THE COUNTESS LUCY:

SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

By R. E. G. KIRK.

Of the many emendations of Dugdale's *Baronage* which, in default of a revision of the whole work, have been attempted by more recent writers, one of the most important and interesting deals with the history and relationships of the reputed Anglo-Saxon heiress, Lucy, who is said to have been Countess of Lincoln in her own right, and who was certainly Countess of Chester by marriage. Dugdale, following his authorities, makes out that there was only one lady of this name, and does not give her the former title. The emendators, on the contrary, suggest that there were in reality two ladies named Lucy, mother and daughter, and heiresses in succession to the earldom of Lincoln. But as the arguments on which they founded their conclusion can be proved to be entirely fallacious, it appeared desirable to reinvestigate the matter, for, on their own showing, they have unjustifiably resorted to the literary barbarity of dividing a lady in halves, to suit the purely imaginary exigencies of a pedigree. Fresh evidence on both sides of the question

is forthcoming, and I need not here anticipate the result of the inquiry, further than by remarking that neither Dugdale nor his critics have given a correct or even a coherent account of the real history of the lady or ladies in question, and that I propose to offer what I hope will be a final solution of the problem. It has been found necessary to review the early history of the Earldoms of Chester and Lincoln, and so much light on the origin of the latter earldom has been obtained, that many misapprehensions and erroneous deductions from its few known facts can at length be rectified.

Dugdale's information on the subject is given under the heads of "Earls of Mercia," "Romara," "Earls of Chester," and "Earls of Lincoln"; and is based on Ordericus Vitalis and other early chroniclers, including the work which goes by the name of Ingulph of Croyland, and the continuation thereof by Peter of Blois, and also on a Genealogy of Earl Leofric contained in a MS. of Florence of Worcester. For his genealogical particulars he relies to a large extent on the last three authorities, if they may be so called; but the Croyland chronicles, as is well known, are very untrustworthy, and the facts they record are almost undistinguishable from the confused mass of wrong inference and pure fiction with which they abound. The Genealogy is also very inaccurate, and obviously based on Ingulph and his continuator.[1] On the main question before us, however, the statements of Ingulph and the Genealogy are supported by the independent testimony of the registers of Spalding priory, two of which are quoted in the old edition of Dugdale's *Monasticon*, and another in the new edition; but some of the charters which have the most important bearing on the matter are omitted from both editions. That these registers are worthy of the utmost credit will be proved by reference to royal charters, and has indeed been admitted by the emendators, who frequently refer to them, and have taken the trouble twice to print from one of them a charter which is apparently of much less importance than those I have alluded to. The *Monasticon* also makes quotations from the Chronicle of Peterborough, which supports Ingulph and the Genealogy both as to the parentage and as to the unity of Lucy.

It is impossible, therefore, to reject off-hand any portion of the history or tradition in question. The only course we can take is to endeavour to distinguish the true from the false, by applying the test of a comparison of the authorities above mentioned with the authentic records of the realm.

Dugdale's version.

The old story is briefly as follows. Lucy was the grand-daughter of Leofric, Earl of Mercia, and of the famous Countess Godiva, the former of whom died in 1057, "in a good old age," while the latter survived the Conquest. Algar, or Ælfgar, Lucy's father, was created Earl of the East Saxons, and on Leofric's death became Earl of Mercia.[2] He twice rebelled against Edward the Confessor, and was twice banished or out-

[1] Both the Genealogy and Peter of Blois make Earl William de Roumare to be elder brother of Roger Fitz Gerold; an error not likely to have been made by independent writers.

[2] Algar's wife was named Alveva, or Ælfgifu. Both she and Godiva survived the Conquest, as Domesday shows. See Mr. Freeman's "Norman Conquest," ii, 629.

lawed, but each time restored to favour, on the second occasion with the gentle aid of an invasion by his son-in-law Griffith, King of North Wales, and by "the Norway fleet." He died soon after, in 1059, probably of no great age, as he survived his father only a few years. Lucy's two brothers were Edwin, Earl of Mercia, and Morcar, or Morkere, Earl of Northumbria. Her sister Algitha or Edgiva, was married firstly to Griffith, above named,[1] and secondly to King Harold.

Earls Edwin and Morcar were almost the only English nobles who were permitted by the Conqueror to retain their dignities and possessions, but these were subsequently forfeited by their rebellion; Edwin in the result being killed, and Morcar imprisoned.[2] Yet as Dugdale in several places refers to Lucy's inheritance, we are left to infer that she was allowed to succeed to the possessions of her brothers, as their sister and heiress, or, ignoring her brothers, to the possessions of her father as his daughter and heir. Earl Leofric's Genealogy positively states that she "obtained the paternal lands."

Dugdale's authorities then go on to describe, with sundry circumstantial details, how she was married three times, her husbands being (1) Ivo Taillebois of Anjou, (2) Roger[3] Fitz Gerold de Roumare, and (3) Ranulph Meschin de Briquessart or de Bayeux, Earl of Chester.

By her first husband she is not stated by Dugdale to have had any children. He seems to have relied on Earl Leofric's Genealogy, which asserts that they had none. By her second husband she is said to have had William de Roumare, son and heir of Roger, and who afterwards became Earl of Lincoln. By her third husband she is further stated to have had Ranulph,[4] who was created Earl of Chester, William, said to have been Earl of Cambridge, and two daughters.

Her last husband surrendered her inheritance to Henry I, in exchange for the earldom of Chester, and died in 1129. After his death, she paid the King a large sum of money for livery of "her father's lands," and a still larger fine that she should not be compelled "to marry again" for the space of five years.[5]

Truly this is a remarkable story, and the lady must have been possessed of great force of character to have maintained the position of an independent heiress till the end of a protracted life, in spite of the forfeiture of her brothers, almost the last representatives of the deposed English nobility, and her marriage to three Norman husbands, the first of whom might well have regarded himself as possessed in his own right, under the grant which would in such case be made

[1] This fact is, without any good reason, denied by the editor of Bohn's translation of Ordericus Vitalis.

[2] The latter remained in prison all his life, with the exception of a short interval, according to Ordericus Vitalis, Florence of Worcester, Roger Hoveden, &c. But Ingulph and the Peterborough Chronicle say that both brothers were killed by the treachery of their own followers; the Chronicle adding that King William, greatly mourning their death, gave their sister Lucy with their lands to Taillebois.

[3] Some have insisted that this is a mistake for Robert Fitz Gerold, the name given in Domesday, but it appears that Robert had a brother and heir named Roger, and that it was Roger who married Lucy.

[4] "William Ranulph" in Ord. Vit. seems to be an error, and not an early example of a double name, as Mr. Freeman suggests. This Ranulph was called "Gernons."

[5] Pipe Roll, 31 Henry I.

by the Conqueror. For, although her inheritance was alienated by her third husband, she was able to pay a large sum of money apparently for its re-purchase; and although, if the story be true, she was at least seventy years of age at the date of her last husband's death, she was still considered to be liable to be married for a fourth time, if the King should so choose; to avoid which fate she preferred to pay a very substantial fine.[1]

The proposed emendation.

But, if the dates given were correct, it is evident that this story would be open to serious objection. In the first place, Lucy was born not later than 1059, if that were the date of Earl Algar's death, and if she were his daughter, as alleged by the monks of Peterborough and Croyland. The date of her marriage to Ivo Taillebois, was 1072, according to Ingulph, or 1073, according to the Chronicle of Peterborough.

There is good evidence that Ivo survived King William I, and Peter of Blois appears to state that he lived till 1114, though Peter's chronology is not very clear, and this date was not adopted by Dugdale. If Ivo died in that year, and left a widow, she would have been at least fifty-five years of age before she could have married again and consequently it would be "physically impossible," to use the words of the emendators, that she could have been mother of the children of Roger Fitz Gerold and Ranulph Meschin.

These considerations induced the Rev. W. L. Bowles and Mr. John Gough Nichols, authors of the "Annals and Antiquities of Lacock Abbey," published in 1835, to question the possibility of all these events having belonged to the history of one and the same lady. Accepting the date of 1114, as the date of Ivo's death, and discarding Peter of Blois' connecting statement, that she bewailed Ivo's death with only "moderate lamentations" (*modico planctu*), and married again little more than a month after, they boldly, for the first time, ventured to suggest that there must have been two Countesses and heiresses of the name of Lucy, mother and daughter. To the first lady they assign Ivo as husband, and to the second lady, Roger and Ranulph; and they assume 1141 to have been the date of the second Lucy's death.[2] This makes matters run smoothly, but the dates on which they relied are very questionable.

The theory originated by Messrs. Bowles and Nichols has been adopted by several later writers, namely, by the author of "Additions to Dugdale's Baronage," contained in the "Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica," vii. 130, and viii. 156, published in 1841-3; by the late Mr. Thomas Stapleton, in his valuable edition of the Norman Pipe Rolls, vol. ii, published in 1844;[3] by the writer—probably the late Mr. J. G. Nichols—of an elaborate but misleading account of the Earldom of Lincoln, contained in the first volume of the "Topographer and Genealogist," published in 1846; by the editor of the Pipe Rolls for

[1] When Dugdale wrote, the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I, was supposed to be of the 5th year of Stephen, or about ten years later than its real date; but this did not excite his suspicion.

[2] Their assumption is based on a misapprehension, as will be seen.

[3] Stapleton was in fact the originator of the new theory, as Bowles and Nichols profess to base it upon information received from him.

Cumberland, &c., 1847; by Mr. John Hodgson Hinde in the Archæological Journal (1859), xvi, 230; and partially by Mr. W. S. Ellis in his "Antiquities of Heraldry," published in 1869.[1] It has also been thoroughly endorsed by Mr. Freeman, who considers the original version to be an exploded myth, as noticed in the last number of the GENEALOGIST, where Mr. Round accepts the proposed emendation, though it does not appear to have commended itself to so great an authority as Mr. Eyton.[2]

The evidence chiefly relied upon by the emendators is the statement of Peter of Blois, that Ivo and Lucy had "an only daughter, nobly espoused" (*unica eorum filia, sponso nobili tradita*); but they did not notice that Peter says this daughter died in Ivo's lifetime, and without issue. Stapleton and Nichols also endeavour to prove, perhaps satisfactorily, that Ivo had a daughter Beatrice, wife of Ribaud, Lord of Middleham, brother of Alan, Earl of Richmond, whose son Ralph and grandson Ribaud took the name of Taillebois; and they triumphantly print a charter from a register of Spalding, showing that "the Countess Lucy" had a daughter named Matilda, who was wife of Hugh, brother of Ranulph Meschin;[3] but they produce no positive authority, good, bad, or indifferent, for stating that Ivo and Lucy had a daughter named Lucy. Yet on such slender and self-contradictory premises, these writers inclined to the opinion that there may have been three daughters and coheiresses of "the first Lucy" to the earldom of Lincoln. This suggestion, though supported by much learned argument, makes confusion worse confounded.

Objections to the double-Lucy theory.

None of the emendators, except Mr. Hodgson Hinde, remarked that the evidence as to the alleged parentage of Lucy is very slight, and open to grave suspicion. But at present I do not propose to go into that branch of the subject, because it will be necessary to discuss, at greater length than Mr. Hinde has done, the question whether Lucy was an heiress; which settled, it will be easier to decide as to her parentage. That question may not indeed really affect the argument from dates. Even supposing that she was not the daughter of Earl Algar, it can scarcely be imagined that the wife of a man who came over with the Conqueror was born at a later date than that of Algar's death. For the present, therefore, meeting the original emendators on their own ground, I proceed to state the objections to the reasons which induced them to launch the double-Lucy theory.

First, as to dates. Earl Algar did not die so early as 1059. Mr. Freeman considers that he died between 1062 and 1065;[4] and the French editor of Ordericus Vitalis assigns 1063 as the date of his death.[5]

There is no doubt that the date of 1114 first attracted the notice

[1] Mr. Ellis inconsistently omits Ivo from the number of the supposed second-Lucy's husbands, but still makes her to be daughter of Earl Algar. His chief argument, however, promises to be very useful, and will be discussed further on.

[2] An account of this controversy is given in a letter by Mr. Round to the *Academy*, 10th December, 1887. He there more correctly admits that this is still an open question.

[3] See abstracts of Charters, *post*, No. 24.

[4] "Norman Conquest," ii, 469, 631.

[5] Edition of the Soc. de l'Hist. de France, ii, 119, note.

of the emendators, and it is singular that, although they themselves afterwards pointed out that Ivo's death really took place before 1100, as appears by a charter of William Rufus, addressed to Roger Fitz Gerold,[1] obviously in his capacity as lord of Spalding and husband of Lucy, nevertheless they did not think it right to question the theory which they had so rashly adopted. It is clear that, taking 1093 as about the date of Ivo's death, Lucy Taillebois may well have been the mother of William de Roumare, who succeeded his father before 1119, for he is described as "son and heir" of Roger Fitz Gerold in that year, when he assisted King Henry I in defeating the King of France at Brémule.[2] We have not the slightest evidence of the dates of Roger's death and the marriage of Lucy to Ranulph Meschin, and therefore it is difficult to pronounce an opinion as to the remainder of the assumed physical impossibility.[3] For all we know to the contrary, this last marriage may also have taken place before 1100, and probably did, as it may be inferred that Roger did not live long after coming into possession of the immense estates previously enjoyed by Ivo, from the fact that so little is known about him.[4]

Then, with regard to the meagre evidence produced by the emendators: it is utterly insufficient to show that Ivo and Lucy had a daughter named Lucy. Their proofs as to Beatrice rest on a charter of Ivo's, to which Ribaud his son-in-law (*gener*) is a witness, and on a charter of Ribaud, brother of Earl Alan, who therein mentions Beatrice his wife; and that the "son-in-law" and Earl Alan's brother were the same is shown by another charter of the same Ribaud, which mentions "Ivo;" but it is not certain that Beatrice was also the daughter of Lucy.

It is necessary to note that Beatrice is said to have had a daughter, who was wife of a certain Gilbert; and that an attempt has been made to identify this daughter with Rohese, niece of Ranulph Gernons, Earl of Chester, who was married to Gilbert de Gant in 1141, and who is supposed to have inherited "a share" of the earldom of Lincoln. But after careful consideration of the evidence, I am quite unable to say anything in support of this view of the matter.

Thus the only good piece of evidence yet before us is the Spalding charter, which mentions Matilda, daughter of the Countess Lucy, and if nothing more definite could be discovered, we should be driven to the conclusion that Matilda was the sole daughter of Ivo and Lucy. Consequently all the elaborate arguments of Mr. Nichols as to the descent of the respective "shares" of the earldom of Lincoln, which he assumes to have been held in coparcenery by the representatives of Lucy, Beatrice, and Matilda, rest upon very sandy foundations.

But the emendators did not call attention to the evidence in support of the original story which is furnished by the charters of the Countess

[1] See abstracts of Charters, *post*, No. 7.

[2] Ordericus Vitalis.

[3] It might be supposed that Ranulph Gernons, the eldest of the children of the third marriage, was considerably younger than his half-brother, William de Roumare judging from the account given of the former's escape from Lincoln Castle in 1141; but they both died in the same year, 1153.

[4] The Genealogy alleges that the third marriage took place in the reign of Stephen, a palpable error of date which is disregarded by both Dugdale and his opponents.

Lucy herself, as recorded in the registers of Spalding priory. It was certainly their duty to have done so, seeing that they carefully examined the transcript of one of the manuscripts, and made extracts therefrom to suit their theory. Two of these registers are quoted in the old edition of the *Monasticon*,[1] and the greater portion of another is transcribed in Cole's MS. No. 43 (Addit. 5844), and quoted in the new edition of the same work. Of these charters, and of all others that I have been able to find relating to Thorold the Sheriff, Lucy, and her three husbands, it will be convenient to give a concise description in this place. For the present, however, the reader need peruse only Nos. 2, 4, 18, 19, 29, and 43. The rest will be referred to later on. This is, I believe, the first attempt which has been made to bring them together.

Abstracts of Charters.

1. Charter of Thorold (the Sheriff) to St. Nicholas and the monks of Spalding, granting tithes in Tetenay, Alkebarge, Normanby, Beltisford, and Scamelisby. (The text of this charter is not set out, but its purport is stated as above.)—Spalding register ; Cole's MS. p. 144 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 215.[2]

2. Charter of Ivo Taillebois to the monks of St. Mary's, York, and Stephen the Abbot, for the souls of himself and his wife Lucy, and of his father and mother, granting various lands in Kirkby-Stephen, Wyntun, Kirkby-Kendale, Eversham, Kirkby-Lonsdale, Hutton, Bethone, Burton, Clepeam, &c. Witnesses: Lucy, his wife, Ribaud, his son-in-law,[3] Ralph Taillebois, &c. (1088-1112.)—Register of St. Mary's, York ; *Monasticon*, iii, 553.

3. Charter of William (I), King of the English, addressed to R. Bishop of Lincoln, &c., and granting that Ivo Taillebois may give the manor of Spalding to St. Nicholas of Angers, but so that the church situate in the same manor and its servants may have the manor; and they shall have it before or after Ivo's death, as he shall please. Witnesses : William, Bishop of Durham (1080-95) ; William, the Chancellor (1083-90), &c. Dated at How. In the rubric Ivo is called "first husband of Lucy the Countess."—Spalding register, f. 12a ; Cole's MS. p. 145 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 216.

4. Grant by Ivo Taillebois to the church of St. Nicholas of Angers, of the church of Spalding, with a carucate of land there, for the souls of King William and Matilda

[1] Dugdale twice visited Spalding, in 1648 and 1659, and on both occasions made extracts from registers, then in the possession of John Oldfield, Esquire, lord of the manor. On the former occasion, he saw a "vetus apographum," and on the latter a "registrum." These two MSS. were still at Spalding in Tanner's time. A chronicle and a register of that priory were preserved at Caius College, Cambridge, according to Tanner, and *Top. and Gen.*, ii, 107, but only the former now remains in the library of that college, according to its catalogue. Possibly it was from the latter that Cole transcribed, but his original was then in private hands. There is also another but different register among the Harleian MSS., No. 742.

[2] The Spalding registers do not contain the foundation charter of the cell at Spalding. Ingulph professes to quote the full text of a charter by "Thorold de Bukenhale" to the monks of Croyland, granting the manor of Spalding for the foundation of a cell there. This is said to have been made in the presence of Thorold's lord, Leofric, Earl of "Leicester," and Countess Godiva, the Earl's wife, and with the consent of his lord and kinsman (*cognati*) the Earl Algar, their eldest son and heir. It is dated at "Leicester" (probably meaning Chester), 1051. Ingulph's charters are admitted to be as untrustworthy as his narrative, and therefore I do not venture to place it in the text It is however certain that the monks of Croyland had an estate in Spalding at the time of Domesday, which also shows that Thorold the Sheriff had granted to them the manor of Bukenhale.

[3] In the same Register there is a charter by Ribaud, lord of Middleham, brother of the Earl (Alan, Earl of Richmond), for the souls of Alan the Earl, Beatrice, his (Ribaud's) wife, &c.

his wife, of himself and his wife Lucy, and his (or their) ancestors, to wit, Thorold and his wife,[1] on condition that "the monks of St. Nicholas" should acknowledge this as the first gift.[2] The abbot and monks of Angers granted to the monks of Spalding the tithes (where, not stated) which Thorold and his [men] had given to St. Nicholas. Ivo made this "convention" with Natalis the abbot and the monks of Angers, at Gloucester, in 1085, with the consent of King William, by the testimony of Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln (1072-92), William, Bishop of Durham, and others, including "Ivo the Knight." (The text of this charter is not set out, but its purport is stated as above.)—Spalding register, f. 12a ; Cole's MS. p. 146 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 216.

5. Charter of William (I), King of the English, confirming to St. Nicholas and his monks the gift of the manor of Spalding made to them by Ivo Taleboys. With attestations of confirmation by William II and Henry I. Witnesses : Robert (Remigius ? 1072-92), Bishop of Lincoln ; William, Bishop of Durham, &c.—Spalding register ; *Monasticon*, iii, 217.

6. Charter of Ivo Taillebois to the monks of Spalding, after the death of William, King of the English, for the souls of King William and Matilda his wife, granting the tithe of the toll and saltpans of Spalding, an aqueduct called Westlade, with a fisherman, 2000 eels from his own fisheries, the tithe of sea-fish in all his land, and other tithes, &c. He also gave "a rustic" in each of the following places, to keep the monks' tithes there—Teteney, Alcobar, Normanby, Bolingbroc, and Beltisford ; and a sheepfold in Spalding, &c.—Witnesses : Thomas, Archbishop of York ; Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln ; Robert, Bishop of Hereford ; Wido de Credon, &c. (This does not mention Lucy.)—Spalding register, f. 12b and f. 392b ; Cole's MS. p. 147 and p. 433 ; Harl. MS. 742, f. 257b ; *Monasticon*, iii, 217.

7. Charter of King William (II), addressed to R. the Bishop and Roger FitzGerold, and to all his barons in Lincolnshire, commanding that the men of Spalding shall render to the monks of Spalding their farm and rent, as in the time of Ivo Taillebois, &c. Osbern the Sheriff and Colgrin[3] are enjoined not to intermeddle.—Spalding register, f. 89a ; Cole's MS. p. 220.

8. Charter of Ribaud, brother of Alan the Earl, to St. Nicholas of Spalding, granting the church of Opton, for the souls of King William, Alan the Earl, Ivo, and himself, and all his (*suorum*) ancestors, "xv annis antequam manerium cum filia sua Gilberto dedisset ; et sic habuerunt monachi tempore Ribaudi illam ecclesiam multis annis qui in Spalding morabantur.[4] Testibus, Hervico filio Ribaudi, et aliis."—Spalding register, f. 414a ; Cole's MS. p. 449.

9. Charter of Ranulph Meschin to Stephen, the abbot, and the convent of St. Mary of York, addressed to Richerius, Sheriff of Carlisle, and to all his men, French and English, who dwell in "the power of Carlisle ;" granting the manor which is called Wederhal, with the lands appertaining thereto, for the souls of King Henry, the donor's father and mother, himself and his wife Lucy. Witnesses : Osbert the Sheriff, Walteof son of Cospatric the Earl, Fornus son of Sigulfus, Chetellus son of Ectredus, &c.—Wetherall register, in the library of Carlisle Cathedral ; *Monasticon*, iii, 583.[5]

10. Charter of Ranulph Meschin to St. Mary and St. Constantine of Wederhale and the monks there, of the sluiceage and pond of the fishery and mill of Wederhale, which has been made and established in the land of Chorkeby. Witnesses : ——

[1] This passage is misquoted by Dugdale, as noticed by Mr. Freeman, who remarks that "the expressions are odd." The actual words are : "Pro sui ipsius et conjugis sue Lucie, et antecessorum suorum, Toraldi scilicet uxorisque ejus, requie." This better reading is also given in a cartulary of Angers, quoted by Nichols, though he does not observe that we thus obtain a notice of Thorold's wife, hitherto overlooked.

[2] The compiler of the Spalding register considered that the effect of this was to "exclude in a certain manner the gift formerly made by Thorold." (Cole's MS. p. 144.)

[3] Colgrin, the reeve of Spalding, is mentioned in the fictitious charter of Thorold of Bukenhale. He could hardly be the same as "Colegrim," who had large possessions in Lincolnshire according to Domesday.

[4] It is obvious that these last clauses could not have formed part of the charter, though they appear to do so.

[5] An attested memorandum in the same register states that the gift of Wetherall was made in the year when St. Mary's Abbey was founded, "1086," or rather 1088. But the charter above abstracted was evidently made after 1100. See Introduction to Pipe Rolls for Cumberland, &c., p. xviii.

Meschin, William the archdeacon, Odard, &c.—Wetherall register, f. 7 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 583.[1]

11. Charter of King Henry (I) to Richard the abbot and the convent of St. Mary of York, confirming the churches of Appelby, to wit, St. Michael and St. Lawrence, with their lands and tithes, and the tithes of the demesne of Meubrun and of Salchild, granted to them, as the charter of Ranulph Meschin testifies. Dated at Reading, and addressed to Thurstan, Archbishop of York (1114-1140), and all the King's lieges and ministers of Westmerland and Cumberland.—*Ibid.* p. 8 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 585 (also 553).

12. Charter of King Henry (I), addressed to Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, and Wig[ot] the Sheriff, and commanding that the monks of Spalding shall have their wood appertaining to "the manor," as they best had it in the time of the King's father and brother, and in the time of Ivo and Thorold ; and they shall also have their marsh. Witness, Nigel de Albini, at Woodstock.—Spalding register (Harleian MS. 742), f. 9.

13. Charter of King Henry (I), addressed to "the abbot of Croyland, Geoffrey," and commanding him to permit the monks of St. Mary and St. Nicholas of Spalding "to hold their customs in marshes and in houses," as the same shall be divided on their oath by lawful and aged men ; otherwise Ranulph Meschin, Godfrey Ridel, Alan de Lincoln, and Pigot shall do right therein, "so that I may hear no further complaint."—Spalding register, f. 39b ; Cole's MS. p. 221.

14. Charter of King Henry (I), addressed to R. the Bishop, O. the Sheriff, R. Meschin, and his barons and ministers of Lincolnshire, and commanding that "the land of St. Nicholas, of Wilinton," shall be in peace, and quit from pleas and plaints, except murder and larceny, and [from] hoegeld, &c.—Spalding register, f. 90b ; Cole's MS. p. 222.

15. Charter of Ranulph, Earl of Chester, and Lucy his wife, to the monks of St. Nicholas of Spalding, granting the churches of Beltisford, Scamelisbi, and Mintinges for the souls of their fathers and mothers and all their ancestors, with the consent of Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln (1123-47).—Spalding register, f. 389a ; Cole's MS. p. 429. See also p. 446.

16. Charter of Henry (I), King of the English, to the monks of Spalding, at the request of Ranulph, Earl of Chester, and Lucy the Countess, confirming their gift of the churches of Beltesford, Scamelisbi, and Minting.—Spalding register, f. 89b and f. 389b ; Cole's MS. p. 220 and p. 430.

17. Charter of King Henry (I) to Geoffrey the abbot (1131-2) and the monks of St. Mary of York, confirming the sluiceage and pond of the fishery and mill of Wederhale, in the land of Chorkeby, as it was established there in the time when Ranulph, Earl of Chester, had the honor of Carlisle, and in the time of Weslutbuid, &c. Dated at Windsor, and addressed to the Archbishop of York and to the King's barons and lieges, French and English, of Yorkshire and Carlisle.—Transcript of the Wetherall register, p. 7 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 585 (also 553).

18. Charter of Lucy, Countess of Chester, to the same monks, granting tithes in Beltesford, Scamelesbi, Stenighou, Normanbi, Tetenei, Donington, and Hautebarge, for the soul of Ivo Taillebois, "my husband" (*domini mei*),[2] and for the souls of her ancestors.—Spalding register, f. 391b ; Cole's MS. p. 432.

19. Charter of Lucy, Countess of Chester, to the same monks, granting the manor of Spalding as freely as "I held" (*tenui*) it in the time of Ivo Taillebois, Roger Fitz Gerold, and Earl Ranulph, for the souls of "myself, my father and mother (not named), my husbands (*dominorum meorum*), and my relatives."—Spalding register, f. 13a and f. 135b ; Cole's MS. p. 147 and p. 250 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 217. See also p. 328 of Cole's MS.

20. Inspeximus by Oliver, Bishop of Lincoln, of a former inspeximus by Bishop Robert of a charter by Reinfrid de Bretevill and Alured his son to the monks of Spalding, granting tithes in Glentham, "with the consent of Ranulph, Earl of Chester, and Lucy the Countess, his wife." Also of the foregoing charter of Lucy,

[1] Ranulph Meschin appears to have made other grants to this monastery. See *Monasticon*, iii, 553, 585.

[2] There can be no doubt that "dominus" here means husband. Compare the charter of "Rohese, wife of Gilbert, Earl of Lincoln," wherein she mentions the land which her husband (*dominus meus*) gave her in dower. (Harleian Charters, 50 F. 32.)

Countess of Chester, for the soul of her husband, Ivo Taillebois. Dated 1284.—Spalding register, f. 405b ; Cole's MS. p. 441.

21. Inspeximus by Oliver, Bishop of Lincoln, of divers charters, including the foregoing charter of Lucy, Countess of Chester, for the soul of her husband, Ivo Taillebois. Dated 1284.—Spalding register ; f. 392a ; Cole's MS. p. 432.

22. Bull of Pope Alexander III., confirming various gifts to the priory of Spalding, including the tithes given by Lucy the Countess.[1] Dated 1177.—Spalding register, f. 282a ; Cole's MS. p. 321 ; *Monasticon*, iii, 218.

23. Charter of Robert Fitz Wate (*filius Wate*) of Kirketon to John Fitz Gilbert of Cibesey, releasing his right in a moiety of a mill and piece of land in Cibesey, with meadow, &c. "To have and to hold in chief of the Lady Countess of Bolingbroc and her heirs, in fee and inheritance ; " doing service therefor to the said Countess and her heirs, *sc.*, forty pence for all service. (No date. Witnesses' names obscure.)—Duchy of Lancaster Coweher-book, ii, f. 279, No. 109.

24. Inspeximus by Oliver, Bishop of Lincoln, of a charter of "Hugh, brother of Ranulph, Earl of Chester, and Matilda his wife, daughter of the Countess Lucy," granting to the monks of Spalding part of the tithes of their manor of Calnesbeie (Candlesby). The inspeximus is dated 1284.—Spalding register, f. 416a ; Cole's MS., p. 451.[2]

25. Charter of Ranulph Junior, Earl of Chester, confirming to the monks of Spalding the churches of Lindesei, Beltisford, Scamelisbi, and Mintinges, as given them Ranulph, Earl of Chester, his father, and Lucy the Countess, his mother, who had also obtained a confirmation of their gift under the seal of King Henry. Witnesses : William de Roumare, "my brother," and others.—Spalding register, f. 389a ; Cole's MS. p. 429.

26. Charter of William de Roumare, to "Robert, grandson (*nepoti*) of the Countess,"[3] granting the land of Ivo and Colsuenus, uncles of the said Robert, in fee and inheritance, and by the service of a fourth part of one knight's fee. "And this I grant to him for the soul of my mother, and for the service which the same Robert did (or has done) to my mother." (1135-52.)—Duchy of Lancaster "Grants in boxes," A. 69.

27. Confirmation of the preceding by William de Roumare, grandson of the donor, in favour of Robert, son of Robert, grandson of the Countess. (1152-88).—*Ibid.* A. 69a.

28. Charter of William the Roumare, Earl of Lincoln, to the prior and monks of St. Nicholas of Spalding, granting all the land of Spalding, as "Lucy, my mother," granted and gave it to them in almoign, with all liberties which "my mother" gave them. This is addressed to Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln (1123-47).—Spalding register, f. 13a ; Cole's MS. p. 147. See also p. 328.

[1] Her charter is not recited. The Bull also confirms a gift by Pikot, son of Colswain de Lincoln, whose charter is quoted in Cole's MS. p. 450, and in the *Monasticon*, iii, 218. It mentions his wife Beatrice, his grandson (*nepos*) Richard, his grand-daughter (*neptis*) Cecilia, and "the rest of his family," all of whom were admitted into the fraternity of the monastery. It grants tithes in Sutton and Lutton, and is dated Sunday, 14th May, 1111, at three o'clock in the afternoon. "Reg." Huardus, grandson of Osbert the Sheriff, was one of the witnesses. As to Colswain, see above, No. 24. There are other charters in this register and in Harl. MS. 742, and also in the Duchy Coweher-book, vol. ii, which show that Pichot son of Colswain had a grandson named Richard de Haia, son of Robert de Haia. It may be necessary to notice these more fully hereafter.

[2] This Charter is printed by both Stapleton (ii, clvii) and Nichols (*Top. and Gen.* i, 303), but they omit the inspeximus clauses of Bishop Oliver, which impart an additional air of genuineness to the register. There is a bungle as to the important word "daughter," but nothing else can be made of it, the words being "fil' filie." By an obvious oversight, Stapleton calls Matilda "daughter-in-law" of the Countess Lucy.

[3] *Nepos* may be translated either grandson or nephew, but in these charters I have usually found it to mean grandson. The charter does not indicate that the Countess here mentioned was Lucy, though Mr. Freeman assumes this. The dates given at the end of this and other Duchy charters are those assigned to them in the 35th Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records.

29. Charter of William de Roumare, grandson (*nepos*) of "William the Earl de Roumare," to the same prior and monks, confirming the grant of the church and manor of Spalding made by "Lucy, Countess of Chester, mother of William the Earl de Roumare," with all liberties "with which she best and most freely held (*tenuit*) in the time of Ivo Tailboys, and Roger Fitz Gerold, and Earl Ranulph."—*Ibid.* f. 13b, and p. 148.[1]

30. Charter of "William de Roumare, the Earl," and William his grandson and heir, to the monks of Spalding, addressed to Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, and granting a moiety of the church of Kelis, viz. that part which Robert the priest possessed, he having given up the hereditary right which he had therein for his life; and also a toft in Bolingbroc, and a man in Cibesey named Bonna, with half a bovate of land and all the family, and another toft in the same vill, &c. for "the souls of us and of our predecessors, to wit, my father and mother, and of William my son." Witnesses: Herbert, prior of Spalding; Hacon the dean; Richard de Leke, dean.—Spalding register, f. 384a; Cole's MS. p. 423; Harl. MS. 742, f. 257.

31. Charter of "William de Roumare, the Earl," and William his grandson (*nepos*) and heir, to the monks of Spalding, granting the church of Bolingbroc, for the souls of "myself, my father and mother, and my predecessors, and of William my son:" to hold the said church with all his land and men in Bolingbroc and Kirkeby. Witnesses: Philip, abbot of Revesbi; Robert (*sic*, for Herbert), prior of Spalding; Hacon, dean of Holand. Addressed to Robert, Bishop of Lincoln (1147-67). The Earl's arms are sketched in the margin.—Spalding register, f. 381b; Cole's MS. p. 421.

32. Inspeximus by Oliver, Bishop of Lincoln of the preceding charter. (Two copies.)—*Ibid.* f. 374a and f. 381b; p. 416 and p. 422.

33. Charter of "William the Earl de Roumare" to the monks of Spalding, granting for the souls of his father and his mother, and his son William, the service of Lambert de Multon for that land which he held of the Earl in Mithingbi, which the Earl gave him for the land held by him of the Earl in Revisbi, &c.—Spalding register (Harleian MS. 742), f. 94b.

34. Charter of William de Roumare, Earl of Lincoln, William his son, and Hadewisa his wife, to the monks of Rivaux (*Rievalle*), granting for the foundation of an abbey [at Revesby] for "our souls, and the souls of our fathers and mothers, and of all our ancestors," all the land of Revesbi, Thoresbi, and Schithesbi. As "this land" was not of his own demesne, he gives to the owners thereof, in exchange, other lands in Minigesbi, Austercales, Chirchebi, Eastercales, Hagnebi, Sticcenaria, and Sticcefordia. —From an old copy formerly in the possession of Sir Henry Spelman; *Monasticon*, iii, 454.

35. Charter by the same three persons to the monks of St. Lawrence of Revesby. Witnesses: Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, and many others.—*Ibid.*

36. Charter by the same to the same.—*Ibid.*

37. Charter of William de Roumare, grandson and heir of "William the Earl," to the same, mentioning (*inter alia*) the land which his grandfather had in Sticheneia.—*Ex armario Comitis de Lindsey apud Grimsthorp*; *Monasticon*, iii, 454.[2]

38. Charter of King Stephen to Ranulph (Gernons), Earl of Chester, granting him the castle and city of Lincoln till the King restore him his land in Normandy, and all his castles; whereupon he may fortify one of his towers of Lincoln castle, and hold that tower till the King restore to him Tickhill castle; and then the tower (*sic*) and city of Lincoln shall remain to the King; "et dicto Comiti remanebit turris sua, quam *mater sua* firmavit, cum constabulatione castelli Lincoln' et Lincolneshir', hereditario jure." The King also grants him sundry castles and lands, and the honor of Lancaster, &c.—Duchy of Lancaster records, Div. 25, A. 9; Dugdale's *Baronage*, i, 39.[3]

[1] Nos. 27, 29, and 36 are probably out of order, but are placed as above for convenience of reference.

[2] The four preceding charters to Revesby were confirmed by Richard I, as appears in the Charter Roll of 2 Edw. III, No. 12; but he does not call the first William "Earl of Lincoln." This confirmation includes common of pasture of the whole marsh appertaining to the soke of Bolingbroke.

[3] Dugdale quotes from Glover, who appears to have seen the original, then in Pontefract castle; but there is now only an abstract of it among the Duchy records, as above. It is not in the "Great Cowcher."

39. Charter of Henry, Duke of Normandy, granting to Ranulph (Gernons), Earl of Chester, and Viscount of Avranches, all his inheritance in Normandy and in England, particulars of which are set out, including all the honor of Eye (*Eia*), as fully as Robert Malet, his mother's uncle, ever held it; and the fee of Alan of Lincoln, his mother's uncle. Witnesses [on the part of Duke Henry]: William, the Chancellor, R. Earl of Cornwall, and others; and on the part of Earl Ranulph: William, Earl of Lincoln, and others. Dated at Devizes [1152]. The borders of the original are ornamented with lines of red and gold.—Cottonian Charters, xvii, 2; Duchy of Lancaster Cowcher-book, ii, 476b; Rymer, i, 16; *Baronage*, i, 39.

40. Charter of Hugh, Earl of Chester (1153-1180), to the monks of Spalding, confirming the tithes in Beltisford, &c., given by his ancestors, viz.: "Thorold the Sheriff, and Lucy the Countess, and Ranulph the Earl, my grandfather, and my father."—Spalding register, f. 391b; Cole's MS. p. 432.

41. Charter of Ranulph (Blundvill), Earl of Chester, to the monks of Revesby, confirming the gifts of William, Earl of Lincoln, William, his son, and William, his grandson. Witnesses: David, the Earl, brother of the King of Scotland, &c.—*Ex armario, &c.* (as in No. 36.)

42. Charter of Ranulph (Blundvill), Earl of Chester and Lincoln, to the same monks, confirming all the donations which "Lucy, formerly Countess of Chester," had made to them, to wit, the church and manor of Spalding, &c., according to her charter and the charter of confirmation of William de Roumare, his (Ranulph's) predecessor (see No. 29). Witnesses: Sir Walter, abbot of Chester, Sir William de Vernon, Justiciary of Chester, &c.—Spalding register, f. 13b.; Cole's MS., p. 148; *Monasticon*, iii, 217.

43. Charter of King Edward III, confirming numerous royal and other charters to the priory of Spalding. Among others, he inspects the charter of Henry I, above referred to (No. 12). Also the charter of Lucy, Countess of Chester, granting the manor of Spalding as amply as she held it (*tenui*) in the time of Ivo de Thallebos, and Roger FitzGerold, and Earl Ranulph, as above (No. 19), but with more witnesses, viz., prior Martin of Pontefract, Ilbert de Lacey, Richard de Foliot, Jurdan and Paganus his brothers, &c. Also the charter of Ranulph, Earl of Chester and Lincoln, as above (No. 41). Also a charter of Henry de Lucy, Earl of Lincoln, 3 Edw. II. He also confirms the grant which William de Roumare, formerly Earl of Lincoln, made by his deed (*scriptum*) of all the land and liberties which Lucy his mother had granted to them (No. 28); also the confirmation by William de Roumare, grandson of the same William, formerly Earl (No. 29); and the confirmation by Alesia de Lacy, daughter and heiress of Henry de Lacy, formerly Earl of Lincoln. Finally, he ratifies all the foregoing and many other gifts made to the priory, "as the said charters fully testify." Dated 16th February.—Charter Roll, 4 Edw. III, No. 95; Spalding register, f. 102a; Cole's MS. p. 234.

44. Letters Patent of King Edward IV, inspecting and confirming the preceding charter of Edward III, and subsequent royal charters.—Patent Roll, 2 Edw. IV, part 4, m. 20-29.

45. Letters Patent of King Henry VIII, inspecting and confirming the preceding letters patent of Edward IV.—Confirmation Roll, 1 Henry VIII, part 7, No. 8.

Besides the charters, there are sundry incidental references in the manuscript transcribed by Cole which deserve notice. Several rubrics speak of Ivo Taillebois as "first husband of the Countess Lucy." At f. 406a, it is stated that the prior of Spalding used to receive tithes from the Northalle in Normanby and the demesnes appertaining thereto, which had formerly belonged to "Lucy the Countess," long after whose death William de Vernon, a Norman, held it. The same manor is also stated to have been held at a later date of the Earl of Lincoln as of the honor of Bolingbroke.

The genuineness of the Spalding registers.

There can be no doubt that the monastery of St. Nicholas of Angers and its cell of Spalding received most extensive grants of lands in Spalding and elsewhere. When the Domesday survey was taken, the

township of Spalding comprised a manor belonging to Ivo Taillebois, a manor belonging to Wido de Credon,[1] and a "berewick" belonging to St. Guthlac of Croyland. All these estates subsequently came into the possession of the cell of Spalding and its superior abbey, as appears in Testa de Nevill, which states that the cell and the abbey possessed all the twelve carucates of land of which the township consisted. It is, therefore, obvious that there once existed sundry deeds of gift to these monasteries, and it would be difficult to believe that the transcripts of them contained in the registers are wholly spurious, even if they were totally uncorroborated.

But the trustworthiness of these registers is beyond cavil. Many of the charters recorded in them are also recorded in the Charter, Patent, and Confirmation Rolls, which contain the royal charters of *inspeximus* of numerous deeds of gift to Spalding, some of which are noticed above, but most are omitted from the collection because they do not relate to the matter in hand. This fact has never yet been recognised, and should suffice to check any disposition to reject these manuscripts with the fashionable but usually undeserved sneer at "monkish historians." As a rule, the cartularies of monasteries are worthy of great respect; certainly of greater than is due to any speculations we may choose to indulge in at this distance of time. At any rate it is advisable to attend to whatever evidence they afford before attempting to settle any controversy; which has not been done in this case.

Cole speaks (p. 141) of the manuscript from which he transcribed as "a most noble register" of 442 folios; and his quotations from the fly-leaves show that it had been several times admitted as evidence in courts of law. It is true that Cole makes some severe remarks (pp. 421, 422) on the occasional verbal inaccuracies of the compiler of that register, and seems to be justified in so doing;[2] but if there were two Lucys, the compiler must have taken infinite pains in editing the text throughout from the point of view that there was only one Lucy, and in that respect his solicitude is really marvellous; for he has not confined himself, if such were the case, to bestowing and changing titles and definitions, but has attended even to delicate nuances of expression. Cole's voluminous notes show that he himself had no suspicion of the existence of two ladies bearing the same name, though he replies to a possible objection on the score of abnormal longevity, by suggesting that Lucy may have been no more than sixty-four years of age in 1129 (p. 147).

The collection of Lucy charters which I have made is not however confined to those recorded in the Spalding registers; it comprises all I could readily discover among the records of the Crown and of the Duchy of Lancaster, in the British Museum, and in Dugdale's *Monasticon*. It will have been observed that, in one of the Duchy Cowcher-books, the hitherto unnoticed title of "Countess of Bolingbroke" occurs. That this was probably intended for Lucy is evident from Testa de Nevill, which

[1] The name was afterwards spelt Creon, Croun, Crohun, &c. A Maurice de Creon was a monk of Croyland in the time of Abbot Robert. See Duchy of Lancaster Cowcher-book, ii, 256.

[2] See also Cole's separate index to vol. 43, under the head of "Inaccuracies of MSS."

mentions her several times by that description. The same title occurs at a later date, in an Inquisition of 37 Henry III (No. 18). As it will be necessary to deal with this new aspect of the subject separately, I need not give fuller particulars here; but I mention these facts in order to complete my task of endeavouring to bring together every available reference to Lucy.

I now propose, with the aid of the evidence thus collected, and of some of the arguments furnished by the emendators, to state all that can be said in favour of the existence of only one Lucy.

The evidence for one Lucy.

It will have been remarked that in the second and fourth of the charters above abstracted, Lucy is called simply the wife of Ivo Taillebois, without any title whatever, whereas in others the description is "Lucy, Countess of Chester," varied by the more familiar appellation of "the Countess Lucy." This discrepancy did not attract the notice of the emendators. As they take no account of it, the inference is that they considered Ivo's wife to have been Countess of Chester by descent, and therefore were not startled by the eighteenth charter, whereby Lucy, Countess of Chester, makes provision for the soul of her deceased husband, Ivo Taillebois. But it can be shown that Lucy did not obtain that title till 1120, when Ranulph Meschin was created Earl of Chester in his own right; whence it would follow that she was married to the first and the last of the three husbands who have been usually assigned to her, and of course to the second of them; and that there could not have been two successive Countesses Lucy. Moreover, in the nineteenth charter, the widow of Earl Ranulph speaks of her husbands in the plural; and as in a previous clause she mentions Ivo Taillebois, Roger FitzGerold, and Ranulph Meschin in due order, and says she herself had held Spalding in their lifetimes, it must be inferred that she was widow of all three. As the testimony of these charters has hitherto been persistently ignored, it will be well to prevent this happening in future by setting them out at full length, with the reasons for their having been disregarded.

Lucy's first charter.

The text of the first charter of the Countess Lucy may be translated as follows.

"To all sons of holy mother Church, as well present as to come, Lucy, Countess of Chester, greeting. Know all of you, that I, Lucy the Countess, in my free power, have given and granted, and by this my present charter have confirmed, to God and St. Mary and St. Nicholas of Spalding, and to the monks there serving God, for the soul of my Lord (*Domini*)[1] Ivo Talbos, and for the health of my soul and [of those] of my ancestors and heirs, in pure and perpetual almoign, all tithes and obventions of my demesne, to wit, of corn, of stock, [and] of my herds in the vill of Beltisford, and in the vill of Scamelisbi, and in Stenighou, and in Normanbi, and in Tetenei, and in Donington, and in Hautebarge, wheresoever they may be within the metes and limits of the parishes of the aforesaid viils, or by whomsoever they may or shall be held. These being witnesses: Gilbert de Lacey, Richard de Foliot, Jordan and Payn his brothers, and others."

No doubt the critics saw this charter, as it is referred to in the index to Cole's MS., but were hoodwinked by the fact that Dugdale affects to trace the "Earls of Chester before the Conquest," among whom

[1] See the note to charter No. 18, *ante*.

he includes Earl Algar. The sole authority he quotes is the discredited Ingulph. Henry of Huntingdon and Bartholomew Cotton seem to be the only other chroniclers who describe Algar as "Consul Cestriæ," the former word being equivalent to "Comes"; and they also speak of the "consulatus Cestriæ." But the title of Earl of Chester has been ascribed to Algar in so many ancient pedigrees and county histories, that no one thought of questioning the use of the title of Countess of Chester by his alleged daughter, Lucy, wife of Ivo Taillebois.

In the third Report of the Lords' Committee on the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm, it is assumed that Anglo-Saxon Earls had an official dignity only, and not an hereditary honour; but in the "Topographer and Genealogist" (i, 4), there are some remarks on the probable existence of Anglo-Saxon earldoms, in fact, if not in name. It seems however to be admitted on all hands that no Anglo-Saxon ealdorman or earl used as a title the name of the county where his lands were situate, or in which he exercised jurisdiction. This view is confirmed by Domesday, which contains many references to Earls Algar, Edwin, and Morcar, but never gives them any further title. As to Earl Algar, if he had any territorial title at all, it would appear to have been that of Earl of Mercia, of which province Lincoln, not Chester, seems to have been the capital;[1] and in fact his lands lay in many counties. Certainly there is nothing to show that he was ever called Earl of Chester, though doubtless he had lands in Cheshire, as his son Edwin is returned in Domesday as having held lands there. As to Lucy's reputed brothers, apparently the only authority for connecting one of them with the earldom of Chester is the Visitation of Cheshire in 1580, which describes Edwin as Earl of March (Mercia?), Chester, and Lincoln. Besides his lands in Cheshire, he had many others elsewhere, and it is very doubtful if he bore the title in question. Lastly, Earl Morcar was called Earl of Northumbria, which included all the northern counties. Thus Lucy could not have been, or been known as, Countess of Chester by descent.

Moreover, as William I is said to have given the title of Earl of Chester, with Earl Edwin's lands in Cheshire, to Gherbod, the Fleming, at the Conquest, and, upon that noble's departure to Flanders, to have conferred the same on Hugh Lupus d'Avranches, William's own nephew, who was succeeded by his son Richard, it is inconceivable that Lucy should have used it, even if it had belonged to her ancestors; although there is little to show that Gherbod, Hugh,[2] or Richard used the name of the county as a title of honour. Indeed the names of counties do not seem to have been in general use in connexion with similar titles even so late as the reign of Henry I.[3]

[1] See Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora, i, 250. Henry of Huntingdon says the city of Lincoln and the province of Lindsey belonged to the Kingdom of Mercia. William of Malmesbury (140, 141) includes both Cheshire and Lincoln in Mercia. Some writers call Algar "Earl of Leicester" also, but this seems to be a misreading of "Legacestria," which means Chester, for "Legrecestria," which means Leicester. (Cf. R. Hoveden, i, 103, 116.)

[2] One instance of the use of the full title by Hugh occurs in a charter of William I, to which he was a witness, and which confirmed to the monks of Coventry all the gifts made by "Leofric the Earl." (Addit. Charters, 11,205.) In his charter to these monks, Leofric calls himself merely "Comes," but a later prior, in quoting this charter, adds "Cestriæ." (*Monasticon*, iii, 190.)

[3] See the Lincolnshire Survey, wherein Richard is called "Earl" simply, throughout.

Nor, it is obvious, did Lucy derive the title in question from Ivo Taillebois or Roger FitzGerold; and even Ranulph Meschin was not created Earl of Chester till many years after his marriage, as we have seen. Consequently it must be inferred that Lucy never used the title of Countess of Chester before 1120.

It is true that none of the emendators have actually insisted on the possible claim of Lucy Taillebois to be called by this title, but they have never repudiated it as they ought to have done; and in repudiating it, they ought further to have stated how they squared the first of Lucy's charters with their view that there were two ladies of that name. Objection may perhaps be taken that this charter is not mentioned in the confirmation by King Edward III, but the same remark holds good with respect to the two charters of Ivo (Nos. 4 and 6), and the charter of Hugh and Matilda (No. 24). It should be noticed that there are two copies of a confirmation of the charter in question by Oliver, Bishop of Lincoln (Nos. 20, 21). As it related to tithes, the Bishop's confirmation was possibly considered sufficient; and the same may be said of Hugh and Matilda's charter. Ivo's gift of a carucate of land in Spalding was no doubt superseded by Lucy's ampler donation, which next requires attention. With regard to his grant of tithes, if he were tenant for life only, it is easy to understand why it was not confirmed either by Edward III or by the Bishop.

(To be continued.)

THE COUNTESS LUCY.

SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

(*Continued from p. 60.*)

Lucy's second Charter.

The second charter of Lucy is printed by Dugdale, and it is surprising that its testimony has been so long overlooked; but this may have been due to a misprint, which, though slight, wholly obscures the sense. For this reason, doubtless, its chief point is missed in the Introduction to the "Pipe Rolls for Cumberland," which I presume was written by Mr. Hodgson Hinde; but he admits that even the mere reference to the three husbands is almost sufficient to show that Lucy was wife to them all (pp. xvii, xviii). The charter may be translated as follows:

"In the name of the holy and undivided Trinity, be it known to all men present and to come, that I, Lucy, Countess of Chester, give and grant to the church and monks of St Nicholas of Spallingis, the manor of Spallingis, with soc and sac, and thol and 'them,' with all its customs, and with the liberties with which I best and most freely held (*tenui*) in the time of Ivo Thallebos, and Roger Fitz Gerold, and the Earl Ranulph, in almoign of my soul, for the redemption of the soul of my father and of my mother, and of my lords (*dominorum*) and relatives. Wherefore I will that they shall hold well and in peace, with all its appendages. Witness[es]: Prior Martin of Pontefract, and Ilbert de Lacey, Richard de Foliot, Jurdan and Payn his brothers, Hugh Fitz Gilbert, William de Semervilla (*sic*), Richard Fitz Guobolt, Guy de Russedene, Peter Fitz Bugard, Ralph de Wevervill, Richard Russel."

For "*tenui*" Dugdale misreads "*tenuit*," which makes nonsense. There can be no doubt that the Countess said, and meant to say, "I held." On this crucial point the Spalding registers are supported by Edward III's charter of confirmation, from which the foregoing translation is derived, and in which, before setting out the text of Lucy's charter, the King positively states that he had inspected it. Moreover Edward III's charter was inspected by Edward IV, who doubtless saw the original charter of his predecessor, and did not quote from the enrolment, the accuracy of which is thus confirmed. Henry VIII in like manner inspected the letters patent of Edward IV. Lucy's charter is also supported by the charter of her great-grandson, William de Roumare (No. 29), who states that *she* held Spalding "in the time" of Ivo, Roger, and Ranulph. What more any one can want in the way of corroboration it is difficult to conceive, and it would be very surprising if any argument, however potent, should enable its propounders to go behind this testimony.*

*Since the first part of this paper was printed, I have seen Cole's transcript of the Croyland register, Addit. MS. 5845, where he gives the names of the previous owners of that register and of the Spalding register. They were both formerly in the possession of John Oldfield, Esquire, and afterwards of Maurice Johnson, Esquire, of Spalding. Dugdale states that the MSS. which he saw were then in the possession of John Oldfield, lord of Spalding. Thus it is clear that the Spalding MS. from which Cole transcribed was identical with one of those which Dugdale quoted from, and that these were not different MSS. as I imagined. The possessor in Cole's time was about to sell it. (See *Top. and Gen.* ii., 107.) Where it is now, I have not ascertained. It is to be hoped that some Lincolnshire society will publish it, if accessible.

Was Lucy heiress to Earl Algar?

It is very remarkable that both of Lucy's charters point to the fact of her having been an heiress. In the first she makes a gift in her "free power" after her husband's death, and in the second she conveys lands which she herself had held in the lifetimes of her three husbands. These expressions could not have been used by a widow who held lands only in dower. Was she therefore heiress to Earl Algar, as alleged by the monks of Croyland and Peterborough? Here the suggestions of the emendators seem to promise us great assistance. I may have misjudged them as to their views about the earldom of Chester, but there is no mistaking the fact that they insist with great pertinacity that "the second Lucy" was Countess of Lincoln in her own right, in succession to her supposed mother "the first Lucy." They did not however see that if an hereditary claim to the earldom of Lincoln were proved, that very fact would go far to establish the existence of only one Lucy.

Let us at first take the most favorable view of this proposition. At the date of Domesday the lands formerly of Earls Algar, Edwin, and Morcar in Lincolnshire were partly in the Crown, which is noticeable, and partly in the possession of several distinct owners, ecclesiastical and lay, whose names, except that of Ivo Taillebois, do not concern us; and it may be for this reason that, not having possession of the lands, she did not use the title of Countess of Lincoln in the lives of Ivo and Roger. She herself is not mentioned in Domesday, and on referring to the survey of the lands of Ivo Taillebois, we find that out of all the lands which had belonged to the three English Earls in Lincolnshire, Ivo was in possession of Spalding only. By the Croyland and Peterborough chroniclers, Ivo is called Count or Earl of Anjou, without any reason. It is true he came over from Anjou, and the "Topographer and Genealogist" suggests that he was called Earl in right of his wife. But he is not called Earl of Lincoln, or even Earl simply, in either volume of Domesday, nor in any of the charters; and he appears never to have borne that title. Nor is there anything to show that Roger FitzGerold had it.

Mr. Hodgson Hinde refers to the distribution of the lands in question "amongst a host of Norman adventurers," but he did not observe that many of the lands of the three Earls remained in the Crown till after Domesday was compiled. It seems therefore possible that Lucy obtained possession of the lands of her alleged ancestors described under the head of "Terra Regis" in Lincoln and other counties, and with them the earldom of Lincoln, after the deaths of Ivo and Roger, and on or before her marriage with Ranulph Meschin; and this would be either by the King's gratuitous favour, or on payment of a fine. Thus the positive allegation of Stapleton and Nichols that Ranulph Meschin became Earl of Lincoln "in right of his wife Lucia" would at first sight appear to be probably well founded. They do not use this argument, or indeed any argument, in support of their allegation, but merely rely on the fact that in the Survey or List of Tenants in Lincolnshire (made before 1120), over the name of "Ranulphus Mischinus" is written, "Comes Lincolniæ," in two places.[1] They were also no

[1] Either by accident or design, the references to this title are not given in the index to Mr. Greenstreet's excellent edition of the Survey.

doubt biassed by the fact that this title, like that of Chester, is alleged in ancient pedigrees to have belonged to Earl Algar.

That the actual possession of the lands of Lucy's inheritance carried with it the title, might also be inferred from the fact that William de Roumare, who about 1122 regained such possession in part, is known to have borne the title of Earl of Lincoln. It might also be suggested that when, after the death of Ranulph, the Countess Lucy paid a fine for livery of her father's lands,[1] she obtained such portions of them as were not restored by Henry I. to William de Roumare. Thus all the statements contained in the monastic chronicles and registers, with regard to this reputed noble heiress and her inheritance, might be considered to tally well with the authentic records.

We should therefore be bound to come to the conclusion, on the showing of the emendators themselves, that there was only one Countess Lucy, and that she was heiress to Earl Algar; and some years ago I actually came to that conclusion on no other grounds. It would then be easy, if necessary, to deal with the possible, though not proved, physical difficulty of the question in a different manner to that first suggested by the authors of the "Annals of Lacock Abbey."

Now the emendators unconsciously offer a solution of their own difficulty which again would lead to the conclusion that there was only one Lucy, by asserting that a later Countess of Lincoln, named Rohese, inherited the earldom in her own right.[2] If this were so, Lucy would have had an only son or daughter, to whom Rohese in her turn would have been sole daughter, and perhaps heiress, unless that son or daughter died in the lifetime of Lucy, in which case Rohese would be grand-daughter and direct heiress to the Countess. Possibly therefore Rohese was the daughter of Matilda, before referred to, who was daughter of Countess Lucy, and wife of Hugh FitzRanulph, a younger brother of Ranulph Meschin, Earl of Chester. In that case, to suit the theory of inheritance, Matilda ought to have been Lucy's sole daughter. This view is endorsed, from an heraldic point of view, by Mr. W. S. Ellis.[3]

If these relationships were positively made out, we should easily be able to establish the existence of only one Lucy, and the alleged physical impossibility would finally disappear, for the other children assigned to Lucy could have been only her step-sons and step-daughters. First of all, Beatrice, wife of Ribaud, would be explained to be the daughter of Ivo by a former wife. William de Roumare would also be Roger's son by another unknown lady, and in a similar way Ranulph Gernons and the other children of Ranulph Meschin could be disposed of.[4]

[1] It is true that Stapleton (ii, cliii) makes out this "father" to have been Ivo Taillebois, but in so doing he spoils his own argument that the second Lucy was heiress to the earldom of Lincoln, for he nowhere shows that Ivo was Earl. No doubt he was of opinion that "the first Lucy" was Countess in her own right; but even so, he should have explained how a title, not assumed by her husband, *was* assumed by her son-in-law, as he alleges.

[2] They really suggest that she inherited a share of the earldom, but I have been unable to discover anything in support of the view that the earldom was divided into "shares" among several heiresses or their descendants.

[3] "Antiquities of Heraldry," p. 186.

[4] Strangely enough, it is stated in the Visitation of Cheshire in 1580, and in Banks, that Ranulph Meschin's (first) wife was Maud, daughter of Aubrey de Vere. If there

The only objection to this solution would be, that Lucy is several times called "mother" of William de Roumare and of Ranulph Gernons; but it might not be insuperable, and "step-mother" would be understood. In like manner Gernons speaks of William as his "brother" and not as his "half-brother." William would be further considered to have claimed his step-mother's lands, unwarrantably perhaps, but his claim would have been thought to be quite as good as Ranulph's right to dispose of Matilda's inheritance. The "might" used by William in support of his claim would in those days be respected even more than his "right," or want of it.

If the matter rested here, a re-consideration of the proposed emendation of Dugdale might at once be demanded with every probability that the original account would be restored to its pristine splendours, save and except the slight modifications which have just been suggested.

But the end is not yet; we are not out of the wood. Though the evidence as to the unity of Lucy is all that can be desired, it is equally certain that the arguments derived from the emendators are untenable. On looking at the original manuscript of the Lincolnshire Survey, I find that it affords no proof that Ranulph Meschin was Earl of Lincoln in right of his wife, or otherwise. The words "Comes Lincolniæ" are interpolated by a hand of at least two centuries later than the date of the Survey, and are capable of a different interpretation to that which has been put upon them by Stapleton and Nichols, as will be presently shown; and I have looked in vain for any other evidence of this title having been used by Meschin. The same Survey also shows that he did not obtain any of the lands of the Anglo-Saxon Earls in Lincolnshire described under the head of "Terra Regis" in Domesday. Thus it is clear that Lucy was not heiress to Earl Algar, nor Countess of Lincoln, and that Rohese was not Countess of Lincoln in her own right.[1] As however it is absolutely requisite to prove that Ivo's wife was an heiress before her unity can be established, the question cannot yet be considered to be finally settled. Indeed, the argument against her having been an heiress at all is much stronger than has been supposed.

A new argument for two Lucys.

Although we are led to the conclusion, after an attentive study of all the direct evidence, that Lucy, wife of Ivo Taillebois, was identical with Lucy, Countess of Chester, there is indirect evidence of the highest authority which, without making the faintest allusion to the lady or ladies in question, appears to demonstrate beyond the possibility of dispute that these were two different ladies.

The monks of Croyland and Peterborough assert that "the inheritance," so often referred to, descended to Lucy, wife of Ivo, from her father, Earl Algar. The original emendators admit this, but consider that "the

were any foundation for this statement, we might at once have concluded that Lucy was Ranulph's second wife, and that he had his four children by Maud de Vere. It may be as well to state that I have made no inquiry as to the three youngest of these four children.

[1] Dugdale did not altogether escape this heresy, for he says that Ranulph Blundvill had some claim to the Earldom of Lincoln in right of his great-grandmother, the Countess Lucy. (*Baronage*, i, 43).

second Lucy" in her turn was heiress to the same possessions. But as every attempt to prove that Lucy Taillebois was heiress to Earl Algar has utterly failed, it now becomes necessary to attend to an important argument in favour of the existence of two Lucys, which has to some extent been indicated by Mr. Hodgson Hinde.[1] He points out that William de Roumare, Lucy's son, was in possession of some of the fees which had previously been held by Ivo Taillebois, as appears by a comparison of Testa de Nevill with Domesday. Of course this could not have been the case unless William's mother were an heiress. These premises being taken for granted, it is certain both that Ivo's wife was *not* an heiress, and that the wife of Roger Fitz Gerold *was* an heiress; and for this reason they must have been two different persons, the latter being Ivo's daughter.

The argument propounded by Mr. Hinde is capable of being made much more forcible by a further comparison of Domesday with another record.

On looking more closely at the Lincolnshire Survey, I find that Ranulph Meschin is returned as holding lands in forty-five places in Lincolnshire, besides many others of which the localities are not specified. The question then arises, how did Ranulph acquire these lands. Were they his own, or did he obtain them with his wife? On this question Domesday sheds a brilliant light. It shows that lands in *all* these places, with a few doubtful exceptions, had formerly belonged to Ivo Taillebois; and Testa de Nevill further shows that lands in at least fifteen of the same places belonged at a later period to "Earl William de Roumare."[2]

The following is a list of the forty-five places just referred to as belonging to Ranulph Meschin; the letter T. showing which of them belonged to Ivo Taillebois, and the letter R. which of them are known to have afterwards come to William de Roumare, Earl of Lincoln.

Alsebi (T. R.),[3] Beniguorda (T. R.), Bliburc (T.), Brochesbi (T.), Broclesbi (T. R.), Buligtun (T.), Crochesbi (T. R.), Clachesbi (T. R.), Caburn (T.), Cucualt (T.), Chelebi (T.), Dunestal (T.), Chintorp (T. R.), Edlingtuna (T.), Glentheim (T.), Parva Grimesbi (T.), Hibaldeston (T.), Houton (T. R.), Humberstein (T.), Haltun (T.), Humbi (T.), Haburc (T:), Helchingtuna,[4] Irebi (T. R.), Lopingheham (T.), Parva Linberg (T R.), Ludeford (T. R.), Nordmanabi (T. R.), Neosum (T. R.), Ounebi (T.), Ouresbi,[5] Ormesbi (T.), Redburn (T.), Rainelestorp,[6] Scottun (T.), Strutebi (T. R.), Torgrimbi (T. R.), Tatenai (T.), Tirnesco (T.), Toresweia

[1] Pipe Rolls for Cumberland, &c., p. xviii; *Archæological Journal*, xvi, 230.

[2] The Index to Testa de Nevill is very faulty. It omits the following references; "Lincoln,' Comitissa," 322b, 396b, 397a, 397b, and many references to the Earls of Lincoln and Chester; Bolingbroc, Comitissa de, 330b, 331, 331b; "Rumor,' Comes Will'a de," 347b; Bolinbroc, honor de, 313 passim, 322b, 323; Linc', Alanus de, 339, 347b. These I noticed accidentally. It also gives a reference to Ivo Taillebois, "397," which should be 393; and omits Cecilia Taillebois, 354b, and uxor Ivonis Talleboys, 391.

[3] Walesbi and Otesbi (T.); Halesbi (R.)

[4] I do not find this in Domesday, which however mentions "Hechintune," but not as belonging to Taillebois.

[5] Qu. same as Otesbi (T.) and Otteby (R.) Both Otesbi and Ouresbi were in Walescroft Wapentake, according to the Linc. Survey, p. 10.

[6] Qu. same as Gamelstorp (T.)

(J. R.), Vada or Wada (T.), Wiflingham (T.), Wihum (T.? R.), Waletun (T.), Westletebi (T.).

Even this long list does not exhaust the possessions of Ranulph Meschin. He held 79 carucates and 6 bovates of land in Bolinbroc Wapentake, and 47 carucates and 3 bovates of land in Cheiretre (Gartree) Wapentake, according to the Lincolnshire Survey. Referring once more to Domesday, it appears that Ivo had held the manor of Bolinbroc, with its soke, which included seventeen townships, all probably in the Wapentake of Bolingbroke; and also the manor of Beltesford with its soke, which included eleven townships, all apparently in Gartree Wapentake. These manors and sokes are evidently identical with the lands of Ranulph in the same two Wapentakes.

The Lincolnshire Survey is not however a complete survey of the county, or rather of Lindsey, as it does not notice four other manors which had belonged to Ivo, namely: Archintone, with its soke in four townships[1]; Brezbi and Sapretone, with soke in four townships;[2] Bertune and Torp in Bergebi, with soke in two townships; and Spallinge, *i.e.* Spalding, with its berewick and soke in seven townships.[3] Ivo also held lands, mostly of small extent, in Cleia, Summertebi, Mortune, Straitone, Alchebarge, Saxebi, and Chevelinghou. The last named is evidently the same as Kilingholm,[4] which belonged to William de Roumare. It must be assumed that these four manors and other lands of Ivo either belonged to Ranulph or were in the Crown, as it is very improbable that, being comparatively few, they could have been both assigned to a coheiress, and omitted from the survey.

Thus it is evident that Ranulph Meschin succeeded to Ivo's lands in nearly a hundred places in Lincolnshire. It is true that in many of these townships there were other manors and estates than those held by Ivo, and that the lord of a manor in such a township could not say "I am lord of all I survey." Nevertheless the coincidence of tenure which has been pointed out occurs in so many instances that it cannot be accidental, and a more minute comparison of the quantities of land held by Ivo and Ranulph respectively could hardly lead to any other result.[5]

[1] Two of these, Grimesbi and Clachesbi, are probably the same as Parva Grimesbi and Clachesbi, mentioned in the foregoing list.

[2] William de Roumare had lands in Hundintone, Barkeston, and Systan (Testa, p. 323), which were in the manor of Brezbi and Sapretone when Domesday was written.

[3] John Capgrave and Henry Knyghton state that in 10 Henry I., 1109, the King gave "his royal vill of Spaldyng" to the Bishop of Lincoln, in recompense for that part of his see which was then transferred to the new see of Ely. This cannot be reconciled with Testa de Nevill, which shows that the lords of the three manors of Spalding gave all their lands there to monasteries. On inspecting the enrolment of the charter of Henry I. in the "Cartæ Antiquæ" of Chancery, I find that what he really gave was the vill of Spalduic (i.e. Spaldwick) "in the territory of Huntingdon," and that this vill is not described as a royal vill, but as having previously belonged to the monastery of Ely.

[4] "Bilingholm" in the printed edition of Testa de Nevill.

[5] Such a comparison has, in fact, already been made by Mr. Eyton, in Addit. MS. 31,941, ff. 92, 93; from which it appears that the coincidence above noticed extends in most cases even to the quantities of land possessed by Ivo and Ranulph in each township. The MS. in question contains comparative tables of Domesday, the Lincolnshire Survey, and Testa de Nevill, and clearly shows that Ranulph succeeded Ivo. There is also a digest of the Linc. Survey in Addit. MS. 31, 940, where Mr.

Here then is a formidable piece of indirect evidence in favour of the existence of two Lucys; for it has already been proved that Ivo's wife was not heiress to Earl Algar, or to his sons, and no one has even hinted that she succeeded to these vast estates as heiress to any one else; certainly, judging from Domesday alone, she did not bring to Ivo all the lands of which he was in possession, since they were previously in the occupation of many different owners. Consequently, if she married again after his death, she could not have conveyed his lands to her subsequent husband or husbands. It is equally out of the question that Ranulph himself could have been heir to Ivo. Hence it would follow that Ranulph obtained these vast possessions with Lucy his wife; and the further necessary deduction is, that the latter was daughter and heir of Ivo Taillebois, and it seems to be irresistible. Or, to put it another way, it is impossible that Ranulph's wife could have previously been the wife of Ivo, as alleged. At length we have some authority, which was wanting before, for assuming that there were two Lucys, mother and daughter.

It would, however, be very surprising if the exceedingly good evidence which has been produced, and which proves that there was only one Lucy, should be negatived by any argument, no matter how forcible. Before admitting the necessity for such a conclusion, it is incumbent on us to inquire whether other reasons are not to be found for believing that Lucy Taillebois was an heiress, and whether the argument for the existence of two Lucys is quite so conclusive as it appears to be. Let us take the latter of these points first.

Objections to the new argument.

That Meschin succeeded to the whole of Taillebois' possessions in Lincolnshire has been proved with tolerable certainty, and therefore his wife must have been sole heiress to them. To put the matter in a nutshell, they were one undivided inheritance. This being so, how can the proposition that there was a "second Lucy" be reconciled with the apparently sound conclusion of the emendators, that Ivo had a daughter named Beatrice, wife of Ribaud, Lord of Middleham?[1] Whether Beatrice was also the daughter of Lucy is immaterial, if Ivo possessed these lands in his own right, for she would have had an equal claim with his supposed daughter Lucy, even allowing that Ivo may have had two wives. Conversely, if Ivo's wife was an heiress, it is not necessary to imagine that Ivo and Lucy had a daughter named Lucy, and it is also intelligible why Beatrice did not come in for a share of these estates. Even if Beatrice died before Ivo, it is known that she had a daughter,[2] who ought to

Eyton gives Ivo Tailboys as "the Domesday correlative of R. Meschin." Mr. Eyton did not reject the double-Lucy theory, as I supposed; for in another MS. (31,929, f. 69b), he says: "Modern enquiry . . . . has well ascertained that Ranulf le Meschin's wife was daughter and coheir, if not sole heir, of Ivo Taillebois;" and on f. 70 he adds: "Lucia, wife of Ivo Talboys, was daughter of William Malet. She brought to her husband certain lands of her father's Lincolnshire fief. *She was not an heiress.*"

[1] See Charter No. 2, and note; and also the Pedigree of Tailbois printed in the GENEALOGIST, new series, iii, 31.

[2] See Charter, No. 8.

have succeeded to a portion of them, if she were co-heiress with the imaginary "second Lucy."

Moreover, in the Register of St. Mary's Abbey of York, and in the Register of Cokersand Abbey, there are copies of a genealogy, which states that Ivo Taillebois had a son named Eltred, who had a son named Ketel, who had a son named Gilbert FitzKetel, &c.[1] Mr. Hodgson Hinde speaks of this as "a fictitious pedigree," which incorrectly traces the genealogy of William de Lancaster from Ivo Taillebois, adding, "an ignorant monk has joined their names as links in one pedigree." If Mr. Hinde's objection rests only upon the supposed discovery that Ivo had a daughter and heiress named Lucy, this pedigree may not be far wrong after all; but to decide this point would require more attention to the history of the barony of Kendal than I am able to give at present. I merely wish to point out that Ivo not only had a daughter, Beatrice, but may even have had a son; so that the argument in favour of the double-Lucy theory is evidently very unsound. Leaving Eltred out of consideration, it seems incontrovertible that Ivo's daughter Beatrice did not succeed to any of his estates in Lincolnshire, nor apparently to those which he had in other counties; and therefore it is certain that Ivo's wife must have been an heiress, and that on her death she conveyed her estates to her second and third husbands, Beatrice having no claim to a share of them.

It may however be as well to notice that, according to Mr. Hinde,[2] the barony of Kendal in Westmoreland formed part of the district of Amounderness, which was in the Crown at the date of Domesday, and that the same barony was afterwards in the possession of Ivo Taillebois, in proof of which assertion reference is made to charter No. 2; but on Ivo's death that barony "passed into other hands," while his Lincoln estates went to (or rather with) Lucy. If this view be correct, the barony of Kendal belonged to Ivo in his own right, and descended to his next heir, who was neither Lucy nor Beatrice, but may have been Eltred, though this is doubtful.[3]

On the other hand, Mr. Hinde asserts that the barony of Appleby belonged to Ivo, and descended from Ivo to Ranulph Meschin, as he infers from charter No. 2, and from a charter of Henry II to St. Mary's Abbey, York.[4] If so, this barony formed part of Lucy's inheritance, and passed by the same title as her estates in the county of Lincoln; but the evidence is very slight.

[1] In Dr. Whitaker's *Richmondshire*, it is objected that these being Saxon names, it is not likely that Eltred and Ketel were descendants of a Norman (ii, 290).

[2] Pipe Rolls, Cumb., p. xliii; Archæol. Journal, xvi, 231.

[3] Chetel son of Ectred (*sic.*) is witness to a charter of Meschin (No. 9). Ketel son of Eltreth seems to have had lands both in Cumberland and Westmoreland, judging from the charter of Henry II., noticed below.

[4] This charter has been accidentally omitted from the "Abstracts" on p. 72 *ante*, where it should have been noticed as follows:—

46. Confirmation by Edward III of a charter of William II, and of three charters of Henry II, to the abbey of St. Mary of York. One of Henry II's charters recites numerous gifts to the abbey—*inter alia*: by Ribald, of lands in Richmond, &c.; by Picot "in Lincoln," of the church of St. Peter; by Ivo Taillebois, of lands in Claxtun, and of the churches of Kirkby-Stephen, Winton, Kirkby in Kendal, Bethum, Burton, and Clapham, with their lands, including the vill of Hotonrof and the land of Haverbek, and tithes; by Colegrim, of lands in Belton; by Picot son of Colswain

Another fact which tells against Ivo having possessed the Lincolnshire estates in his own right is the fact, already noticed, that neither of his charters to Spalding Priory was confirmed by Edward III, though there are early confirmations of his gift by William I and William II before the date of Lucy's final charter. His first gift consisted of the church of Spalding, with only one carucate of land there, whereas Lucy's subsequent gift comprised the whole manor of Spalding. It may, however, be objected that Ivo had obtained a licence from William I to convey "the manor," and that the same King afterwards confirmed the manor to the priory,[1] but the licence states that the grantees were to have it before or after Ivo's death, as he should please. When, therefore, the confirmation of William I speaks of the manor, it doubtless means the reversion. The monks did not really obtain the whole manor till it was granted them by the Countess Lucy many years after, when she stated that she had held it during the lives of Ivo, Roger, and Ranulph. If she had held it only in dower, it would not have been in her power nor would it have been necessary for her to make such a grant as she did. Her grant was afterwards confirmed by Edward III, but Ivo's was not. This again seems to show that Spalding belonged to her rather than to her husband.

Ivo's second charter to Spalding granted certain tithes there, and if this was a grant in perpetuity, it is difficult to understand why it was not confirmed by later Bishops of Lincoln, as other grants of tithes were; it must rather be presumed that he was tenant for life only, and that his grant terminated at his death.[2]

Thus there are very clear indications that Ivo Taillebois was not possessed of the Lincolnshire estates in his own right, and this being the case, it is unnecessary to suppose that they passed to a daughter and heir, as his widow may equally well have been capable of transferring them to FitzGerold and Meschin. This authorises us in proceeding to inquire whether there are any more positive indications that Lucy was an heiress, and if so, to whom.

Lucy heiress to Thorold the Sheriff.

It has already been remarked that Lucy's own charters certainly point to the fact of her having been an heiress; but there is no authentic record which shows from whom she inherited. The compiler of the Spalding register states that she was heiress to Thorold the Sheriff,

"in Lincoln," of certain lands; by Randulph Meschin, of the manor and church of Wederhal, with the mill, fishery, woods, &c., the chapel of Warthwyk, the land called the Chamber of St. Constantine, lands in Corceby, the river Eden over against Corceby, &c.; by Randulph Meschin, of the churches of Apelby, viz., St. Michael and St. Lawrence, with their lands, and the tithes of the demesnes of the same vill; by Ketel son of Eltreth, of the churches of Morland and Wirchintun, with lands; by William Meschin and Ralph his son, of possessions in Chirkebibeceoch, St. Bega, and Ananderdale, &c. Witnesses to Henry II's charter above quoted: T. Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry Bishop of Winchester, Reinald Earl of Cornwall, &c., at Wudestoc. Edward III's confirmation is dated 14th December in his 4th year.—Harl. MS. 236, f. 6 b; Charter Roll, 4 Edw. III, No. 14; *Monasticon*, iii, 546.

The printed version gives only one of the charters of Henry II, and that inaccurately.

[1] See Charters, Nos. 3 and 5.

[2] Possibly, however, the priory, being in possession of the whole manor, did not require a confirmation of the grant of tithes.

relying apparently on inferences drawn from the charters which he transcribed, for he produces no evidence in support of his allegation, nor does he give any particulars as to the extent of the estates which he supposed Lucy to have inherited. Let us see whether he is more reliable than the monks of Croyland. Possibly he had some tradition to guide him, but if he relied solely on the charters before him, his mode of reasoning is not difficult to follow.

Ivo's first charter to Spalding mentions the tithes which had been given by "Thorold and his men" to St. Nicholas, without stating the place or places where those tithes were to be received; and he professes to supersede Thorold's grant by his own. Now the Spalding monk assumes that those tithes were situate in Tetenay, Alkebarge, Normanby, Beltesford, and Scamelesbi, and although according to a later charter (No. 18) they appear to have been first given by Lucy, yet a still later charter (No. 40), by Hugh, Earl of Chester, distinctly recognises that some of them at least had been given by his ancestor, "Thorold the Sheriff," who was, therefore, Ivo's predecessor, as all these places are returned in Domesday as belonging to Ivo. It is moreover clear that Spalding itself had belonged to Thorold before it belonged to Ivo, and that Thorold himself had made a grant, probably of lands, if not of tithes there. This is evident from charter No. 12, which states that the monks had held the wood of that manor in the time of Thorold. The editors of the new edition of Dugdale's *Monasticon* were clearly of opinion that Lucy inherited Spalding from Thorold, but do not explain how this view can be made to tally with Domesday. Mr. Hinde was of the same opinion, and got over the difficulty by supposing a gift from Earl Algar to Thorold; but this guess is both improbable and superfluous.

The evidence above quoted is very slight, but it certainly amounts to this, that some of the lands belonging to Ivo Taillebois had previously belonged to Thorold the Sheriff; and if some, then all. For it has already been proved that all the estates returned under the name of Ivo Taillebois in Domesday, and under the name of Ranulph Meschin, in the *Lincolnshire Survey*, were one inheritance; and if it once be conceded that Lucy was an heiress, and brought any portion of these estates to Ivo, and if it further be allowed that there was only one Lucy, it follows that the whole of them had previously belonged to the person, whoever he was, to whom Lucy was heiress; and there seems to be no reason to doubt that her predecessor in title was Thorold. It may, therefore, be assumed that if Domesday had been compiled immediately after the Conquest, instead of twenty years later, we should have seen the name of "Thorold the Sheriff" where that of Ivo Taillebois now stands.[1] In fact, the former has been almost totally eclipsed by the latter, and it is requisite to pursue a kind of scientific method of observation in order to ascertain his position in the genealogical firmament. Hitherto he has been thought to be one of the lesser lights, and doubts have existed even as to his proper location, but the mental vision, assisted by the telescopic powers of a laborious examination, is now able to discern that his

[1] Mr. J. R. Planché, in "The Conqueror and his Companions," very properly comments on the necessity of bearing in mind the length of time which intervened between the Conquest and the compilation of Domesday.

"magnitude" is not inferior to that of the man by whom his fame has been so long obscured.

This reasoning is apparently supported by the fact that an Earl of Chester at a later period (Hugh Kevelioc) is returned as owing the King twenty marks for "the fee of Thorold the Sheriff," as stated in the Pipe Roll of 11 Henry II. In reality he paid only 100*s.* 4*d.*, the rest of the sum having been pardoned by the King. The amount paid being so small, it is clear that the fee here referred to could not have been the whole of Thorold's estates; indeed, the great bulk of them had then doubtless long been in the possession of William de Roumare, grandson of William, Earl of Lincoln. Hence this entry on the Pipe Roll may require some elucidation, but, as it stands, it is certainly not unfavourable to the view which I have ventured to propound.[1]

Was Lucy daughter of Earl Algar?

It has now been proved that Lucy was not heiress to Earl Algar, but rather to Thorold the Sheriff, yet it remains to be seen whether she may not after all have been daughter of the former. The chronicle of Peterborough indeed states that Thorold was "uncle" to Lucy, daughter of Algar; and the Spalding registers describe Thorold merely as "ancestor" of the Countess, though they make no mention of Earl Algar, or of Earl Leofric, as they would surely have done if these Earls had been the direct ancestors of Lucy. The statement that Algar was her father, therefore, rests solely on the authority of the chronicles of Croyland and Peterborough; and the silence of the Spalding registers on this point is all the more remarkable because the same chronicles further allege that Thorold was brother-german to the Countess Godiva, and cousin to Earl Algar. Still the statements that Lucy was daughter to Algar and niece to Thorold are not actually contradictory, and it is necessary to see what can be said in their favour.

Because Ordericus Vitalis mentions that Earl Algar had two sons, Edwin and Morcar, and "one daughter," Queen Edgiva, it has been argued[2] that Lucy could not have been his daughter, but Ordericus' knowledge in this respect was evidently imperfect, as he states that Countess Godiva was the wife of Algar. If he could make such a mistake, it may be presumed that he would not have been aware of the two famous sons, or of the equally famous daughter, but for the prominent part they played in the history of the time, and that if Lucy were young and unmarried at the Conquest, he would not be likely to hear of her, as it is obvious that he had no particular information about the family.[3]

The little that is known about the early history of Lucy Taillebois connects her in a special manner with Spalding, which was certainly one of the manors of Earl Algar. If she were his daughter, her childhood must have been passed amid scenes of great commotion, conse-

[1] This reference was pointed out by Mr. Round in a letter to the *Academy*, 21st April 1888; but he makes no suggestion as to its real meaning.

[2] Introduction to Pipe Rolls for Cumberland, p. xvii.

[3] There is some evidence that Algar had yet another son named Burchard. See Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, i, 630; and Ellis's *Introduction to Domesday*, i, 325.

quent on Algar's two rebellions, one before and the other after his succession to Earl Leofric. After the second rebellion, it would seem that Earl Algar did not recover possession of all the estates which he had forfeited, and that those which were not restored to him remained in Edward the Confessor's hands till 1066. This is shown in Domesday, where many lands are said to have been held by him, and not by his son Edwin or his son Morcar, previously to the occupation of those lands by Normans. Among the lands thus returned as having been held by Earl Algar, was the manor of Spalding, which was the only portion of his lands that came to Ivo Taillebois, or rather to Thorold the Sheriff.[1] This may, however, lend some countenance to the tradition that Lucy obtained "the paternal lands." Whether Spalding was the principal seat of Earl Algar is very doubtful, but Ivo and Lucy appear to have resided there, as may be gathered from William I's charter (No. 4). Ivo granted the manor to the priory, but retained the power of living in it during his life; at least, so it may be inferred. Certainly Ivo and Lucy showed much partiality for the place, and Ingulph states that during Ivo's banishment in the reign of William Rufus, Lucy kept her court at Spalding. Whatever may be the exact amount of truth in this assertion, it may at least be assumed that the manor-house there was at one time her favourite residence. Such a fact would live long in the traditions of the locality, even taking it that "Ingulph" was not written till the latter half of the twelfth century. And there seems to be no reason to doubt the statement that both Ivo and Lucy were buried there.[2]

Nothing more can be said in favour of Algar's paternity of Lucy, unless he can be identified with the "father" who is mentioned in the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I, and whose lands Lucy then purchased. It has been proved that "the earldom," whether of Lincoln or of Chester, did not descend from Earl Algar or his sons to Lucy Taillebois, and that she did not acquire their lands before the date of the Lincolnshire Survey; but may she not, in 31 Henry I, have acquired such of their lands as are described under the head of "Terra Regis" in Domesday? Here again it is necessary to compare Domesday with the *Lincolnshire Survey* and *Testa de Nevill*. Domesday states that the following manors were then in the Crown, viz.: Tite, Luctone, Gadenai with soke, and Eleot, formerly of Earl Algar; Chirchetone, with soke in many places, formerly of Earl Edwin; and Cherchebi, with soke, Chime, Bodebi, Wellingoure, Basingeham, and Castre and Humendone with soke, formerly of Earl Morcar. As none of these estates are mentioned in the *Lincolnshire Survey*, it may be inferred that they then still remained in the Crown, and also that this Survey did not deal with Crown property. But *Testa de Nevill* shows that most, if not all of them, were afterwards in possession of the Earls of Albemarle, and formed part of the honor of Lancaster. The Duchy of Lancaster records further show that

[1] Among the names of the former holders of Ivo's lands, the name of Alwin frequently occurs; and it is to be noted that in another part of Domesday (Cambridgeshire,, "Alwin, the man or tenant (*homo*) of Earl Algar," is mentioned. But so many Alwins occur in Domesday that identification in this case is impossible, and it would be too much to assume that the Alwin of Lincolnshire may have been merely tenant to Algar.

[2] *Monasticon*, iii, 214, quoting from Gough.

most of these estates afterwards belonged to the Duchy ; but it is clear that they descended through Edmund, Earl of Lancaster, the second son of King Henry III, who married the heiress of the Earls of Albemarle, and that they never formed part of the honor of Bolingbroke, which appears to have come into the Duchy from the Countess Lucy, through her descendants the Earls of Chester and Lincoln.[1]

It is thus evident that the Countess Lucy did not acquire these estates when she purchased the lands of her "father" in 31 Henry I ; and therefore it is certain that Earl Algar was not her parent. This fact confirms the conclusion previously arrived at, that she was not Countess of Lincoln in her own right, and did not convey that Earldom to any of her husbands.

Lucy daughter of Thorold the Sheriff.

Who then was the father of this lady? The Spalding registers refer to Thorold the Sheriff as if he were a distant relative to Lucy, and the Peterborough chronicle calls him her uncle, but it is more probable that he was her father, as the following considerations will show.

The Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I does not specify "the lands of her father" for which Lucy paid a large sum of money, not for their "livery," as has been supposed, but rather for their re-purchase. Having inquired, as we were bound to do, whether these lands had belonged to Algar, and having found that they did not, are we not now justified in supposing that they had belonged to Thorold? It has been seen that Meschin surrendered the lands of Lucy's inheritance, *i.e.* the estates of Thorold, in exchange for the earldom of Chester, and that William de Roumare, in 1122, succeeded in obtaining "a great part" of them from Henry I. It may, therefore, be conjectured that what Lucy purchased after Meschin's death was the remainder of the lands which had not been restored to William. All the authorities are agreed upon this point. There is, however, nothing to show where the purchased lands were situate; but knowing what we now know, we can readily guess the name of one of the manors.

It has been proved that Lucy was not Countess of Lincoln before her marriage to Ranulph Meschin, in spite of all assertions to the contrary ; and as there are sundry references to her as "Countess of Bolingbroke," it may be inferred that she did not use the latter title till after Meschin's death, when she appears to have adopted it in preference to her proper title of Countess of Chester.[2] Doubtless she derived it from the manor of Bolingbroke, which had belonged to Thorold, and was one of the estates surrendered by Meschin, but probably not one of those which were restored to William de Roumare ; and this she could hardly have done unless she had acquired the manor in question as a portion of the "lands of her father" in 31 Henry I.

Therefore it may be assumed on good grounds that the Countess Lucy was daughter of Thorold the Sheriff.

This suggestion is novel, but it agrees with all the authentic evidence.

[1] Hundred Rolls, Lincoln, i, 270, 271, 383, 384. A "manor of Chircheton" was granted by King Stephen to William, Earl of Lincoln (Duchy Cowcher, ii, 445) ; but *Testa de Nevill* shows that part of Chircheton belonged to the honor of Lancaster.

[2] See especially *Testa de Nevill*, p. 313.

Dugdale considered the "father," mentioned in 31 Henry I, to be Earl Algar; while Stapleton, Nichols, and Hinde made out to their own satisfaction that he was Ivo Taillebois; but neither of those views is consistent with the known facts.

The alleged parental relationship of Earl Algar to Lucy has thus been finally disproved, and there seems to be nothing to show that she was even distantly related to him. But there is frequently some foundation, however slight, for the inaccuracies of local historians. Thorold, for instance, is wrongly called "uncle" to Lucy, probably because the writer knew that she had an uncle, or rather two uncles, from whom she or her son inherited, as will be seen.

Lucy's mother is mentioned in two of the charters (Nos. 4 and 19), and it will not perhaps now be difficult to ascertain who she was; but it will be better to leave this point until we come to treat of Lucy's parents and uncles.

Building on the sound basis that Lucy was daughter and heiress to Thorold the Sheriff, and wife successively to Ivo Taillebois, Roger FitzGerold, and Ranulph Meschin, and using the solid materials which have been gathered in the course of this inquiry, thanks in a great measure to the labours of modern antiquaries, but rejecting some of their theories, together with the fabulous portions of the story as told by certain monastic writers, I shall endeavour to establish the true facts in the history of the lady whose individuality is now beyond dispute, and also of her relatives by birth and marriage. We seem to be in a fair way to wipe off the reproach of Mr. Freeman, that this family has ever been the sport of genealogists; but, as may be imagined, it will go hard with his own well meant efforts in that direction, and especially with the wonderful pedigrees of the Malet family which have been recently put forward by Mr. Arthur Malet. It will also be necessary to rehabilitate the early history of the Earldom of Lincoln, which is remarkable not only for the meagreness of its facts, but for the vast amount of misspent ingenuity with which those few facts have been distorted.

(To be continued.)

THE COUNTESS LUCY:

SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

(*Concluded from p.* 114.)

To replace the speculations which have been based on the false views respecting the duality of the Countess, it will be necessary to propose others which, it is hoped, will prove to be much better founded.[1] After the explanations which have been given in the preceding portions of this paper, it will be needless to account in every case for the differences between the new views and the old ones, or even to refute the latter; but all suggestions which seem still to be of service will be readily adopted. It is proposed in the first place, to treat of the Countess's ancestors, then of her husbands, and lastly of herself.

The Family of Lincoln.

According to the charter of Henry, Duke of Normandy,[2] Countess Lucy had two uncles, Robert Malet and Alan de Lincoln, whose fees were granted to her son, Ranulph Gernons. It can be shown with some certainty that Robert Malet was brother of the Countess's mother, and hence it is almost equally certain that Alan de Lincoln was brother of her father, Thorold. This obvious inference did not fall in with the modern theories, but there is very little against it.[3] The family of Lincoln therefore first demands attention.

The account given by Dugdale of this family is very unsatisfactory. He commences with Alan de Lincoln, and says a few words about Alan's daughters; then he goes on to speak of Alfred de Lincoln as a contemporary of Alan, and of Alfred's son Robert, as if the latter inherited from his father. But this Robert and his descendants were settled in Dorset, and had no part of Alfred's large possessions in Lincolnshire.[4]

The fees possessed by Alan de Lincoln are described in the Lindsey

[1] For a summary of the results obtained from the double-Lucy theory, see Mr. Freeman's "Norman Conquest," iii, 776 seq. (2nd edit.). See also Sir Alexander Malet's translation of Wace, and Mr. Arthur Malet's "Notices of an English Branch of the Malet Family."

[2] See Abstracts of Charters, No. 39.

[3] Stapleton supposed that Robert and Alan were half-brothers, the former being son of William Malet by Hesilia Crispin, and the latter son of Hesilia by another husband. See also *Top. and Gen.*, i, 15. But in that case Lucy's son could not have inherited from both, as Hesilia was not an heiress.

[4] Alfred de Lincoln had no estates in Dorset in 1086, but apparently acquired some afterwards, and settled them on Robert, for a gift by Alfred de Lincoln and Robert his son to the priory of Montacute of the land of Gillingham and the land of Brugia in Dorset, is recorded in the *Monasticon*, v, 167. Now several estates in Gillingham are returned in Domesday, one of them belonging to the Crown, but none to Alfred. Robert had a son Alfred de Lincoln, who was followed by others of the same name. (Dugdale's *Baronage*, i, 412; Testa de Nevill.) It is noteworthy that Robert de Haia, also a great landowner in Lincoln, and a successor to Colswain de Lincoln, made a grant to the same priory of Montacute.

Survey, and on comparing them with the fees of Alfred de Lincoln described in Domesday, it becomes evident that they were identical, and that Alan was heir to Alfred. Stapleton considered Alan to have been brother and heir to Alfred,[1] but Mr. Freeman shows that he was son and heir, as a brother could not have succeeded, because Alfred certainly had a son named Robert.[2]

Both Dugdale and Stapleton were influenced by the fact that Alan de Lincoln appears to have been present at a Council held at London in 1082, according to a charter of the Bishop of Durham to the monks there; and this certainly is a knotty point.[3] Dugdale says Alan attended as a Baron, but he had not succeeded Alfred at that date, and if it is necessary to suppose this, "Alan" must be an error for "Alfred." If not, and if this was the same Alan who is mentioned in the Lindsey Survey, and in the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I, he must have been a mere youth in 1082. He may however have been a different person altogether, as the surname of Lincoln was not uncommon, and seems to have been borne by several distinct families.[4]

The fees possessed by Alfred de Lincoln in Lincolnshire[5] and Bedfordshire are set out at great length in Domesday, which also has a reference to one "Alveredus nepos Turoldi." In the dearth of information relative to Thorold the Sheriff, this reference has been eagerly seized upon by Stapleton, Nichols, Mr. Freeman, and Mr. Malet to prove that he was uncle to "Aluredus de Lincole." But though Domesday might perhaps give two different descriptions of the same person, it is now impossible to accept that view, for if Thorold was brother to Alan de Lincoln, as he seems to have been, it follows that he was son to Alfred de Lincoln.

Thus we obtain a pedigree which is vastly different to any which has hitherto been put forward; but to make it complete and acceptable it seems necessary to adopt one or two suggestions which have been made

[1] Mr. Eyton believed that Ivo Taillebois, Alfred, and Alan were brothers. (Addit. MS. 31, 929, f. 68).[b]

[2] Ordericus Vitalis mentions "Rodbertus Alveredi de Lincolia filius" as holding the castle of Wareham against Stephen in 1138; and both Alan and Robert occur in the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I.

[3] The name is certainly "Alano" in the Laud MS., Misc. 748, Bodleian Library, as I am informed.

[4] Wigod of Lincoln was witness to a charter of Edward the Confessor to Ramsey abbey; possibly an ancestor of Alfred de Lincoln. (Charter Roll, 8 Edw. III, m. 29.) Wigot de Lincoln occurs as a landowner in the Lindsey Survey, which also has several references to "Wigot" simply. Wigot, Sheriff of Lincoln (temp. Hen. I), is mentioned in the Spalding Registers, Addit. MS. 5844, ff. 220, 234, and Harl. MS. 742, f. 9. Martin son of Ulf de Lincoln (1120-30) is mentioned in the Ramsey Chronicle. Richard de Lincoln, son of Osbert the Sheriff, and William grandson or nephew (*nepos*) of the same Osbert occur in the Lindsey Survey. As to Osbert, see abstracts of Charters, *ante*, Nos. 6, 7, 14, and 22 (note), and Addit. MS. 5844, ff. 222, 223. He had a brother named Ralph the Canon (Lindsey Survey). Acardus de Lincoln was witness to a charter of Ralph de Bayeux to the abbey of Newhouse. Joel de Lincoln is mentioned in Leland's Collectanea. Alanus filius Johelli Linc,' Ancha de Lincol,' Outi de Linc,' as well as Robert de Linc' and Alur' de Linc,' occur in the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I. John de Lincoln was witness to a charter (temp. Ric. I?) of Nichola de Haya, a descendant of Colswain. (Close Roll, 11 Edw. II, No. 72; *Monasticon*, vi, 1116.) A few Lincolns of later date occur in the Harleian Charters.

[5] "Lincole, Aluredus de, *Linc.*, 357[b]," is omitted from Ellis's list of Tenants *in capite*.

by Mr. Freeman. He supposes that Colswain, whose fees are described in Domesday, was also son of Alfred de Lincoln, and something may be said in favour of this view, though the reasons he gives for it are not conclusive. He further suggests that Alfred had Colswain before the Conquest, and Alan de Lincoln and Robert de Lincoln after the Conquest. If we add Thorold to the list of Alfred's children before the Conquest, we may get rid of the difficult question, how was it that Alan rather than Thorold succeeded Alfred? For it may well be that Alfred married a second time after the Conquest, with a Norman lady, and that his estates were entailed on her issue, and descended to her son Alan, because Alfred's sons by his first wife were already sufficiently provided for. Indeed it seems to have been part of the policy of the early Norman kings to prevent their vassals from becoming too powerful, by regulating successions in this manner.[1]

The further question naturally arises—what position did this family occupy before the Conquest, and how did three members of it, a father and two sons, acquire such large territories? It is clear that these were not in their possession before the Conquest, and it might well have been doubted if they were of Anglo-Saxon origin, were it not for their names;[2] but when we find the name of Colegrim also among the tenants *in capite*, it is evident that it was not unusual for William I to bestow lands on Anglo-Saxons.[3] There are two references to Alfred de Lincoln in Domesday which at first sight seem to show that he was "an Englishman," and the person desiderated by Mr. Malet at the head of his pedigree. Under the head of "The Land of Alfred de Lincoln" in Bedfordshire, p. 215^b, is the following entry:

"(M.) Alfred de Lincoln holds three hides in Wimentone, and Glen (holds) of him. It (the manor) is worth 40 shillings; *when he received it*, 50 shillings; in the time of King Edward, 60 shillings. Godwin Franpold held this manor, and could sell it. With these three hides Alfred reclaims upon Walter the Fleming half a hide, of which he (Walter) unjustly disseised him, as the men of the Hundred bear witness thereof; *for his (Alfred's) ancestor was seised thereof in the time of King Edward, and the same Alfred was afterwards seised*. With this land the same Alfred further reclaims upon the Bishop of Coutances a wood of 100 hogs, *which his ancestor had in the time of King Edward*, but the Bishop disseised him unjustly, as the men of the Hundred testify."

Again, under the head of "Claims in Kesteven," p. 337^b, the following note occurs:

"Alfred de Lincoln claims one carucate of land in Quedhaveringe upon Alan the Earl. The men of Hoilant agree in favour of the same Alfred, *because it was also of his ancestor*, and he himself was seised thereof in the time of Earl Ralph."[4]

These entries appear to imply that Alfred was an Anglo-Saxon by birth, and that his ancestors held lands, to which he had some claim, yet it is clear that his lands in Domesday did not belong to any one

[1] Thus Meschin had to give up the lordship of Carlisle and the estates of his wife in Lincolnshire, before succeeding to the Earldom of Chester.

[2] Thorold's name might however have been Norman.

[3] On this subject Mr. Freeman remarks, "The examples of Thurkill of Warwick, Wiggod of Wallingford, and Colswegen himself show that it was perfectly possible for an Englishman to keep a large estate, to have Norman tenants, and, unhappily, to receive the forfeited estates of other Englishmen." (*Norm. Conq.* iii, 780; 2nd edit.)

[4] Ralph Waher or Guader, Earl of Norfolk and Suffolk. (Ellis, i, 471.)

Anglo-Saxon owner, whom we might have looked upon as his father.[1] Indeed he seems to have obtained his lands in precisely the same way as he would have done if he had been a Norman adventurer, but the grant was probably made to him in consideration of his marriage with a Norman lady; and Thorold and Colswain would seem to have acquired their possessions in the same manner. Besides, many other entries in Domesday clearly prove that the Survey uses the word "antecessor" in the sense of "predecessor," or previous occupier; and in most if not in all cases there was no relationship between the tenant in the time of King William and the tenant in the time of King Edward.

It may be objected that Alan de Lincoln seems to have lived to almost as late a date as Lucy his niece; but this objection has been met by supposing that Alfred married a Norman lady, and that Alan was her son; and as Thorold seems to have married about 1066, there is no reason why the uncle should be much, if any, older than the niece; this being, in fact, a not uncommon occurrence. The date when Alan succeeded Alfred is uncertain, but Alfred may have lived till the beginning of the reign of Henry I, as the name of Alfred de Lincoln occurs among the witnesses to a charter of that King to the abbey of Rheims, dated at Tamworth, apparently between the years 1102 and 1107.[2]

In spite of the grant of Alan's fee to Ranulph Gernons, Earl of Chester, it does not appear that the Earl obtained it. It is hard to see how the grant came to be made. Alan in fact had a daughter, and even if she were passed over, the fee would be more likely to go to his brother Robert than to his niece Lucy. Alan's daughter Margaret married Ranulph de Bayeux, as may be inferred from the Pipe Roll, 31 Henry I, and Testa de Nevill, and as is positively stated in the charters to the abbey of Newhouse. Margaret subsequently separated from her husband, having vowed chastity in the chapter of Lincoln. Their son Hugh de Bayeux speaks of Alan de Lincoln as his grandfather. Hugh had a brother Alan and a brother William.[3] But it would be out of place to treat of Alan's descendants.[4]

[1] There are many references to "Alfred" and "Thorold," simply, in Domesday, both as tenants in the time of Edward the Confessor, and as undertenants at Domesday, in many counties, including Lincoln; but it seems difficult to identify any of them with Alfred de Lincoln and Thorold the Sheriff. It is perhaps only a coincidence that Winterburne in Dorset belonged to an "Alfred" t.R.E., and at a later period to an Alfred de Lincoln, a descendant of Robert, before mentioned. "Alfred the Sheriff" held Lulvorde in Dorset, t.R.E. Robert's descendants held large possessions in that county, but these had mostly *not* belonged to "Alfred." Yet it is to be remarked that Alfred de Lincoln afterwards acquired estates in Dorset, which would be quite intelligible if he had originally belonged to that county.

[2] Patent Roll, 6 Edw. III, p. 1, m. 8; *Monasticon*, vi, 1043, from the original at Rheims. If this may be relied on, the Lindsey Survey was not compiled before 1102.

[3] *Monasticon*, vi, 865, 886; Lindsey Survey; the Black Book, Hearne, p. 275; the Red Book, ff. 54, 63, 64, 79b, 218; Pipe Rolls, 31 Henry I, Henry II, &c. Among the charters to Newhouse is one relating to Lucy, which has been omitted from the abstracts on p. 70, viz.

29a. Charter of William, Earl of Lincoln, addressed to Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, and confirming gifts to the abbey of Newhouse, for the souls of his father (Roger Fitz Gerold) and mother (Lucy); Hadewisa the Countess being one of the witnesses.

[4] It may however be noted that Dugdale makes Alan to have had two daughters, Margaret, wife of Ranulph de Bayeux, and . . . . wife of Humfrey d'Albini; but

With regard to Colswain, a charter before referred to[1] shows that he bore the surname of "de Lincoln," a fact not before noticed, and which greatly supports Mr. Freeman's argument; and both Colswain's and Thorold's descendants claimed the constableship of Lincoln castle, as will be seen.

Colswain had a son named Picot, whose wife was named Beatrice, and whose son or son-in-law was Robert de Haia. This is evident from the charters before quoted, and also on comparing Domesday with the Lindsey Survey.[2] In Testa de Nevill their barony is described as the honor of Haia or Haya, which must not be confounded with the honor of Eye, frequently spelt Heia, Haia, and Heya.

Robert de Haia's wife was Muriel, who may have been daughter and heiress to Picot. They had a son Richard de Haia, a son Ralph de Haia (called "senior"), and a daughter Cecily. Richard succeeded Robert in this Barony. His wife was named Matilda, and Nichola, his daughter and heiress, was married to Gerard de Camville. A Geoffrey de Haya also occurs.[3]

Here we have an important Lincolnshire pedigree from the Conquest to the reign of King John, which I believe has never before been worked out, and which cannot fail to be of interest even if the parentage of Colswain should prove to have been other than is above suggested.

Thorold the Sheriff, Baron of Spalding.

Having done something to clear up the history of the mysterious family of Lincoln, we may now turn our attention to that member of it with whom we are more particularly concerned.

the entries in the Pipe Roll appear to mean that Alan had a daughter, who was married first to Humfrey, and afterwards to Ranulph; that he had given part of his fee to her on her first marriage; and that Ranulph paid a fine for possession of the land of Humfrey d'Albini. Alan de Lincoln may however have had more than one daughter. Testa de Nevill and Mr. Eyton's MS. (Addit. 31, 941, f. 94) show that Richard de Sanford, Hugh de Bayeux, and others were successors to Alan de Lincoln about 1210, and John de Bayeux and others about 1243. For the fees of John de Bayoes, see the Feodary of Lincolnshire, Chapter House Miscell. Books, B. $\frac{1}{15}$, p. 11.

[1] No. 22; see also No. 46, p. 138.

[2] See Abstracts of Charters, No. 22, with note, and No. 46. A Colswain is also mentioned in charter No. 26, as uncle to Robert, "grandson (or nephew) of the Countess" (qu. which Countess?); but he could hardly have been the same as Colswain de Lincoln, whose lands could not have been bestowed by William de Roumare; nor was the Ivo mentioned in that document the same as Ivo Taillebois. Mr. Freeman and Mr. Malet, however, build much upon it.

[3] These particulars are derived from Domesday, the Lindsey Survey, Harl. MS. 742, ff. 219, 219^b; *Monasticon*, i, 968 (old edit.); v, 167; vi, 916, 1116, 1117; the Black Book (Hearne); the Bed Book, ff. 54, 63, 64^b, 71^b, 79^b, 114, 139, 160^b, 210; Pipe Rolls, Henry II; Duchy of Lancaster Cowchers, ii, 254, 476, 480, 482, 486. The account of the barony of "Haye" given by Dugdale (i, 597) says nothing about Robert de Haia's succession to Colswain and Picot's barony in Lincolnshire, but starts with Henry I's grant to him of the honor of Halnac in Sussex. Dugdale makes out that Richard had two other daughters besides Nichola, but does not give their names. In a charter Richard mentions his "nepos" Reginald de Maisnil. Lady Nichola had a daughter and heiress named Idonia, who married William Longespe, Earl of Salisbury. (Feodary of Lincolnshire, as before, p. 11.) The great grand-daughter of this Earl, Margaret Longespe, became the wife of Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, a descendant of the Countess Lucy, and thus the families of Thorold and Colswain became once more united.

The name of Thorold, as Mr. Freeman points out, was of Scandinavian origin, and was in use both in Normandy and England, but he says "we may assume Thorold was an Englishman."[1] This he wrote without knowing that Thorold did not receive his large estates till after the Conquest, which fact might be taken to indicate that he was a Norman; but if Thorold was the son of Alfred de Lincoln, and if Alfred was English, as above suggested, Mr. Freeman is right.[2] Still, Thorold was not an imposing personage in the pre-Norman time, as hitherto believed.

The chroniclers of Peterborough and Croyland were evidently of opinion that Thorold was an Anglo-Saxon landed proprietor,; otherwise they would hardly have alleged that Thorold gave a manor in Spalding to the monks of Croyland so early as the year 1051 or 1052, to be converted into a cell; and thus it is certain that the charter of "Thorold de Bukenhale," as set out by Ingulph, is an unmitigated forgery.[3]

It would be useless now to discuss the assertion of the Peterborough chronicler that Thorold was brother-german to the Countess Godiva.[4] If we are on the right track, they could not possibly have belonged to the same generation. The chronicler seems to have made a bad guess, founded on the equally wrong notion that Earl Algar was father of Lucy; and the latter notion rested merely on the imperfect knowledge that Algar was lord of Spalding, and that Lucy brought that manor to Ivo at her marriage.

There is only one reference to "Thorold the Sheriff" in Domesday, under the head of Bukenhale, which he gave to Croyland abbey for his soul. Other references to the name of "Thorold" have been tortured in order to make them lend some countenance to the various impossible conjectures which have been ventured on the subject, but to no purpose.[5]

[1] *Norm. Conq.*, 2nd edit., iii, 776, 781.

[2] It might also have been argued that an Anglo-Saxon would hardly have given tithes to the monastery of Angers, as Thorold seems to have done: hence Nichols' surmise that Thorold, as well as Ivo, came over from Anjou. The name of Turold occurs among the witnesses to a charter of William, Duke of Normandy in 1060, and this man might have been supposed to be identical with "the Sheriff," especially as his name is joined with that of "Ricardus le Vicomte." (D'Anisy, *Extrait des Chartes* &c., i, 247.) But even before the Conquest it was possible for a grant of property in England to be made to a Norman abbey; thus we find that the abbey of Rheims had the church of Lapley &c. in the time of Edward the Confessor. (*Monasticon*, vi, 1043.)

[3] Thorold is made to convey a manor-house in Spalding with the consent of his "lord and kinsman" Earl Algar in 1051. It is true that the monks had an estate in Spalding at the date of Domesday, but Algar was the previous owner of the chief manor there, and he would have been the person, at the date alleged, to have given the "berewick" in Spalding to Croyland Abbey. Ingulph indeed alludes to a charter made by Earl Algar, but the grant was more probably made by Thorold after the Conquest. The surname of "de Bukenhale" was given to Thorold without authority, and in ignorance of his having held lands in many other places. Another estate in Spalding had belonged to one Alestan, t. R.E.

[4] Mr. Freeman has endeavoured to make something of this statement, but it would take too long to discuss his solution. (*N.C.* iii, 779, 2nd edit.)

[5] "Alveredus nepos Turoldi" has already been disposed of. One of Ivo's estates in Ludesford, a small one, is said to have belonged to "Thorold," t. R.E.; but it is doubtful whether he was the Sheriff. The name of "Turaldus de Gretevill" occurs in the description of the city of Lincoln (f. 336), as noticed by Stapleton; but Mr. Freeman considers that he was not the same as Thorold the Sheriff; possibly he was

This fact furnishes an additional argument for the accuracy of the conclusions which have been come to; for it is obvious that our Thorold must have been a man of considerable property, and it may be asked, where is the description of his lands in Domesday if they are not described under the head of "The Land of Ivo Taillgebosc?"

For this and other weighty reasons which have been given, it is certain that all the lands which were afterwards returned as being in the hands of Ivo Taillebois and Ranulph Meschin, had originally belonged to Thorold the Sheriff. It would take up too much space to set them out fully, but some idea of their names and extent has already been given.[1] At what precise date these lands were given him by the Conqueror is not stated; nor do we know whether it was entirely due to his marriage with a Norman lady. As Alfred and Colswain also obtained large possessions, it is possible that, although they were Anglo-Saxons, they had all three in some way favoured William's cause, and that they shared the spoil as if they were Normans.

A few estates in Norfolk are also returned in Domesday as belonging to Ivo Taillebois, but they are not found to have been afterwards in the tenure of Thorold's descendants; so they may have either belonged to Ivo in his own right, or have been surrendered by Meschin in 1120, and never restored.[2]

All that is known of Thorold's history is that he gave lands in Bukenhale to Croyland Abbey, and lands and tithes in Spalding and other places to the abbey of Angers,[3] for the support of the cell of Spalding, of which he appears to have been the founder. Whether he at first filled the cell with monks from Croyland is uncertain, but this may have been the case, if the writer of Ingulph's chronicle can be

father to Reinfrid de Bretevill (*sic*), who, with his son Alfred, is mentioned in charter No. 20. Mr. Eyton says that Gretevill was not a Norman name, but a Norman reading of "Greetwell," which place is in the county of Lincoln. (Addit. MS. 31,929, f. 65b.) Possibly the real name was Breteuil, which frequently occurs in Ord. Vit.

[1] It may be added that the manor called Archintone belonging to Taillebois is obviously the same as Helchintuna, which belonged to Meschin, the modern spelling being Elkington (see pp. 135, 136, *ante*); and that Meschin must have had Ivo's estate in Alchebarge, for Hautebarge (Aulkborough) subsequently belonged to William de Roumare (the third), who made a gift there for the soul of Alice his wife. (Harl. MS. 742, f. 269b). See also *post*, as to Spalding having belonged to Meschin.

[2] If Ivo possessed the barony of Appleby, and it afterwards went to Meschin, as supposed by Mr. Hodgson Hinde, it must have been part of Lucy's inheritance, and therefore belonged to Thorold. But Mr. Hinde states elsewhere that "the barony of Appleby was included in the grant to Ranulph de Meschines of the earldom of Carlisle." This was more probably the case, and therefore the barony never belonged to Thorold or to Ivo, but Meschin had it in his own right, and not in right of his wife. Mr. Eyton considered Meschin to have succeeded Ivo in Cumberland and Westmorland as well as in Lincoln, but there is no warrant for this supposition; otherwise Thorold would have been "Lord of Cumberland," which is impossible, according to the account given of that lordship by Mr. Hinde, for Thorold died before it was established.

[3] See charters Nos. 1, 4, 6, 12, 40. In support of the argument on p. 140, it should be remarked that Ivo's second charter (No. 6) gives the names of five places where the monks already had tithes, viz., Teteney, Alcobar, Normanby, Bolingbroc, and Beltisford. These places are doubtless referred to in Ivo's first charter, which speaks of the tithes given by Thorold and his men; and therefore they had all belonged to Thorold, which is a most important fact.

trusted upon a point about which he may well have had some tradition. But this could have been only a temporary arrangement, as Thorold made his original gifts to St. Nicholas of Angers, according to charter No. 4, so that Spalding was from the first a cell to that abbey.

From his surname it has been inferred that Thorold was Sheriff of the county of Lincoln, and, if so, he probably held the office for some years. He may have been succeeded in that office as well as in his lands by Ivo Taillebois, for Mr. Eyton gives some reasons for supposing that the latter was Sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1086.[1]

The date of Thorold's death is not stated, but it took place not later than the year 1085; he may have died some years before, leaving his daughter Lucy a minor and unmarried. He was certainly dead when Domesday was taken, and at the date of Ivo's charter in 1085. He evidently died at an early age, since his daughter survived him perhaps more than fifty years. There are two subsequent references to him, one in Pipe Roll, 31 Henry I, when his daughter paid a fine for his lands, and the other in Pipe Roll, 11 Henry II, when his great-grandson Hugh, Earl of Chester, paid a fine for his "fee," or rather for some estates which had not been restored to his grandmother, Countess Lucy.

Such indeed appears to be the true explanation of the obscure entry on the latter Pipe Roll, for on the death of Earl Hugh in 1181, the King assigned to "Bertra" his widow, as dower, the manors of Beltesford, Hemingeby, and Dunington.[2] Now the manor of Beltesford, with soke in Hemingeby, Dunington, and other places, had belonged to Thorold, and it was evidently not restored either to William de Roumare about 1122, or to the Countess Lucy in 1130, as Earl Hugh could not possibly have inherited it. In one of the Duchy Cowchers there is a charter by Ranulph (Gernons), Earl of Chester, granting a yearly rent out of his manor of Beltesford (1147-1153). He must have obtained the manor from the King by purchase, and the entry on the Pipe Roll of 11 Henry II refers either to the settlement of that account, or to the purchase of some other portion of the property by Earl Hugh. Thus the entry in the Pipe Roll of 11 Henry II is fully accounted for, and at the same time the theory that Thorold was the previous owner of all Ivo's estates, is confirmed.[3]

In fact, every fresh item of information tends to justify the effort which has been made to restore Thorold to his proper position as one of "the greater barons" of the kingdom.

Thorold's wife.

Thorold's wife is mentioned in two of the charters,[4] but no particulars as to her parentage or even as to her name are given. Here we

[1] Addit. MS. 31,929, f. 70.

[2] *Baronage*, i, 41, from *Rotulus de Dominabus et Puellis.*

[3] Possibly Earl Hugh acquired some of Thorold's lands in Halton. See a grant by Bretteya, Countess of Chester, of half a fee in Halton. (Duchy Grants in boxes, A. 74.) The distinction between the fees belonging to the barony of Chester in Lincoln and those belonging to the barony of Bolingbroke was long kept up, even after the whole of the latter barony came to Ranulph Blundvill as heir both to Earl Hugh and to William de Roumare. See Feodary of Lincoln, as before, pp. 1 and 14.

[4] Nos. 4 and 19.

obtain great assistance from a suggestion by Stapleton, who pointed out that the manor of Aulkborough, which is returned in Domesday as belonging to Ivo, is there stated to have previously belonged to William Malet. Stapleton shrewdly remarks that this severance from Malet's barony could only have been effected in his lifetime by a gift in frank marriage with a daughter. As Mr. Eyton says, this suggestion is made "in Mr. Stapleton's best manner," and it is only his method of applying it that is at fault. He regarded the passage in question as indicating that she was the wife of Ivo Taillebois. This we know to have been impossible, but the suggestion is none the less valuable. It can now be used to prove that Thorold's wife was the daughter of William Malet; and this conclusion is supported by the fact that at a later date Robert Malet, William's son, is called "uncle" of the Countess Lucy, Thorold's daughter.

The marriage between Thorold and Malet's daughter probably took place just before or soon after the Conquest, for if it had taken place long previously to that event, the gift in frank marriage would have consisted of lands in Normandy, and would hardly have been added to after Malet's settlement in England.[1]

The Malet family.

It will naturally be asked whether the discoveries made in the course of this inquiry throw any light on the question why William Malet is described by Guy of Amiens as "partly Norman, partly English."[2] To this it may be replied that his daughter seems to have married an Englishman, a fact not before known; and it may be worth while to remove a misapprehension as to the rest of Malet's description by the same writer. He is called "compater Heraldi," which Mr. Freeman takes to mean that he and Harold were godfathers to the same child; but the real meaning of the words surely is, that William Malet was godfather to Harold himself. Thus he may well have been regarded as "partly English," by relationship and by sympathy, if not by birth; and it was peculiarly appropriate that the burial of Harold's body should be committed to him.

Mons. Le Prévost, in a note to Mons. Pluquet's edition of Wace, is puzzled to know why William of Poitiers uses the word *concessit* in speaking of the delivery by the Conqueror of Harold's body to Malet for burial, as it implies a demand on Malet's part, for which he, the annotator, could see no cause arising from "*rapports particuliers*." This

[1] There is some probability that Thorold's wife was Beatrice, the sister of Robert Malet, who is mentioned in the cartulary of the priory of Eye (Dugdale's *Monasticon*, iii, 401, 404, 405; Addit. MS. 8177, ff. 100, 101, 109, 111, 114, 130b, 131b); but a charter of Henry I. speaks of her as the wife of "William de Archis," who may however have been her second husband. According to the Lindsey Survey, "William de Arcis" held lands in Scallabi, Redburne, Hibaldestow, and Gameltorp; and as Thorold had lands in all those places, it may be that William held them in right of his wife, she having had them in dower; but if so, she did not possess the whole of those estates, for Meschin is also returned as holding lands in all of them except Scallabi; besides, Osbern de Arcis, William's predecessor, had lands in Scallebi and Redburne in 1086.

[2] Freeman, iii, 466 (1st ed.); iii, 776 (2nd ed.) William's wife Hesilia (Crispin) is mentioned in a charter of Robert Malet to Eye priory, but Mr. Freeman seems to deny that relationship (iii, 776). A gift by William Malet to the abbey of Bec is referred to in the *Monasticon*.

difficulty is removed by the interpretation above proposed, which further promises some aid towards a clear understanding of the conflicting accounts of the burials by Malet and by Harold's mother. Malet has been looked upon as being merely the official executor of a stern mandate, but in granting the body to him, the Conqueror really made a concession to the dead hero's mother, whose wishes Malet would be sure to consult.

There seems to be nothing to prove that William's mother was English, a point on which Mr. Freeman insists, or that he was related to Harold's father or mother. But it may be questioned whether he would have formed an intimate friendship with Earl Godwin, and stood godfather to the Earl's child, unless there were some such relationship as Mr. Freeman imagines. That he was a personage of great consequence is evidenced by the vastness of the territories which were granted to him in England. Sir Alexander Malet, in his translation of Wace, adopts the suggestion of modern genealogists that Earl Algar married a sister of William Malet, but gives no proof.[1]

On William's death at the siege of York by the Danes in 1069,[2] his possessions descended to his son Robert Malet, about whom something has already been said. They were situate in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Lincoln, and other counties, only three of his manors being in the county of Lincoln, namely, Wellebrune, Bergebi, and Sechebroc. These are not mentioned in the Lindsey Survey, but they are described in Testa de Nevill as forming part of "the honor of Eye," which was the title given to the barony of Malet, the castle of Eye, in Suffolk, being its *caput*. They were probably seized with the honor by Henry I, and, being in the Crown, are not noticed in the Survey.[3]

Robert had a brother named Gilbert, and in the cartulary of Eye is recorded a charter, whereby their sister Beatrice makes provision for their souls as if she were their heir, which might also be inferred from the charter granting to Gernons the fee of his great-uncle; but I have made no inquiry in that direction.[4] It may however be observed that, according to Testa de Nevill, Gernons did not obtain any of Robert Malet's lands, as Henry II kept the honor of Eye in his own hands for more than thirty years.

Ivo Taillebois.

The ancestors of the Countess having been ascertained as far as is at present possible, we may now go on to put together the information relating to her three husbands.

The lands in Lincolnshire which are returned under the name of Ivo Taillebois were not given to him at the Conquest, as has always been

[1] Pp. 268-9. See also *Top. and Gen.* i, 15.

[2] Stapleton's Norman Pipe Rolls, ii, cliii.

[3] See *Testa de Nevill*, p. 296, where there is a concise but apparently not quite an accurate account of the history of the honor of Eye. Among other things it states that Henry I seized the honor and kept it for seven years, and then granted it to Earl Stephen his nephew, who held it for 22 years while he was King and Earl. According to this, Henry I seized the honor about 1125, but the Lindsey Survey was compiled before that date.

[4] Robert Malet occurs as witness to charters of Henry I. (*Mon.* i, 161, 437, old edit.) Ralph Malet and Walter Malet are mentioned in the Lindsey Survey, but were probably descendants of Durand Malet. Mr. Arthur Malet professes to trace down the male descendants of Robert and Gilbert for many generations. See also the Roll of Battle Abbey, by Burke, p. 73.

taken for granted, but he really obtained them by his marriage with Lucy, daughter of Thorold the Sheriff. Some writers[1] call him nephew of William the Conqueror; and a rubric in the Spalding register alleges that he came over with William. If he took part in the invasion, he would have received large rewards; but Domesday mentions only a few other estates in Norfolk, besides those in Lincoln, as belonging to him, and these may also have been Thorold's. His charter to St. Mary's, York, however, shows that he had lands in several places in Westmorland,[2] which Mr. Hodgson Hinde describes as the barony of Kendal. These he doubtless possessed in his own right. The same charter mentions his father and mother, but does not give their names.

From his charter to St. Nicholas of Angers it has been inferred that he came from Anjou, but he thereby merely enlarged a previous gift by his father-in-law, Thorold, so that the inference is not well founded. Ingulph calls him Count of Anjou; but Nichols has shown that he could not have borne that title, and in this paper it has been further shown that he was never "Earl of Lincoln," as has been supposed.[3]

The date of 1072 or 1073 has been assigned to his marriage with Lucy, under the mistaken idea that she succeeded Earls Edwin and Morcar, and was given with their lands to Ivo; but if Thorold did not marry till about the time of the Conquest, as is probable, the marriage of Ivo and Lucy would not take place till after 1080; but as Ivo was in possession of Thorold's lands in 1085,[4] it certainly took place before that date.

The charter to Angers (No. 4) speaks of "Thorold and his wife" as Ivo's ancestors, but this may mean only that they were his predecessors in title, the word being used here with the same meaning as in Domesday. Mr. Eyton indeed, referring to this very charter, explains the word "ancestors" in this sense.[5]

It has been suggested (p. 142) that the manor of Spalding was the chief residence of Ivo and Lucy. It was in fact more than a manor; there was a castle, known in modern times as Taillebois' Castle. This name was no doubt correctly given to it, for it must have been built before Ranulph Meschin's surrender; and after Lucy's final grant of the manor to the priory, it would be allowed to fall into decay.[6]

Mr. Eyton notes that Ivo claimed a mansion in Lincoln city formerly belonging to Stori, the Saxon lord of the great manors of Beltesford and Bolingbroc; that Ivo was on a royal commission concerning the rights of Ely abbey about the year 1079; and that Ivo attested a charter of William II about 1090. He gives some reasons for believing that Ivo

[1] Allen's *Lincolnshire*, i, 278; Cole's MS. 43 (Addit. 5844), p. 139; &c.

[2] Not Yorkshire, as in *Top. and Gen.*, i, 12.

[3] Ingulph appears to say that Ivo was a candidate for the earldom of Northampton and Huntingdon on the death of Earl Waltheof. His story that Ivo was taken prisoner in 1071, by Hereward, while defending Thorold, abbot of Peterborough, is very apocryphal.

[4] See charter No. 4, and Domesday.

[5] Addit. MS. 31,929, f. 70. The mention of Thorold's wife as an "ancestor" shows that she brought Thorold some property, doubtless the manor of Aulkborough.

[6] Allen's *Lincolnshire*, i, 293, gives particulars as to its remains in the last century. "The building of castles began late in the Conqueror's reign." (Lecture by Mr. J. H. Parker; Transactions of the Essex Archæol. Society, iv, 236.)

was Sheriff of Lincoln in 1086. He also makes some remarks on Ingulph's account of Ivo's rebellion and his banishment by William II.[1]

Ivo was living at the date of the fire at Croyland, 1091, according to Ingulph. He probably died about the year 1093. Peter of Blois appears to assign the date of 1114 as the date of his death, but William II's charter (No. 7) shows that he was dead before 1100.[2]

The question whether Ivo had a son named Ethelred or Eltred, who begat Ketel, &c., has already been dealt with, though not settled. If he had, it seems clear that Eltred was not the son of Lucy, as otherwise he would have had a better claim than William de Roumare to recover his mother's inheritance.[3]

It has been shown that Ivo had a daughter Beatrice, wife of Ribaud, Lord of Middleham, whose descendants are set out by Whittaker, and in the "Pedigree of Tailbois" before quoted; but she was evidently not the daughter of Lucy. She was in fact married and had a grown-up son before Ivo's death, according to charter No. 2,[4] and hence it may be inferred that she was Ivo's daughter by a previous wife. She was not the "only daughter, nobly espoused," who is said by Peter of Blois to have been the issue of Ivo and Lucy, for she did not die childless, as Peter alleges of Lucy's daughter. Peter may therefore refer to Matilda, daughter of Countess Lucy, mentioned in charter No. 24, and who would also be daughter of Ivo in case Peter is correct. Of course it is possible that Matilda was daughter of Roger FitzGerold; but it is more probable that she was Ivo's daughter, because she married Hugh, brother of her mother's third husband, thus becoming sister-in-law to her own mother, and therefore it is necessary to put the date of her birth as early as may be.

Beatrice's eldest son, Ralph, and it is said other sons, adopted the surname of Taillebois, probably because Ivo had no male descendants, and to keep up the name.[5]

A word or two as to Ivo's relations with Croyland. That abbey had lands in Spalding at the date of Domesday, though Ingulph alleges that

[1] Addit. MS. 31,929, ff. 69b, 70. It has been seen that a few of Ivo's lands did not apparently come to Meschin. Some of them may have been retained by the King on his restoration to favour after his rebellion. But the Lindsey survey comprises only part of the county, and for this reason Spalding, which is in Holland, is not returned among Meschin's lands in that Survey. It is indeed certain that Meschin had Spalding, for Lucy's second charter says she held it his lifetime.

[2] Gough alleges that Ivo was buried at Spalding in 1104. An "Ivo Taillebosc" is mentioned in a charter by the Princess Cecily, youngest daughter of William I, abbess of Caen, who is supposed to have filled that office from 1113 to 1127; but there seems to be some question as to these dates, and besides, this Ivo may not have been the same person as the Ivo of Domesday. (See an article by Thomas Stapleton in the Archæol. Journal, iii, 20-22, 26, referred to in Mr. Eyton's MSS.) The land of William Taillebois in Lincolnshire is described in Domesday. He may have been a brother or near relative of the Ivo of Domesday, and father of the Ivo referred to by the Princess Cecily.

[3] The land of "Edric," son of Ketel, was granted by Henry I to Walter de Gloucester (1115-23).—Duchy of Lanc., Royal Charters.

[4] It mentions Ribaud, Ivo's son-in-law, and Ralph Taillebois, probably Ribaud's son; and it appears to be of later date than No. 4.

[5] This Ralph was witness to one of Ivo's charters, and a charter of William I, in favour of the abbey of St. Alban's, is addressed to him. (Matthew Paris, vi, 33.) Several persons of the name of Taillebois are mentioned by D'Anisy.

its monks were expelled from Spalding priory as early as 1074. It is clear, however, that the abbey did not possess those lands at the date of Testa de Nevill, and therefore it is possible that the account of Ivo's seizure of them is true.[1] Under what pretence Ivo acted may, perhaps, be ascertained from a careful review of the facts. There seems to be no doubt that Thorold made a gift to the abbey of Angers, as well as to the abbey of Croyland. This may have caused some dispute, in which Ivo took the part of the former, and the more especially as Croyland was a Saxon foundation.

Roger FitzGerold de Roumare.

Roger FitzGerold appears to have been son or brother and heir of Robert FitzGerold,[2] who is returned as having lands in Hants, Berks, Wilts, Dorset, and Somerset, at the date of Domesday, but none in Lincolnshire. He married Lucy, daughter of Thorold the Sheriff, and widow of Ivo Taillebois, and succeeded in her right to her father's numerous possessions in Lincolnshire, and, perhaps, to a few in Norfolk. Their marriage took place probably soon after Ivo's death.[3] He is evidently addressed as Lord of Spalding and husband of Lucy in a charter of William Rufus (No. 7), that is, before 1100. He had no title of nobility above that of baron.

Roger and Lucy had issue William de Roumare, who afterwards bore the title of Earl of Lincoln.

The date of Roger's death is unknown. His "son and heir" William is mentioned under the date of 1118, by Ordericus Vitalis. It seems probable that William came of age just before that date, having been a minor when his father died.[4] There are several references to Roger in the charters of his son.

Ranulph Meschin de Bayeux.

Ranulph de Briquessart, Viscount of Bayeux, is not mentioned in Domesday, and therefore he had no estates in England.[5] His son Ranulph Meschin, however, became Lord of Carlisle, but probably not till the reign of Henry I, and the grant included the barony of Appleby.[6]

[1] Various charges are brought by the Croyland monks against Ivo; among others, he is said to have cut off the tails and ears of their cattle. Truly there is nothing new under the sun! (Ingulph, 71.)

[2] Stapleton calls him "brother" of Robert; Norman Pipe Rolls, ii, cliii. Robert FitzGerold was present at the Council held in London in 1082.

[3] There seems to be now no reason why the story that Lucy mourned Ivo with only moderate lamentations, and married again within a month after his death, "must fall to the ground . . . as historical, or rather poetical embellishment," as suggested in the "Annals of Lacock" (p. 71). As great disparity in age must have existed between Ivo and Lucy, there may be some truth in the story.

[4] A long account of the family of Roumare is given in the "Annals of Lacock" by Bowles and Nichols.

[5] He was one of the Norman nobles who conspired against William the Bastard on his accession to the Duchy of Normandy. (Archæol. Journal, xvi, 229, quoting William of Poitiers.) His wife Mahald and his *eldest* son Richard are mentioned in the *Liber Vitæ* of Durham. (*Ibid.*)

[6] See Introduction to Pipe Rolls for Cumberland, &c., p. xv, and Archæol. Journal, vol. xvi, p. 230; and a note by Mr. Luard to Matthew Paris, Chron. Majora, ii, 8. Mr. Luard considers that Ranulph's surname was "de Mezchines," or "de Messina," and the compiler of the Spalding Register calls him "de Messynes" (p. 117);

He is by some writers called Earl of Carlisle. but no such title is given him in the Lindsey Survey.

Meschin married Lucy, widow of Roger FitzGerold, probably about the year 1100, the marriage being referred to by Ordericus Vitalis.[1] Apparently he had no lands of his own in Lincolnshire before his marriage, but his brother, William Meschin, is returned as holding lands in that county.[2]

The lands which Ranulph received with his wife are described in the Lindsey Survey, and were practically co-extensive with those formerly belonging to Ivo Taillebois. That he did not become Earl of Lincoln by marrying Lucy, as alleged by Stapleton and Nichols, is patent to every one who inspects the original Survey. The words "Comes Linc.," on which they rely, do not form part of the text, but are written over his name in only two places out of many, and at a date long subsequent to the compilation; in fact, the handwriting of the annotations is of as late a period as the fourteenth century. The annotator had little or no better means of ascertaining the real titles of Ranulph Meschin than we have at present. Having, as I believe, exhausted all those means, I am unable to produce any evidence that Ranulph Meschin was known as Earl of Lincoln. But did the annotator really mean to imply that Meschin was Earl of Lincoln? By comparison with similar annotations it is evident that he did not, but that he was referring to an Earl of Lincoln of his own time, or a little earlier, probably to Henry de Lacy, who possessed Bolingbroke and Halton, over which names the words "Comes Linc." are written.[3]

but in all authentic records it is written Mischinus, Meschinus, or Meschin. Some recent writers use the form "le Meschin," but there is apparently no authority for the article. Wherever the Latin form is not found, "Meschin" simply is written. The proper spelling would perhaps be Mesquin. (See Cotgrave.) The word means "young," or "junior," and was used to distinguish the person bearing it from an elder person of the same family.

[1] Their eldest son Ranulph (Gernons) was born before 1109, for he was of age before 1130, as remarked by Stapleton, ii, cliv. They are said to have had three other children, viz., William, who is called Earl of Cambridge, Alice, or Adeliza, wife of Richard FitzGilbert, ancestor of the Clares, Earls of Gloucester and Hertford, and Agnes, wife of Robert de Grandmesnil. Dugdale; Banks, i, 210; *Top. and Gen.*, i, 17.

[2] Possibly Ranulph surrendered these to William on marrying Lucy. It is hard to learn to whom William's lands belonged in Domesday. They may have belonged partly to Durand Malet and partly to William le Blund. As to William being brother to Ranulph, see *Top. and Gen.*, i, 302. William Meschin and his son Ralph [de Bayeux ?] are mentioned in charter No. 46, p. 139. Hugh Fitz-Ranulph, another brother of R. Meschin, is mentioned in charter No. 24, and in Pipe Roll, 31 Henry I.

[3] Among the Duchy of Lancaster Records, and also in Léchaudé d'Anisy's "Extrait des Chartes" &c., there are numerous charters by and relating to "Ranulph, Earl of Chester." A few of these relate to Ranulph Meschin, and a few more to his son Ranulph Gernons, but most of them refer to Ranulph Blundvill, grandson of Gernons. There are also many other charters in which "Ranulph, Earl of Chester and Lincoln," is mentioned; and although the dates of some of these last is uncertain, owing to the obscurity of the names of the witnesses, it may with confidence be alleged that none of them relate to Meschin or Gernons, but all to Blundvill. I have been unable to find any instance of the application of the double title, "Chester and Lincoln," to the two former. Special reference may be made to the charter of Henry I to Ranulph Gernons, "Earl of Chester," (Royal Charters, Duchy of Lancaster), and to a charter of Ranulph (Gernons), "Earl of Chester," (Duchy of Lancaster, Grants in boxes, A. 65), as showing that this Earl was not known by the double appellation. Yet it has been alleged that he transferred his "share of the earldom" of Lincoln to Gilbert de Gant

It cannot therefore be supposed that the original compiler of the Lindsey Survey erred in omitting to give the title of Earl to Ranulph Meschin. That he would have inserted it, if due, may be inferred from the fact that he rightly calls Meschin's cousin "Earl Richard," in describing the latter's large possessions in the county. There is therefore no authority for the notion that Ranulph Meschin was Earl of Lincoln before he became Earl of Chester.

It may be surmised that the reason why no Earl of Lincoln was created probably was, that after the rebellion of Earls Edwin and Morcar their lands in Lincolnshire partly remained in the Crown, and were partly granted away in small portions to sundry persons. If Earl Edwin had lived, we should probably have found him described as Earl of Lincoln. He would no longer have been called Earl of Mercia, as the Norman idea, though not at all well defined, seems to have been that there should be an Earl to each county, or to two counties at most, whereas the Anglo-Saxon Earls of the eleventh century, especially those with whom we have been dealing, had much wider jurisdictions, which may be more appropriately described as duchies than as earldoms. The word "ducatus," from which "duchy" is derived, is indeed frequently used by the chroniclers to describe the dominion of those Earls, just as the word "dux" was used interchangeably with "comes" to indicate their personal status.

But, after all, is it certain that there was no Earl of Lincoln, in fact, if not in name, after the death of Earl Edwin? We have disposed of the imaginary claims of Taillebois and FitzGerold, and shown that Meschin did not use this title before he became Earl of Chester. But may not Hugh Lupus have been Earl of Lincoln as well as of Chester? Domesday (p. 336[b]), contains the following references to "the Earl" under the head of Lincolnshire.

"In the time of King Edward, the city of Lincoln used to render to the King 20*l.* and to the Earl 10*l.*; *now* it renders 100*l.* by tale between the King and the Earl."

"The customs (*consuetudines*) of the King and of the Earl in Sudlincolie render 28*l.*; in Norttreding, 24*l.*; in Westreding, 12*l.*; in Sudtreding, 15*l.*"

"Each hundred pays 8*l.* Twelve hundreds amend to the King, and six to the Earl."

"If any man shall be outlawed for any offence by the King and by the Earl and by the men of the shire (*vicecomitatus*), no one but the King shall be able to give him peace."

Now surely some one must have been Earl of Lincoln at that time. It so happens that among the tenants *in capite* in the county, there were two Earls, viz., "Earl Alan" (of Richmond and Britany) and "Earl Hugh" (of Chester). The former's lands were the more extensive, but the latter's possessions are described as being in "Nort Treding," "Sud Treding," &c., which seems to identify him with "the Earl" above mentioned.[1]

on the marriage of Gilbert with his niece, Rohese. In a charter recorded in the Spalding register he calls himself "Ranulph junior, Earl of Chester;" his brother, William de Roumare, being one of the witnesses.

[1] Domesday, pp. 349 a, b.

All authorities have however agreed in calling Hugh Lupus "Earl of Chester," and no one seems to have suggested that he may also have been Earl of Lincoln, as he well may have been. His predecessors, the Saxon Earls, are frequently described as Earls of Chester and Lincoln, as we have seen, but without any good authority. The Lincolnshire Survey also speaks of his son "Earl Richard" without any further title, as if he were Earl of that county; while Earl Alan's successor is distinguished therein as "Stephen, Earl of Britany." Moreover, Ranulph Blundvill, a descendant of the Earls Hugh and Richard, finally assumed the double title of "Earl of Chester and Lincoln," and alleged a claim to "the third penny" of the county of Lincoln, in right of his ancestors, formerly Earls of Lincoln. In one record the third penny is said to have belonged to him "ex parte R. Comitis patris (proavi ?) sui."[1] It has usually been assumed that he claimed as a descendant of the Countess Lucy; but the explanation just offered appears to be much more worthy of acceptance. Possibly Blundvill had two strings to his bow, for he married Constance of Britany, who was heiress to a descendant of Earls Alan and Stephen.[2]

Therefore when, in 1120, on the death of Earl Richard, who perished with his wife in the ill-fated "White Ship," without leaving any issue, Ranulph Meschin was permitted to succeed him, it may be inferred that he became not only Earl of Chester, as is usually stated, but also Earl of Lincoln. But the assertion already made, that he never used or was known by the latter title, still holds good. He was not allowed to succeed to the earldom altogether as a matter of right, but he had to offer a large sum of money, to be paid by instalments, the last of which was paid by his son in 31 Henry I.[3] At the same time he is said to have surrendered the lordship or earldom of Carlisle; but he did not give up all his possessions in Cumberland, for his son Ranulph Gernons granted lands in Calder, Egremont, and other places in that county to the monastery of Calder.[4] He also surrendered his wife's estates in Lincolnshire, though he had no right to do so, as they were the inheritance of his stepson. It is, however, presumable that he did not act from choice, but from necessity, as the surrender was doubtless insisted on by the King, who would naturally consider it dangerous to allow one subject to possess three such vast patrimonies.

The Countess Lucy.

It remains to summarise the facts relating to the principal figure in this genealogy.

Lucy was the sole daughter and heiress of Thorold the Sheriff, a fact which was unknown to the writer of "Ingulph," and has remained in obscurity ever since. She was born about 1067, and was married to her first husband Ivo Taillebois about 1083, to her second husband,

[1] Close Rolls, 1 Hen. III, p. 308[b]. If "R." be an error for "H.," the argument is equally good, for Earl Hugh Cyvelioc certainly inherited nothing from William de Roumare, Earl of Lincoln. See also 2 and 4 Hen. III, pp. 351[a], 355[a], 355[b], 438[a].

[2] He was also heir to the last William de Roumare, whose grandfather was called Earl of Lincoln, though there seems to be some doubt as to his creation, and Gilbert de Gant was Earl of Lincoln at the same time.

[3] See Pipe Roll.

[4] *Monasticon*, v. 339.

Roger FitzGerold de Roumare about 1093, and to her third husband Ranulph Meschin about 1100. She succeeded to no title above that of a baroness, in which degree she remained during the whole of her first and second, and part of her third nuptials. She did not attain the degree of Countess until her third husband became Earl of Chester in 1120, unless it can be shown that he was previously Earl of Carlisle.

In order to obtain the earldom of Chester, which had escheated to the Crown by the death of his cousin Richard d'Avranches, Ranulph Meschin surrendered to the King the lands of "his wife's inheritance;" but her son and heir apparent, William de Roumare, laid claim to those lands, and failing to obtain them he went in great wrath to Normandy, where he made war on the King to such purpose that he was allowed two years later to succeed to "a great part of his right."[1] On the death of Ranulph, according to the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I, Lucy paid the King a large sum for the restoration of her father's possessions,[2] which would doubtless mean such part of them as had not already been restored to William, though not the whole residue, as her son Earl Ranulph and her grandson Earl Hugh afterwards obtained a still further portion or portions. She also agreed to pay the King 500 marks, besides other sums to the Queen and others, for exemption from being compelled to re-marry for the period of five years. At the same time her son Ranulph, Earl of Chester, agreed to pay the King 500 marks for the agreement which the King had made between him and his mother concerning her dower.

The charters describe Lucy either as "Countess of Chester," or simply as "the Countess."[3] It appears that she was also called "the Countess of Bolingbroke," which title occurs five times in Testa de Nevill, where it is stated that she gave large benefactions to the priory of Spalding, viz., 8 carucates and 5 bovates of land in Pincebec, 8 carucates and 5 bovates of land in Spalding, 5 carucates of land in Weston, and 2½ carucates of land in Moleton; and that she also made a donation of 3½ carucates of land in Moleton to the abbey of Angers (?). These lands, except those in Spalding, at the date of Testa de Nevill, are stated to have been held of the honor of Bolingbroke.

During the lifetime of Ivo, she and her husband made the castle of Spalding their chief abode, and Ingulph says she kept her court there during Ivo's banishment by William Rufus; but it was given up by Meschin to the King in 1120. From her second charter, after Meschin's death, it may be inferred that Spalding was one of the estates of her father which she re-purchased in 1130, as otherwise she could not have given the charter.[4] Between 1120, when Meschin made the surrender, and 1129, when he died, the castle and manor were doubtless in the Crown; and during the same interval Lucy resided with her husband at Chester.[5] As on recovering Spalding she gave it up to the priory, it may be conjectured that she removed to Bolingbroke and made that her principal residence: whence the title last mentioned. The Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I states that

[1] Ordericus Vitalis; Dugdale's *Baronage*.

[2] The note to this passage in the printed edition is obviously incorrect.

[3] See *ante*, Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 25, 40, 42, 43.

[4] This affords an additional confirmation of the assumption that Thorold was her father, and the gifts above mentioned further prove her to have been an heiress.

[5] *Baronage*, i, 37.

she had agreed to pay the King 100 marks for the privilege of administering justice in her court among her tenants (*homines*), doubtless at Bolingbroke. Many later documents among the Duchy records show that her son William de Roumare, who afterwards bore the title of Earl of Lincoln, also made Bolingbroke his residence, and the seat of his earldom; but how he acquired the earldom remains to be seen. It is asserted in Allen's *Lincolnshire*, on the authority of a Harleian manuscript, that he built the castle there.[1]

It may, perhaps, be said that the title of "Countess of Bolingbroke" points to Lucy having been Countess of Lincoln rather than Countess of Chester, but "the Earl of Tutbury," in Staffordshire, was really Earl of Derby, though it is true that "the Earl of Arundel" was Earl of Sussex.[2] And it has been shown that the title of Earl was originally used without any reference to the name of a county. In agreement with this custom, the charters before recited prove that Lucy was mostly called "the Countess;" and as she evidently lived in state at Bolingbroke after 1130, it is easy to understand how she came by the appellation.[3]

In an old abstract of a charter of King Stephen to Ranulph Gernons, it is stated that some of the towers of Lincoln castle belonged to him, and that his mother had fortified one of those towers, to which, with the constableship of the castle and "Lincolnshire," his hereditary right was thereby acknowledged.[4] From this and other references to Lincoln castle in connexion with Gernons, it is inferred by Stapleton and Nichols that Gernons was necessarily Earl of Lincoln, but other records show the fallacy of this supposition.

Several charters in one of the Duchy of Lancaster Cowcher-books prove that "the constableship of Lincolnshire," "the wardenship of Lincoln castle," and "the barony of Eye" or "Haia," always went together. They belonged successively to Robert de Haia (temp. Hen. I, and Stephen?), Richard de Haia (temp. Hen. II), and Nichola, wife of Gerard de Camville (temp. Ric. I.)[5]

[1] Allen, ii, 102; Harl. MS. 6829, p. 162.

[2] *Top. and Gen.*, i, 6; quoting Dugdale's Preface. See, also, Lords' Report on the Dignity of a Peer, &c., pp. 407-9.

[3] Even if the objection that Bolingbroke was not in Cheshire were valid, it has been anticipated by the suggestion that Meschin may have been Earl of Chester and Lincoln, and therefore his widow might have adopted a title from any place in either county. The only authority, a very bad one, for calling Lucy "Countess of Lincoln," is a copy of an epitaph at Revesby on William de Roumare, in which he is called "William de Roumare, son of Lucy, Countess of Lincoln, founder of Clyve monastery." Another epitaph speaks of "William de Roumare, Earl of Lincoln, founder of Revesby." "Annals of Lacock," 78. Nichols, however, considers that the former epitaph relates to the grandson of Earl William, and that the words "Lucy, Countess of Lincoln," were inserted at a later date by some one who was ignorant of the true facts. I may further suggest that the writer of the epitaph probably knew that there was a William, Earl of Lincoln, and jumped to the conclusion that his mother "the Countess" also took her title from the name of that county only. Or he may have known that later Countesses of *Lincoln* were sometimes known as Countesses of Bolingbroke. See Inquisitions p.m. 37 Hen. III, No. 18, and Duchy Charters. Hence charter No. 23, abstracted above, may relate to one of these, and not to Lucy.

[4] Duchy of Lanc. Records, Div. 25, A. 9. See Annals of Lacock, 74, and Stapleton, ii, clvi. William of Malmesbury speaks of Gernons and *his* castle of Lincoln, p. 739.

[5] Duchy Cowchers, ii, 476, 480, 482. These people were the descendants of Colswain de Lincoln, and the barony of Eye belonged to Robert Malet; so it might be inferred that they, like Lucy and her son, were descended from Malet,

Although Henry II, in a charter, professes to grant the constableship to Richard de Haia, yet a charter of Richard I recognises that his father Robert de Haya had held it.[1] Richard de Haia and Matilda his wife granted to the abbey of Blancheland the vill of Cambringeham, "et el baile castelli Linconiæ;" and this grant was confirmed by "Nichola de Haya," daughter of Richard de Haya, in her widowhood. Richard of Devizes (*De rebus gestis Ric. I*) says:

"Gerardus de Camvilla, homo factiosus et fidei prodigus, homagium fecerat Johanni Comiti, fratri Regis, de castello Lincolniæ, cujus custodia ad hereditatem Nicholaæ, uxoris ejusdem Gerardi, spectare dinoscitur, sed sub rege."

Thus it would seem that the constableship of Lincoln castle was held jointly by the heirs of Thorold and Colswain, and that it had no connexion with the earldom of Lincoln. The castle was indeed a royal castle, having been built by William I. in 1068,[2] and had always belonged to the Crown. In 19 Edw. I, the "wardenship" of the castle belonged to Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln,[3] and on his death in 4 Edw II, the "constableship" was returned among his possessions.[4] He was a descendant of Lucy and Gernons, and as he married Margaret de Longespee, a descendant of Idonia, daughter and heir of Nichola above mentioned, and wife of William Longespee, Earl of Salisbury, he would have a double claim to the offices in question.

The year 1141 was assigned by Bowles and Nichols[5] as the date of Lucy's death, apparently under the impression that Rohese, Gernon's niece, had some claim to the earldom, as a descendant of "the first Lucy," and in that year succeeded "the second Lucy," and conveyed it to Gilbert de Gant by marriage.[6] But there is no foundation for this idea. Lucy's eldest son, William de Roumare, would of course be her next heir. Gough however alleges that Lucy was buried at Spalding in 1141, but he gives no authority for the assertion,[7] and it cannot well be relied on, as the rest of his statement is incorrect as the date of Ivo's burial.

---

perhaps by the marriage of Colswain with another daughter of William Malet, and that Robert Malet had held the constableship of Lincoln castle; but there is no proof of this, and besides it is clear that the barony of Haia, which belonged to the descendants of Colswain, was totally distinct from the barony of Eye, which belonged to the Malets, though the latter name is often spelt Haia or Heya. From what place named Hay or Haye Robert and Richard derived their names, I have not ascertained; they may have taken it from Eye, and if so, there were two baronies of that name. The name of Eye has also had an unfortunate tendency to become confused with another place whose name at first sight is quite different, namely, Hythe in Kent, because both Eye and Hythe were frequently spelt "Heya," the latter being once even spelt "Eya." Thus it has arisen that both towns lay claim to a charter of King John to the burgesses of "Heya," but no doubt that charter belongs to Hythe, as I pointed out to Mr. Jeaffreson. (See Historical MSS. Reports, x, part iv, p. 515.)

[1] Duchy Cowchers, ii, 476, 482, and Duchy Royal Charters. In the same way Duke Richard in 1189 *granted* to Gerard de Camville his wife's heritage, with the constableship of Lincoln Castle.

[2] Ordericus Vitalis, ii, 185 (ed. 1833).

[3] Duchy Cowchers, ii, 486.

[4] Inq. p. m. of that year, No. 51.

[5] Pp. 65, 74; on p. 72 they give the date as 1148, but this must be a misprint.

[6] In the *Top. and Gen.*, i, 17, Nichols writes as follows: "It appears that King Stephen, *after the death of the Countess Lucia*, granted investiture of the dignity to her two sons by her several husbands, as coparceners."

[7] Addit. to Camden, ed. 1789, ii, 238.

Here it is necessary to pause. It would be very instructive to go on and shew how the new lights we have obtained bear upon the later history of the Countess Lucy's descendants, and of the earldom of Lincoln; but this may well be left to another occasion. I believe I have succeeded in rejoining the dissevered portions of the history of the Countess, and restored her to her integrity after she had been treated by all modern antiquaries as two personages for more than fifty years. This alone would have been worth the doing, but it will have been seen that many other questions turn upon the question whether there was one Lucy or two. Thus the question as to her being an heiress could not have been settled without ascertaining the identity of the wife of Taillebois with the wife of Meschin; and the settlement of this question in its turn led to the reinstatement of Thorold, the discovery of her real parentage, and the elucidation of numerous disputed points in the pedigrees of the Earls of Mercia, Chester, and Lincoln, and of the families of Lincoln, Malet, and Roumare. Besides, many doubtful assertions and theories have been put to the test.

From a topographical point of view this inquiry has also been profitable. Something has been done to clear up the early history of large portions of the counties of Lincoln, Cheshire, Westmorland, Cumberland, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Dorset, and of the baronies or honors of Spalding, Bolingbroke, Chester, Lancaster (in Lincoln),[1] Eye, Haye, Carlisle, Kendal, and Appleby. Sundry incidental matters have also been dealt with from new points of view.

I therefore hope that this paper will not be considered to be of undue length; on the contrary, it may be expected that some of the subjects which have here been dealt with in a cursory manner will be thought worthy of much more extended dissertations.

Before concluding, it is worth while to point out one or two lessons which have been learnt in surmounting the difficulties of this inquiry. One is, that numerous charters, royal and other, of very early dates, are recorded in monastic registers, but are not enrolled among the public records, and that the transcripts of them are passably accurate. Many charters of the Norman Kings exist only in such registers, and are not to be found in the Cartæ Antiquæ, nor in subsequent confirmations on the Charter Rolls and the Patent Rolls. They are frequently of historical interest, or at least are of great value to the general historian, as well as to the local antiquary, and it is much to be desired that a complete collection should be formed of all charters of the first six Kings after the Conquest, whether existing in the rolls of Chancery or in the registers of monasteries.

It has been ascertained that "Ingulph" and Peter of Blois are not utterly unreliable. They were quite correct as to the three husbands of Lucy, although their statement has been scouted as ridiculous. They seem also to have known that she was an Englishwoman by descent, and a great heiress, but they wrongly jumped to the conclusion that she was the daughter of Earl Algar. They were further probably right as to Ivo and Lucy having had an only daughter. But the charters of Ingulph are evidently mere inventions.

[1] As to this, see the Feodary of Lincoln, p. 12.

It would be well to utter a word of caution against accepting the text of documents quoted in Dugdale's *Monasticon* without verification. Wherever they have been tested, they have been found to be most inaccurate, and the editors of the second edition seem to have done very little in the way of correction. The error in the printed version of Lucy's second charter consists only of the addition of the letter *t* to the word *tenui*, but it was sufficient to mislead all writers on the subject. This however is nothing to the flagrant errors which are to be found on almost every page.[1]

Lastly, the ill fate of the emendation under discussion demonstrates that the time has not yet come for attempting a general revision of the old or compiling a new Baronage of England. If all the evidence had been readily accessible, the emendators would never have advanced their unfortunate speculations. Until therefore much more is done to facilitate original research, even the most learned emendations of Dugdale will often stand in need of reamendment.

N.B.—A few misprints in the present paper require correction. On p. 65, note 1, *for* 7, *read* 8; p. 63, No. 18, *for* same monks, *read* monks of Spalding; p. 69, note 1, *for* 24, *read* 26; p. 70, note 1, *for* 36, *read* 37; p. 70, No. 38, *for* the tower (*sic*) and city, *read* the tower and the city; p. 71, No. 41, *for* 36, *read* 37; p. 74, note 1, *add* Simeon of Durham; p. 138, last line, *for* slight, *read* unsatisfactory; p. 140, line 28, *for* is very, *read* may seem, and see p. 159, note 3; p. 141, line 26, *for* cousin, *read* kinsman, and see p. 66, note 2.

---

[1] For a very marvellous specimen of misquotation the reader is referred to a passage touching a later Ivo Taillebois in vol. iii, p. 553, which should be compared with the original entry in Testa de Nevill, p. 393. Among other things, "Rex I." (*i.e.* Rex Johannes) is converted into "Rex primus (*i.e.* Willelmus Conquæstor)."