# TESTA DE NEVILL.

*SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE TWO ANCIENT REGISTERS, COMMONLY SO CALLED, NOW PRESERVED IN THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, WITH AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE DATES OF THE RETURNS PERTAINING TO THE COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER CONTAINED THEREIN.*

By SIR HENRY BARKLY, K.C.B., G.C.M.G., etc., etc., etc.

As pointed out by the Sub-Commissioners who edited the transcript of these Registers, printed by direction of the Record Commission in 1807, the entries specifically entitled, "Testa de Nevill" form comparatively a very small portion of the whole.

Comprising, however, as they do, those which are earliest in date, and forming the nucleus, as it were, of the whole collection, attention is naturally attracted to an investigation of the source from which they were first derived. It is certainly singular that after having been accessible to the Public for eighty years, we still remain so entirely in the dark as to the circumstances under which the original Record, known by the name of *Testa de Nevill*, was compiled. In fact, it remains to be ascertained who this Nevill was; at what period he was connected with the Exchequer; and why his compilation received so unusual a title.

[1] Hopton's Surrender 14 March, 1645-6.
[2] Tanner MSS., (in Cary, ii. 276).

The editors of 1807, in their brief prefatory remarks, allude to two persons, to either of whom the compilation may be assignable,—Ralph de Neville, who they state was "an Accountant in the Exchequer and Collector of Aids in the reign of Henry the Third, and Jollan de Nevill, a Justice Itinerant of the same reign," whom Dugdale in his *Baronage* supposes to be the Author.

The word "Accountant" cannot, of course, have been used in its modern sense, but merely as one rendering accounts at the Exchequer, which every recipient of revenue had to do; and although, undoubtedly, a Ralph de Nevill is named in the *Testa* as one of the Collectors in Rutlandshire of the Aid for marrying the King's sister in 1235, I cannot help suspecting that in representing him as an officer of that department, the editors confounded him with his namesake, who, in 1222, had become Bishop of Chichester. As against the claims of Jollan (or Julian) de Nevill, it is urged by Mr. Foss that he was never an official of the Exchequer, although his father, the first Jollan, who died in 1220, had been so, and he seems to incline, therefore,[1] to Robert de Nevill, who is repeatedly mentioned as a clerk there from 15 John (1213) until his death in 1229. This latter date, however, would not cover that of some of the entries quoted as from the *Testa*, and, on the whole, there seems no sufficient reason for discarding the tradition of Dugdale's day as to the second Jollan, who is found as one of the Collectors in Lincolnshire of the same Aid of 1235,[2] and who, as the son of a former official, may be presumed to have carried on a work which his father perhaps began.

Strange to say, whether Ralph or Jollan was the compiler, neither thought fit to include the collections of the Aid with which they were personally concerned in the work, none of the Rolls relating to it being marked as extracted from the *Testa*.

With regard to the meaning of this word, which has been much disputed, it strikes one as by no means improbable that "Testa de Nevill" is after all no more than a free rendering into Exchequer Latin of "Nevill's Test,"—the standard, that is to say, with which the Accounts of the Sheriffs of Counties, *Custodes* of Honours, Collectors, and others, had to be compared, and their receipts for Aids, Scutages, Serjantries, etc., checked or *tested* at the Treasury. Such an interpretation seems to accord precisely with the objects professed in a memorandum inscribed on the fly-leaf of the Registers, "et sic contenta in eodem libro pro evidenciis habeantur hic in Scaccario, et non pro Recordo."

There is ground for supposing that at the time these Registers were compiled, the Rolls originally known as "Testa de Nevill" were in a state of decay.

The editors of 1807 were, indeed, under the impression that the entries specifically so entitled, had been "copied from a Roll bearing that name, a part of which, consisting of five small membranes, containing ten counties, was then in the Chapter House at Westminster," and in support of this opinion add, that "this Roll appears to be of the age of Edward the First and agrees *verbatim* with the entries in these Books."

This, however, was an entire misconception, for on comparing these

[1] *Judges of England.*
[2] *Testa*, p. 351.

five small membranes, or rather rotulets (which are now likewise deposited in the Public Record Office) with the corresponding portions of the books, they will be found to differ widely from the text in various instances, and to contain besides more than one distinct acknowledgement that they were themselves copied from documents which were at the time of copying defective and in part illegible.

In proof of the first assertion it is only necessary to refer to the discrepancy which exists between the Returns from Cumberland, headed "De Testa de Nevill," in the two collections. That in the Exchequer Register (vol. ii. folio 693, or page 378 of printed book) begins—"Robertus de Veteriponte," and runs on through various entries, embracing lists of churches in the gift of King John, Escheats, &c., to a return of fees held *in capite*, made by the Sheriff to the Barons of the Exchequer, which evidently should have been commenced under a new heading. At this point, from the words "Robertus de Vallibus," the Chapter House rotulet continues in precise accordance with the Exchequer Register to the end, although omitting the whole of the previous matter, which evidently pertained to an earlier Roll of the same reign. With regard to the second assertion, it is to be noted, first of all, that the returns which occur in the Chapter House Roll, although they may exist in the Exchequer Books, are not always in the latter cited as from "Testa de Nevill." This is the case with respect to the two on which my allegation of defectiveness is specially based, that namely for Devonshire, on rotulet 3, and for Hampshire on rotulet 6, each of which stops short with the notification that—"Non potest plus scribi de hoc Comitatu [Devon] propter magnum defectum quod est in rotulo exemplari per quem iste scribitur."

In both instances, nevertheless, fuller particulars are supplied than in the Exchequer Books. The "Inquisitio dominicorum, tenementorum, et feoffamentorum d'ni Regis vel antecessorum suorum in Devonia"[1] instead of concluding as therein at the words "Constantia de Touny tenet Manerium de Suthtant' cum pertinenciis," runs on, "de d'no Rege, sed nescitur per quod servicium; quod Manerium Rex Henricus, Johannis pater, dedit Pescano de Bellomonte in Maritagium de Constancia filia sua que nunc terram illam tenet." Another entry, "Ric'us Malherbe tenet terram de Wykam et Alvedestan cum pertinenciis de d'no Rege Johanne de dono," follows, after which comes the intimation already quoted, that no more can be written on account of a great defect in the Roll which was being copied.

In like manner the Hants rotulet, headed "Isti tenent de d'no Rege in Suth' in capite, *et* (an important conjunction left out by the Exchequer copyist) per Serjantiam," on reaching the words "Rex Willelmus fecit"[2] at the close of an entry about the Abbey of Hyde, instead of diverging to a totally different subject, continues the story of King William's donations thus—"Idem Rex Will's dedit Nic° de Boeles v hidas terre in Cranberge," and goes on—"Rex Stephanus dedit Nicolao de Warine xxxvij libratas terre et 1 m' terre in Cleva. Amicia de Multon tenet quandam terram in Heoguille que vocatur," at which point "non potest," &c., is repeated.

[1] *Vide* page 194 of printed book.
[2] Page 236 of printed book.

In place of these entries, the return in the Exchequer Register is carried on from the one as to Hyde Abbey, without a break, through several folios of escheats in divers hundreds, of which the Chapter House Roll says nothing. They clearly formed no portion of the original Roll, since in the Register twenty-seven lines (the parchment being ruled), are left blank after "Rex Willelmus fecit," of which no further indication is to be found in the printed book than the fact which may be gathered from the margin that folio 122 contained two entries only.

A blank of twelve lines similarly occurs in the Register after the words "Manerium de Suthtant," in the Devonshire Return, previously referred to, this fact likewise being left unnoticed by the editors of 1807.

Such blanks can only be explained by supposing that although traces of writing were still visible, the original rolls had become to a larger extent undecipherable than at the period at which the Chapter House copy had been made.

What has become of these originals since they were handled by the Exchequer copyists about the middle of the fourteenth century, is uncertain, but they do not appear to be now extant, although a good many original rolls of nearly coeval antiquity, the existence of which was unknown to the editors of 1807, have since been discovered among the so-called "Ancient Miscellanea" belonging to the Queen's Remembrancer's Department of the Exchequer.

Some of these have the seals, or tags of them, still attached, and there can be no doubt as to their having been those used in the preparation of the Exchequer Registers, as the words "in libro" are endorsed on them in handwriting of the fourteenth century. They appear, from a memorandum which accompanies them, to have been carefully examined in 1835, by Mr. Hunter, who has written in pencil on the membranes the pages of the printed book at which the copies are to be found. They are especially interesting from the light they throw on the mode adopted by the scribes of the fourteenth century in dealing with rolls recording the collection of an aid, the Feodary of an Honour, or a List of Serjeantries, extending into various counties. The practice seems to have been, doubtless for convenience of reference in fiscal matters, to pick such a roll to pieces (metaphorically at least), and to enter the portion relating to each county, or rather Sheriffdom, in which two were often comprised, in the part of the volume specially reserved for entries relating thereto. Thus, in the case of a Roll endorsed, "Auxilium Prelatorum concessum d'no Regi contra transfretationem suam in Wasconiam anno regni sui xxvi." (1242), still preserved in the Record Office, short separate returns, mere extracts in fact, headed as above, will be found for most counties in the Exchequer Registers. If the same plan had been followed throughout, this would signify little, but, instead of this, such extracts are as often as not mixed up with others, evidently from the preceding ecclesiastical aid of 1235, the Roll of which is no longer extant;[1] or worse still, are tacked on without heading of any sort to Lay Subsidy Rolls, with which they have no connection.[2]

[1] Printed Book, p. 22, Notts and Derby; page 44, Worcestershire.
[2] Printed Book, p. 82, Gloucestershire, &c., &c.

A similar system is adopted in the case of Feodaries. A list of the fees of the Honour of Gloucester will be found dissected, and portions added to returns of the Earl's tenants in various counties, without regard to date, or the slightest intimation that the text is derived from distinct documents, *e.g.* Worcestershire, p. 42, where part of the Roll in question beginning, "Will's Corbet," and ending "Thomas de Hanley dimid' feod' ibidem," has been thus tacked on to another headed, "Feoda Com. Glouc' in hoc Com^tu," which, it so happens contains the names of the same feoffees, accompanied by fuller particulars as to their holdings.

It has already been shown in comparing some of these returns specifically entitled "Testa de Nevill," with those in the Chapter House Collection so called, what patchwork has been made by the Exchequer scribes; in the case, for example, of the one for the County of Cumberland. The same practice is discernible in many others, where the means of comparison no longer exist, a glaring instance being furnished under Wiltshire,[1] headed "De Serjantiis in Testa de Nevill," into which four successive returns on this subject have been incorporated, as is to be inferred, not merely from the repetition as many times of similar entries, but from the changes in the Christian names of holders occasionally found, showing that an interval had elapsed since the previous mention of the Serjantry. But the strongest proof of all of the ignorance and carelessness with which the Exchequer volumes were compiled is afforded by the fact that, after concluding the question of Serjantries by entering at full length the list of those commuted into money rents by Judge Passelewe in 1249, the scribes have actually gone on to record under the same heading the aids paid by the Prelates in this county towards marrying the king's sister in 1235.

In face of all this it would be difficult, if not impossible, to determine what really constituted the original *Testa de Nevill*, or to sift the returns which should properly have been so designated from those interpolated in the midst of them. There seems, fortunately, no particular object in making such an attempt, since many of the latter are nearly as ancient and quite as authentic.

What is really wanted is a new edition of the whole work in a more convenient form, based as far as possible on the Queen's Remembrancer's original Rolls, and with such corrections and annotations as subsequent discoveries require, and the more advanced state of antiquarian knowledge at the present day could easily supply. Above all things the misleading words on the title-page of the Record Commissioners' volume "Temp. Henry III. et Edw. I." require correction, for it is abundantly proved by the headings alone that not only are there numerous returns for the reigns of Richard I. and John, but that the great bulk of the returns in the printed book must be referred to the first half of the reign of Henry the Third, or, at any rate are, prior to A.D. 1250.

It may, perhaps, be said that after the blemishes and defects pointed out, the work can scarcely be deserving of so much trouble and expense, but this would be a hasty and mistaken judgment, for there can be no question that the Exchequer Registers are a mine of valuable informa-

[1] Page 148.

tion, and that they contain much calculated to throw light on a most interesting yet obscure period of English History, the reigns of King John and his son, whose attempts to oppress their tenants in capite ended in such great constitutional changes. The interval covered by the returns in the collection coincides very nearly, in fact, with the thirteenth century. The earliest date which can be assigned with certainty is in the case of one for Yorkshire,[1] quoted as from "Testa de Nevill," wherein Roger de Badvent appears, among others, as Sheriff of the County, an office he held for the year 1198 only.

The latest with which I have met is an extent of the lands of Henry de Pomeroy in Devonshire;[2] made as set forth therein in 21 Edward I (1293). There is, indeed, a marginal note,[3] stating that a certain Charter of Henry the Third's was confirmed by King Edward and enrolled on the Memoranda Roll of the 33rd year of his reign (1305), whilst in another case[4] reference is made in the text itself to the Pipe Roll of 12 Edward II. (1318), but the first, clearly, and the second, in all probability, formed no part of the original Roll.

*(To be continued.)*

## TESTA DE NEVILL.

*SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE TWO ANCIENT REGISTERS, COMMONLY SO CALLED, NOW PRESERVED IN THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, WITH AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE DATES OF THE RETURNS PERTAINING TO THE COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER CONTAINED THEREIN.*

(*Concluded from p.* 40.)

As it has been suggested to me by Mr. Walford Selby that it would facilitate the analysis and classification of the contents of the Exchequer Registers, which it is to be hoped will some day be undertaken, if the Returns for each County were arranged in the order of date, and the occasion on which they were drawn up as far as practicable demonstrated from internal evidence, I have made the following attempt with respect to those for the county of Gloucester, with the archæology of which county I happen to be best acquainted. They are eleven in number, of a miscellaneous character, and occupy ten pages of the printed book, from pages 73 to 82, inclusive :—

### Return No. 1.

The only return that relates to a period so early as the reign of King John is that at page 77a, intituled,

"De Testa de Nevill."

"Isti tenent de d'no Rege in capite in com' Glouc'."

It is correctly printed from the Exchequer Register,[1] and differs only in trifling points from another copy on the back of Rotulet 4 of the Chapter House 'Testa de Nevill' roll[2], including like that the "Terre Normannorum" as well as some Serjantries. The two entries, however, at the end —"Henr' de Monemue 1am partem," and "Will's Wyberd 1am partem"— are not in the Roll, and have evidently been copied by mistake from the succeeding folio of the MS., as will be shown hereafter.

The original roll must have been drawn up, not only later than the sequestration of the lands of the Normans in 6 John, but than the forfeiture of those of William de Braose, which was decreed on 3 May, 1208.

On the other hand, it was probably before this William's death at Paris, in August, 1211, and certainly prior to 18 John (1216), when the greater part of his estate was restored to his eldest son Reginald de Braose[3].

Clearly, too, the Roll was drawn up before Roger de Mortimer (No. 22), who is said in it to hold Lechlade, died at that place on 8 July, 1215, and was succeeded by his son Hugh[4]; also, before the custody of the lands of James de Newmarch (No. 12) was given on his decease to John Russell[5]; or even earlier than the death of William de Montchesni (No. 23) to whose uncle, Warine de Montchesni, livery of the estate of the former was granted in 1213[6].

The interval between this last ascertained date and that hereinafter assigned to the roll, viz., the year 1211, disappears altogether, if it be assumed that the change of phraseology, from the usual "tenet" to "Feoda Will'i filii Alani" (No. 19) was consequent on the death, in 1210, of the second baron of that name, and the minority of his heir.[7]

It will be observed, however, that the same change occurs in seven other instances, and, although it could be shown that in the majority of them the fees referred to were about that time in the hand of the King through forfeiture; yet this certainly could not be affirmed of those of Ralph Musard (No. 10), who is reported to have adhered to John steadfastly,[8] at any rate till then, although even he fell under suspicion before the close of the reign.[9]

It is open to question, therefore, whether such variation of phrase has any special significance, or whether it is inadvertently adopted, like another occasionally found, viz., "debet de" instead of "tenet."[10]

It may be well to add that the part of the roll headed "Terre Normannorum," cannot have been compiled later than 1215, since Warine fitz Gerold, whose name stands third on it as holding Dunamenel (Down Amney), taking part with the rebel barons in that year, was deprived of his lands; this very manor being assigned as an act of clemency for the maintenance of his wife, Alice de Curci.[11]

[1] Q. R., Miscellaneous Book, No. 5.
[2] Box 152, "Rageman," No. 29.
[3] Dugdale, *Baronage*, vol. i, p. 416
[4] *Baronage*, vol. i, p. 140.
[5] *Rot. Lit. Claus*, 17 John, m. 8.
[6] *Rot. Fin.*, 15 John, m. 2.
[7] Eyton's 'Antiquities of Shropshire,' vol. iv.
[8] Foss's *Judges of England.*
[9] *Baronage*, vol. i, p. 512.
[10] *Vide* Nos. 13, 14, 17, and 24.
[11] *Baronage*, vol. i, p. 411.

From these and other considerations which might be adduced, the return in question may fairly be assumed to contain a summary of the Inquisitions taken in connection with the aid granted to King John in the 12th and 13th years of his reign. This point, however, can only be settled by internal evidence, as the list of those assessed to that aid in the county of Gloucester, is one of the few omitted from the Red Book of the Exchequer.

### Return No. 2.

The second Return in order of date is, I submit, that—without special title—which begins near the bottom of page 78b. It obviously relates to a carucage, the number of ploughs to be taxed in every Vill of each Hundred being set down opposite to its name.

There is reason to believe that this was the carucage which (as we learn from an entry under Berkshire, at page 131 of the *Testa*) was "levied" in 5 Henry III (1220), throughout the Kingdom on the earls, barons, knights, and free tenants cultivating lands." It is notified at page 79b that John of Monmouth, is responsible for the tax in the vills of *St. Briavell*, Bickenor, and Stanton, as well as in *Dene* and its neighbourhood; and as it is known that he was not made Constable of St. Briavell's Castle and Custos of the Forest of Dean until 18 John,[1] whilst he ceased to hold the former appointment prior to 1224, in which year a precept issued to Roger de Clifford as Constable[2]; the Return evidently falls between these dates.

As confirmatory of the precise year of the Carucage, it may be pointed out further, that under the Hundred of Whitstan, p. 79a, the vill of Stanley St. Leonards is designated "Stanley Henr,'" doubtless from its Lord—the first Henry de Berkeley, who succeeded in 1220, and died in September 1221.

### Return No. 3.

The Return which immediately follows at the foot of page 81a, comes next in date. The statements it contains regarding Escheats, Sergeantries, Advowsons, Widows and Heiresses, &c., are evidently extracts from Presentments which the Juries of the Hundreds named had made, as in duty bound, to the Justiciars.

The Assize Rolls of Gloucester, between the 5th and 32nd years of Henry III, are not extant, but if the Iters at this period were as supposed, every seven years, it may be assumed that the one to which these presentments pertain took place about 12 Henry III, say in 1228; for in one of the entries, Lucia, the widow of Robert, Lord Berkeley, who had remarried Hugh de Gurnay, is spoken of, together with her second husband, as alive, whereas, she is known to have died in 1234, and *he* must have died before the close of the ensuing septennate, since his name does not appear among those who paid the Aid for marrying the King's sister to the Emperor of the Romans in 1235.

There can be little doubt that the Returns connected with the Aid just referred to should follow. They are, in this, as in other counties, the most important in the whole work, containing much information as

[1] Rot. Pat., 18 John.

[2] Memorials of Dean Forest—Trans. Bristol and Glouc. Archæological Society, vol. iv, p. 314.

to the holders of manors at the period. Those for Gloucestershire are three in number (printed as four), two of the original Rolls, the first and third, being still preserved at the Record Office. The second is not to be found there, although it must of course have been in existence in the fourteenth century, when the Exchequer Registers were compiled. That they were used in its compilation is shown by the words "in libro," written in handwriting of the period, on the back.

There seems, at first sight, a good-deal of repetition in these Returns, but this arises from the fact that (as explained under Beds and Bucks at page 258 of the printed book) this Aid was payable by law in two instalments, of a mark each, the first at the term of Michaelmas, 19 Henry III (1235), the second at the term of Easter, 20 Henry III (1236), an arrangement which occasioned some complication in the Accounts of the Collectors.

### Return No. 4.[1]

Stands at the commencement of those for the County of Gloucester, at the middle of page 73, and is headed "Radulfus de Wylington et Willielmus de Puccot reddunt compotum de Auxilio d'no Regi generaliter concesso per Angliam, per manus eorum Collectorum in Com' Glouc,'" but the object and date of the Aid are supplied by the endorsement "Auxilium Collectorum in Com' Glouc' per Rad' Wylington et Will' de Pucot ad sororem D'ni Regis maritandam Imperatori Romanorum."

The arrangement is according to "Honors,"—a term indiscriminately applied to every holding, however inconsiderable,—the full amount of assessment in each case being set out. The original Roll has the Honors noted in the margin, opposite the names of their holders, instead of above them, as in the printed text, but except in this respect it is identical with the latter.

### Return No. 5.

which begins in the middle of page 74b, with the same heading as No. 4, save that the words "Ad maritandam sororem suam Romanorum Imperatori," are added, is a longer and more elaborate statement, in which the results of the first year's collection are given, no doubt for the information of the Exchequer, a summary of the amounts received being appended at the close. The original, as already mentioned, is missing.

### Return No. 6.[2]

which will be found to begin at the foot of page 75b under the head "Rad's de Wyliton et Will's de Pucot, Oliverus Clericus, et H. de Wald' collectores Auxilii in Com. Glouc., reddunt compotum de auxilio assiso ad maritandam sororem Regis, scilicet, de Scut' ij marc'," is, however, evidently the final reckoning at the Exchequer after collection of the second instalment. As some of those assessed had paid in full on the first application, whilst others did so only in part even on the second, the accounts of the collectors are somewhat confused, there being balances to pay in some cases and arrears still outstanding in others. They start for example by crediting the Exchequer with 10 marks, which

[1] No. 10 of the Record Office series.
[2] No. 11 of the Record Office series.

they had received in a lump sum from Thomas de Berkely by the hands of his Steward in the previous year, but omitted to account for, and then proceed to explain item by item what they owe for the "surplus" or second instalment. This amounts to a further sum of £100 13s. 2d. including, however, as will be seen (page 77a) all receipts under the head "De hiis qui non habent capitales honores in hoc comitatu."

### Return No. 7.

which is printed on page 76a as if it were a separate Return, although it is on the back of the same original Roll as No. 6, and necessarily forms part of it.

The title as above quoted is rather misleading, as it serves to include two very different classes of Tenants *in capite*, those who did not hold *by Barony* in Gloucestershire *or anywhere else*, and those who had the chief seat of their Barony in another County! John Cotele (No. 4) who held but the seventh of a Knight's Fee in Frampton (of the Honour of Walingford) being a good type of the former; Robert Musard (No. 2) who held two and a quarter Fees in Gloucestershire, but whose "Caput Baroniæ" was at Staveley in Derbyshire, of the latter.

### Return No. 8.

There is reason to suppose that the Second Gloucestershire Return specifically quoted as "De Testa de Nevill," that namely, at page 82, at the close of the collection for the county, is little if at all posterior to those just referred to. It begins with a List of Serjeantries, three at least of which are among those included in the previous Return so designated (No. 1), the rest being presumably of later date. One of these, indeed, introduces the well-known name of Hugh de Kilpeck as holding the Manor of Little Tainton by Serjeantry, and he was under age and in ward to William de Cantilupe until July 1216. On the other hand, as this Hugh died in 28 Henry III (1244), we have here the total limit assignable to No. 8. I was at one time disposed to refer it to this latter year, in which, as we learn from page 352 of the printed book, "Inquisitions were made in every County as to the King's Serjeantries," this idea being strengthened by the allusion at the close to some such general enquiry, "in aliis comitatibus per inquisiciones premissas." (*vide* p. 82b).

The twelve entries which follow, recording the payment of an aid by certain Religious Houses, preclude, however, this supposition, and, as on comparing them with the amounts paid by the same Houses towards the aid for the Expedition to Gascony, they are found to differ materially, and to relate to an aid which had been payable *in two tallies*, I feel satisfied that we have here an account of the ecclesiastical contribution for marrying the King's eldest sister, and that the date consequently of this heterogeneous Return cannot be much later than Michaelmas 1236. No such Return exists in the Chapter House *Testa de Nevill.*

### Return No. 9.

The short Return in the middle of page 81b, headed "Auxilium prelatorum concessum D'no Regi contra transfretationem suam in Wascon'

anno Regni sui xxvi° (1242) is the one above alluded to, and, as before explained, an extract merely from the general Roll still extant.

### Return No. 10.

which follows, is of the same date, as shown by its sub-title—"Recepta de Scutagio Wasconie de balliva Cirencestr'"—although the heading "Serjantie mutate in Servicia militaria," followed by the intrusive names of Henry de Monmouth and William Wyberd, has usurped the foremost place.

Who these persons were, and how they had to pay 12 pence each *per annum* for not doing the service as King's cooks, for which they held twenty shillings-worth of land in Leckhampton, is fully set forth in the next Return to be noticed,—but it may be well to point out here, that according to Return No. 3, page 81a,—it was Peter de Aula and *Roger* de Monmouth, who held this Serjeantry in 1228, so that William Wyberd and Henry de Monmouth did not succeed till after that date.

### Return No. 11.

The only Return which remains to be considered is that beginning at the bottom of page 77b, headed—"De Serjantiis arentatis per Robertum Passelewe tempore Henrici filii Regis Johannis,"—as to the precise date of which there can be no question, Madox in his *History of the Exchequer*, citing a document which proves that this Iter took place in 34 Henry III (1249-50.)

Records of it in nearly every county are preserved in the *Testa de Nevill*, but it is to be apprehended that they had been a good deal added to—not to say garbled—before they were finally copied.

Those for Gloucestershire begin, as will be seen, with a verbatim copy of the first fourteen entries in Return No. 8,—which in itself looks suspicious—as an interval of about as many years had elapsed, and there is, moreover, no reference to any commutation into money-rents. A description is then given of eight Serjeantries so commuted, no doubt by Robert Passelewe, including those of Monmouth and Wyberd; this is succeeded by a long and minute account of Serjeantries connected with the town of Cirencester, after which, one is surprised to find a repetition, in somewhat different phraseology it is true, of the eight commutations already described. Although a piece of patchwork, however, some of the Serjeantries are so extremely curious, that this Return well deserves attentive examination, and to many it will perhaps prove one of the most interesting of the entire number.