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The ‘Honours’ of the Earls of Hereford in the Twelfth Century

By DAVID WALKER, D.PHIL., F.S.A.

From various sources a considerable amount of information can be gathered concerning the lands of the family of Miles of Gloucester, earl of Hereford.¹ Their estates were built up gradually over a long period of time and were concentrated largely, though not entirely, in Gloucestershire, Herefordshire and the Welsh Marches. They formed an ‘honour’ in England which was later known as the honour of Caldecote (with its caput, significantly, on the Welsh side of the river Severn, where so much of the family’s strength lay), and the Welsh marcher lordships of Brecknock and Abergavenny. A comprehensive survey of the estates of the earls of Hereford in the 12th century is not possible. Too often we are dependent on charter evidence relating to manors in which lands and rights were alienated to the church; the evidence is never complete. Only through the pages of Domesday Book is a comprehensive survey of the family’s lands in any limited period possible. Within these limitations it is possible to draw some useful conclusions as to how the family’s lands were acquired and dispersed.

The outstanding features can easily be summarized. The basis of the landed wealth of the family consisted of lands which in 1086 were held by two members of the family, Durand the sheriff and Walter of Gloucester. Previously they had been in the possession of Durand and his elder brother, Roger de Pitres, who had received land from William fitz Osbern, earl of Hereford, and from the Conqueror. By 1095 these lands had passed into the possession of Roger’s son, Walter of Gloucester who, if he did not hold all the lands formerly belonging to his father and uncle certainly held the major part of those lands. To this nucleus of estates others were added by direct royal grants. Walter of Gloucester, Miles of Gloucester, and perhaps Earl Roger, as well as the last surviving of Miles’s sons, Mahel of Hereford, all received lands in this way. Two advantageous marriages provided substantial increases in the landed

¹ I have discussed his career in a paper on ‘Miles of Gloucester, Earl of Hereford’, Trans. BGAS,* vol. 77, pp. 65–84.
* See page 211 for Footnote Abbreviations.
THE 'HONOURS' OF THE EARLS OF HEREFORD

wealth of the family. The first, that between Miles of Gloucester and the daughter and heiress of Bernard of Neufmarché brought valuable new estates of which the chief lay in the border lordship of Brecknock. This increase in wealth was retained by later generations of the family. The second was that between Roger, later earl of Hereford, and Cecily, daughter and heiress of Payn fitz John. Cecily brought to her husband a number of manors which were 'of the fee of Hugh de Lacy'. Since this marriage was barren, Cecily's estates passed out of the hands of the Gloucester family on the death of Earl Roger at the end of 1155. Eventually her sister, Agnes de Montchesney, inherited these lands. Since Henry of Hereford was also married it is possible that he, too, may have acquired fresh lands by marriage, but nothing is known of his wife, other than her name, Isabelle, and the effects of his marriage upon his fortunes cannot be estimated.¹

The extent of the lands held by different members of the family varied considerably; it is hardly possible to speak with accuracy of the 'permanent possessions' of the family. But there was a corpus, consisting chiefly of the lands which Earl Miles held at the end of Henry I's reign, by comparison with which fluctuations from one generation to another may be judged. Miles's estates passed, in turn, to his four sons, Roger, who succeeded as earl of Hereford in 1143, Walter, Henry, and Mahel.² When the last of these, Mahel of Hereford, died in 1165, his lands were divided between his three sisters and co-heiresses, Margaret, wife of Humphrey de Bohun, Bertha, wife of William de Braiose, and Lucy, wife of Herbert fitz Herbert. This division of the family's lands is considered in detail in sections IV and V of this paper.

II

At the time of the Domesday Survey the family's lands were held by Durand the sheriff and his nephew, Walter of Gloucester, called in the Survey, Walter, son of Roger. They held lands in chief and as sub-tenants. Durand held in chief in 27 manors with a total assessment of 80 hides 2½ virgates, and valued in 1086 at £67 10s 4d. Walter held land in chief in 5 manors with a total assessment of 27 hides 1 virgate, valued at £24 12s.³ These figures are chiefly of value for the way in which they emphasize the disproportionate share of the family's lands held by Durand. They offer also a rough means of comparison with the

¹ His wife held five knights' fees of Margaret de Bohun in 1166. (RBE, i, 294). She occurs as a witness to one of Henry of Hereford's charters. (Dugdale MS. 17, p. 22; cf. R. W. Eyton, Antiquities of Shropshire, v, 48, n. 26).
² A fifth son mentioned by Giraldis Cambrensis did not inherit any lands.
³ In addition, one manor, East Dean (Hants), rendered 15s at farm.
holdings of other tenants in chief. Edward of Salisbury, for example, sheriff of Wiltshire and, like Walter of Gloucester, the ancestor of a line of earls, held land in 39 manors in Wiltshire alone with a value of over £200.

The manors held by Durand and Walter were distributed over four shires, Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Hampshire and Herefordshire. In Gloucestershire Durand held the manors of Culkerton and Didmarton (near Tetbury), Whaddon and Haresfield (south of Gloucester), Icomb and Condicote (near Stow-on-the-Wold), Shipton Sollers (some distance from Cheltenham, but near Prestbury where Durand held land as a tenant of the bishop of Worcester), and Duntisbourne (near Cirencester). He also held land in Moreton Valence, Ashbrook, Sezincote, Litetune, and an unnamed manor in Westbury hundred. Walter of Gloucester held the two important manors of South Cerney (near Cirencester) and Barrington (near Burford). As a sub-tenant of the archbishop of York Durand held three hides at Standish, land which Earl William fitz Osbern had granted to Durand's brother, Roger de Pitres, and which was in dispute in 1086. Of the bishop of Worcester Durand held 3 hides and 1 virgate in the bishop's manor of Bibury where his land was distinguished as Barnsley. He was also the tenant of the bishop of Worcester in the six-hide manor of Southam, part of Bishop's Cleeve. In the bishop of Hereford's manor of Prestbury Durand held 3 hides. In Newent, a manor granted to St. Mary's, Corneilles, by Roger de Breteuil, a certain Durand held 1 hide. He may well be Durand the sheriff. Walter of Gloucester held 8 hides as the tenant of the bishop of Worcester in Colesbourne (near Cheltenham). Durand, as might be expected, held some tenements within the borough of Gloucester and he had some interest in Winchcombe.

In Wiltshire Durand held land of approximately the same value as his Gloucestershire holding. He had land in the manors of Ashley (near Tetbury, Glouc.), Luckington and Seagry (near Malmesbury), Lockeridge (near Marlborough), and Tockenham (near Wotton Bassett). He also held the large manor of Chirton, and a small tenement in Uffcott in Broad Hinton. In Malmesbury he had 1½ mansure. One, Durand, who is not otherwise identified, held land in East Overton of the bishop of Winchester. It may be, again, that this is Durand the sheriff. Walter of Gloucester held no lands in Wiltshire.

---

1 DB, i, 169. 2 Ibid., i, 164v. 3 Ibid., i, 165. 4 Ibid., i, 166. 5 Ibid., i, 162, 162v. 6 The summary of Durand's fief in Wiltshire which was entered in the Exon Domesday (f.531) credited him with nine manors. See VCH Wilts., ii, 220 for the editor's notes on this entry and its problems.
7 DB, i, 71v; VCH Wilts., ii, 148. 8 DB, i, 64v; VCH Wilts., ii, 113.
9 DB, i, 65v; VCH Wilts., ii, 120. This suggestion is strengthened slightly by the evidence relating to Alresford (Hants) discussed in the text.
Generally speaking Durand's estates in this shire lay in the north of the shire and were probably closely connected with his Gloucestershire manors, particularly with those in the neighbourhood of Tetbury.

In Hampshire Durand held the manors of Cliddesden and Weston,\(^1\) Walter of Gloucester held the manor of Lesborne which is apparently intended for Selbourne. He also held parts of the manors of Barton Stacey and Dean.\(^2\) The bishop of Winchester held Alresford of which 2 hides, valued at 40s, were held by one, Walter, while 4 hides, valued at £11, were held by one, Durand. These tenants were Durand the sheriff and Walter of Gloucester. The identification rests partly on the juxtaposition of the two names. But in 1166 the bishop of Winchester reported that Miles the constable had held the fee of one knight on his fief, which, in 1166, was held by Humphrey de Bohun.\(^3\) The combined evidence of Domesday and the Red Book of the Exchequer provides strong grounds for the identification of the fee which Miles once held of the bishop of Winchester with that of the Domesday tenants of Alresford.

Finally in Herefordshire Durand held the manors of Thruxton (near Hereford), Ashperton (near Ledbury), Weston Bret, Middleton, Calcheberge which has been identified tentatively as Coldborough in Upton Bishop, and Lutelei.\(^4\)

Durand and his nephew also held lands jointly. In Herefordshire they held two manors, Laysters, assessed at 2 hides, which was waste in 1086, and Rocheford, assessed at 1½ hides and valued in 1086 at 30s. There is no indication of the reason for this kind of tenure.\(^5\)

Taken as a whole these estates were not as localized as might have been expected for a family which, in this period, was associated predominantly with local administration in Gloucestershire. The family held

---

\(^1\) *DB*, i, 47v. Cliddesden is the Domesday *Cleredesen*. (Cf. *VCH Hants*, i, 493; iv, 145). Round identified Weston as Weston Patrick. (Ibid., i, 493.) In a later volume it was suggested that this tenement might lie in Weston Corbett, which, in 1325, was in the hands of William de Braisoise. (Ibid., iii, 386.)

\(^2\) *DB*, i, 48v; *VCH Hants*, i, 498. Barton Stacey was a large manor which gave its name to a hundred. Walter's tenement later passed to Llanthony. (Ibid., iv, 417, 422.) Dean is probably East Dean. (Ibid., iv, 498.)

\(^3\) *DB*, i, 40; *VCH Hants*, i, 459; *RBE*, i, 204.

\(^4\) *DB*, i, 186v; *VCH Heref.*, i, 339; *Heref. Domesd.*, pp. 62, 63, 117, 118. The correct identification of Thruxton was first made possible by an annotation in Balliol MS. 356. (Ibid., p. 118.) Middleton was part of Leominster which, in 1086 formed part of the king's land. It is not entered separately as part of Durand's holding in chief. (Ibid., p. 14.) Two possible identifications of Lutelei have been suggested, Luntley in Dilwyn, and Lyttley, but neither can be established clearly.

\(^5\) *DB*, i, 186v; *VCH Heref.*, i, 339; *Heref. Domesd.*, p. 63. There is some evidence in Domesday Book that the sheriff could hold lands by virtue of his office. (Cf. W. A. Morris, *The Medieval English Sheriff to 1300* (Manchester, 1927), p. 53). The outstanding example is that of Edward of Salisbury, whose duchy and lands in Wiltshire were entered under a special rubric and were not included in the account of his lands held in chief. (See *VCH Wils.*, ii, 135.) In a paper on the Domesday tenants of Gloucestershire A. S. Ellis put forward the view that Walter of Gloucester had been a minor at his father's death and that Durand performed the duties of sheriff, and apparently, held lands in virtue of that office. He also considered that Walter had attained his majority by 1086 and was then in possession of those lands which were not held by his uncle as sheriff. (*Trans. BCAS*, iv, 161–4.) It would be hazardous to assume that so large a part of the Gloucester family's possessions were held in virtue of their office of sheriff.
a modest endowment, small compared with the wealth of such a family as the Lacys, small compared with the Wiltshire holding of Edward of Salisbury, another man actively engaged in local administration.

Domesday Book throws some light on the events of the preceding twenty years. South Cerney and Standish were given to Roger de Pitres by William fitz Osbern. There are other instances in which there is some evidence to suggest that the connection between William fitz Osbern and the Gloucester family (and especially with Roger de Pitres) was not confined to these two manors. There was a connection between the earl and the Gloucester family in Westwood-in-Llanwarne (Heref.) though the early history of this manor is obscure and the evidence is somewhat confusing and inconclusive.¹ In Nitwar, part of Hunsthamp (Heref.) there were 2½ hides which Roger de Pitres had diverted to Gloucestertshire in the time of Earl William.² At Newent (Glouc.) Roger de Breteuil had given the manor to St. Mary of Cormeilles and it has already been suggested that the Durand who held land there in 1086 may have been Durand the sheriff.

Roger de Pitres owed part, and perhaps the greater part, of his landed wealth to the influence of Earl William fitz Osbern. He appears to have been one of the earl’s followers in the years immediately after the Conquest. He had been established as a landowner in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire by Earl William before 1071. There is no direct evidence that the lands which Durand and Walter of Gloucester held in Wiltshire and Hampshire at the time of the Survey also represented earlier grants made by William fitz Osbern, but the earl’s activities in Hampshire and, perhaps, the apparent association of their manors in Wiltshire and Gloucestershire, make this an attractive and probable thesis. The close association between the Gloucester family and the earls of Hereford seems to have ended with the death of William fitz Osbern.³ After 1071 the family was associated with the crown, rather than with a powerful local magnate, certainly as far as local administration is concerned. The eclipse of the house of Breteuil in 1075 gave added emphasis to a development which had begun much earlier. Roger de Pitres also received lands from the king. Lutelei (Heref.), which Durand held in 1086, had been given to his brother by the Conqueror.

¹ I have discussed the descent of this manor in a note in Trans. of the Wootton Naturalists’ Field Club, Herefordshire, xxxvi, pt. II, 191.
² DB, i, 181; Heref. Domesd., p. 22. Round made the identification tentatively in VCH Heref., i, 319.
³ The emergence of Roger de Pitres and Urse d’Abbot as men who were, unmistakably, royal officials directly responsible to the king can be dated from 1071. Under Earl William fitz Osbern they appear to have been subject in some degree to the earl, but his son, Roger de Breteuil, complained that the king’s sheriffs were interfering in the affairs of his earldom. Roger did not have the same control over the royal officials of the west midlands as his father had once had.
Roger de Pitres died before 1086. It might have been expected that his son, Walter of Gloucester, should inherit his father's estates, but this was not, in fact, the case. Durand held the greater part of the family's lands. Amongst his manors were those of Standish and Lutelai which had been held by Roger de Pitres, and Westwood-in-Llanwarne which was, almost certainly, part of Roger's holding. The reason for this division of the Gloucester inheritance is unknown and no satisfactory explanation has ever been put forward. Before the end of the century Walter of Gloucester had secured control of the greater part, if not the whole, of the estates which his family held. Before June 1095, he had granted to St. Owen's, Gloucester, tithes in a number of manors, including six manors which had been held by Durand at the time of the Domesday Survey, Whaddon and Haresfield (Glouc.), Caldecote (Mon.), Lockeridge, Chirton and Tockenham (Wilts.). He issued a charter recording that these grants had been confirmed on the occasion of the dedication of St. Owen's by R. bishop of Hereford, who also issued a charter confirming the grants. The bishop dedicated the church (which lay outside his own diocese) at the request of Walter of Gloucester; he stated that Walter had made a grant of lands and tithes in his presence and that Walter had confirmed the grant by charter. He is identified as Robert, bishop of Hereford, in the rubric given to his charter in the Great Register of Llanthony and he must be Robert de Losinga, bishop of Hereford, who died on 26 June 1095, and who could reasonably have been expected to act in a neighbouring diocese during the vacancy which followed the death of Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester, on 18 January 1095. The two charters must, if this identification is sound, have been issued during that period.¹

The qualification that Walter of Gloucester held the greater part, if not the whole, of his family's estates at this time is necessary because of the enigmatic figure of Roger, son of Durand, who appears as a tenant of the bishopric of Worcester in 1095. He was the son of the Domesday sheriff and he had some part of the lands which his family held of the bishop of Worcester. How much is not known. No evidence has ever been adduced to show that he controlled any of the estates which his father held in chief.²

The rise of Walter of Gloucester and his family was due largely to royal favour, gained through the administrative service of the crown. It is not therefore surprising to find evidence of direct grants of land by the king to different members of the family in the 12th century. They can be traced from an earlier generation, from grants to Roger de Pitres

¹ Llant. A 1, I nos. 1, 52.
² For Round's view of Roger son of Durand, see Feudal England, pp. 308–14.
by the Conqueror, down to the time of Mahel of Hereford, that is to say down to 1165. Mahel claimed to have received Turkdean (Glouc.) from Henry II. Walter of Gloucester received all the lands of Edric, son of Chetel, from Henry I in 1123, a grant later confirmed to Miles of Gloucester by Stephen. Edric was a Gloucestershire thegn who still held lands in that shire in 1086, when he was named as the tenant of Baunton and Alkerton. From Henry I, too, Walter received a grant of free warren in his own lands and in the king’s demesne throughout Gloucestershire. To Miles of Gloucester Henry I granted the manor of English Bicknor (Glouc.). The marriage of Miles of Gloucester to the heiress of Bernard of Neufmarché was a royal favour granted in return for the long service which Walter of Gloucester and his son had rendered to Henry I.

The services which Miles rendered to the Empress did not go unrewarded. When, in July 1141, Miles was created earl of Hereford, the Empress granted him the three royal manors of Marden, Lugwardine and Wilton (Heref.). Her charter provides the first evidence for a Gloucester tenure in these manors. At a later date Henry II confirmed them to Earl Roger, to whom he also granted five Gloucestershire manors. Of these, Minsterworth, Rodley, Awre and Dymock had been part of Henry I's demesne between the Severn and the Wye. The fifth manor, Cheltenham, was said to have been granted for 60 librates of land. In both charters the grants were expressed in terms which do not imply any limitation on tenure. Each charter contained a general clause giving a hereditary title and claim to the offices and lands granted or confirmed.

The early Pipe Rolls of Henry II’s reign contain interesting references to the royal grants made to Earl Roger. In 1155 the Herefordshire account refers to the lands of the king’s demesne which had been granted to Roger, earl of Hereford, by the king’s charter, and for which the sheriff was allowed £52 10s 0d for three-quarters of a year. This entry is matched by the shorter entry in the Gloucestershire account, that, for the lands granted (the ‘terre date’ of the Pipe Rolls) to the earl of Hereford the sheriff is allowed £96. These entries clearly refer to the three Herefordshire and five Gloucestershire manors named in Henry II’s charter, while the Herefordshire account refers to the charter itself.

---

1 Llant. A 1, I no. 16.
2 Round, Ancient Charters, p. 18, no. 10; p. 34, no. 20; DB, i, 170v.
3 PRO, Duchy of Lancaster, Royal Charters, nos. 4, 7. The first is printed in C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne, Regesta Regum Anglo-Normanorum, ii, 362, no. ccxivii (Calendared, ibid., p. 235, no. 1622). The second is calendared, ibid., p. 255, no. 1723.
4 T. Rymer, Foedera (Record Commission), i (1816), p. 14, for Matilda’s charter; Henry II’s charter to Earl Roger is known from a text recited in a charter issued by John to Henry de Bohun in 1200. (T. Hardy, Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati 1199–1216 (Rec. Comm., 1837), p. 53.)
5 RBE, ii, 650.
After the death of Earl Roger, Walter of Hereford was called to account for the lands in his capacity as sheriff. He accounted for the £52 10s 0d due from the demesne lands granted to the earl of Hereford in Herefordshire and for the £96 due from the demesne 'which the king gave to Roger earl of Hereford' in Gloucestershire. He was pardoned these amounts by the king in 1157. Rodley, another manor forming part of the 'terre date' held by Earl Roger, was used to endow his new religious foundation at Flaxley. The earl granted the monks a fishery called Noeweria and a meadow called Pulmede, both in Rodley. In 1157 it was recorded that twenty-two shillings of the tithes of the fisheries of Garne (Gerna) and Rodley (Redlega) had been granted to the monks of Farlega. This entry remained a constant feature of the Gloucestershire account throughout the 12th century. So far as I can see this was intended for Flaxley, not for Monkton Farleigh, but it was not corrected. Indeed in 1180, Flaxlega was written and altered to Ferlega, presumably to make the new roll run consistently with the old.

It is clear from the evidence of the Pipe Rolls that these manors did not form part of the permanent endowment of Earl Roger's successors. His brother and heir, Walter of Hereford, had land in Cheltenham, Dymock and Awre in the early years of Henry II's reign. His tenure in Cheltenham was recorded from 1156 to 1159 and the allowance to the sheriff for this land was, presumably, in satisfaction for the 60 librates of land named in Henry II's charter. In the same period Walter held land to the value of £28 in Dymock and £15 10s 0d in Awre. He continued to hold estates in these three manors until 1160, in which year the sheriff was allowed £23 17s 6d for the three manors for a quarter of a year. These allowances for land in Gloucestershire amount very nearly to the £96 mentioned in an earlier Pipe Roll for lands granted to Earl Roger.

After 1160 these manors ceased to be associated with the Gloucester family. In that year the sheriff was allowed £6 for lands in Dymock granted to the monks of Flaxley. From 1161 the sheriff was allowed twenty shillings for land held in Awre by Walter Blund by the king's gift. At Cheltenham, after 1160, an allowance of £14 os 1d was made for Walter of Ashley, a tenant of the Gloucester family who was frequently in attendance on Margaret de Bohun. In 1211-1213 the

---

1 PR 2-3-4 Henry II, pp. 49, 50, 93, 99.
2 W. Dugdale, Monasticon (New ed., 1817-1830), v, 590, nos. I and II; PR 2-3-4 Henry II, p. 100; PR 26 Henry II, p. 112. Ferlega is Monkton Farleigh (Wilts.). Gerna is now represented by Garne Mill, part of Westbury-on-Severn (Glouc.).
3 PR 2-3-4 Henry II, pp. 49, 100, 168; PR 5 Henry II, p. 27; PR 6 Henry II, p. 28.
4 Ibid., p. 28. Henry Plantagenet, as duke of Normandy, confirmed to Flaxley his demesne land of Dymock. (Monasticon, v, 590, no. I.)
5 PR 7 Henry II, p. 22. This remained a constant feature of the Gloucestershire account. In 1170-1171 Walter was succeeded by a son, also called Walter. (PR 17 Henry II, p. 84.)
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Walter of Ashley who then held 14 librates in the king's manor of Cheltenham claimed to hold them by gift of Earl Miles. Here a tenant of the Gloucester family was brought into a direct tenurial relationship with the king after this manor passed out of the possession of Walter of Hereford.\(^1\)

In Herefordshire the tenure of these royal manors, \textit{i.e.} of Marden, Lugwardine and Wilton, ceased at an earlier date. From the first year of Henry II's reign, for example, part of Wilton was held by Hugh de Longchamp and Richard Talbot whose successors continued to hold this manor throughout the second half of the 12th century.\(^2\) Even though Matilda's charter, as well as his own confirmation, contained provisions for a hereditary claim by the Gloucester family, Henry II withdrew these estates from Walter of Hereford. At no time could Walter's successors establish a hereditary claim to the estates granted by Matilda and Henry II in these two shires. So, then, as far as royal grants are concerned, the most fruitful period in the history of the family falls within the first half of the 12th century. Miles of Gloucester received the most valuable gains. Earl Roger retained much of his father's acquisitions, notably the manors given by Matilda and Henry II which formed 'terre date' in the early Pipe Rolls of Henry II's reign. After the death of Earl Roger the family lost a number of valuable manors and the general impression in this, as in other features, is one of slow decline. The death of Mahel of Hereford, the last of the male line, marks the end of the process of acquisition and loss which had taken place during the preceding one hundred years. It was the occasion of a division of the family inheritance between his sisters and co-heiresses. Thenceforward the history of different portions of the Gloucester family's estates is bound up with the drive and energy of the sons-in-law of Miles of Gloucester and their successors.

III

The marriage of Miles of Gloucester with Sybil, daughter and heiress of Bernard of Neufmarché, took place in 1121. It was the first

\(^1\) \textit{PR 6 Henry II,} p. 29. This remained a constant feature of the Gloucestershire account. See also, F. B. Welch, 'The manor of Charlton Kings, later Ashley', \textit{Trans. BGAS,} vol. 54, pp. 145 et sqq.

\(^2\) \textit{RBE,} ii, 630. Hugh and Richard each held land to the value of £16 10s 0d in these manors. \textit{(PR 21 Henry II,} p. 85.) In 1175 the sheriff accounted for £4 of the money which he had for Linton and Wilton after the death of Richard Talbot. (Ibid., p. 85.) Two years later Thurstan fitz Simon held, and continued to hold, this land in Linton. \textit{(PR 23 Henry II,} p. 52.) Hugh de Longchamp held his lands until 1187-1188. From the early years of Richard's reign Henry de Longchamp held land in Wilton 'super Waiam' and Caples (Heref.). In 1187-1188 also Gilbert Talbot paid part of a debt of 200 marks to have the manor of Linton. \textit{(PR 34 Henry II,} p. 209; \textit{PR 1 Richard I} (ed. J. Hunter, London, 1844), p. 141; \textit{PR 2 Richard I,} pp. 45, 48.)
of the marriages through which the fortunes of the family were notably increased. Sybil was given to Miles by Henry I and, as far as material wealth was concerned, this rich marriage was the greatest single expression of royal favour which the family received. Only the grant of the earldom of Hereford to Miles in 1141 can be compared with it as a mark of royal favour. The lands of Bernard of Neufmarché remained permanently in the possession of the Gloucester family, and with his own patrimony, they formed the nucleus of the lands which gave Miles and his heirs great local importance as landholders in the shires bordering the southern marches of Wales. The charter of Henry I in which this grant was recorded has long been known. It is readily available in Round's Ancient Charters, and it has been published in facsimile.¹

To assess this increase in the landed wealth of the family it is necessary to understand the nature of the lordship of Brecknock. Bernard of Neufmarché was a marcher lord who held his lands beyond the Wye by right of conquest. His honour took its name from the Welsh district which he had won by the sword, the tribal district of Brychieniog. These Welsh lands formed a compact unit, but the honour of Brecknock also included estates in England. Part of this English holding was acquired from the Domesday tenements of prominent tenants in chief. The manor of Burghill (Heref.) was held in 1086 by Alfred of Marlborough.² It came into the possession of Bernard of Neufmarché who granted the church to Brecon priory.³ Miles of Gloucester later gave the same church to his new foundation of Llanthony Secunda, apparently unaware that it had already been granted to a religious house by his father-in-law. The monks of Brecon disputed this new grant. Their claim was settled between 1148 and 1155 by Roger, earl of Hereford, in the presence of, and through the mediation of Gilbert Foliot, bishop of Hereford. Bishop and earl issued charters recording the settlement.⁴ The canons retained their church while the monks received in compensation two mills, described in Earl Roger's charter as the mill of Burghill and the mill above it, at Cowarne. When Walter of Hereford issued a confirmation of this grant, he described them as the mills of Cowarne and Shelwick.⁵ The 12th-century tenant of Burghill whose name is given in a marginal annotation to Balliol MS. 350 was William de

¹ Round, Ancient Charters, p. 8, no. 6; C. Johnson and H. Jenkinson, English Court Hand, pl. 2; C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne, Regesta Regum Anglo-Normanorum, ii, 162, no. 1280.
² DB, i, 186; VCH Heref., i, p. 337; Heref. Domesd., pp. 58, 111.
³ His gift was recorded in two charters granting Brecon priory to Battle Abbey. One version, the later of the two, is printed from a copy in a charter roll in Monasticon, iii, 264. Both versions are printed in Brec. Cart., pp. 69, 70.
⁴ Llant. A i, 1 no. 3; Brec. Cart., pp. 37, 78, 80.
⁵ For Shelwick see, DB, i, 182; VCH Heref., i, 323; Heref. Domesd., pp. 27, 89; Brec. Cart., p. 80.
Mineres, who attested charters of Earl Roger and of Mahel of Hereford. The feodaries contain no information about this manor.

Burghill is not an isolated example of a manor once held by Alfred of Marlborough passing into the hands of Miles of Gloucester. In the list of tenants included in Balliol MS. 350 it is stated that Miles held all the Herefordshire manors which Alfred had once held, with the exception of Pembroke. For his manors of Burghill, Much Cowarne and Brinsop, this can be confirmed, but others of Alfred's manors passed to the Tregose family which held Ewias, Eaton Tregose, Monnington and Pencombe.

Much Cowarne formed part of Alfred's Domesday holding, and in 1086 his daughter Agnes was holding the manor of her father. It passed to Bernard of Neufmarché who granted the church to St. Peter's, Gloucester. The manor was named as part of his daughter's 'maritagium' in 1121. It was afterwards held of the honour of Brecknock. Brinsop (Heref.), another of Alfred's manors, passed to Bernard of Neufmarché who gave the tithes to Brecon priory. Brinsop, too, was held of the honour of Brecknock, by the Torel family.

Bernard also acquired lands from the fief forfeited by Roger de Lacy, who had once held the three Herefordshire manors of Collington, Humber, and Gattertop. From the Lacy family the monks of St. Guthlac's, Hereford, received tithes in Humber and Gattertop. Both manors were later held of the honour of Brecknock, Humber by the del Mans family, Gattertop by the family of Weldeboef. Walter del Mans and his wife gave the church of Humber to Brecon priory, while William de Weldeboef, a well-known tenant of the honour of Brecknock and, for a time, constable of Brecon castle, gave the monks of St.

1 Heref. Domesd., p. 58; Brec. Cart., pp. 77, 82-3.
2 Heref. Domesd., p. 79. Tait has some useful notes on these two manors. (Ibid., pp. 110-115.) Pembroke was later part of the honour of Radnor, a Braose honour. The manors of Stratford and Bredwardine (Heref.) may also have passed to the Gloucester family from Alfred of Marlborough, but the evidence relating to them is inconclusive.
3 DB, i, 186; VCH Heref., i, 338; Heref. Domesd., pp. 60, 114; Glouc. Cart., i, 314, no. 281. There is a transcript of this charter in Gloucester Cathedral Register B, f. 57. The grant was confirmed by Earl Miles and Earl Roger. (Glouc. Cart., i, 315, nos. 284, 285.)
4 The material for constructing the descent of Much Cowarne and Little Cowarne is cited in Tait's notes on these manors. (Heref. Domesd., pp. 93, 114.) His notes appear to have been written at different times and it seems unlikely that they were ever correlated. Evidence which is cited in the descent of the Domesday manor held by Nigel the Physician is repeated in an entirely different context in his account of the Domesday manor held by Alfred of Marlborough.
5 Brec. Cart., pp. 69, 70; RBE, ii, 602; Fees, p. 802. Tait has some valuable notes on the Torel family. (Heref. Domesd., p. 112.) Some additional details can be added from the Brecon cartulary. A Ralph Torel made grants to Brecon, recorded in three charters. (Brec. Cart., pp. 45, 46.) He was the son of William Torel who died in 1185. (PR 32 Henry II, p. 136; Tait, loc. cit.) His wife was Joan, who cannot otherwise be identified.
6 DB, i, 180; VCH Heref., i, 314, 315; Heref. Domesd., pp. 11, 12. Two thirds of the tithes of Humber were confirmed to St. Guthlac's by Walter de Lacy, Hugh de Lacy, Henry I and a Robert, bishop of Hereford. (Balliol MS. 271, f.94v, nos. 417, 418; f.95v, no. 422; f.105, no. 466.) For Humber see also, Fees, pp. 800, 813; FA, ii, 392, 383, 399.
Guthlac’s a parcel of land at Gattertop to build a message to collect their tithes in that place.¹ Both manors were included in the possessions of Miles of Gloucester in the list of tenants in Balliol MS. 350, where Humber was said to have been part of Miles’s lands ‘of the tenement of Roger de Lacy’.²

Two manors, at least, were acquired by Bernard of Neufmarché by marriage. These are Bodenham and Berrington (Heref.), which formed part of the ‘maritagium’ of his wife Agnes. In 1086 Roger de Lacy and Osbern fitz Richard each held ½ hides in Bodenham. That part held by Osbern fitz Richard became known as Bodenham Devereux. It was held in 1242–1243 by Walter d’Evreux and Walter de Mucegros of the honour of Brecknock. Bernard of Neufmarché granted the church of Bodenham to Brecon priory.³ Berrington, which had also been held by Osbern fitz Richard in 1086, was given to Brecon by Agnes, Bernard’s wife. She was the daughter of Osbern fitz Richard from whom she received her ‘maritagium’.⁴

A number of English manors later associated with the honour of Brecknock can be named but they cannot be traced through later records. Cleobury North (Salop.) was granted to Brecon priory by Walter de Cropus, one of the followers of Bernard of Neufmarché who confirmed the grant.⁵ Pattingham (Salop.) and Hardington (Som.) were also part of Bernard’s possessions and were granted to Brecon. Glasbury (Heref.) was given to St. Peter’s Gloucester, by Bernard of Neufmarché. When it was exchanged by the abbey for another manor in 1144 elaborate precautions were taken to safeguard the interests of his successors in this manor.⁶

At the time when Miles of Gloucester entered into possession of the lands of Bernard of Neufmarché the honour of Brecknock included not only Welsh lands, which Bernard had gained by conquest, but also manors in England. Some of these he had received, no doubt, by royal grant; the lands which he held from Roger de Lacy’s sief must have been given to him by William Rufus. Others he received with his wife in marriage. The number of English manors attached to the honour of Brecknock for which 12th-century evidence has survived is small, and

¹ Brec. Cart., p. 49; Walter del Mans’s grant was confirmed by Earl Roger (ibid., p. 77), and by Gilbert Foliot, bishop of Hereford (ibid., p. 37). For William de Weldebof’s grant, Balliol MS. 271, f.52v, no. 202.
² Heref. Domesd., p. 79.
³ DB, i, 184, 186v; VCH Heref., i, 329, 340; Heref. Domesd., pp. 41, 66; Fees, 805, 817; Brec. Cart., pp. 69, 70; and for the later history of the manor, FA, ii, p. 394. The Lacy moiety was later known, from the names of tenants, as Bodenham Furches and Bodenham Rogeri.
⁴ DB, i, 170v. For the relationship, Ordericus Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, bk. viii, ch. 2; cf. Lloyd, History of Wales, ii, 397, and n. 335.
⁶ This exchange is discussed below, p. 193.
those which have been discussed here probably do not represent the whole of Bernard’s English possessions. His lands passed to Miles of Gloucester, who inherited them ‘iure uxoris’ from the conqueror of Brecknock. Miles secured possession of these lands when Bernard, either through his own act or at death, gave up possession of his estates. They did not pass out of the hands of his successors but remained with his sons, and, after the death of Mahel of Hereford, passed to the Braiose family. Even when, in the 13th century after the fall of John’s erstwhile favourite William de Braiose, the honour of Brecknock was broken up, it was divided between the collateral descendants of Miles and remained in the hands of the families of Braiose, Bohun and fitz Herbert.

The second marriage which brought about an increase in the landed wealth of the family was the marriage of Roger, son of Miles of Gloucester, to Cecily, daughter and heiress of Payn fitz John, which took place some time before December 1137. A charter of Stephen issued in November or December of that year provides a ‘terminus ad quem’ for this marriage; the death of Payn in the spring of 1137 may limit the date more narrowly. That charter provides some indication of the estates which Roger acquired with his wife.¹ In it the king confirmed to Roger the agreement which Payn made with Roger when he gave his daughter to him. Unlike the marriage of Miles of Gloucester this later wedding was the result of a private arrangement. Payn and Miles were closely associated in local affairs and in royal administration in the west-midlands. The marriage between their children was arranged between them, and the agreement which Payn reached with his young son-in-law in 1137 was the formal statement of the agreement privately reached between himself and Miles of Gloucester. The marriage was not the result of an act of royal favour.

Stephen’s charter was issued after the death of Payn fitz John and it gave effect to provisions which Payn had made for the marriage. It was not an exhaustive statement of the lands which passed to Roger as a result of his marriage. Robert de Escotot granted a hide of land in Cupple (Heref.) to St. Guthlac’s, Hereford, when his nephew, Robert son of Wyger, whose land it was by hereditary right, became a monk there. Cupple is the Domesday Chipelai, which in 1086 was held by Roger de Lacy. Robert’s grant is known from two charters of confirmation issued by Cecily, daughter of Payn fitz John, and by Earl Roger, her husband. Cecily also confirmed to St. Guthlac’s a grant made by Earl Roger who had given the monks a piece of land near the church of St. Ewen, Hereford, which had formerly been part of the fee of Walter de Lacy, described as Cecily’s grandfather. In both cases lands which

¹ Round, Ancient Charters, p. 35, no. 21.
had earlier formed part of the Lacy fief were later in the control of Earl Roger and his wife, and the association of Cecily with her husband in these grants makes it clear that these lands had come to Earl Roger through his marriage. They were not gained by inheritance from Bernard of Neufmarché, and since Lacy lands were obtained in both ways the distinction here is of some importance. Neither of these parcels of land is mentioned in Stephen’s charter.¹

Payn fitz John’s possessions included a considerable part of the former Lacy fief in Herefordshire, if not elsewhere. His claims, which later passed to his son-in-law, conflicted with those which could still be put forward by the Lacs and with those which Gotso de Dinan also had to the Lacy inheritance.² Stephen’s charter drew the sharp distinction between the lands and knights’ fees of Cecily’s ‘maritagium’ and the right which Payn had to the whole honour of Hugh de Lacy. The king confirmed ‘omnem illud juris’ which Payn had in the whole honour of Hugh de Lacy as Payn gave and granted it to Roger with his daughter. The confusion of claims to the Lacy lands at this time suggests that ‘omnem illud juris’ here implied a claim to possession rather than the actual possession of the whole of the Lacy honour. But, at the same time, there is no doubt that Payn fitz John controlled a very considerable part of that honour in the last years of his life. Roger and his young wife were confirmed in their possession of lands which once belonged to the Lacs. In one section of the royal charter Cecily’s ‘maritagium’ was described as ‘all that marriage-portion which Payn gave to his daughter from the honour of Hugh de Lacy, in lands and knights’. Cecily was to receive the manors of Butterly and Aylton (Herf.) and 20 librates of land in Painswick (Gloc.). Painswick church had been granted to Llanthony Prima by Hugh de Lacy (I). His gift was confirmed by Cecily and by Earl Roger. Later, Cecily and her third husband, Walter de Mayence, issued a further confirmation of the gift.³

Cecily’s ‘maritagium’ was intended to carry the service of ten knights. William son of Herembald owed the service of two knights. Herembald of Edgeworth owed the service of one fee. Anfrid de Cuilardvile owed two knights. The fee held by Hugh Puher was to bear

¹ DB, i, 185; VCH, Heref., i, 334; Heref. Domesd., p. 52. The identification was made possible by a marginal annotation in Balliol MS. 350. For Cecily’s charter, Balliol MS. 271, f.78, no. 334; for Earl Roger’s, ibid., f.48v, no. 173. The limits of date, 1148–1155, are provided by the style of Earl Roger and the accession of Gilbert Foliot as bishop of Hereford. The earl’s grant of the land in Hereford is recorded, ibid., f.76v, no. 325.

² For Gotso de Dinan’s interest in the Lacy lands see the charter issued by King Stephen to the earl of Leicester granting him the shire of Hereford. (H. W. C. Davis, ‘Some Documents of the Anarchy’ in Essays... presented to R. L. Poole, p. 173; Eton, op. cit., iv, 201; v, 243–8. I have discussed this charter in Trans. B.G.A.S., vol. 77, pp. 78–96.

³ Llant. A v, i nos. 10, 11; xvi, no. 1. For Painswick see W. St. C. Baddeley, A Cotswold Manor being the History of Painswick (1929).
the service of two knights, if he owed that much; if not, these were to be provided from the remainder of the honour.¹ These arrangements were made before the death of Payn fitz John and Cecily’s ‘maritagium’ passed to the young couple immediately after their marriage. It was not until her father’s death that Cecily inherited all the lands which Payn had previously held. In 1166 Hugh de Lacy owed the service of over 50 knights. That Payn fitz John had been able to alienate approximately a fifth of these fees early in Stephen’s reign is an indication of the extent to which he had gained control over the Lacy lands. His widow, Sybil de Lacy, was intended to hold her estates of Roger and his wife, and there was some difficulty in securing her compliance with this arrangement.²

Payn fitz John and his wife issued charters (of which the texts have survived) relating to three manors, Ewias Lacy, Castle Frome and Holme Lacy. Payn confirmed the church of St. Cuthbert of Holme Lacy to the monks of St. Guthlac’s.³ Sybil granted land in Ewias to her uncle, Walter de Lacy, abbot of St. Peter’s Gloucester, and the monks of that house.⁴ She also granted to the monks of St. Guthlac’s a virgate of land in Little Frome (which is probably Castle Frome) (Heref.). The monks later effected an exchange of this land with Walter son of Hugh, an exchange which received the assent of Earl Roger. Sybil’s grant was confirmed by Herbert of Castle Holgate and his wife, Emma.⁵ Their interest in this manor is not made clear but their charter may have some bearing on the still unsolved problems of the Lacy pedigree which is notoriously obscure for this period.

The struggle for the possession of the Lacy lands continued through the reign of Stephen. Eventually success lay with the Lacs, for by 1166, as his ‘carta’ indicates, Hugh de Lacy had made good his claims to many, if not all, of the Lacy manors. In an earlier decade Roger, earl of Hereford, was actively engaged to establish beyond question his own claims to the Lacy inheritance. To accomplish this he used all the resources at his command. The quarrel between the two families is not well recorded, but it is abundantly clear that the Lacy lands were the prize for which Earl Roger fought and that, in a group of conflicting claims, his own were strong, though not unassailable.

Payn fitz John’s possessions did not consist only of the Lacy’s lands. His daughter carried to her later husbands a considerable endowment

¹ Round, loc. cit.; et feodum Hugonis Puher’ de ii militia si eos debet; si non ad perficiendum de remanenti honore.
² RBE, i, 281; Round, op. cit., p. 38, no. 22.
⁵ These charters occur in Balliol MS. 271, f.51v, no. 194; f. 52, nos. 196, 198. For the identification see Heref. Domesd., p. 98.
THE ‘HONOURS’ OF THE EARLS OF HEREFORD

which provided the service of 29 knights’ fees. After Earl Roger’s death she married William of Poitou, and later, Walter de Mayence (de Meduana), who returned a ‘carta’ in 1166. His fief then consisted of 20 fees of old enfeoffment and nine of new. The ‘honour of Walter of Mayence’ paid scutage on 20 fees during the latter part of the 12th century. Cecily, as countess of Hereford, was accounting for scutage from it until 1202. A late reference to a suit of Warin de Montchesney makes it clear that in 1166 Walter of Mayence had held his honour ‘iure uxoris’. In his ‘carta’ Walter of Mayence stated that the 20 fees of old enfeoffment which he then held had been held by Geoffrey Talbot in the time of Henry I. The inheritance which the Countess Cecily retained permanently was not, therefore, made up of Lacy lands. Her father had acquired a considerable fief during the reign of Henry I and this formed the honour which she took to her later husbands. The Lacy victory appears to have been complete.

Although from various sources a great deal of information about the Lacy fief can be gathered together, very little material can be found to illustrate the terms of Stephen’s charter to Roger, son of Miles. Archenfield, which was named, had been given to Payn fitz John by Stephen in exchange for Lantilio and the farm of Grosmont (Mon.) to which pertained the wood of Orcop (Heref.) and land in Trawarn. The farm of Grosmont and of Lantilio was rendered by the sheriff of Herefordshire after 1162. A payment of 5s was made annually for the wood of Orcop by Walter de Bascherville between 1168 and 1172, and by Robert de Bascherville between 1173 and 1176. From 1177 the sheriff of Herefordshire was made responsible for this payment.

Something further can be said about the manor of Dilwyn (Heref.), which was held in two moieties in 1086. William de Scohies then held 1 hide and Ilbert fitz Turold held 2 hides. In Stephen’s charter the distinction between these two parts of Dilwyn is maintained. One part was then held by Geoffrey Ruffus and R. de Merla. The other was said, in ambiguous terms, to be that of Nicholas son of William, but this need not be taken to mean that Nicholas still held this moiety in 1137. A Geoffrey Ruffus witnesses charters of Hugh de Lacy in the middle decades of the 12th century and his tenure of Dilwyn suggests that this

---

1 RBE, i, 195-6.
2 Ibid., i, 79; PR 4 John, p. 212.
3 F. W. Maitland, Bracton’s Notebook, ii, 517-19. See also Round, Rotuli de Dominabus et Pueris et Puellis . . ., PRS, xxxv, 50, n. 3.
4 PR 8 Henry II, p. 58.
6 DB, i, 180; VCH Heref., i, 315; Heref. Domesd., pp. 13, 14.
7 ‘et Dilun de Nicholaio filio Willelmi’ is the phrase used to describe this land. Nicholas may have been the son of the Domesday tenant. R. de Merla is has not been identified.
manor may have been part of the Lacy lands held by Payn fitz John. Balliol MS. 350 has marginal annotations which show that c. 1160–1170 both these moieties were in the hands of one, Sorel, who is not otherwise identified. The similarity between the two nick-names suggests that this later tenant of Dilwyn may be Geoffrey Ruffus or his successor.¹

There are, finally, the manors which the Gloucester family held as sub-tenants of ecclesiastical and lay magnates, few of which are without some interest. Those which were held by Durand and Walter of Gloucester in 1086 have already been noted.² From Reinelm, bishop of Hereford, Walter of Gloucester received the manors of Ullingswick and Little Hereford (Heref.). For these he owed the bishop the service of two knights. Ullingswick passed to the fitz Pons family when it was given by Walter of Gloucester with his daughter, Maud, in marriage. Little Hereford he gave to his nephew, William de Mara, a prominent baron of the earls of Hereford. To Little Hereford he attached the full service of the two knights due to the bishop.³ In 1166 the bishop complained that Margaret de Bohun (like Hugh de Lacy) would not acknowledge the full extent of her service to his see. He claimed the service of two and a half fees of which she denied him half a fee. This half fee presumably represents the service due for the land which she then held in the bishop’s manor of Prestbury (Glouc.)⁴ A small but useful tenement was acquired by Miles of Gloucester between 1135 and 1139. He was given the lands which the bishop of Exeter held in Gloucester. This grant was made by Robert Chichester, bishop of Exeter and was confirmed by Stephen. Miles and his heirs found this tenement particularly useful after he had embraced the Angevin cause in 1139, for it was used to provide for an Angevin supporter who had lost his possessions in Winchester. A further grant which should probably be associated with this is the grant by the same bishop of the church of St. Mary Crypt, Gloucester, to Roger de Tockenham, a cleric who was a prominent member of the Gloucester family’s honorial administration.⁵

Two manors which the Gloucester family held of lay magnates are of some interest. Bisley (Glouc.) was held by Miles of Gloucester, and

¹ Heref. Domest., pp. 13, 14, 86. Tait suggested that these portions of Dilwyn formed the quarter of a knight’s fee held by Robert le Rus of the honour of Weobley in 1243. (Ibid., p. 86, and see Fees, p. 800.)
² See above, p. 176.
³ For these manors see Round, Ancient Charters, pp. 19–22, nos. 11 and 12. Round held that this charter referred to Reinelm, bishop of Hereford. The editors of the Regesta, ii, prefer to assign it to the first half of 1121 (c. 10 April) and consider that it refers to Richard, bishop of Hereford. There are no firm grounds for this change which the editors suggested without great confidence. (Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, ii, 159, no. 1268.)
⁴ RBE, i, 279.
later by Humphrey de Bohun, as tenants of the earls of Chester. Their
tenure in that manor produced two charters of particular interest. The
first was a writ from Rannulf, earl of Chester, addressed to his vassals
in Bisley, and instructing them to perform their services to Miles the
Constable. The second was a charter confirming the fee to Humphrey
de Bohun issued c. 1170 by Hugh, earl of Chester.¹ Hempstead (Glouc.)
was held of the earls of Warwick and here there was a clash of interests,
for the manor was alienated to Llanthony Secunda and the claims
which the earls of Warwick could make long remained a burden to
the canons.²

Between July 1141, and December 1142, Miles of Gloucester
acquired the honour of Abergavenny. It was granted to him by Brian
fitz Count and the Empress issued a charter sanctioning the arrange-
ment made between Miles and Brian fitz Count and his wife, Matilda
of Wallingford. By this arrangement Miles gained a marcher lordship
which bordered his lordship of Brecknock and so extended his influence
in South Wales. So far as I am aware there is no evidence to suggest that
the lordship of Abergavenny included estates in English manors.³

The Gloucester family built up its landed possessions over a long
period of time. The basis of their honour in England had already been
provided before the Domesday Survey was made. In the first half of the
12th century the family increased its wealth through direct royal grants
and through advantageous marriages. In 1086 the centre of the family’s
interest as landholders lay in Gloucestershire. Their interest extended
into the neighbouring shires of Herefordshire and Wiltshire, and, more
remotely, into Hampshire. By 1155 Herefordshire had become the
centre of Earl Roger’s lands. To the south, in Gloucestershire, lay much
of his patrimony and the manors granted to his predecessors by Henry I
and Matilda. In the west lay his marcher lordships of Brecknock and
Abergavenny. In Herefordshire itself lay the lands of Payn fitz John,
consisting principally of lands of the Lacy inheritance. Round sought an
explanation for the choice of Hereford as the title of Miles’s earldom
when he was created an earl in 1141. He claimed that where an earl
could not take the title of the county in which his greatest territorial
strength lay, he took the nearest vacant county. The earldom of
Gloucester had already been created; Miles therefore took Hereford in
1141.⁴ This view does not accord with the changes which had taken
place in the distribution of Miles’s territorial possessions since 1121.

¹ F. M. Stenton, _The First Century of English Feudalism_, p. 20; the writ and the charter are printed
ibid., p. 257, Appendix nos. 1 and 2. See also, W. Farrer, _Honours and Knights Fees_, ii, 51.
² See my paper on ‘Hospitium: a feudal service of hospitality’, _Trans. BGAS_, vol. 76.
By 1141 Miles and his eldest son held great possessions in and around Herefordshire; Roger, as heir of Payn fitz John, might make good his claims to the great estates of the Lacys. The choice of Hereford for his title in 1141 was a recognition of the extension which had taken place in the Gloucester family’s territorial wealth. In fact the immediate future did not justify the choice. Earl Roger died without a son to maintain his claims to the Lacy inheritance and Payn fitz John’s lands passed out of the control of the Gloucester family. Earl Roger also died in political disfavour. Henry II withdrew from his heirs the rich manors which had been granted to Earl Miles in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire as ‘terre date’. When, in 1165, Mahel of Hereford died, his Welsh and English lands were separated and the place formerly held by the family’s Herefordshire estates ceased to have any geographical significance. The wheel had turned full circle and Gloucestershire was once more the principal area in which the English lands of the family lay. The English manors which passed to Margaret de Bohun and her heirs represented approximately the English lands held by Miles of Gloucester before the death of Henry I.

IV

The last surviving son of Earl Miles, Mahel of Hereford, died in 1165, and his possessions were eventually divided between his three sisters, Margaret de Bohun, Bertha de Braiose and Lucy, wife of Herbert fitz Herbert. This division was not completed until the last years of the 12th century. The method by which it was made is indicated chiefly by the surviving charter evidence. Apart from the interest which is attached to it for its own sake, an analysis of the division of this inheritance has a direct bearing upon an important feature of the earldom of Hereford, for through it can be approached the problem of the knight service which was available from the lands held by Earl Miles.

This division was not made evenly. Bertha, wife of William de Braiose, took as her share her brother’s Welsh lands, the lordships of Brecknock and Abergavenny. These formed compact units which were valuable acquisitions on the Welsh marches. Bertha and her husband were not completely excluded from the division of the English manors belonging to her family. Her sisters, the Bohun and fitz Herbert co-heiresses, took their shares from these English possessions. Margaret de Bohun held these English manors in 1165¹ and she was then, in fact, in possession of all the lands which should have been divided between

¹ Her tenure by that date is established by Llant. A 1, I no. 24.
herself and her sister Lucy. It was not until the reign of Richard that Herbert fitz Herbert took active steps to secure his wife's share of her family inheritance. Even then he was only partly successful.

The Welsh lands of the earls of Hereford added valuable lordships to the possessions of the Braiose family in the southern marches of Wales. By the early years of the 13th century these lordships, together with those of Radnor, Builth and Gower, formed the most formidable nexus of marcher lordships in South Wales. The Braiose tenure of the Welsh lands of the honour of Brecknock is well attested. Charters issued by members of the Braiose family to Brecon priory offer the clearest evidence for this tenure and for an active interest in the affairs of the lordship. For Abergavenny the evidence is much slighter. William de Braiose confirmed to the monks of Abergavenny priory the grants of his predecessors, Hamelin de Ballon, Brian fitz Count, and Walter and Henry of Hereford.¹

That the English manors of the lordship of Brecknock were also held by the Braiose co-heiress and her successors is made clear by the descents of a group of Herefordshire manors. For Brinsop, Humber, Gattertop, and part of Bodenham (Bodenham Devereux) a continuous connection with the honour of Brecknock can be established.² In one instance, that of Glasbury, the connection and its continuity can be illustrated from 12th-century evidence. In 1144 Walter of Clifford and Gilbert Foliot, then abbot of Gloucester, arranged an exchange of lands involving the manors of Eastleach Martin (Glouc.) and Glasbury. Glasbury had formed part of the lands of Bernard of Neusmarché who before 1104, granted the manor and its church, dedicated to St. Cynidr, to St. Peter's, Gloucester.³ His grant was confirmed by Earl Miles and by Earl Roger. In 1144 Gilbert Foliot exchanged this manor for Walter of Clifford’s manor of Eastleach Martin.⁴ The

¹ Round, Ancient Charters, p. 43, no. 26; See G. E. Cokayne, Complete Peerage (New ed., ed. by V. Gibbs and others), i, 21, and Monasticon (New ed.), iv, 616. This indirect evidence is the only indication that Walter and Henry of Hereford held the honour of Abergavenny. For the earlier lords of this honour, see Round, The Family of Ballon and the Conquest of South Wales, Studies in Peerage and Family History, pp. 181–215.
² For these manors see above p. 184. See also, Fees, pp. 800, 813; EA, ii, 382, 383, 384, 399.
³ Gloucester Abridged, i, 314, no. 281; and see the list of donations (ibid., p. 80) in which the grant is ascribed to the year 1088. This exact date cannot be substantiated, but the list also ascribes the grant to the abbacy of Abbot Serlo. Where this method of dating can be checked in the list it is usually found to be reliable. The death of Abbot Serlo in 1104 provides a limiting date for this grant.
⁴ Ibid., i, 315, nos. 284, 285. Eastleach Martin had earlier been granted by Richard fitz Pons to his wife, Matilda, 'in matrimonium', in exchange for Ullingswick (Heref.), which she held by grant of her father, Walter of Gloucester. Ullingswick was given by Richard fitz Pons to Elias Giffard, who married his daughter, Bertha. The charter recording both the exchange and the new grant of Ullingswick to Elias Giffard was issued before 1129. (Round, Ancient Charters, p. 20, no. 12.) Richard fitz Pons had earlier given the church of Eastleach Martin to Malvern priory. (Warner and Ellis, Fascimiles of Royal and Other Charters in the British Museum, no. 10.) By 1144 Walter of Clifford had regained the right to alienate this manor, though he did not then hold it as a tenant-in-chief, as Richard fitz Pons had formerly done.
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Details of this exchange were recorded in a series of charters issued to St. Peter's. A charter of Walter of Clifford provides the basis for a reconstruction of the exchange.\(^1\) Glasbury, formerly the abbey’s manor, was to stand in the place of Eastleach in the possession of Walter of Clifford, ‘in ius ac dominium meum sitque de cetero seculari servitio et conditione subiecta’. In the same way Eastleach was to stand in the place of Glasbury in the possession of the abbey, ‘in ecclesiastica pensione et elemosina et ius atque dominium ecclesie sancti Petri Gloucestrie’. The church of Glasbury was to remain in the possession of St. Peter’s, and that of Eastleach in the possession of the monks of Malvern. The whole arrangement was made in the presence of and with the approval of Roger, earl of Hereford, and his brother, Walter. A second charter in the form of an agreement issued impersonally adds valuable details. The abbot granted Glasbury to Walter of Clifford to be held of Roger de Tosny.\(^2\) Eastleach was to be held by St. Peter’s of Earl Roger ‘ipsius ecclesie beati Petri aduocatus’. Walter of Clifford undertook to secure the assent of Roger de Tosny, to be confirmed by his charter, so that the monks would not suffer any loss ‘uel pecunie uel laboris’. Both the abbot and Walter of Clifford took oaths to uphold this agreement to Earl Roger who placed himself in pledge for them.\(^3\) Both these charters are dated 1144. Roger de Tosny and Roger, earl of Hereford, issued charters confirming the exchange. Earl Roger’s was, presumably, issued on the occasion of this exchange, while Roger de Tosny’s was obtained somewhat later. The earl’s charter added the specific information that Walter of Clifford was to do for Glasbury the services which he had previously performed for Eastleach. A confirmation of this transaction was also issued by Stephen, of which the original survives. The series of charters is completed by a later confirmation issued by Walter son of Walter of Clifford, who then held Eastleach of the heirs of Earl Roger ‘sibi inuicem succedentibus’.\(^4\)

The exchange of these two manors involved the transfer of the secular services due for Eastleach Martin to Glasbury and of the spiritual services due for Glasbury to Eastleach. The interests of the tenants and of their overlords were safeguarded. Earl Roger’s interest

\(^1\) *Glouc. Cart.*, i, 312, no. 278. In addition to the manor of Glasbury the abbot undertook to provide also 40 marks for Eastleach.


\(^3\) There is a shorter version of this charter which is textually similar for those parts which are common to both versions. (*Glouc. Cart.*, ii, 246, no. 819.) Four important elements are omitted: (i) that Eastleach should be held of Earl Roger; (ii) that Glasbury should be held of Roger de Tosny; (iii) that the earl had approved the agreement; and (iv) that Walter of Clifford was to secure the assent of Roger de Tosny. It may be that this represents an early draft of the agreement which was later expanded. The appearance of Roger de Tosny in this exchange is a feature so far unexplained.

\(^4\) *Glouc. Cart.*, i, 311-14, nos. 276, 277, 279, 280. The original of Stephen’s charter is preserved at Gloucester Cathedral: Gloucester Cathedral Charters (Deeds and Seals), iv, no. 12.
seems to have arisen, not from his position as advocate of St. Peter's, but from the claims which he could make on Glasbury as the heir to Bernard of Neufmarché. It is by no means unusual to find the heirs of a donor of land to a religious house taking some part in a future transaction concerning that land. For example Hugh de Lacy (II) refused to allow the monks of St. Guthlac’s, Hereford, to grant the church of Holme Lacy (Heref.) to Ralph the archdeacon of Hereford. The monks had already made this grant which was challenged and overthrown by Hugh.¹

The Gloucester family had a castle at Glasbury. It was held by the Cliffords of the honour of Brecknock. William de Braiose, the nephew of Earl Roger, issued a charter in which he spoke of the tenements, old and new, which Walter of Clifford had received from Earl Roger. For these he owed the service of five knights who performed castle-guard at Brecon castle. The castle of Glasbury was held by Walter of Clifford for an annual render of a sore sparrow hawk each year. William de Braiose retained for himself judgment in matters affecting life and limb over all the men of the castle and of the land which pertained to the abbey of Gloucester there.²

The English manors of the honour of Brecknock were still considered to be an integral part of that honour when the division of the estates of the earldom of Hereford was made. William de Braiose made good a claim on behalf of his wife to the whole of that honour and there is clear evidence of the activities of the Braiose family in the English as well as in the Welsh lands of the honour of Brecknock.

There is also some indication that the Braiose co-heiress received lands in England which had not previously been associated with the honour of Brecknock and which were subsequently incorporated into it. In 1086 Durand the sheriff held Weston, later Weston Bret (Heref.). In the 13th century Matthew le Bret, whose family name was attached to the manor, held Weston of Roger Pichard, who held it of the honour of Brecknock.³ In 1243 it was a quarter of a knight’s fee. This manor cannot be considered an integral part of the honour of Brecknock in the first half of the 12th century. It was acquired by the Braiose co-heiress, and thereafter added to Brecknock.

It is not possible to establish clearly the date at which William de Braiose and his wife entered into possession of their inheritance. In

¹ Balliol MS. 271, f.53v, no. 209; f.54, no. 211. For the history of the ‘advocatus’ in France see F. Senn, L’Institution de Avouries Ecclesiastiques en France (Paris, 1903), and, for a particular order in England, see H. M. Colvin, The White Canons in England, pp. 291–306.
² PRO, Duchy of Lancaster, Ancient Charters, series L.S. 27/1.
³ DB, i, 186v; VCH Heref., i, 339; Heref. Domesd., pp. 62, 117; Fees, pp. 801, 814. It is also possible that the Domesday Calcheberge is a similar case. (Heref. Domesd., pp. 63, 117.)
view of the difficulties which arose later in the 12th century over the
fitz Herbert claims this is an important point and the lack of definite
information is the more regrettable. There is, however, nothing to
suggest that William de Braiose experienced any difficulty in establish-
ing his claims to these lands or that he did not enter into possession of
them immediately after the death of Mahel of Hereford. In his own
charter of confirmation to Brecon priory William named as his predeces-
sors, Bernard of Neufmarché, Earl Miles, Earl Roger, Walter, Henry
and Mahel of Hereford.¹ In episcopal confirmations issued to Brecon
where, as in that issued by Peter de Leia, bishop of Hereford, between
1176 and 1198, the benefactors of Brecon are named, the order is the
same; William de Braiose is named immediately after the sons of Earl
Miles. The same is true of William de Braiose’s confirmation to the
monks of Abergavenny.² There is no suggestion that any other
member of the Gloucester family claimed or held these lands.

While Bertha and her husband took these Welsh lands, her sisters
should have shared the remaining English estates of the family. Thirty
years were to pass before the division of their estates was accomplished
and it was not then made equitably. Charters shed some light on the
way in which their estates were shared. The date of the division and
the circumstances in which it took place can be determined by refer-
ence to Pipe Rolls and to the feodaries. These records show that Margaret
de Bohun retained in her own hands the lands which should have been
shared with the fitz Herberths.

When the division was made some individual manors were
divided between the two co-heiresses and in some cases Margaret de
Boahun retained a larger share of the manor. These aspects of the
division can be illustrated most clearly from the descents of a group of
Gloucestershire manors, Qedgeley, South Cerney, Hareshfield, and
Southam (in Bishop’s Cleeve). With these should be associated
Barnsley (Glouc.) and Chirton (Wilts.).

In the middle years of the 12th century the history of the manors
of Qedgeley and South Cerney was closely connected and they can,
conveniently, be considered together. For Qedgeley we are dependent
on charter evidence; there is no information about this manor in the
feodaries. Walter of Gloucester granted to St. Owen’s, Gloucester, the
chapel of Qedgeley, with all his tithes and the tithes of his villeins.
His grant was confirmed to Llantony Secunda when the possessions of
St. Owen’s were absorbed into the endowment of that foundation by
Miles of Gloucester. To this grant Miles added the tithes of fishing in

¹ Brev. Cart., p. 84.
² Ibid., p. 65; Monasticon (new ed.), iv, 616.
the fish pools of the manor and in the moats around the castle of Quedegeley. It is particularly interesting to find that Miles had a private castle some two miles to the south of the royal stronghold at Gloucester which was in his keeping. The strength of the Empress in the west did not depend solely upon the royal castles which she commanded. Margaret de Bohun made a number of grants in Quedegeley. She gave all the land she held there to Llanthony Secunda in fulfilment of promises of 300 solidates of land made by her brothers, Roger and Walter. In the last two years of Henry II's reign Margaret arranged an exchange of lands with the canons, regaining possession of Quedegeley and handing over in exchange her land in South Cerney. But before many years had passed the canons had once again received the manor of Quedegeley, for, in anticipation of her death, Margaret de Bohun assigned her body for burial at Llanthony Secunda and gave the canons all her land in Quedegeley. This she defined as the two parts of the manor which remained to her after the division of the manor between herself and her sister Lucy. Lucy also assigned her body for burial and gave the canons the remaining third of Quedegeley. Her grant was confirmed by her son Peter fitz Herbert. The two parts of Quedegeley were recognized to have come from different donors when, in 1239, they were cleared of claims made upon them by Giles de Berkeley.

Although the Bohun portion of Quedegeley passed to Llanthony Secunda the family did not give up all claims over the manor, for in 1236 Humphrey de Bohun impleaded the prior. The settlement of their plea was drawn up in a final concord before the justices itinerant at Gloucester. Humphrey claimed that the prior had taken and tried thieves on his fee of Quedegeley to the detriment of his liberties there. It was recognized that Quedegeley was the prior's manor and it was agreed that the prior's bailiffs should arrest thieves there. But they were then to be handed over for trial at the earl's court at Hareshfield. If they were found guilty their chattels were to go to the earl. In return Humphrey de Bohun quitted the prior and his men of their service of suit of court at the earl's hundred court at Hareshfield.

---

1 Llant. A 1, I nos. 1, 3. Both grants were confirmed by Earl Roger and by Walter of Hereford. (Ibid., I, nos. 5, 12.)
2 On what follows see my note, 'A Letter from the Holy Land', English Historical Review, lxxii, 662.
3 The charters effecting this grant and exchange are Llant. A 1, I nos. 18, 25-7.
4 Ibid., I nos. 20, 22, 48.
6 Feet of Fines, C.P. 25 (1/73/10/160.)
distinction between the two courts seems to be deliberately made and is worth more than a passing reference.

Quedgeley, then, was eventually divided between the Bohuns and the fitz Herberts and Margaret de Bohun then retained the larger part of the manor. The earlier grants which she made in Qudgeley illustrate the complete control which she enjoyed there. This is merely one example of the control which she exercised over all the lands which should have been divided between herself and her sister. Her later recovery of this manor and her second grant of lands there to Llanthony Secunda form a curious feature in the history of the manor. Her own later grant and that made by Lucy fitz Herbert provide evidence of the way in which the sisters eventually divided the manor. Even after the canons had received the whole manor the Bohun earls of Hereford enjoyed rights of jurisdiction over Qudgeley which they were not prepared to renounce.¹

South Cerney was held in 1086 by Walter of Gloucester; it was then assessed at 14 hides. The manor was claimed by the abbey of Abingdon, but the whole shire attested that it had been held for ten years by Archbishop Stigand. William fitz Osbern, styled William the earl, had granted the manor to Roger the sheriff, the father of Walter. Walter himself gave two parts of the tithes of South Cerney to St. Owen’s, Gloucester. His grant was confirmed to Llanthony Secunda by Miles of Gloucester, Earl Roger, and Walter of Hereford.² Walter of Gloucester also granted to St. Peter’s, Gloucester, the church of South Cerney, a grant confirmed by Henry of Hereford, and by Simon, bishop of Worcester.³ Walter of Hereford confirmed to the church of South Cerney the grant of 5 solidates of land made by Miles of Gloucester and by Earl Roger.⁴ South Cerney was the site of a castle, apparently built by Miles,⁵ and these grants emphasize the personal interest which Miles of Gloucester and his heirs had in this manor.

Before the date of the exchange of South Cerney for Qudgeley Margaret de Bohun made a number of grants there. She granted the tithes of hay of her manors of Cirencester, Chirton (Wilts.) and South Cerney to Llanthony Secunda, asserting that these had never before been granted to any church.⁶ She also granted to Farleigh 1 virgate

¹ The canons of Llanthony also secured a further part of Qudgeley, as part of the appurtenances of the chapel of that place, from the Parvus family, sub-tenants of the earls of Hereford.
² DB, i, 169; Llant. A 1, I nos. 1, 3, 5, 12.
³ Glouc. Cart., i, 246-7, nos. 167, 168, 170. The bishop’s charter mentions a confirmation by Miles of Gloucester, the text of which does not appear to have survived.
⁴ Ibid., i, 246, no. 169.
⁶ Llant. A 1, I no. 32.
of land in South Cerney with 4 acres of land in *Treia* in return for which John, prior of Farleigh, quitclaimed any right he had in the church of Chirton through a gift made by Humphrey de Bohun, her husband. Reginald fitz Peter, grandson of Lucy fitz Herbert, later quitclaimed to Llanthony Secunda any claim he had against the canons, including claims in respect of the church of South Cerney.¹

The descent of the manor can be traced in the feodaries. In 1166 William Torel held one quarter of a knight’s fee of Margaret de Bohun in South Cerney, while the William of Cerney who also held land of Margaret in that year may have held it in the manor from which he took his name. In 1235–1236 Peter fitz Herbert paid aid on the three fees he held in Duntisbourne Rous, South Cerney, Park End (in Haresfield) and Upton (in Tetbury). Later in the 13th century the family of Sancto Amando held land there of the earls of Hereford. Their holding was noticed in 1248, 1285, 1303, 1310, and 1316.² In this instance the charter evidence emphasizes Margaret de Bohun’s connection with South Cerney, while the feodaries indicate that the manor was ultimately divided.

Haresfield (Glouc.) was also divided between the two sisters. Part of the manor, Park End, was held in 1235–1236 by Peter fitz Herbert. In 1303, when it was held by John fitz Reginald, Park End was said to render the service of half a knight’s fee. In 1316 the lordship of Haresfield was divided between the prior of Llanthony Secunda, John de Bohun and Herbert fitz John.³ The church of Haresfield was given to Llanthony Secunda by Henry of Hereford whose gift was confirmed by Mahel of Hereford, Margaret de Bohun and Roger, bishop of Worcester (1164–1179).⁴ The proportion in which the manor was shared is not known, but Margaret de Bohun appears to have retained the greater part of it. Her share was sufficiently large to make this manor an administrative centre of the lands which she held. In the 13th century the earls of Hereford controlled the hundred court of Whitston hundred which met at Haresfield, and there, too, they held their honorial court. In 1211–1212 it was used to describe the barony of Henry de Bohun, made up of lands from the Gloucester inheritance.⁵

The Wiltshire manor of Chirton was also divided between the Bohuns and the fitz Herberths. It was one of the manors held by Durand

¹ Ibid., I nos. 31, 48. This grant must have been made before Margaret gave Cerney to Lanthony in 1187. The church of Chirton she had already given them in 1167. (Ibid., I no. 28.) It was to be held for life by Reginald the archdeacon in return for an annual render of one bezant. (Ibid., I no. 33.)
² *RBE*, i, 294; *Feas*, p. 439; *FA*, ii, 242, 244.
³ *Feas*, p. 439; *FA*, ii, 267. John was succeeded by his son Herbert in 1303–1304. (Ibid., ii, 250, 258.)
⁴ Llant. A 1, I nos. 14, 16, 24 and, for the bishop’s charter, I no. 72.
⁵ *Feas*, p. 49.
the sheriff in 1086 and it passed to Walter of Gloucester and his heirs. Margaret de Bohun made a number of grants here to Llanthony Secunda, and Peter fitz Herbert also granted the canons a piece of land for collecting their tithes in this manor. In 1210 one third of Chirton was held by Lucy, mother of Peter fitz Herbert. In 1242–1243 Hugh de Mortimer held half a knights’ fee here of the earl of Hereford, and one twentieth of a fee of Peter fitz Herbert. The Templars also had a fee in Chirton given to them by Ralph de Raleg’ who held of John Marshal who was the tenant of the earl of Hereford. In 1242–1243, also, the prior of Llanthony held both lands and villeins in Chirton by gift of Luke de Grucy who held his lands of the earl of Hereford. The connection of the earls of Hereford with Chirton was recorded again in 1316; that of the fitz Herberts in 1324.

In Southam, part of Bishop’s Cleeve (Glouc.), a manor, assessed in 1086 at 6 hides, passed from Durand the sheriff to Walter of Gloucester and the canons of Llanthony Secunda acquired tithes and land there. Margaret de Bohun gave the canons land there in exchange for Blackmere (Hants.). An inquisition taken in 1298–1299 recorded that the earl of Hereford held Southam for the service of half a knight’s fee. In 1208–1209, within the bishop’s manor of Cleeve, Henry de Bohun, earl of Hereford, and Lucy, who had been the wife of Herbert fitz Herbert, held two knight’s fees in Southam and Brockhampton. The lands of this manor were thus divided between the two families, though in what proportion is not known.

In Barnsley (Glouc.) the two families had an interest but the connection between them here was of a different kind. In 1086 Durand the sheriff had held 3½ hides on the 21-hide manor of Bibury, held in chief by the bishop of Worcester. The feodaries show that the earls of Hereford continued to hold land here as tenants of the bishop. In 1208–1209 part of Barnsley was held by Henry de Bohun as one knight’s fee. In 1284–1285 it was held by Reginald de Pesy, the heir of Reginald fitz Peter, who held it of the earl of Hereford. The earl was again named as lord of this part of the manor in 1303.

There is some evidence which forms a link between the 11th and the 13th century records. Margaret de Bohun made some small grants

---

1 DB, i, 71v; VCH Wilts., ii, 147; Llant. A 1, I nos. 1, 3, 5, 12.
2 Ibid., I nos. 25–33, 48.
3 RBE, ii, 489.
4 Fees, pp. 710, 722, 729, 737; FA, v, 204, 218.
5 DB, i, 165; Llant. A 1, I nos. 1, 3. The grant was also confirmed by Earl Roger and Walter of Hereford. (Ibid., I nos. 5, 12.)
6 Ibid., I no. 23.
7 Cal. Inq. iii, 455, no. 522.
8 Fees, p. 39.
9 DB, i, 164v.
10 Fees, p. 39; FA, ii, 237, 247; and for the later tenure of the manor, pp. 256, 272, 280.
in Barnsley to Fulk de St. George, William de Stokes, and Philip the monk.\(^1\) The distinction between the different parts of Barnsley is reflected in the Pipe Roll for 1196, in which it is recorded that Herbert fitz Herbert’s portion of Barnsley owed half a mark for allowing the escape of John son of William.\(^2\) In this manor a sub-tenancy seems to have been created for the fitz Herberts who held an undefined portion of the manor of the earls of Hereford. The Bohuns continued to be tenants of the bishopric of Worcester and became the overlords of the fitz Herberts.

There is at least one case in which it is clear that a manor was held by the fitz Herberts alone. That is the manor of Colesbourne (Glouc.) which was held by Walter of Gloucester as a tenant of the church of Worcester in 1086. He granted to St. Owen’s, Gloucester, two parts of his tithes in the two courts (in duobus curiis) of Colesbourne. Miles of Gloucester confirmed this grant in more specific terms as two parts of the tithes of Colesbourne Sampsonis and of Elias le Holt of Colesbourne.\(^3\) The two moieties of Colesbourne were later in the possession of the Poer and Lohaund families. Peter fitz Herbert confirmed to Llanthony Secunda all the lands which the canons held in Colesbourne of the gift of Hawis de Watteville, a grant which had been confirmed by Roger le Poer.\(^4\) In 1284–1285 William le Poer and Walter Lohaund held Colesbourne for two knight’s fees of Reginald fitz Peter who held them of the bishop of Worcester. The Lohaund fee was recorded again in 1303, 1316 and 1346.\(^5\) The descent of the land formerly held by Elias le Holt is clearly defined; this section of the manor remained in the hands of one family throughout the 12th and 13th centuries. The Lohaund tenure of this manor is well attested from 1137 onwards, and it may be implied from the mention of the two courts of Colesbourne in Walter of Gloucester’s charter that their tenure took its origin in the late 11th century. Colesbourne Sampsonis can be identified with the second moiety of that manor recorded in the feodaries. Both moieties were later held of the fitz Herberts.

There is, on the other hand, a considerable body of evidence for manors which were associated solely with the Bohuns. The strength of the evidence varies. In some cases there is a combination of charter evidence with evidence from the feodaries, in others the descents are indicated in the feodaries alone. A third group, for which the evidence is much weaker, consists of manors for which there is only an occasional

---

\(^1\) Llant. A 1, I nos. 34–39.
\(^3\) DB, i, 164v; Llant. A 1, I nos. 1, 3. The grant was confirmed by Earl Roger and Walter of Hereford. (Ibid., I nos. 5, 12.)
\(^4\) Ibid., XII, no. 25.
\(^5\) FA, ii, 239, 247, 271, 280.
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reference in the feodaries to point to an association with one particular family.

Caldecote (Mon.) which appears to have passed to the Bohuns alone was probably the ‘caput’ of the lands of Margaret de Bohun. It was held by Durand the sheriff in 1086, when it formed part of the royal lands on the Welsh march described in the Gloucestershire section of the Survey. The castle of Caldecote was later held by Margaret de Bohun who granted the canons of Llanthony Secunda the place where her chaplain, Humphrey, who was also their ‘firmarius’, had his house and grange. The canons also held the church of Caldecote which had been given to them by Henry of Hereford, together with the advowson of the church which they received from Margaret de Bohun. In 1242–1243 it was recorded that Roger Pichard held Thruxtone (Heref.) for the service of a quarter of a knight’s fee of the earl of Hereford of the honour of Kaudicot. Caldecote was thus a name which could be used to identify part of the Bohun lands. Other names were used to describe their honour, which was sometimes known as the honour of Bohun or the honour of the earl of Hereford, names which are self-explanatory. But the honour of Caldecote seems to go back to an earlier period. Caldecote could be used to describe lands which the Bohuns obtained from the Gloucester inheritance. It may, I think, be presumed that it was used earlier to describe the honour of Miles of Gloucester in England. It then lay conveniently between his lands in Gloucestershire and his Welsh lordships. In the 13th century, after the Bohuns and fitz Herberts had come to an agreement about the division of the Gloucester inheritance, a different place-name, Haresfield (Glouc.), was associated with the barony held by Henry de Bohun and his heirs. The old ‘caput’ of the Gloucester honour was still held by the Bohuns but it was replaced by Haresfield. It may be that, as Caldecote was rather isolated from the main group of Margaret de Bohun’s manors, the administrative centre of the family’s lands was moved to Haresfield. The separation of the English and Welsh honours once held by Miles of Gloucester went far to destroy any convenience which Caldecote may once have had.

Four Wiltshire manors, Luckington, Seagry, Ashley and Lockeridge, all held by Durand the sheriff in 1086, were held by the Bohun earls of Hereford in 1242–1243. In 1279 the earl of Hereford was

---

1 DB, i, 162. See also, Heref. Domesd., p. 118.
2 Llant. A 1, l no. 41.
3 Ibid., I nos. 14, 40. Henry of Hereford’s grant was confirmed by Mahel of Hereford and Margaret de Bohun. (Ibid., I nos. 16, 24.)
5 Cf. Fees, p. 810.
6 Ibid., pp. 710, 711, 722, 723, 748; FA, v, 236.
said to hold Lockeridge for one knight's fee and his tenure was then associated with the office of constable which he held. Part of Lockeridge was given to the Templars between 1141 and 1143 by Earl Miles, who granted the 2 hides which he held there, together with the 'mansura' of his knight Richard de St. Quintin. The tithes of this land he reserved to the canons of Llanthony Secunda.

Three Herefordshire manors similarly associated with the Bohuns were Laysters, Little Hereford, and Thruxton. Laysters was held in two moieties in 1242–1243, one of the honour of Bohun, the other of the honour of Hereford. Little Hereford was part of the estates of the canons of Hereford in 1086 but before 1123 Walter of Gloucester had become the tenant of the bishop of Hereford in this manor. He settled it upon his son, Miles, and his daughter-in-law, Sybil, but he later exchanged it for the manor of Barnsley (Glouc.). Little Hereford he then granted to his nephew, William de Mara, for the service of two knights. The de la Mare family held this manor throughout the later middle ages. In the middle decades of the 12th century it was held by one, C. de Mara. The monks of Brecon received permission from William de Mara to extend their mill-pool of Berrington into his lands in Little Hereford. In 1242–1243 Reginald de la Mare held two fees there as the tenant of the earl of Hereford who was the bishop's tenant. The continued association of this family with the earls of Hereford in this manor was noted in 1303 and 1346, while there are further references to the de la Mare tenure in 1316 and 1428.

In Gloucestershire a Bohun tenure can be established in Westbury-on-Severn, Moreton Valence, and Whaddon. Westbury was held by Osbert of Westbury and his heirs, a family associated with Miles of Gloucester and his successors throughout the 12th century. Moreton Valence and Whaddon were said in 1246 to have been held by Robert de Pont de l'Arche of the earl of Hereford for the service of two and a quarter knight's fees. Both manors had been held by Durand the

---

1 Comes Herefordie tenet Lockerigge pro uno feodo de domino rege in capite pertin' ad constabularium suam. (Rot. Hund., ii, 269b; quoted in B. A. Lees, Records of the Templars in England in the Twelfth Century, p. cxxviii, no. 4.)
2 Lees, op. cit., p. 207. Richard of St. Quintin is said to have held ten fees of the earl of Hereford in 1166. (Ibid., p. 207, n. 16.) He then held ten fees of the earl of Gloucester, not of the earl of Hereford. (RBE, i, 288.) Part of Lockeridge was also given to the Templars by William de Beauchamp. (Lees, op. cit., pp. 53, 208.) In the inquest of the lands of the Templars taken in 1185 the men of Lockeridge complained that additional services had been imposed upon them after the manor had been transferred to the Templars.
3 Fees, p. 810. Both moieties were also associated with the earl of Hereford in 1249. (Ibid., p. 1483.)
4 DB, i, 182v; VCH Heref., i, 324; Heref. Domesd., p. 29; Brece. Cart., p. 48; Round, Ancient Charters, p. 19, no. 11.
5 Fees, pp. 810, 813; FA, i, 377, 385, 393, 413.
6 Cal. Ing., i, 18, no. 76.
sheriff in 1086. Both were later held by the Parvus family, which held its lands in Whaddon and Moreton Valence, and probably in Quedgeley, of the Gloucester family. The churches of Whaddon and Moreton formed a prebend in Hereford Cathedral. They were given to St. Ethelbert's by Roger Parvus when his brother, William the priest, became a canon. A contest which arose between Gilbert Foliot, bishop of Hereford, the cathedral church, and Hugh, son of Roger Parvus, was settled by a decision in favour of the cathedral by Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1176. The continued association of the Gloucester family with these manors is also demonstrated by charters issued before 1155. A series of charters issued by Roger Parvus, Hugh Parvus, and Roger, earl of Hereford, makes clear the tenurial connection between the two families in Whaddon. In 1303 Joan de Valence held land in Whaddon of the earl of Hereford.

For a small number of Gloucestershire manors there is some slight evidence bearing on this question of tenure. Elmore, was in the possession of Walter of Gloucester by 1095; tithes there were used to endow St. Owen's, Gloucester, and later Llanthony Secunda. It was held in 1303 by the family of Guise, as tenants of the earls of Hereford. Culkerton was held by Durand in 1086 and the tithes were later held by Llanthony Secunda. In 1303 the abbot of Kingswood held a quarter of a fee of the earl of Hereford there. The two religious houses later reached an agreement about their conflicting interests in this manor. For the manors of Ashbrook and Shipton Sollers the evidence is limited to a record of the tenure by Durand in 1086 and of a sub-tenancy held of the earl of Hereford in 1303.

This survey makes clear the extent to which the Domesday holding of the Gloucester family remained part of the landed endowment, not only of the earls of Hereford in the 12th century but also of the earls of the third, Bohun, creation. As far as the division of the Gloucester inheritance is concerned it does little more than indicate that a division

1 DB, i, 168v.
2 W. W. Capes, Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral, p. 12. This charter is now Hereford Cathedral Charter no. 722.
3 Ibid., p. 27. This is now H. C. C. no. 2770. Charters confirming this decision were issued by Hugh Parvus (Ibid., p. 28, now H. C. C. no. 2771), Roger bishop of Worcester, whose charter is dated 'anno verbi incarnati' 1176 (Ibid., p. 30, now H. C. C. no. 2773), and by Henry II (Ibid., p. 31, now H. C. C. no. 2772).
4 Glou. Cart., ii, 49–52, nos. 672–78.
5 FA, ii, 253.
6 Llant. A 1, i nos. 1, 3, 5, 12. Cf. FA, ii, 253, 265, 290. Section XXIV of volume A2 of the Llanthony Cartularies contains a number of charters relating to Elmore, including a number issued by the Guise family. Hubert de Burgh had an interest in Elmore. (Cf. Llant. A 1, II no. 43; and PRO, Feet of Fines, CP 25(1)/74/17/337, a fine levied in 32 Henry III.)
7 DB, i, 168v; and see Llant. A 1, i nos. 1, 3, 5, 12; VII no. 48; FA, ii, 248.
8 DB, i, 168v; FA, ii, 245, 248.
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took place between the Bohuns and the fitz Herberts. From the evidence so far discussed no indication of the date of this division can be gained, nor can any ordered pattern be made out. Manors held in chief were divided, and in two instances the manors were shared in the proportion of a third to the fitz Herberts and two thirds to the Bohuns. Lands held by the Gloucester family as sub-tenants were also shared but the expedient of a straightforward division of lands and obligations was not always adopted. In one case, at least, the fitz Herberts secured the whole of a manor. In a number of instances the Bohuns were in sole possession. The survey gives the impression that the division was disproportionate, and that when the division was made Margaret de Bohun and her heirs secured a large share of the family’s lands, but from the evidence so far cited it would be impossible to claim with certainty that Margaret de Bohun retained two thirds of her brother’s English manors and that Lucy fitz Herbert secured only a third, though there is at least an indication that this was the case.

Entries in the Pipe Rolls make it clear that these impressions are not merely accidental, as they might be, since so much of the charter evidence on which they are based is drawn from the records of a monastery in which Margaret de Bohun had a strong interest. In 1185 Herbert fitz Herbert’s lands were in the custody of Geoffrey fitz Peter who returned a detailed account for them to the Exchequer.¹ In 1191 it was noted that Herbert fitz Herbert owed £100 ‘that he might have justice done about his inheritance’.² In the same year he stood charged with a debt of 100 marks for the lands of his wife Lucy. This debt for his share of his wife’s inheritance he began to settle by small instalments in the same year. By Michaelmas, 1195, he had paid all but 77s 4d of it. That balance was noted annually and was finally cancelled at Michaelmas, 1201, after allowance had been made for a surplus credited to Herbert on his account for the two manors of Calstone Wellington and Stanton fitz Warin (Wilts.).³ By Michaelmas, 1193, he had incurred a second debt of 10 marks ‘to have his rightful portion against Margaret de Bohun (ut habeat legalem portionem suam uersus Margaretam de Bohun).⁴ This was, clearly, to secure a writ to initiate his action against Margaret de Bohun. In 1191, then, Herbert fitz Herbert was actively engaged, firstly to bring to trial the issue for which his lands had been forfeited, and, secondly, to obtain his wife’s share of the

¹ PR 31 Henry II, p. 239.
² PR 2 Richard I, p. 58.
³ Ibid., p. 121; PR 2 John, p. 188. A note was added to the appropriate entry on the roll for 1193. (PR 3 and 4 Richard I, p. 293.) When Herbert fitz Herbert accounted for these manors in 1194 the entry, which was later cancelled, recorded that they were held by his son Reginald. (PR 5 Richard I, p. 80.) The title to these two manors was challenged by Fulk fitz Warin. (F. W. Maitland, Curia Regis Rolls for Richard I, PRS, xiv, 106.)
⁴ PR 5 Richard I, p. 121.
Gloucester family’s inheritance. To secure the latter he had to pay a fine to the king, and to buy out a writ to obtain justice against Margaret. Neither the £100 which he owed to have justice about his inheritance, nor the 10 marks which he owed ‘ut habeat legalem portionem suam’ were paid. They were noted annually until 1204 and in that year the roll was marked to show that these debts were obsolete. In the following year they were omitted from the new roll.¹

Herbert did not obtain his wife’s inheritance without difficulty. The first surviving Curia Regis Roll from the reign of Richard I was ascribed by Maitland to 1194. It contains a brief record which must belong to the litigation brought about by his claims. Margaret de Bohun offered an essoin of sickness in a suit against Herbert fitz Herbert.² The dispute had been settled before her death in 1197. Indeed, by Michaelmas, 1196, part of Barnsley could be described as ‘pars Herberti filii Herberi in Berdesleya’. By 1199 Herbert was accounting for scutage from the lands in Gloucestershire which he had received from Margaret de Bohun.³

Thus the division of the inheritance of Mahel of Hereford between the Bohuns, Braiose and fitz Herbert co-heiresses was not made equitably. William de Braiose and his wife secured valuable new possessions in the southern marches of Wales. Margaret de Bohun retained in her own hands by far the greater part of the English lands of the Gloucester inheritance. Meanwhile the fitz Herberts apparently paid the price of weakness. It is not without significance that Herbert fitz Herbert made an attempt to recover these lands in the first years of the new reign, for it was under Richard that he was employed as sheriff and began, in the service of the crown, to obtain for himself and his successors an importance as a curial official similar to that which had been a source of advantage to his own ancestors, to the Gloucester family, and to the Bohuns.

V

So far the emphasis has been placed upon lands and the division of a territorial inheritance. There was also an attempt to divide the right to claim knight service, an attempt which illustrates more clearly the extent to which the Bohuns and fitz Herberts reached agreement and the disproportionate division of their inheritance. By considering this aspect of the division of the Gloucester inheritance we can approach

¹ PR 5 John, p. 59; and for this procedure, see also the editor’s introduction, p. xvii.
² F. W. Maitland, op. cit., p. 51.
³ PR 7 Richard I, p. 180; PR 1 John, p. 35.
the problem of the amount of knight service which Miles of Gloucester could call upon at the height of his power.

The clearest statement of the knight service which could be claimed by a member of the Gloucester family is to be found in the 'carta' returned in 1166 by Margaret de Bohun who then claimed the service of seventeen knights of old enfeoffment and three and three quarters of new enfeoffment.¹ In addition to the orthodox method she used a personal method of distinguishing between old and new enfeoffments. The first was described in terms of those who were enfeoffed in the time of Henry I on the fee of her father, Miles of Gloucester. The second was described in terms of those who were enfeoffed after the death of Henry I by her father and her brothers. Throughout the 12th century the Pipe Rolls record payments for scutage by Margaret de Bohun which were based consistently on an assessment of seventeen fees. The entries relating to the fitz Herbert family and their estates also remained stable until the end of the 12th century, when, significantly a small number of entries are found which must be ascribed to their tenure of lands formerly held by the Gloucester family. At Michaelmas, 1199, Herbert fitz Herbert accounted for 6 marks for scutage in Gloucestershire.² At Michaelmas, 1208, he was responsible for 56s, an odd figure which cannot be related with any assessment of the knight service which he could claim.³ Six marks in 1199 represents three fees, a figure which acquires a sharper significance when it is considered in relation to the record that in 1235–1236 Herbert fitz Peter owed the service of three knights for land which he held in a number of Gloucestershire manors.⁴ In 1211–1212 the earl of Hereford held fourteen and a half fees in Haresfield.⁵ The two figures produce a total very close to the service of old enfeoffment which Margaret de Bohun claimed in 1166. That close approximation offers one standard for measuring the proportion in which the Gloucester family’s lands were divided between the two co-heiresses.

However, in 1211 a different figure was given in the Pipe Roll. It was then recorded that Henry, earl of Hereford, accounted for the balance due for the scutage of Wales from his seventeen fees. Part of the balance was allowed in pardon to Peter fitz Herbert ‘who has a

¹ RBE, i, 293; T. Hearne, Liber Niger Scaccarii (London, 1771), i, 167.
² PR i John, p. 35. The list of scutages from this roll is reproduced in the Red Book of the Exchequer (i, 130) where Herbert is said to be responsible for 7 marks.
³ PR 5 John, p. 64. In 1202, 1204 and 1206 Peter fitz Herbert was included amongst those who had received quittance by writ in Gloucestershire. (PR 4 John, p. 180; PR 6 John, p. 152; PR 8 John, p. 16.)
⁴ Fees, p. 439. The manors were Duntisbourne Rous, South Cerney, Park End (in Haresfield) and Upton (in Tetbury).
⁵ Ibid., p. 49.
third part of those fees'. Here is a figure which, while favouring the Bohuns, represents a division more acceptable to the fitz Herberts, even though it was not all that they might have desired. Both figures were used for practical purposes and, presumably, had some relation to the actual situation at some time. The apparent advance from the three fees of 1199 to the third of seventeen fees in 1211 suggests a process by which a claim recognized in theory was gradually enforced in practice. The Pipe Roll for 1211 emphasizes that whatever agreement might have been reached between the Bohuns and fitz Herberts, the seventeen fees once held by Margaret de Bohun were still associated primarily with the Bohuns. The interest of the fitz Herberts was an intrusion to be taken into consideration only when some special circumstance made it necessary.

At some point in the negotiations an attempt was apparently made to secure an equal division between the two sisters. A document described as a ‘duissio inter dominam Margaretam de Buhun et inter dominum Hereberdorum [sic]’, now much damaged, set out in two equal sections the distribution of eighteen knights fees held by Margaret de Bohun. These were not all on estates held in chief, nor do the figures equate exactly with the statement of fees held by individual families, such as the Pichard and Parvus families, in Margaret de Bohun’s ‘carta’ of 1166. Unfortunately the document is damaged between the two lists and the second part now begins with an incomplete sentence. It adds little to our knowledge of the dispute but it seems probable that it may have been drawn up in the course of the litigation which secured for the fitz Herberts part of the Gloucester inheritance. It points to an attempt, or perhaps, only an ambition, on the part of the fitz Herberts, to divide the knight service of the old Gloucester lands into two equal parts. It may, perhaps, be a memorandum containing a suggested basis for such a division.

This attempt did not succeed. The fitz Herberts had to be satisfied with less than half the knight service once claimed by Mahel of Hereford. By 1211 it was recognized that they might claim as much as one third. In this context the division of some manors in the proportion of two thirds to Margaret de Bohun and one third to the fitz Herberts cannot be regarded as merely coincidence. The records relating to land tenure and those relating to knight service reinforce the conclusion that the fitz Herbert share of the English lands was limited to one third of those which Margaret de Bohun had once held. The fitz Herberts

---

1 PR 13 John, p. 175.
2 PRO, DL, 40/1, no. 1.
3 The lists are clearly later than the ‘carta’. John Pichard, who is found c. 1176, has replaced the William Pichard of the ‘carta’. (Cf. Heref. Domusd., p. 118.)
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never overcame the advantage which the Bohuns enjoyed through the high-handed action of Margaret de Bohun in the years which followed the death of her brother Mahel. She (or her heirs, immediately after her death) gave up part of the Gloucester inheritance, but even when that was necessary, they retained the larger share.

The knight service which Margaret de Bohun acknowledged in 1166 must represent very closely the service which Earl Miles could claim from his English estates. The seventeen knights of old enfeoffment, having been enfeoffed before 1135, were certainly available. How many of the three and three-quarters fees of new enfeoffment were created before the death of Miles in 1143, we do not know. Nor do we know precisely the amount of service formerly due to him which was taken over by the Braiose family with the English manors of his inheritance which they acquired in 1165. If we propose a figure of twenty knights we shall probably not be far wrong. This may also represent his 'servitium debitum', the demand laid upon him by the crown.1

From his Welsh lands he could claim the service of a large number of knights. Early 12th century sources do not offer any information on this point, but there are two late assessments of the service available from Brecknock and Abergavenny, dating from 1210–1212, after William de Braiose had forfeited his lands. From Abergavenny the service of just over thirteen and a half knights was then available; from Brecknock, the service of thirty-two knights.2 Where the figures given in this list of escheated honours can be compared with earlier returns they reflect the earlier sources with some accuracy. Though late, these assessments may be used as a guide to the strength of the force of knights which Miles could draw from his Welsh lands. With some twenty knights from his English lands, and perhaps forty-five from the Welsh marches, Miles could have commanded a considerable fighting force even though the defence of his Welsh lands may have made it impossible to summon the whole force at one time. When, to these sixty-five knights, is added the service of the knights which he could claim under the terms of Matilda's charter, a very considerable following is produced.

1 It is possible that Miles owed the service of fifteen knights and had enfeoffed more than this number, or he may have owed the service of twenty knights and relied upon household knights to make up the additional service. This rests on two premises; (i) the view held by Round that 'servitia debita' were normally imposed in round numbers, so that fifteen or twenty would be appropriate here, and (ii) that, with that part of Miles's English lands which passed to the Braiose family there passed also a portion of the knight service for which Miles had once been responsible. This certainly included Weston Bret, assessed in 1243 at half a fee. (See above, p. 195.)

2 RBE, ii, 497, 601–9. The actual service available from Abergavenny was that of thirteen fees, plus a third and a quarter, and the service, unspecified, of some small parcels of land. Miles was liable for the service of only three knights for this lordship. (Round, Ancient Charters, p. 43, no. 26.) The full list for Brecknock lists thirty-two fees and an odd fraction.
The Empress granted him the fees and services of Robert de Chandos, Hugh fitz William, and Richard of Cormeilles. From the honour of Snodhill Robert de Chandos could obtain the service of just over fifteen knights of old enfeoffment and four of new. Richard of Cormeilles could claim the services from nine fees of old enfeoffment and one of new. Hugh fitz William (i.e. of Kilpeck) could claim the services from one and a half fees. Altogether, for a short period of time, Miles may have been able to call upon the services of some ninety to ninety-five knights, apart from mercenaries. It was with such a formidable force as this that he was able to make his power effective over the shires of the southern marches during the Anarchy.

From this survey of knight service some general features emerge which are worthy of note. The knight service available from Miles’s English lands is rather smaller than might have been expected. On the other hand, the service available from his Welsh honours formed a large proportion of the total service which he could demand. Brecknock and Abergavenny provided something like two thirds of the total. As in so many other ways, his power was increased during the period of civil war. By the grant of the service due from three tenants-in-chief the force of knights which he could command in Matilda’s service was increased by an additional twenty-five or thirty knights. How long that swollen force remained at the disposal of the earl of Hereford is not clear. The death of Miles in 1143 was a check to the power of the Gloucester family but it need not have marked the break-up of this military power. Earl Roger was an energetic and, on the whole, a loyal supporter of the Angevin cause. His independence before the accession of Henry II reflects the strength of the power wielded locally by his family. Here, as in other respects, the real break came with the rebellion and death of Earl Roger in 1155. The military strength of the young earl of Hereford may have been maintained undiminished until that date. This aspect of the authority exercised by the earls of Hereford is yet another illustration of the difficult problem which Henry II inherited on the Welsh marches. It emphasizes, if emphasis were needed, the danger of the threat to royal authority offered by the defiance of Earl Roger and the lord of Wigmore in 1155.

\[1\] RBE, i, 283-5; ii, 496-7.
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