himself have the customs and the liberties which we have in the same, always excepting the aids which we shall receive from our knights, as is done on the other lands, the church, and always excepting the tithes of this land which are assigned to the house in alms. We have granted these things to be held by him because of the land and service he has shown to our church; but on the condition that after his death the aforesaid land may remain bound to our church and quit of obligations. And in respect of this, the aforesaid William has pledged us that he will neither sell this land nor pledge it in pawn nor alienate it to anyone to the loss of our church. Witness: Robert the prior; William and Herbert, monks; Ralph Bainard; Herluin, brother of Gunzo and many others.

220. An early enfeofment on the land of the abbey of Bury St. Edmunds (1066–1087)

This important text is only preserved in confused copies made in the fourteenth century. The translation therefore must in places be regarded as tentative, and should be compared with the Latin version, which is printed in D. C. Douglas, Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds (1912), p. 531, and fully discussed on pp. 536–538 of that book. The references to homage, to the former holders of the land in question, and to the military and other duties attached to the tenancy are all notable, as is also the date to which the document must be assigned.

Be it known to all of you that Peter, a knight of King William, will become the feudal man of St. Edmund and of Baldwin the abbot, by performing the ceremony of homage. He will do this by permission of the king and with the consent of the monks, and in return for the service which will here be stated, saving always the fealty which he owes to the king, the fief having been freely received except for the six royal forfeitures. Peter promises that he will serve on behalf of the abbot within the kingdom with 3 or 4 knights at their own expense if he has been previously summoned by the king and the abbot to take part in the earlier or later levies of the king’s host. If he is bidden to plead on the abbot’s behalf at any place within the kingdom, they shall likewise bear their own expense. But if the abbot shall take him anywhere else, then the expense of his service shall be borne by the abbot. Besides this, he shall equip a knight for service without or within the kingdom where and when the abbot shall require to have this knight as his own retainer. This is the description of the fee. The land of Edric the blind with 14 freemen and as many peasants; Wulfmer the priest and his land with 3 freemen; Thorkill with his wife and land; and Guthred and his land; Grimhald the priest; Leofstan; Gunnulf; Osfrith; Acuwulf; Wilgiva; Leofgeat; Wilgifu; Lufa; Wilfricus; Tonhardus; Thurstan; Osac; Thurstan ‘Cari’; Thurstan ‘Runpe’; Godwine the priest; Gipus with the

1 mandatu domini. The reference is to the ceremony of homage whereby the man joins his hands together and places them between the hands of his lord. On homage generally, see below, No. 268, pp. 937–946.
2 The interest of the king in a subinfeudation is noteworthy.
3 The careful description of Peter’s obligations suggests that knight’s tenure has as yet no been clearly defined. It will be noted further that no mention is made in the text of hereditary right.
4 Translation doubtful.
5 Edric the blind was apparently Edric of Laxfield, and he and many of the following men can be discovered in Domesday Book as landholders in Suffolk in the time of Edward the Confessor. By comparison with Domesday Book this text therefore provides evidence of the manner in which a particular fief was constructed.
6 Possibly a repetition of the two previous names.
following 7 freemen who are his neighbours: Thurkeda; Brother; Brumstan; Wulfmar; Godgiv; Deorun; Snuthart. All these and their lands are free. Witnesses on behalf of the abbot: 1 Robert Blunt; Frodo; Robert ‘de Valles’; Arnulf; Fulcher; Burgard; Joseley. Witnesses on behalf of Peter: Rannulf; Richard; Herdwyn; Philip; Ralph ‘fuchiez’. William, son of Robert; Thorold ‘papilio’.

221. A grant of land to be held by military service made by Robert Losinga, bishop of Hereford (1085)

This document creates a tenancy for life at Holme Lacy, Herefordshire, to be held by military service from the bishop of Hereford. It is important as evidence of the early imposition of knight-service in England, and also for the terms on which this land is to be held. It is important also in respect of the notable people who were concerned in this transaction. The document itself is printed and discussed by V. H. Galbraith in Eng. Hist. Rev., vol. xxiv (1929), pp. 353 et seq.

This privilege Robert, bishop of the church of Hereford, ordered to be recorded as agreed between him and Roger, son of Walter, concerning certain land which is called ‘Hamme’,2 and those things which pertain to it. This land belongs to the church of Holy Mary, the Mother of God, and of St. Ethelbert the martyr; and previously the said bishop held this land as his own demesne and for the sustenance of the church. This land the aforesaid knight,3 to wit, Roger, asked from the bishop through his friends, and he offered money in respect of it. But the bishop, by the counsel of his vassals,4 gave him this same land in return for a promise that he would serve the bishop with 2 knights as his father did whenever the need arose. This also was part of the contract: that the men of the bishop belonging to King’s Hampton and Hereford, and to the estates pertaining thereto, should be at liberty to take timber from the wood for the use of the bishop as often as it should be needed for fuel or for repairing houses; and the pigs of these manors should feed in the same wood. This refers to the men belonging to the bishop. And this contract further enjoins that if Roger becomes a monk, or dies, neither his mother nor his wife nor his sons nor his brothers nor any of his kinsfolk shall have rights in the aforesaid land, but let the bishop receive whatever in the estate may be to the profit of holy Church, and his men shall receive the same without any contradiction whatsoever. This instrument was executed in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1085, it being the eighth Indiction. The following were witnesses to this matter: Earl Roger,5 his son, Hugh,6 and his other son, Everard,7 and the countess8 and the sherif, Warin,9 Osbert, son of Richard; Drew, son of Pons; Gerard of Tournay-sur-Dive; William ‘Malbedan’; Gilbert, Earl Roger’s constable. Of the men of the bishop there were these: Gerald, his brother; Humphrey the archdeacon; Ansfrid the priest; William; Leofwine; Alfward; Szwulf; Alwine. And there were these laymen from among

1 These men can also be found in Domesday Book as the hononoral barons of the abbey established after the Norman Conquest. They are here in the capacity of witnesses in the honour court of the abbot.
2 Holme Lacy.
3 The court of the bishop’s honour.
4 Roger II of Montgomery, first earl of Shrewsbury.
5 Hugh, Roger’s son by his first wife, Mabel of Beldane.
6 Everard, Roger’s son by his second wife. Adelaide ‘de Putelet’.
7 Adelaide ‘de Putelet’.
8 A hononral baron of Roger of Montgomery in Shropshire in 1086.
the men of the bishop: Udo; Ashalard; Franco; Arnulf; Telbald; Robert; Gozo; Osebert; Peter; Richard the butler. Of the men of Earl Roger there were these clerks: Ralph; Geoffrey; Odo; Gerard. And there were these laymen of Earl Roger: Walter; Heribert 'de Frecis'; Richard of Stanton; Herman 'de Drewis'; Robert of Boscherville; Richard of Ectot; William of Eveux; Ralph of Le Saussay; Nicholas; Godmund. The aforesaid Roger holds other land devoted to the sustenance of the bishop, to wit, at Onibury, on these conditions. As long as he lives he shall give each year on St. Martin's Day 20 shillings, and after his death, or if he becomes a monk, the land shall be returned without question to the bishop in the same condition as it is now. On this matter the following were witnesses: Ansfrid of Cornuelles: Eodic of Wenlock; another Eodic, to wit, the steward; and all the aforesaid except Earl Roger and his household.

222. The barony of the archbishop of Canterbury (December 1093–October 1096)

This is a very early description of a feudal honour in England. The names which follow the names represent knight-service in terms of the knight's fee and its fractions. This document is printed in D. C. Douglas, Donorship: Monasteries of Christ Church, Canterbury (1944), p. 105, and it is fully discussed in the course of that work. Translations appear in Victoria County History: Kent, vol. 10, p. 260, and in D. Jerrold, Introduction to the History of England (1949), p. 373.

Concerning the knights of the archbishop

The bishop of Rochester, 10.
Haimo the sheriff, 6.
Hugh of Montfort-sur-Risle, 5.
Gilbert, son of Richard, 3.
Robert, son of Wazo, 6.
William, son of Ralph, 7.
The count of Eu, 4.
William of Briouze, 4.
Godfrey of Thamoungton, 3.
Lambert of Romney, 3.
Vitalis, 3.
Godfrey of Malling, 3.
Baimard, 2.
William Peverel, 2.
Wimund of Leaveland, 1.
Ralph 'guiz', 1.
William Felet, 2.
Anquetil of Rots, 1.
William of Adisham, 1.
Godfrey the archer, 1.

Ralph of Eastry, 1.
Wibert, 1.
Arnold, 1.
Herengod, 1.
Niel of Montville, 1.
Roger the butler, 1.
William, son of Hermerfroud, 1.
Richard of the Marsh, 1.
Geoffrey of Rots, 1.
Talbot, 1.
Bisco, 1.
Restwold, 1.
Osbern, 1.
Rodulf of Bec, 1.
Hugh of Port-en-Bessin, 2.
Wulsige of Croydon, 1.
Geoffrey 'de Membre', 1.
Buscin of Dives, 1.
Niel of Whiteacre, 1.
Æthelwine, son of Brimthour, 1.

1 The annotations reveal the composition of two great baronial households.
2 'de Mundford'.
3 'de Mundford'.
4 'de Humbert'.
5 'de Huma'.
6 'de Roxt'.
7 'de Membre'.
8 See Nos. 275, 279.