

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

**Knights' Fees in Gloucestershire, 3rd Henry IV., with an
Introduction**

by J. Maclean
1886-87, Vol. 11, 312-330

© The Society and the Author(s)

KNIGHTS' FEES IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE, 3rd HENRY IV.,
WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY SIR JOHN MACLEAN, F.S.A., &c.

WE made a few very brief remarks on Aids in introducing to our readers the Aid granted to King Edward III. in 1346 on making his eldest son, the renowned Black Prince, a Knight, but for reasons which will appear further on we propose now to enter upon the subject a little more at large.

It may be as well, in the first instance, to glance at the sources from which the revenues of the crown were derived under our early Norman Kings, of which Scutage and Aids formed a very important portion. Foremost among these sources, however, were the profits arising from the Royal Demesnes. These demesnes were of vast extent, for in addition to the ancient demesnes of the Crown, consisting of the lands held by King Edward the Confessor, soon arose the lands escheated in consequence of the revolt of the English, so that at the time of the Domesday Survey the Royal Estate was of enormous extent. Money, however, was very scarce. The great tenants of the crown, in respect of the lands held by them, rendered military service when called upon, and the socage tenants, in respect to their tenures, paid their dues in kind; by labour on the lord's demesne, or in supply of provisions for the Royal household; but in the 12th century much of this was commuted for payment in horses, dogs, and hawkes; for birds, for game of divers sorts, and for cattle. Moreover, under the feudal system there were divers other sources of revenue too numerous to mention in detail: *e.g.* escheats of lands, permanently by confiscation or temporarily during the monage of tenants, marriages, the profits of bishoprics or monasteries during vacancies, which were too often unjustly prolonged; the profits of counties after deducting the third penny, the perquisite or fee of the sheriff, and many other incidental and casual profits which it is unnecessary to enumerate.

In the following remarks we propose to confine our attention to the question more immediately before us—Military Tenures. This system was introduced into England at the time of the Conquest, though something of the kind was not unknown in this country previously, the extension and development of the system became a necessity of the circumstances of the time. William had seen in France the difficulties of government unless the King was supreme ; consequently after the victory of Senlac, he claimed the lordship of the whole land, and naturally parcelled it out among those who had been his companions and assistants in the conquest ; not, however, at first, disturbing the possession of those English lords who had not openly resisted him and now submitted to his authority, only exacting from them heavy fines ; but the subsequent revolt of these Englishmen naturally led to the confiscation of their possessions, and enabled the King to endow the crowds of Normans who flocked into England. The result of this appears in the Domesday record, which shews what manors then existed in England, and by whom held, both by tenants in chief and by mesne tenants, and this shews the basis of Knights' fees, but the record does not shew the tenures by which the manors were severally held or the services rendered for the same. We know, however, that these tenures were almost wholly military. The lands were very unequally divided at the will of the King, and were apportioned according to what he considered to be the dignity or deservings of the grantee : *e.g.* his half brother Robert Earl of Mortaine, whom he created Earl of Cornwall, was granted 284 manors in that county alone. These great Barons again divided their fiefs among their followers in such proportions as they thought fit, to be held of them by Military Service as they held of the King. The amount of service rendered for each manor was in proportion to its value, but usually, we may say, the service of a Knight was rendered for every holding sufficient to support a Knight, and generally the variation in the service by which a manor was held did not exceed from a half to two Knights' fees.

When the great inquest was taken there were in Gloucestershire 492 manors, reckoning the berewicks of Berkeley, Deerhurst,

and Tewkesbury Hundreds as separate manors, but this does not help us very far to know the number of Knights' fees by which they were held.

We have already stated that the three principal occasions on which the King could, on his own authority, levy an Aid, were for the marriage of his eldest daughter once, for making his eldest son a Knight, and for the ransom of his person if made captive in war. And the first Return of Knights' fees which we possess are those embodied in the *Liber Niger*, which are supposed to have been called for by King Henry II. (1166) in contemplation of the marriage of Matilda his eldest daughter to the Duke of Saxony.¹ It is immaterial to the question which we are considering for what specific purpose these Returns were ordered. The King's commands were that every Baron or tenant *in capite*, that is holding of him immediately, *sine medio*, should certify what fees they held, how many of the old feoffment, that is granted before the death of King Henry I., and how many of the new feoffment, and of whom the same were holden. These Returns were called the *Cartæ Baronum*, but unfortunately the originals are now lost save one, and we are dependent upon a summary of them preserved in the *Liber Niger*, printed by Hearne, and the *Liber Rubeus*, or Red Book of the Exchequer. According to Maddox, the Earl of Gloucester paid for 307 Knights' fees, of the old feoffment, besides 13½ fees of the new feoffment, held of the demesne land, but they were not in Gloucestershire. These Returns afford us the first information we possess as to the Knights' fees in the County of Gloucester, and it shews by whom they were held in 1166, but the names of the manors are not stated.

The next Aid which claims our attention is that noted by us (ante Vol. X. p. 279) as levied by King Richard I. for the ransom of his person, who having been seized on 20th December, 1192,

¹ Mr. Eytton remarks that "the Returns themselves contain no internal evidence whatever of having been provided for that specific occasion, but it so happened that at the time when the Returns were ordered the Princess's future marriage had been agreed upon, and it so happened that the Auxilium collected in 1168, in consequence of her marriage, was grounded on these Returns, it being in fact the earliest Auxilium levied after these Returns." (Itin. Henry II. p. 90n.)

by Leopold Duke of Austria, when passing through his dominions returning from the Holy land was held in captivity. This assessment was made at 20s. each Knight's fee, and it is brought to account under the name of Scutage in the Pipe Roll of the 6th of the King's reign. There was also a further assessment on this occasion designated Hidage, which meant an Aid charged per hide on lands holden by socage or other tenures than Military Service.

King Henry III., during his long reign, had three notable Aids besides other levies not of this nature. The earliest known of these was levied in the 19th year of his reign for the marriage of his sister Isabel to the Emperor Frederick II. of Germany. It was granted by the common council of the realm under exceptional circumstances, as Isabel was the *third* daughter of King John, at two marks for every Knight's fee both of the old and new feoffment. The originals of the Returns in Testa de Nevil, as relates to Gloucestershire, p. 73 et seq., are not known to exist. It appears upon a careful critical examination that the Returns so printed are in many respects inaccurate. The originals were supposed to have been lost, and that the Record Commissioners who printed *Testa de Nevil* in 1807 derived their knowledge from a Register preserved in the Exchequer, into which, according to a memorandum prefixed, the Returns were transcribed in the reign of Edward II. for facility of reference, though not as of Record. This transcript appears, from copies of some of the Returns since discovered, to have been very loosely made, and is not exempt from error in respect to christian names. It is still possible that the originals may be found, as there are at the Public Record Office chests not yet examined or classified. The accomplishment of this is much to be desired, as the Returns, if found, will be of great value from being the first in which the manors forming the Honours and Fees are specified. We shall endeavour to obtain the examination of these chests to verify the Returns, and, if satisfactory, print them hereafter.

Of the two other notable Aids of King Henry III ; viz., that to marry his eldest daughter Margaret to Alexander King of Scotland, of 20s. per Knight's fee, granted by the Common Council of the Magnates of England, Anno Regni 29, and that for making

his eldest son a Knight, at 40s. per fee, Anno Regni 38, we cannot at present say anything. The Returns for neither of these are known to exist. It is, however, not unlikely that some portions of them may be incorporated in the Testa de Nevil.

This brings us down to the reign of Edward I., in whose 18th year an Aid to marry Eleanora, his eldest daughter to Alphonso, King of Arragon, was granted by the Barons and Magnates of the Realm at the rate of 40s. per fee, and at the same rate for portions of fees, but the grantors stipulated that this grant should not turn to their prejudice, that so in future an Aid to be granted in like case might be increased or diminished at the discretion of the Barons and Magnates, and that it should be levied out of fees in such manner as Aids were wont to be levied. Unfortunately the Returns for this Aid are also missing, but, in this case, the loss is not so greatly to be deplored inasmuch as in almost every instance reference is made to it in the Returns of the 20th Edward III., for which reason we selected that Aid as the first to be printed.

Moreover, the loss of the Returns for the Aid of the 18th Edward is to a large extent compensated for by the Inquisitions taken by John de Kirkeby, Philip de Wilebi, and others. This is the collection known as "Kirby's Quest," so carefully edited and annotated for the Society by Sir Henry Barkly (ante p. 134). After a critical examination of these Inquisitions, Sir Henry states from internal evidence that they must have been taken between 1283 and 1286, thus coinciding, within some six or seven years, with the date of the Aid for the marriage of the Lady Eleanora. And on a comparison of the names of the tenants of the fees in Kirby's Quest with those shewn in the Aid of 20th Edward III. (1346) as having held the same fees in 1290, they will be found very generally to agree. This will be seen by a reference to Sir Henry Barkly's valuable notes.

With reference to the Aid of 20th Edward III., alluded to above, and printed ante Vol. X., p. 278, I would, in the first place, desire to correct a misprint in the date in the title, which escaped correction in revising the proofs, and which our readers may have noticed, as it does not accord with the regnal year of

the King, printed in the same title. For 1349 read *1346*; and on page 275, line 17, for *anno regina* read *anno regni*.

The original Returns for this Aid, like those for the Aids we have already been considering, are no longer extant. The only existing authority for this Aid is a volume known as the "Book of Aids." This is beautifully written, but considerably later than 20th Edward III. Indeed it contains documents in the same hand-writing of the date of 3rd Hen. IV. The scribe was evidently proud of his caligraphy, and well he might be. It is exceedingly clear, and the capitals beautifully illuminated. He was, however, as careless in his orthography as he was particular in his writing. The transcript made for us for the purpose of printing was very correctly copied, but Sir Henry Barkly in preparing "Kirby's Quest" for the press discovered that the Returns for the two Aids are interspersed, those for that of 3rd Henry IV. being inserted in the case of four counties where those of 20th Edw. III. appear to be wanting, and moreover the text of the "Book of Aids" is very corrupt, many of the names of persons and places being mis-spelt.¹

We now reach the Aid of 3rd Henry IV. granted for the marriage of Blanch, the King's eldest daughter, to Louis (surnamed Barbatus), afterwards Duke of Bavaria, her first husband, and printed below. This, as far as it goes, unlike the other Aids of which we have treated, is printed from what remains of the original Inquisitions for the County of Gloucester, which are exceedingly imperfect and decayed, and in places quite illegible. Moreover, the documents are very incomplete, for we find Returns for 15 Hundreds only, and, probably one or two other Inquisitions, now lost, contained the remaining Hundreds. We have, to a

¹ Page 282. Hund. of Respigate, 1st entry—For Gremesfelde read *Bremesfelde*.

5th entry—For Daiton read *De Acton*.

7th entry—For Bailly read *Kaylly*.

Page 286. Hund. of Bottelowe, 3rd entry—For Bugo read *Bogo*, and delete [! Hugo.]

,, 290. Hund. of Kyftesgate, 14th entry.—For Yarnion read *Marmion*.

15th entry.—For Yume read *Mune*.

,, 292. Hund. of Westlit'.—For Westlit read *Westm'*.

And it is not improbable that there may be other instances of error.

large extent, filled up the *lacune* arising from the lost or unreadable portions of the existing documents from the context, or from references to other records. These insertions are, to distinguish them, printed within square brackets. There are, however, some words and passages which it is impossible to restore with certainty. Nevertheless, with all its faults and imperfections, disappointing as they are, we deem the document very valuable as forming a link in the chain of evidence of the devolution of the manors in a large portion of the county during a dark period of our local history; and it is the more valuable as it is to be feared that for this county no record remains beyond the summary of the account rendered by the collectors, at the Exchequer, which shew that only 126 fees were accounted for of the last of the Aids collected, that of the 6th Henry VI.

The grant last referred to was not purely an Aid, inasmuch as it embraced other charges besides those on Military Tenures. Of this every person possessing a whole Knight's fee was charged 6s. 8d., or half a mark, and so after the same rate to the fourth part of a Knight's fee, and persons not possessing a full quarter part of a fee escaped the charge altogether. It is very remarkable how, at that date, the fees had become sub-divided, whether from ordinary causes, or by cozenage to evade payment, it is impossible to say. Few fees, as far as our experience extends, remained entire, and many had become so divided into small shares, and because no one held a full fourth part of a share, no charge was made. It is, however, very valuable in that it refers back to the persons who held the same fees in 1346, when Edward the Black Prince was Knighted (20th Edward III).

The levy, for the reason mentioned above, has been treated rather as a Subsidy than an Aid. And it is very singular that Gloucestershire is the only county for which no Returns exist. The foregoing remarks relate to Knights Fees only and to the Aids charged thereon.

We hope, as time and opportunities offer, to print the whole of this series of Records relating to Gloucestershire.

LAY SUBSIDIES, GLOUCESTER, $\frac{113}{47}$.

INQUISITIO capta apud Wynchecombe, die Sabbati proximo post festum Sancti Gregorii Papæ, [anno regni] Regis [Henrici quarti post conquestum tertio, coram Roberto Somerville nuper Vicecomite] / Gloucestræ, et Roberto Whytyngton', nuper Escactore Domini Regis in Comitatu prædicto, et Johanne Derhurst, collectoribus [rationabilis Auxilii] pro Blanchia, primogenita [filia dieti Domini] / Regis maritanda, virtute commissionis dieti Domini Regis eisdem collectoribus inde directæ, per sacramentum Ricardi Russell',..... Ricardi Tyboton, Roberti / Moryn Johannis Bradwey, Johannis Shadwelle, Roberti Vилleyn, Edmundi Hamwell', Philippi Nethercote,..... Johannes, juratorum, qui dicunt [super sacramentum] / suum, quod omnes subscripti tenent de Domino Rege sine medio in Hundredis subscriptis : videlicet, Abbas de [Wynche]combe tenet [de Domino Rege sine medio] / in villis de Wynchecombe, Charleton', Shirburne, Honyburne, Stanton', et Twynyng', [in] Hundredo de Kyftesgate, et alibi infra Comitatum Gloucestræ, duo feoda militum. Item dicunt, quod Abbas de Evesham tenet [de Domino Rege sine medio in S]jeynesbery ¹ / in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod idem Abbas tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Aston'-Somerville [unum feodum militis]². Item dicunt, quod Margeria Gyffard' et Willelmus Tracy ³ tenent de domino Rege sine medio in Weston' et Norton'⁴ in [eodem Hundredo]..... / Et

¹ The Abbot of Evesham held Seynesbury in 1346 (See ante Vol. X. p. 290.)

² See ante Vol. X. p. 291, where the extent of the fee is given.

³ Aston Somerville was held by the Scmervilles in 1290 and in 1346. We do not find the fee in Kirby's Quest. It was at the date of this Return held by the Abbot of Evesham.

⁴ Weston [sub Edge] and Norton (sub Edge) were at an early date held by Henry de Penbridge (Cott. MS. Jul. C. 1, cited by Fosbrooke), of whom it was purchased by Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York, and upon his death it passed to his brother Godfrey, Bishop of Worcester, his heir, who held it in his own right at the time of Kirby's Quest (see ante pp. 140-141). The Bishop of Worcester after alienating several messuages left the manor to John, son of William the bishop's brother, who was father of John, father of John father of Elizabeth, who dying s.p., it passed to her cousin John,

quod Abbas de Hayles tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Longebergh', in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi m[ilitis. Et quod] ¹..... / tenet de Domino Rege sine medio ibidem, et in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod Johanna que fuit uxor Willelmi.....
[tenet de Domino] / Rege sine medio in Munc,² in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis. Item dicunt, quod Comitissa de Warrewyk' tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in [Wykeware ³ in eodem] / Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis. Item dicunt, quod Edwardus Lodilowe tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Campedene,⁴ in eodem Hundredo, [dimidium

son of William Giffard her father's brother, who, it is believed, married Margery daughter of Sir John Pauncfote. Knt., who, upon the death of John Giffard, married William Tracy, of Tuddington, and, holding these manors in dower, together with her husband, were tenants at the date of this Return. That the manors were held in dower is evidenced by the fact that they returned to the Giffard family.

¹ Richard Lambaunk held this fourth part of a fee in Longborough in 1346 (see ante Vol. X. p. 290).

² This manor in 1346 was held by Peter Mountford. The name of the manor in that Return is erroneously written *Yune* (see ante Vol. X. p. 290 and ante p. 317 n).

In 1164, Henry de Chedringworth was, by the authority of the King's Writ relieved of a payment of viiti bt (blank = silver purified by fire) in Munc. Pipe Roll, 10th Hen. II., Pipe Rolls Soc., Pub. Vol. 7., p. 17)

³ The Earl of Warwick held this fee in 1346 (see ante Vol. X. p. 291).

⁴ Campden.—The numerous sub-divisions of the Manor of Campden, arising from its having repeatedly fallen among coheirs, make it very difficult to trace the devolution of the Fee. From the time of the Conquest it was, with some interruption in consequence of forfeitures, held by the Earls of Chester until the death of Ranulph Blundevil, the seventh Earl, in 1231, s.p., when his three sisters became his coheirs, of whom Mabel, the second, married William de Albini, Earl of Arundel, and her son William inherited Campden, who dying s.p. his brother Hugh succeeded him, being then a minor, and in the Aid levied 1235 (19th Henry III.) upon the marriage of Isabel, sister of King Henry III. to the Emperor Frederic II. he was assessed at one mark for half a Knight's fee in Campden (Testa de Nevil, p. 75). Hugh de Albini dying s.p. his lands were divided among his four sisters and coheirs, Nichola, the third, married Roger de Somery and left issue four daughters: viz., Joan, who married John le Straunge; Mabel, who married Walter de Suly; Maud, who married John de Erdlynton; and Margaret, who married Ralph de Cromwell. The purparties of Joan and Maud were acquired by John de Ludlow, who then held a moiety of the manor, and Edward de Ludlow is here stated to hold half a fee in Campden.

feodum militis.¹ Item] / dicunt, quod Johannes Dalyngrugge et Alicia uxor ejus tenent de Domino Rege sine medio in Syndeley [Sudeley] in eodem Hundredo [unium feodum militis]² [Item dicunt, quod Johannes]³ / Russell' et Elizabeth' uxor ejus tenent de Domino Rege sine medio in Guytyng, in eodem Hundredo, unum feodum militis [quod fuit Templariorum]⁴ [Item dicunt,] / quod Episcopus Exoniensis tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Campedene, in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis. Item [dicunt quod Archiepiscopus Eboꝝ⁵ tenet de Domino] / Rege sine medio in Otynton' et Condycote in Hundredo de Salmondesbury, unum feodum militis. [Et quod⁶[de] / Domino Rege sine medio in Rysyndon' [Rysindon] Magna, in eodem Hundredo dimidium feodum militis. Et quod [Henricus Hussey tenet de Domino Rege in Rysyndon]⁷ / in eodem Hundredo, decimam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod Prior de Parva Malverne [tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Newenton

The other two purparties were recovered by Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester, who died 24th Edward I. seized of the fourth part of the Manor of Campden held by the service of the eighth part of one Knight's fee, leaving his son Gilbert his heir, who being slain at Bannockburn in 1314, s.p., his three sisters became his coheirs, of whom Margaret, the eldest, became the wife of Piers Gaveston, and, after his execution, of Hugh d' Audle, who died in 1347, leaving by the said Margaret his wife an only daughter and heir named Margaret, then the wife of Ralph Lord Stafford. Ralph alienated his share to his brother Richard Stafford, who acquired also the purparty of Margaret de Cromwell, and it should be noted that Richard de Cromwell and Isabella de Barrye in 1290 held half a fee in Campden, which in 1346 was held by Richard de Stafford above mentioned, which Richard died in 1348, and his son Edmund, Bishop of Exeter, is returned as holding the same fee in this record.

See ante note 6, p. 142. See also Fosbrooke's History of Gloucestershire, and the exhaustive memoir on this manor by the Rev. S. E. Bartleet, ante Vol. IX. p. 354.

¹ The extent of the fee is stated ante Vol. X. p. 290, when it was held by Richard Stafford.

² The extent of the fee is stated ante Vol. X. p. 291.

³ See post p. 326. ⁴ See post p. 326. ⁵ See ante Vol. X. p. 288.

⁶ In 1346 this half fee was held by Henry Honep' and Walter de Lisle.

⁷ Fosbrooke states that Henry Hussey held a moiety in Great Rysindon, 2nd Henry IV. citing Ped. Fin. in Trinity term of that year. (History of Glouce. Vol. II. p. 393n.) ; and William Lucy held the sixth part of one fee in Willie and Rysinton in 1346, which William Lucy had held in 1290. (See ante Vol. X. p. 288.)

[Naunton] in eodem Hundredo / tertiam partem unius feodi militis.¹ Item dicunt, quod hæredes Johannis Crosson² tenent de D[omino Rege sine medio in Werinton parva in eodum Hundredo dimidium feodum] militis. Item dicunt, quod, Abbas de Abyndon' tenet de Domino Rege sine medio Manerium de Dumb[ul]ton³ in Hundredo de Kyftesgate per servicium / militare, set per quot feoda [ignorant]. In cujus rei testimonium huic Inquisitioni prædicti Juratores sigilla sua apposuerunt. Data [die, anno, et loco supradictis].

INQUISITIO capta apud Gloucestriam, die Mercurii proximo post festum Sancti Gregorii Papa, anno regni Regis Henrici quarti post conquæstum tertio, eodem Roberto Somervile, nuper / Vicecomite Gloucestræ, et Roberto Whytyngton, nuper Escaetore Domini Regis in Comitatu prædicto, et Johanne Derhurst, collectoribus rationabilis Auxilii pro Blanchia, primogenita filia dicti / Domini Regis maritanda, virtute commissionis dicti Domini Regis eisdem collectoribus inde directæ, per sacramentum Petri Cappe, Thomæ Flewellyn, Ricardi Bour', Edmundi / Forde, Walteri Hulle, Ricardi de Aur', Willelmi Snodhulle, Johannis Wareyn de Piriton', Johannis Felde de Aur', Phillippi de Ame, Johannis Joce, et Johannis / Piryhale, Juratorum, qui dicunt super sacramentum suum, quod omnes subscripti tenent de Domino Rege sine medio in Hundredis subscriptis: videlicet, Robertus Ferrerys / tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Teynton' et Kylcote, in Hundredo de Bottelowe, dimidium feodum militis. Et quod Reginaldus Grey tenet de Domino Rege / sine medio in Kempeleye, in Hundredo prædicto, dimidium feodum militis. Et quod Pembrugge⁴ tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in / Luytuldymmoke (Little Dymock) eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum

¹ See ante Vol. X. p. 288.

² John Crosson and Thomas Hundemille held this half fee in 1346 as persons of the same names had held it in 1290. (See ante Vol. X. p. 288.)

³ Dumbleton is not mentioned in the aid of 1346, only Littleton, but in Kirby's Quest, under the Hundred of Grectiston (ante p. 144), a preceding record will be found.

⁴ Henry Pembridge held this half fee in 1346, as William Pembridge had held it in 1290. (See ante Vol. X. p. 286).

militis. Et quod Ricardus Ruyhale tenet in Dymmoke, in eodem Hundredo, viginti libratas terræ / de Domino Rege in socagio, sine aliquo medio. Et quod Thomas Dominus de Berkeleye tenet in Hundredo de Blydeslowe Manerium de [Aure] de Domino Rege / in socagio¹ sine aliquo medio, quod valet per annum, ultra reprisam, xx libras. Et quod Prior Lantonie juxta Gloucestriam tenet de Domino Rege / sine medio in Ailberton', in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feudum militis. Et quod Ricardus Baret tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Yer/dushulle,² in eodem Hundredo, decimam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod Comitissa Warr' tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in [Ly]deneye, / in eodem Hundredo, octavam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod Johannes F..... tenet de Domino Rege unum mesuagium, c acras terræ,..... acras prati, et quandam piscariam in Aur', / in eodem Hundredo, in socagio, per servicium xij^s iij^d quæ Robertus Baderon' et Phillipus Baderon' nuper teneuerunt; quæ valent per annum, ultra reprisam,...^s viij^d. Et quod Elizabeth, quæ fuit uxor Roberti Eynesford,' tenet / Manerium de Burghull', in Hundredo de Westbury, de Domino Rege in socagio, sine aliquo medio, ad valentiam decem marcarum per [annum]. / Et quod David Tho'mes et Ricardus de Aur' tenent de Domino Rege sine medio unum mesuagium [et] molendinum, duo gardina, un[am acram] / terræ, cum pertinentiis, in Aur', in Hundredo de Blydeslowe per magnam serjeantiam.³ In cujus rei testimonium huic Inquisitioni prædicti Juratores sigilla sua apposuerunt. Data, die, anno, et loco supradictis.

INQUISITIO capta apud S[odbury], die Mercurii in vigilia festi Corporis Christi, anno regni Regis [Henrici quarti post conquestum

¹ Maurice (III) Lord Berkeley purchased, *inter alia*, a moiety of the Manor of Aure and moiety of the advowson of the church, of Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, and Thomas (III) his son purchased the other moiety of Roger Mortimer. Smyth says *in capite* (Berkeley MSS., Maclean's edition, Vol. I. pp. 339-340) but, as Fosbrooke, citing Pedes Finium, 37th Henry III. Hill., says they were subject to a pepper-corn rent, they were clearly in held socage.

² Written Zerdeshill in 1346. (See ante Vol. X. p. 287.) We are unable to identify the place.

³ The Serjeancy was doubtless some office connected with the Forest of Dene, of which there were several.

tertio, coram Roberto Somerville,] / nuper Vicecomite Gloucestræ, et Roberto Whytyngton', nuper Escaetore Domini Regis in Comitatu prædicto et Johanne Derhurst, collectoribus [rationabilis Auxillii pro Blanchia] / filia Domini Regis maritanda virtute commissionis dicti Domini Regis eisdem collectoribus directæ, per sacramentum R..... / ton', Johannis Walker de Tetteworth', Johannis Frempton', Johannis Cope, Johannis Knyte, Johannis Smyth de Saltm.....
/chescombe, Thomæ Adams, Johannis Collewelle, et Hugonis Lucas, Juratorum, qui dicunt super sacramentum [suum, quod omnes subscripti tenent] / de Domino Rege sine medio in Hundredis subscriptis: videlicet, Abbas de Malmesbury tenet de Domino Rege [sine medio in [Littleton]¹ in Hundredo / de Grymboldesasche, octavam partem unius feodi militis. Item dicunt, quod Margareta Sebrok' tenet de Domino Rege [sine medio in..... / in [eodem Hundredo, pro dote sua, tertiam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod Mauricius Russell' tenet de Domino Rege sine [medio in Derham² in / eodem Hundredo, unum feodum militis. Et quod Abbas Sancti Petri Gloucestræ tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Boxwell unum feodum militis [Et quod Johanes (?) Worth tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in F[rampton] Cotell',³ in eodem [Hundredo,]..... / Et quod hæredes Johannis de Wylinton' tenent de Domino [Rege sine medio] in eadem (?) villa..... [Et quod] / Matill' Cauntelowe⁴ tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Dodynton dimidium feodum et quarta pars unius feodi / militis Et quod Alexander Clyvedon' tenet de Domino Rege sine medio.....

¹ See ante Vol. X. p. 284.

² Roger Cantek in 1346 held one fee in Derham which William Russell held in 1290. This is probably the same. It was held by Ralph Russell in 1235. (Testa de Nevil, p. 74).

³ John de Wylington had alienated a part of Frampton Cotell to John Worth, who married Joan relict of the said John Wylington, 20th Rich. II. and held it. They left a son John, whose is probably the surname which is lost. John Wroth died 1412 leaving two sisters his coheirs (Atkyns' History of Glouc. p. 231). Inq. p.m. 13th Hen. IV. No. 25.

⁴ She was the sister and sole heir of Nicholas Berkeley and daughter of John de Berkeley (11) of Dursley, who held the same parts of the fee in 1346. (See ante Vol. IX. p. 375, and Vol. X. p. 285).

..... [per] / annum decem marc' Et quod Johannes Est [w]ode tenet de Domino Rege in Bukton¹(?).....
 / Domini Regis patent' duas partes unius feodi militis in manu dicti Domini Regis ex...../et in custodia Domini Regis existent'. Item dicunt, quod Abbas de Stanleye tenet [de Domini Rege sine medio dimidium feodum in Coderyngton prout predecessores sui tenuerunt idem] / in Hundredo prædicto, per quæ servitia ignorant. Et quod Prior Bathonia tenet de Domino Rege [sine medio dimidium feodum in Olveston per quæ servitia] / ignorant. Et quod Comes Stafford' tenet de Domino Rege Manerium de [Thornbury / in Hundredo de *Thorneham* (sic) sine [medio] per servicium militare vel non, ignorant. Et quod Episcopus Bathon'² tenet de Domino Rege in Aston / [unum feodum militis in] Hundredo de Pocylich[urch'] sive per servitium militare vel non ignorant. Item dicunt, quod Constantia, quæ fuit [uxor Thome] Domini le Dispenser tenet de Domino Rege et quod.....³ / quondam fuerunt in manu Domini Regis ratione minoris ætatis Ricardi, filii et hæredis ejusdem Thome [le Dispenser.....
 ...In cujus rei testimonium huic Inquisitioni prædicti Juratores sigilla] / sua apposuerunt. Data [die, anno, et loco] supradictis.

LAY SUBSIDIES, GLOUCESTER, $\frac{113}{48}$.

INQUISITIO capta apud Gloucestriam, die Martis proximo post festum Sancti Gregorii Papæ, anno regni Regis Henrici quarti post conquestum tertio, coram Roberto / Somervile, nuper Vicecomite Gloucestræ, et Roberto Whytyngton', nuper Escaetore

¹ Button or Bitton? In 1346 the heirs of Stephen de la More, within age, and in the wardship of Thomas de Bradstone and Edmund, son of David le Blount, held one fee in Button which Stephen atte More held there in 1290. (See ante Vol. X. p. 284).

² This fee would appear to have been held by the Prior of Bath in 1346, and was assessed as one fee.

³ It is not easy to fill up the words of this blank with certainty, although the historical facts are well known. After the execution of Thomas le Despenser, 1st Henry IV. the Manor of Chipping Sodbury was granted to Constance his relict for life, her only son Richard, being a minor, remaining at the date of this Aid in the King's hands. (*Vide* Dugdale and Fosbrooke, Vol. II. p. 36).

Domini Regis in Comitatu predicto, et Johanne Derhurst, collectoribus rationabilis Auxilii pro / Blanchia, primogenita filia dicti Domini Regis maritanda, virtute commissionis dicti Domini Regis eisdem collectoribus inde directæ, per sacramentum Ricardi Ecton', / Walteri Pynchyn, Ricardi Milton', Johannis Copovere, Ricardi Russell', Roberti Sumpnur, Johannis Harsefelde, Thomæ Brut, Johannis Doppyng', Thomæ / Southam, Johannis Amfray, et Willelmi Brocworthe, Juratorum, qui dicunt super sacramentum suum, quod omnes subscripti tenent de Domino Rege sine medio / in Hundredis subscriptis: videlicet, Thomas Berkeleye de Berkeleye tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Berkeleyhurnes, in Hundredo de / Berkeley, tria feoda militum. Et quod Thomas Fitz Nichol tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Hulle et Nymedisfelde, in eodem Hundredo, dimidium / feodum militis.¹ Et quod Matill' Cauntelowe² tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Durseleye et Colde Newynton', in Hundredo predicto, dimidium feodum / militis. Item dicunt, quod Thomas Brugge tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Harsefelde, in Hundredo de Whyston', Et quod Matill' Cauntelowe tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Stanley Regis, in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi militis.³ Et quod / Elizabeth' quæ dimidium feodum militis. / fuit uxor Johannis de Arundell' tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in eadem villa, et in eodem Hundredo, unum feodum militis. / Et quod Johannes Perleye tenet in Pychincombe, in eodem Hundredo sex libratas terræ de Domino Rege in socagio sine aliquo medio. / Item dicunt, quod omnia terræ et tenementa, quæ Johannes de la Felde, filius et hæres Roberti de la Felde, tenuit de Rege in eodem Hundredo, ut / de Manerio de Guytyng, quod fuit Templariorum, quondam in manu Regis existente, tenentur

¹ This half fee in 1346 was held by John Fitz Nichol grandfather of this Thomas, whose father Nicholas son of Ralph held it in 1290 (See ante Vol. X. p. 285), as also did Nicholas Fitz Nichol, his ancestor, at the Aid levied in 1183 on the marriage of Maud eldest daughter of King Henry II. (Smyth's Berkeley MSS. Maclean's edition, Vol. III. pp. 223, 224).

² See ante p. 324.

³ In 1346 half a fee in Haresfeld was held by Matthew son of Herbert, which in 1290 had been held by John son of Reginald [Fitz Peter] (See ante Vol. X. p. 286, and further, Fosbrooke's History of Gloucestershire, Vol. I. pp. 300, 301).

nunc de Johanne Russell' et Elizabeth', / uxore ejus, ut de prædicto Manerio; qui quidem Johannes et Elizabeth tenent prædictum Manerium de Domino Rege in capite. Item dicunt quod / Manerium de Colverdene et quædam terræ et tenementa in Moreslade juxta Sandhur[st] in Hundredo de Dodeston', quæ quondam tenebantur de Rege / per certa servitia, nunc tenentur de Abbate Beati Petri Gloucestræ, ut de Manerio de Berton' Regis juxta Gloucestriam; quod quidem Manerium / prædictus Abbas tenet de Domino Rege ad feodi firmam. Item dicunt, quod unum mesuagium, xxv acræ terræ, v acræ prati, et iiij^{or} solidatæ redditus / apud Manerium de Bruerne, quæ Johannes, filius et hæres Beatricis quæ fuit uxor Johannis le Botiller, et Almaricus le Botiller nuper / tenuerunt, tenentur de Domino Principe ut de Castro et Honore Walyngford'. Item dicunt, quod Johannes Staunton' tenet ballivam vocatam / Ballivam de Staunton',¹ in Foresta de Dene, de Johanne filio Regis ut de Castro Sancti Briavelli; quod quidem Castrum, cum Foresta de Denc, / idem Johannes filius Regis tenet ex concessione dicti Domini Regis. Item dicunt, quod Johannes Berkeleye tenet de Domino Rege / sine medio Castrum et Manerium de Beverston', in Hundredo de Berkeleye, per servitium militare, set per quot feoda ignorant.² In cujus [rei] testimonium prædicti Juratores huic Inquisitioni sigilla sua apposuerunt. Data, die, anno, et loco supradictis.

LAY SUBSIDIES, GLOUCESTER, $\frac{113}{49}$.

INQUISITIO capta apud Gloucestriam, die Martis proximo post festum Sancti Gregorii Papæ, anno regni Regis Henrici quarti post conquestum tertio, coram Roberto Somerville, nuper / Vicecomite Gloucestræ, et Roberto Whittington', nuper Escaetore Domini Regis in Comitatu prædicto, et Johanne Derlurst, collectoribus


¹ The Bailiwick of Staunton was long held by the family of Staunton, originally Walding. (See History of the Manor and Advowson of Staunton, ante Vol. VII. p. 227 et seq.)

² In 1346 this manor was held by Thomas de Berkeley by the service of one fee and a half, as it was held by John ap Adam in 1290 (See ante Vol. X. p. 285). Robert de Gurnay held it with Ailburton and Kings Weston

rationabilis Auxilii pro Blanchia, primogenita filia dicti / Domini Regis maritanda, virtute commissionis dicti Domini Regis eisdem collectoribus inde directæ, per sacramentum Walteri Nicholai Mattusdon', Johannis Wynyarde, / Johannis Wethur, Junioris, Thomæ Walter, Willelmi Russell', Johannis Bryd de Heydon', Hugonis Hauker, Roberti Wodewarde, Johannis Taverner de Teukesbury, / Roberti Crese, et Johannis Mynour, Juratorum, qui dicunt super sacramentum suum, quod omnes subscripti tenent de Domino Rege sine medio in Hundredis subscriptis: videlicet, / [Archiepiscopus] Eboracensis tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Churchedon', in Hundredo de Dodeston', duo feoda militum, Prior Lantonæ juxta Gloucestriam tenet de Domino /

in 1172 of the Honour of Maurice de Gaunt (Testa de Nevil, p. 75^a).

The following short pedigree will make this more clear:—



Rege sine medio in Brocworthe, in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis ; Abbas Beati Petri Gloucestræ tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in eadem villa, / et in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis ; Thomas Brugge tenet de Domino rege sine medio in Mattusdon, in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi / militis ; Nicholaus Mattusdon et parcenarii ¹ sui tenent de Domino Rege sine medio in Kyngeshome ² juxta Gloucestriam, in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis. / Et quod Johannes Kyng tenet in Sandhurst, in eodem Hundredo, viginti solidatas terræ de Domino Rege in socagio, sine aliquo medio. Item dicunt, quod / Abbas Westmonasterii tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Bodynton', in Hundredo de Westmonasterio dimidium feodum militis. Et quod idem Abbas tenet de Domino / Rege sine medio in Yevington', ³ in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod idem Abbas tenet de Domino Rege sine medio / in Wyghtfelde, in eodem Hundredo, dimidium feodum militis. Et quod idem Abbas tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Harffelde, in eodem Hundredo, / dimidium feodum militis. Et quod idem Abbas tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Ryll (?), in eodem Hundredo, quartam partem unius feodi militis. Item dicunt, quod / idem Abbas tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Lymynton, (Leminton), ⁴ in Hundredo de Teukesbury, sextam partem unius feodi militis. Et quod idem Abbas / tenet de Domino Rege sine medio in Kynnerton', ⁵ in eodem Hundredo, duo feoda militum. Item dicunt, quod Domina la Despenser

¹ Nicholas de Mattesdon married Margaret, one of the daughters and coheirs of Thomas Berkeley, of Cubberley. The other parceners were her sister Alice, wife of Thomas Bruge, and their mother who held her third in dower.

² Richard Daubeney died in 1361 seized of a moiety of the Manor of Kyngesholme, which he held *in capite* by grand serjeanty, but by what particular service is not stated. (Inq. p.m. 19th Edw. III. 1st Nos., No. 27. See ante 178).

³ Eventon, John Throckmorton died seized of land in Lye and Eventon in this Hundred, 13th Edw. IV., (See Fosbrooke's History of Glouc. Vol II, p. 363).

⁴ See Fosbrooke's, Hist. of Glouc. Vol. II. p. 261.

⁵ Kennerton. In 1346 the Earl of Warwick held half a fee, Walter Beauchamp held half a fee, and John de Ferrers held a whole fee which John de Ferrers held in 1290.

tenet de Domino Rege / sine medio in T[e]ukesbury, in eodem Hundredo, unum feodum militis. Item dicunt, quod Thomas Berkeleye de Coberleye tenet de Domino / Rege sine medio quædam terras et tenementa apud Stoke, [Stoke Archer], in eodem Hundredo, per parvam sergentiam servitium¹ Item dicunt quod Episcopus Wygorniensis tenet de Domino Rege sine / medio in Clyve, Southam, Goderynton', et Brokehampton', in Hundredo de Derhurst et Tebaldeston' unum feodum militis et dimidium. / In cujus rei testimonium prædicti Juratores huic Inquisitioni sigilla sua apposuerunt. Data die, anno, et loco supradictis.

¹The service was that the tenant should carry one bow with arrows for 40 days before the King when he went to war, (See Ante p. 142).

N.B.—The dividing strokes in the text shew the commencement of the lines in the original record.

