

Original Documents.

LICENCE, UNDER THE PRIVY SEAL, TO REMIT A DEBT TO ROBERT BRUCE, IN ORDER THAT THE MONEY MIGHT BE APPLIED TOWARDS THE RANSOM OF A PRISONER IN SCOTLAND. Dated at York, Sept. 4th, 8 Edw. II. (A.D. 1314).

From the Muniments at Barrington Hall, Essex.

Communicated by GEORGE ALAN LOWNDES, Esq.

AMONG frequent proofs of the kind assistance of our lamented friend, Mr. William Clayton, we recall, with grateful remembrance, how freely the stores of documentary evidence, which it was his delight to investigate, were always at our disposal. Not many days before his decease, Mr. Clayton made us acquainted with one of his latest discoveries in the varied historical and topographical materials among the Barrington muniments. By the friendly courtesy of Mr. Alan Lowndes, the document to which our attention was then invited has been placed in our hands, and we are now permitted to bring it before the readers of this Journal.

The transaction to which it relates is of a somewhat unusual nature ; there can be little doubt that it may be connected with an important crisis in the reign of Edward II., namely, the fatal disaster of Bannockburn.

It appears that Sir Thomas de Mandeville had been taken prisoner by the Scots, and, judging by the date, probably at Bannockburn ; that he had agreed with his captor or detainer for his ransom ; that part of the money to be paid consisted of a debt of 94*l.*, which the Bruce owed to Nicholas de "Barntone," or Barenton, who had formerly been his steward of lands held by him (Robert de Bruce) in Essex, and had purchased cloth and other things, which doubtless had been delivered, but the price remained unpaid and was a debt from the king's enemy to Nicholas, which the king was probably considered to have the right to seize, or, at all events, Nicholas did not feel himself safe in remitting it to the enemy without leave from the king. Hence, as we may conceive, arose the need, or at least the wish, to have the king's authority for sending an acquittance to the Bruce, who had engaged to pay the money thereupon to the person entitled to the ransom.

This Licence, as it appears, Nicholas de Barenton had solicited through the sister of Edward II., Elizabeth, countess of Hereford, whose husband had likewise been taken at Bannockburn, and exchanged for five distin-

gushed captives—Isabella, Bruce's wife, his sister, daughter, and nephew, and the venerable Bishop of Glasgow.¹

Thomas de Mandeville was probably a distant relation of the Earl of Hereford, who was descended from an heiress of Mandeville, and he may have held lands of the Earl, as Earl of Essex.

The battle of Bannockburn, which was fought on the memorable June 24, 1314, and put an end to the hopes of the English sovereign to accomplish the subjection of Scotland, was important above all the conflicts between the then rival nations, and attended with results most disastrous to Edward II. and his army. Philip de Mowbray, who had gallantly held Stirling Castle against Sir Edward Bruce, brother of the Scottish king, sorely pressed and apprehensive of the failure of his provisions, agreed to surrender that fortress, if not relieved before the feast of St. John the Baptist (June 24). Edward II. made large preparations for the succour of the fortress, the last stronghold of importance which stood between Scotland and freedom. He summoned the military force of his kingdom to meet him at Berwick, on June 11;² some months later he issued writs to the sheriffs to make levies of infantry, to be assembled at Wark on June 10;³ he demanded aid from the Irish chiefs, and made other extensive preparations for the campaign. It is impossible to ascertain the number of Edward's army, multiplied by Fordun to 340,000 horse and as many foot. Of those summoned some refused to come and others were excused; but, when Edward set forth from Berwick on June 18, he was accompanied by a force superior doubtless in numbers and effective equipment to any previously led against the Scots by an English monarch.⁴ The details of the eventful engagement are familiar to all who take interest in the history of the period; certain discrepancies, however, occur between the accounts of English and Scottish chroniclers, which it may be difficult to reconcile. Edward, closely pursued, effected a disgraceful flight to Dunbar, whence he escaped by sea to Berwick, having lost his privy seal and his treasure, which, as well as the vast array of military engines and provisions, fell into the hands of the victors. It is said that the number of the slain was comparatively small; according to other accounts 30,000 English, including 200 knights, were left on the field. The fugitives captured in their wanderings appear to have been treated with a certain degree of lenity. Walsingham observes that the victor made liberal distribution of the spoil: "*captivos tractavit civiliter*:" he also sent the corpses of the Earl of Gloucester and the veteran Robert Clifford to Berwick for honorable burial.⁵ Twenty-two barons and bannerets, with sixty knights, fell into the hands of the Scots; their lives were preserved for the sake of ransom. Among those who escaped was probably Sir Thomas de Mandeville, to whose liberation the subjoined Licence relates. The captors doubtless reaped a golden harvest on the occasion, besides the great amount of

¹ Rymer, vol. ii. pp. 251, 255. Tytler, *Hist. Scot.*, vol. i. p. 278.

² Rymer, vol. ii. p. 238, dated Dec. 23, 7 Edw. II. A.D. 1313. The writs were addressed to 93 barons.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 246, 248.

⁴ It is stated that the waggons and vehicles laden with military stores would have extended, in a line, to twenty

leagues: *Malmesb.* p. 151.

⁵ T. de Walsingham *Ypod. Neust.*, p. 501. Thomas de la More enumerates some of the chief captives; "*fere trecenti viri militares*" as he observes were spared, for the sake of ransom. *Vita Edw. II.*, *Angl. Norm. Script.*, p. 594. See also *Knyghton*, 2533, and *Trivet's Annals*, contin., vol. ii. p. 15.

booty. According to the curious contemporary ballad on the disaster at Bannockburn, preserved in one of the Cottonian MSS., and printed by Mr. Wright in the selection edited for the Camden Society—

Nostræ gentis Angliæ quidam sunt captivi,
Currebant ab acie quidam semivivi,
Qui fuerunt divites fiunt redemptivi,
Quod delirant nobiles plectuntur Achivi!

Political Songs, p. 266.

The captive knight was probably of Black Notley in Essex: there appear to have been two manors in that parish in which Geoffrey de Mandeville had possessions at the time of the Domesday survey; subsequently the lands belonging to the manor of Gobions in Notley became incorporated into the honor of Mandeville. Walter, younger son of William de Mandeville and brother of Geoffrey, created Earl of Essex by Stephen, had this estate. The descent of the family may be found in Morant's History. Sir Thomas, son of Sir John de Mandeville, had licence, 48 Hen. III., to hunt in the county; and his son Walter, who married Agnes, daughter of Nicholas Barenton, was father of a Sir Thomas Mandeville living in 1372.⁶ The Sir Thomas, to whom the subjoined document relates, was probably the person of that name first mentioned, and the same who occurs among the bannerets of Essex in the Roll of Arms compiled, according to Sir Harris Nicolas, between 1308 and 1314.⁷ In the same Roll are found the arms of "Sire Nicholas de Baringtone,"⁸ a descendant of the family in Essex, of which some notice has been given, from information supplied by Mr. Clayton, in a former volume of this Journal.⁹ We are unable to identify the "Nichol de Barntone," formerly steward of the Bruce's lands in Essex, as stated in the document here printed, in which he is not described as of knightly rank; he may have been Nicholas, one of the sons of Sir Nicholas de Barenton, living *temp.* Edward II. and Edward III., by Alice, daughter and heir of Sir Richard Belhouse.¹

⁶ Morant's Hist. of Essex, vol. ii. p. 123.

⁷ Roll of Arms of the reign of Edward II., p. 39. Among persons of note to whom credentials in favor of John de Hotham on his mission to Ireland were addressed by the king from York, Aug. 12, 1314, including Richard de Burgo, Earl of Ulster, the name of a Thomas de Mandeville occurs. Rymer, vol. i. p. 252. There appears, however, no reason to suppose that he may have been the same person of the name who, according to the royal licence here printed, was a captive in Scotland on Sept. 4th in that year. In Nov. 1309, a Thomas de Mandeville was summoned from Ireland to meet the king at Newcastle *super Aye*, on the feast of St. John next, to join an expedition into Scotland; Rot. Scot. vol. i. p. 79; and in Sept. 1315, 9 Edw. II., a person of the same name received thanks for services in defending Ireland against the Scotch. *Ibid.*, p.

149 b. A branch of the Mandeville family appears to have been settled in Ireland, probably at an early period. In 9 Edw. III. Sir Henry de Mandeville and John de Mandeville occur among persons in Ireland summoned against the Scots; Rymer, vol. ii. p. 907; and others of the name of Mandeville are mentioned in documents to be found in the *Fædera*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

⁹ *Archæol. Journ.*, vol. xx. p. 164.

¹ This Nicholas de Barenton married Emma, dau. and coh. of Sir Robert Baard, with whom he had the manor of Little and other estates. Chauncey's Herts, p. 367. See the account of the Barrington family in Collins' *Baronetage*, vol. i. p. 65, edit. 1741. The alliance between the Mandevilles and the Barenton family, above mentioned, is deserving of notice in connection with the document here given.

The possessions in Essex held by the Bruce, until, on his coronation at Scone in 1306, he was deprived of them by Edward I., were the manors of Writtle, Great Baddow, and Bromeshobery in Hatfield Broad Oak, with the half hundred of Harlow. The descent of these estates to the Earls of Chester is related by Morant: on the death of Ralph Blondville, the last of the line of Hugh Lupus, in 1232, his four sisters became his heirs. Maud, the eldest, espoused David, brother of William, King of Scots; and Isabel, the second, married Robert de Brus, from whom the above-mentioned estates in Essex descended to Robert Bruce, on whose assertion of his right to the kingdom of Scotland all his possessions in England were seized by Edward I.² They were subsequently granted by Edward II. to Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex, and to Elizabeth, his countess, sister of that king; at her request, it will be observed, Edward granted the Licence in favor of the captive Sir Thomas de Mandeville, who probably, as has been stated, was a distant relation of her husband.³

In the number of captives, according to Walsingham, was Roger de Northburgh, Keeper of the Privy Seal (*"Custos targiæ domini Regis"*) which was taken from him by the Scots; a disaster doubtless very mortifying to the fugitive king.⁴ Three days after the defeat at Stirling Edward issued from Berwick writs to the sheriffs, to the constable of Dover, and to the warden of the Cinque Ports, notifying the loss (*"privatum sigillum nostrum a nobis est elongatum"*), and enjoining proclamation to be made in all cities, towns, and elsewhere:—*"et ex parte nostra firmiter inhiberi ne quis, pro aliquo mandato sibi sub dicto sigillo exnunc porrigendo seu etiam liberando quicquam faciat, nisi aliud a nobis habuerit mandatum, de priori mandato sub dicto privato sigillo contento specialem faciens mentionem, vel nisi viderit quod ea, quæ in dicto mandato sub dicto privato sigillo contenta fuerint, ad nostrum tendant commodum et*

² Morant, *Hist. of Essex*, vol. ii. p. 502.

³ Henry de Bohun, Earl of Hereford in the reign of King John, married Maud sister and eventually heiress of William de Mandeville, Earl of Essex.

⁴ Walsingham, *Historia brevis*, edit. 1574, p. 81: the cause of the loss of the king's seal is not stated in the *Ypodigma Neustrie*, where it is also mentioned as the *"targia regis."* Roger de Northburgh was clerk of the wardrobe, and held numerous ecclesiastical preferments in the time of Edward II., by whom he appears to have been much esteemed. In 1322 he was appointed Treasurer of England; in June 27, in the same year, he was consecrated Bishop of Lichfield. It has been erroneously stated by some writers that it was the Great seal which was taken by the Scots at Bannockburn; Hume of Goldscroft, in his *History of Scotland*, as cited by Lord Campbell, adds that the Lord Keeper was slain, and that Sir Ralph Mortimer, not Ralph de Monthermer, as stated by Walsingham, "was dimitted ransome free and obtained the king's Broad Seal at Bruce's

hands." Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. i. ch. xii., asserts that according to the English authorities, which he thinks may be relied upon, but does not cite by name, no one had attended Edward to the north as Chancellor or Keeper. Walter Reynolds, who had been Edward's tutor, had succeeded Langton as Chancellor July 6, 1310; it is probable that having recently been translated to the see of Canterbury he may not have accompanied the king. Edward set forth on March 30, or April 1, and documents occur on the Patent and other Rolls, tested at various places where he sojourned in his progress, extending over more than ten weeks, until his arrival at Berwick. It is probable that the Great Seal had been consigned during that time to the Master of the Rolls, Adam de Osgodeby, as on a previous occasion, when he attended Edward to Berwick in 1311, having the seal in his keeping, and that he may have been also with the king during his expedition in 1314, but have remained at Berwick during the king's absence in Scotland.

honorem." These writs were tested by Edward at Berwick on the 27th June—"Per ipsum Regem, sub privato sigillo Regine."⁵ It would hence appear that during the interval, until Edward II. regained possession of his privy seal, he made use of that of Isabella, his queen, by whom and by the infant prince, Edward of Windsor, he had been accompanied in his ill-advised expedition. The queen's seal here referred to may have been that engraved by Sandford, p. 121, a circular seal of moderate size; the device being an escutcheon of the queen's arms dimidiated with those of her husband, the shield is placed within a quatrefoiled panel surrounded by elaborate tracery, and without an inscription.

We learn from the above-mentioned writs that Edward had reached Berwick on June 27th, the battle having occurred on June 24th. He had fled to Dunbar, a distance of nearly seventy miles, attended by the Earl of Pembroke and 500 horsemen; there he sought refuge with the Earl of March, who provided a small vessel in which the royal fugitive was conveyed to Tweedmouth. Itineraries, such as that accurately compiled by Mr. Duffus Hardy for the reign of John, and Mr. Hartshorne's compilations for the reigns of Edward I. and Edward II., professing to show, from attestations of public documents, the place where the sovereign was on each successive day, are obviously of utility to the historical student. We may take this opportunity, however, to remind our readers that, according to the caution given by Mr. Duffus Hardy in his Introduction to the Patent Rolls, and as pointed out to us by one of the most acute of record-antiquaries, the late Mr. Hunter, Itineraries such as the compilation by the Rev. J. Stevenson, to which Mr. Hunter kindly gave us access at the Record Office, should not be received as of unquestionable authority in regard to the presence of the king at any place where a document was tested. It is even doubtful whether the phrase "Teste meipso," or "per ipsum Regem," unless with the addition "manu sua propria," always indicates personal presence; where "Teste Rege" is found, it cannot be concluded that the king was at the spot in question on the day when a document under the Great Seal is tested.⁶ Our friend, Mr. Hartshorne, may not, as we apprehend, have been fully aware, in preparing his Itineraries printed in the *Collectanea* of the British Archæological Association, how important is the caution for which we are indebted to our friend Mr. Hunter; a proof of the accuracy of whose observation is found in the portion of Mr. Hartshorne's Itinerary under the seventh year of Edward II., according to which we are led to suppose, on the evidence of Patent, Fine, Close, and Scottish Rolls, that the king constantly sojourned at Berwick from June 11, the day when his forces were summoned to assemble there, to June 28, 1314. It is, however, well known that Edward set forth with his host from that town on June 18; they were at Edinburgh on the 22nd, and arrived within view of Stirling on the following evening. It is remarkable that Mr. Hartshorne's Itinerary contains no allusion to Bannockburn; it would indeed induce us to imagine, on the evidence of Parliamentary

⁵ Rymer, vol. ii. p. 249, from Rot. Claus. 7 Edw. II. This was not the only occasion on which Edward II. had the misfortune to lose his privy seal. In 1322, when Robert Bruce compelled him to decamp from Byland Abbey, he es-

caped to Bridlington, having abandoned baggage, treasure, and his "privatum sigillum." Rymer, vol. i. p. 498.

⁶ See Jus Sigilli, Lond. 1673, p. 122; Blackstone, B. ii. ch. 21, s. 2.

Writs and Patent Rolls, that, during the time of Edward's memorable march above-mentioned and at the crisis of his ill-fated expedition, he was still lingering with his queen and her infant son on the banks of Tweed.⁷

It is probable that Edward's lost privy seal or *targia*, which, as already stated, had been taken from Roger de Northburgh when he fell into the hands of the king's adversaries, had actually been restored before the date of the Licence here printed, preserved among Mr. Lowndes' muniments, and it may doubtless have been the matrix of which this interesting document supplies an impression. Walsingham relates that Ralph de Monthermer, who married Joan, sister of Edward II., was among the captives at Bannockburn; that having found favor with the Bruce on account of previous acquaintance with him at the English court, he was released without ransom; and that on his return to England he brought with him the king's privy seal, which had fallen into the enemy's hands;—"reportavit secum domini regis targiam captam a Scotis, usu tamen ipsius primitus interdicto."⁸ It may be remembered that, after the first excitement of the memorable struggle and victory under the walls of Stirling had passed, the Bruce must have felt no slight anxiety for the safety of his consort, who had been captured in the sanctuary of St. Duthac in 1306, and still endured the sorrows of her protracted captivity in Rochester Castle, whither she had been removed in the month of March previously from the more gentle custody of the abbess of Barking, and had been consigned to sterner durance under the constable of Rochester, Henry de Cobham.⁹ Moreover, Christian, Bruce's sister, his daughter Marjory, his nephew the young Earl of Mar, and other Scottish persons of distinction were still prisoners in England at the mercy of the vanquished Edward. It may well be imagined that the Scottish king would be disposed to propitiate his adversary, and that he would evince that generous forbearance as victor, commended not only by Scottish writers, but by our own chroniclers.¹ Before a month had elapsed after the fatal battle, Bruce had successfully negotiated the liberation of his queen and of his daughter, and also of other illustrious captives, who were exchanged for the brother-in-law of the English king, the Earl of Hereford. The probability is obvious that Bruce may even before that arrangement have sought to gratify Edward by liberating Monthermer free of ransom, making him also, as we are informed by Walsingham, the bearer of the lost *targia*. No evidence has been found to show the precise time of his fortunate return to his sovereign;

⁷ Mr. Hartshorne's Itinerary of Edw. II. (Collect. Archæol. vol. i. p. 125) gives, "June 24, Berwick. P. W. 124," namely, Parliamentary Writs, vol. ii. p. 124. The writ was addressed to John de Benstede, requiring his presence at the Exchequer within 15 days, prepared to go to foreign parts on the king's service. "Teste Rege apud Berewicum super Twedam 24 die Junii." In like manner to John Abel and seven others. Rot. Claus. 7 Edw. II.

⁸ Tho. de Walsingham, Ypod. Neustrie, p. 501; and Hist. brevis Angl., p. 81. The expression "usu interdicto" referred

doubtless to the precautionary writs sent forth by Edward from Berwick, on June 27, as before mentioned. Dugdale, Baronage, vol. i. p. 217, citing the relation of Walsingham in regard to Monthermer's liberation after the defeat at Bannockburn, seems to have supposed that *targia* was a shield. He says that he "returned into England and brought the king's target, which had been taken in that fight, but prohibited the use thereof."

⁹ Rymer, vol. ii. pp. 244, 247. See also Tytler, Hist. Scot., vol. i. p. 213.

¹ Joh. de Trokelowe, p. 273.

on August 18th, however, Edward, then at York, issued a writ in favor of Ralph de Monthermer, in regard to his dwelling-place at Clifton near that city, which at the king's request he had permitted the Earl of Surrey to take as his abode on occasion of the approaching parliament at York.² There can exist, we apprehend, no reasonable ground for doubt that, before the date of the following document (September 4), the missing *targia* had been restored.

According to the chronicler, however, to whom we owe the Continuation of Nicholas Trivet's Annals of the reign of Edward II., the king, having lost his seal as above stated, caused another to be quickly provided. After a long enumeration of the slain and of the captive barons and knights at the fatal conflict under the walls of Stirling, these supplementary Annals contain the following statement:—"Clerici quoque et scutiferi plures ibidem fuerunt occisi et capti, de quibus et dominus Rogerus de Northburge, custos Domini Regis *targiæ* ab eo ibidem ablatae, una cum dominis Rogero de Wikenfelde et Thoma de Switone, dicti domini Rogeri clericis, pariter detinebantur ibidem; ob quod diminus Rex cito postea fieri fecit sigillum, volens illud *privatum sigillum* appellari, ad differentiam *targiæ* sic, ut præmittitur, ablatae." The narration of the return of Ralph de Monthermer free of ransom, on account of his former friendship with the Scottish king, is likewise given, as before cited from Walsingham, and it is said that he brought with him the king's *targia*, "usu ipsius, ratione prævia, nihilominus ex toto interdicto."³

No other instance, it is believed, has occurred of the use of the term *targia*, properly signifying a shield, to designate a seal; nor has it been found as the distinctive appellation of a privy seal of any English sovereign, with the exception of Edward II. The term *targa*, however, occasionally denotes pieces of money struck in Bretagne, Gascony, and in Spain, probably at the period when a shield of arms was introduced upon coins, a type of numismatic design not found in earlier times.⁴ In the Appendix to the Liber de Antiquis Legibus, edited for the Camden Society by Mr. Stapleton, we find a memorandum that on St. Agnes' day, 2 Edw. II. (January 21), "isserent les bref le Rei ove ces lettres desuz son prive seal de la *targe* parmy tuz les contes de Engleterre," &c.⁵ In the Liber Custumarum edited by Mr. Riley, in his valuable collection of Muniments of the City of London, we find a petition from the bakers, in 1320, to be relieved from payment of pesage; whereupon "le Roi maunda soun bref a ses Justices eirauntz a la Tour de Loundres, sur soun *targe*;" the writ concludes thus—"Done suth nostre *prive seal* a Gloucestre le primer jour d'Averil, lan de nostre regne xiiij."⁶ Mr. Riley suggests that the seal may have been thus designated from the shield of arms upon it. It will be seen that the device on the seal appended to the king's Licence here printed is an escutcheon only; there was an inscription round the margin, but no ornament or device appears to have been introduced in the field,

² Rymer, vol. ii. p. 253.

³ Nich. Triveti Annales, ed. Ant. Hall, Oxon. 1722; vol. ii. pp. 15, 16.

⁴ See Ducange, v. *Targa*. Mention occurs of "grans blans appellez *targes*," doubtless silver coins, and of "demi *targes*." The term is obviously equiva-

lent to *scutum*, Fr. *écu*, the coin so called from its bearing a shield of arms.

⁵ Liber de Ant. Legibus, App. p. 252.

⁶ Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain, &c., published under direction of the Master of the Rolls, Munimenta Gildhallie, vol. ii. part i., appendix, p. 380.

and the device of the *targe* or armorial escutcheon was thus rendered, upon a seal of comparatively small dimensions, more than usually conspicuous.⁷

ALBERT WAY.

EDWARD par la grace de Dieu Roi Dengleterre seignour Dirlaunde et Ducs Daquitaine a touz ceux qui cestes lettres verront saluz. Sachiez que come nous eoms entenduz que Robert de Brus soit tenuz a Nichol de Barn-tone (*sic*) en quatre vintz et quatorze livres pur draps et autres choses dount le dit Nichol fit chevissance pur lui tanque il estoit piece a⁸ Seneschal de ses terres en Essexe, des queux deniers le dit Nichol voudra aider nostre cher et foial⁹ monsire Thomas de Maundeville, qui est pris et detenuz en prison par noz enemis Descoce, en eide de sa raunzon, et les queux le dit Robert serra prest a paier a celui qui ensi tient en prison le dit monsire Thomas a quele heure que le dit Nichol lui envoit lettre daquitance de la dite somme, la quele aquitance il ne ose faire ne y envoyer saunz especial conge de nous ; Nous, a la requeste nostre cher soer la Contesse de Hereford, avoms donez conge au dit Nichol quil puisse la dite aquitance faire et envoyer au dit Robert saunz estre chalange de ce par nous ou par noz heirs ou par noz Ministres queucumques, issint que meismes les deniers soient tourne en eide de la raunzon le dit monsire Thomas sicome dessus est dit. En tesmoignance de queu chose nous avoms fait faire cestes noz lettres patontes (*sic*). Done souz nostre prive seal a Everwykes le quart jour de Septembre lan de nostre regne oytisme [A.D. 1314.].

There is appended, by a label partially cut from the bottom of the parchment, an imperfect impression of the privy seal on bright red wax ; it is of circular form, diameter nearly $1\frac{1}{4}$ in. ; device, an escutcheon of the arms of England ; of the legend only the letters . . s : EDW remain. The parchment measures only $9\frac{1}{8}$ inches in length, by $3\frac{7}{8}$ inches in breadth.

⁷ Chassant, in his useful Dictionnaire de Sigillographie, p. 131, gives the following in his enumeration of the formulæ of legends on counterseals :—"Sub meo scuto est meum secretum."

⁸ Written on an erasure, possibly intended to be read as one word. "*Pieca, autrefois, olim*" Lacombe.

⁹ "Foial, *feal* : Fidele." Roquefort.