THE SCUTAGE AND MARSHAL'S ROLLS.

By S. R. BIRD, F.S.A.

The most honourable and at the same time the most universal of the feudal tenures was that by knight-service, by which every tenant of a determinate quantity of land called a knight's fee, which varied in extent but was generally of the value of £20 per annum, was bound to attend his lord to the wars for forty days in every year if called upon, the tenant of half a fee rendering twenty days' service, and so on in proportion. Thus, originally, the barons and all those who held their lands direct from the crown by knight-service were compelled, on pain of forfeiture of their estates, to follow the king to his wars in person with a number of knights corresponding to the amount of land they held, in the proportion of one knight for each fee, exacting in their turn similar service from the tenants amongst whom their fees were subdivided. This personal service, however, becoming inconvenient and irksome, the practice arose amongst the tenants of compounding for it, at first by sending others in their stead, and, in process of time, by making a pecuniary satisfaction in lieu thereof, which payment came eventually to be recognized as a regular assessment for warlike purposes, and was levied on all knights' fees under the name of *scutagium*, or, in Norman-French, *escuage;* the ancient appellation of a knight's fee being *scutum*, in allusion to the *shield* which the tenant was supposed to bear in his lord's service.

The levying of scutage appears to have been first reduced to a system in the reign of Henry II., by whom it was recognized as a valuable method of providing foreign auxiliaries, who were more amenable to the royal commands and less likely to prove turbulent than a body of powerful barons, each with a well-armed retinue of his own, and the employment of whom solved the difficult problem of persuading the feudal levies to undertake foreign service. The same monarch also, in order to obtain a longer period of service from his knights than the forty days which alone were his due, introduced the practice of *joint equipment*, by which every three knights were, instead of serving in person, to equip one of their number for a three-fold term of service. This was adopted in the Welsh war of 1157, and again by Richard I. in 1194 on the occasion of the war in Normandy; and King John, in 1205, directed that every nine

knights should join to equip another, with wages of 2s. a day, for the defence of the country. [*Stubbs*, vol. i, p. 589.]

The first scutage of which there is any record was assessed in the second year of Henry II. for the army of Wales, and was levied on the knights' fees held under the prelates only, at the rate of 20s. per fee. A second scutage of two marks for each knight's fee was assessed in the fifth year of his reign for the same army, not only on the prelates but on all other tenants in capite according to the number of their fees.

The word scutage was originally applied to any payment assessed upon knights' fees, whether such payment was for the purposes of the king's army or not; thus, the aid for ransoming King Richard I. is called, *Scutagium ad redemptionem Regis*. In its usual acceptation, however, it signified the payment or service rendered in respect of the army only, and is generally accounted for in the Great Rolls of the Exchequer, or "Pipe Rolls," as money paid by the accountant "*De Scutagio Walliæ*," or "*pro Militibus*" (for his knights' fees), or "*de exercitu Walliæ*," &c.; the particular campaign for which the scutage was levied being specified. The number of fees for which a tenant in capite was liable to pay scutage was determined by certificates or "chartæ" furnished by the tenants themselves, in which they acknowledged themselves to owe such and such service. These certificates appear to have been sent in to the Exchequer by the barons and tenants in capite whenever a scutage was to be levied, and by them the officers of the Exchequer were guided in making their assessment. When the aid for marrying the king's daughter was granted in the fourteenth year of Henry II., charters and certificates of knights' fees were sent in by all the tenants in capite, and are entered in the *Red Book of the Exchequer* [fol. 83-122]; another copy of these certificates, in the *Black Book of the Exchequer*, has been printed by Hearne. This usage of sending in certificates appears to have continued to the time of Henry III., in the twentieth year of whose reign a return thereof was made for a similar purpose.

In the *Red Book of the Exchequer* [fol. 47-81] is also contained a large collection of all the scutages levied between the second year of Henry II and the thirteenth year of King John, compiled from the Great Rolls of the Exchequer by Alexander de Swereford, an officer of the Exchequer in the reign of Henry III. This collection was made for the purpose of serving as a guide in future assessments, and contains the names of the tenants in capite in each county from whom, at the time of levying the several scutages specified, knight-service was due, with the number of knights—or their equivalent in money—to be furnished by each. A copy of this collection in the *Black Book of the Exchequer* has been also printed (very incorrectly) by

Hearne. Similar collections of knights' fees of a later date will be found in the two volumes known as *Testa de Nevill* (printed by the Record Commissioners in 1807), and in the various books of Knights' Fees existing in the Public Record Office.

Scutage was generally assessed at the rate of three marks or 40s. per fee, but the amount varied, being in some cases as high as 100s. and in others as low as 10s. per fee. It was at first levied arbitrarily by the king whenever he went to war, or made a pretext of doing so, but this prerogative being greatly abused, notably by King John, it became a matter of national clamour, and by a clause of Magna Charta it was enacted that no scutage should be imposed without the consent of the Great Council of the realm, by which the assessment was made after the military expedition was ended.

Although the scutage was generally paid according to the rate at which it was assessed, instances occasionally occurred in which the tenant was by the terms of his charter acquitted for a smaller payment, as in the case of William Achard, who, in the eighteenth year of Henry II., was charged with scutage for three knights' fees. He, however, alleged that the lands, in respect of which he was so charged, were granted to his grandfather by Henry I. by the service of one knight only, and on payment of the scutage for one knight's fee he was acquitted of the rest.

On the other hand, some knights' fees were remarkably small, such as for instance the fees of the Honour of Moreton, which were commonly called "*parva feoda Moritonie*," and paid less by about one-third for scutage than the generality of fees. In addition to the knights' fees there were also some serjeanties which paid scutage, but in such cases the tenure of the lands probably specified military service as a condition of the serjeanty.

When the king went forth with his army a Writ of Summons *ad habendum servitium* was issued, directing the sheriffs of the several counties to summon all barons, knights, free-tenants, and others in their bailiwicks who owed the king knight-service or serjeanty, to assemble at a certain place on a day named with their whole service, ready to go with their horses and arms in the king's service whithersoever he should command them. Those who obeyed this summons and either served the king personally in his campaign or sent others in their stead were, upon proof of such service (by certificate or testimony of the commander, or of the Constable or Marshal of the army or their lieutenants, or by the entries on the Rolls of the Marshalsey of the army), not only released from the payment of the scutage assessed upon them in respect of that particular campaign, but were entitled to collect it from their tenants; writs "*de scutagio habendo*" being accordingly issued to the sheriffs of the several counties in the form following:—

REX Vicecomiti &c., Salutem. Quia dilectus et fidelis noster A. B. per preceptum nostrum *fuit nobiscum* [or, in the case of those who sent their service, "*habuit servicium suum*"] in exercitu nostro Wallie anno regni nostri decimo, tibi precipimus quod eidem A. B. *habere facias scutagium suum* de feodis militum que de eo tenentur in balliva tua, videlicet, quadraginta solidos de scuto pro exercitu nostro predicto. Et hoc nullatenus omittas. Teste Rege, &c.

Occasionally, however, his scutage was granted to a tenant in capite as a matter of special favour, although the service due from him was not officially recorded, as in the following example:—

REX vicecomiti Ebor', Salutem. Licet servicium dilecti et fidelis nostri Roberti filius Rogeri, nobis debitum, in rotulis Marescalcie nostre de exercitu nostro Scocie anno regni nostri trice-imo primo *non irrotulatur nec fuerit recognitum ut ei mos erit*; Volentes tamen eidem Roberto gratiam in hac parte facere specialem, concessimus ei scutagium de feodis militum que de eo tenentur in balliva tua. Teste Rege, &c.[1]

The lord who held a writ "de scutagio habendo" could compel the payment of the scutage from his tenants by distraint, if necessary, and when he was unable to do so, a "Writ of Aid" was frequently issued directing the sheriff to assist him.

Scutage was levied on the possessions of the king's wards although the custody of such possessions had been granted out, unless a fine was paid by the custodian to have such scutage, or, unless special services were performed which entitled him thereto, as in the instance following, in which the king appears to have gallantly recognized the hardships endured by a lady, who accompanied her husband in time of war, as equivalent to the knight-service to which he was entitled:—

REX vicecomiti Oxon', et Berks', Salutem. Cum per literas nostras patentes dederimus et concesserimus dilecto et fideli nostri Johanni de Seggrave et Cristine uxori ejus custodiam terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt Hugoni de Plessetis, defuncti, qui de nobis tenuit in capite; habendam cum feodis militaribus, advocationibus ecclesiarum, et omnibus aliis que nobis accidere possit, racione dicte custodie, usque ad legitimam etatem heredis predicti Hugonis: Ac prefatus Johannes nobis jam supplicaverit ut ei scutagium de feodis militaribus que de hereditate dicti heredis tenentur concedere curaremus: Nos licet predicti Johannes et Cristina, racione donacionis et concessionis predictarum eis de dicta custodia factarum, *scutagium de dictis feodis que de hereditate predicti tenentur vendicare non possent aliqualiter seu habere, set ad nos dinoscatur plenius pertinere*; de nostra tamen gratia et pro angustiis et laboribus que predicta Cristina sustinuit et toleravit moranda in partibus Scocie dum predictus Johannes, vir suus, ibidem in nostro obsequio morabatur: Concessimus eidem Cristine scutagium quod ad nos pertinet de feodis militaribus que tenentur de hereditate predicta pro exercitu nostro Scocie anno regni nostri tricesimo primo.

Et ideo tibi precipimus quod habere facias prefatis Johanni et Cristine scutagium suum de predictis feodis in balliva tua, videlicet, quadraginta solidos de scuto pro exercitu nostro supradicto. Teste Rege, &c.[2]

The payment of scutage alone does not appear to have always excused the tenant in capite from personal service, fines being also exacted from those who remained behind *ut ne transfretent*, or, *pro remanendo ab exercitu*, or, *quia non abierunt cum rege*. These fines seem to have generally included the scutage due to

[1] Scutage Roll, 8-11 Edw. II.
[2] Scutage Roll, 31-35 Edw. I.

the king and also, in many cases, to have entitled the tenant in capite to the scutage from his sub-tenants; the words "*et pro habendo scutagio suo*" being then inserted, and a writ to that effect being granted to him accordingly. Personal service appears, however, to have been required most strictly, if not solely, from those who held from the king in capite *ut de corona*, and not from those who held in capite *as of an Honour then being in the king's hands*, who were excused from service on payment of the scutage due from them only.

An account of the fines to be excused from military service, paid into the Exchequer or the Great Wardrobe from 49 Henry III. to 1 Edward III. inclusive, is contained in a roll amongst the "Miscellanea" of the Exchequer, referred to below, from which it appears that the amount of such fines varied in the reign of Henry III. from ten marks to twenty-five marks, and in the subsequent reigns from £20 to £40 per fee, being in the later reigns generally fixed by the king's writ to the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer. In the thirty-fourth year of Edward I., however, the fine was assessed at 20 marks per fee, the king directing "*moderate fines* to be taken on this occasion, because those who had already paid fines for such service twice within a short period, namely in the twenty-eighth and thirty-first years of his reign (on the first occasion of £40, and on the second of £20 per fee), feel themselves much aggrieved thereby."

In the sixth year of Edward II. fines were paid by many persons for *respite* from military service for the space of one or two years, the fines varying from 5 marks to £5, according to the amount of service due.

A list of the most important Scutage Rolls in the Public Record Office—which consist principally of writs "de scutagio habendo" in connection with the Welsh and Scottish wars—is appended, as also of the few "Rotuli Marescalcie," or, Rolls of the Marshalsey of the army, which have survived, two of which, those namely of 31 Edward I. and 16 Edward II., are unnoticed by Palgrave in his "Parliamentary Writs." A specimen of an early Scutage Roll, given *in extenso*, follows this list.

The importance of these rolls from a genealogical point of view—containing as they do the names of such of the greater tenants-in-chief (referred to in Magna Charta as the "Barones Minores") as were not summoned by special writ but only by a general writ addressed to the sheriffs of the respective counties—cannot well be over-rated. Those of the reign of Henry III. especially, are of paramount interest as embracing a period anterior to the commencement of Palgrave's great work.

The Rolls of the Marshalsey, or "Proffers of Service," give very full and curious particulars as to the manner in which the military service due from each tenant was performed, stating

whether he appeared personally or by deputy, with the names of the knights, esquires, serjeants, or others by whom the said service was to be done, the number of their horses and the nature of their equipment, &c.

The following examples, selected at random from the roll of 5 Edward I., will serve to illustrate the minute character of the information supplied, and also the small quantities of land for which some of the tenants performed military service; in one instance a single virgate being represented by an archer with twenty-five arrows, and in another by a horse alone, the value of which is given as *5s. 4d.*, and which was directed to be *sent to the royal kitchen*, not however, it is to be presumed, for culinary purposes!

It will also be observed that Roger de Leukenor, who holds of the honour of Aquila, then escheated, claims *exemption from personal service* on payment of his scutage only; and that when representatives are sent, *ill-health* is generally pleaded in excuse.

SALOPIA. Petrus Corbet recognoscat servicium v. *feodorum* militum *pro Baronia de Kaus*, faciendum per *se ipsum* et Robertum Corbet, *Militcs*; et per Thomam de Raleburgh, Rogerum de Eyton, Adam Haghe, Ricardum de Hope, Robertum de Franketon, et Willelmum de Boules, *Servientes*.

SUFFOLCIA. Robertus de Shelton recognoscit servicium trium feodorum militum in *Ilteye Arse* faciendum per *se ipsum* et Johannem de Shelton, *Militcs*, et per Henricum de Sheiton et Ricardum de Mortimer, *Servientes*.

SUSSEXIA. Rogerus de Leukenor dicit quod non debet aliquod servicium facere in exercitu Regis, quia tenet unum feodum militis et dimidium *de escaeta Aquilæ, et debet scutagium quando currit* pro illo feodo militis et dimidio.

SOUTHAMPTONIA. Egidius de Bosco offert servicium unius *serjantie* cum uno equo discooperto, aketun, haubergioun, gladio, lancea, et capello ferreo, pro Martino de Rupibus, *infirmo ut dicitur*, faciendum per ipsum Egidium, *servientem*.

GLOUCESTRIA. Robertus Russel offert servicium Roberti Atte Grave, *infirmi ut dicitur*, videlicet, cum archu et xxv. sagittis, pro una virgata terræ in Upton (faciendum) per dictum Robertum.

NOTTINGHAMIA. Willelmus de Karleton offert servicium unius equi, sine homine, precii vs iiij*d*, cum uno sacco et una brochia pro Alicia, filia Philippi de Colewik, pro quarta parte unius carucate terræ in Wileby, per xl. dies etc. "*Et liberabitur equus coquine Regis.*"

The levying of scutages seems to have ceased with that of the first year of Edward III., having been gradually superseded by the changes introduced into the military system of the country in the preceding reign, by which the personal service rendered under the feudal system was exchanged for the covenant by indenture with the great nobles and others, to furnish the king with a certain number of troops of a specified character for a fixed period in consideration of a payment in money.

These "Indentures of War," as they were called, are supplemented by "Retinue Rolls" or Lists of the Spearmen, Archers, &c. by whom the several Lords or Captains fulfilled their part of the contract, thus supplying the place of the "Scutage Rolls" and "Rotuli Mareschalciæ" in furnishing to the patient investigator what may be not inaptly termed an Army List of the Middle Ages.

LIST OF THE SCUTAGE AND MARSHAL'S ROLLS AMONGST THE PUBLIC RECORDS.

Scutage Rolls.

16 John. A roll of one membrane, containing writs to the sheriffs of the several counties directing them to collect and account for the scutage due from various persons specified, or to permit the said scutage to be collected by the hands of the persons entitled thereto. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 6.]

6 Henry III. A roll of one membrane, containing writs "de scutagio habendo" for those who served with the army in Poictou. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 8.]

7 Henry III. A roll of three detached membranes, containing the names of those who served with, or who sent their service to, the army in Wales, and who are thereby entitled to their scutage. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 9.]

8 Henry III. A similar roll, entitled "Scutagium exercitus domini Regis Henrici, de Bedeford." (The army employed in the siege of Bedford Castle). [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 10.]

2-15 Henry III. A roll of twenty-three membranes, containing: A list of the barons and others to be summoned to the army of Stamford, anno 2 Hen. III., with the number of knights to be furnished by each; similar lists of those summoned to Worcester and Shrewsbury against Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, with a special writ to J. Earl of Huntingdon urging his attendance at the latter place; also, writs "de scutagio habendo" for those who took part in the wars in Wales and Poictou, from 12 to 15 Henry III. [*Nomina Villarum, Exchr. L. T. R., No.* 430.]

26 Henry III. A roll of one membrane, containing writs "de scutagio habendo" for those who went with the king to Gascony. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 15.]

29 Henry III. A roll of three membranes, containing writs "de scutagio habendo" for the army of Gannok. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 17.]

41 Henry III. A roll of three membranes, containing similar writs for the army of Wales of 41 Henry III. [*Nomina Villarum, Exchr. L.T.R., No.* 433.]

13-18 Edward I. Writs "de scutagio habendo" for the army of Wales in the 10th year of Edward I. A roll of four membranes. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 59.]

31-35 Edward I. Simailr writs for the army of Scotland of 31 Edward I. A roll of two membranes. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 116.]

31-32 Edward I. Writs for the respite, for a specified period, from the payment of an aid of 40*s.* (levied on each knight's fee for the purpose of marrying the king's daughter), granted to those who

were about to go with the king to Scotland. A roll of five membranes. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 117.]

8-11 Edward II. Writs "de scutagio habendo" for the army of Scotland of 34 Edward I. A roll of two membranes.
[*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 124.]

8-18 Edward II. A roll of nine membranes, entitled "Rotulus Marescalcie," containing writs to the collectors of scutage, directing them to acquit from the payment thereof those who, "as appears from the Rolls of the Marshalsey," or otherwise, had their service in the armies of Scotland in the 28th, 31st, and 34th years of Edward I., or who had paid fines to be excused. These writs are all printed in Palgrave's 'Parliamentary Writs,' vol. ii, div. ii. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 179.]

12-19 Edward II. Writs "de scutagio habendo" for the army of Scotland of the 4th year of Edward II. A roll of three membranes.
[*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 193.]

2-11 Edward III. A roll of two membranes, containing writs "de scutagio habendo" for the scutage granted in 1 Edward III, and also for arrears of scutage to those who had served in the Scottish wars of Edward I. and Edward II.
[*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 225.]

49 Henry III to 1 Edward III. A roll of fifteen membranes, containing an account of all the fines, paid into the Exchequer or into the Great Wardrobe, for release or respite from military service between the above dates.
[*Nomina Villarum, Exchequer, L.T.R., No.* 447.]

Marshal's Rolls, or Proffers of Service.

5 Edward I. "Acknowledgments and Proffers of Service taken before the Constable and the Earl Marshal of England at Worcester." A roll of eight membranes and a schedule (the first membrane contains the enrolments of the Writs of Summons). Printed in Palgrave's "Parliamentary Writs," vol. i, pp. 197-213.
[*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 41.]

10 Edward I. "Proffers of Services against Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, and others in the 10th year of Edward I." A roll of two membranes. Printed in Palgrave's "Parliamentary Writs," vol. i, pp. 228-234. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 52.]

10 Edward I. "Acknowledgments and Proffers of Services at Ruthlan against Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, and others." A roll of five membranes. Printed in Palgrave's "Parliamentary Writs," vol. i, pp. 235-243. [*Miscell. Rolls, Chancery, No.* 53.]

10 Edward I. Another copy of the foregoing roll.
[*Nomina Villarum, Exchr., L.T.R., No.* 725.]

31 Edward I. "The roll of services of divers persons acknowledged to King Edward I. for his army summoned to repress the rebellion

of the Scots in the thirty-first year of his reign." A roll of two membranes. [*Nomina Villarum, Exchr. L. T. R., No.* 440.]

4 Edw. II. "Proffers of the services of the King of England taken at Tweedmouth, before Lord Bartholomew de Badelesmere, Lieut. Constable of England, and Lord Nicholas de Segrave, Marshal of the King's Army." A roll of five membranes. Printed in Palgrave's "Parliamentary Writs," vol. ii, div. ii, pp. 401-408. [*Nomina Villarum, Exchr. L. T. R., No.* 463.

4 Edw. II. Another copy, differing slightly from the foregoing. [*Nomina Villarum, Exchr. L. T. R., No.* 684.]

16 Edward II. "The Roll of the Summons of the Army of King Edward at Newcastle-on-Tyne, the 2nd day of August in the 16th year of his reign, against Robert le Brus of Scotland and other rebels." A roll of eight membranes. This roll contains also the names of the men-at-arms furnished by the several towns and villages, arranged under Hundreds. [*Nomina Villarum, Exchr. L.T.R., No.* 448.]

In addition to the foregoing, there are amongst the Subsidy Rolls and the "Miscellanea" of the Exchequer a few isolated accounts relating to the collection of scutage in several counties.

SCUTAGE ROLL OF THE SIXTH YEAR OF KING HENRY THE THIRD.

REX Domino Cycestriensi Episcopo, Cancellario suo, et S. de Segrave, salutem. Mandamus vobis quod habere faciatis Ricardo de Muntfichet scutagium suum de feodis militum que de nobis tenet in capite, scilicet, de scuto tres marcas pro exercitu nostro Pictavie post primum transfretationem nostrum in quo fuit nobiscum per preceptum nostrum. Teste Rege apud Nonetas xvij die Septembris.

Omnes subscripti habent consimiles Litteras :—

Gilebertus deVmframuill'— qui fuit cum Domino Rege; de feodis militum, etc.
Johannes filius Alani— " " " " "
Walterus de Bello Campo— " " " " "
Johannes de Braos'— " " " " "
Gilebertus de Gaunt— " " " " "
Ricardus Luuel— qui habuit milites suos.
Rogerus de Huntingefeld'—qui fuit cum Domino Rege
Johannes de Neuill'— " " "
Radulphus Basset de Welledon'— " " "
Rogerus filius Pagani— " " "
Oliuerus de Vallibus— " " "
Ricardus de Kaynes— " " "
Ernisius de Neuill'— " " "
H. Comes Hereford'— " " "
Philippus de Columbar'— " " "
Philippus de Kancy— " " "
Radulphus Gernun— " " "
Petrus de Goldinton— " " "
Reginaldus Basset— " " "
Rogerus de Quency— " " "
Robertus de Tateshal— " " "
Henricus de Hastinges— " " "
Normannus de Arescy— " " "

} De feodis militum quas tenet de Rege in capite.

Willelmus de Cantilupo qui fuit cum Domino Rege habet de feodis militum quæ de Rege tenet in capite; et de feodis militum de Wardis quæ tenentur de Rege in capite, et sunt in custodia sua de dono Domini Regis.

Rogerus de Scalariis— qui fuit cum Domino Rege.
Warinus de Muntchenesya— " " "
Hereicus de Stafford— " " "
Willelmus Briwer'— " " "
Henricus de Scrupes— " " "
Reginaldus de Moun— qui fuit etc.
Robertus de la Bruer'— qui fuit etc.

Johannes de Burgo—qui fuit—habet scutagium suum de feodis militum quæ tenet de Rege in capite; et de feodis militum de terris quæ fuerunt Comitis Sancti Pauli, et sunt in manu sua de baillio domini Regis.

Walterus de Dunstanuill'—qui fuit cum Domino Rege.
Johannes Biset— " " "
Oliverus de Punchardun— " " "
Thurstanus Dispensator— qui fuit, etc.

Comes Cestriæ—qui fuit, etc.; de feodis militum quæ tenet de Rege in capite, et de feodis militum quæ tenentur de Wardis, quæ de Rege teneri debent et sunt in manu sua.

Robertus de Muscegros— qui fuit, etc.
J. Constabularius Cestriæ— "
Reginaldus de Valle torti— "
Robertus Greal'— "
Henricus de Trasey— "
Thomas Mauduit— "
Willelmus de Dutton— "
Robertus de Curtenay— "
Hugo de Vinon'— "
Hugo de Hodlingeselea— qui habuit unum militem.
Radulphus filius Bernard'— " " "
David de Lindesya— qui habuit militem suum
Philippus de Kyme— qui habuit milites suos.
Nicholaus de Haueresham— qui habuit militem suum
Hugo Paynel— qui habuit duos milites, etc.
Radulphus de Suthlegh'— qui habuit militem suum.
Alicia Comitissa Augi— qui habuit milites suos.
Henricus del Ortlay— " " "
Johannes de Heriz— qui habuit militem suum.
Willelmus Pencrel de Samford—in quo fuit, etc.
Rogerus Bertram— qui fuit, etc.
Hugo Paynel— qui habuit duos milites.
Radulphus Russell'— qui fuit cum domino Rege.
Radulphus de Mortuo Mari— [" " o] "[1]
Willelmus de Boterell'— [" " "]
Willelmus Buzzin— [" " "]
Willelmus de Lancastre— [" " "]

Willelmus de Bello campo habet de feodis propriis et de feodis [*hole in parchment*] ...o tenere debet in capite, et sunt in custodia ipsius.....

Walterus de Langeton'— .....
Ricardus de Percy— qui fuit.
Ricardus de Chileham, frater domini Regis— "
Hugo filius Radulphi— "

Rogerus de Cressy habet scutagium de dono domini Regis de feodis militum quæ Margareta de Cressy, mater ipsius Rogeri, tenet de Rege in capite; qui fuit, et de feodis quæ tenet de Rege in capite.

Margar' Comitissa Winton'—habuit milites suos.
Paganus de Chaurc'— qui habuit unum militem.
Johannes filius Galfridi— [qui fuit][1]
Gileb'to [*sic*] de Lasey— [.....]
Oliverus de Aencurt— [.....]
Radulphus de Camois— [.....]

[1] The lower part of the Roll has two large holes in it.

Willelmus de Ros— qui fuit, etc.
Eustachius de Moretoin— "
Willelmus Russellus— "
Comes Gloucestriæ— "
Johannes de Baioc'— "
Vitell' Engaine— qui habuit, etc.
Rogerus de Clifford— qui fuit cum domino Rege.
Petrus de Malo lacu— " " "
Johannes filius Roberti— qui fuit, etc.
Willelmus de Percy— qui fuit.
Andreas Peuerel— "
Radulphus Sanzaueir— "
Elyas de Amundeuill'— "
Robertus filius Mesudred'— "
Comes Britann'— "
Engelardus de Cygayny—qui fuit; de feodis militum quæ Henricus de Berelay tenuit de Rege in capite et sunt in custodia cum filio et hærede ipsius.
Willelmus Mauduit—qui fuit.
Hamo Peche— "
Willelmus de Ferrar'— "
Godefridus de Craucumb'—qui fuit; habet litteras directas vicecomitibus Wiltes', Hereford', Glouc', Somers."[1]
Hugo Wac— qui fuit, etc.
Johannes de Bailloil— qui habuit milites suos.
Adam de Bruinton'— qui fuit.
Willelmus Bardulf— "
Johannes de Bello Campo de Eton'— "
Comes de Ferrar'— "
Henricus de Tybetot—qui fuit; habet de feodis militum quæ Radulphus filius et heres Willelmi de Haya, qui est in custodia sua, de domino Rege tenere debet in capite.
Petrus de Bruis—qui fuit.
Comes Glouc'— "
Elyas de Boulton'—de feodo unius militis; qui fuit, etc.
Alanus de Lindon'— "
Robertus de Pauilly "
Johannes de Vallibus—de dono Regis, de feodis militum quæ de baillio Regis tenet de terra quæ fuit Baldewini de Osterwic'.
Ricardus de Alencun—de dono Regis, de feodis militum quæ filius et heres Alexandri Neuill', qui est in custodia sua, tenere debet de Rege; qui quidem hæres est in custodia sua.
Walterus de Burgo—qui fuit cum Justiciario—habet scutagium de dono Regis de terra quam tenet de baillio Regis in Thorinton'.
Radulphus de Thoeny—qui fuit, etc.
Nigellus de Moubray— "
Robertus de Muschams— "
Comes Albemarl'— "
Willelmus de Albin'— qui habuit milites suos.
Warinus Basset habet de dono Regis scutagium de feodis militum quæ tenet de Rege in capite de hæreditate Katerine uxoris sue.
Radulphus de Verdun—qui fuit.
Rogerus de Clar'— qui fuit, etc.
Herebertus filius Mathei—de dono, scutagium suum de feodis militum quæ filius et hæres Willelmi Painel, qui est in custodia sua, de Rege debet in capite.
Emericus de Sacy habet scutagium de feodo unius militis.
Nicholaus de Verdun— qui fuit, etc.
Alureclus de Nich'— qui habuit milites suos.
Willelmus de Vescy— qui fuit.
Willelmus de Sancto Johanne—qui fuit, etc.
Hugo de Gurnay— "
Thomas de Berelay— in quo habuit milites.
Comes Mar'— qui fuit.

[1] This entry is cancelled on the Roll and noted in the margin, "quia aliter istius."

Nicholaus de Lectres—de dono, scutagium de feodo unius militis quod tenet de baillio Regis; et de feodis duorum militum quæ tenet de Henrico de Oyly, et de feodo unius militis quod tenet de Willelmo le Buteiller—qui fuit.[1]
Willelmus de Siffrewast— qui fuit.
Ricardus Soward—de dono, de feodis militum que tenet in dotem Philippe Com' Warewic' uxoris sue, et de feodo j. militis quod tenet de Rege in Hedindon'.
Fulco filius Warini— qui fuit etc.
Radulphus de la Newelaud'—in quo habuit militem suum.
Radulphus de Haya— in quo habuit.
Johannes Comes Huntindon'—qui fuit etc.; habet scutagium de feodis militum que tenet de Rege in capite; et similiter, de dono Regis, scutagium de feodis militum que tenet in capite de Rege Scottorum de Comite Huntindon', et idem Rex Scottorum de domino Rege.
Rogerus de Merlay—qui habuit milites suos.
Willelmus del Estre habet de dono Regis scutagium de feodis militum quæ tenet de Rege in capite.
Baldewinus de Boton', Willelmus de Ganages, Johannes de Erlegh', Johannes de Aur', et Alanus Basset, qui sunt de familia Comitis W. Mar', habent de dono Regis scutagium suum de feodis militum quæ de Rege tenent in capite.
Ricardus Marescallus—qui habuit militem suum, habet scutagium de feodo j. militis.
Walterus de Pavylly— qui habuit militem suum.
Philippus de Albin'—de feodis militem quæ tenet de baillio nostro, et quæ filius et hæres Willelmi de Rokel', qui est in custodia ipsius Philippi, de Rege tenere debet in capite; in quo fuit.
Goslefridus de Craucumb'—Scutagium de feodis militum quæ de Rege tenet in capite, et quæ filius et hæres Ricardi le Brun, qui est in custodia sua, de Rege tenere debet in capite in Com' Gloucestriæ; et de feodis militum quæ filius et hæres Thome de Bosclegh, qui est in custodia sua, de Rege tenere debet in capite in Comitatu Wiltes'; et de feodis militum quæ de Rege tenere debet in capite in Comitatu Sumers' et Hereford'.
Robertus de Maundeuill'—qui habuit milites suos.
Johannes de Mares— qui fuit, habet de medietate feodi unius militis.
Willelmus de la Escech', habet de dono Regis de feodis militum quæ tenet de baillio Regis
Hamon de Creueq'r— in quo fuit, etc.
Hugo de Kilpec— qui fuit, etc.
Walterus de Esselegh—qui habuit j militem.
Reginaldus de Mely'—qui fuit, etc.
Johannes Gueux— "
Galfridus le Saluag'—de dono Regis—qui fuit, etc.
Gilebertus de Aquila—qui habuit milites suos.
Radulphus filius Nicholai—de feodis militum quæ tenet de Rege; et de feodis militum quæ tenentur in capite de Rege de Wardis quæ sunt in manu sua.
Galfridus de Dynam— qui fuit.
Eustachius de Fercles — "
Nicholaus Auenel— "
Ranulfus filius Roberti— "
Hugo Dispens'— "
Jordanus de Sauckeuill'—qui fuit, etc.
Willelmus de Brion' habet de feodo dimidii militis.

---

[1] This entry is cancelled on the Roll and noted in the margin "non habebit."