however was formerly devoted to the entombment of the lords of Perton and their families and was known by the name of the Perton chapel; though none of the ancient memorials of this family are now apparent, as they have been removed and effaced to make room for the more modern family of Lane, well known as the 'loyal Lanes' of Charles the second's time. Dugdale however mentions that the arms of Perton were in his time here as follows:—"Argent on a chevron gules, three pears or," but the restoration of the church in modern times in all probability erased all that was left of the Perton records, from the crowding out by the Lane monuments. Speaking of the heraldry of the Pertons, the oldest emblazonment appears to have been a red chevron, between three tawny or proper pears on a silver shield, but later we find the chevron charged with three golden pears, in lieu of those on the field, and which are those mentioned in the Shropshire Archæological Society's Journal, Vol. 7, as belonging to and borne by John Perton of Barnsley, leaving in 1610; while Sir Robert Glover in his 'visitation' of Staffordshire for 1583 gives the arms of Sir John Perton knight of Perton as, 'Azure, on a chevron between three pears or, three pellets gules' The charge of the three pears on a chevron, was the impress of a seal on several deeds now at Wrottesley. On a signet ring that belonged to William Hardwicke of Burcott parish Worfield, who married Mary daughter of Joseph Perton of Chesterton in 1763, was a shield bearing, "quarterly, first and fourth, azure a chevron gules, charged with three bezants or, between three pears of the third; second and third, argent, on a chevron gules, three pears or." Several of the collateral descendants of the Pertons have borne more or less fantastic arrangements of heraldry; supposed to be of that family, but frequently very incorrect, in detail.

THE PERTONS OF WORFIELD PARISH CO., SALOP.

We may now go on to the consideration of the remnant of the Perton family that survived the general collapse of the patrimonial stock on the death of Sir John de Perton without legitimate issue. Of the illegitimate sons of this warrior Knight were Lionel or Leo living 1332 O. S. P.;

William, rector of Blynhill in 1399, who died about March 1424; Richard living in 1375 and 1282, O. S. P.; and John living in 1382 O. S. P.; so that his direct line was entirely extinguished. But Walter de Perton the next brother of John, and who predeceased him, but was noticed in 1339, had married Margery de Stirchley, said to have derived her distinctive name from her long residence at that place, but in all probability a daughter of the Stirchley family, who was his wife in 1343 and his widow in 1388, and left by him two sons and a daughter Matilda wife of.....del Crouch of Solihull in Warwickshire, who were parents of Thomas del Crouch of Solihull who however died without issue. The second son Richard de Perton died without issue, but the elder son John de Perton had two sons, 1. William de Perton of Stirchley, who had also two sons John of Stirchley who sold his interest in Perton in 1389 and died issueless, and Thomas de Perton of Stirchley noticed 1395, who also in 1396 sold all his interest in Perton and died without issue. 2. Leo de Perton who succeeded his father as lord of Perton Trescote, etc., and has already been noted, more than once, during his father's lifetime. He had been appointed escheator for Worcestershire in 1370 and died about 1420, leaving by his wife Cecilia, daughter of.....Corbet of Leigh, a son who succeeded him.

William de Perton, the last lord of Perton, Trysull and Trescote, in about 19th Richard the second (1396) sold his patrimony to Sir Humphrey Stafford, knight, who had already purchased the reversionary and other interests of his cousins John and Thomas of Stirchley. He died very shortly after his own marriage and his father's death in 1420 leaving one son.

Henry Perton "esquire," settled at Oldington, a township in the neighboring parish of Worfield Co., Salop, in 1406, an estate that had been purchased by his father, before his death, probably with the proceeds of the sale of Perton. Without paying too much attention to the statement of the frequently inaccurate Stebbing Shaw, that the Pertons had a castle here before the Norman conquest, we have tangible proof of the occupation of Perton Manor by the Perton family from a period about one hundred years later than the above event, namely in 1166, and that they continued thereafter in uninterrupted possession thereof, for a period of nearly 250 years. The sudden and incomprehensible collapse of this ancient and almost distinguished house is very difficult to account for, and probably there existed some obscure and little dreamt of reason; for at the moment when the family sky appears to become suddenly over-clouded, its serene aspect seemed to be at its clearest, brightest, and rosier, under the auspices of the military knight, basking in the sunshine of royal favor, bought by doughty deeds of valor and prowess; and the incubus of the Westminster abbey claim permanently removed. The family sank almost at once, to the grade of ordinary well to do yeomanry, in the Manor of Worfield, in an alien county, and their existence became so obscure that the members thereof have been identified only with great difficulty and patient research. Superstition may moralize, that the judgment of heaven, or some other place, had sat upon them, for the tyrannous and grinding oppression with which they had treated the homagers and sub-tenants on their estates. E. C. Purton, B., A. of Oldbury, states erroneously that the Oldington property was "an estate inherited from Sir William de Shareshull;" but, *imprimis*, William and Henry de Perton were not descended from that legal luminary, and *secunde* the Oldington, Holdington or Oulton property which he purchased as a portion of the Manor of Patteshull, was

a farm or hamlet with mansion, etc., in Staffordshire, and now for the most part submerged under the placid waters by the western shores of Patteshull Pool, having been part of the land taken in, or to speak precisely, wiped out when that sheet of water was so extensively enlarged by Sir John Astley. Olton is described in a deed of transfer as "all that messuage, tenement, or farm house situate in Olton otherwise Oldington, in the Parish of Patteshull aforesaid." It stood where the present Temple and boat house are erected in the ornamental grounds of Patteshull new Park. This property along with the rest of Patteshull Manor went through the Sharesulls to Elizabeth, sister of the third Sir William de Sharesull, who became the wife of John de Knightley, whose daughter Joan married Roger Peshall, and their daughter again, took it to her husband William Lee in 1401; they, having no issue, left it to Thomas Astley, whose descendant drowned Oldynton in his great pool of Patteshull, and so completely ended its career and history. Being so nearly situate to the Oldington in Worfield, although in different counties, it must have so frequently caused confusion, that one may be, in some measure consoled for its loss. It is a curious circumstance that the ancient home of the Hardwicke was similarly submerged on the opposite or eastern shore of the Pool, in the Manor of Pattingham, and is described in the same deed of transfer in 1765, as "a messuage and yard land in Hardewyke with a pasture called Tewalle, also the underwood growing thereon, a meadow called Mill Meadow, the Bank, and a meadow called Lord or Lady Dole, with certain acres in Ballfield, etc." This Henry de Perton was fined in the manor court of Worfield in 1406, on the presentment of the township of Ewdness, for having assisted in making an illegal footpath in Ewdness Fields. William Hardwicke assigns the year 1450 for his death, when he was 60 years of age, which would bring his birth date to 1389-90. His wife's name has not as yet been ascertained, but they must have been married about 1410, and left a son,

John Perton of Oldington, who was born about 1411, and married about 1432 to Mary daughter of.....Rowley of the parish of Worfield, according to a genealogical parchment document of the time of Charles the first *pene* E. A. Hardwicke; he died about 1451 and left a son,

Walter Perton of Oldington, born in 1431, married Lettice.....about 1437. He lived later at Hallon where he died and was interred at Worfield in 1500 aged 68, leaving a son.

John Perton of Hallon, born at Oldington in 1475, married first in 1505, Elizabeth...who died S. P. in 1522, and secondly Agnes.....who died at a great age at Roughton, his widow in August 1591 and was interred at Worfield on the 11th. He died at Hallon in 1536 and was interred at Worfield, when six pence was paid to John Lecay, Lye, or Lee the priest of the virgin Mary's chantry in Worfield church to pray for his soul, when he left three sons:—

2. John Perton of Penn Co. Stafford, born about 1523, married about 1552 and was interred at Penn August 24th 1613, leaving one son John Perton of Penn, born about 1556, living there a freeholder in 1621, he married Ann Preene of Penn, June 12th 1582, who was interred there his widow May 3rd 1629, leaving a son William Perton of Penn born at ar after 1582, married prior to 1618, Margaret.....he was living there a freeholder in 1653, and was interred at Penn October 8th 1671, leaving an only daughter Anne baptized at Penn, December 14th 1618.

3. Thomas Perton of Sonde and later of Penn leaving at the former in 1564, married Anne....., and died between 1573 and April 19th 1579 leaving two daughters Alice interred 19th April 1579, and Constance married 6th February 1573, to William Wyllot of Roughton, at whose house her mother afterwards lived and died they were parents of John Wyllot of Hallon who died 1511, leaving a daughter Agnes wife of.....Colleton, whose widow she was in 1580.
- 1 William Perton of Hallon, the eldest son was born about 1517, and married prior to 1550. He had two sons, Lewis Perton the younger son of Stockton, then of Ackleton and lastly of Stableford, was married 4th July 1590 to Joyce daughter of Richard Warter of Stableford, who was interred his widow at Worfield September 24th 1616 : he died at Stableford and was interred at Worfield, March 12th 1614, leaving Thomas Perton, born at Stableford and baptized at Worfield 20th December 1593 and Joan baptized at Worfield 2nd April 1591. The eldest son

John Perton of Hallon and later of Worcester city was born at Hallon 1551, married prior to 1580, Elizabeth daughter of Thomas Botterell of Aston Botterell (born about 1559, and interred at Ryton, June 20th 1666); by whom he left one son.

John Perton of Hallon and Barnsley, born about 1580. In 1603 he purchased lands from William Gatacre of Gatacre, and in connection with this purchase he probably met his future wife, for on December 8th 1607, he married Agnes daughter of Richard Rogers of Farmcote parish of Claverley (and Elizabeth, his wife), widow of Richard Palmer of Barnsley, who was baptized at Claverley, July 25th, 1568, after which he went to reside at Barnsley, and continued to do so up to his death in March 1640, when he was interred at Worfield on the 30th. His wife survived him less than one year, and was also interred at Worfield on March 10th, 1641, leaving a son.

John Perton of Hallon, baptized at Worfield, January 20th, 1611, married there, June 25th, 1635, Benedicta only child of William Coxon of Barnsley, (grand daughter of Thomas Coxon, by Anna his wife, daughter of William Davenport of Chorley Co., Chester, ancestor of the Hallon Davenports.) who was interred, October 26th, 1676, as his widow, and by whom at his death, April 12th, 1662 he had five sons and four daughters as follows:—

1. Thomas Perton of Hallon, baptized at Worfield March 22nd 1639, married Ursula by whom he had John, born May 6th 1670 ; Thomas born 1st September 1683 ; Mary born 5th May 1673, married to Samuel Bradborne and died S. P. 8th August 1754 ; Jane, born 2nd January 1676, married 27th April 1711, Robert son of Robert Williams of Hallon, who died 30th August 1746, leaving Robert Williams of Cranmere, surveyor, etc., born 8th April 1717, and interred 9th November 1791 ; and Elizabeth born 13th January 1712 and interred 21st January 1792. Elizabeth 3rd daughter of Thomas Perton and Ursula born 14th July 1678.
2. Josiah Perton of Oldington 2nd son, born 1641, married Mary daughter of.....Kidson of Claverley, who died 14th April 1715, leaving 1. Richard born 19th January 1674, married Elizabeth...

- and died 10th June 1699; leaving a daughter Jane. born 8th November 1699; 2. John *ob. inf.*; 3. Anne, born 14th November 1677; 4. Jane born 2nd April 1680.
3. John Perton of the Day House, parish of Oldbury, and of Eudon, baptized at Worfield, 5 January 1645, married Jane daughter of William Grenowes of Stottesden and Elizabeth Rushbury his wife), baptized 28th September 1653; he died at Eudon 1715, leaving two sons and three daughters; 1. Henry Perton born 1684, and died at sea S. P.; 2. William Perton of Eudon Burnell, baptized 14th January 1686, married Sarah eldest daughter of Matthias Astley of Tamhorne and Madeley Court, (and Sarah his wife), and died at Eudon 1740, having changed the orthography of his ancient patronymic to Purton, for what reason is not apparent. He left three sons, and two daughters.
- (a) Arthur Purton O. S. P.
- (β) William Purton of Madeley Court and Bradsey, married Elizabeth Brewer and had; William Purton born December 6th 1758, married Elizabeth Ford and had issue that died S. P.; 2. Margaret born August 31st 1752; 3. Sarah born 7th January 1754; 4. Elizabeth born May 4th 1755; 5. Maria born and died 1757; and 6. Kitty born 17th May 1761.
- (g) John Perton of Eudon born 1722, married Mary third daughter of Edward Gibbons of Ettingsall in 1756, who died April 29th 1777, leaving five sons and three daughters, John Purton *ob. inf.*; 2. Matthias Astley Purton *ob. inf.*; 3. William Purton of Faintree Hall, married 25th November 1799, Hester Maria only child and heiress of Thomas Pardoe of Faintree Hall, (high Sheriff 1791), who was interred at Chetton 1801 leaving three sons, A. Thomas Pardoe Purton of Faintree Hall M. A. Oxon, married first Karoline Frances daughter of Lionel Lampet, surgeon, of Bridgnorth, and the Highlands Co., Oxon, who died young, when he married again, but left no issue; B. William Purton, M. A., Oxon, of Woodhouse near Cleobury Mortimer married his cousin Sarah daughter of Charles Cooper of Hampstead, and had two sons William Purton, B. A., Oxon, and John Purton, Rector of Oldbury near Bridgnorth, who had a son Ralph Cooper Purton, B. A. of Oldbury. C. John Perton M. A. and Esther Maria O. S. P.; 4. Christopher Purton of London, O. S. P.; 5. Thomas Purton of Alcester born 1768, married Ann Bloxam and left Colonel John Purton, O. B., born 1794 and married Charlotte Katherine Matilda Smyth; and Henry Bloxam Purton, O. S. P.; 1. Dorothy wife of Charles Cooper of Hampstead, parents of Charles Purton Cooper; Q. C. of Lincoln's Inn and Denton Court Co., Kent. Queen's Serjeant for the Duchy of Lancaster, and masonic provincial grand-master for Kent, and of John Henry Cooper of Bridgnorth, banker, married Emma daughter of William Perry of Everton. 2. Sarah died 1813; 3. Mary died 1825.
- (a) Sarah wife of Thomas Wylde of Glazeley, who left a son Thomas Rous Wylde of Woodlands O. S. P.
- (β) Mary wife of Richard Hinckman of Glazeley O. S. P.
1. Anne married at saint Mary Magdalen's Bridgnorth, 22nd July 1721 to George Robinson of Bridgnorth.

2. Elizabeth baptized at Oldbury, 30th March 1685, married to..... Stephens.
3. Jane ob. *inf.* and interred at Oldbury, 11th July 1691.
4. William Perton of Chesterton, born 25th September 1650, married first Jane Farelaw, 11th April 1681, who died S. P. 24th November 1706, and secondly at Claverley, 12 April 1708, Jane only child of Joseph Mansfield of Farmcote, (and Jane his wife daughter of John Cole of Cole Hall, and Anna his wife, daughter of Sir Edward Littleton, bart. of Pillaton, and Alice his wife daughter of Francis Cockayne). She died 5th March 1719, and was interred at Worfield 8th; he died 19th August 1720, and was interred at Worfield 21st, leaving one son, Joseph Perton born at Chesterton, 22nd December 1709, who became an officer of excise and married 10th May 1736, Mary only surviving child of William Grinsell of Market Drayton, tanner, (and Mary Lewis of Acton Reynell his wife), baptized 10th January 1719 and re-married to John Worrall of the Morrey parish of Adderley. He died from small-pox 30th April 1746, and was interred at Oswestry, May 1st leaving three sons and two daughters (a.) William Perton born 9th October 1737, married Mary Kent and died 1801 S. P.; (b.) Joseph Perton born 17th July 1739, married Mary Bate O. S. P.; (c.) John Perton born 31st May 1746, married Elizabeth Eaton; (d.) Mary born 6 p. m., 23rd July 1741, married at Worfield 9th October 1763, William Hardwicke of Burcott born 1738 (descended from the Hardwicks of Hardwicke, parish of Pattingham Co. Stafford). He died at Diamond Hall, Bridgnorth, the residence of his second son William, and was interred at Worfield, 28th September 1807: his wife was interred at Worfield, 4th May 1824, having had issue, Joseph born at Alscote 31st August 1775 *ob. inf.*; Anna *ob. inf.*; John Bell Hardwicke of Burcott, born at Alscote, 15th August 1765, married at Tasley 27th September 1804, Sarah eldest daughter of William Tayler of Tasley, and his wife Mary daughter of Job Beard of Erdington, parish of Quatford, and had issue; and William Hardwicke of Diamond Hall, Bridgnorth, attorney-at-law, born at Alscote, 12th January 1772, proctor and registrar of the royal peculiar and exempt jurisdiction of Bridgnorth, in the deanery of Lichfield. He was an antiquary, topographer, and genealogist of repute, and author of several M. S. S. on Shropshire history. For a fuller account of William Hardwicke who left a numerous progeny, see Hubert Smith's "Memoir of William Hardwicke (J. Randall, Madeley), and of the family of Hardwicke see "The Reliquary," Vol. 23rd April 1879, "Family of Hardwicke" by Leighton Price (Bemrose and Sons, London and Derby); also 'Visitation of England and Wales,' Vol. IV by J. Jackson Howard, L. L. D., F. S. A., Maltraver's Herald Extraordinary. (e.) Elizabeth the youngest child of Joseph and Mary Perton, born at Bishop's Castle 5th July 1743, married to Matthias Cundall of Burcott villa, and died 12th June 1819 S. P.
5. Roger Perton O. S. P.
4. ~~The four daughters were Jane, Anna, Elizabeth and Mary.~~

1. 1743
 2. 1743
 3. 1743
 4. 1743
 5. 1743