When this writ was read in the shire court of Berkshire, it brought much benefit to the abbot and the church. For the king’s officials were in those days wont to inflict much injury on the men occupying the scattered estates of the church, exacting from them many obligations of different kinds, all of which were sufficiently grievous. But when the aforesaid royal orders had been proclaimed and when the rights given to the church by King Edward’s charter had been publicly recognized by the same shire court which had witnessed that charter, then these officials suffered a rebuff which was of great advantage to the church.

... At the beginning of his abacy [Abbot Athelhelm] deemed it necessary never to go about without an armed retinue, for in the midst of the conspiracies which broke out almost daily against the king and the kingdom, he felt compelled to take measures for his own protection. Then castles were built at Wallingford and Oxford and Windsor and other places for the safety of the realm, and the king ordered this abby to provide guards in Windsor. For this purpose soldiers who had come to England from overseas were considered to be the most suitable. In the midst of such upheavals the lord abbots, Athelhelm, secretly protected the place committed to his charge with an armed force of knights. For this purpose he first used the hereditary knights. But after the disturbances had died down, it was noted in the annals by the king’s command what knights should be demanded from bishops and abbacies for the defence of the realm when the need arose. Abbot Athelhelm, therefore, having retained the lands which had aforesaid been given to the church afterwards allotted the manors of those who would hold them from the church, and in each case he declared what would be the obligations involved in its tenure. These estates had previously been held by men called thegn who had been killed in the battle of Hastings...

Malcolm, king of Scots, at this time refused to submit to King William. An army was therefore raised and placed under the command of Robert, eldest son of the king, who was sent to Scotland on behalf of the king. With him were many of the magnates of England, including Abbot Athelhelm. They were instructed to offer peace or war: peace if submission was promised; otherwise war. Then King Malcolm coming to Lothian with his troops chose to treat rather than to fight. Accordingly he gave hostages in surety that the principality of Scotland should be subject to the kingdom of England. On the completion of this pact, the son of the king with his army hastened joyfully to his father. And in recompense for their achievement, he and those who were with him received such rewards as were suitable to their several ranks.

Also the army was sent against the Welsh, and in this expedition also almost all the knights of the abbey were ordered to join, but this time the abbot remained at home. When the king’s plans in this expedition had been fulfilled he went to Normandy....

Then a report spread through England that the Danes were preparing a fleet wherewith to invade the country. Wherefore stipendiary knights1 were collected from all quarters, and the king ordered that provision should be made for them wherever they were, including the bishoprics and abbeys, until it should be known for certain whether the invasion would in fact take place. Nearly a year elapsed, and still no Danish invasion could be predicted with certainty, and so the stipendiary knights (who were paid by the king) were allowed to return to their own homes.

Thus the causes of strife and unrest in England were diminished, and the blessings of peace were enjoyed. Wherefore the abbot, turning his mind from secular affairs, studied the needs of the church. He supervised the instruction in letters of those who were under his care, and watched over their practice of the religious life. He also added to the ornaments of the church, and sought to arrange for the future good conduct of its affairs. Besides all this, he made plans to rebuild the church from its foundations, and set aside money which might be sufficient for that purpose. He died suddenly in the midst of these activities on 10 September.2

(b) THE CARTAE BARONUM OF 1166, BEING THE RETURNS MADE BY HIS TENANTS-IN-CHIEF TO KING HENRY II IN RESPECT OF AN INQUIRY INSTITUTED BY HIM AS TO THE KNIGHTS ENFEOFFED ON THEIR HONOURS

Early in 1166 King Henry II ordered through the sheriffs to all his tenants-in-chief who before the first Sunday of Lent should send him returns answering the following questions:

(i) How many knights were enfeoffed on your estates "by the old enfeoffment"—that is to say, at the time of the death of Henry I?

(ii) How many have been enfeoffed "by the new enfeoffment"—that is to say, since 1135?

(iii) How many knights are "on your demesne" (super dominion)—that is to say, how many knights, if any, are required in addition to those you have enfeoffed in order to make up the amount of knight-service you owe to the king?

(iv) What are the names of your knights?

It will be noted that all these questions (whose scope is exactly indicated in the return of the archbishop of York printed below) refer not to the servitutum debita—the quota of knights owed by the tenant-in-chief for the king’s service—but to the actual enfeoffments which the tenants-in-chief had made, or had failed to make, upon their lands. This distinction must always be borne in mind in studying those records, and it is clear that in any particular case the tenure-in-chief might in fact have enfeoffed either the requisite number of knights for the king’s service,4 or more,3 or less, than that amount.

It was in the last eventuality that the third question became of importance. If the tenant-in-chief had not enfeoffed sufficient knights to perform the service he owed to the king, then the balance was described as being chargeable on his demesne—super dominion.5 When, therefore, a return states that so many knights are "on the demesne",

---

1 Household knights not enfeoffed with land.
2 Cites two royal edicts in annalibus anglosaxonis—remotum est novi et novi, quos supra, pp. 393, 941.
3 The impositions of feudal tenure upon the precedents of the land is noted in having taken places during the Conqueror’s reign.
4 The actual enfeoffments by the tenant-in-chief follow the imposition by the king on the tenant-in-chief of the annalibus abditus (see above, pp. 994, 995), and below, (pp. 993, 994).
5 Note distinction between the new enfeoffments and the Anglo-Saxon thegn (see above, pp. 993, 994).
6 This may refer to the events of 1077.
7 milites quos solidiores vocant: to be distinguished from those knights who had already been enfeoffed.

---

1 1294.2
2 1181.3
3 The servitut debita are given on pp. 994-995.
4 Exempted from servitutum debita (see below, (pp. 993, 994).
7 See return of Walter of Avesnes (No. 260).
it does not mean that these knights were actually established on the demesne, but merely that the lord had to provide this number of knights in addition to his escoffed knighthood in order to fulfill his obligations to the king.

It is probable that this distinction between the servitium debitas and the actual escoffments also explains the main motive of the royal inquiry. The purpose of the king may have been to provide a new feudal assessment. If the tenant-in-chief had escoffed more than the necessary number of knights, his servitium debita might be raised to correspond with the actualities on his honour. If less than the required number of knights had been escoffed, then the servitium debita could be reduced as the basis of his assessment. The new assessment might therefore be made to work "in no case to the advantage of the tenant, but in many to the advantage of the crown." 1, 2

The king may also, in 1166, have had a political motive in instituting this inquiry. He was in that year about to leave England for a considerable time, and the return of the archbishop of York (No. 24) suggests that "he wished to assure himself that the knights escoffed by his tenants had done allegiance to him before his departure." 2

Few of the tenants-in-chief seem to have failed to make a return, and these records therefore supply an exhaustive survey of English military feudalism in 1166. In their totality they indicate, not only that each honour must be considered as a separate unit reflecting the results of an individual development, but also that "the establishment of knight-service upon a territorial basis belongs in the main to the time before the death of Henry I." 3, 4

On most honours the fees of the new escoffment form an insignificant addition to those which had been created before 1155. 3, 5, 6

The returns which have been printed below have been selected to give an indication of the character of these indispensable records, and to show the chief varieties in the returns. As will be seen, they include both large honours and small, and the holdings of both laymen and ecclesiastics. They also show some honours where escoffments have been made in excess of the servitum debita, and others where the escoffments are insufficient to discharge the knight-service due to the king. 4

The Cartae Baroniae are among the most important records for the study of Anglo-Norman feudalism. They provide in particular evidence, not only of the number of knights escoffed in 1166 and before 1155, but also of the servitum debita which in the vast majority of cases had been fixed by William the Conqueror and had subsequently remained unchanged. This testimony as to the servitum debita may be set out in tabular form, but it must be emphasized that the figures which follow indicate in each case not the number of knights which had been escoffed by the tenant-in-chief, but the servitum debita of the tenant-in-chief as expressed in the number of knights he was required to produce for the king's service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE SERVITIA DEBITA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Bishops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARTAE BARONUM (1166)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Abbeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury St. Edmunds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavistock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eveleigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) Greater lay tenants-in-chief (where ascertainable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert, son of the king 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Derby (Pericles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honour of Tenness 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honour of Tichhill 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert of Stafford 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of Eu 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Wilmun 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy of Pontricrest 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger 'of Mowbray' 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Essex 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honour of Richmond (Yorks.) 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gervase Payn 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald of St. Valery 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter of Ancourt 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Salisbury 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Montflext 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payn of Montflext 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Roumara 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert of Ryes 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert, son of Ralph 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter 'de Walsle' 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See No. 214
2 See No. 245
3 See No. 322
4 See No. 288
5 See No. 288
6 See Nos. 291, 292.
7 Illegitimate son of Henry I by Edith, probably daughter of Fries Sigafusson, lord of Greyskote.
8 See No. 289
9 See No. 230.
in the return the names of all those, both of the old and new enfeoffments, because you wish to know if there are any who have not yet done you allegiance and whose names are not written in your roll, so that they may do you allegiance before the first Sunday in Lent. Wherefore I, being one of those subjected to all your orders, have made as thorough an investigation in my holding as the short time permitted, and in this return I am declaring all these things to you as my lord.

Know therefore, in the first place, my lord, that there is no knight's fee on the demesne of the archbishopric of York, since we have sufficient enfeoffed knights to discharge all the service which we owe you, and which our predecessors have performed. We have indeed more knights enfeoffed than are necessary for that service as you may learn from what follows. For our predecessors enfeoffed more knights than they owed to the king, and they did this, not for the necessities of the royal service, but because they wished to provide for their relatives and servants.

Here follow the names of those who were enfeoffed in the time of King Henry 1.

William, count of Auamale, holds a fee of 3 knights.
Henry of Lassy, 2 knights.
Roger of Mowbray [Mowday], a quarter of a knight's fee.
Herbert, son of Herbert, 3 knights.
Gilbert, son of Nigel, 2 knights.
Payn 'de Lande', 3 knights.
Mauger, son of Hugh, 1 knight.
Richard, son of Hugh, 1 knight.
William of Bellewe, 1 knight.
Robert Morin, 2 knights.
Gilbert, son of Herbert, 2 knights.
Hugh 'de Munchamp', 2 knights.
Walter of Acon, 2 knights.
Robert Manel, 1 knight.
Robert, son of Wiard, half a knight's fee.
Peter 'de Peritote', half a knight's fee.
Hugh of Velot, 4 knights.
William Cokered, 1 knight.
Thomas of Everingham, 2 knights' fees.
Simon Walart, 1 knight.
Ralph 'de Nowewic', half a knight's fee.
Robert Poer, half a knight's fee.
Walter of Denton, half a knight's fee.
Robert, son of Hugh, a quarter of a knight's fee.
William of Lopponham, half a knight's fee.
Alexander of Newby, 4 parts of half a knight's fee.
Herbert of Markington, a quarter of a knight's fee.
Peter 'de Belinge', 1 knight.
Oliver the Angebung, 1 knight.

1 Henry 1.

2 See below, p. 415.
3 See above, p. 305.
4 See below, p. 412.
William *de Pantone*, 1 knight.

Thomas, son of Aubert, a quarter of a knight's fee.

Alice of Mostroff, a quarter of a knight's fee.

Thomas, son of Hervey, 1 knight.

Benedict of Sculcotes, the eighth part of a knight's fee.

Bernard of Cottingham, a quarter of a knight's fee.

Leofred, a thirteenth of a knight's fee.

John of Meaux, an eighth of a knight's fee.

Ivo, a quarter of a knight's fee.

Serle of Poole, a third of a knight's fee.

After the death of King Henry there were enfeoffed:

Peter the butler, with half a knight's fee.

Peter the chamberlain, with the twentieth part of a knight's fee.

Geoffrey of Burton, with a twelfth of a knight's fee.

Gervase of Bredon, with a third of a knight's fee.

And since, my lord, I claim from some of these men more service than they are now performing, whereas others are keeping back services which are said to be due, not to themselves, but to the table and the demesne of the archbishop, I humbly beg that this my return may not be allowed to do harm to me or to my successors by preventing the Church from recovering or preserving its legal rights. Farewell, my lord.

And besides the aforesaid knights:

Thurstan *de Lechamton* [holds] half a knight's fee.

Gilbert *de Maner*, a third of a knight's fee.

Werti *de Maritinius*, a third of a knight's fee.

William of Ectures, a half of a knight's fee.

William Pallefrei, 1 knight.

William of Bellewe and Richard *de Crochetone* hold a quarter of a knight's fee.

225. Return (carta) of the bishop of Exeter

To his reverend lord, Henry, by the grace of God, the illustrious king of the English, etc. Bartholomew, by the grace of God styled bishop of Exeter, greeting and faithful service. You have commanded me that I should inform you by my sealed and open writ not how much service I owe you, but how many knights there are enfeoffed on my land from the enfeoffment of the time of King Henry, your grandfather, and how many knights have been enfeoffed since his death, and how many knights there are on my demesne. Wherefore I send you a true record of these things in so far as my diligent inquiry has been able to discover it.

Robert, son of the king, holds from me 3 knights' fees. William *de Tracy*, 1 knight's fee.

*1 Liber Niger Scaccarum*, vol. 1, p. 115; *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, p. 241; *the servitium dechanum of the bishop of Exeter was of 175 knights' fees*. 2 *i.e.* not the servitium dechanum but the details of actual enfeoffments; see above, p. 904. 3 *super desinientes,* for the technical meaning of this term, see above, p. 903. 4 Robert, bastard son of Henry I.

Entwase *de Jou*, 3 knights' fees.

Cecilia *de Beur*, 3 knights' fees.

Richard of Radcliff, 2 knights' fees.

William *de Botrellis*, 1 knight's fee.

Alexander of Colebrooke, 2 knights' fees.

Osbert *de Watone*, 1 knight's fee.

Osbert of Bicton, 1 knight's fee.

Alan *de Parnellis*, 1 knight's fee.

William, son of John, 1 knight's fee.

William Hay, 1 knight's fee.

Ralph *de Roke*, 1 knight's fee.

Ralph, son of Stephen, 1 knight's fee.

William *de Egloshail*, 1 knight's fee.

Henry of La Pommeraye holds 1 knight's fee in Cornwall, and half a knight's fee in Devon. He denies the duty of service in respect of this half knight's fee. But it is owing from him.

Roger, son of Eustace, half a knight's fee.

Stephen *de Stantora*, half a knight's fee.

Roger *de Lanuvatora*, half a knight's fee.

Roger *de Campello*, half a knight's fee.

Geoffrey *de Torakings*, half a knight's fee.

Payn, son of Reinfred, 1 knight's fee except for a fifth part.

Adam *de Launceli* holds the fifth part.

Edel of Northcott and his lady cousin hold a quarter of a knight's fee.

The prior of Plympton, a quarter of a knight's fee.

Joel of St. Winnov holds half a knight's fee but claims that it should belong to his demesne.

Osbert *de Crugalain*, half a knight's fee.

Baldwin of Penare, a quarter of a knight's fee.

Jordan of Tricarrad, half a knight's fee.

Peter *de Lamellis*, half a knight's fee.

Robert *de Venmer*, two-thirds of a knight's fee. Margaret holds the other third.

Richard, son of Oulph, half a knight's fee.

John *de Talumpa*, half a knight's fee.

Jordan *de Menestre*, half a knight's fee.

Edward *de Wotole*, half a knight's fee.

All the aforesaid were enfeoffed in the time of King Henry. Ralph *de Stanga* holds a third of a knight's fee of the new enfeoffment. John Bernard, the son of Bernard, holds a quarter of a knight's fee.

Ivo and Osbert of Eu hold a quarter of a knight's fee.

William, son of Wimund, holds a twelfth of a knight's fee.

Roger, son of Roger *Larcevesque*, holds half a knight's fee but claims that it ought to belong to his demesne.

And besides all these, as I have heard from many, the earl of Gloucester and
231. Return (carta) of Lambert of Etoquigny

To his reverend lord, Henry, king of the English, Lambert of Etoquigny, greeting.

Know that I hold from you by your favour 16 carucates of land and 2 bovates by the service of 10 knights. In these 16 carucates of land I have 5 knights enfeoffed by the old enfeoffment:

Richard ‘de Haia’ holds 1 knight’s fee; and he withheld the service which he owes to you and to me from the day of your coronation up to now, except that he paid me 2 marks.

Odo ‘de Cranesbi’ holds 1 knight’s fee.

Thomas, son of William, holds 1 knight’s fee.

Roger ‘de Millers’ holds 2 knights’ fees.

And from my demesne I provide the balance of the service I owe you, to wit, that of 5 knights. And from that demesne I have given Robert ‘de Portemort’ three-quarters of 1 knight’s fee. Therefore I pray you that you will send me your judgment concerning Richard ‘de Haia’ who holds back the service of his fee, because I cannot obtain that service except by your order. This is the total service in the aforesaid 16 carucates of land. Farewell.

232. Return (carta) of Hugh of Buckland

Hugh of Buckland holds a fee of 1 knight of the old enfeoffment from the time of King Henry, and from that fee after the death of King Henry he enfeoffed 1 knight and half a knight.

And William, son of Ernald, holds 1 knight’s fee. Richard, son of William, holds with him the other part, so that after the death of King Henry together they perform the service of 1½ knights’ fees.

233. Return (carta) of Gerard Giffard

Gerard Giffard have no knight enfeoffed by the old enfeoffment from the time of King Henry, the grandfather of the king, nor of the new enfeoffment after his death, but from my demesne I discharge the service of 1 knight to the lord king.

234. Return (carta) of William of London

To his dearest lord, Henry, by the grace of God, king of the English, William of London, greeting. Know that I have no knight enfeoffed either by the old enfeoffment or the new, but I am bound to discharge the obligations of my fee by the service of my own body.

---

1 Liber Niger Scaccarii, vol. 1, p. 273; The Red Book of the Exchequer, p. 385. Lambert’s servitium debitum was 10 knights. This barony was under-enfeoffed; 5 knights were “on the demesne”. Lambert ‘de Scotteni’ took his name from Etoquigny, a hamlet of St. Martin-le-Gaillard.
2 Liber Niger Scaccarii, vol. 1, p. 183; The Red Book of the Exchequer, p. 207. A typical small honour. Hugh of Buckland was not only a tenant-in-chief but a sub-tenant of the abbey of Abingdon by knight-service. See above, p. 910.