ENGLAND AND NORMANDY, 1204-1259

by

Wendy B. Stevenson

Volume II

Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. in the

University of Leeds

1974

Appendix I : A Provisional List of the English Possessions (by counties) of Norman Sees and Abbeys in 1204[1]

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Almenèches	Sussex	C.D.F., no.695.
Ardennes	Not known	Calvados, Série H,I, no.H.218.
Aumale	Lincolnshire Yorkshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1020.
Aunay-sur-Odon	Lincolnshire Northamptonshire Oxfordshire	C.D.F., nos.525,534.
Barbery	Not known	G.C.XI, Instrumenta, col.88, no.xxiii.
Bayeux cathedral	Cambridgeshire Surrey	D.B. I., f.196. Ibid., I, f.31.
Beaubec	Norfolk or Suffolk	Rec.Henri II, I, no.CLXVIII.
Beaulieu	Kent	Mon.Ang., VI, 1012.

(1) See page 28 above.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Bec-Hellouin	Berkshire, Devonshire, Dorset, Essex, Hampshire, Lincolnshire, Middlesex, Norfolk, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire, Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex, Warwickshire, Wiltshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1068, nos.III-IV.(1)
	Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Rutland	Mon.Ang., III, 463.(1)
	Monmouthshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1021.(1)
	Kent	C.D.F., no.357.
	Somerset	Ibid., no.389.

(1) Many of the places mentioned in Mon.Ang. were identified with the help of M.M. Morgan, The English Lands of the Abbey of Bec, Appendix: Property in the Bailiwick of Ogbourne, pp.138-50.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Bellencombre	Sussex	Mon.Ang., VI, 1113.
Bernay	Essex Lincolnshire Northamptonshire (1) Suffolk Worcestershire	R.R.A-N(2), no.1436 and C.D.F., no.413.
	Norfolk (2)	Mon.Ang., III, 405.
Blanchelande	Lincolnshire	C.D.F., nos.866,868
Les Blanches	Not known	G.C.XI, Instrumenta, col.109, no.VI.
Bocherville, Saint-Georges-de-	Gloucestershire Rutland Wiltshire	C.D.F. no.196.
Caen, La Trinité	Derbyshire	Ibid., no.439.
	Devonshire	D.B., I, f.104.
	Dorset Essex Gloucestershire	C.D.F., no.422.
	Norfolk Wiltshire	Ibid., no.427.

(1) In C.D.F., no.413. "Ebredona" has been identified as "? Eversden, Cambridge" but the place concerned is, in fact, Everdon, Northamptonshire. (Mon.Ang. VI, 1051).

(2) Places mentioned in Mon.Ang., III, 405 have been identified from the entry from the Valor Ecclesiasticus, temp. Henry VIII in Mon.Ang., III, 410.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Caen, Saint-Etienne	Berkshire Cambridgeshire Devonshire Dorset Essex London Norfolk Suffolk	Ibid., no.452.
	Somerset	Mon.Ang., VI, 1070.
	Wiltshire	C.D.F., no.459.
Cérisy-la-Forêt	Hampshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1013.
Chaise-Dieu	Warwickshire	C.D.F., no.1062.
Cherbourg, Notre-Dame-du-Voeu	Devonshire Lincolnshire	G.C.XI, Instrumenta, col.229, no.III. Manche, Série H,I (2e partie) nos.H.1974, H.2301.
Conches	Gloucestershire Herefordshire Worcestershire	C.D.F., no.416.
	Norfolk	Mon.Ang., III, 635.
	Sussex	Rec.Henri II, I, 550.
	Warwickshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 994.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Cormeilles	Gloucestershire Hampshire Herefordshire Monmouthshire Worcestershire	Ibid., VI, 1076.
	Wiltshire(1)	Rec.Henri II, II, no.DLXIX.
Coutances cathedral	Dorset	C.D.F., no.958.
Croix-Saint-Leufroi	Surrey	D.B., I, f.34.
Eu, Notre Dame	Not known	C.D.F., no.1419.
Evreux cathedral	Suffolk	Ibid., nos.285,288,295.
Evreux, Saint-Sauveur	Not known	G.C.XI, Instrumenta, col.135, no.VIII.
Evreux, Saint-Taurin	Glamorganshire Worcestershire	C.D.F., no.316.
Falaise, Saint Jean de	Not known	Ibid., no.609.
Fécamp	Kent Lincolnshire Middlesex(2) Oxfordshire Sussex(3) Wiltshire	Ibid., pp.37-53.

(1) Exchanged for a church in Normandy before 1204. (Rec.Henri II, II, no.DLXIX).

(2) See C.D.F. no.124 for details of an exchange before 1204.

(3) See C.D.F. no.115 for details of an exchange before 1204.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Fontenay	Gloucestershire[1]	Mon.Ang., VI, 1048.
	Lincolnshire	G.C.XI, Instrumenta, col.98, no.XXXIX[2].
	Norfolk	
	Wiltshire	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.67 b[3].
Foucarmont	Not known	C.D.F., no.186.
Gaille-Fontaine	Oxfordshire	Mon.Ang.,VI, 1088[4].
Grestain	Buckinghamshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1090.
	Cambridgeshire	
	Cornwall	
	Dorset	
	Hertfordshire	
	London	
	Northamptonshire	
	Suffolk	
	Sussex	

(1) No date of acquisition is given by Mon.Ang., VI, 1048. However, as Brimpsfield, Gloucestershire was Fontenay's main property in England, and her other English properties were received before 1204, presumably Brimpsfield was also received before that date.

(2) This is a charter of "Robertus filius Erneisi" in 1217 but the relevant section is a confirmation of a gift from his father. Presumably this gift was made before 1204 as the lands of "Robertus filius Erneisi" are terrae Normannorum after 1204. (R.N., p.128: 1204; B. of F., p.169: 1212, p.388: 1226-8, pp.615 and 619: 1237). "Welles" and "Warham" can be identified as Welles next the Sea and Warham, Norfolk, through B. of F., p.388 and "Hammgebi" as Hemingby, Lincolnshire, through B. of F., p.169. It has not been possible to identify "Hasfoiff".

(3) Although this entry is dated 23rd March 1206, it apparently relates to the 1204 seizure. See also B. of F., p.743.

(4) "Mapeltreham" has been identified as Mapledurham Gurney, Oxfordshire, as the Gornay family held lands in this county (See the index to the B. of F.) It has not been possible to identify "Brokedale".

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
	Hampshire	D.B. I., f.43 b.
	Wiltshire	Ibid., I, f.68 b.
	Somerset	R.N., p.126.
Hambye	Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Yorkshire	C.D.F., no.917 (1).
L'Isle Dieu	Kent	B. of F., p.1345 (2).
	Wiltshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1054 (3).
Ivry	Norfolk	Ibid., VI, 1057 (4).
	Oxfordshire	Ibid., VI, 1052 (5).

(1) The place-names given in C.D.F. have been identified by comparison with a transcript in E.Y.C., VI, 95.

(2) Although this entry is under the year 1227, it reveals that "Canonici de Insula Dei tenent ecclesiam de Upcheriche per Regem Ricardum".

(3) "Charletone" was wrongly identified as Charlton Marshall, Dorset, in Rec.Henri II, II, no. DCLXXI.

(4) Mon.Ang., VI, 1057 does not give the date of acquisition but it was prior to 1204 according to J. Nichols, Some Account of the Alien Priories, and of such lands as they are known to have possessed in England and Wales (London, 1799), I, 71.

(5) Mon.Ang., VI, 1052, merely gives the date of acquisition as "before 8 John" but according to C.R.R., IV, 260, Minster Lovell belonged to Ivry in the time of Walter of Coutances, bishop of Lincoln (1183-4).

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Jumièges	Hampshire Wiltshire	C.D.F., no.154.
	Somerset	Ibid., no.161.
Lessay	Lincolnshire London Sussex	Ibid., nos.921-3,928.
Lisieux cathedral	Sussex	R.B., II, 600,696.
Longueville, Sainte-Foi	Bedfordshire Berkshire Buckinghamshire Cambridgeshire Norfolk Oxfordshire	C.D.F., nos.219,225.
Lonlay	Kent	Mon.Ang., IV, 672.
	Somerset	Ibid., VI, 1012.
La Luzerne	Sussex	C.D.F., no.776.
Lyre	Berkshire Cheshire Dorset Gloucestershire Hampshire Herefordshire Leicestershire Monmouthshire Wiltshire Worcestershire	Rec.Henri II, I, no.LXV.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Montebourg	Berkshire Devonshire Dorset Hampshire	C.D.F., nos.876,879.
	Somerset	D.B., I., f.91.
Montivilliers	Dorset	R.N., p.124.
Mont-Saint-Michel	Berkshire Cambridgeshire Cornwall Devonshire Hampshire Somerset Yorkshire	C.D.F., pp.249-80, passim.
Mortain	Dorset	R.R.A-N(1), no.204.
	Lincolnshire(1)	R.R.A-N(2), no.680.
	Sussex(2)	C.D.F., no.1205.
	Wiltshire(3)	Manche, Série A, no.A.696.

(1) According to D.Matthew, The Norman Monasteries and their English Possessions, p.54, Mortain lost its interests in Lincolnshire before 1204.

(2) "Wideham" is probably Withyham, Sussex (See D. Matthew, op.cit., p.52).

(3) The "manoir de Languefort en Angleterre" can be identified as being Hanging Langford, Wiltshire, by reference to B. of F., p.742 and Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.77.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Noyon, Saint-Martin	Berkshire, Hampshire, Oxfordshire	R.R.A-N(2), no.1338
Plessis-Grimoult	Dorset	C.D.F., no.565.
Pont-Audemer	Dorset	Ibid., nos.240,243,248.
Préaux, Saint-Léger	Dorset	R.N., p.123.
	Wiltshire	P.R. 8 John, p.189(1).
Préaux, Saint-Pierre	Berkshire, Dorset, Hampshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Norfolk, Oxfordshire, Warwickshire	C.D.F., nos.318,326,334.
Rouen cathedral	Devon	Ibid., no.1.
	Hampshire	Ibid., nos.5,22-3.
	Nottinghamshire	Ibid., no.61.
	Yorkshire	Ibid., no.15.

(1) This Pipe Roll entry relates to the 1204 seizure.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Rouen, Saint-Amand	Sussex	Ibid., no.89[1].
Rouen, La Trinité	Middlesex	Ibid., no.77.
	Nottinghamshire	Mon.Ang., IV, 620,623.
Rouen, Saint-Ouen	Essex	C.D.F., no.104.
Sainte-Barbe-en-Auge	Gloucestershire Lincolnshire	Ibid., no.568.
Saint-Evroul	Bedfordshire Berkshire Buckinghamshire Cheshire Gloucestershire Hampshire Hertfordshire Leicestershire Lincolnshire Northamptonshire Norfolk Oxfordshire Warwickshire Wiltshire Worcestershire	Ibid., nos.625,628,632,636,645,648,653.

(1) C.D.F. does not give the date of acquisition but according to D. Matthew, op.cit., p.7, it was "before the mid-twelfth century".

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Saint-Fromond	Lincolnshire	Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.36.(1)
Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive	Berkshire	D.B., I, f.59 b.
	Devonshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1042.
	Derbyshire Leicestershire Staffordshire Warwickshire	C.D.F., nos.578,580,583.
Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte	Hampshire Somerset	Ibid., nos.979-80.
Saint-Sever	Derbyshire Dorset Leicestershire Lincolnshire Hampshire Norfolk Oxfordshire Somerset Suffolk Wiltshire	Ibid., no.615.
Saint-Victor-en-Caux	Hampshire Wiltshire	D.B., I, f.46 b. Mon.Ang., VI, 1054.

(1) The exchange of Saint-Fromond's English possessions for Merton's Norman property to which this entry relates, never in fact took place (D. Matthew, op.cit., p.99).

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Saint-Wandrille	Dorset Northamptonshire Wiltshire	Ibid., VI, 1108.
	Cambridgeshire	D.B., I, f.193.
	Surrey	Ibid., I, f.34.
	Yorkshire	C.D.F., no.178.
Savigny	Essex	Ibid., no.807.
	Hampshire	Ibid., no.842.
	Lincolnshire	Ibid., no.846.
	Norfolk	Ibid., no.801.
	Northamptonshire	Ibid., no.806.
	Staffordshire	Ibid., no.822.
	Yorkshire	Ibid., no.805.
	Rutland	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.60 b(1).
Séez cathedral	Oxfordshire	R.R.A-N(2), no.1711.
Séez, Saint-Martin	Cambridgeshire	C.D.F., no.656.
	Devonshire	Ibid., no.661.
	Hertfordshire	Ibid., no.656.
	Lancashire	Ibid., no.664.
	Lincolnshire	Ibid., no.663.
	Northamptonshire	Ibid., no.656.
	Pembrokeshire	Ibid., no.666.
	Suffolk	Ibid., no.677.
	Sussex	Ibid., no.656.
	Yorkshire	Ibid., no.667.

(1) Although this entry is dated in December, 1205, it relates to the 1204 seizure.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Tréport, Le	Sussex	Ibid., nos.230,233-4.
Troarn	Devonshire, Dorset, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Sussex	Ibid., no.470.
	Kent	Rec.Henri II, I, no.LXV.
	Lincolnshire	R.R.A-N(2), no.1088 a.
Notre-Dame-du-Val	Cornwall	Mon.Ang., VI, 1045(1).
	Devonshire	C.D.F., no.1455.
Valmont	Berkshire, Hampshire	Mon.Ang., VI, 1044.
	Norfolk	Rec.Henri II, II, no.DCXXVI.

(1) Although Mon.Ang., VI, 1045 does not give the date of acquisition.

Abbey, see etc.	County	Reference
Avranches cathedral	Hampshire	B. of F., p.705; Cl.R. 1231-4, p.186; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.140.
Rouen, Saint-Lô	Hampshire	C.R.R., XIII, nos.1036,1225,1427,1854, 2599; Ibid., XIV, nos.138,793,1318,1828.
	Lincolnshire	C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.248.

Appendix II

Norman sees and abbeys whose English possessions are known to have been seized in 1204

Norman abbey, see etc.	Sample Reference
Beaulieu	Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.374.
Bec-Hellouin	Ibid., p.314.
Bocherville, Saint-Georges-de-	P.R. 9 John, p.204.
Caen, La Trinité	R.N., p.125.
Caen, Saint Etienne	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.10 b.
Coutances cathedral	Ibid., 1204-24, p.47 b.
Fécamp	Ibid., 1204-24, p.9 b.
Fontenay	Ibid., 1204-24, p.67 b.
Grestain	Ibid., 1204-24, p.16.
Lisieux cathedral	Ibid., 1204-24, p.62 b.
Lyre	Ibid., 1204-24, p.54.
Montebourg	Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.313.
Montivilliers	R.N., p.124.
Mont-Saint-Michel	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.127 b.
Mortain	R.N., p.125.
Préaux, Saint-Léger	Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.339.
Préaux, Saint-Pierre	R.N., p.122.
Rouen cathedral	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.68.
Rouen, La Trinité	Ibid., 1204-24, p.66.
Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive	C.R.R., VI, 85-6.
Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.77.
Saint-Wandrille	Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.400.
Savigny	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.60 b.
Séez cathedral	Ibid., 1204-24, p.23.
Troarn	P.R. 6 John, p.150.

Appendix III

Norman Priories in England and Wales, 1204-1259[1]

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
83	Appuldurcombe	Hampshire (I.O.W)	Montebourg	
83	Arundel	Sussex	Saint-Martin, Séez	Cl.R. 1227-31, p.403.
83	Astley	Worcestershire	Saint-Taurin, Evreux	Ibid., 1256-9, p.257.
83	Atherington	Sussex	Saint-Martin, Séez	
83	Avebury	Wiltshire	Saint-Georges-de-Bocherville	Ibid., 1247-51, p.135.
83	Axmouth	Devonshire	Montebourg	
181	Beckford	Gloucestershire	Sainte-Barbe-en-Auge	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.113.
52	Blyth (c)	Nottinghamshire	La Trinité, Rouen	Cl.R. 1227-31, p.12.
83	Bonby	Lincolnshire	Saint-Fromond	
52	Boxgrove (c)	Sussex	Lessay	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.37.

(1) See pp.95-6 above.

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
83	Brimpsfield	Gloucestershire	Fontenay[1]	C.R.R., XIV, no.2283.
83	Burstall	Yorkshire	Aumale	Mon.Ang., VI, 1020, no.iii.
184	Cammeringham	Lincolnshire	Blanchelande	
83	Carisbrooke	Hampshire(I.O.W)	Lyre	P.R. 7 John, p.130.
83	Charley	Leicestershire	Saint-Evroul	
184	Charlton	Wiltshire	L'Isle-Dieu	
83	Charlton on Otmoor	Oxfordshire	Saint-Evroul	
53	Chepstow	Monmouthshire	Cormeilles	
83	Clatford	Wiltshire	Saint-Victor-en-Caux	B. of F., pp.563,1132,1140.
83	Cogges	Oxfordshire	Fécamp	Rot.Lit.Cl., 1204-24, p.111 b
53	Cowick (c)	Devonshire	Bec-Hellouin	C.R.R., XII, no.143.
83	Creeting St Mary	Suffolk	Bernay	

(1) According to D. Knowles and R.N. Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses : England and Wales (London, 2nd ed. 1971), p.83 and V.C.H., Gloucestershire, II, 102, Brimpsfield was a priory of Saint-Wandrille. However, see also Beaunier, op.cit., VII, 129, 52; Episcopal Registers, Diocese of Worcester : Register of Bishop Godfrey Giffard (1268-1301), ed. J.W. Willis Bund (Worcestershire Historical Society, 1902), II, 357,365,368; C.R.R., XIV, no.2283.

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
83	Creeting St Olave	Suffolk	Grestain	
83	Docking	Norfolk	Ivry	
83	Dunwich	Suffolk	Bernay	
83	Ecclesfield	Yorkshire	Saint-Wandrille	
83	Edith Weston	Rutland	Saint-Georges-de-Bocherville	C.R.R., IV, 268 (monks).
83	Ellingham	Hampshire	Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.77 (monk).
83	Everdon	Northamptonshire	Bernay	
54	Eye (c)	Suffolk	Bernay	P.R. 12 John, p.31.
129	Field Dalling	Norfolk	Savigny	
54	Folkestone (c)	Kent	Lonlay	C.P.L., I, 17.
83	Frampton (c)	Dorset	Saint-Etienne, Caen	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.10 b.
54	Goldcliff (c)	Monmouthshire	Bec-Hellouin	P.R. 13 John, p.174.
129	Great Limber	Lincolnshire	Aunay-sur-Odon	
97	Great Witchingham	Norfolk	Longueville	
83	Harmondsworth	Middlesex	La Trinité, Rouen	Ibid., 14 John, p.25.

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
83	Haugham	Lincolnshire	Saint-Sever	Rot.Hugonis de Welles, III, 158.
83	Hayling	Hampshire	Jumièges	Cl.R. 1247-51, p.24.
83	Hinckley	Leicestershire	Lyre	P.R.11 John, p.26.
54	Horsham St Faith (c)	Norfolk	Conches	C.P.R. 1232-47, p.270.
84	Horsley	Gloucestershire	Troarn	C.R.R., VII, 161.
84	Horstead	Norfolk	La Trinité, Caen	
181	Hough	Lincolnshire	Notre-Dame-du-Voeu, Cherbourg	Cl.R. 1242-7, p.167.
84	Lancaster (c)	Lancashire	Saint-Martin, Séez	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.206.
84	Livers Ocle	Herefordshire	Lyre	
84	Llangennith	Glamorganshire	Saint-Taurin, Evreux	Gir.Camb.op., IV, 33.
84	Llangua	Monmouthshire	Lyre	Cl.R. 1242-7, p.420.
84	Loders	Dorset	Montebourg	P.R. 8 John, p.133.
129	Long Bennington	Lincolnshire	Savigny	Rot.Hugonis de Welles, III, 188-9 (monk).
254	Lyminster	Sussex	Almenèches	P.R. 13 John, p.126, note 3 (nuns).

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
84	Minster Lovell	Oxfordshire	Ivry	C.R.R., IV, 305.
84	Modbury	Devonshire	Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive	
84	Monkland	Herefordshire	Conches	B. of F., p.569, bis.
84	Monk Sherborne	Hampshire	Cérisy-la-Forêt	C.R.R., X, 106.
84	Newent	Gloucestershire	Cormeilles	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.344.
97	Newton Longville	Buckinghamshire	Sainte-Foi, Longueville	Cl.R. 1227-31, p.268.
84	Ogbourne St George	Wiltshire	Bec-Hellouin	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.111 b.
84	Otterton	Devonshire	Mont-Saint-Michel	Ibid., 1204-24, p.412 b.
84	Panfield	Essex	Saint-Etienne, Caen	P.R. 7 John, p.190.
181	Patrixbourne	Kent	Beaulieu	Ibid., 9 John, p.36.
56	Pembroke (c)	Pembrokeshire	Saint-Martin, Séez	Cl.R. 1242-7, p.426.
84	Ruislip	Middlesex	Bec-Hellouin	C.P.R., 1232-47, p.69.
84	Runcton	Sussex	Troarn	Two Cart., nos.352,344.
84	St. Michael's Mount (c)	Cornwall	Mont-Saint-Michel	C.L.R., 1245-51, p.299, (canons).

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
56	St Neots (c)	Huntingdonshire	Bec-Hellouin	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.69 b.
84	Sheffield	Berkshire	Saint Martin, Noyon	
85	Sidmouth	Devonshire	Mont-Saint-Michel	
85	Spettisbury	Dorset	Saint Pierre, Préaux	
85	Standon	Hertfordshire	Bec-Hellouin	
85	Steventon	Berkshire	Bec-Hellouin	P.R. 13 John, p.63.
85	Steyning	Sussex	Fécamp(1)	
85	Stogursey	Somerset	Lonlay	Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.190 b.
85	Stoke by Clare (c)	Suffolk	Bec-Hellouin	Pat.R. 1216-25, p.363.
85	Stratfield Saye	Berkshire	Valmont	Rigaud, p.110 (monk)(2).
85	Toft Monks	Norfolk	Saint-Pierre, Préaux	?(3)

(1) See D. Knowles and R.N. Hadcock, op.cit., p.92.

(2) Rigaud states, on a visit to Valmont in 1251, that "in Anglia moratur unus solus monachus, et in uno alio prioratu, unus solus similiter" (Rigaud, p.110). Stratfield Saye was the only English priory of Valmont.

(3) There was a prior in 1200 and again at the beginning of Edward I's reign (V.C.H., Norfolk II, 464), so presumably there was a prior in the intervening period.

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
85	Tooting Bec	Surrey	Bec-Hellouin	C.P.L., I, 271.
181	Tregoney	Cornwall	Notre-Dame-du-Val	B. of F., pp.568,573.
57	Tutbury (c)	Staffordshire	Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive	Cl.R., 1227-31, p.386.
85	Upavon	Wiltshire	Saint-Wandrille	
85	Ware	Hertfordshire	Saint-Evroul	P.R. 11 John, p.395.
85	Wareham	Dorset	Lyre	Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.197.
85	Warminghurst	Sussex	Fécamp	
85	Warmington	Warwickshire	Saint-Pierre, Préaux	C.R.R., IV, 226.
85	Well Hall	Norfolk	Saint-Etienne, Caen	?(1)
85	West Mersea	Essex	Saint-Ouen, Rouen	Cl.R. 1247-51, p.128.
85	Wilmington	Sussex	Grestain	V.C.H., Sussex, II, 123.
85	Wilsford	Lincolnshire	Bec-Hellouin	Cl.R. 1234-7, p.165.
86	Winghale	Lincolnshire	Saint-Martin, Séez	Rot.Hugonis de Welles, III, 132-3.

(1) According to V.C.H., Norfolk, II, 465 "Herbert and Ralph occur as priors of this cell at the beginning of the thirteenth century. In 1275 the prior was found to hold the manor of Welle in free alms". No references are cited in support of the first statement.

Page no. in Knowles and Hadcock	Priory	County	Mother House	Reference
86	Withernsea	Yorkshire	Aumale	Pedes Fin.Ebor., p.159.
86	Withyham	Sussex	Mortain	
86	Wolston	Warwickshire	Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive	
86	Wootton Wawen	Warwickshire	Conches	Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.150.
86	Yenston	Somerset	Saint-Sever	

Appendix IV

-A-

APPENDIX IV[1]

Contents

Section A : Tenants who chose the Norman allegiance after 1204 and lost their English property.

(1) Roger de Amundeville

Roger seems to have held lands in Worcestershire, England, as well as in Normandy, for the lands of a Roger de Amundevill' are listed under this county in the "Rotulus de valore terrarum Normannorum" of 1204[2].

---

(1) See above, pp. 202-206.

(2) R.N., p.122 bis. See also Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.5 b, 94.

-A-

(2) Rogerus Bacon

According to Loyd, the Roger who held half a fee of Campigny in 1172, was Roger, lord of Le Molay[1]. Roger was succeeded by his son William at some time between 1180 and 1198[2]. In 1204 William chose the Norman allegiance[3] and lost his English lands in the counties of Essex and Devon[4].

(3) Robertus Bertram

By 1204, Robert had been succeeded by his son Robert who was a minor. As Powicke has noted, "this caused some confusion in 1204, for whereas Philip Augustus seized Robert's lands on the grounds that he was in England with John, John seized his English lands on the grounds that Robert of Thibouville, who held the heir, had deserted. In 1207, however, it is clear from judgements of the Norman Exchequer that Philip was respecting the boy's rights"[5]. In England, on the other hand, Robert's lands continue to be treated as terrae Normannorum[6].

(4) Robertus de Bonesboz

In 1204, Robert apparently chose the Norman allegiance for after this date his English lands are consistently described as terrae Normannorum[7].

---

(1) L.C. Loyd. The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, ed. C.T. Clay and D.C. Douglas (Harleian Society, 1951), p.11.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, lxxix and Rec.de Jugements, no.117.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 684e and Rec.de Jugements, no.117.

(4) R.N., p.127; B.of F., pp.121,612,615.

(5) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.333.

(6) e.g. B.of F., pp.224,227,280,389,619; Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 288.

(7) Rot.Chart.1199-1216, p.142; Pat.R. 1225-32, p.318; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.109.

(5) Thomas de Colunces

By 1204, Thomas had been succeeded by Hugh who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands[1].

(6) Willelmus Curseio

By 1204, William had been succeeded by Robert of Courci who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands[2].

(7) Willelmus de Ferraria

William de Ferrières, or his successor of the same name, continued to hold lands in Normandy after 1204[3]. It seems that he had also held lands in England before the loss of Normandy, for on 5th September, 1204, the king instructed the sheriff of Southampton, "quod... facias habere Henrico Hose terram de Idesword' cum pertinentiis quae fuit Willelmi de Ferraria..."[4]. Moreover, Idsworth is subsequently described in the Book of Fees as terrae Normannorum[5].

(8) John of Gisors

In 1237, John of Gisors is described in the Book of Fees as "extraneus"[6]. The use of this word rather than the word "Normannus" reflects the fact that John had chosen the French allegiance well before 1204. As Powicke records,

---

(1) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.30.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.337.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 716 g.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.7 b.

(5) B.of F., pp.257,700,1155,1416.

(6) Ibid., p.618.

he "held an extensive honour in the French and Norman Vexin near Gisors. After the loss of the Vexin, or rather the valley of the Epte, in Richard's reign, John's Norman lands escheated, so far as they were in the duke's power. His Sussex lands ultimately went to Hugh of Gournai"[1]. After 1204, John recovered his Norman lands from Philip Augustus[2].

(9) Gaufridus de Mauquenci

By 1204, Geoffrey had been succeeded by Gerard[3], who adhered to Philip Augustus and lost his English property at Stoke Bruern and Shutlanger, Northamptonshire[4].

(10) Walterus de Meduana

Walter of Mayenne's chief interests were in Maine where he was lord of Mayenne[5]. By 1204, he had been succeeded by Juhel, who adhered to Philip Augustus[6] and lost his English lands[7].

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.340.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 630 a.

(3) Cf. ibid., XXIII, 696 b,613 a,707 g.

(4) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.56. Gerard was apparently a minor at the time of the conquest - see Rec.des hist., XXIII, 696 b,707 g.

(5) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., pp.62-3.

(6) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 683 b,684 k,719 b.

(7) e.g. B.of F., pp.86,97,612.

-A-

(11) William of Roumare

In this case there is nothing to add to Powicke's findings. He says: "In 1172 William of Roumare owed the service of fourteen knights for his various fiefs in the Roumois.... William died before 1198. His heir is mentioned on the exchequer roll for 1203, and the Feoda Normanniae, after the Conquest, repeats the statement of service without comment. It would appear, therefore, that no change resulted from the loss of Normandy. The family, however, does not seem to have survived. The English lands of William of Roumare remained in the custody of the crown"(1).

(12) Jordanus Taisson

By 1204, Jordan had been succeeded by his son, Ralph Tesson, who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands(2).

(13) Camerarius de Tankervill

The lord of Tancarville in 1204 seems to have been Ralph(3), although by 1205 he had been succeeded by William(4). Ralph chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands(5).

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.350-51.

(2) Ibid., pp.352-3.

(3) Pat.R. 1225-32, p.28; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.86.

(4) C.N., nos.124-5.

(5) e.g. R.N., p.142.

-A-

The Close Rolls record that on 7th December, 1252, "Mandatum est Ricardo de Grey quod caute et diligenter loquatur cum heredibus de Tankarvill' de terris et possessionibus quas predecessores sui habuerunt in Anglia et maxime de villa de Staunford' et aliis terris, in quibus se dicunt habere jus regium, pro certa quantitate pecunie dimittendis, et qualiter negocium illud expedire poterit, quam cito poterit, scire faciat, et si illud expedire poterit, capiat ab eis securitatem quod voluntatem suam in hac parte non mutabunt"(1). However, the lord of Tancarville did not recover his English lands.

---

(1) Cl.R. 1251-3, p.433.

Appendix IV: Section B : Tenants who chose the English allegiance after 1204 and lost their Norman property.

(14) Guillelmus Abrincarum

William d'Avranches held lands in Kent as well as in Normandy. By 1204 he had been succeeded by another William who chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1].

(15) Helias de Amondeville

By 1204, Elias Amundeville had been succeeded by his son, Jollon or Jocelin, who chose the English allegiance and apparently lost his Norman lands[2].

(16) Comes Arundellia

In 1204, the earl of Arundel chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[3].

(17) Hugo de Bello Campo

By 1204, Hugh de Beauchamp had been succeeded by his grandson, Hugh, who chose the English allegiance[4] and forfeited his Norman interests[5].

---

(1) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., pp.9-10; I.J. Sanders, English baronies - a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327 (Oxford, 1960), p.45. No trace has been found of him or his heirs in Normandy after 1204.

(2) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.3. No trace has been found of Jollon or his successors in Normandy after 1204.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.331.

(4) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.40.

(5) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 697 h.

(18) Comes Hugh Bigod

By 1204, Hugh had been succeeded by Roger Bigod who chose the English allegiance(1) and lost his Norman lands(2).

(19) Manasserus Biset

By 1204, Manasser had been succeeded by Henry Biset who chose the English allegiance(3) and lost his Norman lands(4).

(20) Engelger de Bohoun

By 1204, Engelger de Bohun had been succeeded by a relative of the same name who chose the English allegiance(5) and apparently lost his Norman lands(6).

(21) Humfridus de Bohun

By 1204, Humphrey had been succeeded by Henry, who was created earl of Hereford in April, 1200(7). Henry chose the English allegiance(8) and apparently lost his Norman lands(9).

---

(1) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.47.

(2) C.A.Ph.Aug., no.819; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 709 j.

(3) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.5.

(4) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 642 d.

(5) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.333.

(6) No trace has been found of Engelger or his successors in Normandy after 1204.

(7) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.333; C.P., VI, 458.

(8) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.333.

(9) No trace has been found of Henry or his successors in Normandy after 1204.

(22) Willelmus de Braiosa

By 1204 William de Briouze had been succeeded by a relative of the same name, who chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1].

(23) Gerardus de Camville

Gerard chose the English allegiance in 1204[2] and forfeited his Norman lands[3].

(24) Hugo Carbonel

In the 1172 list, the entry for Hugh Carbonel is under the heading "De ballivia de Cerenciis"[4]. Cérences is in dept. Manche, arr. Coutances. In the same year 1172, a charter of the bishop of Coutances was witnessed at Coutances by "Pagano et Hugone Carbonellis" amongst others[5]. In the Red Book of the Exchequer, for the year 1211-12 under the county of Salop, we read "Honor Castri Ricardi ... Paganus Carbonel iiij^{am} in Wolvertone.... Hugo Carbonel, dimidium militem in Esseford"[6]. The association of these two names in England and Normandy suggests very strongly that the same two men are concerned on each occasion. It seems, moreover, that both men chose the English allegiance in 1204.

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.334.

(2) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.109.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII; cf. 714 f and 643 k.

(4) Ibid., XXIII, 697 g.

(5) C.D.F., no.1217.

(6) R.B., p.604.

(25) Philippus de Cartrai

In 1172, Philip de Carteret held one knight's fee in Normandy. Moreover, as Loyd observes "in 1166 Philip de Chartrai held thirteen or fourteen knights' fees of the old feoffment of William de Briouze as of the honour of Barnstaple, among Philip's knights being Richard de Chartrai. Philip can be identified with Philip, seigneur of Carteret from c.1130 to c.1178"(1). He was also seigneur of St Ouen, Jersey. According to the editor of the Cartulaire des Îles Normandes, Philip had two sons, Renaud and Richard. Philip died c.1178-9 and in 1204 Renaud chose the English allegiance and lost Carteret(2). Although Renaud clearly succeeded his father as Seigneur of St Ouen, he does not seem to have succeeded to his father's Devon property. In 1210-12, the fourteen knights' fees in Devon were held by Richard(3), which suggests that Philip left his lands in the duchy - Carteret and St Ouen - to Renaud, and his English lands to Richard. What became of Richard is not clear; in August 1216 his lands in Devon were granted to Richard de Crues(4) and after this time his name disappears from the records. Renaud, who died c.1215, was succeeded by his son Philip(5).

---

(1) L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, p.25.

(2) C.I.N., p.56; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 611 f.

(3) R.B., p.558; B.of F., p.97.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.283 b.

(5) See also Appendix V, section B, no.20.

Appendix IV

-B-

(26) Comes Ebroici

In 1172, the count of Evreux's name appeared under the heading "Isti sunt qui non venerunt nec miserunt nec aliquid dixerunt"(1). Under the terms of the Treaty of Le Goulet, May 1200, Amaury, count of Evreux and earl of Gloucester ceded Evreux to the French king(2). However, he retained the honour of Gravenchon-en-Caux until 1204 when it was added to Philip's demesne because Amaury chose the English allegiance(3).

(27) Willelmus filius Estur

Loyd has the following entry under William son of Stur:

"In 1086, William son of Stur was a substantial tenant-in-chief in the Isle of Wight and Hampshire. By a charter, probably temp. William II, Hugh de Insula son of William son of Stur of the Isle of Wight gave to the abbey of Marmoutier the tithe of the mill of Torlavilla which he held by hereditary right. The Infeudationes militum of 1172 show William son of Estur holding half a knight's fee in the district near Cherbourg. Although it is not completely certain that Tourlaville was the original home of the family, the name not being territorial, it seems clear that William came from the Cotentin"(4).

It appears that William or his heirs chose the English

---

(1) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 698 h.

(2) C.A.Ph.Aug., no.613.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.341.

(4) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.99.

allegiance in 1204, as there seems to be no further reference to the family in Normandy. There is very little trace of it in England either but we do know that in November, 1224, the sheriff of Southampton was ordered "quod cum receperit a Winton' Episcopo filiam et heredem Baldewini Estur, tunc eam sine dilatione tradat Galfrido de Insula cui custodiam ejusdem concessimus"(1). Moreover, the following entry occurs in the Book of Fees under the years 1287-90 among the fees of Carisbrooke castle: "Domina Matillis le Estour, domina de Gatecoumb', tenet de eadem comitissa in capite v feoda, unde eadem tenet in dominico maneria de Gatecoumb', Whitewell', et Caulbourn' quod Willelmus le Etur, filius et heres ejusdem, tenet de dono ejusdem"(2).

(28) Comes Gloucestriae

As Powicke records: "The Norman fief of the earl of Gloucester had its centre at Saint-Scolasse.... The fief came to King John in right of his wife, but a greater part of it, together with the title of earl, went to Amauri, count of Evreux, after the loss of Evreux"(3). The count of Evreux (q.v.) followed King John to England in 1204, and the Norman fief of the earls of Gloucester was taken into the French king's hand.

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.6.

(2) B.of F., p.1302.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.340.

Appendix IV

-B-

(29) Radulfus de Haia

By 1204, Ralph had been succeeded by Robert de la Haie who chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1].

(30) Sello de Lingeure

In 1172, Sello de Lingieure held half a fee in the Bessin[2] which suggests that he is one of the missing links in the family which has been described by Loyd as follows:

"In 1166 Ralph de Lingieure held one knight's fee of the old feoffment of John de Port. Lingèvres lies 19 kil. south of Port-en-Bessin... In 1208, Philip Augustus had half a fee in Lingèvres as an escheat; and in 1242-3 Albreda de Lingyvre was holding half a fee in East Parley, Hampshire, of William de la Falese, who held of Robert de St John, the heir and successor of Hugh de Port. This suggests the possibility that on the separation of England and Normandy the successor of Ralph remained in England and forfeited land held by him in Lingèvres"[3].

---

(1) Ibid., p.342.

(2) Rec. des hist., XXIII, 697 d.

(3) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.54.

Appendix IV

-B-

(31) Ricardus de Luceio

By 1204, Richard de Lucy had been succeeded by his granddaughter, Rose de Dover, who chose the English allegiance and lost her Norman lands[1].

(32) Comes Willelmus de Mandevilla

By 1204, William de Mandeville had been succeeded by Geoffrey fitz Peter, earl of Essex, who chose the English allegiance[2] and lost his Norman lands[3].

(33) Ricardus de Martinvast

In 1204, Richard de Martinwast, chose the English allegiance and apparently lost his Norman lands[4].

(34) Hugo de Monpinceun

Powicke says: "In 1172 Hugh of Montpincon held the honour by the service of 3 knights; he had in his service twelve knights. In 1204 Philip Augustus gave the honour to Guerin of Glapion. In 1220 it was an escheat.

In 1236 a Fulk de Monte Pinzin was tenant of the barony of Valoines in Essex and Norfolk"[5].

It has not proved possible to add anything to this account.

---

(1) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I, lxxix and II, ccxlii, note y; I.J. Sanders, English baronies - a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327, p.111; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 620 f; C.N., no.1147.

(2) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.71.

(3) No reference has been found to Geoffrey or his heirs holding lands in Normandy after 1204.

(4) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.61; R.B., p.552; B.of F., pp.520, 523,525,527.

(5) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.346.

(35) Nigellus de Montbrai

By 1204 Nigel de Montbrai had been succeeded by his son William who chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1].

(36) Robertus de Monteforti

Robert de Montfort was succeeded by Hugh who appears to have held lands in Kent as well as in Normandy[2]. In 1204, Hugh's Norman lands were annexed to the royal demesne together with the lands of other knights "qui sunt in Anglia"[3]. However, the only reference to Hugh in the English records after 1204 is an entry in the Close Rolls, dated 20th September, 1205, recording the grant to Ingram de Préaux of Saltwood, Kent, "quae fuit Hugonis de Monte forti"[4]. The most likely explanation of Hugh's disappearance from the records of both England and Normandy[5] is that he died shortly after the loss of the duchy without leaving an heir.

(37) Hugo de Mortuo Mari

By 1204, Hugh de Mortemer had been succeeded by his son, Roger, who chose the English allegiance and forfeited his Norman lands[6].

---

(1) Ibid., pp.345-6.

(2) Ibid., p.346; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.50.

(3) C.N., no.113.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.50.

(5) Cf. Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.346.

(6) Ibid., p.353.

(38) Willelmus de Mouin

By 1204, William de Moyen had been succeeded by his grandson, Reginald, who chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1].

(39) Gervasius Paganellus

Gervase Paynel died before Michaelmas, 1194, and was succeeded by his nephew Ralph de Somery, son of his sister Hawise. In 1204, Ralph chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[2].

(40) Gerebertus de Perceio

The 1172 entry relating to Gerbert de Percy reads: "In ballia de Tenechebrai - Johannes de Soligneio, 1 militem, de honore de Gilibervilla, et sibi IIII milites - Gebertus de Perceio, 1 militem de eodem honore, et sibi III milites"[3]. An entry in the Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas 1178 under the county of Devonshire reads: "Et Gerberto de Perci xl.s. numero in Axemenistra pro fine quem fecit cum Johanne de Soleigni de terra de Girbertvilla"[4]. Clearly these two entries refer to the same two men. By 1204, Gerbert had been succeeded by Roger de Pole and Roger de Newburgh who held half the barony each[5]. Both men and their heirs remained

---

(1) Ibid., pp.347-8.

(2) E.Y.C., VI, 47-50; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 619 h.

(3) Ibid., XXIII, 697 hj.

(4) P.R. 24 Henry II, p.10.

(5) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.72. For evidence that the Gerbert who held lands in Dorset and the Gerbert who had property in Devon are one and the same person, see, for example, P.R. 26 Henry II, p.94 and P.R.27 Henry II, p.31.

in England after 1204, and apparently lost their Norman lands[1].

(41) Robertus Rufus

By 1204, Robert de Ros had been succeeded by another Robert[2], who chose the English allegiance[3] and lost his Norman lands[4].

(42) Robertus de Sancto Johanne

In 1172, Robert de Saint-Jean held one knight's fee at Terregatte[5]. In view of the proximity of his fee to Saint-Jean-le-Thomas[6] which in 1172 was held by William de Saint-Jean of the abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel[7], it seems likely that Robert was William's brother. In this case, Robert held lands in England as well as in Normandy for, between 1162 and 1169 William de Saint-Jean and Robert, his brother, granted their manor of Compton in Sussex to their mother for her life[8]. William and Robert must both have died without direct heirs for William was succeeded by another William, son of Adam

---

(1) No trace has been found of any of Gerbert's successors in the Norman records after 1204.

(2) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.53.

(3) Ibid., p.53; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.194.

(4) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 709 h.

(5) Ibid., XXIII, 697 c. Terregatte is dept. Manche, arr. Avranches.

(6) Also dept. Manche, arr. Avranches.

(7) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.352.

(8) C.D.F., no.1070.

Port and the daughter of his sister Muriel[1]. This William assumed the surname of Saint-Jean. In 1204 he chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[2]. The list of knights' fees drawn up in Normandy between 1210 and 1220 records "Terra Gasta, unum feodum, de escaeta de domino Terrae Gastae"[3].

(43) Willelmus de Siffrewast

According to Loyd[4], William de Sifrewast held property in Nottinghamshire as well as in Normandy and had a son named Helénas. No reference has been found to the Nottinghamshire property later than 1166 but in that year and again in 1171-2, a William de Sifrewast held property in Berkshire[5]; this William was succeeded before 1186-7 by a Helénas de Sifrewast[6]. It therefore seems certain that the William in Normandy in 1172 and the William in Berkshire in 1171-2 are one and the same person. Helénas apparently chose the English allegiance in 1204 for he and his successors continue to appear in the English records[7] but disappear from the records of the duchy.

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.352; C.P. XI, 320, note f.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.352.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 612 h.

(4) L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, pp.61,98.

(5) R.B., pp.308,50.

(6) Ibid., pp.67,73,93,107,127,143.

(7) Ibid., p.513; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.347; B.of F., pp. 105,1415.

(44) Willelmus de Tresgoz

By 1204, William had been succeeded by Robert de Troisgots, who chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1].

(45) Willelmus comes Warenne

By 1204, William, earl Warenne, had been succeeded by his son of the same name, who chose the English allegiance and forfeited his Norman lands[2].

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.356-7.

(2) Ibid., p.347.

Appendix IV: Section C : Tenants whose families enjoyed continuing cross-Channel links after 1204.

KEY[1]

(a) Families where brothers or adult male cousins chose opposite allegiances after 1204.

(b) Families where there was some degree of cross-Channel relationship after 1204.

(c) Families where one or more members changed their allegiance between 1204 and 1259.

(d) Proven cases of double tenure after c.1204.

(e) Probable cases of double tenure after c.1204.

(46) Comes de Albamarla (d)

In 1204, Baldwin de Béthune was Count of Aumale in right of his wife Hawise whose third husband he was. Baldwin died in 1212 and Hawise two years later when she was succeeded by the son of her second marriage, William de Forz[2]. The family chose the English allegiance in 1204 and apparently lost their Norman lands for none of their names appear in the post-1204 lists of knights' fees in the Registers of Philip Augustus. However, the following charter dated February 1234 shows that William de Forz

---

(1) See above, pp.204-206.

(2) CP., I, 353-5.

recovered his Norman lands for a time only to lose them again:- "Ego A.comitissa Augi, notum facio universis... quod ego terram de Forz, quam habebam in pignore pro centum et quadraginta marchis argenti, de quibus me teneo pro pagata, dimisi in manu karissimi domini mei Ludovici Regis Francorum illustris, ad cujus manum devenerat ex escheata Guillelmi quondam domini de Forz et comitis Albemarle"(1).

(47) Willelmus de Albigneio (a,d,e)

It seems highly probable that the William d'Aubigny with lands in Normandy in 1172 was the same person as the William d'Aubigny of Brittany who was the father of Ralph d'Aubigny of South Ingleby, Lincs., and Philip d'Aubigny sometime Warden of the Channel Isles(2), for we know from later evidence that Ralph's heirs had interests in Normandy as well as in Brittany and England(3). In 1204 Ralph adhered to Philip Augustus and lost his English lands(4) while his brother Philip chose the English allegiance and apparently lost his Norman lands(5). Although Philip originally fined for the custody of

---

(1) C.N., no.406.

(2) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.8; C.P., IV, 93-4.

(3) C.P.R., 1232-47, p.106.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.68 b; P.R. 7 John, p.217; Rot. de Ob.et Fin., p.347.

(5) See R.N., p.89 for evidence that Philip held lands in Normandy before 1204. He does not appear in the Norman records after 1204.

Ralph's English lands, his fine was returned and the custody of South Ingleby granted to William d'Aubigny of Belvoir of whom it had been held[1].

On 29th December, 1215, however, King John allowed Philip, son of Ralph, to recover his father's English property[2]. It is not clear whether or not Ralph was already deceased. It is possible, however, that he was living until April 1227 when his widow was granted her dower in South Ingleby[3]. In December 1224, Henry III granted to Philip, brother of Ralph, "custodiam terre quae fuit Philippi de Albin' de Britannia nepotis sui in Engleby ad se sustentandum in servicio domini Regis quamdiu domino Regi placuerit"[4]. It is possible that Philip junior was already dead at this time but it seems more likely that his property was seized in accordance with the royal mandate of that year "de terris Normannorum et Britonum in manu domini Regis capiendis"[5]. He was certainly dead by 6th January 1227, however, for on that date Philip brother of Ralph was granted "custodiam terre quae fuit Philippi de Albiniaco de Britannia, nepotis sui, in Engleby, usque ad etatem heredis ipsius Philippi, ad se sustentandum in servicio domini regis"[6]. Philip junior

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.68 b; P.R. 7 John, p.217; Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.347.

(2) Rot.Lit.Pat., 1201-16, p.162.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.182.

(4) Ibid., 1224-7, p.9 b.

(5) Ibid., 1224-7, p.593.

(6) Pat.R., 1225-32,p.106.

was succeeded by his younger brother, another Ralph[1]. This Ralph was still a minor in October 1229[2], but must have been of age by 23rd January 1234, when it was recorded that he had done homage for some English property given to him by his uncle Philip[3]. It seems that Ralph also held the family's continental lands for on 6th June 1235, the king granted "licence for Ralph de Albiniaco, kinsman and heir of Philip de Albyniaco to come to England in safety when he will and to return to his own parts in Normandy and Brittany"[4]. Ralph and his heirs continued to hold lands in England and Brittany throughout the thirteenth century[5], but the fate of the family's Norman property is not known. If an entry in Les Olim under the year 1260 relates to the family with which we are concerned, it is possible that in 1235 Ralph was only just going to France to claim his continental inheritance, having recently come of age. If the Norman property had been granted to Ralph's mother as her dower, then the facts would fit. The entry in Les Olim to which reference is made reads as follows:

"Inquesta facta per Arnulphum de Curia-Feraudi, militem, ballivum Cadomi, ad sciendum qualiter terra de Gasto, quam petit Radulphus de Albigniaco, miles, devenit

---

(1) C.P., IV, 93-4.

(2) Pat.R. 1225-32, p.276.

(3) Cl.R. 1234-7, p.25.

(4) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.106.

(5) C.P., IV, 96, note c.

ad manum Regis : Dominus Radulphus de Albigniaco non habebit terram de Gasto quam petit; immo remanebit penes dominum Regem, cum idem Radulphus moraretur in Angliam, tempore quo mater sua decessit, cujus fuerat dicta terra, et que erat in saisina de dicta terra tempore quo decessit, et quia dictus miles, post mortem dicte matris, in Angliam per plures annos continuam moram fecit"(1).

(48) Fulco de Alnou (b,e)

Powicke does not attribute any English lands to Fulk de Aunou(2) and Stapleton says of his son of the same name that "having no lands in England, after the conquest of Normandy he transferred his allegiance to King Philip"(3). However, the following entry occurs in the Red Book of the Exchequer for 1166 under Lincolnshire: "Guido de Russedale et Fulco de Alneto, j.militem(4). The Somerset family of the same name does not seem to have held lands in Lincolnshire and in any case was represented at this time by Alexander de Aunou(5). Moreover, during the reign of Henry III, we find references to a Thomas de Aunou, "Normannus", with

---

(1) Les Olim, I, 122, no.xii.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.332.

(3) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, lxxxviii.

(4) R.B., p.380.

(5) J. Collinson, The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset, II (Bath, 1791), p.421.

property in Lincolnshire[1]. The earliest reference to this Thomas being in possession of his Lincolnshire property is in November, 1221[2]. He seems to have remained in possession from then until his death in 1244[3], when his property escheated to the king as terrae Normannorum[4]. No reference has been found to Thomas in Normandy between 1204 and his death and, if he was connected with the Fulk de Aunou of 1172, he was not the direct heir because Fulk's Norman fees were still held c.1242 by someone with the first name of Fulk[5] at a time when Thomas was in possession in England. It is possible, however, that Thomas was either a younger brother or a younger son of the Fulk who chose the Norman allegiance in 1204. Whatever his family connections, however, there can be no doubt that he was regarded in England as a Norman.

(49) Richerius de Aquila (b,d)

Richerius de L'Aigle was succeeded by his son Gilbert who chose the Norman allegiance in 1204[6]. All Powicke has to say about Gilbert's English lands is that "the land of Gilbert of L'Aigle in Dorset was

---

(1) e.g. Cl.R. 1242-7, p.393; C.P.R. 1232-47, p.474.

(2) Pat.R. 1216-25, p.230.

(3) B. of F., pp.359,617,1035 bis; Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 420.

(4) Ex e Rot.Fin., I,420,446; Cl.R. 1242-7, pp.393,410; C.P.R. 1232-47,p.474.

(5) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 729 c d.

(6) Ibid., XXIII, 612 f, 618 b c, 709 a; C.N., no.206.

among the terrae Normannorum in 1204.... The honour of Aquila in England was centred in Sussex. By 1212 it was confiscated. The honour was granted to Gilbert Marshal in 1234"[1]. In fact, however, the story is far more complicated than this.

In 1207, William earl Warenne, gave three thousand marks "pro habenda custodia terrarum Gilleberti de Aquila ad opus sororis sue cum omnibus exitibus"[2], and an entry in the Book of Fees under the year 1212 reveals that William's sister was Gilbert's wife[3]. Thus, after 1207, Gilbert's lands were once more in the family. In the year ending Michaelmas 1214, earl Warenne was held responsible for the scutage of Poitou due on Gilbert's fees[4], but Gilbert appears to have recovered his lands from his brother-in-law between then and the outbreak of the Civil War in 1215. Our source of information is the king's request to Gilbert in December 1216 to return to his allegiance from which he has apparently again departed during the civil strife. The king promised Gilbert that "si redieritis, concedimus vobis omnes terras vestras, quas habuistis ante gwerram inter nos et barones nostros motam, tempore pacis..."[5].

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.331.

(2) Rot. de Ob.et Fin., p.402.

(3) B. of F., p.65.

(4) P.R. 16 John, p.37.

(5) Pat.R., 1216-25, p.17.

However, Pevensey castle was excluded from this offer "quia, si esset in manu vestra, Ludovicus illud a vobis exigeret, nec illud ei denegare possetis". In spite of his promise, Gilbert had still not returned to his allegiance by June 1217[1] but presumably he made his peace after the Treaty of Lambeth, if not before. Certainly he was once more in possession of his English lands by November 1222 when a lawsuit in which he was involved was postponed because "de licencia nostra in partes transmarinas profectus est"[2]

He seems to have remained in possession of his estates on both sides of the Channel during the greater part of the war of 1224-27, and indeed, to have crossed the Channel more than once during this period. On 4th May, 1225, the bailiffs of the port of Shoreham were instructed "quod habere faciant Gileberto de Aquila j.nascellam ad homines suos transfretandos in Normanniam" and on the same day the sheriff of Sussex was informed that Gilbert had sent his knights to the army at Montgomery and therefore did not owe scutage[3]. In April, 1226, Gilbert was "in partes transmarinas" and held royal letters of protection valid until Michaelmas of the same year[4]. In September 1226, the king seized

---

(1) Ibid., 1216-25, p.70.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.518.

(3) Ibid., 1224-7, p.36.

(4) Pat.R. 1225-32, p.26.

Gilbert's English lands, together with the property of several others who also held estates on both sides of the Channel[1]. It seems, however, that the motive behind the seizure was primarily a financial one, for on 7th December of the same year, Gilbert was allowed to recover his property on the payment of a fine of five hundred marks[2]. Clearly the English king did not suspect Gilbert of treachery for on the following day he announced "quod concessimus et licenciam dedimus quod dilectus et fidelis noster Gilebertus de Aquila, quotiens voluerit, libere et sine impedimento et sine occasione eat de Anglia in Normanniam, et redeat de Normannia in Angliam, et utrobique moretur quando ei placuerit, quamdiu nobis bene et fideliter servierit"[3].

From December 1226, Gilbert appears to have remained in possession of his English lands until his death which occurred in or shortly before December 1231[4]. On his death, his English lands escheated to the Crown as terrae Normannorum[5], presumably because his heir, Henry de Avaugor was not acceptable to King Henry. Henry de Avaugor was the grandson of Gilbert's aunt and inherited Gilbert's Norman lands[6]. He was an important

---

(1) Ex e Rot. Fin., I, 147.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.160 b.

(3) Pat.R. 1225-32, pp.95-6.

(4) Cl.R. 1227-31,pp.232,350,445,544; ibid., 1231-4,pp.12,16; Pat.R. 1225-32,pp.248,361,366.

(5) e.g. C.Ch.R. 1226-57,p.163.

(6) Rec.des hist., XXIV (ii), 728-9.

Breton baron whose father had held lands in England prior to 1204. On 14th October 1230, Henry had recovered these lands, presumably in return for his support of Henry III's expedition to Brittany[1]. However, he soon switched his allegiance back to King Louis[2] and by July 1231 had again lost his English lands[3]. Gilbert's widow was allowed to enjoy her dower until her death in or shortly before November 1234, when these lands, too, escheated to the Crown[4].

(50) Ricardus de Auffai (d)

Powicke says "In 1172, Richard of Auffai owed the service of five knights and had sixteen knights in his own service. In 1198, John of Auffai accounted for the residue of his relief. The barony was divided between the king and William Martel after the conquest.

John died in or shortly before 1204, leaving a daughter as heiress of his English lands, the chief of which was the manor of Norton Ferris in Somerset"[5].

However, it was not John who rendered the residue of his relief in 1198 but his heir who was apparently a

---

(1) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.443.

(2) S. Painter, The Scourge of the Clergy (Baltimore, 1937), p.73.

(3) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.525.

(4) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 269; Cl.R. 1234-7, p.19.

(5) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.332.

minor in the custody of Reginald de Pontibus[1].
At some time during 6 John 1204, Lauretta de Pontibus gave a hundred marks "pro habendo manerio de Norton' cum pertinentiis suis quod est Johanne neptis sue, scilicet filie et heredis Johannis de Aufei"[2]. Presumably Joanna died some time between 1204 and 1212 for the Book of Fees records under the latter year that "Reginaldus de Punz tenet Norton' cum hundredo in capite de domino rege, et est heritagium uxoris sue"[3]. There does not seem to be any possibility of Joanna having remained in Normandy for, as Powicke has observed, her Norman lands were divided between the king and William Martel after the conquest[4].

No reference has been found to Lauretta's being in possession of lands in Normandy during the reigns of Philip Augustus and Louis VIII but in 1236 and 1242 she was clearly in possession of property there[5]. Meanwhile, she continued to hold Norton Ferris in Somerset until 1244 when it was taken into the king's hand as terra Normannorum[6]. Presumably Lauretta,

---

(1) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxxx, 422.

(2) Rot. de Ob.et Fin., p.224.

(3) B. of F., p.81.

(4) Rec. des hist., XXIII, 707 j, 708 a.

(5) Ibid., XXIII, 726 b, 729 f.

(6) B. of F., pp.404,1146-7,1156,1265; Cl.R. 1242-7,pp.177,187.

whose husband Reginald was dead by 1235[1] had chosen the Norman allegiance in that year.

(51) Comes Augi (c,d)

Ralph of Exoudun, a Poitevin noble, who held the county of Eu in right of his wife Alice, deserted King John at an early stage in his struggle with Philip Augustus and was deprived of his lands in England and Normandy[2]. After 1204 he apparently recovered his Norman lands from Philip Augustus[3] but his English lands remained in King John's hands[4]. In May 1214, however, Ralph deserted the French king and went over to King John. The latter restored to him the English lands belonging to his wife and promised him compensation for the loss of his Norman lands resulting from his changed allegiance[5]. Apparently Ralph supported the rebellious barons in the civil war at the end of John's reign for on 29th September 1217, Geoffrey de Nevill was ordered "quod habere faciat R.comiti Augi omnes terras suas....sicut eas habuit in principio guerra"[6]. He seems to have remained in possession of his English lands from this

---

(1) B. of F., p.404.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.147 and note, 338.

(3) C.N., no.1082,

(4) e.g. Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, pp.59 b, 87 b, 93 b, 106 b bis.

(5) Ibid., 1201-16,pp.116, 116 b.

(6) Pat.R. 1216-25, p.96.

time until his death in 1219, when they were granted to his widow Alice[1]. Alice had influential relations in England who took an interest in her affairs. This is clear from a letter written in August 1219 by William, Earl Warenne, to Hubert de Burgh, Justiciar of England. In this letter, Alice is described as "cognata" of the writer and "neptis" of the recipient[2]. In fact, she was the first cousin of Hubert's second wife Beatrice, who was William's daughter[3].

In the same year, 1219, Philip Augustus returned to Alice her county of Eu and "ce que le comte d'Eu, son mari, possédait de la terre de Roumare quand il prit parti pour le roi d'Angleterre" but imposed certain conditions; Alice had to promise that "elle ne réclamera rien sur Neufchâtel, ni sur Mortemer, ni sur Arques;... toutefois la comtesse n'élèvera aucune prétention sur la forêt de Roumare ni sur le Neuf-Marché;...Alix ne se mariera pas et ne fortifiera pas de places sans la volunté du roi; elle lui payera quinze mille marcs d'argent"[4].

---

(1) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 13; Pat.R. 1216-25, p.203.

(2) Royal and other Historical Letters Illustrative of the Reign of Henry III, ed. W.W. Shirley, I (Rolls Series, 1862), p.42.

(3) C.P., V, 159; D.N.B., VII, 317.

(4) C.A.Ph.Aug., no.1920.

-C-

From 1219 until 1244[1], Alice seems to have held her English lands without a significant break. There is no evidence that, like certain others who held lands in Normandy as well as in England at this time[2], she suffered seizure during the war of 1224-27. She did, however, reach an agreement whereby in May 1225, she "tradidit ipsi domini H.regi castrum de Hastinges, tenendum in manu sua quousque pax firmata fuerit cum rege Francorum et suis, vel longas treugas cum eis ceperit"[3]. In the same month the constable of Hastings was instructed "non...aliquid capiat de hominibus vel terris Comitisse Augi sive de aliis rebus ad eam pertinentiis et si quid inde ceperit, id eidem Comitisse reddi faciat"[4]. When the war with France was renewed in 1229, Alice may have had to pay a fine in order to retain possession of her English lands, for in February 1230, the king pardoned her a hundred pounds "de fine trecentarum marcarum quem fecit cum rege pro terris suis habendis"[5]. In the same month she was granted permission to take an aid from her tenants to help her pay off her debts to the king[6].

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.338, says that she lost her English lands in 1242, but this appears to be a misprint. She was still in favour in England in April 1243 (Cl.R. 1242-7, p.128).

(2) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 147.

(3) Pat.R. 1216-25, p.579.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.41.

(5) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.290.

(6) Pat.R. 1225-32, p.324.

In 1244 her lands were seized in accordance with Henry III's instructions for a general seizure of the terrae Normannorum[1] and this time the loss was permanent although, as Stapleton has observed, her heirs attempted to recover the English lands of the house of Eu in 1259 and again in 1290[2].

(52) Willelmus Avenel (a,c)

William died in 1203 leaving three sons of whom the elder two seem to have been Nicholas and Roland. It is not altogether clear, however, which of these two was his father's heir[3].

It seems that they both chose the English allegiance in 1204 for, according to the copy of the 1172 list of knights' fees made for Philip Augustus shortly after the conquest, the fee of William Avenel was then in the hands of the Count of Boulogne[4]. Roland, however, apparently soon switched his allegiance to the French king, for in March 1205 his land at Ashley, Hampshire, was granted to the Earl of the Isle of Wight[5]. Moreover, his name occurs later in King Philip's registers among the "Milites Normanniae ferentes banerias"[6] and he was present at the Norman Exchequer during the Michaelmas term, 1212[7].

---

(1) Cl.R. 1242-7, p.157; C.P.R. 1232-47, p.420.
(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, ccxxxvi.
(3) Ibid., II, ccxxxviii, ccl, ccli.
(4) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 696 h.
(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.21 b.
(6) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 684 h.
(7) Rec. de Jugements, no.104.

Nicholas, on the other hand, did not switch his allegiance and remained in possession of his English lands until his death in 1246 when they passed to his son William[1]. By 1253, William, too, was dead and had died moreover, "without heir of his body; but he had an uncle...in Normandy, having an inheritance named Rocheland, who left sons who are still living"[2]. Consequently, William's lands escheated to the Crown as terrae Normannorum[3]. By the time of his death his lands included Ashley, Hampshire[4] which had belonged to his uncle Roland before 1204-5 and which he or his father evidently acquired at some date not known to us.

(53) Doun Bardulf (d)

The Doun Bardolf of 1172 was succeeded first by Thomas, who died between 1188 and 1194[5], and then by another Doun who died in 1205 leaving a son named William who was a minor[6]. Doun, father of William apparently remained in England after the loss of Normandy for he died in possession of his English lands[7]. William did not attain his

---

(1) B. of F., pp.96,432,759,765,782-4; Ex e Rot.Fin., II,2.

(2) C.I.P.M., I, no.278.

(3) Cl.R. 1253-4, p.54; ibid., 1256-9, p.33.

(4) Ibid., 1253-4, p.54.

(5) I.J. Sanders, English baronies - a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327, p.76.

(6) Mag.Rot.Scac.Normn., II, ccxvi-ccxvii.

(7) e.g. Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.20 b, 23,227.

majority until 1215 in which year he obtained seisin of his father's English property. Stapleton says of William that "in the year 1220 he was still tenant of the fiefs of Bernonville and Putot in Normandy"(1). However, there is no mention of either Doun or his heir in the statement of knight service drawn up between 1204 and 1208, so it seems likely that Doun lost his Norman property in 1204 but that his son was allowed to recover it when he came of age. The recovery was not permanent for in February, 1235, Louis IX granted to one of his servants a rent "in terra que fuit Guillelmi Bardol, apud Putot"(2).

(54) Goel de Baudemont

As well as his lands in Normandy, Goel held the manor of Mutford in Suffolk. His heir was his daughter Hildeburgh, whose first husband was Osbert de Cailly. Hildeburgh and Osbert had two daughters, Petronilla and Matilda, who were coheirs of their parents, whose property they inherited before 1204(3). For the post-1204 history of their maternal grandfather's property, see the entry under Osbert de Cailly in this Appendix, Section C, no.56.

---

(1) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, ccxvii.

(2) C.N., no.410.

(3) L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, pp.12-13; Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.334-5; Appendix IV, Section C, no.56.

-C-

(55) Richard de Bello Fago (a)

As Powicke records, Richard de Beaufou's heir was his son Henry[1] who remained in Normandy in 1204[2]. However, Powicke makes no mention of the family's English lands or the fact that Henry's brother Richard remained in England after 1204. The Pipe Roll for the year ending Michaelmas 1205 records that "Ricardus de Belfou debet xx m. et j. palefridum pro habendis c. solidatis terre in Peri, quam Henricus frater suus ei dedit et unde idem Ricardus dissaisitus fuit ea occasione quod idem Henricus recessit a servitio Regis"[3]. Richard junior seems to have held this property until his death in 1246[4] when it escheated to the Crown as terra Normannorum and as such was granted to Robert Passelewe, archdeacon of Lewes in June of that year[5]. Richard's widow Agnes was to be allowed to hold her dower of Robert Passelewe until her death when it would revert to him[6].

(56) Osbertus de Caillio (b,c,e)

As Powicke has noted, "the history of this fief before and after 1204 is complicated, and is involved with the history of Baudemont, and the families of Longchamp, du Bois, and Vere"[7].

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.332-3.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 635 e; C.I.P.M., I, no.73.

(3) P.R. 7 John, p.151.

(4) Cl.R. 1234-7, p.105; B.of F., p.826; C.I.P.M., I, no.73.

(5) C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.294.

(6) Cl.R. 1247-51, p.5.

(7) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.334.

-C-

This enquiry has not added anything significant to the account given by Powicke, which is therefore quoted in full:

"In 1172 Osbert, son of Roger of Cailly, owed the service of two knights and also held two knights' fees in the barony of Saint-Saens. In right of his wife he was lord of Baudemont, a castle in the châtellenie of Vernon, in the Vexin. Osbert died between 1189 and 1198. He left two daughters, one of whom, Petronilla, was married to Stephen Longchamp, the other, Matilda, to Henry de Vere. It appears that Stephen received Baudemont as well as a share of the honour of Cailly, for in the treaty of Louviers in January, 1196, his actual or future possession is secured; but the rights of Matilda were recognised later. Henry de Vere died early, and Matilda was in 1204 the wife of Reginald du Bois.

The English lands attached to Baudemont which came to Osbert of Cailly through his wife, formed the manor and half hundred of Mutford in Suffolk.

In 1204 Reginald du Bois took the side of Philip and consequently lost his English lands at Lothingland in Suffolk. On the other hand, Stephen Longchamp, except for a brief interval in November, 1205, retained his lands in England. For a short time Reginald apparently got possession of the Cailly lands in Normandy, while Stephen received Reginald's English lands and his share of the Baudemont inheritance at Mutford. The other half of

Mutford was secured for Henry de Vere's son by Matilda, who was under age. But before 1213 Stephen had definitely attached himself to Normandy; he was present at the judgement upon the Tesson inheritance in that year. He is said to have fallen on the French side at Bouvines. In the Scripta his son, Baudri, is said to be in possession of his lands and also his share of the Cailly inheritance. Baudri died before 1223. The last survivor of these tangled events seems to have been Matilda, who describes herself in 1231 as 'vidua, domina de Cailli et de Baudemont'.

The heir of Henry de Vere died young without heirs, and Mutford came back to the crown"(1).

The only aspect of this account where further comment seems necessary is the reference to Stephen de Longchamp's temporary possession of lands on both sides of the Channel after 1204. In a footnote, Powicke refers his readers to Stapleton, who collected together the various writs relating to Stephen which were issued in England after the loss of the duchy(2). Since Stapleton's account is somewhat verbose and he cites no references, a fresh account of the course of events seems called for.

Stephen apparently chose the English allegiance in the first instance for he was still in this country on

---

(1) Ibid., pp.334-5.

(2) Ibid., p.334, note 9; Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxiv-cxvi.

6th September 1204 when the king ordered the constable of Wallingford "quod liberes Stephano de Longocampo Baldric' filium suum primogenitum et alium filium suum retineas. Nos enim dedimus ei licentiam ducendi secum in Normanniam predictum filium suum"(1). On 22nd September 1204, he was granted the land of Reginald de Bosco in Mutford(2), which suggests that either he had not yet left England, or had promised to return. The reasons for saying this are two: in the first place, no other instance of double tenure has been found as early as this; in the second place, instructions were given on 26th October 1204 that Mutford should be taken into the king's hand(3). However, by 28th November 1204, Stephen was apparently back in England, for on that date the constable of Wallingford was instructed to release to him his other son William who was being held as a hostage(4). On the following day, instructions were given that if Stephen's property at Mutford had been seized it should be returned to him. However, he was only to receive the portion which he held in right of his wife and not the portion which had belonged to Reginald de Bosco(5). As we shall see, Stephen was definitely in Normandy again on

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.45 b.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.9.

(3) Ibid., 1204-24, p.13.

(4) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.48.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.15.

13th November 1205[1] and on 30th June 1207 the land in Mutford which had once been his was granted to Robert Fitz-Roger, custodian of the lands and heir of Henry de Vere[2]. Once more, however, Stephen was restored to King John's favour and on 10th November 1207 he was granted his lands in Suffolk at the king's pleasure[3]. After this date, Stephen's name disappears from the English records until several years after his death when his lands are described as terrae Normannorum[4]. It is possible that when Stephen was granted his English lands on this last occasion, he retained possession of his Norman lands also; this is suggested by the fact that the grant was on this occasion made at the king's pleasure and if Stephen had not been holding lands in Normandy his English lands would have been his as of right. How long Stephen continued to hold Mutford is unfortunately not known to us.

Unfortunately, too, the Norman records are insufficiently full to enable us to reconstruct the full story of Stephen's relations with Philip Augustus. Shortly after the conquest of Normandy, when the 1172 list of tenants-in-chief was copied into the Register of Philip Augustus, the whole

---

(1) C.N., no.124.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.86 b.

(3) Ibid., 1204-24, p.96.

(4) Ibid., 1204-24, p.448; Cl.R. 1231-4, p.67.

honour of Cailly was in the hands of Reginald de Bosco[1]. However, on 13th November, 1205, Stephen Longchamp was among the barons who met at Rouen and made a statement of the rights which they and Kings Henry III and Richard I had enjoyed in their relations with the Norman clergy[2]. Moreover, the relevant entry in the Feoda Normanniae which was compiled between 1204 and 1208, reads, "Stephanus de Longo Campo et Ren. de Bosco, duos milites de honore Challiaci"[3]. The later evidence from the Norman records has been cited by Powicke.

(57) Radulfus de Chainies (d)

By 1204 Ralph had been succeeded by William de Cahagnes who chose the English allegiance[4]. His lands in Normandy were presumably confiscated for his name does not occur in any of the post-1204 lists of knights' fees[5]. He died before 22nd February 1222[6] leaving a son William, who was a minor[7]. On 27th April 1222, his widow Letitia was granted her dower in England[8] and at the Easter 1223 session of the Exchequer at Caen, she was granted her dower

---

(1) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 694 j.

(2) C.N., no.124.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 707 g.

(4) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, ccli, note c; I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.146.

(5) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 705-14,608-81.

(6) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, p.82.

(7) Ibid., I, 95; I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.146.

(8) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 86.

in Normandy. The Exchequer's judgement reads: "Judicatum est quod Leticia, uxor quondam W. de Chahagniis defuncti, cujus terra est in manu domini regis per escaetam, habeat dotalicium suum de terra illa de qua dictus W. erat saisitus quando eam Leticiam duxit in uxorem"(1).

(58) Jordanus de Campo Arnulfi (d)

Although Jordan de Cambernon deserted John in Normandy in 1203(2), he apparently returned to his allegiance after the loss of the duchy, for he was in possession of his English lands in March 1206(3). Presumably he remained in England until his death, for he was still in possession of his lands in Devon in 1211-12(4) while his Norman lands were in the French king's hands in the Easter term of 1221 when the Exchequer at Caen ordered that his widow should be given "dotalicium suum de terra que fuit ejusdem Jordani, que est in manu domini regis, de qua saisitus erat quando eam duxit in uxorem"(5).

(59) Comes Cestriae (b)

In 1204, the Earl of Chester chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands(6). He had married before 7th October 1200, Clemence, grand-daughter of

---

(1) Rec.de Jugements, no.342.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.175.

(3) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.26; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.68. See also P.R. 8 John, p.144.

(4) R.B., p.607.

(5) Rec.de Jugements, no.303.

(6) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.335-6.

Appendix IV

-C-

William du Hommet, who chose the Norman allegiance in 1204. Clemence was living until 1252[1].

(60) Eudo filius Ernisii (d)

By 1204, Eudo had been succeeded by Robert filius Ernisii[2] who chose to remain in Normandy[3] and lost his lands in Essex, Lincolnshire and Norfolk[4]. However, in 1216, Robert offered a fine of two hundred marks and two horses "pro habenda gratia et benevolencia domini Regis". Since the sheriffs of the three counties in which he held property were instructed that "per visum servientis ejusdem Roberti quem ipse ad eos mittet et per testimonium legalium hominum de terris suis, omnes exitus terre sue in baillia sua salvo faciant reservari ad predictum finem quem cum domino Rege fecit aquietandum"[5], it seems that the intention was that once the fine had been paid, Robert should recover possession of his property.

After this date, the evidence becomes confusing. It seems that either Robert never actually obtained seisin of his lands or, having obtained seisin he forfeited his lands again during the remaining period of civil war. On 27th May 1217, the sheriff of Lincolnshire was ordered

---

(1) Appendix IV, section C, no.70.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 695 f.

(3) Ibid., XXIII, 619 k, 684 e.

(4) R.N., p.128; B.of F., p.169; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.154 b.

(5) Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.576.

to give seisin to William filius Ernisii "de terra quae fuit Roberti filii Ernisii in Hemmingeham et Horsinton' quam dominus Rex ei concessit"(1). On 29th June in the same year, the sheriff of Norfolk was informed that "Dominus Rex concessit Willelmo filio Ernisii totam terram quae fuit patris [sic] sui ad sustentandum in servicio suo nisi dominus Rex J. pater domini Regis vel ipse Rex alii eam concesserint"(2). On 10th September following, the sheriff of Lincolnshire was again ordered to give William seisin "de tota terra quae fuit Roberti filii Ernisii fratris [sic] sui quae eum hereditarie contingit scilicet in Hammingeby et in Horsinton"(3). It seems unlikely in spite of all this that William actually obtained possession of Robert's lands in 1217. According to the Book of Fees, his Lincolnshire property was held in 1219 by William de Mandeville(4) to whom it had been granted in 1213(5). Moreover, in 1220, the king informed the Earl of Gloucester and William de Mandeville that, "Audivimus quod Robertus filius Ernisii mortuus est cujus heres est Willelmus filius Ernisii frater ejus junior et homagium ipsius Willelmi cepimus de jure suo quod habet in terris quae fuerunt predicti Roberti fratris sui. Et ideo vobis mandamus quod de

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.309 b.

(2) Ibid., 1204-24, p.313.

(3) Ibid., 1204-24, p.321.

(4) B.of F., p.284.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.154 b.

terris quae fuerunt predicti Roberti quas habetis in manu vestra plenam eidem Willelmo saisinam habere faciatis"(1).

Presumably William did obtain seisin of Robert's lands on this occasion for, on 12th November, 1222, the sheriff of Norfolk was ordered "quod capiat in manu domini Regis terras quae fuerunt Roberti filii Ernisii in Welles et Warham et eas salvo custodiat donec dominus Rex aluid inde preceperit"(2). Unfortunately, no reason for the seizure is given. However, Robert's lands are subsequently described as terrae Normannorum(3).

(61) Robertus de Esneval (b,d,e)

Powicke makes no mention of this family's English property but merely states, "In 1172 Robert of Esneval owed the service of three knights and had that of twelve and a quarter. In 1204 his son Robert was one of the Norman barons who signed the capitulation of Rouen and afterwards joined Philip Augustus"(4).

However, according to the Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae, the widow of Robert senior was called Helouis(5) and she was apparently in possession of lands in England in February 1233 for an entry in the Fine Rolls under that

---

(1) Ibid. 1204-24, p.442.

(2) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, p.96.

(3) B.of F., pp.388,615 bis, 619 bis.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.338.

(5) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxlvii.

date reads as follows: "Norf' - Robertus de Wendevall' dat domino Regi centum marcarum pro habenda carta Regis quod quamcito Helewis' de Wendevall' mater ejus decesserit vel mutaverit habitum religionis assumenda predictus Robertus et heredes sui predicte Isabella [sic] in terris suis de hereditate sua propria hereditarie succedant"(1).

The earliest references to Robert's being in possession of property in England are to be found in the Book of Fees under the year 1242-3(2). Here the property concerned is a quarter of a knight's fee in Folkestone, Kent. In 1244 he also held property in Saxthorpe and Stiffkey, Norfolk, "de dono fratris sui"(3). It has not been possible to discover any further information about this brother, except that his name was William(4). In 1244 Robert's lands in both Kent and Norfolk were seized by the crown as terrae Normannorum but he was allowed to fine for their recovery(5). However, they escheated to the crown as terrae Normannorum after his death in or shortly before December 1247(6).

(62) Wakelinus de Ferariis (b)

Powicke records that Walchelin "died in 1201 and was succeeded by his son Henry. Henry joined Philip.

---

(1) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, p.238.

(2) B.of F., pp.659,673.

(3) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, p.424. Cf. B.of F., p.1151.

(4) Ibid., p.1151.

(5) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 424; Cl.R. 1242-7, pp.200,215,301.

(6) Ibid. 1247-51, pp.11,21; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.329.

Appendix IV

-C-

The English lands of this house included the manors of Oakham in Rutland and of Lechlade in Gloucestershire. Walchelin of Ferrières had given the latter to his other son Hugh. His daughter, Isabella, wife of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, was after 1204 allowed a life interest in both manors. After her death they escheated to the crown as terrae Normannorum"(1).

(63) Mathaeus de Feritate (d)

Loyd says of this family, "Matthew de Feritate, lord of la Ferté-Macé, married Gundreda daughter of Fulk Paynel (probably) of Bampton, who had Halsworthy, Devon, as her 'maritagium'; their son William adhered to John and lost his Norman lands"(2). However, the editor of Early Yorkshire Charters, Vol.VI points out that "Gundreda... appears to have retained her interest in Bellou [Bellou-en-Oulne, dept.Orne] until her death in 1216"(3). This was in spite of the fact that her second husband, Ralph de Bray, had seisin of her Devon property after 1204.

William's heir was his daughter, also named Gundreda, who married Pain de Chaworth of Kempsford, Gloucestershire(4).

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.338.

(2) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.41.

(3) E.Y.C., VI, 53-4.

(4) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.123.

On 3rd July, 1241, their son Patrick de Chaworth was given "licence...to go to Normandy and stay there until Christmas, 26 Henry III"[1]. Unfortunately, the reason for his visit is not stated but it seems likely[2] that he wished to attempt to recover the Norman lands to which he was entitled through his mother. The Chaworth family came from Sourches, dept. Sarthe and is not known to have had lands in Normandy[3]. If such an attempt was made, then it did not meet with any success for William de la Ferté's lands were still in the hands of the King of France at the time of the Querimoniae Normannorum in 1247[4].

(64) Godefridus de Gamages (a)

Godfrey had two sons, Matthew and William, both of whom held lands in England and Normandy in 1204. Matthew, the elder, chose to remain in the duchy and lost his English property, while William chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[5].

(65) Mathaeus de Geraudeville (b,d,e)

Since Powicke has noted the main points of interest in this case, his account is quoted in full:

"In 1172 Matthew of Graville held Graville by the service of four knights. In 1204 William Malet was the

---

(1) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.254.

(2) Cf. Philip de Carteret, Appendix V, Section B, no.20.

(3) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.27.

(4) Q.N., no.436.

(5) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.45; R.W. Eyton, Antiquities of Shropshire. IV (London, 1857), pp.144-9.

lord of Graville. His wife was Philippa, daughter of the count of Alencon, and when he died, soon after the conquest, he left her with a son Robin or Robert. This Robert Malet was, through his mother, one of the heirs to the honour of Alencon. On his father's death he was a minor and Graville was for some time in the custody of his mother's third husband, William de Preaux, brother of Peter de Preaux.

The history of the English fiefs of the honour of Graville is interesting. In 1204, Lilley in Hertfordshire and Coleby in Lincolnshire were seized as terrae Normannorum, which belonged to William Malet. William de Preaux, who had at first stayed in Normandy, came to England late in John's reign and received seisin of Coleby in right of his wife Philippa. He thus maintained for a time a connection between the English and Norman fiefs of the honour of Graville. Robert Malet, who had lived in Normandy is said by Stapleton to have done homage to Henry III for his ancestral lands at Lilley and Coleby in 1242. This statement is not borne out by the records. In 1242 Robert Malet lost Coleby, which had previously been restored to him"(1).

The main comment which needs making is that Stapleton was correct in stating that Robert did homage for his father's lands in England in 1242. On 23rd February 1242, Henry III informed the sheriff of Lincolnshire "quod

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.341-2.

Appendix IV

-C-

cepimus homagium dilecti et fidelis nostri Roberti Malet de omnibus terris et tenementis quae eum jure hereditarie contingunt in regno nostro et ideo tui precipimus quod de manerio de Coleby cum pertinentiis de quo Willelmus Malet pater ipsius Roberti fuit seisitus ut de feodo die quo obiit quod eum jure hereditarie contingunt ei plenam seisinam habere facias"(1). However, the recovery was shortlived for on 25th October, 1242, William Caperun was granted "restitution... of the manor of Coleby, which he held before of the king's gift but whereof the king disseised him and committed the same to Robert Malet"(2). It is not known exactly when Robert's property returned to royal hands but it is known that he died some time between 21st July and the end of September, 1242, while serving in the French king's army in Poitou(3). It seems likely that he had been allowed to recover his English lands in the first place in the hope that he would join King Henry in Poitou, for Henry's expedition to Poitou had been planned at least as early as January, 1242(4). If this were so, then presumably his property was seized as soon as it was realised that he had joined King Louis.

---

(1) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, p.370.

(2) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.336.

(3) M. Paris ... Chron.Maj., IV, 225.

(4) Sir Maurice Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307 (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1962), p.102.

-C-

Unfortunately it has not been possible to establish whether Philippa retained her dower in Normandy when William de Préaux was granted seisin of Coleby on her behalf.

(66) Comes Giffardi (d)

In 1191, the Giffard inheritance was divided between Richard de Clare, earl of Hertford, and William Marshal, later earl of Pembroke. In 1204, Richard de Clare chose the English allegiance and lost his Norman lands[1]. William Marshal, on the other hand, managed to retain his lands on both sides of the Channel. As Powicke records, "At Lisieux in 1204, the Marshal and the earl of Leicester .. .. paid a large fine for a year's delay before deciding whether or not they would do homage to Philip for their Norman lands. The earl of Leicester had died before the time had elapsed, but the Marshal - who, according to his biographer, had John's permission - did homage in 1205[2]. His family retained their Norman property during the early reign of Henry III"[3].

William Marshal died in 1219 and in July of that year his widow Isobel made the following arrangements with the king of France:-

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.336.

(2) Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, ed. P. Meyer, III (Paris, 1901), p.178.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.294.

Appendix IV

-C-

"Dominus Rex reddit michi et liberis meis terram nostram de Normannia, illam scilicet de qua dominus meus Guillelmus Marescallus erat saisitus ea die qua decessit, salvo jure et servicio suo. Sciendum est etiam quod dominus rex Guillelmo et Richardo, filiis meis, dedit licentiam veniendi in Franciam et inde redeundi, cum ipsi voluerint, cum quinque militibus et eorum familiis secum, ita tamen quod, tam ipsi quam illi milites, domino regi jurabunt quod nullum malum ipsi vel regno suo, per se nec per alium fieri procurabunt, et, si id scirent, inde premunirent dominum regem quam cicius possent. Illi etiam qui custodient fortericias meas in Normannia, scilicet Longam villam et aliis, domino regi jurabunt quod eas ipsi vel ejus certo mandato reddent ad magnam vim et ad parvam. De hiis autem conventionibus firmiter domino regi tenendis, pono terram meam de Normannia erga ipsum in hostagium et contraplegium". (1)

This agreement has been quoted in full primarily in order to show how it refers firstly to Isobel's children in the plural and then to her sons William and Richard by name. This suggests that it had perhaps already been decided that Richard should hold his father's Norman lands. The charter is also interesting because it shows the elaborate precautions upon which King Philip insisted

---

(1) C.N., no.1120.

before admitting into France such important subjects of the King of England.

Whether or not his action had been decided upon as early as July, 1219, William Marshal junior certainly granted his father's Norman lands to his brother Richard at Melun eleven months later. His charter of June 1220 is quoted in full because several interesting points emerge:-

"Ego Guillelmus Marescallus, comes de Penbroc notum facio universis quod ego voluntate mea propria donavi et quitavi Ricardo fratri meo minori natu totam terram quam Guillelmus Marescallus, pater meus habebat et possidebat in Normannia ea die qua decessit, et requisivi dominum Philippum illustrem Francorum Regem ut ipsum Ricardum fratrem meum reciperet in hominem suum ligium de tota terra illa, tali modo quod si idem Ricardus sine herede de uxore sua desponsata moreretur terra illa ad me rediret, et ego facerem pro ea domino regi Francorum hominagium ligium citra mare et quicquid deberem eo modo et in tali puncto in quo predictus Guillelmus pater meus fecit ei hominagium, scilicet afferendo ei litteras Regis Angliae sicut pater meus fecit, et reddendo relevia qualia terra debet ad usus et consuetudines Normanniae. Si vero terra illa ad me reverteretur, ego jurarem domino Regi Francorum quod ego rederem ei vel ejus certo mandato fortericias tocius terre predicte ad magnam vim et parvam, quotiens cumque ab ipso vel certo mandato super hoc fuero

requisitus"[1].

In the first place this charter illustrates the difficulties which arise when the same man holds lands in England and in Normandy. There is no indication in the English sources that Richard held lands in England at this time and so it can be stated quite simply that he is to hold his father's lands of Philip Augustus by liege homage. If, however, he dies without heirs and his lands revert to his elder brother William, all that can be demanded of William is liege homage "citra mare" as his prime duty is clearly to the English king. In the second place, the terms of the charter suggest that although William says that he is making the grant to Richard "voluntate mea propria", there may in fact have been some pressure brought to bear from one side or the other, or both. On the one hand, it is clear from the additional conditions with which William would have had to comply, that Philip Augustus preferred the Norman lands to be in the hands of someone who could be his liege man in the full sense of the term and not merely "citra mare". On the other hand, the English king may have refused to grant to William junior the letter authorising his homage to Philip Augustus which the French king would clearly have required.

---

(1) Ibid., no.285. Cf. S. Painter, William Marshal (Baltimore, 1933), pp.280-81: Painter suggests that William senior bequeathed Longueville to Richard and in support of this suggestion cites Layettes du Trésor des Chartes, ed. A. Teulet, I (Paris, 1863), no.1397. However, this is the same charter as that printed in C.N., no.285.

-C-

If Richard had not held lands in England before 1219, he certainly acquired interests north of the Channel after that date[1] and, moreover, visited England on at least one occasion[2]. Nor were Richard's interests restricted to Normandy and England; in 1222 he became by marriage lord of Dinan in Brittany[3]. In spite of his importance as a Breton[4] and Norman magnate[5], Richard received many favours from King Henry apart from grants of land. For example, on 13th February 1226, a debt which he owed at the English Exchequer was remitted[6]. Then, too, his merchants were allowed special concessions during the wars of 1224-7[7] and 1229-31[8], when ships of subjects of the French king were banned from English ports. On the other hand, in common with certain other men who then held lands on both sides of the Channel, he seems to have suffered the temporary seizure of his English lands towards the end of the war of 1224-7[9].

---

(1) See, for example, Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 147 (Southampton); Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, pp.99 (Buckinghamshire), 103 (Huntingdonshire); C.P., X, 368, note g (Northamptonshire).

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.559.

(3) C.P., X, 368.

(4) Ibid., X, 369, note a.

(5) C.N. no.1140.

(6) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, 98 b.

(7) Ibid., 1224-7, pp.47,48 b, 145 b, 149; Pat.R. 1225-32, p.4.

(8) Ibid., 1225-32, pp.242,375.

(9) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 147.

-C-

In September 1230, when England and France were at war, Henry promised William Marshal, earl of Pembroke "quod si de ipso humanitus contigerit quamdiu moram fecit in partibus transmarinis in servicio nostro, Ricardus Marescallus, frater ejus, occasione more quam fecit in terra et potestate regis Francie, in nullo impediatur quin predicto comiti sine contradictione succedat, tamquam heres suus recuperet in tota potestate nostra"(1).

Henry's favours to Richard were not entirely unreciprocated for some of the latter's ships sailed with King Henry to Brittany in the spring of 1230(2). However, Richard himself apparently remained on the side of his liege lord, the king of France. This is clear not only from Henry's promise to William Marshal in September, 1230, but also from Richard's presence at the Norman Exchequer in the Easter term of 1231(3), and from Henry's attitude towards Richard at the time of his elder brother's death.

William Marshal died in April 1231(4), and in spite of Henry's promise, it seems that he was not too happy about accepting Richard as his brother's successor. On

---

(1) Pat.R. 1225-32, p.400.

(2) Ibid. 1225-32, p.375.

(3) Rec.de Jugements, no.467, note.

(4) Sir Maurice Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307, p.96.

15th April he instructed the bailiffs of a number of ports "quatinus non permittatis aliquem qui fuerit de potestate vel consilio regis Francorum, neque Ricardum Marescallum neque alium, applicare in portu vestro. Et si contingat ipsum Ricardum vel alium ... ibidem applicare, illum sine dilatione arrestari faciatis, donec aluid a nobis habueritis mandatum"(1). The reasons why Henry feared Richard were given in a letter to the magnates of Ireland in which the king notified them that the lands of the late earl of Pembroke had been taken into his hand. He says, "Nec credatis aliquatenus nos hoc fecisse occasione injuriandi in aliquo Ricardo Marescallo, fratri predicti comitis, quem non dubitamus suum esse propinquiorem heredem. Verum, quia idem Ricardus est homo ligius regis Francie capitalis inimici nostri, qui exhereditatione nostre insistit modis quibuscumque potest, a cujus ligancia si ipse Ricardus recedere velit, adhuc ignoramus; terra et tenementa que fuerunt ipsius comitis tenemus in manu nostra donec predictus Ricardus ad nos venerit, sicut venire debuerit, et super hereditate sua nobis fecerit que de jure facere debuerit, quem parati sumus audire et ei facere in hac parte que secundum legem et consuetudinem terre nostre facere debeamus..."(2)

---

(1) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.582.

(2) Pat.R. 1225-32, pp.435-6.

However, Richard soon convinced Henry of his good faith through Nicholas, prior of Notley and on 22nd June 1231, the king sent him letters of safe-conduct(1). On 8th August 1231, Henry took Richard's homage as earl of Pembroke and gave instructions that he should be given seisin of his late brother's lands(2).

Although Richard succeeded his brother as earl of Pembroke in 1231, he apparently retained his Norman lands until his death in 1234. Our evidence is provided by two entries in the Querimoniae Normannorum of 1247. One complainant says, with reference to Richard, that "terra dicti Marescalli devenit ad manum regis annis XIII jam elapsis"(3). Another says that certain lands "ad manum domini regis devenerunt eo quod Ricardus le Mareschal, miles, decessit in Anglia, nec venit ad pacem regis"(4). The latter entry suggests that it was the French king and not the English king who prevented Richard's successor Gilbert from succeeding to his brother's Norman lands. In December 1234, Gilbert Marshal was given compensation in England for the lands which he had lost in Normandy(5). Nevertheless,

---

(1) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.590.

(2) Ibid. 1227-31, p.541. As the editor of C.P. has said (C.P., X, 369, note c) "It is difficult to reconcile these facts with the stories of his having suffered injury through unjust delay (Ann.Mon., III, 127; Chronica Rogeri de Wendover liber qui dicitur Flores Historiarum, ed. H.G. Hewlett, III (Rolls Series, 1889), pp.13-14)".

(3) Q.N., no.331.

(4) Ibid., no.327.

(5) C.Ch.R. 1226-57, pp.189,191.

neither he nor his brother Walter, who succeeded him, gave up hope of recovering the family's Norman estates. On 18th June, 1240, King Henry granted Gilbert that "when he can, he may acquire and possess all his lands in Normandy; and assign them to whom he will of his brothers"(1). This, perhaps, suggests that it was the English king and not the French king who had been responsible for the arrangements of June 1220. On the other hand, in October 1241, after Walter Marshal had succeeded his brother Gilbert as earl of Pembroke, the king conceded that "notwithstanding the truce(2) with L. king of France, [he] may do homage to that king touching his right in Normandy, to wit, touching the lands late of his father and brother"(3). However, Walter was no more successful than his brother had been before him.

(67) Hugo de Gurnaio (c)

Hugh de Gournai deserted John in 1203 and lost both his Norman and his English lands(4). He eventually returned to John's allegiance, but not until after 28th December 1205 when the king informed him that "pro amore et petitione karissimi nepotis nostri O.illustris Regis

---

(1) Ibid. 1226-57, pp.252-3.

(2) i.e. presumably, truce and not permanent peace.

(3) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.261.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.340-41.

Romani perdonavimus tui malivolentiam nostram. Et ideo tui mandamus quod secure venias per terram nostram ad eundum in servicium nostrum in insulam de Geres' vel apud Rupellam ubi melius viderimus expedire. Et concedimus quod adducas tecum uxorem et filios tuos et eis providebimus"(1). Presumably Hugh obeyed the king's instructions fairly promptly for on 13th February 1206, the sheriffs of all the counties in which he had lands were ordered to restore his property to him(2).

(68) Robertus de Harecurt (d)

As Powicke has noted the main points of interest in this complicated family history, it seems best to quote his account in full and then comment on it. He says:-

"In 1204 Robert of Harcourt was still living, but he was succeeded by his son Richard before 1208. Richard, as the husband of Matilda, the youngest daughter of Ralph Tesson, was, after 1213, lord of Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte. He died between 1236 and 1242.

Richard of Harcourt's relations with England are important. In 1204 his father had possessed the manors of Sileby and Burstall (Leicestershire), Sherston (Wiltshire),

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.57b.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.65.

Wellingborough (Northamptonshire), Ludham (Suffolk), Ilmington (Warwickshire), and Bensington (Oxfordshire). In 1204 these lands were confiscated. His son John held Rothley in Leicestershire, and this also was confiscated. Both Richard and John of Harcourt made overtures to the king in 1206, but only John returned to England and received possession of his own and the ancestral lands between 1211 and 1215. He died before Damietta in 1219. In the following year Richard, the elder brother who lived in Normandy, got seisin of the Harcourt lands in England for £500 and retained them until 1236 when he lost them, owing perhaps to his share in the campaign undertaken by Saint Louis in that year. His son John succeeded for a time in securing Ilmington, which had gone to Simon de Montfort: he defended Simon in 1260 against the charge of treason. This is an interesting illustration of the effect produced by the civil wars upon the terrae Normannorum. Ilmington afterwards came to the Montforts".(1)

The first comment which is necessary is about the date of the elder John's return to England. Powicke substantiates his claim that John recovered part of his English lands as early as 1211 by a reference to an entry in the Close Rolls under that year(2). However,

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.342-3.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.115 b.

Appendix IV

-C-

he has failed to notice the editor's comment that "Hoc fragmentum erronice ad annum duodecim ascribitur, portio esse exemplaris Rotuli anni sextidecim evidenter apparet"(1). This fragment is indeed an exact copy of a section of the later Roll where the entry referring to John of Harcourt is dated 14th May 1215(2).

A second point which is worth making is that John seems to have retained his lands in Normandy when he recovered his English lands, for a writ dated in August 1216 informs us that "Willelmus de Bruill' homo Johannis de Harecurt et sui quos secum ducent habent litteras de conductu in veniendo ad dominum Regem cum rebus ipsius Johannis quas secum defert de partibus transmarinis sine termino"(3).

Thirdly, Richard's English lands were taken into the king's hand in 1236 because he was dead and not for any other reason. In October, 1236, the king instructed the sheriff of Warwickshire and Leicestershire to give seisin to Simon de Montfort "de terris et tenementis que Ricardus de Harecurt, Normannus, qui mortuus est tenuit in ballivia tua de feodo predicti Simonis"(4). The king

---

(1) Ibid. 1204-24, p.115 b.

(2) Ibid. 1204-24, p.200.

(3) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.192.

(4) Cl.R. 1234-7, p.319.

had previously promised Simon any terrae Normannorum in his fee which escheated to the crown(1). Apparently Richard's lands were regarded as terrae Normannorum after his death because his son, who was in Normandy, was a minor. The following entry in the Patent Rolls, dated 15th May 1237, suggests that the king may have intended to return Richard's lands to his heir when the latter came of age: "Grant to William de Mastac of the manors of Wycham, county Suffolk, and Schorestan, county Wiltshire, during the minority of the heir of Richard de Harecurt, a Norman, on this condition, that the king will assign to him and his heirs within the said term 50 l. a year of land, and then the said manors shall revert to the king"(1). Presumably John de Harcourt had not attained his majority before the events of 1244 put an end to this possibility for the time being; certainly, he was still a minor in May 1242 when the "relicta Richardi de Harecuria" was named as responsible for providing the service due to the French king from Richard's Norman fee(2).

Powicke cites a chronicle reference in support of his claim that John recovered Ilmington, Warwickshire, in 1260.(3) However, the Close Rolls record that in July,

---

(1) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.182.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 728 d.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.343, note 15 : "See a chronicle, probably of Evesham, in Leland, Collectanea, ed. Hearne (1715), i, 245".

1260, the king "concessit Johanni de Harecurt quod secundum legem et consuetudinem regni Angliae possit brevia regis in curia regis impetrare et per ea placitare de terris et tenementis in que jus sibi vendicat" and that the property concerned was Ilmington(1). Moreover, we know that he recovered his rights, for the Charter Rolls record in June, 1272, the "Inspeximus and confirmation of a charter whereby John, lord of Harecurt, knight, gave to Peter de Monte Forti... all the manor of Ylmindon, county Warwick..."(2)

A point which Powicke has not mentioned is that Richard's English lands were temporarily taken into the king's hands on at least two occasions as a result of his double allegiance. On the first occasion the seizure took place on or shortly before October 1226(3) and lasted until December in the same year(4). On the second occasion, instructions were given for the seizure of his lands in July 1234(5) and for their return in the following September(6). On the latter occasion it was stated that the seizure had taken place "eo quod dicebatur ipsum nuper fuisse in exercitu regis Francie contra P.comitem Brittanie..."

---

(1) Cl.R. 1259-61, p.189.

(2) C.Ch.R. 1257-1300, p.182.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.141.

(4) Ibid. 1224-7, p.162 b.

(5) Cl.R. 1231-4, p.475.

(6) Ibid. 1231-4, p.525.

-C-

As well as his brother John, Richard had another brother called Amaury. Prior to 1204, Amaury was dean of Wimbourne in England as well as of Mortain in Normandy(1). However, in 1204 he lost all his rents in England, the majority of which were granted in June, 1204, to the treasurer of Poitou(2). Although Amaury was still living in the reign of Louis IX(3) there is no evidence that he ever recovered his English revenues despite the fact that his brothers John and Richard in turn enjoyed the English kings' favour.

(69) Jordanus de Humeto (a,b,c)

By 1204, Jordan du Hommet had been succeeded by his son John(4). In September 1204, John's English lands were in the king's hands as terrae Normannorum(5) but by 22nd June 1205 he had offered a fine of £100 and one palfrey for their return(6). In the Feoda Normanniae which was compiled between 1204 and 1208, the entry under his name is endorsed "rex habet"(7). Before long,

---

(1) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, ccvi.

(2) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.43.

(3) Q.N., no.352.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.336.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.7.

(6) Ibid. 1204-24, p.38 b; P.R. 7 John, p.235; Rot.de Ob.et Fin. p.259.

(7) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 709 b.

Appendix IV

-C-

however, John had either had a change of heart or forfeited the English king's confidence in some way for, on 14th March, 1207, instructions were issued that all his English lands were to be seized once more[1]. Again the seizure was only temporary for the Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas 1208 records that "Radulfus de Trublevill' reddet compotum ... de exitibus terrarum Johannis de Humez ... de tribus partibus anni antequam redderetur Johanni de Humez"[2]. John apparently took the part of the rebellious barons in the civil war for on 26th February 1216 his son-in-law was granted "totam terram que fuit Johannis de Humez qui est cum inimicis domini Regis..."[3]. However, John returned to his allegiance before King John's death for in 18 John 1216 he fined twenty marks and one palfrey for the king's favour and the return of his property[4]. John du Hommet was himself dead by 18th June 1223 when his English lands were granted to his daughter Lucy and her husband, Richard de Grey[5].

John's vacillations were no doubt connected with the fact that other members of his family chose the Norman allegiance in 1204. The record of a judgment made at the Norman exchequer in 1214 reveals that his uncle, William du Hommet,

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.69 b.

(2) P.R. 10 John, p.14.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.249.

(4) Rot.de Ob.et Fin., p.586.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.552.

Constable of Normandy[1] was granted some of John's Norman lands. It is interesting to note that, in spite of his apparent unreliability, provision was made in this judgement for the contingency of John's return to the French king's peace[2]. Although William was granted some of his nephew's lands, it is clear from the Querimoniae Normannorum that others remained annexed to the royal demesne[3].

(70) Ricardus de Hummeto (a,b,e)

By 1204, Richard du Hommet had been succeeded by his son William who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands[4]. However, as Powicke points out, his loyalty to Philip was apparently not above suspicion for c.1210 he was required to find "plegios de M.marcis pro legitimo servicio faciendo domino Regi"[5].

Philip's suspicions were probably not altogether unconnected with the fact that not all the members of William's family chose the Norman allegiance in 1204; his nephew John chose the English allegiance[6], as did his widowed daughter Agnes Wake[7] and his granddaughter

---

(1) See Appendix IV, section C, no.70.

(2) Rec. de Jugements, no.145.

(3) Q.N., no.287.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.343.

(5) C.N., no.204.

(6) See Appendix IV, section C, no.69.

(7) I.J. Sanders, English baronies - a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327, p.107 and note 9; C.N., no.437 and note 1.

Clemence who was married to the powerful earl of Chester[1].

William's eldest son Richard died before the loss of Normandy but he had a second son Thomas[2] who can be traced in the duchy after 1204[3]. It seems likely that he and the Thomas de Humeto whose land in Jersey had been granted to Thomas Paynel by 3rd October, 1207[4] were one and the same person.

As Powicke has noted, "Through his mother William and his brother Enguerrand succeeded to the honour of Remilly (Manche). This was held by Enguerrand in parage"[5]. Enguerrand was dead by 1198 and his heir was William de Semilly[6]. In England, William de Semilly inherited from his father the manor of Risborough, Buckinghamshire, which had been granted to Richard du Hommet by Henry II in 1173[7]. Risborough was seized as terra Normannorum in 1204[8]. However, on 28th October, William de Semilly was restored to King John's favour[9]. In November, 1223 William filius Ernisii was granted Risborough "quae fuit Willelmi de Simlly

---

(1) P.R. 5 John, p.114; C.P. III, 168; D.N.B. V, 271; Ann.Mon. I, 305.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm. II, clxxxi.

(3) C.N., no.204.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.93.

(5) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.343.

(6) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, lxxix.

(7) Ibid., II, clxxxiii - clxxxiv.

(8) R.N., p.131.

(9) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.158.

qui mortuus est"[1] but by 18th January 1224, William de Semilly junior had done homage for his father's English lands[2]. By September 1242, William junior was also deceased and Drogo de Trubleville had Risborough in his custody, together with William's heir[3]. Presumably this heir was another William and chose the Norman allegiance in 1244, for an entry in the Book of Fees under the year 1247 states, "De terris Normannorum, dicunt quod manerium de Ryseberg' est escaeta domini regis de Willelmo de Simili"[4].

Although no evidence has been found in the Norman sources that the three Williams retained their lands in Normandy between 1215 and 1244, it seems almost certain that they did. In the first place, the fact that Risborough was taken into the king's hands and then granted out to William filius Ernisii after the death of the first William suggests that his son William did not succeed to Risborough automatically because he held lands in Normandy and had to negotiate with the English king for seisin of his English inheritance. Secondly, the fact that Risborough became terrae Normannorum between 1242 and 1247 suggests, as already said, that its holder

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.576.

(2) Ibid. 1204-24, p.582.

(3) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 385.

(4) B.of F., p.1405.

was one of those who had to choose between their English and Norman estates in 1244. In the third place, a William de Semilly was among those present at the Norman Exchequer in 1252[1].

(71) Comes Leycestriae (b)

Powicke states that "in 1204 the honour [i.e. of Leicester] included Breteuil and, through Petronilla, the mother of Robert IV, Grandmésnil. It had been stripped of Paci-sur-Eure in 1194 but was still of vast extent. In 1172 it had contained 121 knights. According to the life of the Marshal, Robert IV was prepared to come to an arrangement about his Norman fiefs in 1204, but he died in October. Philip Augustus added his lands to the demesne"[2].

However, Philip Augustus arranged for the compensation of Robert's two sisters and coheirs for the loss of their Norman lands. Amice, the elder, was married to Simon de Montfort, Seigneur of Montfort and Rochefort and consequently remained in France after 1204. In that year "Philip Augustus granted to her Saint-Leger in Iveline in exchange for Bréteuil and by her charter of the same date she quitclaimed him all her late brother's possessions in Normandy, and bound herself to indemnify her sister, if necessary, out of the English estates". Amice's sister

---

(1) Rec.de Jugements, no. 793.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.343-4.

and coheir was Margaret, wife of Saher de Quincy, later Earl of Winchester.

Amice's son, another Simon de Montfort, held his mother's English lands for a time but lost them in February 1207. Then, in August 1231, her grandson, a third Simon, secured all her rights in England, having previously quitclaimed any rights he had in France to his elder brother Amaury(1).

(72) Willelmus de Mara (e)

In 1172, William de La Mare held half a knight's fee in Normandy(2). In May, 1219, Philip Augustus granted to a burgess of Meulan, "une maison sise à Rouen, dans la rue du Grand-Pont, laquelle avait appartenu à Guillaume de la Mare, et avait été possédée par Henri, archidiacre de Cantorbery"(3). Whether or not this is the William with whom we are concerned, it is impossible to say, but this William seems to have held property in Surrey as well as the house in Rouen. The Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas, 1200, records that "Henricus Cantuar' archidiaconus debet dimidium m. ut scribitur in magno rotulo quod Willelmus de Mara dedit et concessit et carta sua confirmavit ei totam terram suam quam habuit apud Bedefund'..."(4). The association of the two names on

---

(1) This and the preceding paragraph are based on C.P., VII, 538-45.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 697a.

(3) C.A.Ph.Aug., no.1911.

(4) P.R. 2 John, p.219.

both sides of the Channel makes it more or less certain that the same two men are concerned on each occasion. As Philip's grant of 1219 suggests, William chose the English allegiance in 1204.

According to the Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas, 1214, William de La Mare of Surrey had a brother Henry whose debts he had taken over in or before 1213[1]. In September 1205, a Henry de la Mare, whose wife was Petronilla de Craon, fined with King John for the return of the lands which he had held "die qua recessit de servicio nostro" and his brother William quaranteed his fine[2]. The lands concerned were in the counties of Southampton, Lincolnshire, Sussex and Wiltshire. On 5th September 1207, the sheriff of Southampton was instructed to take into the king's hand "totam terram Henrici de Mara Normanni in baillia tua ... quia idem Henricus nihil nobis reddidit de hiis quae nobis debet."[3] The fact that Henry is described as "Normannus" implies that he retained his lands in Normandy when he recovered his English lands. Unfortunately, however, no evidence has been found to confirm this. This Henry was dead by 1211 when Oliver Vaux fined with the king for his widow Petronilla[4]. Since our William had inherited

---

(1) Ibid. 16 John, p.36.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.49 b; Rot.de Ob. et Fin., p.315.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.91 b.

(4) P.R. 13 John, p.1.

his brother Henry's debts and therefore presumably his lands, by 1213 at the latest, it seems almost certain that the Henry who was married to Petronilla was the same person as Henry, brother of the William de la Mare who held lands in Surrey. If William inherited Henry's English lands, it is possible that Henry recovered them between September 1207 and his death.

(73) Robertus de Marmion (a,b,d)

Powicke has observed that this was a case of double tenure after 1204, but his note is not very full or explicit. He says:

"After 1204 Robert Marmion stayed in England, but his eldest son Robert remained in Normandy. The latter's son, Philip, left Normandy for England, and in 1256 Joan, daughter of Ralph Tesson, had the disposition of the Norman fief in virtue of some relationship.

The circumstances under which Philip Marmion came to England are significant. Robert Marmion the elder died in 1218 leaving, in addition to Robert of Fontenai, another son Robert, by a second wife. In May 1218, after his father's death, this second son Robert made an elaborate fine with Henry III, whereby he was to hold the extensive English lands of his father, 'until the lands of the English and the Normans should be common to both' again. On his elder brother's return, he would retire to the lands already granted to him by his father. Robert, the eldest son, availed himself of this arrangement in

1220 and, in spite of his tenure in Normandy, contrived to hold Tamworth and Scrivelsby of Henry III. This is one of the most striking cases of double tenure. Both sons died shortly after 1240, and were succeeded by their sons Philip and William. Philip came to England in 1242. The cousins took opposite sides during the civil wars, Philip fighting for the king and William being an adherent of Simon de Montfort"[1].

A few additional points are worth making. In the first place, not only Robert the elder and the second born of his two sons named Robert chose the English allegiance in 1204, but also the former's third son William. William, who was dean of Tamworth, held lands in Lincolnshire and Sussex[2].

In the second place, Robert senior, the first born son of Robert the elder, had entered into negotiations with King John for the return of his own English lands as early as 1216; safe-conducts were issued to him in November 1216[3] and again in June 1217[4]. Presumably he failed to utilize these safe-conducts for the next we hear of him is in the above-mentioned fine made by his

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.339.

(2) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, pp.166 b, 171,193; Pat.R. 1216-25, pp.7,77,84; Ex e Rot.Fin., I,9.

(3) Pat.R. 1216-25, p.4.

(4) Ibid. 1216-25, p.68.

younger brother Robert in 1218, when he was clearly not in possession of any lands in England[1].

Another point which Powicke does not mention is that the English lands of both Roberts and their brother William were for some reason in the hands of the Earl of Chester at some time between 1226 and 1228, according to an entry in the Book of Fees[2]. The seizure was only temporary and presumably took place at some time during the war of 1224-7. Possibly Robert junior and William were staying with their brother at Fontenai at the time Henry III decided to confiscate all terrae Normannorum and were therefore treated as Normans themselves.

As Powicke observes, Robert senior retained his Norman lands when he acquired his father's English lands in 1220. According to Stapleton, in fact, he was for the most part resident at Fontenai[3]. Certainly his English lands seem to have been committed to the custody of someone else for most of the period of double tenure[4]. Robert senior was succeeded by his son Philip and it seems that for a time Philip, too, held lands on both sides of the Channel. He had been granted his father's

---

(1) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 9.

(2) B.of F., p.362.

(3) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, civ.

(4) Pat.R. 1216-25, p.319; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.186.

English lands before the latter's death[1] and in 1243, after Robert's death, was involved with his brother Roger in a lawsuit with the church of St Sepulchre at Caen[2]. In 1256, however, Joan daughter and coheir of Ralph Tesson, confirmed to the abbey of Barberie all the grants and concessions made by her ancestors in the fief of Robert Marmion[3]. Since Philip was still alive and in possession of his lands in England[4], it seems likely that he had lost his Norman lands as a result of having to choose between the French and English allegiances in 1244.

(74) Galfridus Martel (b)

By 1204, Geoffrey had been succeeded by William Martel who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands[5]. Loyd remarks that other members of this family seem to have remained in England after 1204 but cites no names or references[6].

(75) Rogerus Martel (b,d)

Roger seems to have been the brother of Geoffrey

---

(1) C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.248.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, civ.

(3) Ibid., II, cvii.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.339.

(5) Ibid., p.332; L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, p.60.

(6) Ibid., p.60; see also Appendix IV, section C, no.75.

Martel (q.v.)[1]. By 1204, Roger had been succeeded by his son Ralph[2], who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands[3].

However, on 2nd November 1215, the sheriffs concerned were instructed to return to Ralph his property at Tattenhoe, Buckinghamshire, and Lillingston, Oxfordshire[4]. At some date not known to us, Ralph gave his English property to "Willelmo fratri suo, qui eam post modum forisfecit apud Bed'"[5]. According to an entry in the Book of Fees, William was one of those who were hanged after the seige of Bedford in 1224[6]. From this date onwards, Tattenhoe and Lillingston are described as terrae Normannorum[7].

(76) Comes Mellenti (b,c,d)

The story of the effects of the war of 1202-4 on the count of Meulan and his family is a complicated one and for the basic outline one can do no better than to quote Powicke:-

"The history of the count of Meulan in 1204 and the next few years suggests a story of great misfortune. Owing to the fact that they were vassals of the king of France, his predecessors had never been able to retain

---

(1) Appendix IV, section C, no.78.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxl.

(3) R.N., p.131; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.16 b, 17.

(4) Ibid. 1204-24, p.234.

(5) C.R.R., XIV, no.1223.

(6) B.of F., p.614.

(7) Ibid., pp.614,1397,1404.

uninterrupted possession of their Norman lands.... The honour stretched along the valley of the Risle, at Pont-Audemer, Brionne and Beaumont-le-Roger. Count Robert was so unfortunate as to become reconciled with John for the last time in April, 1203. A month later his son Peter betrayed Beaumont-le-Roger to Philip Augustus, and lost his Norman lands and English benefices. Robert was obliged by his circumstances to pledge his Norman lands for 5000 marks and to retain only a contingent interest in them. On May 1, 1204, the count, who was an old man, divested himself of all his lands in France, Normandy and England in favour of his daughter, Mabiria, wife of William, earl of the Isle of Wight. This act apparently took place at Préaux, near Rouen. Neither Philip nor John was disposed to pay any heed to this attempt on the part of the count to transmit his honour intact. The eldest son, Waleran, had been killed during a pilgrimage, Peter, the traitor, was dead, Mabiria, a woman. Philip Augustus excluded the count from his peace proposals and John's officials enrolled Stourminster, the caput of his English lands, among the terrae Normannorum. In France and Normandy all knowledge of him was lost. He lived for a few years, dependent on John's charity. His wife Matilda was rather more fortunate since she possessed lands in Cornwall in right of her father, Reginald, earl of Cornwall.....

The Norman honour owed the service of fifteen knights and comprised sixty three. It was added to the demesne ...

King Philip did not admit the claims of Ralph of Meulan, son of Waleran and nephew of Peter, to succeed to Beaumont-le-Roger and Brionne but assigned him Courseulles-sur-mer (Calvados). This recompense was confirmed and enlarged by King Louis in August, 1255, 'in consideration of his noble ancestry'"(1).

However, Powicke has failed to notice that for a few years Ralph of Meulan held lands in England as well as in Normandy. An entry in the Book of Fees records that "Dominus Radulfus de Meulent tenet [sic] manerium de Ippolepenn' de domino rege in capite post coronacionem domini regis. Et quia Radulfus de Meulent non venit ad exercitum domini regis quando dominus rex fuit in Britannia, dominus rex dedit dictum manerium Nicholao de Lettres ...."(2) The coronation to which reference is made must be the second coronation of Henry III which took place on 17th May 1220(3) and, even then, there must have been a time lag before Ralph recovered his property for in November, 1221 Ipplepen was still in the hands of the earl of Chester to whom it had been granted by King John(4). Ralph must have been restored to favour at some time between this date and May 1223, when he was granted the gift of a stag from the royal forest of Dartmoor(5).

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.344-5.

(2) B.of F., p.1262.

(3) Sir Maurice Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307, p.18.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.481.

(5) Ibid. 1204-24, p.549.

-C-

The manor of Ipplepen, which was in Devon, had come to Ralph through his mother Margaret to whom it had been granted in marriage by her father, Ralph of Fougères[1]. However, he was granted it not as of right but " de baillio regis"[2]. Ralph lost Ipplepen again in the early months of the war of 1229-31 but on 25th October, 1229, the sheriff of Devon was ordered to restore to him the land "quam cepit in manum regis eo quod dicebatur quod fuit in partibus transmarinis"[3]. However, this restoration was shortlived for on 26th September 1230 the king granted Ipplepen to Nicholas de Lettres at pleasure[4] and thereafter it is described in the records as terrae Normannorum[5].

(77) Rogerus de Nonant (b)

(78) Guido de Nonant (b)

According to the Red Book of the Exchequer, three members of this family held in chief of the Norman duke in 1172; Roger and Guy each held eleven and a quarter fees and John three and a half fees[6]. However, the text preserved in Register A omits the entry for John and ascribes three and a half fees instead of eleven and a

---

(1) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxcviii.

(2) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.378.

(3) Ibid. 1227-31, p.224.

(4) Ibid. 1227-31, p.439.

(5) B.of F., pp.612,1262.

(6) R.B., pp.630,632.

quarter to Roger[1]. Since only two persons with the surname of Nonant, Henry and Renaud, are mentioned in the Feoda Normanniae, 1204-8[2], Powicke has concluded that the Red Book entries are inaccurate and the Register A entries correct. Referring to later lists of knights' fees drawn up between 1210 and 1220, he says "If Henry's six fees near Nonant[3] are added to the four and two ninths fees which are detailed as having gone to Guérin of Glapion[4], and to the extra fee (four and a half instead of three and a half) which had gone between 1172 and 1204 to Renaud of Nonant[5], we have eleven and two ninths, approximately the eleven and a quarter which belonged to Guy in 1172. This calculation assumes that Renaud was Roger's successor, and that Roger held only three and a half fees"[6]. This argument appears ingenious but is unfortunately based on the incorrect assumption that Renaud succeeded Roger and Henry succeeded Guy. In fact, it is clear from the English records that Henry succeeded Roger[7]. This makes the whole situation

---

(1) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 695 d and j.

(2) Ibid., XXIII, 706 e.

(3) Ibid., XXIII, 636 f g.

(4) Ibid., XXIII 620 b.

(5) Ibid., XXIII, 706 e.

(6) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.349, note 23.

(7) I.J. Sanders, English baronies - a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327, p.89; Cf. P.R. 23 Henry II, p.3 and ibid. 24 Henry II, p.11.

far more complex than Powicke suggests. Nevertheless, the basic conclusion reached by Powicke remains true; Henry of Nonant chose the English allegiance in 1204 and lost his Norman lands[1], while Renaud chose the Norman allegiance[2]. It has not been possible to establish whether Renaud or his predecessors ever held lands in England.

(79) Henricus de Novo Burgo (a)

Henry de Neubourg was succeeded by another Henry who in 1204 chose the Norman allegiance[3]. From 1212 onwards, his English lands are described as terrae Normannorum[4]. However, it appears that his brother Robert may have held them for a short time after 1204 until his death, for, in 1220, and again in 1228, Robert's widow Ela tried, unsuccessfully, to recover he dower in England[5] and two of the places to which she laid claim are places once held by Henry[6]. Although it is not explicitly stated in the record of the proceedings that

---

(1) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 706 e, 620 b, 636 f g. See also I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.89.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 706 e.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.348.

(4) e.g. R.B., p.497; B.of F., pp.106,1416; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.261.

(5) C.R.R., IX, p.300; ibid., XIII, no.705.

(6) i.e. Basildon, Berkshire (cf. B.of F. pp.106,1416 with C.R.R., IX, 300) and Stoke Edith, Herefordshire (cf. R.B., p.497 with C.R.R., IX, p.348 and ibid., XIII, no.705).

Robert held these lands after 1204, the inference is strong. In 1220 Ela and her new husband stated that "heres domini sui Roberti de Novo Burgo est in transmarinis partibus, et nesciunt quis sit ille; set ipsa, quando terra de Normannia amissa fuit, venit in Angliam et numquam postea exivit, et ideo petit judicium si debeat dotem amittere"(1). Moreover, in 1228 she said that "Robertus vir suus obiit sine herede de se, nec scit quod aliquem habeat heredem nisi dominum regem, qui terram illam cepit in manum suam post mortem ipsius Roberti"(2). If Robert had died before 1204, his lands in England would presumably have reverted to his brother Henry as his heir, and not escheated to the crown.

(80) Ricardus de Oilleio (d)

Richard de Oilleio had lands in Berkshire and Oxfordshire as well as in Normandy(3). However, he was dead by the time the "Rotulus de valore terrarum Normannorum" was compiled for this document records that "villa de Faleday quae fuit Ricardi de Oilly quam Ernulfus de Mauley habuit in custodia cum herede ipsius Ricardi capta est in manu domini Regis..."(4) Richard's heir was in fact his daughter who later married Ernulf

---

(1) C.R.R., IX, 300.

(2) Ibid., XIII, no.705.

(3) R.B., pp.59,73,83,94,100,108,123,127,143,176.

(4) R.N., p.142.

de Mandes[1]. Although Ernulf chose the Norman allegiance in 1204[2], he recovered his English lands on two separate occasions. On the first of these occasions, the recovery lasted only a few months: the sheriffs of Oxfordshire and Berkshire were instructed to give him seisin of his lands there on 8th September 1204[3] but on 1st April 1205 his Oxfordshire property was granted to Geoffrey de Caux[4]. On 6th October 1217, the king informed the sheriff of Oxfordshire that "ad peticionem et instanciam domini Ludovici reddidimus Ernulfo de Maude terram suam de Auberbur' quae est jus uxoris sue..."[5]. This time, Ernulf apparently retained possession of his English lands until his death for an entry in the Book of Fees under the year 1248 records that "villa de Suhtfalle est escaeta domini regis per mortem Ernulfi de Maunes, Normanni...."[6]. His death must have taken place before 10th November 1224 when his lands in Oxfordshire and Berkshire were granted to Walter de Verdun and Adam de Stawill respectively[7]. Thereafter, his lands are

---

(1) B. of F., p.1154; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.327 b.

(2) R.N., p.142; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 706 cd, 616 hj.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.7 b.

(4) Ibid. 1204-24, p.25 b.

(5) Ibid. 1204-24, p.327 b.

(6) B. of F., p.1415. Ernulf's property had been temporarily seized in 1221 in accordance with "preceptum domini Regis... de dominicis et escaetis in manum suam capiendis" but was quickly restored (Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.482 b).

(7) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.6.

described as terrae Normannorum[1].

(81) Willelmus de Ouville (b)

The William of 1172 was succeeded in 1203 by another William[2]. This William had a brother Simon and both men held lands in England as well as in Normandy[3]. In 1204 they both chose the Norman allegiance and lost their English lands[4]. In July, 1212, the king instructed the sheriff of Leicestershire "quod plenariam saisinam habere facias Willelmo de Breaute vadletto nostro de terra quae fuit Willelmi de Ovilla avunculi sui"[5]. In spite of William de Breauté's relationship with William de Ouville, he was only granted his uncle's lands "quamdiu nobis placuerit". In 1225 when the same property was granted to the earl of Chester, the previous holder is named as Nicholas de Nereford.[6]

(82) Hugo Paganellus (a,b,c)

By 1204, Hugh Paynel had been succeeded by his grandson, another Hugh[7]. Hugh II chose the English allegiance and his Norman honour of Moutiers-Hubert was

---

(1) e.g. C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.134.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, ccxxxviii.

(3) Ibid., II, ccxxxviii; R.N., p.117; B.of F., pp.1153,1393.

(4) William : Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.120; B.of F., p.1393;
Simon : B.of F., pp.301,864,1153.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.120.

(6) Ibid., 1224-7, p.11.

(7) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.347; E.Y.C., VI, pedigree facing p.1.

added to Philip's demesne[1]. By way of compensation he was given lands at Drax, Yorkshire, which had belonged to Fulk II Paynel of Hambye, his father's cousin[2]. It seems that Hugh may have hesitated before finally deciding upon the English allegiance for, on 15th April, 1205, the sheriff of Lincolnshire was instructed to return to him his land at West Rasen, "unde ipse dissaisitus fuit occasione dissaisine Normannorum"[3].

Fulk II Paynel of Hambye chose the Norman allegiance in 1204[4] and lost his lands in England, which included Bingham, Nottinghamshire[5] and Duddington, Northamptonshire[6], as well as Drax, Yorkshire[7]. In 1208, judgement was given at the Norman Exchequer "quod Fulco Paganelli habeat terram fratrum suorum fugitorum, quam eisdem dederat pro servicio suo, et unde ei fecerant homagium suum, quia dominus rex habuit exitus ipsius terre de uno anno"[8]. The brothers to whom reference is made are presumably Hasculf and Thomas Paynel.

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.347; C.N. no.113.

(2) E.Y.C., VI, 10-11, and pedigree facing p.1.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.27 b.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.342; C.N., no.124.

(5) R.N., p.141; B.of F. pp.230,618.

(6) R.N., p.134.

(7) B.of F. p.357.

(8) Rec.de Jugements, no.30.

-C-

Hasculf was a clerk and sometime prebendary of York[1] who chose the English allegiance ultimately, although not apparently until 1207. Before the loss of Normandy he had been in receipt of rents in the duchy as well as in England, for in March, 1208, the bailiffs of the Channel Islands were ordered "quod habere faciatis Hasculf' Painel redditus clericorum Normanniae qui sunt in bailliis vestris qui habent redditus ejusdem Hasculf' in Normannia. Et praeterea faciatis ei habere omnes ecclesias monachorum de omnibus insulis quae sunt in baillia vestra"[2]. On several occasions after this date, we see Hasculf engaged on the king's business[3], but he was dead by 1220[4].

Although no definite evidence has been found that Thomas Paynel was the brother of Hasculf and Fulk, the circumstantial evidence is strong. For example, we find Thomas in the company of Hasculf in April 1207 when the king orders the bailiffs of Portsmouth to provide a ship to take them to Guernsey[5]. On 3rd October, 1207, Thomas Paynel was granted the land in Jersey which had

---

(1) E.Y.C., VI, 20-21.

(2) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.81.

(3) e.g. Ibid. 1201-16, pp.145 b,180,195; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.217 b,218 a.

(4) E.Y.C., VI, 21.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.81 b; and see also E.Y.C., VI, 21 on Thomas.

belonged to Thomas de Hommet[1] and a later charter relating to this same grant reveals that it was an exchange for the lands he had lost in Normandy[2].

Another member of the Paynel family who chose the Norman allegiance in 1204 was a certain Gertrude, who seems to have been the aunt of Fulk II Paynel of Hambye[3]. On 5th September 1205, the sheriff of Yorkshire was ordered to take into the king's hand the land in Barton-le-Street which had belonged to Gertrude and her nephew "qui sunt ultra mare cum inimicis contra nos"[4]. This property was never again in the hands of any branch of the Paynel family[5].

In 1214, Fulk II Paynel of Hambye was restored to the English king's favour. A charter of King John's dated in June 1214, states: "Sciatis quod remisimus Fulconi Painell' omnem iram, rancorem et indignationem et malivolentiam quam erga eum concepimus a tempore praeterito et ipsum in gratiam nostram plene recepimus et concessimus ei totam terram suam et feodum suum integre quae de nobis tenuit in Anglie et alia tenementa sua in Normannia cum

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.93.

(2) Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.192.

(3) E.Y.C., VI, 26.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.48 b.

(5) E.Y.C., VI, 26.

omnibus pertinentiis suis sicut ea habuit tempore quo ultimo recessimus ab Normannia"(1).

The wording of this charter suggests that Fulk changed his allegiance in 1214; if he had recovered his English lands while remaining in possession of his Norman lands, it seems unlikely that King John would have made the reference to his lands in the duchy. It seems that the clause relating to his Norman lands is, in fact, a contingent clause - if King John recovers Normandy he will return to Fulk the Norman lands which he lost when he went over to the English king. It should be noted that the charter was issued while King John was on the continent and before his fortunes declined after the disaster at La Roche-aux-Moines(2).

With reference to this charter, the editor of Early Yorkshire Charters, Vol.VI, states that "the English lands were evidently not delivered to him"(3). However, it seems that Fulk was for a time in the king's service in England for, on 3rd March 1215, John informed Philip de Ullcotes that "mittimus ad vos Fulconem Painel militem qui pacatus est de liberacionibus suis usque ad viij diem Marc' eadem die computata, mandates quatinus a die

---

(1) Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.207 b.

(2) A.L. Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216 (Oxford, 1955), pp.466-7.

(3) E.Y.C., VI, 27, note 5.

illa liberaciones suas ei habere faciatis quousque aliud inde vobis mandaverimus"[1]. Moreover, on 24th June 1217, instructions were issued that Hasculf Paynel should be given seisin "de tota terra quae fuit Fulconis Paynell' fratris sui"[2] as if Fulk had recently been disseized. Hasculf's enjoyment of these lands was, however, only temporary, and Drax was later restored to Hugh Paynel who had for a time supported the rebellious barons[3].

Before 1230, Fulk II had been succeeded by his son, Fulk III[4]. Meanwhile, in 1229, members of the family had apparently risen against the French king in support of Peter of Brittany. Although the rebels are not actually named, they are described by one French chronicler as "ceux de la Haye-Painel" and by another as "Les habitans de la Haie-Paisnel"[5]. However, they were crushed almost immediately by a small force despatched against them by Queen Blanche. In spite of this defeat, the Paynel family was still inclined to treachery. Roger of Wendover records that in the year

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.189 b.

(2) Ibid. 1204-24, p.312 b.

(3) E.Y.C., VI, 20 and note 6; see also p.10.

(4) Ibid., VI, 27,29.

(5) Les Grandes Chroniques de France ou Chronique de Saint-Denis, ed P. Paris, IV (Paris, 1838), p.239; Le Nain de Tillemont. Vie de Saint Louis, roi de France, ed. J. de Gaulle, I (Paris, 1847), p.533. See also Guillaume de Nangis. Gesta sanctae memoriae Ludovici regis Franciae, Rec.des hist., XX, 316, on this incident.

1230, Fulk III and his brother William, together with about sixty other knights, "viri strenui et potentes", joined Henry III in Brittany. They tried to persuade the English king to invade Normandy, assuring him that he would be certain of success. Although the king was inclined to listen to them, Hubert de Burgh persuaded him that such an invasion would be very hazardous. On hearing this, Fulk and his companions said that if Henry would spare them two hundred knights from his army, they would take the duchy for him themselves. Again, however, Hubert de Burgh persuaded the king to reject their offer. And so, says Roger of Wendover, "nobiles illi miserabiliter illusi fuerunt, quia rex Francorum incontinenti exhaeredavit eos, castella et omnia quae illorum erant potenter in sua jura convertens"(1).

The record sources suggest that Wendover's story is firmly based on fact. In June, 1230, the king informed Fulk Paynel that "ea que ... P. dux Britannie et comes Richemundie et comes Cestrie et Lincolnie nobis exposuerunt ex parte vestra grata habentes et accepta, parati sumus eadem opere complere quatinus ad fidelitatem et servicium nostrum venire et nobis adherere velitis; et quamcito poteritis ad nos accedere, securitatem de predictis tenendis vobis faciemus, sicut inter prefatos fideles nostros et

---

(1) Chronica Rogeri de Wendover liber qui dicitur Flores Historiarum, ed. H.G. Hewlett, III (Rolls Series, 1889) pp.5-6.

vos est prolocutum et provisum"[1]. In September of the same year the king promised William de Gaugy, Nicholas de Lettres and Hugh Paynel that he would not return to Fulk Paynel his English lands which they were holding without compensating them in full[2]. In the following month, Henry declared that "nos tenemur ad festum Sancti Michaelis anno regni nostri XV, deliberare et reddere dilecto et fideli nostro Fulconi Paynel omnes terras suas quas jure hereditaris habere debet in Anglia, et pro exitibus earundem terrarum de anno precedenti dabimus ei in denariius ad valentiam eorundem exituum per extentam et estimationem factam per sacramentum proborum et legalium hominum"[3]. In view of the time lag before Fulk was to recover full control of his English lands, it seems that the king first wanted proof of loyal service. In fact, there is no evidence that Fulk ever actually recovered seisin of his property in England.

If, as Roger of Wendover says, Fulk and his brother lost their Norman lands when they joined Henry III in Brittany, they recovered them again later; Fulk seems to have been back in the French king's favour as early as March 1231[4]. According to the editor of the Inventaire

---

(1) Pat.R. 1225-32, p.382.

(2) Ibid. 1225-32, pp.399-400.

(3) Ibid. 1225-32, p.404.

(4) C.N., no.374; Rec.de Jugements no.666; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 728 d,729 de.

sommaire, Série H, tome III, of the archives of the département of Manche, Fulk's treachery during the minority of Louis IX "a valu au château de la Haie-Painel, le surnom de Château Gannes, sous lequel il a été connu pendant tout le Moyen-Age, et a donné naissance au dicton fameux : 'La Haye-Pesné, où le diable fut né' "[1].

Fulk's son William apparently negotiated with Henry III for the return of his father's English lands on two occasions after 1259. An entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls dated 14th July 1261, records that "Whereas the king when in Brittany lately granted to Fulk Paynel that upon his return to England, he would cause restitution to be made to him for all the lands which ought to belong to him by hereditary right, and Fulk afterwards did not obtain seisin of them because they were not in the king's hands; the king, in consideration of the services of the said Fulk, has granted to William Paynel, his son and heir, that when the king have deramed the said lands by judgement of his court as his escheat of the lands of the Normans, against those who now hold them, or against others, he will do the said William such grace and courtesy on this behalf that he shall have reason to be grateful"[2]. A similar

---

(1) Manche, Série H, III, ii.

(2) C.P.R. 1258-66, pp.165-6.

promise was made in May, 1262[1], but neither promise appears to have been kept.

(83) Willelmus Patric

William died in 1174 leaving a son also named William who died in the same year. The succession then passed to William's younger brother Ingram who died in 1190-91 leaving two daughters, Maud and Joan, who each inherited half the barony. Maud married Ralph Tesson, son of Jordon (q.v.) and Joan married John de Préaux (q.v.). The family's possessions included eighteen librates of land in Ryarsh, Kent.[2]

(84) Rogerus de Pavillio (b,e)

All that Powicke has to say in this case is as follows:-

"In 1172 Roger owed the service of two knights. He also owed service at Lions. His successor, in 1204, was Thomas of Pavilly, who after joining in the capitulation of Rouen, remained in Normandy....

The Wiltshire family of this name was by this time distinct..."[3].

---

(1) Ibid. 1258-66, p.211.

(2) L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, p.76; I.J. Sanders, English baronies - a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327, p.135. See also Appendix IV, section C, no.88 and ibid., section A, no.12, for John de Préaux and Ralph Tesson, respectively.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.350.

-C-

Although our sources provide only disjoint fragments of information, they reveal that the history of the Pavilly family after 1204 was more complex than Powicke's note suggests. In the first place, it is clear that prior to 1204, Thomas de Pavilly held lands in England as well as in Normandy. In the second place it is clear that his widow and three sons all held lands in England at various times after 1204.

Thomas himself apparently remained in Normandy from 1204 until his death(1); he was dead before 1236 for by this date he had been succeeded in Normandy by his son Reginald(2). At some unknown time after his death, his widow Eustacia was granted her dower in England. Our evidence for this is an entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls under December 1242 which reads as follows: "Grant to Roger de Pavilly that if he survive his mother Eustachia de Pavilly, he may hold land to the value of twenty pounds a year of the lands which she holds in dower of the gift of Thomas de Pavilly sometime her husband, in England, notwithstanding that these lands are lands of the Normans"(3). Unfortunately, the Norman records do not reveal whether Eustacia was also granted her dower in Normandy.

---

(1) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 613 c, 615 h, 684 f, 707 g; B.of F., pp.359, 387; Pat.R. 1225-32, pp.190-91.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 726 a, 729 e (Cf. 696 j, 707 g, 615 f).

(3) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.351.

-C-

The earliest reference which has been found to Roger de Pavilly and his brother Thomas is dated in 1238, which suggests that perhaps they came to England with their mother when she came to claim her dower. In July 1238, the king granted "to Thomas de Pavilly and Roger de Pavilly, nephews of J. earl of Lincoln, that they may keep the manors of Linlegh and Wylie, formerly committed to the said earl during pleasure, and by him committed, with the king's licence, to them"(1). Linlegh and Wylie had been held by their grandmother Theophania de Pavilly prior to 1204(2).

It seems that Reginald, the elder brother of Roger and Thomas, who had succeeded their father in Normandy by 1236, had also held land in England for a time: the Close Rolls record that in April, 1243, King Henry "concessit Rogero de Pavilly terram illam cum pertinentiis in Nortwaud' que fuit Reginaldi de Pavily, fratris sui..."(3).

Thomas and Roger were both in King Henry's service on the continent in 1242(4), which means that they would be fighting on the opposite side from their elder brother Reginald, who was listed among the Normans who were summoned to perform their service for Louis IX in that year(5).

---

(1) Ibid. 1232-47, p.226.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxliii, note.

(3) Cl.R. 1242-7, p.20.

(4) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.296; Cl.R. 1242-7, p.5.

(5) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 729 e.

-C-

The events of 1244 did not apparently affect the English interests of Eustacia, Roger and Thomas de Pavilly for all three remained in possession of lands in England after that date.(1)

(85) Henricus de Pomaria (b)

Henry was still living in 1204 and chose the English allegiance, losing his Norman lands(2). However, Joscelin de Pomaria, who was almost certainly related to Henry(3), chose the Norman allegiance(4) and lost his English lands(5).

(86) Johannes de Praeriis (b,c)

John de Préaux's name appears in the 1172 list under the heading, "In baillia de castro Virae". The full entry for this bailliage reads: "Johannes de Praeriis, dimidium militem - Mathaeus de Praeriis, quartem partem militis - Thomas de Colunces, 1 militem regi, et sibi 1 militem de Colunces. Idem de Vale Dari, 1 militem regi, et sibi 1 militem"(6). On 4th April, 1206, King John confirmed to "Johanni de Pratell' rationabilem donationem

---

(1) e.g. C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.304; Cl.R. 1254-6, p.170.

(2) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., p.78; I.J. Sanders, op.cit., pp.106-7; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 619 bc.

(3) Cf. I.J. Sanders, op.cit., pp.106-7; C.D.F., no.536; Rot. Chart. 1199-1216, p.5.

(4) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 617 a.

(5) R.N., p.138.

(6) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 697 c.

quam Rann' comes Cestriae ei fecit pro homagio et servitio suo de tota terra quam habuit in Tywa ... excepta terra quae fuit Hugonis de Colonc' in eadem villa"[1]. Hugh de Colunces was, in fact, the son of Thomas de Colunces[2]; the juxtaposition of the names of John and Thomas in the 1172 list and the names of John and Hugh in the charter of 1206, suggests very strongly that the John de Préaux named on each occasion is one and the same person.

The property mentioned in the charter of 1206 is in Oxfordshire[3] and on 28th July 1204, King John had instructed the sheriff of Oxfordshire to grant to the abbot of Beaulieu "plenariam saisinam terre de Selfton quam dederamus Johanni de Pratell' "[4]. If this is the John with whom we are concerned, it seems that he had lands in England before 1204 but forfeited them in that year because he originally chose the Norman allegiance. However, from 1206 onwards, John and his heirs remained in England[5].

The juxtaposition of the names of John and Matthew de Préaux in the list of 1172 together with the fact that both men held property in Oxfordshire[6], suggests that

---

(1) Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.163 b.

(2) See Appendix IV, section A, no.5.

(3) Cf. B.of F., p.447.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.3 b.

(5) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 239; B.of F., p.447.

(6) See Appendix IV, section C, no.87.

they were related in some way. Matthew's successor, Hasculf, chose the Norman allegiance in 1204 and remained in the duchy thereafter[1].

(87) Mathaeus de Praeriis (b)

By 1204, Matthew had been succeeded by Hasculf de Préaux[2] who chose the Norman allegiance and forfeited his lands in Sussex and Oxfordshire[3]. However, several members of the family whose exact relationships to Hasculf are not known, remained in England after 1204[4].

(88) Osbert de Pratellis (a,c,e)

By 1204, Osbert de Préaux had been succeeded by his eldest son John[5] who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands[6]. However, John recovered his lands in England for a few months in 1215-16. He was granted his property in Kent and Gloucestershire on 3rd September, 1215, and his property in Oxfordshire on the following day[7]. It seems that he did actually obtain seisin of his English lands for, on 28th May 1216, the sheriff of Gloucestershire was ordered "quod sine dilatione

---

(1) See Appendix IV, section C, no.87.

(2) Cf. Rec.des hist., XXIII, 697c and 707e.

(3) B.of F., pp.72,614.

(4) W. Farrer, Honours and Knights' Fees, II (London, 1924), pp. 143-4; see also Appendix IV, section C, no.86.

(5) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.350.

(6) R.N., pp.135,138,140,142.

(7) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.227 b.

habere facias ... Warino filio Geraldi plenariam saisinam terre de Amenell' quam ab eo capi fecimus et liberari Johanni de Pratel' "[1]. Presumably he lost his other properties also for no reference has been found to his being in possession of lands in England after this date.

John's brother Enguerrand[2], on the other hand, chose the English allegiance in 1204 and adhered to the kings of England thereafter[3]. It has not been possible to discover whether Enguerrand had ever held lands in Normandy.

Peter de Préaux, another brother, originally chose the Norman allegiance[4] and lost his English lands. However, the Patent Rolls record under June 1206, that "Petrus de Pratellis habet litteras domini Regis patentes quod secure veniat ad dominum Regem infra festum Beati Petri ad vincula anno etc. viij et dominus Rex reddet ei terram suam in Anglia et gratum suum faciet de Insulis secundum consilium R.Comitis Cestriae et Inger' de Pratellis"[5]. In fact, Peter does not appear to have recovered his interests in the Channel Isles[6] but in

---

(1) Ibid. 1204-24, p.272.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I, cxlvi.

(3) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, pp.68,132; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.3 b, 50,56 b.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.263.

(5) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.68 (29th June 1206).

(6) J.H. Le Patourel, The Medieval Administration of the Channel Islands, 1199-1399 (Oxford, 1937), p.121.

-C-

March 1207 was granted lands in Cambridgeshire and Essex[1]. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to discover whether Peter was abandoning his Norman allegiance or whether he retained his Norman lands when he was granted lands in England. Since, however, he was restored to the English king's favour at a time when the latter was on the continent at the head of an army[2], the former alternative seems the most likely. Peter was dead by 1213[3].

William de Préaux, another of Osbert's sons[4], also chose the Norman allegiance in 1204 and lost the property at Hemington, Somerset, which had been granted to him until an equivalent grant could be made elsewhere[5]. However, on 26th October, 1215, King John granted him the manor of Coleby, Lincolnshire, in right of his wife[6]. In the following March he was promised either all the land of William de Lanvaley and Ralph de Rochester in Lincolnshire, or the restoration of the Channel Isles, or three hundred librates of land in England[7]. By April 1216

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.79 b.

(2) A.L. Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216, p.442. Cf. Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.68.

(3) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm. II, ccxxxi.

(4) Ibid., I, clxvi.

(5) Ibid., II, cxlvi; R.N., p.126.

(6) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.233. See also Appendix IV, section C, no.65.

(7) Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.220.

he was in possession of Alton, Hampshire[1]. Both the Channel Isles and Alton had once been held by Peter de Préaux[2]. Unfortunately, it is not clear whether William continued to hold his lands in the duchy after 1215. However, in view of the fact that several proven cases of double tenure came into existence about the time William recovered his English lands[3], it seems likely that he, too, re-united his English and Norman estates. William remained in possession of interests in England until at least 8th May 1226[4], after which date his name disappears from the records.

(89) Ricardus de Rollos (b)

By 1204, Richard had been succeeded by William who chose the Norman allegiance and lost his English lands. William had a cousin, Robert Cotele, who was resident in England after 1204[5].

(90) Aumaricus de Sabrolio (b)

Powicke does not mention the English lands of this family but merely records that, "the honour of Gacé ... was held in 1172 by Amauri of Sablé.... He was succeeded by Lisiard and by Peter of Sablé, who died in

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.175 b.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxlv.

(3) e.g. Appendix IV, section C, nos.47,49,60,68,75.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.110.

(5) E.Y.C. VI, 95-8.

1195 and 1203 respectively. In 1203 Reginald du Bois had the custody of the heirs. The family remained in Normandy. According to Register A, Guy of Sablé had the honour shortly after the conquest, perhaps as guardian of the 'heres de Gaci'. In 1227, Amauri was lord of Gacé"(1).

However, according to Stapleton, Peter of Sablé had interests in Derbyshire in 1199(2). Moreover, the Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas 1204 records under the county of Nottingham and Derby, that "Galfridus de Mustiers reddit compotum de l.m.pro habenda Amitia de Sablello in uxorem cum terra sua"(3). Since Peter of Sablé died in 1203, it seems very likely that Amitia was his widow. If this is so, she was separated from her late husband's relatives in 1204, for her new husband remained in England(4). It is even possible that Amauri, lord of Gacé in 1227 was her son.

(91) Hasculfus de Sancto Hillario (d)

Powicke states: "Hasculf of Saint-Hilaire died before 1180, and his rights descended to his daughter and her husband Frederick or Fraeric Malesmains ... A certain Peter of Saint-Hilaire... had rights in Lapenty and

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.340.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, lii.

(3) P.R. 6 John, p.170.

(4) Ibid. 7 John, p.227.

Les Loges, near Saint-Hilaire, for which he strove with more or less success in the reigns of Richard, John and Philip Augustus. Peter seems to have gone to England in 1220 and made fine for his English lands at Corfton in Somerset, leaving Fraeric in possession of his Norman claims..."(1).

However, further examination suggests that Peter did not abandon all his Norman interests when he fined in 1220 for the recovery of his lands at Corfton. Peter held this property in right of his wife Gunnora(2) and on 5th March 1229, Gunnora made it over to her son, Henry of Saint-Hilaire(3). In 1244 Corfton was taken into the king's hands as terra Normannorum(4) which means that Henry must also have held lands in Normandy which were presumably inherited from his father.

(92) Bernardus de Sancto Valerico (b,d)

By 1191 Bernard Saint-Valéry had been succeeded by his son Thomas(5). Although this family had interests in Normandy, its main continental interests were in Ponthieu(6). It seems that Thomas was allowed to retain

---

(1) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, pp.351-2

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I, lxvii.

(3) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 52; Cl.R. 1234-7, p.250.

(4) Ibid. 1242-7, p.231; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.305.

(5) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.10.

(6) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 685 j, 718 f.

his lands on both sides of the Channel after 1204[1], the reason no doubt being that he was in Ponthieu when Philip confiscated the Norman lands of those who withdrew to England and John retaliated by confiscating the English lands of those who remained in the duchy.

In May 1212, however, Thomas's English lands were in the king's hands[2]. Presumably the seizure was not unconnected with the fact that in September 1211, when Enguerran, vidame of Picquigni, promised to serve Philip Augustus faithfully, and not to aid the count of Boulogne, the Emperor Otto or the king of England, "il donne pour cautions de sa promesse Thomas de Saint-Valeri et Renaud d'Amiens"[3].

By 8th June, 1213, John was apparently negotiating for Thomas's support in his forthcoming campaign against the French king, for he instructed the sheriff of Middlesex, "quod ponas aliquem discretum de tuis in terra Tom' de Sancto Walerico in baillia tua ad videndum quod nichil unde amoveatur et summone ibidem per bonos summonitiones eundem Thom' quod sit coram nobis in crastino

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.8 b, 43, 70b, 82; Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, pp.46 b, 52, 63 b; B.of F., pp.20,102; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 685j, 718 f.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.118.

(3) C.A.Ph.Aug., no.1302.

Sancti Johannis Bapt., responsurus ad hoc quod ei proponetur"[1]. By 21st January 1214, Thomas had been restored to the king's favour and his land returned[2]. However, according to chronicle evidence, he fought on the French side at the battle of Bouvines in July 1214[3]. Whether he lost his English property as a result is not known but, if he did, he recovered it again before his death.

He was dead before 16th January 1219[4] and on 13th February, Robert of Dreux and Annora his wife were granted "terram suam in Anglia quae ipsam Annoram hereditarie contingit ex parte Thome de Sancto Walerico patris sui et unde idem Thomas saisitus fuit die quo obiit"[5]. In the war of 1224-7, Robert seems to have tried to retain the favour of both the French and English kings. His English lands were apparently seized at one stage of events, but on 8th March 1225, their custodian was ordered "quod de exitibus terre R. Comitis de Drewes quae est in custodia vestra per preceptum nostrum inveniatis Engelrano capellano ejusdem Comitis moranti in Anglia expectando

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.135 b.

(2) Ibid. 1204-24, p.161.

(3) Les Grandes Chroniques de France ou Chronique de Saint-Denis, ed. P.Paris, IV (Paris, 1838), pp.185,190; Ouevres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, ed. H.F. Delaborde, I (Paris, 1882), p.285; II (Paris, 1885), p.302.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.385 b.

(5) Ibid. 1204-24; p.387 b.

adventum domini sui in Anglia rationabiles expensas suas"[1]. Presumably Robert came to terms with the English king on his arrival in England for on 9th April, 1225, his lands were restored to him[2]. It looks as if Robert had agreed to give Henry a measure of support in his struggle against the French king for in December 1225, his ships were exempted from the general order prohibiting the vessels of subjects of the king of France from leaving English ports, provided that they returned to England again as soon as possible[3]. In January 1227 he was still in possession of his English lands[4] but they had again been taken into the king's hand by 8th June 1227[5].

In July 1227, Louis IX granted Robert certain lands in Normandy, "in restaurationem terre sue quam habebat in Anglia"[6]. Although this time the loss of his English lands seems to have been permanent, it is interesting to note that Louis's charter of 1227 recognised the possibility that Robert may in time recover them again; if this should happen, the compensatory grant in Normandy would revert to the French king.

Robert's wife, Annora, still had relatives in England

---

(1) Ibid. 1224-7, p.22.

(2) Ibid. 1224-7, p.26 b.

(3) Ibid. 1204-24, pp.90 b bis, 145 b.

(4) Ibid. 1224-7, p.164 b.

(5) Ibid. 1224-7, p.189.

(6) C.N., no.361, p.311.

after 1227; her father's brother Henry and his heirs held lands in England throughout the period 1204-1259[1]. No evidence has been found that Henry ever held lands in Normandy.

(93) Guido de Sancto Walerico (b,d,e)

In 1172, Guy de Saint-Valéry owed "1 militem pro allodiis de Taillebois"[2]. In the Feoda Normanniae which was compiled between 1204 and 1208, a Guy de Saint-Valéry is shown as holding half a fee of the earl of Chester[3] but it is not clear whether this is the person with whom we are concerned. Nevertheless, it seems that the Guy named in the 1172 list chose the Norman allegiance in 1204, for the Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas 1209 records that "Reginaldus de Sancto Walerico debet xl.m. et ij. palefridos pro habenda hereditate Albrede Tailebois matris sue, scilicet in Aspel' et in Henlawe que fuit uxor Walteri de Wahall' et est in Normannia salvo servitio dominorum feodorum et salva eidem Albrede hereditate sua quando de Normannia redierit"[4]. By 1210, if not before, Guy, too, was dead, for the Pipe Roll for the year ended Michaelmas 1210 records that, "Albreda que fuit uxor Walteri de Wahull' r.c. de xl.m.et j.palefrido pro habenda tota hereditate sua unde Reginaldus

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.82; B.of F., pp.418,420,458; Cl.R. 1253-4, p.142.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 697 d.

(3) Ibid., XXIII, 706 j.

(4) P.R. 11 John, p.36.

filius suus per Regem saisinam habuit usque adventum ejusdem Albrede de Normannia, et pro habenda rationabile dote sua que eam contingit de terris que fuerunt predicti Walteri quondam viri sui, et pro habenda dote sua quam habuit de terris que fuerunt Guidonis de Sancto Walerico quondam viri sui"(1).

By October 1224, Reginald was again in possession of his mother's lands which he had presumably inherited after her death. The fact that he had farmed these lands out, together with the fact that he temporarily lost possession of them in November 1224, when they are described as terrae Normannorum(2), suggests that Reginald had returned to Normandy after his father's death and his mother's arrival in England. He did recover his English property again for a short time but in 1227 sold it to Hubert de Burgh(3).

(94) Johannes de Soligneio (c)

By 1204 John de Suligny had been succeeded by his son Hasculf(4). It seems that at first Hasculf chose the Norman allegiance and then changed his mind. On 15th January 1205, his English lands are described as terrae Normannorum(5), but on 27th March, 1206, the

---

(1) Ibid. 12 John, p.14.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.624 b; ibid. 1224-7, p.6.

(3) Ibid. 1224-7, p.186; C.I.P.M., I, no.461; C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.60.

(4) Cf. Rec.des hist., XXIII, 695 j and 697 h with 612 f, 620 l, 621 c, 709 a. See also C.D.F., no.785.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.17 b.

sheriff of Somerset was ordered "quod habere facias Hasculfo de Suleny terram suam ... unde dissaisitus fuit per preceptum nostrum occasione Normannorum qui recesserat a servicio quia illam ei reddidimus"(1). From this time onwards Hasculf and his successors remained in England(2) and lost their Norman lands(3).

(95) Robertus
(96) Nicholaus } de Stuteville (b,d)
(97) Guillelmus

The editor of Early Yorkshire Charters, Vol IX says of the Stuteville family, "The various branches of the family, which took its name from Etouteville-sur-Mer, in the arrondissement of Yvetot, dept. Seine-Inférieure, present several intricate problems. In the first place, it is desirable, and not always easy, to distinguish between what may be called conveniently the Norman line, whose tenure of Valmont, lying about thirteen miles from the place of origin, passed in male succession for many generations, and the English line... Confusion between members of the two lines is accentuated by the fact that the christian names Robert and Nicholas were used extensively in both. Thus, in the second half of the twelfth century, a Robert was head of each line; a

---

(1) Ibid. 1204-24, p.68.

(2) B.of F., passim; Ex e Rot.Fin. I, pp.415,461.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 612 f, 620 l, 621 c, 709 a.

Nicholas with a son Nicholas occurs in each line at the beginning of the thirteenth; and as a climax of complexity fifty years later a Robert in each line had a wife named Joan. It is only by an attempt to use the evidence of the descent of land that a distinction between members of the two lines can be preserved"(1).

However, it is only in the case of England that we have sufficient evidence about their landholdings to differentiate between the various members of the two lines of this family. The Norman records are insufficiently full for us to be able to identify with any certainty the three members named in the 1172 list. In each case, there is more than one possibility as reference to the two family trees will show(2).

Although the English line seems to have lost its Norman lands in 1204, the Norman line continued to hold lands on both sides of the Channel long after 1204. Before 1204, Henry d'Estouteville held lands in England which had been made over to him by his mother Leonia, as well as the Norman lands to which he had succeeded on his father's death in 1185. In 1203, King John seized Henry's English lands because he had taken the side of the king of

---

(1) E.Y.C., IX, v.

(2) Ibid., IX, facing p.1 and p.42.

France. In the following year, however, Leonia fined with the English king for the recovery of her lands and seems to have held them until her death between January 1215, and April 1216. In the meantime, her son Henry remained in Normandy. Nevertheless, he recovered his inheritance in England at some time between his mother's death and 5th September 1226, when the sheriff of Nottingham was ordered to take his lands into the king's hands. This seizure was, no doubt, connected with the renewal of the war with France in 1224. On 21st December 1226, when his father was still living and England and France were still at war, Henry's son and heir, John d'Estouteville, was given seisin of his father's English lands. Although Henry was dead by 1236, John seems to have held the English lands continuously until February 1244, when they were once more taken into the king's hand in accordance with the order for a general seizure of the terrae Normannorum. This seizure was, however, only temporary. For on 10th July in the same year John's lands were restored to him again. When he died in 1258, they passed to his son Robert and subsequently remained in the family until shortly before the outbreak of the Hundred Years' War(1).

(98) Gilbertus de Tileriis (b,d)

Gilbert of Tillieres held lands in several English counties. Of these English lands, he granted Hadleigh,

---

(1) This account is based on the more detailed account given in E.Y.C., IX, pp.43,48-57.

Surrey, and Compton, Berkshire, to Thomas Malesmains in marriage with his daughter Joanna[1]. Hadleigh was confiscated as terra Normannorum in 1204[2], presumably on the assumption that Thomas was in Normandy. He was, in fact, on a pilgrimage and was allowed to recover Hadleigh on his return to England in September, 1206[3]. Gilbert's other daughter, Juliana, was married to Baldwin Rastell, and received lands in Normandy as her dowry[4]. The remainder of Gilbert's English lands were held in right of his wife, Eleanor de Vitré. Gilbert was Eleanor's second husband and after his death she was married, in turn, to William, earl of Salisbury and Gilbert Malesmains[5].

Gilbert of Tillières died in the Holy Land in 1190 leaving a son Gilbert who was still a minor. Gilbert junior was living in 1219 but was dead before 1227[6] Stapleton says, "prior to the year 1227, the succession of the honour of Tillières had devolved upon Juliana, then the widow of Baldwin Rastel, for in the chartulary of the abbey of Mondaye is transcribed a deed, whereby Juliana, entitling herself Lady of Tillières, declares that she has chosen the abbey of St Martin for her supulture, and has given to God and the holy convent there twelve pounds

---

(1) B.of F., pp.68,106.

(2) R.N., p.133.

(3) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.74 b.

(4) R.N., p.63.

(5) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, xlvi-xlvii (note o).

(6) Ibid., II, xliv.

in the prévôté of L'Aigle ... She was there interred, and in 1227, Alienora, formerly Countess of Salisbury, for the redemption of her soul and the soul of Juliana her daughter, gave the said monastery ten shillings money of Tours, by way of pittance to the convent on the day of the anniversary of the said Juliana.... In the following year ... the same venerable countess ... gave to God and the church of St Martin of Mondaye, the advowson of the church of St Vigor of Trungy ... After her daughter's example, she the same year chose her sepulture in the abbey ... and added to her former gifts ... Hylaria, Lady of Tillières, and Nicholas Malesmains, son of Sir Thomas Malesmains, at the same time confirmed and ratified by their charters these gifts of Alienora, ... the former adding that she did so for the soul of Juliana, Lady of Tillières, her mother ... The husband of Hylaria, Lady of Tillières was Sir James de Bavelingham..."[1].

The rights of Nicholas, son of Thomas Malesmains and Joanna, who died in 1219[2] and 1221[3] respectively, were probably recognised at the same time as the rights of Juliana, for the Close Rolls reveal that in May 1225, Nicholas had "litteras de licentia eundi in Normanniam

---

(1) Ibid., II, xlviii.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.389.

(3) Ibid. 1204-24, p.468.

ad terras suas videndas sine termino"[1]. It should be noted that when Nicholas acquired his share of the honour of Tillières in Normandy, he retained his inheritance in England. Thus, this is an example of an occasion when it was the French king who permitted a case of double tenure to come into existence. It would appear that Nicholas continued to live in England for in June 1227, and again in March 1237, he was granted permission by the English king to go abroad for a limited period only to deal with his affairs[2].

When Eleanor de Vitré finally died in 1233, Hilaria de Bavelingham and Nicholas Malesmains - the heirs of her children by Gilbert of Tillières - were entitled to a share of her English lands. On 6th August, 1233, Henry III took the homage of Hilaria's husband James de Bavelingham for her share of this property[3]. Now both cousins held lands on both sides of the Channel and this time it was the English king who had allowed the new case of double tenure to come into existence.

However, the events of 1244 put an end to this interesting situation. Nicholas was dead by December, 1240[4] and his heirs were his daughters, Joanna and Roes.

---

(1) Ibid. 1224-7, p.73.

(2) Ibid. 1224-7, p.188; C.P.R. 1232-47, p.178.

(3) Ex e Rot.Fin., I, 246.

(4) Cl.R. 1237-42, p.257; C.P.R. 1232-47, p.240.

According to a complaint made by Joanna's husband, Ferrand de Bruecourt, in 1247, Nicholas had left his Norman lands to Joanna and his English lands to Roes, but in 1244 the French king had seized Joanna's lands "ratione partis dictae Roes quae moratur in Anglia, nec venit ad pacem regis"(1). When Hilaria's husband, James de Bavelingham, was forced to choose between his two allegiances in 1244, he chose the Norman allegiance and forfeited his English lands(2).

(99) Henricus de Tilly

As well as his Norman lands, Henry de Tilly held certain lands in Devon and Dorset but in the last decade before the loss of the duchy, his right to these lands was being challenged by Geoffrey de Mandeville and his son and successor, William(3). Henry was dead by 1st December 1203, when Ralph Tesson paid part of the fine which he had offered for the custody of Henry's heir(4). In 1204, Ralph Tesson chose the Norman allegiance for himself and Henry's heir(5) and the latter's English lands were granted to Robert de Mandeville, successor of William de Mandeville(6). In 1219, William, son of Henry

---

(1) Q.N., no.54.

(2) C.I. Misc., I, no.25.

(3) L.C. Loyd, op.cit., pp.103-4.

(4) R.N., p.117.

(5) P.R., 6 John, p.87.

(6) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.64.

de Tilly, attempted to recover his English lands from Robert by due process of English law but was unsuccessful[1]. Presumably the fact that he was allowed to plead his case means that if he could have proved his right to the lands in Devon and Dorset, he would have been allowed to recover seisin thereof.

(100) Thomas de Tornebu (e)

Powicke says: "In 1172 Thomas of Tournebu owed the service of three knights for his seventeen. His successor appears to have been Amauri, whose fief at Saint-Sulpice, near Bayeux, was farmed by the duke in 1198. Richard of Tournebu was in Normandy in and before 1212 and had been deprived of his lands in England. A Richard of Tournebu, the same or another, was granted the Tournebu manor of Charborough in Dorset in 1215. In 1220 the lord of Tornebu was John, who said that he held sixteen fees by the service of two"[2]. However, the situation was more complicated than Powicke suggests.

It seems that Amauri's successor was John and not Richard, although the latter certainly held half a fee in Normandy of the honour of Evreux at some time between 1210 and 1220[3] when John was lord of Tournebu[4]. John was

---

(1) Ibid., p.64; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.405; C.R.R., VIII, 23.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.355.

(3) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 636 a.

(4) Ibid., XXIII, 619 a.

apparently a minor in 1204 for when the 1172 list of tenants-in-chief was copied into Philip's Registers shortly after the conquest, the entry for Thomas de Tournebu was endorsed, "Richart de Harcurt habet"(1). In the "Rotulus de valore terrarum Normannorum" of 1204, Charborough is described as "terra Roberti de Harecurt"(2) but Robert, who was succeeded by his son Richard before 1208(3), was presumably holding this property in custody for the heirs of Thomas de Tournebu at the time it was confiscated. In 1212, Charborough is described as land "que fuit Ricardi Turnebuo qui est in Normannia"(4). Presumably Richard was a younger brother of John and Charborough was his share of his father's English property; certainly he must have been a minor in 1204 otherwise the property would not have been in the custody of Robert de Harcourt.

In February 1215, Richard recovered Charborough(5) and on 8th December of the same year the king returned to William de Tournebu "terram cum pertinentiis que fuit Johannis Turnebu patris sui in Clafford' "(6). Since the John de Tournebu with whom we have been concerned was a minor in 1204, he could hardly have had a son of age

---

(1) Ibid., XXIII, 695 c. See also Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, ccv.

(2) R.N., p.140.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.342. Cf. Rec.des hist., XXIII, 695 c.

(4) B.of F., p.88.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.186 b.

(6) Ibid. 1204-24, p.254.

in 1215; it therefore seems that either "patris" is an error for "fratris" or that the John mentioned here belongs to a different branch of the family. In 1219, both Charborough and Clatford are again described as terrae Normannorum(1) and continue to be so described thereafter(2). Unfortunately it is not clear whether Richard and William held lands in Normandy at the same time as they held Charborough and Clatford, respectively. However, in view of the fact that several proven cases of double tenure came into existence about the time they obtained seisin in England(3), it seems likely that they, too, temporarily re-united their Norman and English estates.

(101) Oliverus
(102) Willelmus de Traceio (b)
(103) Turgillus

As well as his lands in Normandy, Oliver de Tracy held half the honour of Barnstaple in Devon. In 1204 he chose the English allegiance and apparently lost his Norman lands. In 1210 he was succeeded by William's son Henry(4).

William held lands in Devon and Gloucestershire(5) in addition to his Norman lands. He was dead by 1199 when

---

(1) B.of F., pp.260,259.

(2) Ibid., pp.379,1267 and pp.1365,704,1419.

(3) e.g. Appendix IV, section C, nos.47,49,60,68,75.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.356.

(5) R.B., pp.43,56,88,112,248,254,295.

Henry de Tracy paid a thousand marks, "pro habenda tota terra que fuit Willelmi de Traci patris sui in Anglia et in Normannia"[1]. In 1204, Henry chose the English allegiance[2] and apparently lost his Norman lands[3].

No evidence has been found that Turgil ever held lands in England. Powicke says, "he was succeeded by a William of Tracy who died before 1200. In that year William of Pirou fined with John for his lands ... William Pirou and his descendants continued to hold the fief"[4]. Since Powicke includes the Tracy family amongst those which show "how the Anglo-Norman families fell apart after 1204, just as, in so many cases, they had fallen apart in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, into English and Norman lines"[5], he obviously believes that Turgil was related in some way to Oliver and William de Tracy and also presumably to William of Pirou. However, no evidence has been found for these relationships. It does not seem that the William de Tracy who succeeded Turgil can be the same person as William de Tracy father of Henry, otherwise Henry would have inherited Turgil's lands along with his father's in 1199.

---

(1) P.R. 1 John, p.198.

(2) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.356.

(3) No reference has been found to Henry or his successors being in possession of lands in Normandy after 1204.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.356.

(5) Ibid., p.328.

(104) Gaufridus Trossebot (d)

Geoffrey Trussebut was succeeded by his brother Robert who died in 1193 when his heirs were his sisters Rose, Hilary and Agatha. By 1204, Rose's share of the inheritance had passed to her son Robert de Ros. In 1204 Robert and both his aunts chose the English allegiance(1) and lost their Norman lands(2). Hilary died without heirs in 1241 when her lands were divided between her sister Agatha and her great-nephew, William de Ros(3). Neither Hilary in her life time nor the descendents of Rose seem to have recovered their share of the Norman lands. However, in January 1237, within a year of her husband's death(3), Agatha was granted a licence "to go beyond seas to sue her rights which are being detained from her in the power of the king of France"(4). In 1238, she was granted licence "to go beyond seas on the king's affairs"(5). There is no evidence that Agatha made use of either of these licences although, of course, she may nevertheless have done so. In March 1241, she was granted "licentiam transfretandi in Normanniam et ibi moram faciendi usque ad festum Omnium Sanctorum anno regni nostri xxvj"(6) and this

---

(1) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.56.

(2) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 696 d.

(3) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.56.

(4) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.173.

(5) Ibid., 1232-47, p.224.

(6) C1.R. 1237-42, p.280.

time we have grounds for believing that she made use of her licence. According to the Querimoniae Normannorum of 1247 Agatha recovered some property in Normandy in 1241. The relevant complaint concludes: "Devenit autem dicta terra ad manum domini regis tempore regis Philippi, quam accepit [i.e. the complainant] pro dicta XXXII solidis cum gallinis predictis a dicta Agatha, quando a domino rege reddita sibi fuit terra, annis VI elapsis"(1). Since she was still in possession of this land in 1247, and was also in possession of her lands in England(2), Agatha had obviously not been forced to choose between the French and English allegiances in 1244.

(105) Ricardus de Vernone (b)

Powicke notes that by 1204, Richard de Vernon had been succeeded by his grandson of the same name, who chose the Norman allegiance(3). However he does not mention the English lands of this branch of the Réviers family. William de Vernon, father of the Richard named in 1172, had held the manor of Freshwater in the Isle of Wight as well as his Norman lands(4). At some time before 1204, Freshwater had been given as her marriage portion to Margaret de Vernon(5), who seems to have been

---

(1) Q.N., no.57.

(2) I.J. Sanders, op.cit., p.56.

(3) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.348.

(4) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cclxxv.

(5) P.R. 5 John, p.148; ibid. 7 John, p.130.

the daughter of Richard de Vernon[1]. She continued to hold it[2] until at least 25th March 1249, when the king made a gift "to William de Chabeneys, king's yeoman, and his heirs, of the manor of Freschewatere, which is in the hands of Margery de Vernon and which ought to be the king's escheat after her death as lands of the Normans, to be held after the surrender or death of the said Margery by the service due therefrom, until the lands of England and Normandy are one, or until the king restore the said manor to the right heirs of his free will or by a peace"[3].

(106) Fulco de Veteri Ponte (b)

Fulk was succeeded by Robert de Vieuxpont, who was also lord of Courville in France. In 1202, when war broke out between John and Philip Augustus, Robert withdrew into France and his Norman lands were granted to his brother William and afterwards to William's son Robert. In 1204 this last Robert chose the English allegiance and the Norman lands of his uncle Robert, who was now deceased, were granted to his widow, to hold for his heir who was a minor[4].

---

(1) Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.59 b.

(2) e.g. P.R. 7 John, p.130; B.of F., p.76.

(3) C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.340.

(4) Powicke, Loss of Normandy, p.357.

-C-

(107) Robertus de Vitreio (b,d)

Robert de Vitré held lands in several counties in England. He died in 1173 and was succeeded by his son Andrew. In 1204, Andrew chose the Norman allegiance[1] and lost the English lands which he still held at that date[2]. Prior to 1204 he had granted some of this English lands to his sister Eleanor in marriage. At the time of the loss of Normandy, Eleanor was married to her fourth and last husband, Gilbert Malesmains. Gilbert chose the Norman allegiance and Eleanor's English lands were confiscated as terrae Normannorum. However, in 1216 they were restored to her and from then until her death she continued to enjoy her dower in both England and Normandy. Possibly the restoration of her English lands was brought about through the intercession of Ela, countess of Salisbury, Eleanor's daughter by her third husband, William, earl of Salisbury[3].

The disposal of Eleanor's English lands after her death in 1233 was a complicated business. A portion of them escheated to the crown as terrae Normannorum; this was presumably the portion which should have reverted to the heirs of Gilbert Malesmains, who had chosen the

---

(1) Rec.des hist., XXIII, 612 f.

(2) e.g. Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.287,407,541 b.

(3) Except where otherwise stated, the remarks in this paragraph are all based on Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, xlvi-xlviii.

the Norman allegiance in 1204. A second portion went to the heirs of her children by Gilbert of Tillières, who died before 1204; these heirs were Nicholas Malesmains and Hilaria, wife of James de Bavelingham[1]. A third portion went to her daughter by her third husband, William, earl of Salisbury[2].

---

(1) See Appendix IV, section C, no.98.

(2) e.g. Cl.R. 1231-4, pp.249 and 403, read in conjunction, show how the manor of Cooling, Suffolk, was divided up in this way.

APPENDIX V[1]

Contents

Section A: Channel Island tenants who chose the Norman allegiance after 1204 and lost their Channel Island property

(1) The Fief d'Anneville (Jersey)

Although we learn from the extent of 1274 that the carucate d'Anneville was then in the king's hands[2], it is the Jersey extent of 1331 which tells us that the fief once belonged to "un certain Raoul Daunvile chevalier, qui tint la part des Normands"[3].

---

(1) See above, pp.292-293.

(2) Ext. 1274, p.28.

(3) Ext. J. 1331, p.11.

(2) The Fief d'Anneville (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 refers to the possession by the de Cheney family of 2 carucates of land "de escaeta Sampsonis de Audeville quando tenentis partem Normannorum"[1] and the grant apparently dates from 1248[2]. According to the Rolls of the 1309 Assizes, Henry III had granted William de Cheney "all the tenements which belonged to John and Sampson de Anneville"[3] which suggests that John, too, chose the Norman allegiance.

(3) The Fief Baard (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 merely records that "Rex percipit de feodo Baard, iiij panes ij gallinas quae sunt de escaeta cuiusdam Normanni"[4] but it seems almost certain that the fief took its name from the Baard family of the Cotentin[5]. The holder of the fief in 1204 may well have been that Geoffrey Baard whose English lands are described as terrae Normannorum on a number of occasions[6].

(4) The Fief de Becqueville (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 refers to the fief de Becqueville as "escaeta Ricardi de Martynvast tenentis partem Normannorum"[7]. We have mentioned elsewhere a person of the same name who held land in both England and Normandy in 1204 but who chose

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.33.

(2) C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.331.

(3) R.A. 1309, p.38.

(4) Ext. 1274, p.34.

(5) A.H. Ewen, "The Fiefs of the Island of Guernsey", La Société Guernesiaise, Transactions, XVII (part ii)(1962) 193-4.

(6) C.R.R., XIII, no.17; Cl.R. 1237-42, p.36; B.of F., pp.359,1158.

(7) Ext. 1274, p.35.

the English allegiance[1] and it is tempting to see some connection between the two cases in spite of the apparent contradiction in their circumstances. Certainly, the possibility that the two men were in fact one man and that the English allegiance had later been deserted for the Norman allegiance had to be investigated. However, investigation shows that the man with property in Normandy and England, or his successor of the same name, was still in England in 1254[2]. One of his English properties was Hallaton in Leicestershire[3] and in 1267 John de Welham was claiming Hallaton in right of his wife Joan who was the heiress of Robert de Martinwast[4]. It would seem, therefore, that the Richard de Martinwast with property in England and Normandy was loyal to the English crown all his life. Clearly, the Richard de Martinwast who forfeited his property in Guernsey was another person of the same name.

(5) The Fief de Boutvilain (Jersey)

The extent of 1274 refers to "escaeta Botevileyn Normannus"[5] and the surname Boutvilain can be found in the Norman records both before and after 1204[6].

---

(1) Appendix IV, section B, no.33.

(2) Cl.R. 1253-4, pp.57,87; C.Ch.R. 1257-1300, p.273.

(3) L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, ed. C.T. Clay and D.C. Douglas, Harleian Society Publication 103 (Leeds, 1951), p.61; B.of F., pp.520,557.

(4) C.P.R. 1266-72, p.153.

(5) Ext. 1274, p.18.

(6) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I,2; Rec.des hist., XXIII, 620 g; Q.N., nos. 4, 246,258.

Appendix V

-A-

(6) The Fief of Richard le Boulanger (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 records that "heredes Henrici Mabell debent regi x.s. annuatim de escaeta Ricardi le Bolenger tenentis partem Normannorum"[1].

(7) The Fief of the Fortescues (Guernsey)

The extent of the 1274 records that "Rex percipit de feodo quod dicitur Fortescu iij.s.qui sunt de escaeta ejusdem (sic) Normanni nuncupatur Fortescu"[2].

(8) The Fief de Henot (Jersey)

The extent of 1274 refers to the annual rent which the king receives "de feodo de Henot, de escaeta Willelmi de Henot militis Normanniae"[3].

(9) The Fief de Legat (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 just refers to "escaetam le Legat Norm' "[4]. However, in 1247 Drew de Barentin, Warden of the Islands, was instructed to ensure that Ralph Burnel received an annual rent of seven quarters of grain "quae Robertus Legat habere consuevit, et quae nunc sunt excaeta regis"[5]. It seems highly likely that Robert Legat was the Norman to whom the extent of 1274 refers.

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.31.

(2) Ibid., p.34.

(3) Ibid., pp.17-18.

(4) Ibid., p.32.

(5) Cl.R. 1242-7, p.523. See also ibid. 1247-51, pp.87,177.

(10) The Fief de Lemmyng (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 records that "Rex percipit de feodo de Lemmyng j. quarterium frumenti et x.s. qui sunt de escaeta Radulfi de Lemmyng Normanni"[1].

(11) The Fief de Mautalent (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 records that the king receives certain rents which are "de escaeta quorundam tenencium partem Normannorum videlicet Rogeri Suward et alterius nuncupati Mautalent"[2].

(12) The Fief de Morville (Jersey)

The extent of 1274 just describes the fief de Morville as "de escaeta Willelmi de Comandas"[3] but in 1242 when it was granted to William de Cheney, the grant was made "donec terra nostra Angliae et terra Normanniae sint communes..."[4], thus indicating that the fief was terra Normannorum.

(13) The Fief d'Orlaundes (Jersey) b

The extent of 1274 merely refers to the fief d'Orlaundes as "de escaeta cuiusdam militis Normanni"[5] but, as de Gruchy says, there can be little doubt that the holder of the fief in 1204 "was of the family which

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.34.

(2) Ibid., p.34.

(3) Ibid., p.23.

(4) C.I.N., no.340. See also C.P.R. 1232-47, p.328.

(5) Ext. 1274, p.23.

took their name from their fief of Orglandres near Néhou in the Cotentin"[1]. As Loyd has shown, the Orglandres family was closely associated with the Reviers-Vernon family in both England and Normandy and at least one branch of it remained in England after 1204[2]. Other members of the family, however, remained in the duchy[3] and would therefore have lost any Channel Island possessions. Although the family had representatives in both England and Normandy after 1204, no evidence has been found of a continuing family link between the Islands and the duchy.

(14) The Fief of Jean Perles (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 refers to "escaetam Johanne (sic) Perles Normanni"[4].

(15) The Fief de Rosel (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 just refers to an annual rent of 17 quarters of grain received by the king 'de feodo de Rosel que sunt escaeta, per quemdam dominum quondam de Rosel tenentem"[5]. However, we know from twelfth century sources that the fief was in fact held by a family who took its name therefrom[6].

---

(1) G.F.B. De Gruchy, Medieval Land Tenures in Jersey, p.57.

(2) L.C. Loyd, The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families, pp.74-5.

(3) Polyptychum Dioecesis Constantiensis, Rec.des hist., XXIII, 525 f and h.

(4) Ext. 1274, p.31.

(5) Ibid., p.31.

(6) A.H. Ewen, loc.cit. 193-4; C.I.N., no.166, p.243, note 1.

(16) The Fief de Suart (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 records that the king received certain rents which are "de escaeta quorundam tenencium partem Normannorum videlicet Rogeri Suward et alterius nuncupati Mautalent"(1).

(17) The Fief of Richard de Vernon (Sark)

The Rolls of the 1309 Assizes record that "the Island of Sark was never in the demesne of the kings of England until the time of the Lord John formerly King of England in whose time the said island of Sark came into his hand as his right and escheat by the forfeiture of a certain Lord de Vernon, a Norman, who held the same of the said Lord the King and afterwards withdrew from the allegiance of the same king and took the part of France"(2). It is clear from twelfth century grants to the abbey of Montebourg that the de Vernons of Sark were the de Vernons already discussed in Appendix IV(3). The head of the family, Richard de Vernon, chose the Norman allegiance in 1204 but his daughter Margaret retained the manor of Freshwater in the Isle of Wight until her death, which took place at some unknown date after 1249. Although the family had representatives in both England and Normandy after 1204, no trace has been found of a continuing family link between the Channel Islands and the duchy.

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.34.

(2) R.A. 1309, p.76.

(3) C.I.N., nos.306-9; Appendix IV, section C, no.105.

-A-

(18) The Fief à la Vilese (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 records that "Rex percipit de feodo Ala Vilese xiij quarteria iij busselli frumenti et ij.s.vi.d.qui sunt de escaeta cuiusdam mulieris Normannae quondam nominate la vielese"(1). As Ewen points out, this fief seems to have been one of the Channel Island fiefs whose tenants once had responsibility for keeping a watch on the coast. This responsibility seems to have lapsed by 1274 and the extent's explanation of the name of the fief 'clearly confuses vieille (old woman) and veiller (to keep watch), a confusion which doubtless arose all the more readily as coastal watching was usually the duty of old women"(2). It has not been possible to discover who did hold the fief in 1204 or anything about the history of the fief from 1204 to 1274.

(19) The Fief of William de Wereville (Guernsey)

The extent of 1274 refers to the escheat of "Willelmi de Werevill' Normanni"(3).

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.34.

(2) A.H. Ewen, loc.cit., 193.

(3) Ext. 1274, p.35.

Section B: Channel Island tenants who chose the English allegiance after 1204 and lost their Norman property

(20) The Fief de Philippe de Kertret | (Jersey)
The Fief de St Ouen |

The holder of the fief of St Ouen in 1204 was Renaud de Carteret who was also seigneur of Carteret in the Cotentin. He chose the English allegiance in 1204 and lost his Norman lands. In 1215 he was succeeded as seigneur of St Ouen by his son Philip(1).

In August, 1231, Philip obtained a writ from Henry III which read as follows: "Sciatis quod si a rege Francorum impetrare poteritis quod terram vestram in partibus transmarinis vobis reddat, bene concedimus vobis quod ad hoc laboretis et eam recipiatis de eo tenendam, salvis nobis homagio et fidelitate vestra nobis prestitis"(2). If Philip approached the French king in 1231 he was apparently unsuccessful for in May, 1235, he was given licence "to go to the King of France to obtain, if he can, his land, which he says is his right in Normandy, so that when recovered he may give it to his two daughters to marry them, and afterwards return to the king's islands to dwell there as he did before"(3). Although there is no evidence that this second attempt was any more successful than the first,

---

(1) Appendix IV, section B, no.25.

(2) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.550.

(3) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.106.

it is nevertheless interesting that Philip felt the attempts worth making.

The first reference to the fief of Philip de Carteret is in the extent of 1274, which records that it owed full relief[1]. In 1331 it was held by the four co-heirs of Philip[2]. De Gruchy has shown that the St Ouen fief held by the de Carteret family was reduced in size by division during the Middle Ages and suggests that the "fief de Philippe de Kertret" was once part of St Ouen[3]. In 1274 the seigneur of St Ouen was Renaud de Carteret[4] and the fief of St Ouen is mentioned separately in the extent of that year[5] so there can be no confusion between the two fiefs. Unfortunately, it has not proved possible to establish when the fief of Philip de Carteret was created.

(21) The Fief de Saumareys (Jersey)

From at least 1180 until at least 1226, the fief of Samarès was in the hands of the de Salinelles family[6]. The holder of the fief in 1180 had the first name William and so did his son and grandson. As de Gruchy points out, "The surname occurs also in Continental

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(2) Ext. J. 1331, p.61.

(3) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., pp.63,80-81.

(4) C.I.N., p.57.

(5) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(6) C.I.N., nos.240,232,96,320.

Normandy in the Bessin, a Gervaise de Salinelles in 1195 and a Guillaume de Salinelles in 1198[1]; the latter owed 12 li. as a pledge of the Constable and may have been one of our Jersey Guillaumes, who would thus have had Continental lands"[2]. Certainly no trace of the name has been found in the Norman records which were consulted for the period 1204 to 1259.

By 1309 the fief was in the hands of Pierre de St Helier[3] and he or an earlier member of his family had probably acquired it by marriage with a de Salinelles heiress. This is suggested by the fact that in 1309 Peter claimed that he and his ancestors from time immemorial had enjoyed certain rights in connection with Samarès[4].

Section C: Channel Island tenants c.1204 who apparently held no Norman property

(22) The Fief de Cannely (Guernsey)

The Guernsey extent of 1331 records that William de Cheney owed fealty, homage and relief for the fief de Cannely[5] but, in fact, William held only half of

---

(1) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I, 189; II, 375.

(2) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., p.66.

(3) R.A. 1309, pp.55-7,62.

(4) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., p.67; R.A. 1309, pp.55-7,62.

(5) Ext.G. 1331, p.122.

the original Cannely fief. This fief was in the hands of the Cannely family from before 1204 until the late thirteenth century when Henry le Cannely was succeeded by his two daughters, Avice and Guilemete. The former married Thomas de Vicq of Guernsey and her half of the fief later became known as the fief Robert de Vicq after her nephew who inherited it. Robert later sold the fief to the de Cheney family, which accounts for the entry in the 1331 extent(1).

The 1204 holder of the de Cannely fief may have held lands in Normandy too. We learn from the Close Rolls that Henry le Cannely had succeeded his father William in Guernsey in 1227(2) and the Norman Rolls for the second year of John's reign record that "Willelmus le Kanelzy dat domino Regi Lx.lib.And' pro terra de Sumeresvill' et de insula de Gerner' quam Matilda de Langetot et Henricus filius ejus tenent capienda in manum domini et detinenda donec discussum fuerit in curia domini Regis coram domino Rege quis eorum majus jus de jure habeat in terra illa"(3). Unfortunately it has not been possible to identify Sumeresvill', although it was probably in Normandy. Since the place cannot be identified and we do not know whether or not William recovered it, it will be assumed

---

(1) A.H. Ewen, loc.cit., 195-6.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1224-7, p.202 b.

(3) R.N., p.38.

for the purposes of analysis that the 1204 holder of the Guernsey fief did not possess any Norman property.

(23) The Fief de William L'Emperere (Jersey)

The fief described as "feodum Willelmi Imperatoris" in the extent of 1274[1] seems to have been in the hands of the Lempriere family since at least 1180 when the name of Gilbert Lempriere is found in the Jersey section of the Norman Exchequer Roll[2].

(24) The Fief de la Hague (Jersey)

The reference to the fief de la Hague in the extent of 1274[3] appears to be the earliest reference to a fief of that name. In 1309 and 1331 it was held by Pierre de la Hague[4]. However, as de Gruchy points out, "there is some reason to believe that it was connected with a fief in the same parish granted to St Sauveur in c.1140 by Simon de la Hague, knight. In addition to the holders having the same surname, both fiefs were carucates, were adjoining to one another, and owed firma to the Crown. On the other hand, Simon is stated to have granted all his land in Jersey, but if the present fief is half of the original fief held by a relative, this theory would agree with the known facts"[5].

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(2) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I, 25.

(3) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(4) R.A. 1309, p.251; Ext. J. 1331, p.60.

(5) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., p.78; C.I.N., pp.250, 295-6.

-C-

(25) The Fief ès Hormans (Jersey)

The fief ès Hormans is mentioned in the extent of 1274 as owing half relief[1]. We know that it was held by Roger Horman in 1331[2] and the evidence suggests that Roger's family had held it from the late twelfth century. A Roger Horman witnessed a charter c.1180 together with other important Jerseymen[3] and a Robert Horman was among the Channel Island hostages released by King John in 1214[4].

(26) The Fief of the L'Ingénieur family (Alderney)

Towards the end of the twelfth century William L'Ingénieur, "seigneur d'Aurigny", granted five acres of land in Alderney to the Abbey of Cherbourg, with the consent of his son Ranulph[5]. The family seems to have retained interests in the island until 1238 when Peter and Maynerus L'Ingénieur renounced their rights "sur dix livrées de terre dans l'île d'Aurigny, que leur père, Guillaume L'Ingénieur possédait, et ce pour et en consideration du paiement par le Roi de dix livres sterling"[6].

(27) The Fief ès Malet (Jersey)

In 1180 the fief ès Malet was in the hands of Robert Malet[7], who died while his son William was a hostage of

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(2) Ext. J. 1331, p.60.

(3) C.I.N., no.240, p.323.

(4) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.122 b.

(5) C.I.N., no.251.

(6) Ibid., no.317.

(7) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., I, 26.

King John in England. William was released in 1214 but in 1223 was still trying to obtain seisin of his inheritance in Jersey(1). It would appear from later evidence that he was ultimately successful(2).

(28) The Fief Maumarquis (Guernsey)

The Guernsey extent of 1331 describes the fief Maumarquis as being "at present in the hand of the Lord the King by escheat"(3). The fief appears to have taken its name from the Malmarchy family whose name occurs in Guernsey charters of the second half of the twelfth century(4). Since no trace of this family has been found in the Channel Island records after 1204, it is tempting to assume that the fief was terra Normannorum, especially as we know that two unnamed persons in the parish of St Andrew chose the Norman allegiance(5). However, no trace of the name Malmarchy has been found in the Norman records which were consulted either before or after 1204 so it may well be that the fief Maumarquis escheated to the Crown for quite a different reason. Moreover, it could have escheated before or after 1204.

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.122 b; Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.550.

(2) Ext. 1274, p.15.

(3) Ext. G. 1331, p.122.

(4) A.H. Ewen, "The Fiefs of the Island of Guernsey", La Société Guernesiaise, Transactions, XVII (part ii)(1962) 190-91; C.I.N., nos.153,144.

(5) Ext. 1274, p.33.

(29) The Fief de Richard le Petit (Jersey)

The fief was held by Richard le Petit in 1274[1] and by William le Petit in 1309 and 1331[2]. Although there is no definite evidence that the le Petit family held the fief before 1204, they presumably held it in 1214 when Colin le Petit (Parvus) was one of the Channel Island hostages released by King John[3]. If they held it in 1214, the likelihood is that they held it before 1204 for most of the grants of terrae Normannorum were made much later than the former date. Moreover, King John is unlikely to have taken a hostage from a man trustworthy enough to be granted a Channel Island fief after 1204. The name le Petit is found in the Norman records both before and after 1204[4] but there is no evidence to suggest a link between the mainland le Petits and the Jersey family.

(30) The Fief de Wynceleys (Jersey)

The fief described in the extent of 1274 as "feodum de Wynceleys"[5] had been in the hands of the Vinchelez family since at least 1156[6].

---

(1) Ibid., p.28.

(2) R.A. 1309, p.262; Ext. J. 1331, p.53.

(3) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.122 b.

(4) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, xl,clxxviii; Rec.de Jugements, no.46,note.

(5) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(6) e.g. C.I.N., nos.165,36,37,306,240,14,348.

Section D: Channel Island tenants c.1204 whose families enjoyed continuing links with Normandy after 1204

Key[1]

a. Families where brothers or adult male cousins chose opposite allegiances after 1204.

b. Families where there was some other degree of cross-Channel relationship after 1204.

c. Families where one or more members changed their allegiance between 1204 and 1259.

d. Proven cases of double tenure after c.1204.

e. Probable cases of double tenure after c.1204.

(31) The Fief du Comte (Guernsey) b

The Guernsey extent of 1248 records that "half of the island of Guernsey is of the Lord the King and the Knights and others who hold of him in chief; the other half is divided between the Abbot of Mont St Michel de periculo maris and Robert de Vere. Indeed, the quarter that Robert de Vere holds is called the land of the Count"[2].

From the mid-twelfth century until 1240 the Fief de Comte belonged to the Wake family, whose head was

---

(1) See above, p.293.

(2) Ext. G. 1248, p.24.

also lord of Négreville in the Cotentin and of Bourne in Lincolnshire. In February, 1240, Hugh Wake granted his Guernsey fief to Baldwin de Vere in return for an annual rent of six pounds. Robert de Vere, who held the fief in 1248, was Baldwin's son and heir(1).

In 1204 the fief was in the hands of Baldwin Wake whose loyalty to the English king was apparently at first in doubt. Indeed, in August 1204 his English lands were in the king's hands and the sheriff of Lincolnshire was instructed to return them to him only if he produced "illos quatuor obsides unde locutum est"(2). By March 1207, his loyalty was once again suspect and the king gave instructions for the seizure of his estates and ordered him to leave the realm(3). How it came about is not clear but by June 1207, if not before, Baldwin had been imprisoned in England(4). It is not known how long his imprisonment lasted but he had certainly been restored to favour by Michaelmas 1210 when he witnessed a charter in England(5).

It seems almost certain that Baldwin came into conflict with the English king because of his Norman

---

(1) C.I.N., no.130, note.

(2) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.6.

(3) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.69 b.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.85 b.

(5) Percy Cartulary (Surtees Society no.117,1909), p.348.

connections which he presumably tried to maintain after the loss of the duchy. His mother, Agnes, was the daughter of William du Hommet, Constable of Normandy[1], and when in March 1207 the king had ordered that Baldwin's property should be seized and Baldwin himself should leave the realm, the instruction had also applied to John du Hommet, his uncle[2]. Agnes herself seems to have retained the king's favour even when Baldwin lost it. A few days after ordering her son and cousin John to leave the country, the king confirmed that Agnes could continue to hold in chief the land in Winchendon, Buckinghamshire, which had been given to her in marriage by her father William du Hommet[3].

(32) The Fief du Hommet (Jersey) a,b,c

The fief du Hommet seems to have belonged to Thomas du Hommet before the loss of Normandy. Thomas was almost certainly a younger son of William du Hommet, Constable of Normandy[4]. In 1207 the fief was granted to Thomas Paynel[5] who seems to have been the brother of Fulk Paynel of Hambie and Hasculf Paynel, clerk[6]. Thomas visited Jersey in the company of his brother

---

(1) C.P., XII (ii), 297.

(2) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.69 b; Appendix IV, section C, no.69.

(3) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.70.

(4) Appendix IV, section C, nos.69-70.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.93.

(6) Appendix IV, section C, no.82.

Appendix V

-D-

Hasculf in April 1207 and again in February 1208[1]. Some time during the fourteenth year of John's reign viz. between May 1212 and May 1213, Engelger de Bohun gave an undertaking that Thomas Paynel "fideliter serviet domino nostro Regi Johanni et quod a servitio suo non recedet nec illum sollicitabit ad aliam terram ei dandam in excambium terre sue quam habuit in Normannia donec dominus Rex per auxilium Dei Normanniam recuperavit, quam illam quam dominus Rex ei dedit in insula de Geres' "[2]. The fact that the grant of the fief du Hommet was confirmed in December, 1212[3], suggests that Engelger's undertaking was given between May and December 1212. Although Thomas had been prepared to lose his Norman lands to support King John, he was clearly not completely trusted, no doubt because of his family connections. In April 1214, Philip d'Aubigny was instructed to give Thomas full seisin of all his lands in Jersey and ensure that his men were not molested[4]. Unfortunately these instructions do not make it clear whether Thomas had been temporarily deprived of the fief du Hommet by the king or was merely being harassed locally. Like other members of his family, Thomas did in fact prove a turncoat. Although the exact date

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, pp.81 b, 104 b.

(2) Rot.Chart. 1199-1216, p.192.

(3) Ibid. 1199-1216, p.189 b.

(4) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.142 b.

at which he switched his allegiance to Philip Augustus is not known, it must have been between April 1214 and October 1216 for the Rolls of the 1309 Assizes refer to "the forfeiture of Thomas Paynell who withdrew from the allegiance of the lord John formerly King of England"(1).

(33) The Fief de Hundeuaus (Jersey) b

The "feodum de Hundeuaus", mentioned in the extent of 1274 as owing full relief(2), is now known as the fief of Handois. It was held from before 1204 to the early years of the fourteenth century by the Gallichan family(3). In 1214 Ralph Gallichan was one of the Channel Island hostages released by King John(4) and presumably he was the son and heir of the then holder of the fief. Ralph's wife Jeanne had two uncles, Adam de Sottevast and Guillaume de Briquebec, both of whom had made her grants of Channel Island property on the occasion of her marriage. Both uncles subsequently chose the Norman allegiance(5). Guillaume may have granted the whole of his Channel Island property to Jeanne but Adam de Sottevast(6) had other property in Jersey which he forfeited when he adhered to Philip Augustus(7).

---

(1) R.A. 1309, p.229. See also Ext.J. 1331, p.26.

(2) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(3) G.F.B. De Gruchy, Medieval Land Tenures in Jersey, p.68.

(4) Rot.Lit.Pat. 1201-16, p.122 b.

(5) Cl.R. 1237-42, p.284.

(6) See Appendix V, section D, no.41.

(7) Ext. 1274, p.19.

Appendix V

-D-

(34) The Fief d'Ouville (alias des Mouriers) (Jersey) e/bc

The extent of 1274 merely refers to the fief de Morers as "escaeta Willelmi de Dunvill militis"[1] but the Jersey extent of 1331 refers to the "ancienne échète des Normands le fief Dorvile alias Le Mourier"[2]. It is clear from pre-1204 charters that the correct form of the surname is d'Ouville[3] and the holder of the fief des Mouriers in 1204 was in all probability that Guillaume d'Ouville who held lands in England and Normandy but chose the Norman allegiance thereby losing his English lands[4]. In 1214, however, Lucy, widow of William d'Ouville was granted her dower in the island of Jersey[5]. No trace has been found of any other d'Ouvilles in the Islands either before or after 1204 and it therefore seems likely that this is another case where the English king allowed the widow of someone who died in Normandy to have her dower in his realm. I have found no evidence that Lucy was granted her dower in England too, but the possibility nevertheless remains.

On the other hand, this may not be a case of double tenure but a case of a change in allegiance: Lucy may have been an Islander who chose to return to Jersey after

---

(1) Ibid., p.17.

(2) Ext. J. 1331, p.37.

(3) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., p.58.

(4) Appendix IV, section C, no.81.

(5) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.181.

her husband's death even if it meant losing her dower in Normandy. If this were so, then there was a continuing family connection between the Islands and Normandy for William d'Ouville's heirs seem to have remained in the duchy(1).

(35) The Fief of William Pinel (Jersey) b/e

The extent of 1274 records that the heirs of William de Cheney held property "de escaeta Willelmi Pynel militis partem Normannorum aliquando tenentis"(2). The fief was first granted to William de Cheney "during pleasure" in 1244(3) and then in 1253 it was granted to him and his heirs "until the lands of England and Normandy shall be one"(4).

An entry in the Calender of Inquisitions Post Mortem dated 11th April 1244 records that William Pinel had "two daughters who are married within the power of the King of France, and his lands are the king's escheat". The estate was said to be worth 381. 5s.4d. tournois "from which 30s.6d. tournois are deducted yearly for the dower of the late wife of John Pynel"(5). Since the dower was still being paid in 1244, this entry should presumably have referred to the wife of the late John

---

(1) Rec.de Jugements, no.793.

(2) Ext. 1274, p.24.

(3) C.P.R. 1232-47, p.424.

(4) C.Ch.R. 1226-57, p.419.

(5) C.I.P.M., I, no.38.

Pinel rather than to the late wife of the same gentleman. Since we do not know where John's widow was resident, it is not clear whether this is a case of relatives choosing opposite allegiances in 1204, or a case of double tenure after that date. Since no certain example has been found of a widow resident in Normandy receiving her dower in the Islands[1], the former possibility seems the most likely.

(36) The Fief de Robelinoys (Jersey) b

De Gruchy has identified the fief de Robelinoys which owed half relief in 1274[2] as the fief later called la Robeline in the parish of St Mary. He states "It was no doubt the 'terra Robelinorum' which yielded 10s., evidently the 'firma' below, in the Ministerium de Crapout Doit in 1180. The surname Robelin continued to exist in the same parish but the bearers had lost the fief at an early date. By 1331 it had got divided into two parts, each paying 5s. 'firma' and quarter relief of 15s., the one held by Guillaume Levesque in the right of Nicholas Levesque, the other by Guillaume du Buhot for Richard Levesque"[3]. The fief had in fact been divided into two before 1204 and the half held by William du Buhot "for Richard Levesque" was terra Normannorum forfeited by Richard Levesque. For many years Richard's property

---

(1) See Appendix V, section D, no.34.

(2) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(3) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., p.84.

had remained in the family. The extent of 1274 records that "Willelmus le Esveske tenet escaetam Gervasiae le Esvesky partem Normannorum quondam tenentis"(1). According to the Rolls of the 1309 Assizes, Gervase was the daughter of Richard. In 1309, Jordan Levesque, son of William, stated that his grandfather Jordan had purchased the half fee from Gervase, daughter of Richard Levesque "in the time of her widowhood". Jordan senior had enjoyed the rent from the property for the rest of his life and his son William had inherited it. Then, during Sir Otto de Grandison's Wardenship of the Islands, the property had been seized on the king's behalf because Richard had "taken the part of the Normans" and Gervase "had not any right in the land which her father had forfeited"(2).

(37) The Fief de Rosel (Jersey) a,c

The fief de Rosel mentioned in the extent of 1274 as owing full relief(3) belonged in the late twelfth century to the de Fornet family(4). In 1208 the king informed the Warden of Jersey "quod commisimus Ingerammo de Furnetto terram quae fuit Silvestri de Furnetto fratris sui in Insula de Geres' quae est escaeta .... habendam

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.20.

(2) R.A. 1309, pp.3-5.

(3) Ext. 1274, p.8.

(4) G.F.B. De Gruchy, op.cit., p.59.

et tenendam quamdiu ipse bene nobis servierit"[1]. This strongly suggests that Silvester had chosen the Norman allegiance. Enguerrand seems to have remained faithful to the English king until at least June 1227[2] but by 1233 his fief had been forfeited and was described as terra Normannorum in 1247[3].

(38) The Fief de Sausmarez (Guernsey) b

The fief known in 1331 as the fief de Sausmarez[4] was earlier known as the fief de Jerbourg[5] and was originally held by the Norman family of de Barneville[6]. Jordan de Barneville held land in Normandy in 1172[7] and is named in the Norman Exchequer Roll of 1198[8]. He sold some land in Jersey to Benjamin, abbot of St Helier, probably in the 1180's[9] and granted a rent in the island to the abbey of Lessay at an unknown date[10]. By the early thirteenth century the Jerbourg fief had passed to a woman, Nicola de Barneville. We learn this

---

(1) Rot.Lit.Cl. 1204-24, p.104 b.

(2) Ibid. 1204-24, p.244; ibid. 1224-7, pp.114,114 b; Rot.Lit. Pat. 1201-16, p.172; Pat.R. 1216-25, p.574; ibid. 1225-32, p.127.

(3) Cl.R. 1231-4, p.211.

(4) Ext. G. 1331, p.123.

(5) T.W.M. De Guérin, "Feudalism in Guernsey", La Societé Guernesiaise, Transactions, VI (1918), 81; R.A. 1309, p.35.

(6) T.W.M. De Guérin, loc.cit., 81; Cl.R. 1227-31, p.289.

(7) R.B., p.635.

(8) Mag.Rot.Scac.Norm., II, cxcii.

(9) C.D.F., no.953. Cf. G.F.B. De Gruchy, Medieval Land Tenures in Jersey, pp.102-3.

(10) C.D.F., no.926.

from a writ of 29th January 1230 which states that the king was returning to Jordan de Lucy, son of Maurice de Lucy and Nicola de Barneville, the land in Jerbourg which belonged to him by hereditary right. This land had been in the king's custody since Maurice met his death while serving King John in the island. The reason for the seizure was that Jordan was then a minor but by 1230 he had come of age[1]. By 1309 the fief had passed into the hands of Matthew de Sausmarez, probably by marriage, for the Rolls of the Assizes of that year quote Matthew as saying that he and his ancestors had possessed certain rights in Jerbourg "from time immemorial"[2].

If a judgement made at the Norman Exchequer in 1216 relates to the daughters of Jordan de Barneville, then Nicola had sisters in Normandy after 1204. The judgement was "quod due sorores Alienor de Barnevilla, qui sunt ad pacem domini regis, habeant escaetam ejusdem Alienor defuncte, salvo jure tercie sororis, qui est in Anglia, si ad pacem regis venerit"[3]. No reference has been found to Jordan de Barneville after 1198, or to a male heir, so it seems very likely that he was succeeded by his four daughters as co-heiresses.

---

(1) Cl.R. 1227-31, p.289.

(2) R.A. 1309, p.35.

(3) Rec.de Jugements, no.171.

(39) The Fief de Scrakkevill (Jersey) b

The extent of 1274 records that "Margeria que fuit uxor Jordani de la Hoge tenet in feodo de Scrakkevill' escaetam Ricardi de Scrakkevill' militis partem Normannorum quondam tenentis cuius filia de permissione Drogonis de Barentin tunc ballivi dimisit escaetam eandem ... predicte Margerie in escambio terre quam ipsa habuit in Normannia. Et ... eadem Margeria ad defencionem seysine sue constanter asseruit quod predictus Ricardus de Scrakkevill' regibus Anglie tota vita sua fideliter adherens de terra predicta seysitus obiit"(1).

No further references have been found to Richard d'Escraqueville or his son but it would seem that the former chose the English allegiance while the latter adhered to Philip Augustus. When Richard died, his son could not inherit his Channel Island property so exchanged it with Margaret for land she possessed in Normandy. Although this suggests that Margaret held land in the duchy while she and her husband lived in the Islands(2), it may be that she came from a Norman family and the exchange was made at the time of her marriage.

(40) The Fief of Robert Serle (Jersey) b

The extent of 1274 contains the following entry: "Item dicunt quod idem Petrus reddet I cabatellum frumenti ex dimissione Roberti Serle qui recessit in Normannia.

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.20.

(2) C.I.N., nos.15,73; Cl.R. 1251-3, p.104.

Item dicunt quod filius Ricardi Serle tenet I peciunculam terre in landis de forisfactura Ranulphi Duriuaut..."[1]. It seems likely from the juxtaposition of their names under the same parish that Robert Serle and the son of Richard Serle were related.

(41) The Fief of Adam de Sotuward (Jersey) b

The extent of 1274 contains a reference to "escaeta domini Regis pro forisfactura Ade de Sotuward tenentis partem Normannorum"[2]. Adam's niece Jeanne was married to Ralph Gallichan[3] so he had relatives in the Islands after 1204.

---

(1) Ext. 1274, p.22.

(2) Ibid., p.19.

(3) See Appendix V, section D, no.33.