

From the *Transactions* of the
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

Kirby's Quest.

by H. Barkly
1886-87, Vol. 11, 130-154

© The Society and the Author(s)

KIRBY'S QUEST,

CONTRIBUTED BY SIR HENRY BARKLY, K.C.B., G.C.M.G., &c., *President*.

PART I.—ITS HISTORY.

THE Inquisition, known by the above title, was instituted whilst John de Kirkeby was Treasurer, (12th to 18th Edward I.) to ascertain what knights' fees there were "held of the king, or of any one else." The importance attached to it is shown by his presiding *ex-officio* over the commissioners in several counties,¹ whilst Philip de Wylebi, who, after long acting as one of the barons of the exchequer, had been promoted to the chancellorship of that court at the earlier date, (1284) presided in others.

No copy of the Royal Writ authorising this inquiry is known to exist, so that we are left to conjecture the occasion of its issue, and the ulterior objects in view.

The nearest parallel is to be found in the returns of fees and sub-*enfeoffments* called for from his tenants *in capite* by Henry II. in 1166.² In both instances the kingdom was gradually recovering from the devastating effects of a protracted civil war, at the close of which many lordships and manors had passed from the losing to the winning side, and it must have been expedient for the officers of the exchequer to obtain full particulars of the new distribution of lands on which the fiscal, not to mention the military, resources of the crown mainly depended.

Kirby's Quest does not seem to have been directly connected with any intended impost, though it doubtless proved useful afterwards in the assessment of the heavy burdens entailed by Edward's Foreign Conquests.

It formed part rather of that general scheme for re-establishing

¹ As he became Bishop of Ely in July, 1286, and is never so styled in these Rolls, the Inquisition must have been taken prior to that date.

² "Liber Niger Scaccarii."

and securing the rights of the crown against encroachment from the church or baronage, which the king had steadily pursued since his accession. Just as the special Inquisitions for the Hundred Rolls—by their disclosures of the strife and oppression that prevailed throughout the realm, paved the way for the Statute of Gloucester in 1278, under cover of which the proclamations of *Quo Warranto* were put forth—so those now held, by demonstrating the extent to which the multiplication of petty lordships, often sub-infeuded four or five deep, had been carried,¹—naturally led to the enactment in 1290 of the statute, "*Quia Emptores*," whereby a simple but effectual check was placed on the creation of new manors, by providing that in all future alienations of any portion of an estate, the land should be held, not of the immediate feoffer, but of the chief lord of the fee.

Another reason for this inquiry may perhaps be found in the fact that the Monks were still striving to evade the provisions of the statute of Mortmain passed in 1279, so that precise information as to the lands they already held and of the enfeoffments they had made, must have been indispensable for preventing a repetition of the frauds from which the royal revenues had previously suffered.² Hence the names and holdings of all tenants of whatever degree were called for, contrary to the usual practice, and hence, too, the indisposition clearly perceptible in many cases to furnish the details sought.³

In spite of this, however, the accounts of the sub-feoffees given, is a feature of peculiar interest in these returns, and renders them of unusual genealogical importance. The Rev. Mr. Eyton, who made great use of those relating to Shropshire, classes Kirby's Quest in the same category with Domesday, the

¹ Manors of half a hide, held as one-tenth of a knight's fee, will be found in the return annexed, in possession of holders six stages removed from the original lord.

² A Fee was, in order to escape the military service due on it, granted to some abbey collusively, and regranted to the donor for a trifling consideration.

³ Juries often declare that they know not by what service or for how many Fees a Lordship is held, or even that they cannot find out the actual holder.

Liber Niger, the Testa de Nevill, and the Nomina Villarum, whilst the Council of the Surtees Society, when intimating their intention in 1866 to publish the portion respecting Yorkshire, describe it as "in value and importance second only to Domesday Book."

It may seem strange that a record so highly extolled by competent judges, should have hitherto attracted so little attention,¹ and that with the exception of Yorkshire, the return for no county should yet have been published in full. This neglect is probably due in no small degree to the disappearance long since, not merely of the original Inquisitions, but of such early abridgements of them as once existed: whilst even those of later date have come down to us in an incomplete and unauthentic form.

Putting out of the question some fragments of parchment, which are supposed to be part of the actual returns made on oath by jurors in certain counties, none however having any heading left to guide us—our knowledge of the results of the Quest is (save in the case of Yorkshire for which independent abstracts are extant) derivable from a paper book, now in the Public Record Office,² into which have been transcribed, in small legal handwriting of the sixteenth century, abstracts of the Inquisitions for twenty counties arranged in alphabetical order—those for Devon, York, Somerset, Dorset, Surrey and Sussex, and Leicester, being stated in the headings to have been taken before John de Kirkeby, treasurer, whilst those for Lincoln, Nottingham, and Derby, were before Philip de Wylebi, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

These abstracts, which are perfectly homogeneous, occupy about 230 folios, out of a total of 457, extending from folio 120 to folio 349 consecutively. The earlier and later portions of the volume are filled with rough notes of escheats, extents of lands, &c., of various dates, but having no connection with Kirkby's Quest. They are in darker ink, and in a bolder hand, evidently that of the owner of the memorandum book himself, additions and alterations

¹ A version of one of the fragments alluded to in the next paragraph, relating to the County of Kent, was contributed to the "Archæologia Cantiana" by Mr. James Greenstreet, in 1887. (Vol. xi p. 365).

² Exchequer Miscellaneous Records—No. 52 T.G. 15. 644.

being made in the same writing throughout the abstracts, which he had presumably employed a clerk to enter from some earlier copy then in existence.¹

There is no clue to the name or office of this owner, nor are any introductory remarks prefixed to the part containing the "abstracts," nor explanation added of the reason why similar abstracts for the rest of England were not given.

The book in question was brought from the Exchequer, where it is supposed to have belonged to the department of the Queen's Remembrancer, in the year 1857. It must have been lost sight of for many years previously, since Madox, who wrote his well known History of the Exchequer at the close of the 17th century, was ignorant of the existence of any copy of Kirby's Quest; and on the other hand, Stacey Grimaldi, in the carefully compiled Catalogue of Authorities prefixed to his "*Origines Genealogicæ*," published in London so recently as 1828, makes not the slightest allusion to such a record.

The substantial accuracy of the version since recovered is fully established by its close agreement in the case of Yorkshire, with that given in an ancient roll preserved in the archives of that county, the history of which can be traced back as far as the year 1484.²

It is also, to a minor extent, corroborated in the case of the County to its connection with which the remainder of this paper will be devoted.

¹ These details are entered into, because a recent writer, on the supposition that the entire contents of the volume belong to Kirby's Quest (a title only endorsed on it within the last thirty years), proceeds to describe it as a collection of documents from the time of Edward I. to Edward IV., so roughly and badly made as to be comparatively worthless, "or only valuable because the records which it preserved may have been lost or destroyed." I am not aware that any one ever claimed more for the Quest than is admitted in the last sentence. We do not possess the original: we have not even an authenticated copy; but the same may be said as to the "*Nomina Villarum*," and that has never been undervalued by antiquarian students.

² *Vide* Introduction to Vol. 22 of Publications of the Surtees Society, "Kirby's Inquest, the Survey of the county of York, temp. Ed. I."

PART II.—THE RETURN FOR GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

This was not one of the counties selected by John de Kirkeby for his *Iter.*, for we learn from the heading that the commission was presided over by Richard Rowell, probably from his name a local man, there being a manor so called in Kiftesgate Hundred.

There is internal evidence in the Inquisitions to prove that they were held not much earlier than 1283, nor later than the autumn of 1286,¹ and this accords not only with the approximate dates assigned to those of other counties, but with the opinion expressed by that indefatigable antiquary, John Smyth, of Nibley, two hundred and fifty years ago²

The recent publication by the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archæological Society of his "Description of the Hundred of Berkeley," has revealed the fact that Smyth was well acquainted with a very early abstract of these Gloucestershire Inquisitions, which he repeatedly quotes as "an ancient book of Knights' Fees of the time of King Edw I., with the Remembrancer to the Lord Treasurer in the Exchequer, compiled of divers Inquisitions taken by Richard de Rowell and others." This "ancient book," which was clearly not the paper book of the 16th century,³ must have, like that, disappeared soon after Smyth wrote in 1639, and as no trace of it has since been discovered, we must be content with the later one which has been preserved. Unfortunately the Return for Gloucestershire is extremely defective, as may be seen at once on comparison with the "Nomina Villarum" compiled

¹ John Botetourt holds Dursley (Woodmanecote). He only succeeded to it in right of his wife, on the death of her brother Otto in 1282, and as there were other sisters, some legal delay was inevitable. On the other hand, Anselm de Gurnay holds Beverston, and as his writ of "*Diem clausit*" is dated 23rd October, 1286, the return must have been made at an earlier date than that.

² Smyth, after referring to the Inquisition on the death of Henry de Berkely, of Dursley, in July, 1287, speaks of a return of knights' fees of *temp.* Edward I., in which his tenure is mentioned as "somewhat more ancient." Description of Hundred of Berkely, page 75.

³ My reasons for this conclusion are given in full in a paper in *Genealogist* for January, 1887.

about thirty years later. The separate holdings of all sizes mentioned in the former are under 180; whereas in a summary at the end of the Return of 9th Edward II., the numbers of "Vills" in the county is given as 234, or deducting the five boroughs, 229.

The deficit is mainly due to the entire omission of the following Hundreds, which, in 1316, comprised 44 manors, viz.: Tewkesbury, Westbury, Salmonesbury, Pucklechurch, and Dudesstan.

This may have arisen from various causes; as, for example, they may have been "in the king's hand" by reason of escheat, so that the particulars wanted could be obtained without inquiry on oath; or they may have been owned by Ecclesiastical Corporations, or by great Nobles who threw obstacles in the way, just as it is recorded that in Yorkshire the bailiffs of Earl Warrenne refused permission to the jurors to enter within his "liberties."¹

Gilbert de Clare, "the Red Earl" of Gloucester, who was then lord of the Hundred of Tewkesbury, was both self-willed and powerful enough to have ventured on a similar course,² and it is to be noted that although other hundreds and manors owned by him are nominally included in the Return, scarcely any information as to the services they were held by, or the names of his feoffees is supplied.³

The absence of Westbury is more easily accounted for, as it was a Royal Hundred, and the four or five parishes it contained were so scattered by the interposition of parts of the Forest of Dean, as to be often included in Blideslowe.⁴

The other missing Hundreds had ecclesiastical lords. Pucklechurch belonged to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, of whom its two or three manors were held by knight service. Salmanesbury had

¹ *Vide* Introduction to Surtees Society's Survey of County of York.

² Though not actually in rebellion, he was at this moment waging a private war on the Earl of Hereford in the Marches of Wales.

³ Under Thornbury Hundred we find—"Item comes Glouc. ten. manerium integrum de Rege in Capite, *sed non fit mentio in Inquisitionibus predictis per quod servitium.*" Under Britwoldsbourne Hundred—"Item comes Glouc. ten. manerium de Fayreford quod est de Honore Glouc., de Rege in Capite, *sed non fit mentio in Inq. predictis per quod servitium, &c., &c.*"

⁴ *Vide* Fosbroke's History of Gloucestershire, Vol. II. p. 13.

been given by Henry III. in exchange for the lordship of the maritime towns of Rye and Winchelsea to the foreign Abbey of Fécamp; but as, with the exception of the town of Cheltenham, none of the 19 manors contained in it were held of the Abbot, this does not explain why the Inquisitions regarding them were omitted, nor is the explanation to be found apparently in the Hundred having escheated, since in the Quo Warranto proceedings at Gloucester, in 1287, the Abbot was duly represented by his attorney, brother Richard de Bromdeffeld. The last in the list, Dudes-tan, though owned by the Crown, was usually farmed by the Abbot of St. Peters, Gloucester, of whom, however, no mention is to be found throughout the entire Return, although numerous manors, not only in that but in eight other Hundreds, were held by that monastery.

The omission is, I believe, due to the circumstance of all these manors having been seized by the king's escheator on the death of Abbot Reginald in 1284; and, in spite of the election by the chapter of his successor shortly afterwards, not restored until in 1287, a judgment adverse to the rights claimed by the Crown during vacation of the Abbacy, was pronounced.¹

There are other omissions in the Return more inexplicable than any of the foregoing: as for instance, where—although the name of a Hundred is set forth, instead of the full number of manors in it following—a fraction only are entered. Thus, in the case of Grumboldash, 1 alone, out of 15 in the “*Nomina Villarum*,” appears; and in that of Whitstan, but 4 out of 13. A few of the manors so passed over are to be found included under other Hundreds,—a remark which applies likewise to some pertaining to the Hundreds wholly omitted.

¹ Reginald died on 13th September, and John de Gamages was installed on 30th of November as Abbot, the chapter voting him a subsidy “on account of the manifold oppressions which had overwhelmed the community since the time of the vacancy.” In 15th Edward I., in an Inquisition before the Justiciary at Gloucester, the Jury found “that on vacancy no Royal Escheator was accustomed to enter on the manors of the abbey and receive the rents.” Probably a compromise was thereupon arranged with the Crown, for on the death of Abbot John in 1307, there is an entry of the payment of 200 marks, the fine fixed on a vacancy in the abbey. *Cartulary of St. Peter's, Glouc.*, Vol. I., pp. 34-39, Rolls Series.

The boundaries of Hundreds had indeed become very fluctuating and uncertain in the thirteenth century, depending a good deal on the influence of the great lords, who sought as far as possible to have their possessions, however isolated, included for fiscal and judicial purposes in their own liberties. In the case too of some of the larger manors, which extended into two or even three conterminous Hundreds, there seems to have been no settled rule as to whether the holders should account partially in each, or collectively in one of the number.

A comparison of such Returns as the present, with those of earlier or later date, is thus rendered difficult and unsatisfactory, as will be at once found on attempting to collate it with the "Aid for making the Black Prince a Knight," recently contributed to the Society's Proceedings by Sir John Maclean.

Still with all its omissions and imperfections, which of course in some degree impair its utility, Kirby's Quest for Gloucestershire is an invaluable record, and it is high time it should receive the attention it deserves. It must be borne in mind that excepting in so far as they unconsciously followed Smyth in respect to a single Hundred, the historians of the county hitherto have written not only without its aid, but in entire ignorance of its existence. As they often had little to guide them, when tracing the devolution of manors in the period which intervened between the last mention of them in the fiscal Returns which have been published under the title of "Testa de Nevill," the latest of which for Gloucestershire comes scarcely further down than 1250, and the curt announcement of the names of their lords in the "Nomina Villarum" of 1316, it need not be wondered that they occasionally made mistakes, especially in the case of families not holding direct of the Crown and not impleaded therefore by writs of Quo Warranto, nor included in the "Inquisitiones post mortem" formerly in the Tower.

Any one indeed who glances over Fosbroke's History, the latest and most elaborate yet published, can hardly fail to be struck with his inability frequently to account for the changes of ownership that had occurred during these eventful sixty or

seventy years, nor to appreciate the importance in a genealogical point of view of a record which helps to bridge over this interval.

The study of Kirby's Quest in fact must form an essential preliminary to the compilation of anything pretending to be a complete history of the County, and its publication therefore in an easily accessible form, will certainly constitute not the least of the services rendered by the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society.

The clerk, who, in the 16th century, copied this Return into the paper book now at the Public Record Office, although he gave the abbreviated latin text correctly enough, seems to have had no acquaintance with Gloucestershire ; and when unable to decipher the names of places or persons, to have entered them at a guess.

Moreover, he wrote almost a running hand ; and many of his letters are so carelessly and imperfectly formed that it is often hard to be sure of them : his *c*, for example, being scarcely distinguishable from *t*, or his *n* from *u*, and *vice versa*.

It has been thought best, however, to have the MS. merely extended, without any attempt to correct errors and misreadings, even where obvious, leaving such rectifications as seemed essential to be suggested in notes at the foot of each page.

These are chiefly based, as will be seen, on the authority of Domesday (denoted by D), of the Hundred Rolls (H.R.), of the Placita de Quo Warranto (Q.W.), and above all of the Nomina Villarum (N.V.)—The Return of the aid levied for knighting the Black Prince in 20th Edward III., wherein reference is often made to an aid of 18th Edward I., is also cited as A.B.P.

Brief explanations are occasionally appended, but where Fosbroke's History affords any clue to difficulties it has been deemed sufficient to refer to it. The last three Notes as to the Hundreds of Hagedede, Campden, and Cranbourne, respectively, have extended to inconvenient length, but they touch on points of some interest, and I was anxious to show the probability of the entries to which they relate, having been added at the Exchequer subsequently, on the termination of certain law suits in which the Earl of Gloucester had been engaged.

EXCH: Q. R. MISCELL. BOOKS, VOL. 52.—"KIRBY'S QUEST."

GLOUC.—Rotuli feodorum que tenentur de Rege in capite et de aliis diversis in Coñi Glouç seundum inquisitiones inde factas coram Ricardo Rowell et sociis suis ad hoc assignatis per ipsum Regem.

HUNDRED DE BURNETRE¹ JUXTA BRISTOLL.

STOKE GYFFARD.—Item Johannes Gyffard miles tenet in villa de Stoke unum feod. milit. de Episcopo Wygorn.' Et Episcopus de Rege.

RADE².—Item Radulphus de Wilinton tenet in villa Rade di. feod. mil. de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege ut supra.

JOHINTON³.—Item Rogerus Corbet tenet in villa de Johinton di. feod. milit. de Coñi Heref. Et Comes de predicto Episcopo. Episcopus de Rege ut supra.

HAUST⁴.—Item Jacobus Russel tenet villā de Haust di. feod. mil. de predicto Episcopo. Et idem Episcopus de Rege.

CANCOK⁵.—Item Margar' de Cancok tenet unum feod. in eadem villa de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

WESTON S'CI LAUR' IBID.—Item Walterus Cancok tenet di. feod. in Weston S'ci Lauř de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

Item Willielmus de Weyn tenet duas hydas terre in Weston S'ci Lauř de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

HEMBURN⁶.—Item Willielmus de la Haye tenet in Hemburn de predicto Episcopo duas hydas terre. Et Episcopus de Rege.

Item Hildeburga de Westbur' tenet unam hidam terre per serviciū militař de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

Item Robertus Coveleye tenet unam hidam terre et di. de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

YRIDDELOND⁷.—Item Willielmus Maunsel tenet unam hidam terre in Yriddelond per serviciū milit. de Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

HAMPTON⁸.—Item Ansilius de Gurnay tenet unam hidam terre in Hampton per idem serviciū de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

IBM'.—Item Willielmus Savage et Rogerus le Buteler tenent unam hidam terre in Hampton per idem serviciū de Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

1 Known later as Henbury Hundred. It belonged to the See of Worcester before the Conquest, D.

2 A mistake of the copyist for Yate, N.V., an outlying manor long held by the Willintons.—A.B.P.

3 Ichinton N.V., another outlying manor in Thornbury Hundred, held by the Corbets.—A.B.P.

4 Aust N.V., held by the Russels of Dirham as to one moiety.—A.B.P.

5 Cantok.—This is not the name of a manor, but of the family which held the other moiety of Aust.—N.V. Her husband died 12th Hen. I. (Close Roll, m. 10.)

6 Henbury.—I can find nothing as to this William de la Haye. The *Nomina Villarum* does not give the names of the bishop's tenants in this manor.

7 Tridland, or Thirdland, according to Fosbroke, Vol. II. p. 74.—A.B.P.

8 Shirehampton,—apparently, as the Butler's held there of the Bishops of Worcester. The holding of the De Gurneys must have been Radwyk, which came to them from Robert Fitzharding, and of which Thomas, son and heir of John apAdam was Lord in 9th Edward II. N.V. cl. A.B.P.

STOKE EP'I.—Item florencius Humfrey tenet unam virgat. terre in Stok Epi per idem servicium de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

HAININGTON¹.—Item Ricardus de Greneville tenet di. hidam terre in Hainington per idem servicium de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

CUMTON².—Item idem Ricardus de Greneville tenet di. feod. milit. in Cumton de Galfrido de Apeote. Et idem Galfridus de Willielmo de Bello Campo, Comite Warf. Et idem Comes de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

HAININGTON.—Item Petrus Crok tenet unam virgat. terre in Hainington per servicium milit. de predicto Episcopo. Et idem Episcopus de Rege.

WERKESBURN³.—Item Willielmus de Werkesburn tenet di. hidam terre in Werkesburn per idem servicium de predicto Episcopo. Et Episcopus de Rege.

HUNDRED DE KYFFTESGATE.

SENEBUR.⁴—Item heredes Radulphi Musard tenent manerium de Senebuř de Rege in capite pro quarta parte unius feod.

WESTON⁵.—Item Episcopus Wygorn' tenet manerium de Weston pro uno feod. milit. sed non fit mencio in Inquisitione de quo etc.

HOMBURN⁶.—Item Abbas de Wynch tenet manerium de Homburn de Rege in capite sed non dicunt per quod servicium.

OLLINTON⁷.—Item Johannes de Ollinton tenet villam de Ollinton de Roberto de Mortuo Mari. Et idem Robertus de Rege sed etĉ.

ADELEMINTON.—Item abbas de Wynch. tenet manerium de Adeleminton de Rege sed non dicunt pro quot feod.

WOKELTON⁸.—Item Abbas de Eynesham tenet manerium de Wokelton de Episcopo Line'. Et Episcopus de Rege sed (non) dicunt etĉ.

CHEVERINGWORTH⁹.—Item Hugo de Chaveringworth tenet manerium de Cleveringworth de Willielmo Burnel. Et idem Willielmus de Petro de Marius. Et idem Petrus de Radulpho de Tony. Et Radulphus de Rege.

BACKESHORE.—Item villa de Backeshore tenetur de Johanne Golaffre. Et idem Johannes de Ricardo de Solar.¹⁰ Et idem Episcopus de Rege pro di. feod. milit.

1 Hainington.—There is no place of this name in Gloucestershire, but there is near Highworth, in the adjoining county of Wilts, now in the Diocese of Bristol, but some 30 or 40 miles distant from that city.

2 Compton Grenville N.V. cl. A.B.P., now "Greenfield."

3 Werkesburn is not mentioned in N.V. or Fosbroke, but a William de Werkesborne was the Bishops' chief baillif in 3 Hen. III., *vide* Jury List, Trans. Vol. X.

4 Saintsbury—part of the Musard Barony of Miserden. Ralph Musard died 1st Edward I., leaving his heirs infants.

5 Weston on Avon.—There were several Westons in this Hundred. This one was held by the Bishops of Worcester for Evesham Abbey. Fosbroke Vol. II. p. 315, V. etiam Rot. Q.W.

6 Honeyburn, *alias* Cow Honiburn—held by the Abbot of Wynecheombe N.V.

7 Ullington.—John de Olynton held it of Robert de Mortimer.—Esch. 16th Edward I., No. 30.

8 Wokelton—Not mentioned by Fosbroke, nor included in the Monasticon among the Gloucestershire possessions of the Abbey of Eynsham, Oxfordshire.

9 Charingworth—Fosbroke II. p. 323.

10 Backsore was held by the de Solers family.

LANGEBERY¹.—Item Ricardus Labank in Langebery. tenet ij carucas terre de Briano de Branton pro di. feod. milit. Et idem Brianus de Edmundo de mortuo mari. Et idem Edmundus de Rege.

WESTON².—Item Johannes de Cantilupo tenet manerium de Weston de Abbate de Evesham pro ij partibus unius feod. Et idem Abbas de Rege in capite.

Item dicunt quod xij virgat. terre tenentur de Abbate de Evesham pro di. feod. milit. sed non dicunt qui eas tenet. Et idem Abbas de Rege.

PUBBEWORTH³.—Item Johannes de Bosco tenet maneria de Pubbeworth de heredibus Comitis Wynton. Et iidem heredes de Rege pro ij feod.

NORTON GYFFARD.—Item Episcopus Wygorn' tenet manerium de Norton Gyffard de Rege in capite pro di. feod. milit.

WYLLESHEYE⁴.—Item Abbas de Evesham tenet manerium de Wyllesheye de Rege in capite per Baroñ sed non dicunt per quot feod.

SUELL⁵.—Item idem Abbas tenet manerium de Suell de Rege in capite sed non dicunt ut supra.

LONGA MERSTON⁶ Item Abbas de Wynch. tenet manerium de Longa Merston de Prior Covetr'. Et idem Prior de Rege sed non etē.

WESTON⁷.—Item Johannes de Langel tenet manerium de Weston de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege sed non etē.

QUENTON.—Item Johannes Marmioun tenet manerium de Quenton de Philippo Marmum. Et idem Phillipus de Comite Leyc'. Et Comes de Rege.

MUNE⁸.—Item Johannes de Penbrigg' tenet villam de Mune de Rege in capite pro di. feod. milit.

HUNDRED DE VISEL⁹.

PAYNDESWIK¹⁰.—Item Willielmus de Monte Caniso tenet villam de Payndeswike de Rege in capite que pertinet ad Baroniam suam.

EGESWORTH.—Item Walterus de Elynn¹¹ et Stephanus de Egesworth tenent villam de Egesworth de eodem Willielmo per servicium di. feod.

LA MUSARDIRE¹².—Item Johannes Musard qui est in custodia Regis tenet villam de la Musardire de Rege in capite per servicium di. feod.

1 Longborough—a remnant of a great estate of the Mortimers. Rudder gives the tenant's name as *Leblanck*, but it was probably *Lebane*, as the place is known as Bank's Fee, or *Langborough le Bankeys*—Fosbroke VII. p. 290 et A.B.P.

2 Weston Cantilupe—N.V.

3 Pebworth.

4 Willarsleye N.V., now Willersey.

5 Swell, Upper or Overswell.

6 Marston Long or Sicca—purchased by the Abbot of Wynchcombe from St. Mary's Coventry *temp* Hen. III.—Fosbroke Vol. II.

7 Weston Mauduit—John de Langley succeeded 8th Edward I. esch., et A.B.P.

8 Mune, or Meon, a manor in the Hundred of Botloe, but reckoned as a dependency of Quenton.—Fosbroke, Vol. II.

9 Bisley - one of the seven Hundreds of Cirencester.

10 Painswick was part of the Barony of Munchensy.

11 Edgworth was held by the *Helyons*, as a dependency of Painswicke.—Fosbroke, Vol. I. p. 359.

12 Musarden, corrupted into Miserden, was the "Caput Baronie" of the Musards. As John came of age in 15th Edward I., esch. No. 75 (Probatio ætatis), this inquisition is clearly earlier date

SEPERTON¹.—Item Henricus Huse filius Henrici Huse qui est in custodia Regis, Walterus de Yhill et Henricus de Leye tenent villam de Seperton de Rege in capite per servicium di. feod. milit.

FROMTON².—Item Johannes Mansell filius Willielmi Maunsell tenet hamelectum de ffromtom de eodem per servicium quarte partis unius feod.

HUNDRED DE DEERHURST.

WHYCFELD³.—Item Nicholaus de Hedenet tenet Whycfeld de Willielmo le Poer. Et idem Willielmus de Abbate Weston.⁷ Et idem Abbas de Rege per servicium di. feod. milit.

TYMBERDENE⁴.—Item Robertus Blaunket tenet Tymberdene in Com. Wygorn' de eodem Willielmo. Et idem Willielmus de predicto Abbate. Et Abbas de Rege per idem servicium.

Item Hugo Mustell tenet aliam medietatem predicti feod. de Willielmo le Poer in Brokemoncote. Et idem Willielmus de Abbate. Et Abbas de Rege.

HUNDRED DE TEBALDESTON.

CLYVE.—Item Episcopus Wygorn' tenet manerium de Clyve cum membris de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio per quod servicium.

STOKE.⁵—Item Nicholaus le Archer tenet partem de Stoke de Rege in capite per servicium deferendi unum Arcum cum sagittis cum Rege in exercitu suo sumptibus suis pro xl diebus.

HUNDRED DE CAMUPPEDEN.

CAMUPPEDEN⁶.—Item Camuppeden tenetur de Rege in capite per servicium di. feod. milit, sed non fit mencio qui cam tenet.

BURGUS DE BERKELEY.

BERKELEY.—Item Thomas de Berkeleye tenet Burgum de Berkeleye de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio per quod servicium.

IN'M.—Item Abbas S'ci Augusti Bristol tenet vj tem partem predictae ville de Berkleye [blank] de predicto Thoma. Et idem Thomas de Rege sed non fit mencio etē.

1 Sapton—Sapperton.—The name of the second tenant was de L'Isle,—Fosbroke, Vol. I. p. 360.—Et in A.B.P.

2 Frampton Mansel is in Sapton.—Fosbroke, Vol. I. p. 366—Et in A.B.P.

3 Wightfield—In the parish of Deerhurst (see ante p. 2.) A hamlet in the Liberty of the Abbot of Westminster 7—A.B.P.

4 Tymberden—Robert Blanket died seized of this manor, 19th Edward I. esch. No. 64.

5 Brockmoncote.—I cannot discover, but Hugh Musted held half a fee of the Abbot in Wodynton (Bodynton?) in Westminster Hundred.—Vide A.B.P.

6 Campden reckoned only as a borough in the Hundred Rolls, and is included in the N.V. under Kiftsgate Hundred. It was in fact no more than a lordship which the Earls of Chester had held from the Conquest till their extinction, when it passed through heiresses to Roger de Somery, who left four daughters, whose husbands, Cromwell, Ludlow, Erdington and Sudley shared it, though a suit against them, brought by Gilbert, Earl of Gloucester, as heir to Ranulph Earl of Chester, was at this time pending, which accounts for the open verdict of the jurors.

HUNDRED DE BRITWOLDESBURWE.

LECHLADE.—Item Comes Cornub' tenet manerium de Lechlade. Simulū cum

Castro de Hochall.¹ Idem Comes tenet manerium de Langeberg' de Rege in capite pro tribus feod. milit.

SUTHORGE ETON ET AL'².—Item heres Benedicti de Blakeham qui est infra etatem et in custodia Regis tenet manerium de Suthcorum simul cum Eton quod est in Com. Berk. et Westwell quod est in Com. Oxon. et Thormerton quod est in hundredo de Bradel per servicium unius milit.

ESTLETHI³.—Item Radulphus de Lethi tenet in Estlethi unum feod milit. de Herberto de S'co Quintino. Et idem Herbertus de Comite Glouce'. Et Comes de Rege in capite

IB'M. —Item Abbas de Bruera⁴ et Robertus Deverus tenent in eadem villa unum feod. milit. de Willielmo Comyn. Et idem Willielmus de Theobaldo de Verdon. Et Theobaldus de Rege unde predictus Robertus respondet pro quarta parte predicti feod. et predictus Abbas pro tribus partibus ejusdem feod.

Item Robertus Devereus et Simon Morye tenent di. feod. milit. de Abina de Blakeford. Et eadem Abiua de Willielmo Comyn. Et idem Willielmus de Theobaldo de Verdon Et idem Theobaldus de Rege in capite.

HETROP⁵.—Item Abbatissa de Lakot tenet manerium de Hetrop de dono Ele Comitis Sarum in puram elemosinam de Comite Linc' pro quarta parte unius feod. milit. Et idem de Rege in capite.

FAYREFORD. —Item Comes Glouce' tenet manerium de Fayreford quod est de honore Glouce' de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio in Inquisitionibus predictis per quod servicium.

AURINCONE.—Item Johannes le Soer tenet manerium de Aurincone quod membrum predicti manerii de fayreford de predicto Comite in capite pro uno feod. milit.

KINEMERFFORD⁶.—Item Heres Patricii de Cadurtis tenet manerium de Kinemerfford de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

BEYEBUR⁷.—Item Episcopus Wygorn' tenet manerium Beyebur de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

BARDESLE⁸.—Item Robertus de Plesy et heres Reginaldi filii Petri tenent Bardesle de Comite Heref' pro uno feod. milit. Et idem Comes de Episcopo Wygorn.' Et idem Episcopus de Rege in capite.

1 The words "*de Hochall Idem Comes ten*," are inserted in different ink and handwriting, the latter apparently that of the owner of the memorandum book. Perhaps he only filled in a gap left by the copyist. I have searched in vain Pearson's Castles of England and Wales for anything approaching to *Hochall*. Longborough, in Kyffesgate Hundred (see note 1, page 141 ante), was taken by Henry III. from the Mortimers, and given to Edmund Earl of Cornwall.

2 Southrop.—An account of Benedict de *Blakenham* will be more conveniently given under *Thormanton* in Bradley Hundred.

3 East Leach.—Throughout this entry *c* must be substituted for *t*.

4 Bruern—A Cistercian Abbey in Oxfordshire, founded by the Bassets.

5 Hatherop N.V., held by Lacoek Abbey in Wiltshire. Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln had acquired the rights of the Earls of Salisbury by marrying the daughter and heiress of the last William Longspée (Dugd. Bar).

6 Kenmersford N.V., now Kempford, was the Barony of the family of de Cadurcis or Chaworth, and passed with the heiress to Henry Earl of Lancaster before 9th Edward II.

7 Bybury N.V.

8 Brandesley, N.V., held by Edmund de Plessey, now Barnsley.

ABLYNGTON¹.—Item Radulphus de Wylton² tenet manerium de Ablington de Episcopo Wygorn' pro uno feod. milit. reddent inde per Annum.—xxxiijs. iijj^d.

HUNDEED DE GRECTINSTON.³

SUDLEYE ET AL'⁴.—Item Johannes de Suleye tenet manerium de Suleye cum Todinton, Newinton, Stanleye, Grete, Grecton, Piseleye, Cotes, Yrap, membra ejusdem una cum aliis terris suis de Rege in capite per servicium duorum feod.

AUMELDON⁵.—Item Abbas de Abbindon tenet manerium de Aumeldon de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio per quod servicium.

LUCHINTON⁶.—Item idem Abbas tenet Luchinton de Roberto de mortuo mari de Castro Ricardi per servicium di. feod.

ESTON SOMT'VILL⁷.—Item Johannes de Eston tenet Eston Somervill de herede Radulphi Musard per servicium unius feod.

THEWENGE⁸.—Item Abbas de Wychineumb tenet manerium de Thewenge SNOWESHULL cum Brokhampton Cherleton cum membris Staunton et Hallingg' de Rege in capite per servicium ij milit.

HUNDRED DE BRADELE.

STOWELL⁹.—Item Ad Mercel tenet Stowell pro di. feod. milit. de Emma de la Penne. Et eadem Emma de Baronia Willielmi de Hasting' que tenetur de Rege in capite.

STOWELL¹⁰.—Item Archiepiscopus Ebor' tenet manerium de Cumton quod pertinet ad Baroniam de Chirethedon sed non fit mencio etē.

CUMTON.—Item Adam le Despens tenet in Cumpton quartam partem unius feod. de Archiepiscopo Ebor'. Et idem Archiepiscopus de Rege.

SEVENAMPTON.—Item Episcopus Hereford' tenet Sevenampton que pertinet ad Baroniam suam.

SKIPTON¹¹.—Item Robertus Pulye tenet di. feod. in Skipton de Comite Hereford'. Et idem Comes de Rege per Baroniam

ID'M .—Item Robertus Clive tenet in eadem villa terciam partem unius feod. de Ade de Clurrugge. Et idem Adam de Roberto de Mortuo mari. Et idem Robertus de Rege per Baroniam.

1 Ablinton. 2 Abbreviation for Wylington.—Fosbroke Vol. II., p. 466.

3 Afterwards merged in Kiftsgate.

4 Sudley N.V., held by John de Sudley and his wife Alicia—ct. A.B.P.

5 Dumbledon N.V., held by Abbot of Abingdon.

6 Lutlinton? no doubt one of the many Littletons, and a portion of Dumbleton, which Fosbroke states to have been held by the Abbot of Robert Mortimer.

7 Aston Somerville N.V., then held by William de Somerville. This family seems to have been styled indifferently de Aston or de Somerville.—Fosbroke II. p. 302.

8 Twenyng N.V., now Twining. The Abbots other manors were adjacent.

9 Stowell—part of the manor of Thormenton held by Adam Martel N.V., et A.B.C.

10 Stowell is, it strikes me, here repeated in the margin by mistake for Cumton. Chirchedon or Churchdown, the Caput of the Archbishop of York's Barony lies near Gloucester in the omitted Hundred of Dudstan. A Feodary of rather earlier date, printed by the Surtees Society, gives Turstin le Despencer as answering for half a fee at Compton Abdale and Brithampton, whilst Gilbert Morin, Reginald de Periton, Geoffrey de Longchamp, Walter de Mucegros and Peter Fitz Herbert answer in the aggregate for nearly three more fees.

11 Shipton—Pelie—Fosbroke Vol. II. p. 455.

IB'M¹.—Item Willielmus de Solers tenet in eadem villa di. feod. de Rogero Tyrel. Et idem Rogerus de Roberto de Chandos. Et idem Robertus de Rege per Baroniam.

WYTINGTON.—Item Ricardus de Crupes tenet Wytington pro uno feod. de Rege in capite.

SALPERTON.—Item Thomas Comyn tenet Salperton pro di. feod. de Willielmo Comyn sed [non] fit mencio et̄ de quo idem Willielmus tenet.

WYNESTON².—Item Johannes le Brun, Walterus de Berton, Absolvo Clericus, Sinon de Solers tenent Wyneston pro di. feod. de Baronia de Cornyayles.

WYDINTON³.—Item Episcopus Wygorn' tenet Wydinton de Rege per Baroniam.

ASTON⁴.—Item Radulphus Pypard tenet Aston pro uno feod. de herede de Longo Campo. Et idem Heres de Herede Walteri de Clyfford. Et idem heres de Episcopo Wygorn'. Et idem Episcopus de Rege per Baroniam.

DOUDESWELL.—Item Willielmus dominus de Doudeswell tenet Doudeswell Hamlectum de Wydinton pro uno feod. de templař. Et Templař de Comite Heref'. Et idem Comes de Episcopo Wygorn'. Et Episcopus de Rege per Baroniam.

FOXCOTE⁵.—Item Willielmus Cressun tenet ffoxcote pro tribus partibus unius feod. de Templař. Et ipsi de heredibus de miners. Et idem heredes de Episcopo Wygorn'. Et idem Episcopus de Rege per Baroniam.

NUTGRAVE.—Item Bartholomeus de Turbevill tenet Nutegrave pro uno feod. de Episcopo Wygorn'. Et Episcopus ut supra.

HOLDECOTE⁶.—Item Willielmus de marisco tenet Holdecote pro quinta parte unius feod. de Episcopo Wygorn'. Episcopus ut supra.

PARVA COLESBURN.—Item Robertus de la Burere tenet quintam partem unius feod. in parva Colesburn de Johanne de Marisco. Et idem Johannes de Episcopo Wygorn'. Et Episcopus de Rege.

HANNEPENNE SUPERIOREM⁷.—Item Robertus de Marmilun tenet Hannepenne superiorem de Reginaldi filio Petri. Et idem Reginaldus de Episcopo Heref'. Et idem Episcopus de Rege sed non fit mencio et̄ per quod servicium.

GUNKEDA SUPERIOREM⁸.—Item Abbas de Oscneye Matill' de Pelton, Galfridus de Langel tenet Gunkede superiorem pro di. feod. de Episcopo Bathon'. Et idem Episcopus de Comite Cornub.' Et Comes de Rege in capite.

1 Shipton—Solers—divided between Robs. de Solers and the Knights' Hospitallers N.V.

2 Winstone, in Bislely Hundred, according to Fosbroke Vol. I. p. 356, but entered under Bradley Hd. in N.V., as held by the Abbot of St. Peter, Gloucester, Thomas de Bertram, John de Aston and Simon de Solers. John le Brun died seized of Wyneston 31st Edward I., No. 169.

3 Wychinden N.V., now Withinton, and still held from Saxon times by the See of Worcester.

4 Cold Aston, or Aston Blank, on the death of Ralph Pipard in 3rd Ed. II., it passed with his daughters and heirs, half to Edmund le Botiller and half to John Rodborough, N.V.

5 Foxcote had been held by a Henry de Miners—"Testa de Nevill." I believe the name became Meyners and Manners later. The Cresons held in A.B.P.

6 Holdecote or Hilcote is a hamlet of Wychindon.—A.B.P.

7 Harnpen.—Geoffrey *Marmion* was lord of Hagnepenne temp. John.—Fosbroke Vol. II., p. 436 et. A.B.P.

8 Turkedon, N.V., then held by the Abbot of Osency, the Abbot of Cirencester, John de Pelton, and Laur. Semaur. The copyist evidently wrote down this place-name at a venture.

THORMANTON¹.—Item Benedictus filius Benedicti qui est in custodia Regis tenet in Thormanton unum feod. milit. de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

IB'M.—Item Petrus de Staunton tenet in eadem villa di. feod. de Nicho [sic] de multon. Et ipse de predieto Benedicto. Item Willielmus de Ramesden tenet di. feod. de eodem Benedicto. Et idem Benedictus tenet omnia predicta feoda de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

HAMPTONETH².—Item Henricus Pynkeneye, Reginaldus de Grandigall, Johannes de Mutterich tenent Hamptoneth pro uno feod. de Baronia Willielmi de Breuse. Et idem Willielmus de Rege in capite.

HUNDRED DE RESPEGATE.

SHEDEWORTH³.—Item Comes Warr' tenet Shodeworth pro duobus feod. de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

CERNEZE⁴.—Item Archiepiscopus Ebor. tenet di. ville de Cerneze que pertinet ad Baroniam suam de Chirthesden.

RENDECUMB.—Item Willielmus de la Mare tenet Rendecumb pro tribus feod. de Comite Glouc'. Et idem Comes de Rege in capite.

BRUMEFFELD.—Item Johannes Gyffard tenet Brumcfield quod pertinet ad Baroniam suam de Rege in capite.

CODBRICLEYE⁵.—Item Egidius de Berkeleye tenet Codbricleye pro uno feod. de herede Roberti Waleraund. Et idem heret [sic] de domino de Durseley. Et idem dominus de Rege in capite.

COLESBURN.—Item Willielmus le Poer et Walterus Lonhed tenent Colesburn de Reginaldo filio Petri pro duobus feod. Et idem Reginaldus de Episcopo Wygorn'. Et Episcopus de Rege in capite.

HULKESTON⁶.—Item Johannes le Brun tenet unum feod. in Hilkeston de Rege in capite de Baronia Cormeale.

SYDE⁷.—Item Simon de Caly tenet in villa de Syde di. feod. de Simone de Crome. Et idem Simon de Johanne de Brun. Et idem Johannes de Rege in capite.

DUNTISBURN⁸.—Item Thomas de Gardino et Henricus de Leye tenent di. feod. in Duntisburn et in gardino de Johanne de Brun. Et idem Johannes de Rege in capite.

1 Thormanton, better known as Farmington, part of the Barony of William de Hastings, on whose death in 6th Edward I. it passed to Benedict de Blackenham, who had married his daughter Joan. They cannot have enjoyed it long, as we find it in the King's hand with Benedict their son and heir. The latter must have come of age before 20th Edward I., for he gave part of Thurmanton to Alice—probably his sister, wife of Hugh de St. Phillbert, whose son John de St. Phillbert held it in N.V.

2 Hampnet, N.V., John de Muntriche was then one of the Lords, De Breuse's Barony, as Fosbroke suggests, was that of St. Valery.

3 Chedworth N.V., when it was still held by the Earl of Warwick, Guy de Beauchamp.

4 North Cerney, not included in the Feodary of the Barony of Churchdown already referred to. The Archbishops of York had wrested it from St. Oswald's Priory, Gloucester.

5 Cubberley or Coberleye in N.V.

6 Elkstone—Eweston, N.V.

7 Side.—Likewise held of the Barony of Cormeilles, *de Brun* must be a mistake for *le Brun*.

8 Duntisburn is not now in Rapsgate Hundred but in the adjoining one of Cirencester, though one of the three Manors into which it was divided, was, according to Bigland, reckoned in the former. This was Duntisbourn Lear, given by William Fitz Osbern to the Abbey of Lire in Normandy.—D.

HUNDRED DE BRIDESLOWE.

BRIDESLOWE¹.—Item Grimbaldus Pauntefot et Johannes de la Boxe tenent quartam partem unius feod. in Brideslowe de Comite Heref'. Et idem Comes de Re e.

IB'M.—Item Rogerus de Brideslowe tenet quartam partem unius feod. ibidem de Alano Plunkenet. Et idem Alanus de Rege.

LYDENEYE.—Item Radulphus de Wylington tenet unum feod. milit, in manerio de Lydeneye de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

IB'M².—Item Willielmus fit. Ancelli de Gurnay tenet quartam partem unius feod. ibidem. de Ancello Patre suo. Et idem Ancellus de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

ALINGTON³.—Item Ricardus de Alington tenet x^{am} partem unius feod. ibidem de Johanne de Curly. Et idem Johannes de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

IB'M.—Item Thomas Pavy (?) tenet sextam partem unius feod. ibidem de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

Item Johannes de Nasse Capellanus et Walterus Waryn tenent sextam partem unius feod. de Philipo de Maundevill. Et idem Philippus de Riardo de Maundevill. Et idem Ricardus de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

CRANELINWORTH⁴.—Item Hugo de Chane [?Chave] linworth tenet sextam partem unius feod. ibidem de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

ABERTON⁵.—Item Prior Banthon' juxta Gloue' tenet in Ayberton feod. unius militis de Bartholomeo de Mora de quo idem Bartholomeus tenet medietatem de Willielmo de Colevill. Et idem Willielmus de Waltero de Laey, Et idem Walterus de Rege. Et aliam medietatem ejusdem feod, tenet predictus Bartholomeus de ffuleon de Lacy. Et idem ffuleo de Waltero de Lacy. Et idem Walterus de Rege.

HUELFESFELD⁶.—Item Abbas de Tinternye tenet villam de Hueldesfeld de Rege in capite de dono Regis Edwardi nunc pro lxi^s. de feod. firma per annum.

1 Blideslowe.—The first entry relates to the hamlet of Boxe, in which the Pauncefots at de la Boxes long held shares. Fosbroke Vol. II. p. 196. et, A.B.P.

2 Lidney.—This was the Manor of Pirton in Lydney derived by the de Gournays from Maurice de Gaunt. This "William son of Anselm de Gournay," is a younger son, not mentioned in the pedigree, but he must have died, like his elder brother John, at an early age, as his lands passed to John Apadam, who married their sister.—V. et. A.B.P.

3 Alvington? I cannot, however, trace the names of any of the Feoffees of the Earl of Warwick, except in the case of the Waryns, who are recorded as holding Nasse.

4 Chevelinworth, in Blideslowe Hundred, is nowhere mentioned, and I can only conjecture that *Hugh de Cheveringworth*, who held the manor of the name in Kitesgate of William Burnell, happened to hold one here of the Earl of Warwick, which had come to be known by the surname of the tenant.

5 Aylberton N.V., held by the Prior of Lanthony. The B of the above entry is a mistake for L.—V. et. A.B.P.

6 Hewelsfield in St. Briavel's Hundred, which we are told in the Hundred Rolls was given by Edward I. to Tintern Abbey. It is the only mention of the King in the Roll.

RYDENE¹.—Item Ricardus Talebot tenet manerium de Rydene de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege sed non fit mencio etē per quod servitium.

LANGELE.

HALWESTON².—Item ffulco fī ffulconis tenet Halweston de Rege in capite pro di. feod.

LUTHBAGTON³.—Item Abbas de Malmesbur. tenet Luthbagton de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio etē per quod servitium.

ROCHAMTON⁴.—Item Johannes Gyffard tenet Rochamton de Rege in capite pro di. feod.

OVERE⁵.—Item Ansilinus de Gurnay tenet Overe de Comite Warr'. Et idem Comes de Rege sed non fit mencio etē.

TOKINTON.—Item Hugo Poynz tenet Tokynton de Comite Glouc'. Et Comes de Rege sed non fit mencio etē.

HUNDRED DE GRIMBALDESHAM.

DURAM⁶.—Item Guydo fferre tenet Duram de Rege in capite per servitium unius feod.

HUNDRED DE BERKELE.

BERKELE ET AL'⁷.—Item Thomas de Berkele tenet de Rege in capite Berkele Hamme, Alkinton,⁸ Erbingg, Coveleye, Slembrigg, Canne Jweleye, Kingeston,⁹ Wotton, Gromhall,¹⁰ Asselexorxe, ¹¹ et Borefeld ¹² per servitium iij milit.

BORFIELD¹³.—Item Johannes Gyffarde tenet di. feod. in Borefeld de Thoma de Berkeley. Et idem Thomas de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio in Inquisicione per quod servitium.

CROMHALE¹⁴.—Item Willielmus de Wanton tenet quartam partem de Cromhale de eodem Thoma. Et idem Thomas ut supra.

IB'M.—Item Cristiana de Mariscus tenet alteram quartam partem de Cromhale de eodem Thoma. Et idem Thomas ut supra.

ERLINGH.—Item Robertus de Berkele tenet Erlinge. de eodem Thoma. Et idem Thomas ut supra.

1 Ruerdean in St. Briavels' Hundred N.V., but I cannot find that the Earl of Warwick ever held the Manor, or the Talbots under him, as it belonged at this date to the heirs of William de Alba Mara. Richard Talbot, however, held the adjacent manor of La Ley which may have been really a dependency of Ruerdean.

2 Alwston.—The tenant in capite was Fulk, son of Fulk fitz Warinc.

3 Littleton.—Abbot of Malmesbury N.V.

4 Rockhampton held by John Gyffard of Brimsfield N.V.

5 Over.—Although this Over is in the old Hundred of Swinesheved, which is now incorporated with Langley, it is generally reckoned in Berkeley Hundred, because it passed with Beverston for centuries, and is so given by Fosbroke Vol. I. p. 489.

6 Dyrham, in Grumbolds ash Hundred. On the decease s.p., in 12th Edw. I. of Matilda, widow of Robert Walrand, and d. of Ralph Russel, this manor reverted to her next of kin, and Robert Russel died seized thereof in 25th Ed. I., esch No. 28. It is difficult therefore to understand in what capacity it was held by Guido Ferre, but, whether as custos or trustee, his tenure must have been merely temporary.

7 Berkeley.—The names of the Villis were carelessly copied. 8 Erlingham. 9 Kingscote. 10 Cromhale. 11 Ashelworth, and 12 Horefield should be substituted.

13 Horefield.

14 Cromhale was held by the Wautons (or Waltons) not Wantons.

IVELEYS¹.—Item Walterus de Brumpton tenet di. feod. Iveleys de eodem Thoma. Et idem Thomas ut supra.

IB'M.—Item Walterus de Bet tenet di. feod. de eodem Thoma ut supra. Et idem Thomas ut supra.

KINGESTON.—Item Ricardus de Kingescote tenet di. feod. in Kingeston de eodem Thoma ut supra. Et idem Thomas ut supra.

IB'M.—Item Johannes de Olepenne tenet di. feod. in eodem villa de eodem Thoma ut supra.

DURSEL².—Item Johannes Buteturt tenet Dursel de eodem Thoma ut supra.

WOTTON.—Item Robertus le vel tenet ij virgatas terre in Wotton de eodem Thoma ut supra.

BEVERSTON ET KINGESWESTON³.—Item Anselinus de Gurnay tenet Beverston et Kingesweston de Rege in capite per servicium unius milit, et di.

HULL⁴.—Item Nicholaus fii. Radulphi tenet Hull de Rege in capite per servicium di. milit.

DURSEL ET NEWENTON.—Item Henricus de Berkele tenet Dursel et Newenton de Rege in capite per servicium duorum milit.

OSLEWORTH.—Item Abbas de Kingeswode tenet Osleworth de predicto Henrico de Berkeleye et idem Henricus de Rege.

HUNDRED DE CYRENCESTR'⁵.

DUNAMENEYE⁵.—Item Nicholaus de Walers tenet Dunameneye de Edmundo fratre Regi per servicium quarte partis unius milit. Et idem Edmundus de Rege.

HAMPTON MEYSY.—Item Robertus de Meysy tenet Hampton Meysy de Comite Glouc' per servicium di. feod militis. Et idem Comes de Rege.

SUTHERNEYE⁶.—Item Amaricius de S'co Amando tenet in Suthterneye unum feod. milit. de Comite Hercford'. Et Comes de Rege.

IB'M.—Item idem Amaricius tenet in eadem villa unam hydram terre que fuit Anselini de Tudemor que tenetur de dicto Comite. Et idem Comes de Rege sed non fit mencio etē per quod servicium.

SOTINGTON⁷.—Item Johannes de Langeley tenet in Sotington unum feod. milit. de Galfrido de Genevill. Et idem Galfridus de Rege in capite.

⁸ Item idem Johannes tenet unam hydram terre de feod. Asculfy le musard de Arleberne per servicium di. feod. milit. Et idem Asculfus de Johanne Musard. Et idem Johannes de Rege per Baroniam.

¹ Eweley, now Uley.—Smyth, who, in his "description of the Hundred of Berkeley," cites, in the case of almost all the manors, "the ancient book compiled from the Inquisitions taken before Richard Rowell," gives the names of the tenants respectively as *Robert de Brampton* and *William de Bett*.

² Dursley, or rather "Woodmancote, juxta Dursley," which John Boteturt acquired after the death of Otto fitz Thomas. Esch. 10th Ed. I., No. 23.

³ Beverston was always held in combination with Kings Weston, which is in Henbury Hundred. Anselm de Gurnay died in 14th Ed. I.—October 1286.

⁴ Hill.—Held in conjunction with Nimpsfeld.—vide A.B.P.

⁵ Down Amney was held by the family of de Valers N.V., Vid.—A.B.P.

⁶ South Cerney N.V., et A.B.P.

⁷ Suthington Langeley, now Siddington, St. Peters.

⁸ I do not know who this Haseulf Musard was, but his Christian name was common in the family.

SOTINTON ¹.—Item Matilda que fuit uxor Radulphi musard tenet in Sotinton x^{li} terre nomine dotis de Baronia de ffordre de hereditate Johannis musard fii sui qui est infra etatem et in custodia Regis sed non fit mencio etē. per quod servicium.

HARHULL AND HAMENEYE ².—Item Robertus de Harniell tenet in Harhull et in Hameneye ij feod. milit. de Rogero de Towneye et idem Rogerus de Hugone de Sarinis. Et idem Hugo de Comite Heref'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

HAMENEYE ³.—Item Alanus Pluckenet tenet in Hameneye di. feod. milit. de Johanne de Bathon'. Et idem Johannes de Stephano le Bret. Et idem Stephanus de Comite Sarum. Et Comes de Rege.

IB'M. —Item Eufema le Bret tenet in Hameneye di. hidam terre de Stephano le Brut per servicium decime partis unius milit. Et idem Stephanus de Comite Sarum.

COTES ⁴.—Item Ricardus le Waleys tenet in Cotes unum feod. milit. de herede de Ponneye. Et idem hered [sic] de Theobaldo de Verdun. Et idem Theobaldus de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

IB'M ⁵. Item Elyas Cokerel tenet in Cotes di. feod. milit. de Radulpho Russel. Et idem Radulphus de heredibus de Durham. Et iidem heredes de Rege in capite per Baroniam.

IB'M ⁶.—Item Walterus de Cotes tenet in Cotes unam hydram terre de Willielmo de la Sale per servicium quinque (sic) partis unius militis. Et idem Willielmus de Comite Glouce'. Et Comes de Rege per Baroniam.

TRUSSEBYRY ⁷.—Item Elena de Befford tenet unam dimid. hydram terre in Hamelecto de Trussebyry de dono Johannis de Solariis. Et idem Johannes de Solar' de Waltero de Solar'. Et idem Walterus de Constane' de Leye. Et ipsa de domino Willielmo de la mare. Et idem Willielmus de Comite Glouce' per servicium decime partis unius militis. Et ipse Comes de Rege.

1 Suthington Musard. There is no record of this Barony of Forde. The only place of the name in Gloucestershire is a hamlet in Temple Guiting in Kiftesgate Hundred, but it was not held by the Musards. Besides their chief barony, however, of Musarden in Bisley Hundred, they held extensive possessions both at Saintbury in Kiftesgate, and in Cirencester Hundred, which may have constituted a separate barony, but in the inquisitions on the death of Ralph Musard 56th Hen. III., and 1st Ed. I., No 13; he is stated to have died seized of the Manors of Sudington, Senisbury, Aston, and Musard, and of the Barony de la Musardean, only in Gloucestershire. In the Index to the *Calendarium Genealogicum* Ford is given for Forz or Fortibus, but the Somersetshire Barony of that name belonged to the Earls of Albemarle.

2 Harnhull, in Driffield, held by Robert de Harnhull, N.V.

3 Amney Crucis—which the le Brets held of the Earl of Lincoln (inq. ad qd damnum, 1st Ed. II. No. 69), who in right of his wife held also the Earldom of Salisbury.—Vide Doyle's *Official Baronage*.

4 Cotes, which closely adjoins the town of Cirencester, is stated by Fosbroke (Vol. II. p. 505) to have formed part of the Fee of Walter de Lacy *temp.* Ed. I. (he died 30th Hen. III.) his reference being to MS. Cotton Jul. C.I., but he does not name his successor in the overlordship. As the father of Theobald de Verdun, however, married the grand-daughter and heiress of this Walter his succession is accounted for.

5 That of the Russells was, I conjecture, derived through marriage with a de Verdun. The mention of the "heirs of the Barony of Dirham" shews that Matilda Walrand's Escheat was not yet relinquished.

6 The Earl of Gloucester's interest in Cotes was possibly derived from his mother, Maud de Lacy, daughter of John Earl of Lincoln.

7 Trewsbury, a hamlet in Cotes. It is a good instance of the extent to which sub-infeudation of small manors had been carried.

STRAITON.—Item Ricardus de Hampton tenet in Straiton unum feod. milit. de Theobaldo de Verdun. Et idem Theobaldus de Rege in capite.

BATHINDEN¹.—Item Ricardus de Bathinden tenet in Bathinden unum feod. milit. de Roberto de Chandos. Et idem Robertus de Rege per Baroniam.

DALLINGWORTH².—Item Radulphus Bluet tenet in Dallingworth ij feod. milit. de Willielmo Bluet de Lacham. Et idem Willielmus de Comite Marescallo per Baroniam. Et idem Comes de Rege.

DUNTESBURN³.—Item Rogerus le Rus tenet in Dutesburn di. feod. de Phillipo de Mattisdonne. Et idem Philippus de Reginaldo fit. Petri.

LE'M.—Item Henricus de Leye tenet in Dutesburn quartam partem unius feod. milit. de Johanne le Brun. Et idem Johannes de Rege.

BAUDUNTON⁴.—Item Johannes de Muleford tenet in Baudunton unum feod. milit. de Anselino Basset. Et idem Anselinus de Comite Glouc'. Et Comes de Rege per Baroniam.

WYGWOLD⁵.—Item Walterus Springaud tenet in Wygewold quartam partem unius milit. de Johanne Ripar'. Et idem Johannes de Barone de florde. Et ipse de Rege.

MANERIUM DE TORBYE.⁶

Item Comes Glouc' tenet manerium integrum de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio etē per quod servicium.

TIDINGTON⁷.—Item Rogerus Corbet tenet Tidington de eodem Comite pro uno feod. milit.

LABRUG⁸.—Item Johannes de Acton tenet Labrug' de Rogero la ware. Et idem Rogerus de Anselino de Gurnay. Et idem Anselinus de predicto Comite pro uno feod.

WYK⁹.—Item Rogerus la Ware tenet Wyk de eodem Anselino. Et idem Asselinus de predicto Comite sed non fit mencio etc.

HUNDRED DE WYSTON.

STAULL LEONARD¹⁰.—Item Henricus de Berkele dominus de Bursel tenet medietatem ville de Staul Leonard de Rege in capite per servicium quarte partis unius feod.

1 Bagendon, which was held by Richard de Bagendon of Robert de Chandos.—Fosbroke Vol. II. p. 501.

2 Daglynworth—N.V., waste in the Manor of Stratton.—D.

3 Dutesboun Rous—alias Mattesdon.

4 Baudynon N.V. (now Baunton).—It seems doubtful, however, whether this does not relate to No. 2, for Richard de Bagynon is stated to be Lord, and nothing said of the tenants above specified.

5 Wigwold was held by Walter Springald. The Baron de Forde must be John Musard. Vide Note 1, p. 150.

6 Thornbury is still styled a manor, as in the Hundred Rolls, but it shortly after this, through the influence of the Earl of Gloucester, became a hundred as in N.V.

7 Tydington N.V., still held by the Corbets, also in A.B.P. where it is called Tyderington.

8 Ladenridge, or Lateridge, is part of the manor of Iron Acton.—Fosbroke, Vol. II., p. 114.

9 Wick-war, in the adjacent Hundred of Grumbold's Ash, was held by Roger le War. of Anselm de Gurnay.—N.V. and Fosbroke.

10 Stanley St. Leonards.—Held by the Lord of Dursley.

STAULL REG¹.—Item Adam le Despens' tenet Staull Reg' de Rege in capite pro di. feod. milit.

WYTENHURST.—Item Comes Hereford tenet Wytenhurst de Rege in capite pro uno feod. milit.

MORTON¹.—Item Willielmus de Valenciis tenet Morton de Rege in capite. sed non fit mencio eť per quod servieium.

BOTTELAW².—Item Willielmus de Pennebrigge tenet di. feod. in villa de

BYMMEK³.—Bymmek de Rege in capite.

HUNDRED DE LANGETRE.

TETUBIR.—Item Willielmus de Breuse tenet manerium de Tetubir de Rege in capite de Baronia S'ci Valerici.

IB'M.—Item Abbas de Kingeswood tenet quartam partem unius feod. milit. in eodem manerio de eodem.

IB'M.—Item Jacobus Folyot tenet quartam partem unius feod. ibidem de eodem.

IB'M.—Item Johannes de Bremclan tenet quartam partem unius feod. ibidem de eodem.

IB'M⁴.—Item Rogerus de Doneton tenet quartam partem unius feod. milit. ibidem.

RODMERTON.—Item Willielmus de Rodmerton tenet sextam partem unius feod. milit. in Rodmerton de predieto manerio.

CHIRINGTON.—Item idem Willielmus tenet in Chirington in eodem manerio quintam partem unius feod. de eodem Willielmo de Breuse. Et idem Willielmus de Rege ut supra.

SKIPTON⁵.—Item Willielmus le Moyne tenet Skipton per serjantiam essendi Lardinar Regi.

IB'M.—Item Gilbertus de Skipton tenet in eadem villa unam feod. milit. de predieto Willielmo. Et idem Willielmus de Rege.

LESSEBERWE⁶.—Item Henricus de Dene tenet in Lesseberwe unum feod. milit. de heredibus Roberti de Caynis. Et iidem heredes de Rege in capite.

WESTON⁷.—Item heres Johannis le Bret tenet di. feod. et x^{am} partem unius feod. in Weston de domino de Kilpek. Et idem dominus de Rege in capite.

Item Willielmus de Rodmerton tenet terciam partem unius feod. de predictis heredibus. Et iidem heredes de Rege.

1 Morton Valence.—Held by Audomar de Valence, N.V.

2 Botloe.—A Hundred containing eleven Villis in N.V.; adjacent to the Forest of Dean.

3 Dymock-Parva.—This is really an adjunct to the Manor of Munc, held by the Penbridge family as already mentioned, under Kift-gate Hundred.—Fosbroke Vol. II., p. 239. The principal Manor of Dymock was held by the Grandisones as in N.V.

4 Tetbury.—William de Breouse inherited the Barony of St. Valery through the marriage of his ancestor with the heiress Matilda de St. Valery. He died 24th Ed. I. Doughton was a dependency of Tetbury Manor.

5 Shipton Moyne N.V. The serjeantey of keeping the King's larder was long held by the Moynes.

6 Lasborough.—Henry de Dene inherited through the daughter and heiress of William de Lasseberge *temp.* Hen. III.

7 Weston Birt. or Bret.—Alan Plukenet was Lord of Kilpeke at this time. Walter de Cheltenham was probably a trustee for Thomas Lord Berkeley. Roger de Dunnyle had given a rent charge to the Abbey of Cirencester thereon.

IB'M.—Item Walterus de Chiltham tenet quartam partem unius feod. de Abbate Cyrencestr' in Weston & Skipton. Et idem Abbas de Rogero Donevill. Et idem Rogerus de domino de monte Aito de honore Comitris Cestr'. Et idem Comes de Rege.

CHELINTON¹.—Item Petrus de la Mare tenet in Chelinton unum feod. milit. de Comite Cornub' de honore de Wallingf'. Et idem Comes de Rege in capite.

WYLCESTR'².—Item Johannes Mautravers tenet Wylcestr' de Comitissa Devon' et eadem Comitissa de Rege sed non fit mencio per quod servicium.

HUNDRED DE HAGEMED.³

DODINGTON.—Item Henricus de Berkele tenet Dodington de Rege in capite sed non fit mencio etē per quod servicium.

CAUMPEDEN.—Item Caumpeden tenetur de Rege in capite pro di. feod. milit. de honore Comitris Glouc'.

HUNDRED DE CRANEURN.

CRANEURNE.—Item Comes Glouc' tenet honorem de Craneburn de Rege in capite sed non dicunt per quot feod. nee per quod servicium.

1 Cheriton.—Long held by the de la Mares.

2 Woodchester.—Held by John Maltravers—on his death in 25th Ed. I.—of the Honor of Albermarle. Isabella de Redvers, Countess of Devon, had married William de Fortibus, Earl of Albermarle. She died 21st Ed. I.

3 "Hagemede" was not a Domesday Hundred. In the Survey, Dodington is described as in *Hedrestan* Hundred along with three other manors, the principal of which, Marshfield, then belonged to the Crown. It came in the next century to the Earls of Gloucester, who soon contrived to get it erected into a Liberty. Probably upon this a change took place in the site of the Hundred Court, and the new name was adopted. At all events, throughout the Assize Rolls of Henry III., Dodington is said to be in Hagemed or Aggmead Hundred. The area of the latter, however, was so small that it soon merged in the adjacent division; for, in the Hundred Rolls, we are told "Hundred de Hagemead respondet cum Hundred de Grumboldashe," and it had ceased to be mentioned before the close of the 13th century, as in the Subsidy Roll of 28th Edward I. Dodington is placed in Grumboldash. The manor of Marshfield meanwhile became a separate outlier of the new Hundred of Thornbury, which it continues to be to the present day. As Gilbert, Earl of Gloucester, had long striven to compel Henry de Berkeley to acknowledge him as overlord of Dodington, this entry affirming the fact that Henry held that manor in capite of the King, looks as if it had been made after the judgment pronounced at Bristol in July, 1287. (*Vide* "The Berkeleys of Dursley." *Trans. Bristol and Glouc. Archaeological Society*, Vol. IX., p. 20). If so, it must have been added as a postscript to the original Return, which it has been shown was made before October, 1286.

The same idea is suggested by the following entry, which seems also of later date :

4 "Campden," for although we were informed under the heading of "Hundred of Campden" (page 142), that the jury "knew not who held this Manor, nor on what Tenure," it is now stated to be held as half a Knight's fee of the Honour of Gloucester; a fact which could scarcely have been ascertained until after the decision of the suit brought by Earl Gilbert against the heirs of Roger de Somery (*vide* note page 142), which was not given until 1287. (*Placita*, 15th Edw. I. Rot. 31. Fosbrooke, Vol. II. p. 325).

5 "Cranbourne Hundred." The last entry likewise concerns the Earl of Gloucester, but it is extremely difficult to account for its appearance here at all. It is, as everyone knows, in Dorsetshire, its only connection with the County of Gloucester, having arisen, so far as I am aware, from the fact that the right to the profits from it, as well as to its extensive chase and manor, had always passed with the Honour of Gloucester; added to which, the church

founded at Cranbourn by St. Dunstan, was a far more ancient and venerated establishment than the Abbey of Tewkesbury, to which Robert fitz Hamon had transferred most of its monks, and many of its richest endowments early in the 12th century. Perhaps, in consequence of these circumstances, it was still considered in some sort the "Head of the Honour," so that where we find "The Hundred of Cranbourne" here inserted—Tewkesbury—(of which, as already pointed out, no mention is made in the Return) may be really indicated; whilst when "the Honour of Cranbourn" is spoken of, that of Gloucester is meant. Such quasi-identification, on account of the early association of the two lordships, is far more likely to have been noted subsequently by the Remembrancers of the Exchequer for fiscal reasons, than made at the time by Robert Rowell and his associates at Gloucester. As, however, we only possess a copy, probably two or three times removed, of the original Abstract of the Inquisitions taken before them, it is, of course, impossible to verify these conjectures.
