

## CASTLE GUARD.

By J. H. ROUND, M.A.

Of all the distinctive features of the feudal system in England none was more venerable and none more strangely persistent than the burden of castle guard.

We read even in *Domesday Book* of a manor being bound to find "Loricati in custodia de Windesores," that is to say, knights for the guard of Windsor castle; and in the *Abingdon Chronicle* it is specially stated that the abbey was called on by the Conqueror to provide knights for the guard of Windsor Castle.<sup>1</sup> The same chronicle contains a writ of King Stephen relating to this duty of the abbey.<sup>2</sup>

Passing from the south to the north of England, we find the barony of Bywell, held by the Baliols, charged with finding thirty knights for the guard of Newcastle-on-Tyne, it having been so granted, we read, by William Rufus<sup>3</sup>; and in the next reign an important entry reminds us that the guard of Norwich Castle was partly provided by the knights of Ely.<sup>4</sup>

And this feudal burden of castle guard was no less persistent than ancient, for, owing to its commutation for money, it continued to exist when the castles themselves had long crumbled into ruin.<sup>5</sup> This was decided in a

<sup>1</sup> "Huic abbatiæ militum excubias apud ipsum Wildesore oppidum habendas regio imperio jussum" (II, 3).

<sup>2</sup> II, 183.

<sup>3</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 392, "Hugo de Baillo tenet in capite de domino Rege baroniam de Bywelle cum pertinenciis per servicium v militum. Et tamen debet ad wardam Novi Castellum super Tynam xxx milites. Omnes vere antecessores sui tenuerunt per eadem servicia post tempus domini regis Willelmi Ruffi qui eos feoffavit."

<sup>4</sup> "Et idem Episcopus Elyensis reddit Computum de M libris ut Milites Episcopatus de Ely faciant Wardam suam in Insula de Ely sicut faeiebant in castello de Norwic" (*Rot. Pip.*, 31 Hen. I. [1130], p. 44). Compare *Monasticon*, III, 153 (No. xv).

<sup>5</sup> Good examples of payment for castle guard under Henry VII. will be found in the valuable *Calendar of Inquisitions*, published by the Public Record Office. In Vol. I, we have payments from Stanwell to Windsor (p. 13), Little Wymondley to Craven (p. 14), Scalesho and Islington to Dover (pp. 15, 16), Butlers in Basilidon to Bishop's Stortford (p. 43), Clothall to Dover (pp. 51, 507), Southbury in East Hanney to Windsor (p. 53), Morton Pinkney to Windsor (p. 130), Claverham, Bowley, and Horsey to Pevensey (p. 182), Ruxley to Dover (pp. 184, 470), Tiled Hall in Iatchingdon to Dover (p. 222); from Wimpole to Cambridge (p. 241), Throwley to Dover (p. 30), and Alfriston to Pevensey (p. 308).

case referred to by Sir William Chauncy, who tells us in his *History of Hertfordshire* that Sir William Capel, who purchased the manor of Hadham Hall—

“held it of the Bishop of London as of his Castle of Stortford in this County, by Homage, Fealty, and to pay 40s. Escuage, and if more, more, and if less, less, and by the yearly rent of 5s. for Castle Guard to be paid at the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel, and by the yearly rent of 13s. and 4d. for the Sheriff's Aid at the four Feasts of the year; and upon a Replevin brought by Sir William Capel upon a Distress for arrear of Rent for Castle Ward for three years, it was resolved upon a Demurrer by the Judges<sup>1</sup> that though the Castle was ruinous and decayed, yet the Rent remains; for when the Tenant holds of the Lord to keep or repair his Castle, and afterwards, in old time, such service was changed by the mutual consent of the Lord and Tenant into a yearly Rent, yet such Rent is paid *pro Warda Castri* in satisfaction of Castle Guard, for in such case the Word *pro* signifies plain and perpetual Recompense and Satisfaction, so that the Lord may have Castle Guard when he pleases, for the Seizin of Rent is no seizin of Castle Guard.”

I make the date of this decision to be in or about the year 1508.

But even when feudal burdens were abolished at the Restoration (12 Charles II., cap. 24), castle guard remained in force as a charge on the manors from which it was due. I give in an appendix a curious list of the castle guard rents of Windsor, derived from so unlikely a quarter as the Journals of the House of Commons for the year 1700; and it is almost startling to find, as we do, that even so late as the middle of the eighteenth century, ejectments were served on the owners of certain estates in Kent for non-payment of their castle guard rents to the owner of Rochester Castle. This we learn from an important passage in Hasted's *History of Kent* (II, 413-414), quoted on the next page.

I would invite attention to the antique character of the penalty for default, and to the fact that the rents were payable on St. Andrew's day, old style; for St. Andrew was the patron saint of Rochester. The Kentish manor of Swanscombe, which was the head of the system, gave name to that barony of “Swaneschamp,” or “Swainscamp,” which occurs frequently in mediaeval records and the descent of which is of much interest.

<sup>1</sup> A marginal reference cites “Co. 4 receipt., fo. 88, Luttrell's Case.”

Hasted writes as follows :

“The manor of Swanscombe, as well as that of Combe in this parish, holden of Rochester Castle, owed service towards the defence of it, the owner of Swanscombe being, as it were, one of the principal captains to whom that charge was anciently committed, and there were subject to this manor several knights' fees, as petty or subordinate captains, bound to serve under his banner there. (Lambard, *Perambulation*, p. 530.)”

“These services have long since turned into annual rents of money. The following is a list of these manors and lands which were held by *castle guard*, and now pay rents in lieu of it:

Luddesdown manor (Luddesdon).  
 Ryarsh manor (Ryarsh).  
 Delce magna (Great Delce).  
 Addington manor (Addington).  
 Cobham Eastcourt (in Thurnham).  
 Aldington Eastcourt (in Thurnham).  
 Stockbury manor (Stockbury).  
 Little Delce.  
 Hamwold Court manor.  
 Farnborough Court manor.  
 Boughton Monchelsea manor.  
 Midley and Little Caldecott (Calcot in Midley).  
 Goddington manor (in Frindsbury?).  
 Paddlesworth manor (near Snodland).  
 Bicknor manor (Bicknor).  
 Fraxingham manor (Frensham in Rolvenden).  
 Wootton manor (Wootton).  
 Eccles manor } (in Aylesford).  
 Part of ditto }  
 Sholden manor in Surry.  
 Lands in Westborough farm in Surry.  
 Dairy farm in Higham.  
 Mickleham manor in Surry.  
 Barrow-hall manor in ditto.  
 Ingraft [Ingrave], Harringfield [Hanningfield], East Harringfield, and West Horden [Horndon] in Essex.  
 Great and Little Borstaple [Barstaple] manors (in Essex).  
 Widford manor in Essex.  
 Alchardin *alias* Combes manor (in Swanscombe).  
 North-court.

“These rents are paid on St. Andrew's day, old style, and the custom has been held, that if the rent is not then paid, it is liable to be doubled on the return of every tide in the Medway, during the time it remains unpaid. This custom was very near being brought to a legal decision some years ago; for Sir Thomas Dyke, Bart., owner of Farnborough-court manor [*d.* 1756] and Thomas Best, Esq., owner of Eccles manor, having made default in the payment of their castle guard rents, Mr. Child, owner of Swanscombe manor [after 1740] and the castle, required the penalty of their being

doubled; which dispute was carried so far that ejectments were served on the estates, and a special jury was struck to try the matter. But by the interposition of friends, the dispute was compromised, and a small composition was accepted, in lieu of the penalty, though it was entered in the court rolls of Swanscombe manor, with the consent of all parties, in such a manner that the custom of this payment might not be lessened in future by it."

I shall give in an appendix an account of an unpublished record which contains an interesting list of fees owing ward to Rochester Castle, and which proves that the barony of Swanscombe represented only half of them.

When working on Northamptonshire in *Domesday* for the Victoria history of that county, I was led to examine the connection of its baronies with the system of castle guard, and this investigation resulted in a very suggestive discovery. The manor of Hartwell in that county owed castle guard to the distant fortress of Dover, and the service due from it was that of two knights, each of whom was liable to serve fifteen days a year. The total liability of this manor was commuted for twenty shillings a year, which works out, you will find, at exactly eightpence a day. Now eightpence, in the twelfth century, was the recognized pay of the knight. I proved this long ago in the pages of *Feudal England* (pp. 271-272) and showed that it explained the words of the *Dialogus*: "Duo milites bajuli clavium quisque in die VIII [den.] *ratione militiae*; asserunt enim quod equis necessariis et armis instructi fore teneantur." And, as to actual castle guard, I cited the Pipe Roll of 1162 (8 Henry II.),<sup>1</sup> where we have, under Kent, a payment of £84 18s. 8d. to seven hired knights as their wage for a whole year, which represents, for a year of 364 days, eightpence a day each. Two years later we have a standing guard of five knights kept up, during the summer months, at the castle of Walton on the estuary of the Stour, and their pay is again exactly eightpence a day each.<sup>2</sup> Lastly, at Dover itself, the very next year, we have a payment of £25 to five knights for 150 days' service; that is, eightpence a day

<sup>1</sup> p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> Pipe Roll, 10 Hen. II., p. 34.

each.<sup>1</sup> Passing to 1173, a year of great military expenditure owing to the risings against the King, we have an entry of £5 16s. 8d. paid to five knights for thirty-five days of service in Northampton Castle,<sup>2</sup> that is, exactly eightpence a day each. In the following year the ten knights who were in garrison at Worcester Castle received £12 for thirty-six days' service; that is, eightpence a day.<sup>3</sup> And in 1175 the knights who were guarding the castles of Worcester and of Warwick were paid at the rate of eightpence a day.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, we find that, as was natural, when there was a sudden demand for knights, in times of great emergency, their rate of pay had the same tendency as the price of horses and the wages of yeomen have shown in the present war; that is to say, it rose. And it rose sharply. In the struggle of 1173 and 1174, the garrisons of knights guarding castles were paid, in the majority of cases, at the rate, not of eightpence, but of twelvepence a day.<sup>5</sup> You may see here a feature of mediæval finance. Wages were reckoned by rule of thumb; there was no subtle adjustment. The foot serjeant received his penny, the horse serjeant twopence. Thus the scale rose to the highest offices of all, in which such magnates as the King's butler, the Lord Chancellor, and so forth, had five shillings a day. Military wages were based on the same crude principle even at the siege of Calais in the fourteenth century. The archer then had threepence a day, the horse archer sixpence, the squire a shilling, the knight two shillings, the banneret four shillings. Pay had thus practically tripled since the twelfth century, but the absence of nice gradations is just as marked as it was. And that is why in the twelfth century, if the knight was to be paid more than eightpence, he was at once paid a shilling. The artless simplicity of this finance greatly facilitated the work of account.

<sup>1</sup> Pipe Roll, 11 Hen. II., p. 2. There are other instances in point, in addition to which I showed in *Feudal England* that a scutage of two marcs would represent exactly eightpence a day for the forty days of feudal service.

<sup>2</sup> Pipe Roll, 19 Hen. II., p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Pipe Roll, 20 Hen. II., p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> Pipe Roll, 21 Hen. II., pp. 91, 127.

<sup>5</sup> This was the rate at Salisbury, Cambridge, Hertford, Lincoln, Rochester (Pipe Roll, 20 Hen. II., pp. 34, 63, 67, 96, 125, 138.)

Now my reason for dwelling on the rate of the knight's pay at the time is that if we find castle guard commuted at the rate of eightpence a day we may fairly infer that this commutation was effected at a time when eightpence a day was the recognized value of the service, that is, under Henry II. And this conclusion is, I think, supported in the case of Dover by the fact that we find the Crown in 1165 already paying knights for its guard. And, in any case, it is clear that under Richard I. the payment of money in lieu of guard was a well established practice; for when Abbot Sampson of St. Edmund's had his well known dispute with his knights, one of the points at issue was the amount they were accustomed to pay towards the castle guard of Norwich.<sup>1</sup>

But I must now pass to my next point, namely the system by which from a very early date the Crown distributed the burden of castle guard. And here we must distinguish very carefully between the guard of the royal castles and that of the baronial castles, for which special provision was made, which was due from the tenants of the lord.

In Northamptonshire we obtain an excellent example of the distribution of castle guard. Rockingham, a castle built by the Conqueror, was provided for by making its guard a charge on the knights of the Abbey of Peterborough,<sup>2</sup> on the barony of "Wahull," now Odell, composed of thirty knight's fees,<sup>3</sup> and on the barony of Warden—

<sup>1</sup> *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey* (Rolls Series) I, 270-271.

<sup>2</sup> Writ of 27 Jan., 1217: "Mandatum est Constabulario de Rokingh[am] quod nullas tensesias exigat de terris vel hominibus Abbatis de Burgo et quod pacem eis habere faciat et quod manuteneat et defendat omnia sua. . . . Mandatum est eciam eidem quod non distringat dominica Abbatis et Monachorum ad wardas faciendas castro de Rokingelham sed vos inde capiat is ad terras militum qui feoda illa de eis tenent pro quibus wardas illas facere debent. T. eod." (*Cal. Rot. Litt. Claus.* I, 297). Compare *Chronicon Petroburgense*, p. 41, where Geoffrey de St. Medard is returned as having held four fees of the Abbot in Northants, "et reddidit domino abbati per annum ad

wardam de Rokingham xxiiii solidos." So also pp. 42, 114, 131, 153.

<sup>3</sup> The Earl Marshal's Commissioners reported to the King, in 1605, on this barony that "the land, consisting of thirty knight's fees, being his [the claimant's] ancestors' in the tyme of the Conqueror, and hath continued in lineal descent to this day, and is yet held of him, and nine pounds per annum being the Antient Fee of the castle guard of Rockingham, continually paid into the Exchequer, and is at this day," etc. This payment would represent six shillings on the fee, which seems to have been also the rate from the Peterborough fees. Odell itself was in Bedfordshire, but the barony lay mainly in Northants (see *Victoria History of Northamptonshire*, I, 290).

now Chipping Warden—held by the Reinbudcurt family. I reckon that the fifteen knights' fees which composed this barony became liable to an annual payment of five shillings each when the service was commuted for money.<sup>1</sup> The castle of Northampton itself was garrisoned by the knights of another local barony, that of Gunfrei de "Cioches" (*i.e.* Chocques), the fifteen fees of which commuted their service subsequently for a payment of ten shillings a year each. But a third local barony, that of the Pinkenys, which consisted, like the two others, of fifteen fees, was one of those which were liable for the guard of Windsor Castle.

The castle guard of Windsor is one of peculiar interest, and we are fortunate in having a record of the baronies from which it was due in a volume which contains others of the kind, the *Red Book of the Exchequer* (pp. 716–717). But, to understand its system, there is need of some explanation. We saw at the outset that Abingdon Abbey was called on to provide knights for the guard of Windsor Castle. The service due from the abbey, under the feudal system of the Normans, was thirty knights, and it was reckoned at the same figure for the purpose of the Windsor ward. Exactly half that number, fifteen knights, must have been originally exacted from the barony of the Windsor family, whose founder was castellan of Windsor at the time of Domesday.<sup>2</sup> For in the *Red Book* list we are able to recognize the fragments of what had once been his fief, William de Windsor holding half of it, and Thomas and Hugh de "Haudeng" a quarter each. There has been considerable confusion on the history of this barony, which was first divided into two halves by Walter and William de Windsor in 1198, and then further divided as a consequence of Walter's half being shared by the two Hodengs. Then there was the Pinkeni barony, with its fifteen knights, of which I have already spoken. We have now accounted for sixty fees owing ward to Windsor. To these were added a barony consisting of ten fees, of which the *caput* was at

<sup>1</sup> See the list of "Wardae de Castello de Rokinham" in *Red Book of the Exchequer*, p. celxxx. The total of the payments amounts to £3 15s.

<sup>2</sup> See my article in *The Ancestor*, I, 123.

Little Easton, Essex, though its fees ranged from Suffolk to Dorset. The inclusion of this barony may have been due to the fact that it came into the hands of a Windsor cadet in the days of Henry I. Lastly, three single fees were added to these seventy, thus raising the total number to seventy-three, of which the service, commuted at 20s. a fee, was worth £73 a year. Now seventy-three may seem to you an odd and meaningless number, but a moment's thought will show that it is exactly one-fifth of the 365 days in the year, so that this £73 represented 4s. a day, neither more nor less. And 4s. was exactly the pay of six knights at 8d. a day, or four knights at a shilling. I dare say it sounds like a theory on the Great Pyramid or the number of the Beast, but if you will work it out for yourselves you will find that it is absolutely correct.

In all these calculations twelfth century man was trying to harmonize as best he could three different elements. One was the decimal system of reckoning, seen in the unit of ten hides for fiscal and territorial purposes and in the *constabularia* of ten knights which formed the unit of feudal service. Another was the monetary system based upon the marc and the pound, 8d. representing the twentieth of a marc, and 1s. the twentieth of a pound. The third was the number of days in the year, which could not be made to fit with either of the two others. Under Henry II. we find knights engaged for castle guard by *vigenia* or *vicenia*,<sup>1</sup> a rare word which means twenty days' service. This enabled their total pay to be easily reckoned in marcs or pounds. For the Windsor guard the sixty fees of the two great baronies paid their commutation in money *per quadragenas*, that is, in instalments due every forty days. But this was an attempt to solve the difficulty by reckoning the year as consisting of 360 days. On the other hand, at Dover, where the castle guard was arranged on a most elaborate system, it is clear that the unit of service was fifteen days, and that some fees were liable to perform two or even three turns a year. I believe that at Windsor the service due was thirty days

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Pipe Roll, 20 Hen. II., p. 138.

of guard, and that this was commuted at 8*d.* a day for a pound a year.

For the castle guard of Dover we have extremely full information. I have elsewhere traced for the first time the true history of the Constable's Honour, which represented the Domesday fief of Hugh de Montfort, often afterwards called the Honour of "Hagenet" from its *caput* at Haughley in Suffolk. Each of its fifty-six fees was liable for 10*s.* a year, which represented the commutation for fifteen days of castle guard. But in the case of the other baronies liable for Dover guard, an elaborate arrangement can be traced. Three of these baronies were each of them liable for the payment of the same sum, £19 10*s.*, as commutation, although they respectively consisted of 15, 17½, and 24 fees, while another, in which there were 12 fees, was liable for two-thirds of that sum, that is, £13. This result was arrived at by making some of the fees liable for twice or even thrice as much castle guard as others.

But I must not dwell upon these details, for I have other points to bring before you. The ward system of private castles is harder, of course, to trace than that of the King's fortresses; but it is extremely interesting. In Essex, for instance, we find manors held of the Bishop of London which owed ward at his castle of Bishop Stortford; others, held of the Earls of Richmond, liable to perform ward at the Yorkshire stronghold of their lord; others, which had formed part of the fief of Odo of Bayeux, charged with ward service at Rochester; others, as part of the Honour of Haughley, performing their service at Dover Castle; and, most interesting perhaps of all, some which, held of the Lords of Dunmow, Ralf Baynard's successors, owed ward to Baynard's castle, right in the City of London.<sup>1</sup>

It is essential to remember that a baron's fief was often scattered over several counties, and that therefore, in the case of a private castle, and still more in the case

<sup>1</sup> Wanstead paid two shillings a year to the Bishop of London's castle of Stortford; Willingale Spain paid castle-guard rent to Richmond; Thorrington, Barstable, and Ingrave to Rochester; Little Baddow, Pentlow Hall, Little

Oakley, and Ramsey, to Baynard's Castle (Morant's *Essex*). To Dover castle-guard, rent was due from several Essex manors on the Domesday fief of Hugh de Montfort.

of a royal one, knights might have to come from far to take their turn at castle guard. This leads me to my last point, namely, the value of castle guard and of the money rent for which it was commuted as a means of tracing the descent of manors and the barony to which they have belonged. As an instrument of research it is in some cases the most valuable we possess. Speaking from a somewhat wide experience in the work of identifying manors, I think that the statements, even in records, which allege a manor to be held of this or that Honour, are open at times to question. Payment of rent for castle guard is a far safer guide.

Let me give you an instance from Essex. Adjoining one another are two parishes, West Thurrock and Grays Thurrock, of which the latter is better known as Grays. Morant, the historian of the county, states definitely that Grays Thurrock is the large and valuable manor of Thurrock, which appears in Domesday as the one holding in Essex of the Count of Eu. The Count's fief was forfeited at an early date to the Crown, so that its descent is difficult to trace; but I observed that, according to Morant, the church, not of Grays, but of West Thurrock, "was the endowment of one of the seven prebends founded in the collegiate church within the castle of Hastings, in Sussex." But who founded that collegiate church? Why, the Count of Eu.<sup>1</sup> It must therefore have been West and not Grays Thurrock that was held by the Count of Eu at the time of Domesday. And yet, when we study its manorial history as given in Morant's work, we discover nothing to connect it with Hastings, and we even find it returned in Inquisitions of 1287 (15 Edward I.), 1310 (4 Edward II.), and 1316 (9 Edward II.), as held by the Briancon family of the Duke of Brittany or Earl of Richmond respectively, as if it formed part of the well known Richmond fief. The explanation of this is simply that the castle and Honour of Hastings were held at the time by the Earls of Richmond, in virtue of a special gift from the Crown. And when we turn to an Inquisition of 1279/1280 (8 Edward I.) on the so-called "Barony of Hastings,"

<sup>1</sup> *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI, 1470.

we find that, of fifty-seven fees paying £21 0s. 9*d.* to the ward of Hastings castle, two were at "Thurrock" in Essex.<sup>1</sup> Here, then, if you trusted only to the name of the magnate of whom the manor was held, you would be misled; but the rent for ward was still payable to the castle of the Domesday holder.

Another Essex example is that of the manor of Thorrington, of which an altogether erroneous account is given by Morant, the local historian. This manor is found in a deed of about the middle of the thirteenth century liable to an annual payment of 12*s.* to the ward of Rochester Castle,<sup>2</sup> which enables us to trace its descent as part of the barony of Swanscombe.

That Thurrock, on the north bank of the Thames, rendered castle guard to the distant castle of Hastings reminds us that, as I have warned you, this service was assigned, not to manors which happened to be situated near the castle, but to those which formed, wherever they might lie, part of a certain barony or of certain baronies; this, indeed, should be common knowledge. In the words of the learned authors of the *History of English Law*, "often a tenement owed 'ward' to a far-off castle; thus in Cambridgeshire were lands held of the Count of Aumale which owed ward to his castle of Craven, and lands held of the Count of Brittany which owed ward to his castle of Richmond."<sup>3</sup> But although this, as I have said, ought to be common knowledge, ignorance of so elementary a fact has led to an appalling blash in the official edition of our chief authority on the details of castle guard. In the *Red Book of the Exchequer* we have three separate lists of the baronies from which castle guard was due to Dover Castle and of the knights' fees composing them. Of the great Honour of the Constable, the most important of all, we have in the same volume two independent lists containing further information. The *caput* of this Honour was in Suffolk and many of its manors in the eastern counties, while the baronies had all formed part of the vast fief of

<sup>1</sup> Chanc. Inq. p.m., 8 Edw. I., No. 50. The words are, "Reddunt per annum pro custodia castelli de Hasting xxii*lib.* ix*d.*"

<sup>2</sup> Ancient deed A 821.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. 1895, I, 258.

Odo of Bayeux, who had charge, under William the Conqueror, of Dover Castle. And yet Mr. Hubert Hall, the official editor of the *Red Book*, has endeavoured to ram and cram all these manors into Kent.

Let us take "the Barony of Arsic" as a case peculiarly in point. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, had an under-tenant, Wadard, whose name is prominently preserved by the legend on the Bayeux Tapestry "Hic est Wadard," which is found above a mounted warrior. This Wadard is found in Domesday holding under Bishop Odo in no fewer than seven counties, his estates ranging from Lincolnshire to Dorset and from Oxfordshire to Kent. Within twenty years of Domesday these scattered possessions are found constituting the barony of Arsic, so named from the family which held it. This fact, I believe, has not been previously known. Now when we turn to the list of fees entered in the *Red Book of the Exchequer* (p. 709) as constituting this barony, we at once recognize the scattered manors that Wadard had held of Bishop Odo in 1086. "Ramesham," the first, is Rampisham in Dorset; Mr. Hall asserts it is Faversham in Kent. "Swindene," the second, is Swindon in Wilts; Mr. Hall makes it Sevington in Kent. "Karsintone," the third, is Cassington, Oxon; Mr. Hall suggests it is Keston in Kent. Another of these manors, "Baselcote," is now Balscote, Oxon; Mr. Hall insists on placing it in Kent, though he cannot find in that county any name resembling it. The same remark applies to "Bartone," which is Barton Ede, Oxon, but of which he can only tell us that it must be somewhere in Kent. The result is that every fee in this barony that is not in Kent is wrongly identified by the editor.<sup>1</sup> So, again, with the barony of Maminot: Mr. Hall suggests that its "Bretinghurst" is Bredhurst, in the heart of Kent; as a matter of fact it is Bretinghurst in Camberwell, a Surrey manor of which the name is now eclipsed by Peckham Rye. And its "Hertewelle" also he places in Kent, although it is the Hartwell in Northants of which I have already

<sup>1</sup> Among them is Ditton in Surrey, which in one place (p. 1158), Mr. Hall suggests is in Oxfordshire, while in

another (p. 1163) he evidently imagines that (like those above) it must be Ditton in Kent.

spoken, as indeed Domesday shows. I must not weary you with further instances beyond the cases of two manors belonging to the Honour of the Constable. "Leyre" is Layer in Essex, as the *Red Book* itself proves (pp. 502, 742); and yet, without the slightest hesitation, Mr. Hall rams it into Kent (pp. 614, 706, 718, 1231). "Livermere" (or "Liveremere") is Livermere in Suffolk, as the *Red Book* itself shows (pp. 622, 742), and yet, without the slightest hesitation, Mr. Hall rams it into Kent (pp. 614, 706, 718, 1233). Every one of my statements you can easily verify for yourselves, and every one of the above errors arises from the same strange delusion that because a manor has rendered castle guard to Dover it is, must be, and shall be in Kent, even though the evidence proves most clearly that it was not.

Now we are all of us liable to error, and no one knows better than myself how difficult it often is to identify the names of manors. Therefore, although Mr. Hall's errors arise only from his own delusion, and not from any difficulty in tracing the manors I have dealt with, I should not have felt myself obliged to dwell on them were it not that, unless attention is thus publicly called to them, they will plunge the history of these manors into absolutely hopeless confusion. For this, remember, is an official work; it is edited by an officer of the Public Record Office; and the editor has gone out of his way to assure the student that all the place-names have "been subjected in turn to a three-fold scrutiny" (p. ccclxxix) an "unspeakably laborious" process (p. ccclxxx), of which he describes the details. Of this I will only say that the simplest scrutiny will show that his identifications are wrong. But my point is that these assurances, given as they are in an official work, will of course be accepted by the student, and will lead him hopelessly astray unless he is publicly warned against this unfortunate work. The errors I have brought before you are but a minute fraction of those I have discovered, and am still discovering, in making use of these volumes, and I will gladly place the whole of my corrections at the service of the Public Record Office if and when it consents to substitute another edition.

The importance, for castle guard, of the *Red Book of the Exchequer* has led me to offer these observations; and now I must not detain you longer. I can only hope that I have shown you, at least so far as the limits of a paper permit, the interest and importance of castle guard, a subject which seems, so far as I know, to have hardly received, as yet, the attention it deserves.

## APPENDIX I.

"CASTLE GUARD RENTS" OF WINDSOR.<sup>1</sup>

[12th February, 1699/1700.]

|   | £  | s.               | d. |
|---|----|------------------|----|
| A rent out of Manor of Huntercomb .. .. . | 3  | 15               | 0  |
| Morton Pinkney .. .. .                    | 4  | 11               | 4  |
| Wappenham .. .. .                         | 7  | 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  |    |
| Rectory of Wappenham .. .. .              | 4  | 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  |    |
| Manor of Culworth .. .. .                 | 1  | 2                | 10 |
| " Sulgrave .. .. .                        |    | 11               | 5  |
| " Astwell .. .. .                         | 1  | 2                | 10 |
| " Midgham .. .. .                         | 1  | 0                | 0  |
| " Mandeville .. .. .                      | 1  | 2                | 10 |
| " Easton .. .. .                          | 10 | 0                | 0  |
| " Knight Ellington .. .. .                |    | 10               | 0  |
| " Purly Maling .. .. .                    |    | 1                | 0  |
| Vaccary of Bagshot .. .. .                | 1  | 5                | 0  |
| Bailiwick fines .. .. .                   |    | 10               | 0  |
| Tenements in Datchett .. .. .             |    | 1                | 0  |
| Vaccary of Cuffield .. .. .               | 1  | 0                | 0  |
| Inhabitants of Halley .. .. .             |    | 1                | 0  |
| Inhabitants of Tongham .. .. .            |    | 1                | 0  |
| Inhabitants of Farnborough .. .. .        |    | 1                | 0  |
| A tenement in Abington .. .. .            |    | 3                | 0  |
| Manor of Tubney .. .. .                   | 1  | 0                | 0  |
| Land in Hanney .. .. .                    | 1  | 0                | 0  |
| From Fish-hide manor in Garford .. .. .   |    | 4                | 10 |
| Lands in Pewsey .. .. .                   |    | 13               | 4  |
| A tenement in Locking .. .. .             | 2  | 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ |    |
| Lands in Chilton .. .. .                  |    | 18               | 0  |
| From manor of Hardwell .. .. .            |    | 10               | 0  |
| " " Frilsord .. .. .                      | 1  | 4                | 0  |
| Lands in Balking .. .. .                  |    | 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ |    |
| " Longworth .. .. .                       |    | 6                | 8  |
| " Denchworth .. .. .                      | 1  | 0                | 6  |
| From manor of Besleigh .. .. .            | 1  | 0                | 0  |
| " " Witham .. .. .                        | 1  | 17               | 0  |

<sup>1</sup> *House of Commons Journals*, XIII, 204-205.

|                                     | £  | s. | d.            |
|-------------------------------------|----|----|---------------|
| Lands in Padbury .. .. .            | 3  | 8  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| "    Sugworth .. .. .               |    |    | 10            |
| From manor of Lifford .. .. .       | 1  | 0  | 0             |
| Lands in Woollaston .. .. .         | 1  | 1  | 6             |
| Inhabitants of Uffington .. .. .    | 11 | 1  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Lands in Watchfield .. .. .         | 10 | 7  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Other lands there .. .. .           |    | 2  | 0             |
| Lands in Goosey .. .. .             | 4  | 0  |               |
| "    Leckhamstead .. .. .           | 1  | 0  | 0             |
| Inhabitants of Sunningwel .. .. .   | 16 | 0  | 8             |
| Manor of Boxare .. .. .             | 4  | 8  |               |
| "    Kingston Lesleigh .. .. .      | 1  | 0  | 0             |
| "    Beedon .. .. .                 | 2  | 10 | 0             |
| "    Leverton .. .. .               | 10 | 0  |               |
| Lands in Wheatley .. .. .           | 11 | 7  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| "    Denton .. .. .                 | 6  | 5  |               |
| Chawers manor in Garsington .. .. . | 1  | 0  | 0             |
| Manor of Sampford .. .. .           | 1  | 0  | 0             |
| Bereford St. Michael .. .. .        | 1  | 0  | 0             |
| Buckland .. .. .                    | 1  | 0  | 0             |

## APPENDIX II.

## CASTLE GUARD OF ROCHESTER.

There is preserved in the Public Record Office an important and unpublished document which gives the names of the "baronies" and fees owing castle-guard rent to Rochester Castle.<sup>1</sup> It is very much of the same character as that which exists for Dover Castle.<sup>2</sup>

The first entry in this list is "De Baronia Ingeramm' Patrich' xv feoda que talia sunt." Then follow the names of the places in which the fees were situate, ranging from Patricksbourne and Little Delce in Kent to Tadworth, etc., in Surrey. Next follow the other "baronies" in this order:

"De Baron' de Helte vij feod'.

De Honore de Perche v feod'.

De Baronia Roberti de Sancto Johanne iij feod'.

De Baronia Domini Warini de Monte Canis, xxx<sup>a</sup> feod' pro quibus Idem Warin' respond' totaliter per manum suam, et respondet de xviii<sup>l</sup>."

In this arrangement of baronies and fees there is some similarity to that adopted in the case of Windsor Castle. There, as we saw, the ward of 60 fees (out of the 73) was due from sundry tenants-in-chief in the proportion of 30, 15, 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ , 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ . Here the ward of 60 fees was divided into portions of 30, 15, and another 15 made up from sundry baronies.

Warine de Montchensi, who was charged with 30 fees, was lord of the barony of Swanscombe (see p. 145 above). Enguerrand Patrich

<sup>1</sup> K. R. Knights' Fees  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

<sup>2</sup> *Red Book of the Exchequer*, pp. 706-712.

is known *abunde* to have held 15 fees.<sup>1</sup> He occurs at the court of Henry II. in 1183. Of the smaller baronies, that of "Helte" is of some interest because "Helto Constatularius" was one of those who swore to the return for the knights of the see of Bayeux in 1133.

But the chief interest, perhaps, of this document is found in its evidence as to the rate of commutation for Rochester castle guard. We are told of this document by Mr. Hubert Hall that:

"A contemporary list of Castle-ward services, which can scarcely have been any other than those of Dover, is, however, missing, for the Rochester roll has this interesting note, 'Summa totalis rotuli alterius, clxixl. xiijs. ijd. Summa totalis utriusque rotuli cc et vijl. et xiijs.'"<sup>2</sup>

The note is interesting, no doubt—when correctly quoted. But unfortunately both the totals are wrongly given by Mr. Hall. According to him they are these:

|                         |     |     | £   | s. | d. |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
| Total of the other roll | ... | ... | 169 | 13 | 2  |
| Total of both rolls     | ... | ... | 206 | 14 | 0  |

This would leave £37 0s. 10d. as the total of the Rochester roll. But the actual sums in the MS. are these:

|                         |     |     | £   | s. | d. |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
| Total of the other roll | ... | ... | 169 | 17 | 2  |
| Total of both rolls     | ... | ... | 206 | 1  | 2  |

This leaves only £36 4s. as the total of Rochester payments. The difference may seem small, but it proves to be all-important for the rate of commutation. The MS., having stated as above that Warine de Montchensi was liable to a payment of £18 for his 30 fees, proceeds, "Summa totius Warde xxxvjli. iiij sol." This, at first sight, appears strange, for if Warine's 30 fees paid £18, why should the other 30 fees pay £18 4s.? The discrepancy can be beautifully explained. On careful study of the MS. it will be found that two of the fees of "Helte" were each entered as  $1\frac{1}{2}$  fee; this would give a total excess of  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee, which, at 12s. on the fee, would account for the excess of 4s. And that this solution is right is absolutely proved by the fact that one of these fees of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  fee was, according to our MS., in Aldington, and that we find an estate there held in 1248-9 which paid 14s. castle guard rent to Rochester,<sup>3</sup> that is, at the rate of 12s. a fee on  $1\frac{1}{2}$  fee.

Thus we attain the conclusion that the Rochester rate of commutation was 12s. on the fee, just as the Dover rate, we have seen, was 10s. And this is in perfect accordance with the fact that the one fee at Thorrington, Essex (see p. 154 above), paid 12s. a year.

There remains the "total of the other roll," £169 17s. 2d., of which Mr. Hall, we have seen, holds that its castle-guard rents "can scarcely have been any other than those of Dover." As the total of the Dover rents is printed by himself in this same volume (p. 712) as £145 7s. 8d., and as this total agrees with the sum of the details, we have here yet another instance of his curious inability to edit MS. records, and of the possible, if rare, need in officers of the Public Record Office of more scientific training in the work.

<sup>1</sup> *Red Book of the Exchequer*, pp. 135, 197.

<sup>2</sup> *Red Book of the Exchequer*, p. ccxxxviii.

<sup>3</sup> Hasted's *Kent*.