

A LINK IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF LONDON.

BY

HAROLD SANDS, F.S.A., M.I.M.E.,
OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

PART III.

*Continued from Vol. V, page 526, of the
Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archæological
Society.*

(concluded.)

Robert, the son of Ernuceonus, and William son of Herlwin, owe one mark of gold, that they may have the debts due to their father [i.e. leave to collect those due to him]. The Sons of Goislinus of London, render account of two marks of gold, for the debts of their father, and have paid into the Treasury sixty shillings for half a mark of gold, and still owe one and a half marks of gold. Abraham, and Deuslesalt, Jews, render account of one mark of gold, that they may have their debt from Osbert of Leicester, they have paid into the Treasury sixty shillings for half a mark of gold, and still owe half a mark.

And the said Sheriffs render an account of £15 15s. od. for the former [preterito] aid [auxilium] due from the City. [an arrear from the previous, or thirtieth year not the present, or thirty first year's account]. This is *not* the ordinary feudal aid, but a purely arbitrary assessment levied [at will] upon towns and cities. The corresponding term for the Counties is 'Donum,' a [forced] gift; and in remissions of sums due by the King's

LONDONIA. 7. Middelsex.

QUATTOR Succom Lond. redd. Compote. de firma Londonie. s. s. xlv. f. 7. xlv. f. 7. ix. s. ff.
 14 litterarum Constat. s. vii. f. 7. i. s. no.
 14 litterarum Comite. Ostrycon. xxi. f. 7. xxi. f. 7. vi. s. no.
 14 littere Seruante q. custodiare Com. 7. Sigillu. 7. Forcaris Turris. xxi. f. 7. iii. f. 7. iii. s. no.
 14 littere Sycors. Om. s. p. vii. f. 7. vii. s. no.
 14 littere Gauff. Ingermatoris. x. f. 7. xii. f. 7. xi. s. no.
 14 littere R. de Arbor. s. vii. f. 7. xii. f. 7. i. s. no.
 14 Turribus Londoni p. Carbone. lx. f. 7. x. s. no.
 14 Oleo ad apend. ante Sepulchru. Regne. xvi. f. 7. ii. s. no. ff.
 14 littere Archieps. Rochomas. 7. In Lannis Com. s. xlv. f. 7. x. f. no.
 14 Hartung. 7. Wyngon. 7. Oles. 7. Hucub. 7. ductu usq. ad. Sodepoe. vii. f. 7. xlv. f. 7. vi. s. no.
 14 Emptione Sini. 7. Condictu. xlv. f. 7. vi. f. 7. i. s. no.
 14 Emptione Pipis. 7. Cunnin. 7. Emigbri. 7. Olmiregoy. 7. Bacin. 7. Causli ad op. bag. xxxvi. f. 7. xix. f. 7. ix. s. no.
 14. ii. Arch. de ponte Londoni faciend. x. xvi. f. no.
 14 Emptione Turris London. xlv. f. 7. vi. s. no.
 14. v. Domb. quis fuit. Ouzer. 7. Capella reficend. 7. Talis minus. Opib. xxxvi. f. 7. ix. s. no.
 14. Quittacionib. Thelon. Mysterion. Com. Toob. de s. un. z. lx. xvi. f. 7. iii. s. no.
 14. Anno onto ad ponend. sup. Sepulchru. Regne. iii. f. no.
 14. Oct. CCC. 7. x. f. 7. ix. f. 7. ii. s. ff.

writ to the Bishop of Salisbury, £8 10s. od., and the Count of Gloucester, £7 5s. od., and the Sheriff is quit (*quietus est*).

We next come to a lady of considerable importance—Ingenolda, the widow of Roger, the nepos, or nephew, of Hubert, of Caen, whose husband, as we have seen, had died while on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and the mother of Gervase de Cornhill. She owes two marks of gold that (as in the case of Countess Lucy of Chester, already mentioned) she may have the right to re-marry whom she will, and have her dower and goods.

Next, Philip "Soparius" the Soaper, or Soap-boiler, owes 63s. od., for the money or cattle of Gosselinus, or Jocelyn, of London. Ulvietus owes 20s. od. of the same money, or cattle, and Bliherus¹ [a very Welsh sounding name, which closely resembles that Bleheri mentioned under Carmarthen, as having had his daughter forcibly abducted by another Welshman named Blehien de Mabuder], also owes 40s. od. of the same money, or cattle.

Next we have Gervase FitzRoger, nephew of Hubert, of Caen (who in future may be abbreviated to de Cornhill), owing £6 12s. 6d. on account of the debts of Roger, his father, and two persons with very Danish-sounding names—Algarus and Sprachelingus—owing 10 marks of silver, fine (either for making, or circulating "*forisfactum*" [which may be also translated a transgression or "forfeiture"], bad money (*falsorum denariorum*) or silver pennies.

We next come to a heading which at once suggests legal proceedings. "New Pleas, and New Agreements, for fines or other mulcts," headed by a third mention of Jews, when Rubi-Gotsce, Jacob, and Manasserus, Jews, render an account of 6 marks of gold that the King will give judgement in their favour, and against Richard (de Clare), the son of Gilbert Fitz Richard, for his debt to them, they pay into the Treasury

¹ P.R.H.I., p. 90.

£24 os. od. for four marks of gold, and still owe two marks of gold.

This (which may be described as "a new way to collect old debts) is an admirable example of the manner in which the King sold his justice, which certainly has a most venal appearance.

Richard, who apparently had been borrowing money from the Jews, seems to have been unable to repay principal, or interest, and as they were dunning him (which, for a Norman gentleman of high-birth, was alike annoying, embarrassing, and as Dogberry says, "Most tolerable, and not to be endured"), he had *promised* the King 200 marks for his aid in resisting the Jews' attempt to recover the debt due to them,¹ but this had been *merely* a promise, and nothing had been paid, even on account, of this sum. The Jews became aware of it, and also that with the money-loving King, the financial bird in the hand would be worth more than the prospective one in the bush, and that it would be better to make the King an offer, backed by at least half the amount paid cash down, which they did with success.

This Richard de Clare, or Richard Fitz Gilbert, was the direct great, great, grandson of Godfrey, Count of Brionne in Normandy, eldest of the illegitimate sons of Richard Sans Peur, Duke of Normandy A.D. 943 to 996, so by descent he was closely connected with the Norman ruling family, and after 1066 A.D. could claim kinship with the Crown of England. Richard's father, Gilbert, was known as "de Tonbridge" from his large estate there.

Henry, son of Josselin of London, renders account of one good "Samictum," or Samite,² for the right to the giving in marriage to him of his wife, or in other words, a fine for permission to marry her; this he has rendered

¹ P.R.H.I., p. 53, sub. Essex and Hertford.

² A rich silk cloth often interwoven with designs in gold and silver thread.

to the King according to the royal writ, and has his quittance.

Next comes a remarkable and interesting case of a great privilege being obtained by paying for it. The Citizens of London render account of one hundred marks of silver that they may have the right to elect *a* Sheriff (not four) of their own choosing, and they have paid into the Treasury £30 os. od., but whether the Roll is defective or not, there is no mention as to what became of the unpaid remainder; from the amount of the fine, £86 13s. 4d., it would seem they attached considerable value to a privilege that had to be so dearly bought. Then follows what can hardly have been a pardon (*perdona*), but must have been a discharge, or remission of some payment due by no less a person than King David of Scotland, who in the peerage of England was also Earl of Huntingdon, of 16s. od.

The King of Scotland had a large and important Soke in the City, which in extent was practically equivalent to what afterwards became the Ward of Farringdon Within. It was bound up with the Honour of Huntingdon, and may have been given to Earl Waltheof on his marriage with Judith, the niece of William I in 1070 A.D. David, King of Scotland, had married their daughter Maud, and held the Soke early in the twelfth century, and there is still extant a writ addressed to his Soke reeve there, dated circa 1108–1124 A.D. (*Cal. Docs. Scotland*, I, p. 1). This Soke had been created from the King's lands next to Aldermanbury and three other fees, also from the same source, which may be deemed to have been Sokes, are Lothbury, held by Albert of Lorraine (a D.B. tenant in Bedfordshire).

Bocointe and Bucklersbury, the holders of which have been already dealt with.

Then follows a list of other similar ones—Ranulph of Poitou pays 7s. od.; the Bishop of Ely, 7s. 10d.; Robert Fitz Ralph, 8s. od.; and John Fitz Ralph, 18s. od. Tierrico, or Thierry, the son of Derman, 20s. 6d. (and

Thierry, who in a later age dwindles into the modern surname of Terry), was probably the son of that Derman, of whom Domesday Book records that he held of the King half a hide of land in Islington with land to half a plough, and one villein, and it was worth 10s., and that he had displaced one Algar, a vassal of King Edward the Confessor. If so he was the grandfather of one Bertram filius Theodorici, filii Derman, who, according to Tomlins,¹ was called "Bertram de Barwe," and held Newington Barrow in Islington, and was a benefactor to the Nuns of Clerkenwell, and had a son, Thomas, who, about the beginning of the thirteenth century, is found bestowing a serf upon St. Paul's.² Tierri had a daughter, who married William Blemund (le viel), the old, who was a son of Hubert of Caen, and it is of particular interest because it is from his name that Bloomsbury (Blemundsbury) was derived, and also because it adds another to the list of eminent citizens who either were foreign settlers in the City after the Norman Conquest, or were of foreign extraction. William Blemund, senior, had two sons, William, the elder, became a Canon of Holy Trinity, and the younger was called Tierri, or Terri, after his uncle Tierri, the son of Derman.³ Nicolas the hireling, or mercer (mercenarius), 2s.; Conan the mason (Cementarius), pays 12d; Aluric the fat (grosso), 11s. od.; Men (i.e. Tenants) of the Queen, 27s. 6d.; the Chancellor, Geoffrey Rufus (or the red), 33s. 6d.

Another important foreigner destined to play a very considerable part in the next reign, William de Pont de l'Arche, pays 16s. od. Under Stephen he became Chamberlain, and in 1135-6 A.D., we find his name among the witnesses to Stephen's grant of the Bishopric of Bath.

Herlwin, son of Herlwin, 5s. od.; Hervey of Lanvallei,

¹ T. E. Tomlins, *Perambulation of Islington*, pp. 60-64, 1858.

² Fifth Report Hist. MSS., p. 422.

³ Add. MS., 14,252, fo. 127d.

3s.; Joscelyn of Ely, 3s. od.; the Bishop of Ely (amerced for the second time) now pays eighteenpence (1s. 6d.); Tesson¹ (Taissoni) of London, 3s. od.; William Coterele, 2s. The Count of Mortain, 1s. 6d., a most incomprehensible item when we remember the man was a prisoner, unless the payment was from the revenues of his English estates forfeited to the Crown; the total amount of these fines being £9 6s. 4d. And in sundry payments made by the King's writ (breve) Fulcheredus Fitz Walter, £12 os. od. for an "Estructum"² for the Count [Robert, the King's eldest brother] of Normandy, then a state prisoner; and £15 7s. od. is left owing.

Robert, the son of Ernuceonus, owes one good "Cendaz" (possibly a thin silken cloth called Cendal, a very expensive fabric imported from the East, that he may have jurisdiction over, or right, to his land.

The Dean of London³ renders account of 20 marks of silver, in order that the King may aid him in his pleas with the Bishop, and has paid into the Treasury 5 marks, and still owes 15 marks of silver.

Ralph Havoc owes two gersfalcons and one Norway hawk (accipitrum Norriscum), that he may have the same exemption, discharge, or acquittance from claims, or pleas, that his father had.

Robert Fitz Ralph, and John his brother, render an

¹ See Vol. V, Part IV, p. 517, for a previous mention of him.

² See ante Vol. V, Part IV, p. 525, for the probable meaning of this word. If (as I infer) a Goshawk, it shows the Count had occasional liberty to Hawk, if not to hunt, and that he was not a close prisoner in durance vile, but closely watched and securely guarded against attempts to escape.

The word should be "*Asturcum*," a goshawk under which it is found in Ducange's Glossary and is undoubtedly due to a misspelling by the scribe.

³ William, who was Dean of London from 1111 to 1138 A.D., and also a Prebendary of Chichester, would appear to have been blessed (?) with what Carlyle would have called a somewhat "high-flying Bishop." This individual, who had been (prior to his appointment to the See of London) a mere Canon of Lyons, rejoiced in the name of Gilbert "the Universal," and consecrated at Canterbury in 1127-8 A.D., died in 1134, his pretensions seem to have soon embroiled him with his inferior clergy, and the Dean of St. Paul's in particular, resulting in the law suit here mentioned. (*Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. Edn. Le Neve and Hardy, 1854, Vol. II, pp. 281, 307.)

account of 3 marks of gold, that the King may grant to them the pledges, and lands, that Gervase [de Cornhill] granted or gave to them.

The next three lines on the Roll [p. 149] appear to have been inserted by mistake, and have been cancelled by the scribe running his pen through them. Nevertheless, I shall quote them because the opening words are a confirmation of there having been at this time no less than *four* Sheriffs of London and Middlesex. It begins thus: "The *four* Sheriffs of London render account of eight marks of gold that they may withdraw from the office they now hold; they have paid into the Treasury 3 marks of gold, and still owe one mark." An additional proof, were any needed, that it was customary, not merely to pay for taking up an office, but also for permission to relinquish it.

Gervase, the son of Peverel,¹ owes 30 marks for the claim of a boy (*calumpnia pueri*), Picot Impasterator owes 10 marks of silver to be paid that he may have judgment against his debtors.

Next follows a remarkable entry about the entire Jewry. The Jews of London render account of £2,000 os. od. (!!) concerning a certain sick man (*infirmo*) whom they slew! They have paid into the Treasury 610 . . . , but here, owing to a defect in the Roll, which is illegible, we do not know whether it was pounds, marks, shillings, or pence, but, presumably, the former.

¹ There were two separate holdings in the City, those of Peverel of London, and Peverel of Nottingham, and it is not possible to say with certainty (but probably to him of London) to which of them the plea related. The Church of St. Martin in the Vintry belonged to Ranulf Peverel, of London, who also held a great fief in Essex and the Eastern Counties. He died in or about 1090 A.D., and left a son, William, who gave the Priory of Hatfield Peverel, founded by Ingelrica, his mother, to St. Albans Abbey, and died in this reign, possibly without issue, as there is nothing to connect Gervase with him; later the Soke of Peverel of Nottingham had in 1189 A.D. been granted by John Earl of Mortain to Richard Fitz Reiner, and as some of his property was situated in Vintry and Queenhithe Wards, it is probable both the Peverel Sokes were there. William Peverel, of London, is also mentioned under Essex, p. 60; Suffolk, p. 99; and Rutland, p. 135; and a William Peverel, p. 48, but not described as "of London" in this Roll.

The reputation of Jewish physicians at that time was much higher than of the European leech, or medicus, but if the sick man had been under their treatment, it would appear to have been just one of those cases where, as Holy Writ hath it, "In the multitude of Counsel there wanteth not safety," albeit, rather for the physicians than for the patient, and in this instance as they seem to have failed to effect a cure, the chance of extorting an enormous fine was too good a one to be let pass by the fine exacting monarch!

As a rule, the Crown did not interfere much with the Jewish Colony, and from Pipe Rolls of a later period, we gather that it was usual to permit them a fairly free hand during their lives (even if they had (as probably they had) been practising usury, in which case Richard Fitz Neal¹ tells us that all their goods would be forfeited to the King), but to confiscate all their property at their deaths, and call up all sums due to them most strictly. As a class, we hear little or nothing of the Jews prior to the Norman Conquest, though there is a clause in the so-called "Laws of Edward the Confessor," placing them under the special protection of the King! but this is obviously of Norman date, if not an interpolation, while it is mentioned by the contemporary Chroniclers that William I settled them in London, and brought Jews from Rouen, and the earliest Norman Records mention the Jews as a notable class *ostensibly* engaged in trade, and making such exorbitant profits (out of *secret* moneylending transactions) as to enable them to bear and survive the most severe exactions.

The Church held usury up to public detestation, and made no difference between reasonable interest on equitable and moderate terms, and what we now consider exorbitant and usurious exactions. The result of the condemnation by the Church of the practice of usury

¹ Son of Nigel Bishop of Ely, who was probably the son of Roger Bishop of Salisbury, and the author of the *Dialogus de Scaccario*, or book setting forth the methods on which the Exchequer worked.

was that all dealings in money in the early Middle Ages fell at once into the hands of the Jews, and such transactions being under the ban of the Church as regards Christians, naturally became their sole monopoly.¹ And in payments made by the King's writ by Rubi Gotsce 100 marks of silver and Manasser the Jew 80 marks of silver and £3 4s. 4d., and Jaco [b?]. At this point the roll is defective, and Abra [ham?] the Jew, 15 marks of silver and 5s. 10d. for two silver cups, and the same Rubi Gotsce 80 marks of silver for William the son of— here again the roll is defective—and some words are missing. . . . And owe £1116. 13s. 4d.¹ Rubi Gotsce, and Judei (the Jews), to whom Count Ranulph² [of Chester] was indebted, owe 10 marks of gold, that the King may decide in their favour against the Count, because of his debts to them, and of h. . . . but here again the Roll is defective, and there is a considerable hiatus, till it goes on . . . 6 marks of gold, and other Jews, 4 marks of gold.³ William Lelutre, and Geoffrey Bucherellus, and Ralph, son of Herlewin, render account of 6 marks of gold that they may be allowed to relinquish (exeant) the Office of Sheriff of London, and Middlesex, and they pay into the Treasury three [marks of gold?], but here the roll is again illegible, and still owe three marks of gold.

William de Balio (of the bailey, or of Bailleul?) also owes two marks of gold that he may do the same, so here we have the names of the four Sheriffs.

William Lelutre (or Luttrell?), Geoffrey Bucherell, Ralph Fitz Herlewin, and William of Bailleul? or de

¹ For a detailed account of how this traffic was carried on in England, see Madox's *History of the Exchequer*, Ch. VII (1711), and the *Dialogus de Scaccario*. Edn. Hughes, Crump and Johnson, 1902, II, X F and I, pp. 136-7-8.

² This was Ralph I (husband of the Countess Lucy), who had died some time before, in 1129 A.D., and was succeeded by their son, Ralph II, surnamed de Gernons, as Earl of Chester; Alice, the daughter of Ralph I, was the wife of Richard Fitz Gilbert de Clare, and mother of Gilbert, first Earl of Hertford.

³ So this would appear to have formed part of the great fine of £2,000 already mentioned.

Balio, and the said Sheriffs render account of the aid (auxilio) of the City, and have paid into the Treasury £80 os. od; and in remissions, pardons, or releases, granted by the King's writ (breve).

The Archbishop of Canterbury (William of Corbeuil, the builder of the great Keep Tower of Rochester Castle), pays £6 2s. od; the Archbishop of York, 10s. od.; the Earl (Comes) of Gloucester, £5 4s. od.; the Bishop of Ely, 21s. od.; Hugh Bigod (Dapifer in 1136 A.D.), 5s. od.; Robert Fitz Ralph, 33s. 4d.; Milo, son of Thierry (probably identical with the already mentioned son of Derman,¹ 16s. od.; Herlewin, son of Herlewin, 20s. od.; Hervey of Lanvalei, 13s.; William Maltravers, 30s. od. An early mention of this once great family, whose name appears in eight other places in this Roll, usually in connection with pardons, releases, or remissions² in divers counties.

Aluric Gernon (perhaps a nickname from whiskers, "grenons"), 10s.; Joscelin of Ely, 5s.; Taisson of London,³ 13s. od.; William Coterell, 10s. od.; the Count of Mortain, 5s.; the Abbot of Reading (the King's own foundation), 15s.; Rene or Rainald of Valenciennes, 3s.

¹ See p. 157.

² P.R.H.I., pp. 28, 29, 34, bis. 57, 62, 121, 123, and his brother Walter, *ibid.*, pp. 15, 87, 124.

³ *Taisson of London*. Little or nothing is known of him, save that his name occurs four times in the Roll under London, and that he was the father of Waldric (see footnote to Vol. V, Part IV, p. 517). His name does not occur in the Domesday survey either as a tenant in Capite, or under tenant. Possibly (though this is quite uncertain) he may have been of the great Norman family of Tesson of La Roche Tesson and Cinglais, one of whom Raoul Teisson, Wace in his "Roman de Rou," tells us was present at the Battle of Hastings, but does not seem to have acquired any English possessions! As Ralph Taxo, or Taisson, he appears among the list of witnesses to a charter by William Duke of Normandy to the Abbey of Holy Trinity at Caen on June 17th, 1066. Also in a memorandum as Ralph Taxo, son of Ralph of Anjou, granting lands to the Abbey of Fontenay, also at Caen, between 1070 A.D. and 1079, and as one of the witnesses to a Notitia, or memorandum, of a restitution made to the Abbey of Holy Trinity of Rouen in 1091 A.D., and again among the witnesses to a Charter of Robert Duke of Normandy to the Abbey of St. Stephen Caen about 1103 A.D., and, lastly, in a similar capacity to a grant by King Henry I to the Abbey of St. Stephen Caen before July in 1128 A.D., after which there is no further mention of him.

a Ralph (sans Tesson) does! See note at end.

Richard de St. Audemer, 3s. (St. Omer); the King of Scotland, 34s. (or £1 14s. od.); John, Fitz Ralph, Fitz-Everard, 20s. od.; Conan the Mason, 3s.; Aluric the fat (grosso), 20s.; Hugh, son of Ulgerus, 2s.; the men of the Queen, £1 17s. od.; the Chancellor, £2 16s. od.; William de Pont de l'Arche,¹ £1 3s. od.; Herman Boselinus, 1s. 6d.; the Abbot of Caen, 6s.; Roger the Clerk (clerico), 1s. 6d.; Nicholas the hireling, or mercer? (Mercenarius),² 10s.; total, £34 10s. 10d., and still owing, £5 9s. 2d.

This completes that portion of the Roll which relates to the City of London, and in the text as printed occupies pp. 143-150. The County of Middlesex, which immediately follows it, being compressed into practically two pages, pp. 150-152.

Before dealing with Middlesex, it may not be out of place to make a more detailed mention of Ralph Fitz Herlewin, and his family, and connections with other leading families in the City at this time.

Herlewin, of whom nothing is known, save that his name suggests a Norman origin, had three sons: Ralph, the Sheriff in 1130 A.D. (with three others), William, and Herlewin, all of whom were living in 1130 A.D., and a daughter, Ingenolda, married to Roger, "Nepos Huberti," who was (as we have already seen) joint Sheriff in 1125 A.D. They had two sons, Gervase and Alan (nephews to the three Fitz Herlewin brothers), the elder married Agnes de Cornhill, and was joint Sheriff of London in 1155-56 A.D., and had three sons, Henry de Cornhill, Sheriff of London, Kent, and Surrey; Reginald de Cornhill, who had a son, Reginald, junior; and Ralph de Cornhill. Henry married Alice de Courci, heiress of the English family of de Courci, by whom he had a daughter, Joan de Cornhill, who married Hugh de Nevill, described as "Forester" of England, in 1195 A.D., and he, in 1193 A.D., had been appointed chief justice of the Forests. Of Alan, brother to Gervase, we know he was married, and had a son, Roger Fitz

¹ Chamberlain in 1136.

² ? Mercer.

Alan, whose name repeatedly occurs among the chief witnesses to London documents of the end of the twelfth and early in the thirteenth centuries; he seems to have continued the family connection with the City, and on the death of the well-known Henry Fitz Ailwin in 1212 A.D. he reached the loftiest pinnacle of civic greatness, being appointed Mayor.

Gervase de Cornhill, at a later date, appears to have served as Justiciar of London. John Fitz Ralph (Fitz Everard) was another eminent citizen who throughout his civic career was more or less closely connected with Gervase. Late in the reign of Stephen they are found at St. Albans witnessing a charter of the King, and they were joint Sheriffs of London in 1155-6 A.D. John also is a witness to one of Gervase's charters, next after his brother Alan.

Gervase married Agnes de Cornhill, daughter of Edward de Cornhill (living in 1125 A.D.), whose wife Godeleve was the daughter of Edward of Southwark, also living in 1125, and had a brother William, and he and his father figure among the leading witnesses to that other invaluable document which, as I have already mentioned, records the surrender by the English Cnihtengild of their Soke to the Priory of Holy Trinity in 1125 A.D.¹ This is a singularly interesting pedigree, as it is obvious from the dates that the birth of Edward of Southwark must have taken place very shortly after the Conquest, and we may be certain that the son and his father, and the son-in-law, were all men of the old English race, and so connected with that mysterious body—the Cnihtengild. Moreover, it proves how the Normans settled in the City and intermarried with the native stock, and how the elder Edward gave the name of the Norman Conqueror to his English son.

We have now reached the commencement of that portion of the Roll dealing with the County of Middlesex.

¹ Pipe Roll Society, *Ancient Charters*, Vol. X, p. 26.

The first entry relates to the Abbot of Westminster, who renders account of 1,000 marks of silver as a fine in order that (the goods, or property of his Church having been collected, and then unlawfully dispersed) he may have the keeping of what was so collected. In the Treasury 50 marks of silver, and the Chancellor, Geoffrey Rufus, 50 marks of silver at the feast of St. John Baptist by the King's writ, and in a remission granted to the Bishop of Salisbury, and Geoffrey Rufus, the Chancellor, 800 marks of silver, and 100 marks of silver are due, and the same Abbot owes £46 13s. 4d. and 1 mark of gold, for the pleas of the Cardinal (probably the Papal Legate, John of Crema), and of the Jews against him. According to Domesday Book, the Abbot was a considerable landholder in the County, ranking fourth in the list, the three larger ones being King William himself, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London and his Canons.

The Abbot held in Ossulton Hundred, Westminster, and the Manor of Hampstead, the two afforded pannage for 300 hogs, and there were four¹ arpents of vineyard newly planted at Westminster. In Spelthorne Hundred the Abbot held Staines, with pannage for 30 hogs, and two arpents of vineyards, also the Manors of Sunbury and Shepperton. In Elthorne Hundred, the Manor of Greenford, and pannage for 300 hogs, Hanwell and pannage for 50 hogs, Cowley and pannage for 40 hogs. In the hundred of Gore, William the Chamberlain (of London) holds 2½ hides in Kingsbury, *under the Abbot*, and pannage for 200 hogs, and the manor of Hendon and pannage for 100 hogs; the pannage for the varying numbers of hogs tends to bear out what I have already stated as to the heavily wooded condition of the greater part of the County, and this must have been chiefly oak and beech, for the acorns and beechmast. The various values show slight decreases; Westminster, £2 less than in King Edward's time, when it was worth

¹ Arpent—a small plot of land about an acre in extent.

£12, and other holdings in the village had also dwindled from £6 T.R.E. (or in the time of King Edward) to £3 os. od. Hampstead was reduced from £5 T.R.E. to £2 10s. od. Staines T.R.E. answered for £40, now (that is at the time of the Survey 1085 A.D.) only £35. Sunbury, from £7 T.R.E., was reduced to £6. Shepperton T.R.E. £7, reduced to £6 16s. 6d. Greenford T.R.E. £10, reduced to £7. Hanwell T.R.E. £7, reduced to £5 10s. od. Cowley T.R.E. £2, reduced to £1 10s. od. Kingsbury T.R.E. £3, reduced to £1 10s. od. Hendon T.R.E. £12, reduced to £8.

These reductions in the value are probably due to the devastation which followed the Norman Conquest, when the army of William swept round London, thereby isolating it from the rest of England, and compelling its surrender. In many places further distant the decreases are much greater than any of these. The same Sheriffs render account of £32 3s. od. for the *old* pleas (of the year previous, 1128-1129 A.D.) and for a murder, and have paid in 20 marks of silver, and still owe £18 16s. 4d. And the said Sheriffs owe 36s. 11d. for a murder in Elthorne Hundred.

This is the Helethorne of the Survey, being the fine charged upon the hundred for murder, where the murderer escaped undiscovered. Under William I, if a Norman was murdered, the Lord of the manor had to produce the assassin within five days, or pay 46 marks (£30 13s. 4d.) to the King, and failing the Lord, the Hundred.

The Hundred (according to the theory advanced by the Exchequer at the date of the Dialogus) was held liable for every secret homicide (where the murderer remained undiscovered) to a fine of £36, or £44 to the Crown, this practice having, it is said, been introduced by William I to put a stop to the frequent murders of Normans after the Conquest; originally only these were punished, but when the Coroner's jury presented that the victim was English, that is to say "Saxon"

(employing the term in contradistinction to "Norman"), the Hundred escaped payment of the fine for murder, but this was by no means easy of proof in the case of a freeman. One thing is clear from the Pipe Roll, that in 31 Henry I the fine is always levied on the Hundred, and that the amount was far less than the £36 os. od. or £44 os. od., or 46 marks of the legal authorities, or the *Dialogus*, and seems to have fluctuated considerably in this Roll from 16s. 8d. in this County to others elsewhere from 7 to 20 marks, based possibly upon the ability of the Hundred to pay, as upon a sparsely populated one, nearly all forest land, and not under cultivation, there would be few households to levy upon. It seems to have gradually decreased and temp: Richard I the fine seldom exceeds three marks, until it was finally abolished by the Statute of 14 Edward III.

There is little room to doubt that murder, as such, was at first regarded as a venal offence, *or* serious crime according as it referred to a Saxon slain by a Norman, or the reverse.¹

Adam and Samson, sons of Aldwin the Chamberlain (*Camerarius*), render account of £38 os. od. fine for possession of their father's lands, and have paid into the Treasury £5 os. od. and remain indebted for the balance, £33 os. od., and the Sheriffs render account of 7s. od. of the *old* Danegeld, that is of the year 1127-1128 A.D., and pay in 5s., and Gervase Fitz Roger (or Gervase de Cornhill) has by the King's writ a pardon, or remission, for 2s., and has a quittance for it, and the same Sheriffs owe 40s., payable by the small men (*minutis hominibus*), persons of small holdings, not in capite, and of little importance, for a "defectum" or evasion of the Hundred, possibly either an attempt at revolt, or a disappearance by absconding, and taking to the woods, and they also owe 16s. 8d. for a murder in Ossulton Hundred, but this does not concern the land of Alberic

¹ *Dialogus de Scaccario*, IX B, pp. 99-100.

de Vere,¹ who held Kensington of the Bishop of Coutances, and had pannage there for 200 hogs, and three arpents of vineyard. In T.R.E. its value was £10, but had sunk to £6 os. od. Alberic, or Aubrey de Vere, was one of the Royal Chamberlains, and in the following reign his son was created Earl of Oxford by the Empress Matilda in 1142 A.D. And the same Sheriffs render account of £14. 9s. 11d. for the past (preterito) Aid levied on the County, and have paid in £1. 16s. 4d. And in a pardon, or remission, to Reginald de St. Valery, £11. 16s. 2d. The Chancellor 14s. 11d., and the Sick (infirmis) of London 2s. 6d. (by way of alms?). Total, £12 13s. 7d., and have their quittance (quietus est). And they further render account of £5. 9s. 8d. for a murder in the Hundred, and half Hundred of Edmonton (Edelmetona), and have paid in £1. 14s. 8d., and in a pardon or remission by the King's writ to that great landowner and important magnate (who was to play so prominent a part in the next reign, when he became in 1140 A.D. Earl of Essex), Geoffrey de Mandeville, £3. os. od., and the King of Scotland 15s. od., and has his quittance, and they also render account of 31s. 6d. for a murder (presumably from the smallness of the amount, of a Saxon) in Ossulton Hundred, and have paid in 11s. 4d. and in a pardon or remission by the King's writ to the Bishop of Chester 3s. 2d., and from William Fitz Otho 13s. 6d., and Hugh, son of Ulgerius, 3s. 6d., and have their quittance, and they render account of £27 15s. 4d. for the past Danegeld of 1128-1129 A.D. and in remissions by the King's writ. The Archbishop of Canterbury, £13. 1s. od.; the Bishop of Chester, 5s.; Brian Fitz Count, £4. 8s. od.; Geoffrey de Mandeville,

¹ Probably the murder took place on a portion of the Hundred which was held by some one of the other landholders, and Aubrey de Vere was exempted from contribution, though a landholder *in* the Hundred, as were also the Bishop of London, the King himself, the Canons of St. Paul's, the Abbot of Westminster, the Abbess of Barking, Geoffrey de Mandeville, Robert Gernon, Robert Fafiton, Robert Fitz Rozelin, Edward Sarisberie, Ranulf, brother of Ilger, Derman, and Eddeva.

£7. 15s. od.; Geoffrey Purcello, 2s.¹; Turstin Escanceoni, 2s.²; Walensi de Hosa, 12s.³; the Count of Mortaine, 13s. 4d.; William Fitz Otho, 22s. od.⁴ In the land of Gervase Fitz Roger,⁵ *which was waste!* 7s. Total, £27. 15s. 4d. and have their quittance.

Ralph Tricket renders account of 30 marks of silver fine, that he may have his father's land, has paid £2 6s. 8d. in, and still owes £17. 0s. od. and one mark of

¹ Geoffrey Purcell was one of the King's ushers; he and his under-tenants held land at Catteshill and Chiddingfold, co. Surrey; his name occurs in a writ to Richard Basset and Aubrey de Vere, the sheriff and the burgesses of Guildford, which is attested by Miles of Gloucester at Winchester in 1130 A.D., and was the son of that Goisfredus, or Geoffrey, who held five hides of the Bishop of Bayeux's forfeited lands in Surrey in Benestede under Richard, temp. D.B. Surrey, p. 31 *b* Surrey.

² Turstin, the Normanised form of Thorstein, a distinctly Norse or Danish name. Later it is found corrupted into Tustin, or Thurston.

³ Hosa, which at a later period is corrupted into Hussey.

⁴ Walter Fitz Other (or Otho) was a Middlesex landowner, and held Stanwell, Bedfont, West Bedfont, and Hatton in Spelthorne Hundred, and may have been a brother of William Fitz Otho, who is mentioned on p. 56 of the Roll in a list of remissions under Essex, and is not identical with the . . . filius odoni, who pays £1 14s. od. under Devonshire on p. 157 of the Roll, which is defective before the word filius, several words being wanting at this point. Walter Fitz Odo (or Other) is mentioned on p. 114 under Lincolnshire, as rendering account. It is not impossible that Otho, their father, may have been the identical Othowerus mentioned by Stow. In the *Testa de Nevill*, p. 362, it states that Willelmus Fitz Otho, held in Lileston (now Lisson) in Middlesex in Serjeanty, one carucate of land worth £2. 0s. od. per servicium, servandi signa R. monetae et facet servitium per totem annum, and as such was ancestor of Thomas Fitz Otho engraver of the dies for the King's Mint, Henry I. Four early Constables of the Tower are mentioned by Stow, "Othowerus"! "Acolinillus," and Otto, all of whom, particularly the second may be dismissed as more or less mythical, but with the last, Geoffrey de Mandeville, we are on firmer ground, unless the first and third should refer to "Other," or Otho, whose son Walter is eleventh in the list of D.B. Tenants in Capite for Middlesex. He also says that all these Constables forcibly withheld a portion of land in East Smithfield near the Tower which had been part of the Cnihtengild's Soke, and passed from them to Holy Trinity Priory without Aldgate and making thereof a vineyard did not give it up till 2 Stephen, 1137 A.D. (*Stow Survey of London*, Edn. Kingsford, Vol. I, p. 45.)

⁵ Gervase had already been excused 2s. on account of the old Danegeld of 1128-29 (?) A.D.; this remission of 7s., if, as it appears, was for Danegeld, must be that of 1129-30 A.D., but as to how his (presumably Kentish land at Chalk) came to be *waste*, the Roll is unfortunately silent.

Wasta, or waste, Mr. J. H. Round has pointed out, is one of the pitfalls of the Domesday Survey; in a town it may point to destruction for castle building, but when it occurs in the country it probably means land uninhabited, or vacant, with no one there to pay geld.

silver, and the same Sheriffs render account of the present year's (1129-1130 A.D.) Danegeld, and have paid in £35 2s. od. And in remissions by the King's writ granted to the King of Scotland, 10s.; the Archbishop of Canterbury, £15. 6s. od.; the Bishop of St. David's, 4s.; the Bishop of Chester, 5s.; the Abbot of Holy Trinity Abbey at Rouen, £3. 2s. od.; William the Almoner, £1 0s. od.; Reginald of St. Walery, £10. 10s. od.; William de Roumara, 40s. od.; William Fitz Otho, 14s. od.; the monks of Bec (in Normandy), £2. 18s. od.; Brian Fitz Count, £4 8s. od.; William de Montefichet, 8s. od.; Hugh de Hastings, 5s. od.; Maurice de Windsor, 10s. 3d.; Adelulf the Fleming (Flandrensis), 10s.; Hasculf de Taneia, 3s. od. Hasculf de Tania, in addition to being a Middlesex landowner, temp. D.B. Survey, had also a Soke in the City which was in, or near, Queenhithe, and was sold to Richard de Mandeville (Ancient Deeds, A. 6128).

At a little later date we find, 1166-68 A.D., that this family of de Taney, or Tany, were connected with that of Roger de Rames, who, Temp. D.B., had held Cardentone (Charlton) of the King, and 9 hides in Stanmore, and left a son William, who had died some time previously, for we find under Essex, p. 54, his sons Roger and Robert (de Raimis) fining with the King for £100 for leave to have their father's lands, and Hasculf de Taneia (on p. 53 also under Essex), fines for £16. 6s. 8d. that he may have certain land (in dominio) which William de Boville had unjustly taken from him.

William Cabus, 9s. 6d.; Morell of the Chapel (de Capella), 9s.; Richard the Chamberlain, 8s.; the Bishop of Salisbury (Old Sarum), 4s.; in lands of the Queen, 10s.; the Chancellor, £1. 15s. od.; the Count of Mortain, 13s. 4d.; Nigel (afterwards Bishop of Ely), nephew, or son of the Bishop (Roger of Salisbury), 6s.; Hugh, son of Ulger, 10s.; Alberic de Vere, 10s. od.; Fulcred Fitz Walter, 5s.; Henry Arborarius, 14s.; the Prebendaries of Westminster Abbey, 4s.; the Sick (infirmis) of London,

2s.; Roger, the blacksmith of Northolt (Norhalla), 3s.; possibly that Villein whom D.B. singles out from his brethren (though not by name) as the holder of a hide of land there under Geoffrey de Mandeville; Tofi, or Tovi, Inganet, 2s. 5d. Total, £49 18s. 6d., and have paid it in, and received their quittance, and this completes that portion of the Roll which relates to Middlesex.

All these constantly recurring names for small or varying amounts would appear to have been remissions, or excuses, from contributing to the Danegeld; these remissions vary between a quarter and a half, and in some few cases to *more* than the whole of the sum exacted annually. And these remissions go a long way towards explaining the fluctuating total yielded by the Impost, for though this in the Royal Accounts stood nominally at £4,200, yet the King remitted £1,785, and only received £2,300, while £146 of that was still in arrear and due by various Sheriffs. Several of the names occurring in these lists are found in the Domesday Survey for Middlesex as landholders "in Capite," that is to say tenants in chief; among them we find the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Abbeys of Westminster and Barking, and that of Holy Trinity at Rouen; the Earl of Mortain, Geoffrey de Mandeville, Walter, son of Other (or Otho), Walter de St. Valery, Richard (de Clare) (whom we have seen in trouble with the Jews), Roger de Rames, Edward de Sarisberie (who may have been related to, if not identical with, Edward of Southwark), Aubrey, or Alberic de Vere, and Derman "Londoniensis" already mentioned, and so ends the list of names from the Domesday Survey of Middlesex.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

Vol. V, Part IV, p. 525. The word "assaltu," I am assured, *must* be translated as meaning assault, but I have vainly searched through the contemporary Chronicles to see if any disturbance took place in London in the years 1129-1130 A.D., and I can find no record of anything of the kind having taken place. It is impossible there

could have been any attack by foreigners upon either the houses, or the ships, which, presumably, even then hailed from the Port of London, many of which were owned by its merchant citizens. I therefore lean to the opinion that, as in the case of the words "Cainsili, and Estructum," there had been not only a mishearing, but a misspelling by the scribe, and that the word may have been some form of "Solutio," a payment, which seems more probable in the absence of any mention of an external attack, or even supposing there should have been such, why the Sheriff should have been held responsible for so large a sum as £99. 1s. od. under this head which could only have been raised from the City itself; ships do not assault houses, nor the converse; the phrase seems meaningless, unless construed in the sense of a specially levied tax, or duty, over and above the Firm; moreover, it is absurd to suppose that citizens or shipowners would be fined for damages sustained by them in any internal commotion. The King was in England from August 1, 1129 A.D., till September, 1130 A.D., then in Normandy, and did not return to England till August 1, 1131 A.D., during which time there is no record of any disturbances in London, in particular, or the country generally.

In the first part of this paper the *then* printer's reader was so good (?) as to correct my Latin for me (or rather that of the Roll), and altered the word "debet" he owes to "dedet" he gave, which made nonsense of the passage in which it occurs on p. 305, Vol. V, and on p. 516 the word "eight" should read "eighty," the final "y" having been omitted.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE WORD CAINSILI, VOL. IV, P. 511.

Since the former note upon the meaning of that baffling word Cainsili was written its true meaning has at last been discovered, and in a way that leaves small room to doubt that the scribe not merely failed to hear the word spoken, but misspelt it into the bargain. The discovery was made at the Public Record Office, is accepted by them as correct, and is inserted as such in the Glossary of mediæval Latin words hitherto unexplained and untranslated which is now in preparation. The word was found in Ducange's Glossary as *camisili*, and the author cites an instance of its use in the Chronicon Fontanell, c. 16, "Lintea ad manus tergendos Camsilis"—a linen cloth of the length of an ell, for wiping the hands upon; the spellings vary from the above to Camsili, Camisiles, Camisilus, Camsile, and Camsellus, but not as Cainsili. I observe that the late William Farrar, in his Itinerary of King Henry I, has rendered it as "wine vessels"! a remarkably free translation for which there is not a scrap of evidence unless we may suppose him to have had some hazy idea of basins involving jugs, and so worked round to a nebulous connection with a mediæval "Jug and Bottle

Department"? As it is it must be (as in the cases of "Assaltu" and "Estructum") set down as another of the scribe's errors in spelling.

WALDRIC FITZ TAISSON, ADDITIONAL NOTE TO VOL. V, P. 517.

Since writing the above-mentioned note I have had access to a later and better, if not the best, edition of Orderic by A. A. Prevost; an error in the earlier text by Duchesne misled me (as I fear it has done many others). Instead of reading *Laudonensis* or *Laon*, the older edition had *Landavensis* or *Llandaff* in South Wales quite erroneously substituted for *Laon*, where Waldric met his tragic fate as related and correctly by a contemporary chronicler, Guibert of Nogent; his dates are most valuable, as they prove that Waldric did not return to England with the King in 1107 A.D., and cannot have acted as Chancellor for long after November 7th, 1106, as evidenced by a contemporary charter. The See of Laon seems to have been the stormy petrel of Bishopricks and to have been (after the death of Bishop Ingelrann II in 1104 A.D.) hotly contested by divers not very desirable candidates; at this juncture the electors determined to ask the King of England for Waldric as their Bishop, having heard marvellous tales of his great wealth! The mission sent found the King at Rouen, which can hardly have been before October, 1106 A.D., and was probably at an even later date in that year. The King consented, but in order that the appointment should outwardly present a more reputable appearance, the Chancellor was rapidly consecrated a sub-deacon, and then with neatness and despatch, promoted to a Canonry in the Cathedral of Rouen, whence he proceeded to Laon, and shortly afterwards journeyed on to Langres to meet and obtain from the Pope (Paschal II) due recognition of his title. The Pope's itinerary proves the meeting took place at the end of February, or early in March, 1107 A.D. (Selon Jaffe, *Wattenbach. Regesta Pontificum*, I, 729). Despite his dubious antecedents, and decidedly unclerical way of living, for, like *Nimrod*, he is described as "a great hunter before the Lord," he contrived, possibly by the usual means of a liberal application of "palm oil" in the proper quarters to satisfactorily pass the more or less perfunctory scrutiny of the Pope and the College of Cardinals. During the five years that elapsed before his murder by his faithful flock in 1112 A.D., the affairs of his turbulent diocese took up the whole of his time, and only once, in the year 1109-1110 A.D., did he revisit England in the novel character of a Papally consecrated Bishop, and that visit was to endeavour (*in which, strange to say, he was successful*) to borrow money from the King! though of this we find no trace in Henry's charters. It is said that his conversation abounded in criticisms of English hunting dogs and horses; indeed, he seems to have been the prototype of what in a later age has been described as the "Squarson," or nicely compounded mixture of

squire and parson. Both in dress and behaviour he seems to have been a most unconventional Bishop, and, like his illustrious successor in the Chancellorship, St. Thomas of Canterbury, perhaps better known as Thomas Becket, he never could forget that he had been a soldier, and first and foremost a statesman, while his becoming a Bishop in the abrupt manner he did was an accident, due to and earned by military service on the battlefield. If report is credible, he is said to have come by his great wealth by methods that would not bear exposure to the fierce light of day, but Guibert of Nogent, upon whom we have to depend for some account of him, was by no means friendly to the Bishop, so we have a portrait, sketched by the hand of a lively, but on the whole hostile observer, for from his description it is perfectly clear that to Guibert he was a "Doctor Fell," and that he disliked him so strongly on account of his arbitrary ways and high handed methods of coercing his flock; but all this is, after all, but as the intolerable deal of sack to one small half-penny worth of bread, in attempting to connect Waldric Fitz Taisson of the Roll with Waldric the Chancellor, for whom his father, as we have seen, renders an account; only the name is most unusual, and the connection with hawks and hounds suggested the possibility.

a Radulfus Taisson is mentioned in this Roll, under *other* different counties as an undertenant, Notts. and Derby, p. 11, a remission of 9s. 10d.; Yorks. and Northumberland, p. 84 ditto, 8 marks of silver!!; and for what is now Lancashire, p. 34, 6s. 2d. ditto; Leicester, p. 89, 5s. ditto; Lincolnshire, p. 211, 12s. 6d. ditto; Devonshire a *share* in pleas of his men, p. 155, 12½ marks of silver! and a remission, or pardon, all for non-payments of Danegeld. All these are found in D.B. Survey as simply "Ralph," under Notts., p. 284a; Lincoln, p. 141; Leicester, p. 231; Yorkshire, p. 315; Cornwall, p. 125; and Inter Ribam et Mersam (now Lancashire), p. 270, to B.S.I.

NOTE ON "PARDONS."

The varying sums set down under the heading of "pardons" are not what is usually understood to be the meaning of the word to-day, but are in most cases (at least as regards fiefs in Middlesex) and elsewhere *remissions* of the amounts for which they were assessed to the tax known as "Danegeld." It is remarkable that both barons and bishops figure among the considerable remissions of this tax to favoured individuals. The City of London was exempt, so we must assume that the King's remission grants applied not only to lay fees held by ecclesiastics and to lands that "stricte dicte" were not demesne lands, but also to the holdings of undertenants. The King may have (while recognising the general exemption of Church lands) made a favour (which had to be paid for in some form)

of granting remissions at will. In almost all cases there is no question of pardons for committed offences in the modern sense.

Since the above was written I have found a later mention of Picot Impasterator (see page 160) in a Confirmation dated 1141, by the Empress Maud, of a gift of lands in the "vill" of Beckenham in Kent, by him to Holy Trinity Priory in London, so that he was evidently a landholder in that part of West Kent. (Pipe Roll Soc. Vol. X, Ancient Charters xxv, 42.) It is clear he was not the Picot son of Colsuen of Lincolnshire, because that man is reputed to have died about 1116. The name is not so uncommon, and in this Roll occurs in four other Counties, Ralph and Trihan Picot, under Kent! p. 64, Roger Picot under Cambridge p. 45, and Lincoln p. 112, and William Picot, under Norfolk p. 94.

Under *Berkshire* in this Roll p. 126 the Goldsmiths of London have a remission of 14s. 3d. for their share of the Danegeld, so it would appear they held some land, somewhere in the county, on which this impost was levied. As they were mentioned under London in connexion with charcoal for their use they may have had a guild of their own; though they are not otherwise mentioned until 1180, when they come under notice as one of the so-called "adulterine" Associations, or guilds that had been founded, and had assumed certain rights without having first obtained the royal license. They were mulcted in a fine of 45 marks, a fairly high one, but there is reason to infer that it was never paid as it is entered as a debt so late as 10 John! *vide* Pipe Roll of 26 $\widetilde{\text{Hy}}$ 11, p. 153, P. R. Soc., Vol. 29.