

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

## **The Domesday Tenant of Hawling**

by D. Douglas  
1965, Vol. 84, 28-30

© The Society and the Author(s)

# The Domesday Tenant of Hawling

By PROFESSOR DAVID DOUGLAS, F.B.A.

AMONG the tenants-in-chief of William the Conqueror in Gloucestershire in 1086 was Sigar 'de Cioches'. He held 10 hides in Hawling, 10 hides in Hazelton and 5 hides in Yanworth,<sup>1</sup> and, though, elsewhere, his estates were not so considerable, he also possessed lands in Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire.<sup>2</sup> He was clearly a man of some limited importance, and the purpose of this note is to suggest that his career may have a wider significance than is always appreciated. What follows is, in short, an attempt to relate in this respect two lines of research which seem to have been kept distinct, and to suggest that if a connection could, in fact, be made between them, the result would be of interest in illustrating the wide ramifications of Norman influence in the latter half of the 11th century.

## (i)

Students of the contribution made from Flanders and Hainault to the feudal aristocracy established in England by William the Conqueror have noted the presence in Domesday Book not only of Sigar, but also of Gunfrid 'de Cioches'.<sup>3</sup> The parentage of these men is unknown, as is also the relationship between them.<sup>4</sup> But they must have belonged to the same family since the descent in England of the 'Honour of Chokes' has been well established, and it included lands which in 1086 had been held both by Sigar and by Gunfrid.<sup>5</sup> The family can, moreover, be derived, without question, from 'Chocques: Pas de Calais, west of Béthune'.<sup>6</sup>

## (ii)

Turn now to an independent inquiry<sup>7</sup> on what might, at first sight, seem to be a wholly different subject. The earliest chroniclers of

<sup>1</sup> D.B. i, fol. 170.

<sup>2</sup> D.B. i, fols. 142a, 216b, 227b.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Douglas, *William the Conqueror*, p. 267. Gunfrid's considerable estates were scattered, but mainly in Northamptonshire (D.B. i, fol. 227b).

<sup>4</sup> Sigar, and doubtless also Gunfrid, were dependants on the family of Béthune (Round, *Calendar of Documents preserved in France*, 1, no. 1359), who were themselves hereditary *advocati* of the abbey of St Vedast at Arras (A. Duchesne, *Maison de Béthune*, 1639, pp. 11-13). Many of Sigar's estates in Gloucestershire were later to pass by gift to Gloucester abbey (*Cart. Mon. S. Petri Gloucestriae*—Rolls Series, ii, pp. 179-82).

<sup>5</sup> W. Farrer, *Honors and Knights Fees*, 1, pp. 20-29.

<sup>6</sup> L. C. Loyd, *Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families* (Harleian Soc., 1951), p. 29.

<sup>7</sup> Respecting this I am directly dependent upon the notable appendix which Professor C. W. David added to his biography of *Robert Curthose* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1920). This is Appendix 'C' on pp. 217-20.

the First Crusade describe in considerable detail the events which immediately followed the capture of Jerusalem in 1099.<sup>1</sup> They show that among the first acts after the bloody subjugation of the city was the appointment, despite controversy, of Arnulf as Patriarch of Jerusalem. This Arnulf was then chaplain to Duke Robert of Normandy and had gone on crusade in his company.<sup>2</sup> Considerable confusion has been caused by Albert of Aix who has been interpreted as saying that he was 'of Rohes, a castle of Flanders'—and, though no such place can be identified,<sup>3</sup> the description 'Arnulf of Rohes' has been adopted by some modern writers.<sup>4</sup> But Albert's words:

Arnulfus de Zokes castello Flandriae<sup>5</sup>

are not (as printed) unambiguous, and (whatever their value) they are susceptible to a different translation.<sup>6</sup> It is important, therefore, that a poem of the early twelfth century<sup>7</sup> derives this Arnulf from 'Cyokes'—and this has been identified as 'the village of Chocques in the diocese of Therouanne on the river Clare, an affluent of the Lys'.<sup>8</sup> This conclusion must now be accepted,<sup>9</sup> and it is finally confirmed by independent testimony<sup>10</sup> that Robert's chaplain did in fact come from Chocques, since a charter given by Duke Robert to Rouen Cathedral on 15 August 1095 was attested by

Ernulpho de Cioches capellano meo.<sup>11</sup>

We have thus, in the case of Arnulf the Patriarch, been led back to the same village near Béthune to which we were conducted by Sigar and Gunfrid.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Gesta Francorum*, ed. R. Hill (1962), p. 92. He was to be deposed in the same year, but subsequently to be re-appointed.

<sup>2</sup> He had also a considerable reputation for learning, and his possible contributions to scholarship are discussed in an important article by Mlle. R. Foreville—'L'école de Caen au XIe. siècle et les origines normandes de l'université d'Oxford' (*Études médiévales offertes à Augustin Fliche*, pp. 81–100). Ralph of Caen dedicated to Arnulf the *Gesta Tancredi*.

<sup>3</sup> Mlle. Foreville (op. cit. p. 84) suggests that he may have come from 'Roex' or from 'Socx', but in view of the other evidence these conjectures hardly carry conviction.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. S. Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, I, pp. 290, 291, and *passim*. See however his *Eastern Schism*, p. 87.

<sup>5</sup> C. W. David, op. cit., p. 217, quoting *Rec. Hist. Croisades. Scriptures Occid.*, IV, p. 470.

<sup>6</sup> 'Zokes' could probably be treated as plausibly as a corruption of Chocques, as a corruption of a hypothetical 'Rohes'.

<sup>7</sup> *Versus de Viris illustribus Diocesis Tarvanensis*. This was edited in 1904 with a valuable commentary by Charles Moeller (*Mélanges—Paul Fredericq—Brussels*, 1904, pp. 189–202).

<sup>8</sup> C. W. David, op. cit., p. 217.

<sup>9</sup> David, loc. cit.; Setton and Baldwin, *History of the Crusades*, I, pp. 338, 340, 347.

<sup>10</sup> C. H. Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp. 70, 74.

<sup>11</sup> The only printed text of this charter seems to be that given by G-A. de la Roque in his important, and neglected, *Histoire de la Maison de Harcourt*, III (1662), p. 34. This was taken from an original that now appears to be lost. There is a version in a cartulary now in the Public Library at Rouen. The charter is calendared in Round, op. cit. No. 2, and in H. W. C. Davis, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, I, No. 384. It is commented upon constructively by Haskins (op. cit. loc. cit.).

Arnulf's fortunes, like theirs, had, moreover, been founded on his connection with William the Conqueror. According to Guibert of Nogent,<sup>1</sup> he had early been made tutor to the Conqueror's eldest daughter, Cecilia, when she was a nun at Holy Trinity Caen, of which she later became abbess. Here was probably the basis of Arnulf's subsequent advance. Cecilia, it is said, wished him in due course to be given a bishopric,<sup>2</sup> and it was, doubtless, partly through her influence, that he became chaplain to her brother, Duke Robert. And, as has been seen, it was in that capacity that he went on crusade, and started his notable, if tempestuous, career in the Holy Land.

## (iii)

It seems difficult to dissociate these two lines of inquiry. The fact that two members of a hitherto undistinguished family from Chocques should receive lands in England by favour of William the Conqueror at the same time as a cleric with the same territorial designation was advancing to authority as tutor to the Conqueror's daughter and chaplain to his son, warrants at least the conjecture that Arnulf was related to Sigar and Gunfrid. In the absence of further express testimony, caution is of course necessary, and perhaps some difficulty may be found in the accusations which were levied against Arnulf by his enemies at Jerusalem. These not only asserted that he was a man of low birth and of scandalous life, but that he was the son of a priest, and therefore ineligible for high ecclesiastical office;<sup>3</sup> and it should be noted that at a later date Pope Paschal II, while dismissing the moral charges as without foundation, saw fit to overrule the objection as to Arnulf's birth 'by apostolic dispensation'.<sup>4</sup> Whether any weight should be given to these accusations in connection with a possible relationship of Arnulf with Sigar and Gunfrid is, however, doubtful. It is surely plausible to suggest that these may have been three members of the same family who all rose from obscurity to prominence by association with William the Conqueror: the two laymen to be rewarded with lands in England as tenants-in-chief of the Norman King; the cleric to serve the Conqueror's daughter and son, and, at last, through Norman influence, to become Patriarch of Jerusalem at the culminating moment of the First Crusade.

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CLVI, col. 800.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Raymond of Aguilers (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CLX, col. 661).

<sup>4</sup> *Cart. de l'église de Saint-Sepulchre*, ed. de Rozière (1899), No. 11.