English Manors & Lordships: History, Law and Bibliography

To speak *intelligently* of England's Manors and Lordships is rather like speaking of automobiles: at law they are commonly defined and are regulated equally on public motor ways; but who would deny the very substantial differences of quality and value between a *Rolls-Royce Corniche* Convertible and a *Ford Anglia?* So it is among English Manors and Lordships; at law they are commonly defined and are subjected equally to property laws; but among them there are *great differences of quality and value.*

History

Following the Conquest in 1066, Duke William of Normandy, called "The Conqueror", became King of England and imposed the Iron Canons of feudal law, *Nulle terre sans seigneur; Nulle seigneur sans terre* (No land without a lord; No lord without land), the traditional policy of Norman dukes. He gave English lands to many of his Norman followers and certain Anglo-Saxons, their heirs, and their successors to hold of the new King and his heirs, an his successors, to help govern the newly transformed Anglo-Saxon kingdom.

Norman and formerly Anglo-Saxon subjects who held lands *immediately* of King William became *tenants-in-chief in right of the Crown;* they were called "lords" and their lands, "manors". If such lands were large enough to be divided into smaller manors tenants-in-chief were called "lords paramount" and their manors were also known as *land baronies* or *Honours*. Subordinate tenants of lords paramount given smaller manors were also called "lords", but as a class they were inferior or *mesne* lords.

In this way, the Feudal Pyramid was constructed from the top downwards. The king was at the apex; his tenants-in-chief beneath him rendered military, spiritual, and certain Honourable personal services called "grand serjeanty" to him. In turn, tenants-in-chief in turn received minor military, administrative, farming, and skilled trade services from other occupants of their lands, the mesne lords, and freemen at the base of the Feudal Pyramid. All of England became a unified structure; its bricks were land and its mortar a tangle of greater and lesser manors and lordships.

When a certain territory was recognized as an Honour and Barony, it retained that identity through *all* its fortunes. When a tenant-in-chief in right of the Crown's Land Barony fell into the king's hands through wardship or forfeiture because of attainder for treason, the estate continued as an Honour or Barony. Important legal meaning attached to a manor that was named an Honour and Barony: they owed exceptional feudal duties and burdens. King George III's Royal Historiographer, Thomas Madox, explained the differences among them:

"Tenure of the King *in Capite ut de Corona*, as of his Crown; and Tenure of the King *in Capite ut de Honoure*, *Baronia*, *Castro*, as of an Honour, Barony, Castle, being in the Kings hands."

When a tenant-in-chief in right of the Crown's Estate came into the king's hands did his *mesne* lord tenant became the king's tenant-in-chief? Was his mesne lord now subject to the duties and burdens incident to chief lordship? No, that would have been unfair and it would have changed the terms of the mesne lord's tenure. So, it became necessary to distinguish between those tenants-in-chief who *always* held immediately of the king *ut de corona* and those who came to hold of the king by reason of their *former lord's* forfeiture to the king by escheat or wardship. These tenants were considered to hold of the king *ut de escaeta* or *ut de Honoure* where the tenant held lands of an Honour that came into the Crown by escheat or wardship or *ut de persona* where the tenant held lands of a lord whose lordship escheated to the Crown.

Law

England's Constitution and the whole of its public law rests squarely upon immutable principles of Feudal Custom and the Common Law. Some authorities on England's Constitution believe it to be "merely an extension of [England's] Property Law. It is a characteristic feature of English law from earliest times that the right of property has been particularly jealous of any attempt to limit it or encroach upon it.

No statute of England, Great Britain, or the United Kingdom extinguished the feudal baronage and peerage, and none bars the use, enjoyment, or any right to the use and enjoyment of any "Title of Honour, *Feodal* or other" formerly used, enjoyed, or claimed by ancient constitutional declaration or

prescription." To the contrary, *The Abolition of Tenures Act*, cap. 12, *specifically* preserves them: "Provided also, that neither this act, nor any thing therein contained, shall infringe or hurt any title of honour, *foedal* or other, by which any person hath or *may* have right to sit in the lords house of Parliament, *as to his or their title of honour* or sitting in Parliament, and the privileges belonging to them as peers; this act or any thing therein contained to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. (Emphasis added) and the Law of Property Act, 1925, preserves the existence of manors, lords, and the rights of lordship. Except for statutory rights of political representation, re-creations of some feudal barons as modern parliamentary Barons by Writ, and the creation of new modern parliamentary Barons by Letters Patent; the immutable principles of feudal custom and the Common Law remain unchanged. *Halsbury's Laws of England* notes that the dignity of peerage "can only be lost by attainder or an Act of Parliament". Attainder was abolished by *The Forfeiture Act, 1870*, and Parliament has extinguished peerages in only two instances. In the fifteenth century, Parliament degraded George Neville, Duke of Bedford, because of his poverty (which rendered him unable to support the dignity of peerage). In this century, *The Titles Deprivation Act*, 1917, deprived three dukes and a viscount of their peerages for bearing arms against the Crown or adhering to its enemy.

In the sixteenth century, King Charles I's attacks on the rights of property owners that evoked their bitter resistance ending in his the execution and the *Inter Regnum.* The hapless king's efforts to exercise to the fullest his rights under feudal law, perhaps legally defensible, resulted in much indignation and brought about the abolition of military and other chivalrous feudal tenures following the monarchy's restoration.

Before the Abolition of Tenure Act, tenancies-in-chief in right of the Crown were at law "lordships of the manor". *They remain so today;* honorable lordships and closest in relationship to the Crown, but they were also subject to more burdensome feudal duties and services than were *mesne* or lesser lords of the manor. Among Parliament's first business following the *Interregnum* and restoration of England's monarchy in 1660, was enactment of 12 Car. II cap 24, the Abolition of Tenures.

The purpose of *The Abolition of Tenures Act* was to do away with the burdens of that feudal relationship which had by then become an irritation to the barons, and a source of friction between them and the Crown. The Act was not intended to destroy ancient dignities annexed to land or extinguish

the feudal peerage of manor lords whose status of tenants-in-chief in right of the crown created a special Honourable relationship with the Crown.

The Act abolished all military and chivalrous tenures and the burdensome feudal services that *Magna Carta* 1215 thrust upon them. It cut away the luxuriances that had grown out of England's military tenures while preserving the ancient system's vigour. *The Abolition of Tenures Act* canceled the burden of required attendance at Parliament together with all of the other burdensome feudal obligations of chivalrous tenures, and converted them to *common socage*. However, tenures to which "Any Title of Honour, *Feodal* or other" was attached or tenures held by *grand serjeanty* were preserved intact:

"XI. Provided also, and be it further enacted, That this act, or any thing herein contained, shall not take away, or be construed to take away… the honorary services of grand serjeantry…."

"XIII. Provided also, that neither this act, nor any thing therein contained, shall infringe or hurt any title of honour, *Feodal* or other, by which any person hath or may have right to sit in the lords house of Parliament, as to his or their title of honour or sitting in Parliament, and the privileges belonging to them as peers; this act or any thing therein contained to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding."

The language of *The Abolition of Tenures Act, 1660*, which reserved "Titles of Honour, *Feodal* [a Barony or an Earldom] or other, by which any Person hath or may have Right to sit in the Lords house of Parliament" was consistent with the language of the *Constitutions of Clarendon* 1164, affirming England's feudal law that baronies subsisted in those who held of the Crown in chief. In later times, antiquarian and constitutional lawyers held that *all* subjects who possessed tenures as tenants-in-chief in right of the Crown before the Abolition of Tenures Act were *Barons by Tenure*. It was accepted doctrine as late as 1799:

"A proprietor holding immediately of the Crown, and having his land either erected or confirmed by the king into a free Barony is the only person, in strict law, denominated a baron… *The baron is such a free lord as hath a lordship* or baronie, whereof he beareth his name." (Emphasis added)

This was also the earlier view of England's great jurist, William Blackstone's view:

"A baron's is the most general and universal title of nobility; for originally every one of the peers of superior rank had also a Barony annexed to his other titles when an ancient baron hath been raised to a new degree of peerage... the original and antiquity of baronies has occasioned great enquiries among English antiquarians. *The most probable opinion seems to be that they were the same with our present lords of manors,* to which the name Court Baron, (which is the lord's court, and incident to every manor) gives some countenance. All lords of manors, or barons, that held of the king in capite, had seats in the great council." (Emphasis added)

It was also consistent with Blackstone's predecessor, John Selden, antiquarian lawyer and scholar:

"As the use of the word Baron, is to this day such that it denotes, in the most Honourable sense, only the Barons of Parliament, and yet it is variously communicated to some Officers of Courts of ordinary justice, to those of the Cinque Ports, and to the *Lords of Manors*... But in the most Honourable sense, it denoted the King's thanes or Tenants by grand Serjeanty, or knights service in Chief: who were joyned with Earls in those times as afterwards Barons were." (Emphasis added)

None of the *Magna Cartas,* 1215, 1216 and 1217 or any statute from the *Magna Carta,* 1225, England's first statute, or any thereafter, take from feudal peers their ancient right to the dignity and style of Barony and peerage upon which *Summons by T*

English Manors & Lordships: History, Law and Bibliography

To speak *intelligently* of England's Manors and Lordships is rather like speaking of automobiles: at law they are commonly defined and are regulated equally on public motor ways; but who would deny the very substantial differences of quality and value between a *Rolls-Royce Corniche* Convertible and a *Ford Anglia?* So it is among English Manors and Lordships; at law they are commonly defined and are subjected equally to

property laws; but among them there are *great differences of quality and value.*

History

Following the Conquest in 1066, Duke William of Normandy, called "The Conqueror", became King of England and imposed the Iron Canons of feudal law, *Nulle terre sans seigneur; Nulle seigneur sans terre* (No land without a lord; No lord without land), the traditional policy of Norman dukes. He gave English lands to many of his Norman followers and certain Anglo-Saxons, their heirs, and their successors to hold of the new King and his heirs, an his successors, to help govern the newly transformed Anglo-Saxon kingdom.

Norman and formerly Anglo-Saxon subjects who held lands *immediately* of King William became *tenants-in-chief in right of the Crown;* they were called "lords" and their lands, "manors". If such lands were large enough to be divided into smaller manors tenants-in-chief were called "lords paramount" and their manors were also known as *land baronies* or *Honours*. Subordinate tenants of lords paramount given smaller manors were also called "lords", but as a class they were inferior or *mesne* lords.

In this way, the Feudal Pyramid was constructed from the top downwards. The king was at the apex; his tenants-in-chief beneath him rendered military, spiritual, and certain Honourable personal services called "grand serjeanty" to him. In turn, tenants-in-chief in turn received minor military, administrative, farming, and skilled trade services from other occupants of their lands, the mesne lords, and freemen at the base of the Feudal Pyramid. All of England became a unified structure; its bricks were land and its mortar a tangle of greater and lesser manors and lordships.

When a certain territory was recognized as an Honour and Barony, it retained that identity through *all* its fortunes. When a tenant-in-chief in right of the Crown's Land Barony fell into the king's hands through wardship or forfeiture because of attainder for treason, the estate continued as an Honour or Barony. Important legal meaning attached to a manor that was named an Honour and Barony: they owed exceptional feudal duties and burdens. King George III's Royal Historiographer, Thomas Madox, explained the differences among them:

"Tenure of the King *in Capite ut de Corona*, as of his Crown; and Tenure of the King *in Capite ut de Honoure*, *Baronia*, *Castro*, as of an Honour, Barony, Castle, being in the Kings hands."

When a tenant-in-chief in right of the Crown's Estate came into the king's hands did his *mesne* lord tenant became the king's tenant-in-chief? Was his mesne lord now subject to the duties and burdens incident to chief lordship? No, that would have been unfair and it would have changed the terms of the mesne lord's tenure. So, it became necessary to distinguish between those tenants-in-chief who *always* held immediately of the king *ut de corona* and those who came to hold of the king by reason of their *former lord's* forfeiture to the king by escheat or wardship. These tenants were considered to hold of the king *ut de escaeta* or *ut de Honoure* where the tenant held lands of an Honour that came into the Crown by escheat or wardship or *ut de persona* where the tenant held lands of a lord whose lordship escheated to the Crown.

Law

England's Constitution and the whole of its public law rests squarely upon immutable principles of Feudal Custom and the Common Law. Some authorities on England's Constitution believe it to be "merely an extension of [England's] Property Law. It is a characteristic feature of English law from earliest times that the right of property has been particularly jealous of any attempt to limit it or encroach upon it.

No statute of England, Great Britain, or the United Kingdom extinguished the feudal baronage and peerage, and none bars the use, enjoyment, or any right to the use and enjoyment of any "Title of Honour, *Feodal* or other" formerly used, enjoyed, or claimed by ancient constitutional declaration or prescription." To the contrary, *The Abolition of Tenures Act*, cap. 12, *specifically* preserves them: "Provided also, that neither this act, nor any thing therein contained, shall infringe or hurt any title of honour, *foedal* or other, by which any person hath or *may* have right to sit in the lords house of Parliament, *as to his or their title of honour* or sitting in Parliament, and the privileges belonging to them as peers; this act or any thing therein contained to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. (Emphasis added) and the Law of Property Act, 1925, preserves the existence of manors, lords, and the rights of lordship. Except for statutory rights of political representation, re-creations of some feudal barons as modern parliamentary Barons by Writ,

and the creation of new modern parliamentary Barons by Letters Patent; the immutable principles of feudal custom and the Common Law remain unchanged. *Halsbury's Laws of England* notes that the dignity of peerage "can only be lost by attainder or an Act of Parliament". Attainder was abolished by *The Forfeiture Act, 1870*, and Parliament has extinguished peerages in only two instances. In the fifteenth century, Parliament degraded George Neville, Duke of Bedford, because of his poverty (which rendered him unable to support the dignity of peerage). In this century, *The Titles Deprivation Act*, 1917, deprived three dukes and a viscount of their peerages for bearing arms against the Crown or adhering to its enemy.

In the sixteenth century, King Charles I's attacks on the rights of property owners that evoked their bitter resistance ending in his the execution and the *Inter Regnum.* The hapless king's efforts to exercise to the fullest his rights under feudal law, perhaps legally defensible, resulted in much indignation and brought about the abolition of military and other chivalrous feudal tenures following the monarchy's restoration.

Before the Abolition of Tenure Act, tenancies-in-chief in right of the Crown were at law "lordships of the manor". *They remain so today;* honorable lordships and closest in relationship to the Crown, but they were also subject to more burdensome feudal duties and services than were *mesne* or lesser lords of the manor. Among Parliament's first business following the *Interregnum* and restoration of England's monarchy in 1660, was enactment of 12 Car. II cap 24, the Abolition of Tenures.

The purpose of *The Abolition of Tenures Act* was to do away with the burdens of that feudal relationship which had by then become an irritation to the barons, and a source of friction between them and the Crown. The Act was not intended to destroy ancient dignities annexed to land or extinguish the feudal peerage of manor lords whose status of tenants-in-chief in right of the crown created a special Honourable relationship with the Crown.

The Act abolished all military and chivalrous tenures and the burdensome feudal services that *Magna Carta* 1215 thrust upon them. It cut away the luxuriances that had grown out of England's military tenures while preserving the ancient system's vigour. *The Abolition of Tenures Act* canceled the burden of required attendance at Parliament together with all of the other burdensome feudal obligations of chivalrous tenures, and converted them to *common socage*. However, tenures to which "Any Title of

Honour, *Feodal* or other" was attached or tenures held by *grand serjeanty* were preserved intact:

"XI. Provided also, and be it further enacted, That this act, or any thing herein contained, shall not take away, or be construed to take away… the honorary services of grand serjeantry…."

"XIII. Provided also, that neither this act, nor any thing therein contained, shall infringe or hurt any title of honour, *Feodal* or other, by which any person hath or may have right to sit in the lords house of Parliament, as to his or their title of honour or sitting in Parliament, and the privileges belonging to them as peers; this act or any thing therein contained to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding."

The language of *The Abolition of Tenures Act, 1660*, which reserved "Titles of Honour, *Feodal* [a Barony or an Earldom] or other, by which any Person hath or may have Right to sit in the Lords house of Parliament" was consistent with the language of the *Constitutions of Clarendon* 1164, affirming England's feudal law that baronies subsisted in those who held of the Crown in chief. In later times, antiquarian and constitutional lawyers held that *all* subjects who possessed tenures as tenants-in-chief in right of the Crown before the Abolition of Tenures Act were *Barons by Tenure.* It was accepted doctrine as late as 1799:

"A proprietor holding immediately of the Crown, and having his land either erected or confirmed by the king into a free Barony is the only person, in strict law, denominated a baron… *The baron is such a free lord as hath a lordship* or baronie, whereof he beareth his name." (Emphasis added)

This was also the earlier view of England's great jurist, William Blackstone's view:

"A baron's is the most general and universal title of nobility; for originally every one of the peers of superior rank had also a Barony annexed to his other titles when an ancient baron hath been raised to a new degree of peerage… the original and antiquity of baronies has occasioned great enquiries among English antiquarians. *The most probable opinion seems to be that they were the same with our present lords of manors,* to which the name Court Baron, (which is the lord's court, and incident to every manor)

gives some countenance. All lords of manors, or barons, that held of the king in capite, had seats in the great council." (Emphasis added)

It was also consistent with Blackstone's predecessor, John Selden, antiquarian lawyer and scholar:

"As the use of the word Baron, is to this day such that it denotes, in the most Honourable sense, only the Barons of Parliament, and yet it is variously communicated to some Officers of Courts of ordinary justice, to those of the Cinque Ports, and to the *Lords of Manors*... But in the most Honourable sense, it denoted the King's thanes or Tenants by grand Serjeanty, or knights service in Chief: who were joyned with Earls in those times as afterwards Barons were." (Emphasis added)

None of the *Magna Cartas,* 1215, 1216 and 1217 or any statute from the *Magna Carta,* 1225, England's first statute, or any thereafter, take from feudal peers their ancient right to the dignity and style of Barony and peerage upon which by *summons by tenure* rests. *Magna Carta* declares "No free man shall be deprived of his standing except by the law of the land." The Royal Prerogative, when exercised to create modern parliamentary barons and other peers, is not the law of the land. The Common Law and statutes enacted by the *Crown in Parliament* is the law of the land.

The Act for the Placement of Lords, 1539, refers to "Barons of the Parliament" in several of its sections. If the lawyers who drafted it thought it necessary specifically to identify "Barons of Parliament," they must have known of barons who were not summoned by name to Parliament: the feudal barons who did not receive the individual summons of Magna Carta, 1215.

Writing the Majority Opinion in *Metropolitan Asylum District v Hill*, 6 App Case 193, House of Lords, 1881, Lord Blackburn affirmed that:

"It is clear that the burden is on those who seek to establish that the legislature intended to take away the private rights of individuals to show that by express words or by necessary implication such an intention appears."

Lord Blackburn's statement of the law was strengthened in *Central Control Board (Liquor Traffic) v Cannon Brewery Co Ltd,* App. Case 744, House of Lords, 1919, in which it was the Lords' Majority Opinion that:

"The rule [as to Parliament's] intention to take away the property of a subject without giving him a legal right to compensation for the loss of it is not to be imputed to the legislature unless that intention is expressed in unequivocal terms. Apart from the force of public opinion, one of the protections of subjects' liberties is the rule of construction that statutes and other legislative acts are, so far as it is possible, to be interpreted so as not to cause any interference with his vested constitutional rights."

Nineteenth century historian Maurice Powicke, author of *The Thirteenth Century*, 1216–1307, concurred:

"The idea that statute law was a separate body of written law, not customary… has never implied a superiority which requires no accommodation to the common law."

In *29 State Tr. 1, Rex v Cobbet*, 1804, Lord Ellenborough declared, "The law of England is a law of liberty." Although the liberties of English subjects, and aliens under protection of the Crown, are not expressly defined in any statute they are implications drawn from two well-accepted constitutional principles:

"Subjects, and aliens under protection of the Crown, may say or do what they please provided they do not transgress the substantive law or infringe the legal rights of others; and the Crown may do nothing but what it is authorized to do by some rule of the Common Law or statute."

It is true that the sovereign can do no wrong in the eyes of the law; but it is *not true* that the sovereign can act wrong or sanction the wrong acts of others contrary to the Common Law or statute. If the Royal Prerogative exercised to create titles, rank, places, preeminence, and precedence in one class of persons effects an intended or unintended abrogation of the rights of another class of persons without authority of Common Law or an Act of Parliament such exercise of the Royal Prerogative is *bad law*. *Magna Carta* forbids the sovereign to make any grant or charter that derogates the public or private rights of subjects. *The Crown's Estate Act*, 1322, specifies that:

"The matters to be established for the estate of the king and his heirs, and for the estate of the realm and of the people, should be treated, accorded, and established in Parliament, by the king, and by the assent of the prelates,

earls, and barons, and the commonality of the realm, according as had been before accustomed."

The Bill of Rights Act restrains the sovereign from making any grant or charter in derogation of the Common Law or any statute law; and England's great historian Hallam also noted,

"There is not a single instance from the first dawn of our constitutional history, where a proclamation or order of council, has dictated any change, however trifling, in the code of private rights."

Nine years after *The Abolition of Tenures Act,* Charles II's Privy Council over-reached its constitutional authority and "discontinued" Barony by Tenure. At Common Law English monarchs had power to legislate by *Order in Council* (a relic of the time when legislation was part of the Royal Prerogative). The seventeenth century attempt to exercise that power was limited to legislating for newly ceded or conquered territories. Moreover, *The Habeas Corpus Act*, 1640, made it law "That neither His Majesty, nor his Privy Council, have or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power or Authority…to examine or draw into Question, determine or dispose of the lands, tenements, Hereditaments…of any the Subjects of this Kingdom."

It is now well-settled law that a *Sovereign's Proclamation* may not enact any new law, or contradict any old law, or extinguish or restrict a subject's rights in matters about which the law is otherwise silent. With few exceptions, Titles of Honour are not a matter of statutes; mostly they have their origin in the Royal Prerogative or in ancient constitutional declarations and prescriptive usages with which the Crown may not interfere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This monograph is by no means a complete statement of all the works and sources available about *English Manors & Lordships: History and Law.* The bibliographic resources cited here are merely general starting points for persons who wish to study further the complex history and law of England's Property Law, Land Tenures, Manors, and Lordships.

Statutes

Statutes of the Realm. Statutes of the period 1235-1989, with the exception of the years 1642-60.

Public Documents & Archives

United Kingdom. House of Lords. [Report from the Lords] *Committee on the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm etc. [and appendices I-IV]*. London: 1826.

———. *The London Gazette (Extraordinary)*. Number 39566. "Royal Proclamation", page 3165. Friday, 6 June 1952. London: HMSO.

———. Statutory Instruments. 1959 No. 1399. *Manorial Incidents and Records*. The Manorial Documents Rules, 1959.

———. Statutory Instruments. 1963 No. 976. *Manorial Incidents and Records*. The Manorial Documents (Amendment) Rules, 1963.

———. Statutory Instruments. 1967 No. 963. *Manorial Incidents and Records*. The Manorial Documents (Amendment) Rules, 1967.

Books

Adlington, John Henry, Esq. ed. *Cyclopædia of Law or the Correct British Lawyer*. London: J. M'Gowan, 1820.

Anglo-Saxon Charters. A. J. Robertson, ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, The. gen. eds., David Dumville and Simon Keynes. Cambridge: Biblio Distribution Services, 1983.

Anson, Sir William E., Bt. *The Law and Custom of the Constitution*. 5th ed. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.

Bagehot, Walter. *The English Constitution*. 2d ed. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1925.

Blackstone, Sir William. *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. 1st ed. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1765.

Briggs, Asa. *A Social History of England.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1983.

Brodrick, George C. *English Land and Landlords.* London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., 1881.

Burke, John, Esq., ed. *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies of England, Ireland, and Scotland*. 2d ed. London & Baltimore: Burke's Peerage/Genealogical Publishing Co., 1841.

Burke, Sir Bernard, ed. *A Genealogical History of the Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire*. 2d ed. London and Baltimore: Burke's Peerage/Genealogical Publishing Co., 1883.

Clinch, George. *Handbook of English Antiquities*. London: L. Upcott Gill, 1905.

Coke, Edward Sir. *The First Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England*. London: E. Nutt and R. Gosling, 1738.

———. *The Second Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England*. London: Printed for E. and R. Brooke, 1797.

———. *The Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England*. London: Printed for W. Clarke and sons, 1817.

———. *The Fourth Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England.* London: Printed for E. and R. Brooke, 1797.

Cruise, William. *A treatise on the origin and nature of dignities, or titles of Honour etc*. London: Printed by A. Strahan for J. Butterworth and Son, 1823.

Domesday Book. John Morris, gen. ed. 35 vols. Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore & Co. Ltd., 1983.

Dugdale, William, Sir. *The Baronage of England etc*. London: T. Newcomb, 1675-76.

Fosbroke, Thomas Dudley. *Lives of the Berkeleys*. London J. Nichols and Son, 1821.

Fox-Davies, Arthur Charles. *A Complete Guide to Heraldry*. New York: Dodge Publishing Co., 1909.

Guillim, John. *A Display of Heraldrie*. 4th ed. London: Jacob Blome, 1660.

———. *A Display of Heraldry*. 6th ed. London: R. & J. Bonwicke and R. Wilkin, and J. Walthoe and Thomas Ward, 1724.

Hallam, Henry. *The Constitutional History of England*. 2d ed. 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1834.

Halsbury's The Laws of England. 3d ed. ed. Lord Simonds. Vols. 5, 7, 8, 18, 29, and 32. London: Butterworth & Co. (Publishers) Ltd., 1952.

Hazlitt, W. Carew. *Tenures of Land and Customs of Manors: Originally collected by Thomas Blount and republished with Large Additions and Improvements by the Beckwiths in 1784 & 1815*. London: Reeves and Turner, 1874.

Hector, L. C. *The Handwriting of English Documents*. 2d ed. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd, 1966

Holt, J. C. *Magna Carta*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

Hone, Nathaniel J. *The Manor and Manorial Records*. London: Methuen & Co., 1906.

Jessel, Christopher. *The Law of the Manor*. Chichester: Barry Rose Law, Publishers Ltd, 1998.

Jolliffe, J. E. A. *The Constitutional History of Medieval England*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1961.

Knightly, Charles. *The Customs and Ceremonies of Britain*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1986

Littleton's Tenures, Eugene Wambaugh, ed.. Washington, D.C.: John Byrne & Company, 1903.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Lord. *The History of England*. 8 vols. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans & Roberts, 1858.

Maitland, Frederic William. *Domesday Book and Beyond*. Cambridge: University Press, 1897.

———. *The Constitutional History of England*. Lectures at Michaelmas term 1887 and Lent term 1888. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.

Megarry, Sir Robert and Wade, H. W. R. *The Law of Real Property*. 5th ed. London: Syevens & Sons Limited, 1984.

Milsom, S. F. C. *The Legal Framework of English Feudalism*. Maitland lectures 1972. Cambridge: University Press, 1976.

Osborne, Elizabeth. *The History of Essex From the Earliest Period to the Present time*. Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Browne: 1814.

Oxford English Dictionary. 2d ed. Edmund Weiner and John Simpson, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Pike, Luke Owen. *A Constitutional History of the House of Lords*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1894.

Pine, L. G. *The Story of Titles*. Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1969.

———. *Written and Spoken Guide to Titles and Forms of Address*. Kingswood, Surrey: Elliot's Right Way Books, n.d.

Pollock, Sir Frederick, Bt. and Maitland, Frederic William. *The History of English Law*. 2d ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1898.

Poole, Austin Lane. *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087–1216*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Radcliffe, G. R. Y. and Cross, Geoffrey. *The English Legal System*. London: Butterworth & Co. Ltd., 1937.

Scargill-Bird, S. R. *A Guide to the Public Record Office*. 3d ed., London: HMSO, 1908.

Scriven, John, Esq. *A Treatise on Copyhold, Customary Freehold, and Ancient Demesne Tenure*. 3d ed. vols 1 and 2. London: Henry Butterworth, 1833.

Selden, John, Esq. *Titles of Honour*. 3d ed. London: Thomas Baffet, 1672.

Sources of English Constitutional History. Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham, eds. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1937.

Stenton, F. M. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947.

Strutt, Joseph. *Manners, Customs, Arms, Habits Etc of the Inhabitants of England*. 2 vols. London: John Thane, 1724.

Stubbs, William. *Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

———. *The Constitutional History of England*. Library ed. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.

Taylor, Arthur. *The Glory of Regality etc*. London: Printed by and for R. and A. Taylor; sold by Messrs. Payne and Foss (and others), 1820.

Townsend, Peter, ed. *Burke's Peerage & Baronetage*, 105th ed. 4th impression. London: Burke's Peerage (Genealogical Books) Ltd., 1980.

Wollaston, G. Woods. *Coronation Claims*, 2nd ed. London: Harrison and Sons, 1910.

Woodward, John. *A Treatise on Ecclesiastical Heraldry*. London: H. & A. K. Johnston, 1894.

———. *A Treatise on Heraldry British and Foreign*. 2 vols. London: W. & A. K. Johnston, 1896.

Wright, Thomas. *The History and Topography of Essex etc*. London: G. Virtue, 1836.
1836.