THE FAMILY OF LINCOLN.

In a previous paper[1] I had occasion to refer to the early history of the Lincoln family, and produced sundry fresh items of information which led me to reject to a large extent previous speculations on the subject, and to reconstruct the pedigree on a fresh basis, while retaining some few of the old notions. But it appears necessary to carry the process of rejection still further.

It will be recollected that Alfred de Lincoln was succeeded in his great Lincolnshire barony by Alan de Lincoln, and that most writers have assumed the latter to have been *brother* of the former, but that Mr. Freeman considers Alan to have been rather the *son* of Alfred, because he discovered a notice of Robert son of Alfred de Lincoln, who would, therefore, hardly have been succeeded by a brother.

This Robert and his father were however located in Dorset, and it has always seemed difficult to account for the migration of the family from Lincoln to the southern county. But Mr. Thomas Bond, in his addenda to the last edition of Hutchins' Dorset (i. pp. 609, 718, 719), proposes to surmount this difficulty by suggesting that Alfred de Lincoln, "the favoured Englishman," as Mr. Freeman calls him, married the widow of Hugh FitzGrip, whose estates in Dorset are set out in Domesday Book (p. 83 b.), because it can be shown from the Black Book of the Exchequer and from Testa de Nevill that the family of Lincoln succeeded to most of those estates. There is no actual proof of the marriage, but Mr. Bond refers to a charter of King Henry I. in 1106, confirming a gift by Alfredus de Nicola (*i.e.*, Lincoln) to the monks of Tewkesbury of "two hides of Purbeck and one hide with two tithes."[2] I find also that in the following year, 1107, Henry I. again confirmed the same gift in the same words, which are not very precise. They are elucidated by a confirmation charter of Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, in 1109, in which the tithes are described as follows:—"Duas decimas de elemosina Aelfredi de Nichola, vidlt. decimam de Tachetona et de la Harpine."[3] On further reference to Domesday (p. 84), it is found that the widow FitzGrip had estates in Herpere and Tacatone; and she is also returned as holding two carucates in the "Hundred of Porbiche" under William de Braiose (p. 82).

Here is presumptive evidence of the supposed marriage, but I have shown that Alfred de Lincoln possessed other estates in Dorset which

[1] Vol. v. pp. 153-157.

[2] *Monasticon*, ii. 66; Charter Roll, 28 Edw. I., Nos. 2, 16; Patent Roll, 10 Henry IV., part 2, m. 16 (not 5, as in Dugdale). These monks were originally settled at Cranborne in Dorset. Dugdale prints only one of the charters of Edward I., omitting No. 2, which inspects the charter of 1107; and in the middle of No. 16 he interposes a misleading reference to the confirmation of Henry IV. Had he really quoted from this last, he would have given us both the charters of Edward I., which were dated at the same place and time, *viz.*, at Carlisle, 1st July (1300). In confirming the charter of 1107, Edward I. wrongly speaks of Henry I. as his *proavus*, which term he usually applies to Henry II. Several other charters of Henry I. are confirmed by his successors, besides those mentioned above.

[3] *Monasticon*, ii. 69, 70; MS. Cotton. Cleop. A. vii, f. 74b.

did not belong to the widow, such as Gillingham and Brugia.[1] Moreover, Mr. Bond has given a number of interesting particulars relative to East Holme, where there was a cell to the priory of Montacute, and he presumes this cell to have been founded by Alfred de Lincoln, because the prior was bound "to find four monks chanting throughout the year for the souls of Aluered, de Lyncoln, and of his progenitors and successors,"[2] no mention being made of the widow, though "Holne" was part of the priory's lands in Purbeck, where her two carucates were situate. But I believe these were not identical with the two hides given by Alfred, for an undated charter of Henry I. confirms "duas hidas in Porbica de feodo Roberti de Clavilla," which seems to show by what tenure Alfred held them. Turning to Domesday, we find that Walter de Clavile held two and a quarter hides in Holne, or Holme in the Isle of Purbeck. If this were the locality of Alfred's two hides, it is evident that he did not acquire them by the alleged marriage, and we need not wonder that the monks were not bound to pray for the widow.[3]

In the Black Book (Hearne, p. 88) there is a list of the Knights who held fees of Glastonbury Abbey in the time of King Henry I., including "Aluredus Senior de Lincoln," who held five knights' fees. These may have belonged to the widow, for in Domesday she is returned as holding Odiete and part of Adford, in Dorset, of that abbey; but an Aluredus is also returned as holding part of Adford, in Dorset, and Sapeswich, in Somerset, of the same abbey; so that it is not safe to assume that Alfred de Lincoln became tenant to the abbey in right of his wife. Thus the only known fact which would corroborate the inference above referred to cannot be thoroughly relied on, as there is apparently nothing to show that Alfred held any of her other estates except those above mentioned. In the reign of Henry II., according to the Black Book, the fees of Alfred Senior belonged to another "Alfredus," who was doubtless the son of Robert de Lincoln, son of Alfred Senior.

There is, therefore, some room for doubt whether the Lincoln family acquired their lands in Dorset by the supposed marriage, for the widow may have died without heirs, and her lands with others may have been given by the King to Alfred. Yet Mr. Eyton, in his "Key to Domesday, Dorset" (p. 78), without qualification and without giving any reasons, boldly states that Alfred married the widow, and he describes Alfred as "her second husband."[4] If this

[1] Vol. v. p. 153.

[2] Inquis. p.m., 9 Edw. I. No. 47.

[3] Mr. Bond has kindly sent me a table showing which of the widow's lands are known to have come to the Lincoln family. The descent of many of them is not made out. Of those which can be traced the greater portion went to the Lincolns, and the rest to the family of Goviz.

[4] In the same work Mr. Eyton calls Alfred "an Anjovin," but gives no reason for the appellation. We know from his Lincoln MSS. that he was of opinion that Ivo Taillebois, Alfred de Lincoln, and Alan were brothers, and that Ivo came from Anjou, but both these ideas have been shown to be groundless. (See Vol. v. pp. 154, 163.) Still it may be remarked that the name of "Alveredus" was not so undoubtedly Anglo-Saxon as Mr. Freeman supposes. In the charter of Richard II., Duke of Normandy, to the monastery of Fécamp, about the year 1001, the name of "Alveredus Vicecomes" occurs among the Norman Viscounts who attest it. The same name was not uncommon in Normandy after the Conquest, and is translated

view should prove to be the true one, then Alfred set a precedent to his granddaughter the Countess Lucy by marrying three times; for if Thorold the Sheriff was his son by an English wife before the Conquest, we may still retain Mr. Freeman's view that Alfred married a Norman lady directly after the Conquest and that Alan was their son. And if the supposed marriage with the widow FitzGrip took place at all, it was after 1086, and Robert would be her son.

I have thus endeavoured to state all the facts relating to the early members of the Lincoln family, as well as the theories which have been built on them. But one fact has not received the attention it deserves. In the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I. both an Alfred and a Robert de Lincoln are mentioned as having been pardoned certain sums due from them, evidently as landowners in Dorset; and at the same time Alfred paid a fine for having the manor of Puleham in that county as long as he should live. I merely noted these references to Alfred in my original paper because, influenced by the existing theories, I concluded that he was a later Alfred, the successor of Robert, with whom I was not concerned, and this may have been the case.

On reconsideration, however, I feel bound to point out that there is an alternative. It may be strongly suspected that the Alfred and Robert thus mentioned in 1130 were identical with the "Alveredus de Lincol' et Robertus filius ejus" who gave Gillingham and Brugia to Montacute priory, as they are mentioned after Robert de la Haye in the charter of Henry II.;[1] and that the description given by Ordericus Vitalis of "Rodbertus Alveredi de Lincolia filius," in 1138, really applies to these two. Now, as I have shown that the Alfred de Lincoln of Domesday died before the compilation of the Lindsey Survey (1112-1119), it would follow, if this view be correct, that Mr. Freeman is mistaken in identifying Robert as a son of the Domesday Alfred, and his argument that Alan de Lincoln was necessarily the son, rather than the brother, and heir of that Alfred, would fall to the ground, were it not supported by the fact that Alan lived till thirty years or more after his predecessor in title.

Alan de Lincoln is also mentioned in the roll of 1130, under Lincolnshire, and it was doubtless these notices of an Alfred and an Alan as living at the same time, taken in connexion with the dubious reference to Alan in 1082, which induced Dugdale erroneously to describe the Domesday Alfred as a contemporary of Alan, and Stapleton to assume that they were brothers.

This view of the case further leads one to question whether the Alfred who gave lands and tithes in Dorset to the monastery of Cranborne or Tewkesbury, in or before 1100, is not more likely to have been the Dorset Alfred of 1130 than the Lincoln Alfred of 1086. *Primâ facie*, a man whose large barony was situate in the north, would hardly have shown so much partiality for southern monasteries.

"Auvré" by modern French writers. It is curious that, judging from the Domesday lists, the name of Alfred was not so comparatively popular in England as might have been expected. It is, however, significant that one of the charters of Henry I. and the charter of the Bishop of Salisbury give the Latinised Anglo-Saxon form of the name, Aelfredus, as above, though in the charter of 1107, the Norman-Latin form Alueredus occurs. Norman writers would hardly convert a Norman name into a Saxon one, though they might do the reverse.

[1] *Monasticon*, v. 167.

It may also be that the witness to the Rheims charter between 1102 and 1107 was the Dorset Alfred, and therefore the Lincoln Alfred may not have lived to quite so late a period as I supposed.[1]

No doubt the Alfred of 1130 was related in some way to one of the northern families of Lincoln, but it may be assumed that he was not the eldest son of any one of them, and had no lands in Lincolnshire, and that he obtained part of his estates in Dorset and Somerset by marriage with an heiress, probably with the widow FitzGrip. On this point Mr. Thomas Bond's researches may be profitably reverted to.

It will then be asked, was he a son of the Domesday Alfred? I do not think it is imperative to suppose so. He was an Anglo-Saxon by birth, judging from the manner in which his name is spelt in the Tewkesbury charters, and he was probably named after the great Lincoln Alfred. But, seeing that Robert de la Haye, a successor of Colswain de Lincoln, made grants to the very same monasteries of Tewkesbury and Montacute, it is more reasonable to conjecture that this Alfred was a relative, perhaps a younger son, of Colswain; though it is remarkable that the Malets, the relatives of the Lincoln Alfred, likewise held knights' fees of Glastonbury Abbey; which fact, however, may only point to the intimate relationship between them and both the Lincoln families, and of the latter to each other. The description "Aluredus Senior" (temp. Hen. I.) is used in the Black Book to distinguish him from "Alfredus" [son of Robert], who was in possession of the Dorset estates in 8 Henry II. (1161-2) according to the Pipe Roll of that year, and in 12 Henry II. (1165-6) according to the Black Book.

It should be remarked that Robert de Lincoln also probably married an heiress, as he was evidently holding lands in Dorset in his father's lifetime; and this may explain how some estates which had not belonged to the widow FitzGrip came into the family, though Holne, Gillingham, and Brugia seem to have belonged to Alfred. A Robert de Lincoln occurs in the Pipe Roll of 12 Henry II., under Lincolnshire, but the Dorset Robert was dead before that date.

I venture to submit this new interpretation to the consideration of genealogists, as it seems to be at least as plausible as previous suggestions, and removes all difficulties.[2] However that may be, we are now in a position to accept any fresh evidence which may turn up, and this was far from being the case previously.

Some surprise may be expressed at the narrow period above assigned to the Lindsey Survey. Attempts have been made to reduce the limits, 1101-1120, between which it is supposed to have been compiled, but with only doubtful success, judging from Mr. J. H. Round's remarks in a previous volume of the GENEALOGIST.[3] I have shown that Colswain was succeeded by his son Picot, or Pikot, and that Picot was succeeded by his son-in-law Robert de Haia.[4] Further, I have called attention to Picot's interesting charter to Spalding, dated on Sunday, 14th May, 1111,[5] and to the fact that in the Lindsey Survey Robert de Haia is returned

[1] Vol. v. p. 156.

[2] Among other things, according to this view, Robert could have had no claim to Alan's fee. (See Vol. v. p. 156.)

[3] Vol. iv. pp. 205-213.

[4] Vol. v. p. 157.

[5] Vol. v. p. 69.

as holding the barony of Colswain. Therefore, as Picot was living in 1111, the survey could not have been taken till after that year. The other extreme date is fixed by the fact of Ranulph Meschin being returned in the survey as in possession of the estates which he surrendered in 1120. Thus, taking no account of the odd months, we may confine the possible period of the compilation to the years between 1112 and 1119, reducing the previously wider limits by about twelve years, which must be important to the proper understanding of many matters therein recorded, but does not affect the Countess Lucy controversy.

Picot's charter is also noticeable because it mentions that he then had two grandchildren. It is consequently reasonable to assume that he was about sixty years of age in 1111, and was born about 1050, so that his father Colswain would have been born about 1020. On this ground it seems impossible that Colswain could have been son of Alfred de Lincoln (the first), as argued by Mr. Freeman, and thus another modern theory goes by the board. If there were any relationship between them, Colswain was more probably the brother than the son of Alfred; and it should be noticed that Colswain's barony is described immediately *before* Alfred's in Domesday. But the suggestion that Alfred was twice married, and had part of his family before the Conquest and part afterwards, is still valuable.

To sum up the Lincoln pedigree: we have been dealing with three distinct families, which may, however, have been related in the manner above indicated.

(1) Alfred de Lincoln, living in 1086, was succeeded in his barony by his son Alan de Lincoln, whose daughter Margaret married Ranulph de Bayeux. Thorold the Sheriff was also apparently a son of this Alfred, by a former marriage, for reasons already given, and was succeeded by his daughter the Countess Lucy.[1]

(2) Colswain de Lincoln, living in 1086, was succeeded by his son Picot, who was living in 1111, after which date he was succeeded by Robert de Haia, whose wife Muriel seems to have been daughter and heiress of Picot.

(3) Alfred de Lincoln, who probably married the widow Fitz Grip, was living in 1130. He was succeeded soon after by his son Robert, who was succeeded by another Alfred, living in 1165-6, and whose widow in 10 Richard I. paid a fine to marry again.

I append some further notes touching the relatives of the Lincoln family, as supplementary to what was stated in my original paper.[2]

THE COUNTESS LUCY.—Since the abstracts of the Lucy Charters were printed, three more charters referring to the Countess have been published by the Rev. Joseph Stevenson in the eleventh Report of the Historical MSS. Commission, part vii. p. 59 (on the MSS. of the Marchioness of Waterford, at Ford Castle, Northumberland). Two of

[1] As to Thorold's wife, it is necessary to add these words to the note in Vol. v. p. 161 :—but none in Hibaldestowe or Gameltorp, which is very important.

[2] To the list of early members of the Lincoln family given in Vol. v. p. 154, note 4, line 2, should be added Norman de Lincolia, who held a church in the borough of Derby, as stated in Domesday, p. 280. It should be further noticed that Aluredus de Lincole held one small estate and claimed another in Rutland (p. 293 b), but not as an undertenant, though he is included in Ellis's third list.

them are charters by Henry II. to the nuns of Stikeswald, in Lincolnshire, and refer to a gift of land in Hundinton, made by "the Countess Lucy" and Earl Ranulph (her son ?). The third is a charter by Hamo de Hundingtone, son of Toli, granting a bovate of land there which his father had bought of Lucy the Countess, and seven selions of land which Lucy the Countess held of his father in Wornabe. There is also a charter by "William the Earl de Roumare," Lucy's eldest son, relating to the same land of Hundinton.

Tanner states that the Countess Lucy founded a nunnery at Stixwould in the reign of King Stephen, and he refers to the charter of foundation, but his reference is incorrect. There, is however, an inspeximus by Henry IV. of a charter of Henry, Duke of Normandy, who confirmed the donation which "Lucy the Countess," Ranulph, Earl of Chester, and "Willelmus Comes Rosmar'," had made to the nuns of Stikeswald, "as their charters testify," the names of the witnesses showing that the charter was granted between 1143 and 1154.

A register of this abbey formerly belonged to the Coventry family, and, if still extant, should be consulted for the charter which must have been made by the Countess, and which ought to prove very instructive.

A late reference to the Countess occurs in the Valor Ecclesiasticus of Henry VIII., where she is erroneously stated to have been the founder of Spalding priory. Thorold was of course the founder, though his daughter was no doubt considered to be its chief benefactor. The entry is also remarkable because it is the only record which gives her the title of "Countess of Lincoln," but in this respect it is of no authority. As it is curious in other ways, it will be useful to quote it fully.

"In moneys distributed, to wit, yearly to thirty poor people in the vills of Multon and Awkbarow, for the soul of Lucy, Countess of Lincoln, foundress of the monastery aforesaid, to wit, to each of them 3½ ells of woollen cloth called 'duds,' price of the ell 8*d.*, with 28*s.* as of the price of seven quarters of beans, called 'pardon benys,' distributed to the poor there, of the foundation of the said Countess, 4*l.* 18*s.*"

By these doles the memory of the great Countess was kept green till the priory's dissolution.[2]

THE MALET FAMILY.—It is worth noting that the French editor (Mons. Le Prévost) of Ordericus Vitalis inclines to the belief that William Malet may have been "established in England previously to the Conquest" (ii. 151). A Robert Malet, like an Alfred de Lincoln, was a tenant of Glastonbury Abbey in the reign of Henry I. to the extent of twelve knights' fees, in which he was succeeded by another William Malet, temp. Hen. II.[1] This William was witness to a charter dated after 1154, and quoted by D'Anisy (ii. 388).

[1] In his Domesday Studies, Somerset, pp. 60, 61, Eyton expresses a doubt whether Robert Malet, the abbey's tenant, was identical with the Robert son of William who suffered forfeiture and banishment early in the reign of Henry I., as there is no evidence that the latter was restored. This agrees with the view stated in Vol. v. p. 162. But, though the latter forfeited the lands he held of the King, may not he or his son have retained lands held of the abbey? The Malets, however, like the Lincolns, are not mentioned in Domesday Book under Somerset, where Robert de Corcelle is returned as holding the estates which they subsequently obtained.

[2] She may possibly have been "the famous heroic princess" who dwelt at Alkborough, where "Countess Close" is situate. See the curious tradition in Abraham De la Pryme's Diary, p. 164. (Surtees Society.)

Ivo Taillebois.—"Hermentrude,"[1] referring to the allegation that Ivo was nephew of William I., states that the records of St. Martin d'Auchier, near Aumale, show that he was *not* the son of Adelais, the Conqueror's sister. One event in his life may be added to those which have been stated. He was appointed by William Rufus to be one of the custodians of the temporalities of the bishopric of Durham when that King deprived the Bishop for taking the part of Duke Robert.[2]

Ralph Taillebois.—The person to whom William I.'s writ was directed[3] was not the son of Beatrice, but the Ralph who is mentioned in Domesday as the late holder of lands in Herts, Bucks, Cambridge, and Bedford, some of which remained in his widow's hands, others in his daughter's. This makes it all the more certain that the Ralph mentioned in Ivo's charter to York Abbey (1088-93?) was the son of Beatrice.

Roger FitzGerold.—This baron was a witness to a charter of King William (II?) to the abbey of Tewkesbury, recited in the Charter Roll of 28 Edw. I. Mr. Eyton, in the work above quoted (p. 76), considers Roger to have been elder brother of Robert FitzGerold, and that they were both brothers of Edward de Sarisberie. The first portion at least of this conjecture has no good foundation, as Roger does not seem to be mentioned in Domesday Book. He also states that the son of Roger claimed to be heir of Robert in the reign of Henry I.

De Haia or De la Haye.—The close connexion between this family and the Lincolns is further evidenced by the two charters of Henry I. to Tewkesbury in 1100 and 1106,[4] which mention grants by Robertus de la Haia to that Abbey along with those of Alfred de Lincoln; Robert Malet being a witness in 1100. The former charter confirms a gift, by Robert de la Haia, of Ceotol and the churches of his demesne; the latter, a gift by Robert de Haia of the mill of Raz and certain fisheries. As these gifts were made before he succeeded to Picot's estates, we have here evidence that he was previously a landowner. "Ceotel," in Dorset, had belonged to Aiulf the Chamberlain in 1086, but the rest of Aiulf's lands did not belong to Robert, apparently. Robert de Haia possessed many lands in Lincolnshire which had not belonged to Colswain, among them being Middle Rasa.[5] If this were the same as Raz, he was settled in Lincolnshire long before he obtained Picot's barony. It should be noticed that the Lindsey Survey does not mention many of the lands which had been Colswain's, and some would almost appear to

[1] *Notes and Queries*, 6th S. vi. 395. There is a long correspondence on these matters in this and previous volumes of *N. & Q.*, between Mr. Goulton Constable (who gave me the references to the Valor Eccl. and De la Pryme), Mr. Edmund Waterton, Mr. A. S. Ellis, Col. Harold Malet, and others.

[2] Archæol. Journal, xvi. 231. The Bishop was not Flambard, as there stated, but St. Carilef.

[3] See Vol. v. p. 164, note 5.

[4] Charter Roll, 28 Edw. I. No. 16; Patent Roll, 10 Hen. IV. part 2, m. 16. In the *Genealogist*, iv. 138, Mr. J. H. Round calls the latter confirmation "a mere *Inspeximus*," made "some three centuries" afterwards; a most unfortunate remark. There can be no doubt that the Chancellor always actually *saw* the original charters which the King professes to inspect, or a previous enrolment of them, as the case might be. In the present instance, Henry IV. does not profess to have seen the charters of Henry I., but two charters of *inspeximus* by Edward I., who quotes from the originals of his predecessor.

[5] Some of them had belonged to Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. Robert seems to have had nothing by inheritance in England.

have gone to other persons; hence it might have been suspected that Robert suceeeded to only part of them, and that Picot left co-heiresses, or that part of the barony had been seized by the Crown; but most of the missing estates are afterwards found in the possession of Gerard de Camville, successor in title to Robert de Haia, so that there can be little doubt but that he acquired the whole honor. Richard de la Haye was witness to a charter of Henry, Duke of Normandy, abstracted by D'Anisy (i. 362), who also refers to several others of this name. It may be suspected that the surname was a Norman one. The family, in fact, had lands in Normandy as well as in England, and gave some of both to the abbey of Essey. In the Black Book Aluredus de Lincolnia (junior), in 12 Henry II., returns Sanson de Lincolnia and Willelmus de Haia among his knights.

Ranulph Meschin and the County of Carlisle.—I have shown that Ranulph Meschin is not called Earl in the Lindsey Survey, as commonly supposed, although at that time he must have been in possession of whatever honour he held in the north.[1] Consequently it is certain that he was never Earl of Carlisle, as he is called by many writers. This fact was unknown to Mr. Hodgson Hinde, who, though he rejects the dates assigned by chroniclers to the supposed creation, does not cease to write of the earldom of Carlisle.

In the appendix to his "Reign of William Rufus," Mr. Freeman has a long article headed "The Earldom of Carlisle," in which there is a summary of the literature on the subject; and recently Professor Creighton, in his "Carlisle," has referred to the creation by Henry I. of an Earl of Carlisle. For this the latter has been taken to task by Mr. J. H. Round,[2] who, however, leaves it to be inferred that nothing of the kind was created, being influenced probably by Lappenberg, who, in correcting Palgrave, falls into that error.[3]

What was actually created by William II. or Henry I. can be ascertained by perusing the charters recorded in the register, or registers, of Wetherall Priory, extracts from which are given by Dugdale.[4] Mr. Hinde, it is true, rejects "the pretended confirmation charter of William I. to that monastery" as a "palpable forgery,"[5] but that charter professes to have been granted by William II., which makes all the difference, though the title of "Earl of Cumberland" contained in it is suspicious, as the district was not then called by that name, and one would desire to see the original entry. On the other hand, Mr. Hinde refers with approval to "the real foundation charter" of Ranulph Meschin.[6] It should be remarked that the donor calls himself by his simple name, without any title whatever. But the important point in this charter is its address, which runs as follows:—"To Richerius, Sheriff of Carlisle, and to all his (Ranulph's) men, French and English, who dwell within the *power of Carlisle*."

[1] Vol. v. 166, 167. [2] *Athenæum*, 26 Oct., 1889.

[3] Lappenberg's suggestion that Matthew of Westminster's date of 1072 is a mistake for 1122 will not hold water. It is noticeable that Matthew does not really state that an earldom was created at all, or that such creation took place in 1072. He says, "Hijs temporibus regebat comitatum Carleoli Comes Ranulphus de Micenis," &c. It may rather be conjectured that he had some authentic but undated information on the subject, and did not know where to insert it.

[4] *Monasticon*, iii, 553, 582 *seq.* Dugdale derived his extracts from three sources.

[5] Pipe Rolls, Cumb., p. xviii.

[6] *Ibid.*, and Archæol. Journal, xvi. 229. See also Hodgson's Northumb., 197.

The regal style here adopted may be considered as proving that Ranulph Meschin had comitival and palatine jurisdiction over a district which he himself calls a power (*potestas*),[1] though it was evidently a shire or county; and he must have had the appointment of the Sheriff, whom he addresses as his own officer. His rank was thus not inferior to that of a *Comes*. Few Earls, indeed, had so much authority.

Matthew of Westminster is, therefore, strictly correct in saying, "regebat comitatum Carleoli," though the context has led all writers to construe this as "earldom" rather than as "county," both of which meanings belong to the word *comitatus*. Yet he would hardly talk of "ruling" an earldom. Nor is the *Chronicon Cumbriæ* far out in using the description "totam terram de comitatu Cumbriæ." Meschin may not have had all the land, but he had jurisdiction over the whole.

Another definition of Meschin's barony is given in the Wetherall register, which quotes a charter of King Henry I., about 1131-2, confirming to St. Mary's Abbey, York, a gift made "in the time when Ranulph Earl of Chester had the *honor of Carlisle*." But Edward III.'s *inspeximus* of a similar charter merely says, "as they (the monks) had when Randulph Earl of Chester had Carlisle."[2] At any rate, Henry I. never called Carlisle an earldom.

We are not, therefore, authorised to call "the power of Carlisle" an earldom, though it was very like one. It would be more correct to call it a palatinate or a marquisate, though "marquis" was considered to be an *estraunge noun* in England, even so late as the year 1400.[3] But, as a matter of fact, Meschin had honour and power without title. At a later date, in Testa de Nevill, he is called merely "Lord of Cumberland."

Ranulph Meschin and Calder Abbey.—Relying on the *Monasticon* (v. 339), I suggested that Ranulph Gernons possessed lands in Cumberland, and gave some of them to Calder Abbey.[4] There was some doubt about the matter, as the charter professes to be made by Ranulph Meschin, though the abbey is alleged not to have been founded till 1134, five years after the death of Ranulph Meschin, Earl of Chester, and the editors of the *Monasticon* professed to settle this difficulty by supposing the gift to have been made by the Earl's son Ranulph Gernons. But it has at length been more satisfactorily dealt with by the Rev. A. G. Loftie in his recent History of the Abbey (pp. 44, 45), where it is suggested that the lands in question were really given by "Ranulphus Meschinus filius Willelmi filii Ranulphi," who is mentioned in charters to St. Bees' Priory. I presume this Ranulph to have been the same person as Ranulph de Bayeux, who was nephew of Ranulph Meschin, Earl of Chester, and married Margaret, daughter of Alan de Lincoln.[5] Consequently there is no reason to

[1] This word calls to mind the governors of Venetian territories, who were called *podestà*.

[2] Charter Roll, 5 Edw. III. No. 66. This inspects two charters similar to those noticed in my abstracts, Nos. 11 and 17. There is no confirmation of the supposed charter of William II., but it is remarkable that in Patent Roll, 40 Edw. III. p. 2, m. 34d., the King states that the priory of Wetheral "is of the foundation of our progenitors, formerly Kings of England."

[3] Nicolas, however, quoting Cruise, "derives the appellation from the word *Marchio*, which had been used for many ages to describe both Earls and Barons, but especially those who were Lords Marchers, or Governors of frontier provinces."

[4] Vol. v. p. 168.

[5] Vol. v. pp. 156, 157, 166.

suppose that Earl Ranulph the first retained any of his Cumberland property after 1120.

RANULPH MESCHIN AND BELTISFORD.—It will be remembered that Meschin surrendered this great lordship, in 1120, with the rest of his wife's inheritance; but it is probable that he repurchased this and other estates on his own account.[1] Certainly, he and his wife, after the year 1123, join in making a charter to Spalding priory, which grants the churches of Beltisford, Scamelisbi, and Mintinges. They would scarcely have done this if those places were then in the Crown, though King Henry I. himself confirmed the gift. There is, a faint possibility that their charter was a confirmation, as the monks had long previously been in possession at least of the tithes of Beltisford and Scamelisby; and it was customary in those days to draw up confirmations in the same terms as original grants, from which they are undistinguishable. If Meschin purchased Beltisford, this may have given rise to some complications when the question of dower arose, and it explains why Ranulph Gernons paid to the King the large sum of 500 marks for making an agreement between his mother and himself concerning her dower. She would of course be entitled to a third of her husband's estates, but over and above that she would naturally claim some compensation for the loss of her inheritance. We know that Beltisford belonged to Gernons.

CASTLES AND EARLDOMS.—The following extract from Blomefield's Norfolk (ix. 60) will help to explain how it was that Countess Lucy came to build one of the towers of Lincoln Castle.

"Sir Richard de Wodehouse, son of Sir William, lived in the reign of Edward III. and was Lord of Rydon, and by virtue of this lordship, etc., held of the Castle of Rising, was obliged to maintain a tower of that Castle called Wodehouse's Tower, and paid a sum of money yearly for castle-guard."

In like manner the Countess would hold her barony or some at least of her manors under the obligation of maintaining one or more of the towers of Lincoln Castle; and her father Thorold doubtless held by the same tenure. As Colswain's descendants had the wardenship, he and they may have had to maintain the other towers.

It has been shown negatively that Earls did not usually adopt the names of counties as titles immediately after the Conquest.[2] On consideration, I think we are justified in proceeding beyond a mere negation, and in alleging positively that they took their titles, when they used any at all, from the castles where they resided. Instances have been given, but I was prevented from arriving at a definite conclusion by the fact that Hugh Lupus, in a charter previously referred to,[3] calls himself Earl of Chester. But that is not really an exception to the rule. He did not take his title from the *County* but from the *Castle* of Chester. Had he resided at any other place in the county, he would doubtless have been known by the name of that place. Hence, moreover, his adoption of the title of "Earl of Chester" does not prove *per se* that he was not also Earl of Lincoln, as he seems to have been, although he never used that title.[4]

It is hoped that all the difficulties which have so long prevented a

[1] Vol. v. 160, 169. See also the abstracts of charters on pp. 67, 68; Nos. 1, 6, 15, 16, 18.

[2] Vol. v. pp. 74, 168.

[3] Vol. v. p. 74.

[4] There is an interesting reference to "Will. de Rumar. Com. *Cestr.* senior" and his son in County Placita, Lincoln, 47 Edw. III., No. 65.

clear understanding of the history of these important families have at last been removed. The labour has been immense, as may be gathered from the fact that a learned antiquary, only a few years ago, printed this remark:—"I have long since despaired of seeing a satisfactory solution." Another wrote: "one can do little more than sum up the arguments as they stand." Yet another declared that whoever should "smooth away" the confusions "will deserve everybody's gratitude." If I have succeeded in doing this, I am satisfied.

R. E. G. KIRK.

INDEX TO DAVY'S SUFFOLK COLLECTIONS.

(*Continued from p.* 115).

Shaw, Bart., of Cheshire, 343
Shawe, of Dallingho, 345
Shawe, of Kesgrave, 247 to 354
Shawberry, 355
Shedden, 356 to 358
Shelley, of Bury St. Edmunds, 359
Shelton, 361 to 376
Shene, of Eye, 377
Shepheard, of London, 378 to 381
Sheppard, 382 to 391
Sheppard, of Mendlesham and Ash, 392 to 395
Sheppard, of Wetheringset, 396 to 411

ADD. MS., 19,149.

Sheriffe, of Diss, 1 to 4
Sherington, of London, 5
Sherman, of Melton and Ipswich, 6
Sherman, of Yaxley, Braisyard, &c., 8 to 12
Shimpling, of Sudbury, 13
Shipmeadow, 14
Shirley, Lord of Barnham, 15 to 22
Shore, of London, &c., 23
Shorland, of Winstow, 24 to 27
Short, of London, &c., 28
Shorting, of Eye, 30
Shrewsbury, Earl of. *See* Talbot
Shribb, 32
Shrimpton, 33
Shrive, 34
Shrubland, of Barham, &c., 35
Shuckford, of Diss, 36
Shuldham, of Beccles, &c., 38 to 47
Shuldham, of Melton, 48 to 56
Shurlok, of Badley, 57
Sibton, 58
Sicklemore, of Bramford, 60 to 64
Siday, 65
Sidney, of Yoxford, 66
Sydnor, of Suffolk, 68 to 72
Syfrewast, of Suffolk, 73 to 78
Sikes, of Sudbury, 79
Simpson, of Mendlesham, 80
Simpson, of Ufford, 82 to 85
Sims, of Kedington, 86 to 88
Singleton, of Wingfield, 89
Sirr, 91
Skarlet, of Hadley, 93
Skinner, of Suffolk, 94 to 99
Skippon, of Hingham, co. Norfolk, 100 to 105
Skoulding, of Sibton, 106 to 108
Skrene, of Cantelupes, 109
Slapp, of Botesdale, 110 to 112
Smalbridge, 113
Small, 114
Smallpeece, of Hockinge, 115 to 118
Smart, of Bury St. Edmunds, 119 to 121
Smear, of Mutford, 122 to 124
Smith. *See* Dowsing
Smith or Smyth, 125 to 203
Smith, of Cavendish, 130 to 137
Smith, of Cratfield, 139 to 144
Smith, of Fornham and Elmswell, 147 to 149
Smith, of Halesworth, 150 to 152
Smith, of Holton, 153
Smith, of Hundon, 155 to 158
Smith, of Parkfield, Laxfield, 159 to 163
Smith, of Marlesford, 166 to 169
Smith, of Stonham, 171 to 173
Smith, of Stratford St. Mary, 174
Smith, of Sproughton and Stoke by Ipswich, 175 to 184
Smith, Sir James Edward of Norwich, 185 to 189
Smith, of Ipswich, 190
Smith, of Stutton and Woodbridge, 192 to 196
Smith, Tuddenham and Bury, 197 to 199
Smith, of Walsham and Willowes, 200
Smith, of Bury, 203
Smithier, of Ipswich, 204