

THE OMISSION OF EDGWARE FROM DOMESDAY

BY CHARLES F. BAYLIS

THERE are several possible explanations of this omission. They are discussed in the following pages. But, unless further information is discovered, the reason for the omission must remain uncertain.

One explanation offered is that Edgware belonged to St. Alban's Abbey and was lost when the Conqueror seized their land between Barnet and London Stone.¹ But neither Edgware nor Stanmore is so situated, and the numerous chronicles emanating from St. Alban's contain no suggestion of a claim to the ownership of Edgware, though they include precise accounts of the properties which had belonged to the Abbey in Saxon times.² If the Stanmore manors were then forfeited, they would be shown in Domesday as owned by the Abbey T.R.E., but they are then held by Saxons.

Another suggestion is that Edgware was in the king's hands at the time of the survey. If so, it would have been shown as "Terra Regis."

There is also the possibility of accidental omission. The British Museum has a document³ which J. H. Round considered to be a copy, of the time of King John, of an earlier original of not later than the middle of the 12th century.⁴ An extract relating to the Hundred of Gore is here set out with the addition, in the last column, of the corresponding Domesday hidage:

Herghes	C hid	100
Kingsb(er)ia	X hid	10
Stanmere	IX hid	9½
Terr Com'	VI hid	
Alia Stanmere	IX hid et dim	9½
Henedune	XX hid Abb	20
Summa C et XL et IX hid		149

The hidage totals 154½, not CXLIX, as is stated, which latter agrees with Domesday, plus 6 for Terr Com'. In a summary at the end of the document the total is given as 149½, again incorrect. If one corrects the Stanmere figure to 9½, one gets

a multiple of the five-hide unit: by combining items 3, 4 and 5 one gets 25 hides, which makes each of the four components a multiple of the unit. "Terr Com'" may signify either Terra Comitatus or Terra Comitatis, "land of the earl." Patric, Earl of Salisbury, who will be mentioned later as an earlier owner of Edgware, first appears as an earl in 1149. Either might explain an apparent omission implying a subsequent certification for geld. In 1597, Edgware is described as "the manor of Edgware *als* Erlesburye,"⁵ evidently an earlier name.

The possibility remains that Edgware was included in one of the other Domesday manors. The distant Harrow can be ignored; there is nothing in the history of the adjoining Hendon that suggests any connection; the descent of Great Stanmore is known. There is, however, a possibility that Edgware was included either in Little Stanmore or Kingsbury.

The known facts about the early ownership of Edgware can be set out briefly. In 1176, Henry II confirmed to the canons of St. Bartholomew whatever William de Ramis or Adam Buceminte or Patric, Earl of Salisbury, or his wife, Countess Ela I, had granted to them in Eggeswere or Tidulfuestree (Elstree).⁶ Secondly, a mandate was issued in 1216 directing that Alianor, Countess of Salisbury, widow of the second earl, should be allowed to hold her manors of Gatesden, Eggeswer and Wootton in peace.⁷ Edgware was not the ancestral property of Alianor, but probably part of her dower, because her father-in-law, Earl Patric, had owned land in Edgware. Thirdly, a deed at the British Museum, which must be dated between A.D. 1226 and 1240,⁸ shows that Ela II, widow of the third earl, but countess in her own right, gave the manor of Edgware to her fourth son, Nicholas Longespee.

From the above we see that the connection of the Salisbury family with Edgware began before Earl Patric's death on 27th March, 1168.

The first known member of this Salisbury family was Edward of Salisbury, also called Edward the Sheriff. Vincent, in a pedigree at the College of Arms, gives the name of Edward's wife as Matilda; in other places she is said to have been a de Raimes. We are told that the wife of Robert de Stuteville was of the issue (*parentela*) of Edward of Salisbury on the parental side and of the progeny of Roger de Raimes on her mother's.⁹ Her name was Leonia and in a confirmation grant by her to Welbeck Abbey, she is described as Leonia de Remis.

In a later confirmation, Henry de Stuteville refers to Leonia de Reynes, his mother.¹⁰ Leonia's use of her mother's maiden name tends to confirm the supposition that she inherited the de Raimes' Norman manor of Rames. Robert de Stuteville and Leonia gave to the Abbey of St. George de Bosherville a *rent charge in substitution for rents at Rames previously given to the abbey by Edward of Salisbury*.¹¹ About 1130, Payn de Hocton paid the king 200 silver marks and 2 gold marks for permission to marry Edward's widow, while his father, William, gave the king £200.¹² From this marriage there were two daughters, Matilda, who married Robert Grimbald, and Emma, who married Ernald de Bosco.¹³ Matilda, as Matilda de Houghton, gave to Bittlesden Abbey certain rents and land for the souls of herself, her deceased lord, Robert Grimbald, her father Payn, her mother, Adeliza de Raimes, and her grandfather William.¹⁴ This deed proves that the widow of Edward of Salisbury was Adeliza and that her maiden name was de Raimes. The sums paid by the de Hoctons for permission to marry her show that she had considerable wealth, was an heiress in her own right and apparently the owner of the Norman fief of Rames.

Domesday shows the "manor in Stanmera," later called Little Stanmore, as part of the barony of Roger de Rames, who also owned estates in Normandy. William, presumably his son, succeeded to the English barony and was dead in 1130, when his sons Roger and Robert were assessed for relief, the property being divided.¹⁵ What relation was Adeliza to the Domesday Roger and why did she inherit the Norman fief? A. L. Raimes¹⁶ suggests that Roger had two sons, William and Roger, who in 1130 was excused his debt to the Treasury because he was dead,¹⁷ and that the English barony went to William and the Norman fief to Roger, whose only child and heiress was Adeliza. Daughters did not inherit large estates except in the absence of a son and heir. Adeliza could not have been much over 45 when she married Payn de Hocton about 1130, as there were two children of the union. Her marriage to Edward of Salisbury must have been after 1100, and Leonia's birth much later, as she was living *circa* 1212.¹⁸ Edward had two other children, Walter and Matilda, who married Humphrey de Bohun at the instance of William Rufus.¹⁹ She must have been born some time before 1100, and Edward must have had an earlier wife, probably the Matilda of Vincent's pedigree.

Had Walter been Adeliza's son, he would have inherited her Norman estates.

Patric, Walter's son, created Earl of Salisbury in 1149, is the first of the Salisbury family known to have owned land in Edgware and the same source shows that the de Raimes family did also. Among the benefactions confirmed by Henry II to St. Bartholomew's Priory were: "Of the gift of Robert de Ramis the church of St. Bartholomew, Tidulfuestre" and "of the gift of Roger de Ramis the church of St. Lawrence, Stanmere."²⁰ When William died in 1130, the English barony was divided between his sons Robert and Roger, each taking a block of manors and a part of Dedham.²¹

Little Stanmore seems to have been divided also and a distinction made between the two parts which continued after the fief had been re-united. The dividing line was the vanished high road to Watford; the northern part was known as land in Edgware and the southern as land in Stanmore. William de Raimes, 1165 to 1196, granted one hide of land "in my land of Egeswere" for the fifth part of a knight's fee performed in money in the same vill of "Egeswere."²² He also granted land in "Egeswere and Stanmere" by the service of half a knight paying pence in "Egeswere." William's "house of Stanmere" is mentioned.²³ There are a number of similar documents, but these suffice to show that land in Little Stanmore was described as in Edgware. The point to be noted is that the de Raimes' holding extended to the east of Watling Street and Little Stanmore is entirely on the west side.

A possible hypothesis is that the Domesday manor "in Stanmera" included both Edgware and Little Stanmore, with a church and manor house at the north end of it. This church of St. Bartholomew served the whole area. On Edward's marriage to Adeliza he received, in free marriage, the part east of Watling Street, except the church and house and a small parcel of land adjoining, because they served the rest of the manor. Finding this inconvenient, de Raimes built a new church, St. Lawrence's, and a house more centrally situated. The division of the manor may account for the name Little Stanmore, first found about 1210,²⁴ the part south of the Watford road being much smaller than Great Stanmore.

The circumstantial evidence in support of this hypothesis is strong, if not conclusive, but I think it is the explanation of the omission of Edgware from Domesday.

There remains the possibility that Edgware was a part of the larger Kingsbury manor—they were long coupled as the manors of Edgware and Kingsbury.²⁵

R. W. Eyton maintains, with overwhelming evidence, that Walter de Salisbury married Sybil, one of the three daughters and co-heiresses of Arnulf de Hesdin, the Domesday owner of a barony which included Kingsbury,²⁶ and we may assume that the part of Kingsbury coupled with Edgware was a part of Sybil's inheritance. At the time of Domesday the manor had been subinfeudated and was held by Albold, de Hesdin apparently having little more than a seigniorship or chief fee with perhaps a rent, unless Edgware, mainly virgin forest, as indicated in the St. Alban's chronicles, was appurtenant to the lordship of Kingsbury.

Kingsbury is 1,829 acres. Hence the larger or $7\frac{1}{2}$ hide Domesday manor could be about 1,350 acres and the $2\frac{1}{2}$ hide holding about 450 acres. The smaller holding had wood for 200 pigs, Great Stanmore, with 1,500 acres, for 800, and Little Stanmore, with 1,600 acres, for another 800. The larger manor of Kingsbury with 1,350 acres had wood for 1,000 pigs. Are we justified in thinking that the Kingsbury swine found their food in the appurtenant woods of Edgware?

NOTES

1. *Gest. Abb. St. Albani a Walsingham*, Rolls Series, I, p. 50.
2. Matthew Paris, *Chron. Majora*, Rolls Series, pp. 1-30.
3. B.M., Add. MSS. 14, 252, fo. 126.
4. J. H. Round, *Commune of London*, p. 257.
5. Hoveden's Maps, *penes* All Souls College, Oxford.
6. *Inspeximus*, Pat. Rolls, 11 Edw. I, Pt. 2, m. 8.
7. Hardy, *Cal. Rot. Claus.*, I, p. 285.
8. B.M., Harl., ch. 53, B. 12.
9. Rot. de Dominabus, 1185, p. 38, Pipe Roll Society.
10. Dugdale, *Monasticon*, VI, Pt. 2, p. 875; B.M., Add. MSS. 6705, p. 76.
11. J. H. Round, *Cal. Doc'ts in France*, p. 70.
12. Pipe Rolls, 31 Hy. I, p. 81. Bowles and Nicholls, *Lacock Abbey*, p. 55.
13. Dugdale, *Monasticon*, VI, p. 424b.
14. Bittlesden Cart., Harl. 4714, fo. 5.
15. Pipe Rolls, 31 Hy. I.
16. A. L. Raimes, *Reymes of Overstrand*, Norfolk Archaeology, XXX, p. 15.
17. Pipe Rolls, 31 Hy. I.
18. Inquisition of John. Printed by Madox from Liber Feodorum.
19. Chron. of Lanthony Abbey.
20. *Inspeximus*, Charter Rolls, 18 Edw. I.
21. J. H. Round, *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, pp. 237-9.
22. Ancient Deeds, P.R.O., A. 2097.
23. *Ibid.*, A. 2146.
24. Inq. Knight Service. John.
25. L.M.A.S., *Trans.*, N.S., III, Pt. 1.
26. *Herald and Genealogist*, VI, p. 241.