The Genealogist.

NOTES ON ANGLO-NORMAN GENEALOGY.

In my "Calendar of documents preserved in France," I have touched on some of the points it illustrates in Anglo-Norman genealogy (pp. xlv-li); but the Government regulations, limiting the length of the Preface, compelled me to omit what I had written with reference to others. My notes on these may, possibly, be of service, and I therefore give them here.

The Brian "comes in Anglia" of No. 1176, is a personage of whom little is known, but as to whom I would venture to make a novel suggestion. His parentage, at least, is well ascertained, for, as we see in the above charter, he was a son of Count Eudes, of Penthièvre, and a brother of Alan, the Earl of Richmond. As to his career and possessions, two facts are certain; we know from Orderic, and from the Worcester chronicle (which styles him "Breon Eorl") that he encountered and defeated the sons of Harold when they made their plundering descent on Devon in 1069; and we know from Domesday that he died before 1086, when his Suffolk fief had passed to Count Robert of Mortain. But there is nothing to shew why he should be acting as Earl in the south-west of England. If we should, however, adopt the hypothesis that Brian was "antecessor" to Count Robert, not only in Suffolk but in Devon and Cornwall, the mystery would at once be solved. This, again, would explain what is inexplicable without it, namely the grant to St. Michael's Mount by Count Alan, who succeeded in obtaining Cornwall from Stephen, in 1140, "pro redemptione animæ Brientii avunculi mei, de cujus hereditate terram Cornubie possideo" (M.A., vi, 990).[1] Have we not here a hint also that the real founder of the house upon the Mount (see below) may have been Earl Brian himself, who would be likely enough to give it to Mont St. Michel? This would explain why the Count of Mortain, his successor, appears in Domesday as its spoiler. Lastly, the Breton tenants of the Count, Briend, Alvred, Wihumar,[2] etc., would have their existence well accounted for, if they had been enfeoffed by his predecessor, Earl Brian.

On this hypothesis, the above charter (No. 1176), harmonising so well with our native chronicle, implies that Brian was the first of the brothers to attain comital dignity. We must not enquire whether, on his death, the Conqueror preferred to see his race established in the parts of England most remote from Britanny, or whether the transfer of his fief to Count Robert of Mortain was connected with that mysterious Almodis,[3] who takes so

[1] Styling himself "comes Britannie et Cornubie et Richemuntis," he speaks of Cornwall as his "conquisitio," but puts forward this hereditary claim in right of his uncle Brian.

[2] There was a Wihumar, *dapifer* of Count Alan, and his Domesday under-tenant in Cambridgeshire.

[3] She is not mentioned in the *Dictionary of National Biography's* life of Robert.

prominent a position in No. 716, in conjunction with her no less mysterious son Robert, unknown it would seem to genealogists. But we must examine the evidence further.

A very interesting question is raised by the charters relating to St. Michael's Mount. In an *excursus* on "The possessions of Robert of Mortain in the West,"[1] Mr. Freeman discussed the foundation of its monastery, and decided that its relations to Mont St. Michel and to Robert of Mortain "are anything but clear," but that "whoever was the founder of the Cornish house, it was not Earl Robert." This he did chiefly on the ground that "the spuriousness" of the charter which makes him the founder, and which is printed in the *Monasticon* and transcribed by D'Anisy (No 715) is glaringly manifest from the date it bears (1085), Queen Matilda (d. 1083) and Bishop Leofric (d. 1072) being among the witnesses. He was not, however, acquainted with the charter which follows it in D'Anisy's transcripts (No. 716), and which, from internal evidence, appears to be eminently authentic. By this charter Count Robert, with his wife the Countess Almodis (unknown to Dugdale and his successors), gives St. Michael, in the days of William Rufus, "Luduhanum" (Ludgvan), a manor of Richard, son of Turulf, which duly appears in Domesday as "Luduha[m]" and as held by a Richard; also the holding in Trevhalum of Bloicus, who similarly figures in Domesday (125) as "Blohin," holding of the Count a hide at "Trevthal," which, adds the Survey, "abstulit comes æcclosiæ St. Michaelis." This charter further informs us that the so-called gift involved the payment of a certain sum by the Monks to the Count. Now, if we turn to the spurious charter we find that its date, which is the greatest difficulty, is not found in the document, but is supplied, as M. D'Anisy observes, from the cartulary. If we discard it,[2] the names of the witnesses present no obvious difficulties in themselves. If, for instance, Robert of Mortain gave St. Michael's Mount to the parent house as the first fruits of his western dominion, which dominion he is supposed to have acquired early in 1068, the charter might perfectly well belong to the early years of the reign. It is not a little remarkable that the last of its witnesses was Turulf, and that the genuine charter proves the Earl's Domesday tenant Richard to have been the son of a Turulf. As to the contents of the "spurious" charter, it is admitted that "Treiwal" was given to St. Michael between the death of the Confessor and the making of the great Survey, and we find "Trevelaboth" given by this charter. That the form of the charter, as we have it, is probably not genuine, does not of necessity invalidate its substance. On the other hand, as Mr. Freeman points out, it is only as a spoiler of St. Michael that Domesday mentions the Count; and what I have termed the genuine charter implies that he only disgorged his spoil in consideration of payment.[3] But in any

[1] *History of the Norman Conquest*, vol. iv.

[2] It is wrong by the Indiction.

[3] It is a noteworthy coincidence that the records of St. Alban's Abbey (M.A. ii, 220) mention him (with this same wife Almodis) as a benefactor to the house in Herts, though there also Domesday reveals him only as a spoiler.

case, the solution to which Mr. Freeman, and Mr. Ellis[1] also, leant, namely that the real founder was "Robert's son William," is inadmissible. For the genuine charter (in addition to its mention of Abbot Roger) shows us Roger de Ardevone acting as a witness on the part of St. Michael, and he was, we know, a tenant of the Abbey of Mont St. Michel. It is clear then that, even in Robert's lifetime, the house on the Mount was a cell of St. Michael "in peril of the sea."

The form, it may be added, of this charter, deserves careful attention. For while the Count speaks of a gift and of charity (*caritas*), the Abbot and Monks employ the phrase "conventio et caritas," and are careful to record the sum they paid for obtaining it. The inference is that the Count desired to represent it as a free gift, while the Abbey treated it as a compromise of a lawful claim. Hence this ambiguous language.

Although the documents calendared in my volume do not throw any light on the alleged descent from William Malet of the baronial Malets of Somerset, it is very singular that the name of Fichet, which the latter are supposed to have assumed for a time, appears in conjunction with their own (No. 324) in Normandy as in Somerset. The mention there, however, of Robert Malet is not such as to suggest relationship. In another Préaux document (No. 319) we may certainly recognise the great William Malet and Robert, his son.

"Les Malets et les Marteaux sont les plus nobles de Caux."

It is with the Pays de Caux that this charter connects him, and more especially with Harfleur, adjoining Graville. That the religious houses founded by the Malets at the respective *capita* of their English and Norman honours, Eye and Graville (St. Honorine), should both have been cells of the Abbey of Bernai (No. 413) is a fact which may have been overlooked, and which is deserving of notice. For these benefactions to houses in the *comté* of Evreux suggest that the benefactor to St. Taurin of Evreux (No. 316) was Robert Malet, the Domesday tenant, in which case the charter gives us the name of his wife. Another charter in the archives of the Eure (No. 372) records the date at which the church of Conteville was given to the Abbey of Bec by William Malet, who, as we know from another source,[2] became a monk there.

Another genealogical problem on which new light is thrown is the origin of the house of Dunstanville. Mr. Eyton, who devoted to their barony special attention, traced the family back to Wiltshire about the close of the reign of Henry I.[3] But a charter of William Rufus (No. 1234), in the valuable cartulary of La Sauve, shews us Robert and Walter de Dunstanville already connected with Shropshire at that early date.[4]

Again, it is marvellous how much may be learnt from Nos. 1167,

[1] Landholders of Yorkshire, 1086.
[2] "De Genere Crispinorum" (*Opera Lanfranci*, Ed. Giles, i, 341).
[3] *History of Shropshire*, ii, 268, et seq.
[4] Cf. my *Ancient Charters* (Pipe Roll Society, p. 15).

1171, when studied in combination. Guy de La Val, whose namesake held some twenty knights' fees in England under Henry II, married we discover, about 1025,[1] a sister of Robert de Tosny (*Toeniaco*) and Berenger Spina, receiving, with her, lands at Vesly, on the Norman border, some twelve miles, as the crow flies, from Tosny. Robert himself held lands at Gournay, in the Vexin, twice as far from his *stammhaus*. He, with Berenger, his son and heir, are here found in a charter of 1063, although hitherto their first known appearance has been as tenants-in-chief in 1086. From this it is clear that the Lord of Belvoir was even older than suspected at the time of the Domesday Survey. It is further evident that Berenger was his eldest, and not, as believed, a younger son.[2]

The charter of Gerold de Roumare in favour of the Nuns of St. Amand (No. 88) is of interest chronologically, as belonging to William's first visit to Normandy as king (March—August 1067), and genealogically, as that of one who was father of a considerable Domesday tenant (here named as his son and heir) and grandfather of the first Earl of Lincoln. Among its witnesses, also, may be recognised three of the heroes of the battle of Hastings, Roger de Montgomery, afterwards Earl, Robert, son of Roger de Beaumont, and Alan the Red of Britanny.

One of the most striking illustrations of the way in which documents from a French source may confirm an English narrative is afforded by two Fontevrault charters (Nos. 1057, 1058), which shew us Reginald de St. Walery and his son in temporary possession of the revenues arising from the port of Dieppe, until "God helping, they shall have recovered their rightful inheritance in England," when the revenues would return to the Duke of the Normans (whose cause they had espoused against Stephen). For in the register of Kingswood Abbey we find this passage:—

"tempore hostilitatis, regnante rege Stephano post mortem Henrici regis Angliæ, emerunt illi de Kingeswode Haseldene a quodam Johanne de Sancto Johanne cui rex ille Stephanus dederat quasdam terras Reginaldi de Sancto Walerico tempore hostilitatis. Redeunte autem pace et justitia, reddente unicuique quod suum erat, Reginaldus de Sancto Walerico recepit Haseldene et monachos effugavit."[3]

The place is Haselden, an appendage of Tetbury, Gloucestershire, which latter lordship is believed to have been bestowed by Henry I on Guy de St. Walery, as an escheat; and the two accounts, it will be observed, agree absolutely as to the confiscation of St. Walery's lands by Stephen.

J. H. Round.

[1] This date, which is derived from internal evidence in the charter, is almost impossible. I have shown in my Introduction (p. xxv), that the date of the charter itself is a question of great difficulty, and it is probable that the above marriage (which depends on it) took place much latter than 1025. The genealogical facts, however, would not be affected.

[2] As a matter of fact, I have succeeded in establishing, from another source, the true descent of the Lords of Belvoir in the Norman period, which, as I had always suspected, is quite incorrect in its familiar form.

[3] *Mon. Ang.*, v, 425.