

CHAPTER VI. FIEFS NOBLES.

CONTENTS.

Classes of society—Definition of Fiefs Nobles—Many different tenures of Jersey fiefs—Probable rise in the status of lower fiefs after the separation under John—Jersey concerned with fiefs de haubert and sergeanties, not with counties and baronies—Holdings in Jersey of Continental lords confiscated as *terrae Normannorum*, viz. the Fiefs du Hommet, Pinel, d'Orglandes, des Mouriers, d'Anneville, Morville, Rosel, Henot and Boutvillain—Fiefs allowed to be sold or exchanged, viz. d'Escraqueville and Grainville—Fiefs known from surnames of past holders, viz. Gorges and La Gruchetterie—Fiefs held by loyalists, viz. St. Ouen, Vinchelez, Samarès, Handois, la Maletière, Surville, Lemprière, ès Hormans, and Saval—Fiefs not known to have existed before 1204, viz. Diélament, La Trinité, Les Vingt Livres, Melesches, Les Augrès, La Hague, Le Franc Fief en St. Brelade, Les Arbres, Jourdain Payn, Luce de Carteret, St. Jean, Longueville and Quetivel—Other fiefs of doubtful status—Attempt to classify fiefs according to their owing relief or suit of court, or possessing the right to a dovecot, all unsatisfactory—Indivisibility among brothers seems to be only test of a Fief Noble—Various tenures by homage, wardship, knight service, military service, grand sergeanty, fancy rents and money rents—Enhancement of the status of fiefs during the Middle Ages and since.

In the previous four chapters we have dealt with the holdings of what may be termed the lower classes of society, and in this and the next chapter I review the holdings of what may be termed the upper classes. It must be remembered however that in the Middle Ages a man's social status depended largely upon the nature of his tenement, and that a man might hold more than one tenement under very different tenures; also that the high status of Churchmen was due to their office, not in most cases to noble birth. So that we cannot apply to the Middle Ages the clean cut social distinctions of the XIX century. We shall see that the holders of Jersey fiefs were of varied status with a distinct tendency to rise in the social scale.

It is difficult to find a generic term to describe the higher class of lay fiefs in Jersey but I have adopted that of Fiefs Nobles, following Delisle's distinction between these and terres roturières, in which latter class he includes vavassories and lower tenures.⁽¹⁾ But noble is not used in the English sense of the word; in fact none of the fiefs under

this heading as they existed after the separation in 1204 was at all large or important. The *Ancienne Coutume* defines the higher fiefs as those, such as fiefs de haubert, counties, baronies and sergeancies, which are not divisible among brothers and for which the overlords have the wardship of heirs who are minors.⁽²⁾ The Jersey fiefs were not divisible among brothers, contrary to the custom ruling other landed property, though some were divisible among co-heiresses, and thus they comply with the first condition laid down. But very few of them were held subject to wardship, and so the majority do not comply with the second condition. In fact they were held by a number of differing tenures—fealty and homage, military service, wardship, sergeancies, suit of court, by the payment of *firma* or of greverie, by money rents, by fancy rents such as silver spurs, as well as by relief. The payment of relief was the only charge due by the majority of these fiefs, but each owed several, but none all, of the services. The *Extente* of 1274 divides these fiefs into three classes, 2 which owed wardship and full relief, 12 which owed full relief and 7 which owed half relief, but the much fuller details of the *Extente* of 1331 show that this statement cannot be taken too literally.⁽³⁾

The impression one gets from these facts is that the fiefs before the separation had been of varying rank and status and that the status of the lower fiefs was enhanced by the separation, perhaps because they were thenceforward held *in capite* of the King, whilst it is probable that some at least had previously been held from Continental overlords. But some differences in rank and status have survived to the present day.⁽⁴⁾

I propose to deal with the subject of these fiefs nobles and their holders by giving a resumé of what we know about those existing before the separation and of their subsequent fate, and then by giving some account of the fiefs which originated after the separation. It must be remembered that there was not in Normandy in 1204 a clean cut between loyalty to the Duke or to the Capetian King; some families committed themselves definitely to the one and lost their lands in the power of the other, but there were families which wavered in their allegiance well into the reign of Henry III.

Of the four classes of fiefs nobles mentioned in the *Ancienne Coutume* we are concerned with fiefs de haubert and sergeancies, not with counties or baronies. Of the few counties held from the Duke none is recorded as having included Jersey; it is true that John when Count of Mortain received the Ducal revenues of the Islands, but they retained their administrative independence and were not added to the county.⁽⁵⁾ A number of Norman barons held fiefs or the overlordship of fiefs in Jersey, as is shown by their grants of the advowsons and tithes of churches and by their confirmations of the grants of subordinate lords to monasteries. But there seems to be no evidence that such holdings in Jersey formed part of the Continental honours of their lords; on the contrary it would seem that they were included in the three *ministeria* or units into which Jersey was divided for fiscal and administrative purposes in 1180, though we gather that when the bulk of the holding was in one of the Continental

bailiwicks such casual charges as relief might be collected in one sum there for all of the scattered fiefs.⁽⁶⁾ The late Colonel de Guérin was of opinion that an item in the Rolls of the Exchequer for 1180, stating that the heirs of Guillaume de Courcy, who died in 1177, owed for Robert d'Agneaux 200 li. from the Islands and certain oats brought from the Island or Islands, means that Guillaume had farmed the whole of the Islands as one unit and had left these arrears unpaid, the conclusion being drawn that the fiscal arrangements in the Roll of 1180 were quite recent. This inference does not seem to be at all warranted by the known facts; Guillaume may well have done no more than guarantee the solvency of Robert as fermor of one of the Island units, probably Guernsey from the amount of 200 li.; there appears to be nothing to connect the Islands with his honour of Courcy in the Oximin.⁽⁷⁾

In chapter VII I give details of grants to monasteries by Norman barons with holdings in Jersey. They belonged to the families of—de Vernon of Néhou, Bertram of Briquebec, de la Haye of La Haye du Puits, de Magneville of Ollonde, de Barneville, and du Hommet of Le Hommet; the de la Hayes and de Magnevilles (anglicised Mandeville) adhered to John, the rest to Philip Augustus. It seems probable that the Roger Wach who held a fief in St. John in 1154 was of the family of Wake of Négreville, because the charter ends with the words "pro anima Hugonis Wach" and Hugh was the head of that family then, also Hugh and Roger Wac were witnesses together in 1153; if so the Wakes were faithful to John and lost Négreville.⁽⁸⁾ It is notable that the powerful Paynells of Hambie, in spite of a legend connecting them with La Hougue Bie, seem to have held nothing in Jersey until after the separation, when a younger son was granted a number of confiscated fiefs which he held until the vacillations of the family ended by their adherence to Philip. I cannot find what happened to the Continental fiefs, if any, of Guillaume Fils Hamon. Less important houses with holdings in Jersey were those of de Vauville, de Sottevast (apparently a junior branch of the de Magnevilles), du Buisson and d'Asnières. I cannot find what was the status of these four families; they are not mentioned in the Red Book of the Exchequer, but may have held from tenants *in capite*.⁽⁹⁾

The Fief du Hommet in St. Clement was lost by Thomas du Hommet, a younger son of Guillaume, Constable of Normandy, and Lucia his wife, when this great family went over to Philip in 1204; as Thomas held the fief in his father's lifetime he may have inherited it from his mother. It was regranted to Thomas Paynel in 1207 after homage had been done for it, and again to the same for one knight's service in 1213, but was confiscated after the defection of the Paynells c. 1216. In 1274 it was still undivided, but by 1331 the fief had been divided into two halves, one held by the Seigneur of Samarès who had bought it of Jourdain du Mont and the other by Richard du Crapoudoit, each paying 13 s. greverie and 30 s. relief. The halves continue in private hands under the titles of Fiefs du Hommet and de Crapdoit, both at present being held by the Dame de Samarès.⁽¹⁰⁾ The fief of Thomas is mentioned in two XII century documents (v. chapter VIII under Stallage).⁽¹¹⁾

With the exception of a small fief held by Adam de Sottevast, all of the other great houses must have parted with their land here before 1204, as, if it had been confiscated, then we ought to know of it. Probably the grants to monasteries had comprised the whole of the Jersey holdings in most cases.⁽¹²⁾ Though some of the barons visited Jersey, *e.g.*, Jourdain de Barneville, their influence upon Island history seems to have been small.⁽¹³⁾ It was at and after the separation that loyal Norman barons, such as Pierre des Préaux, Geoffroi de Lucy, Hasculf de Suligny, Philippe d'Aubigny, and Henri de Trumbleville, appointed Wardens of the Islands, helped to decide their future history by holding them for John and Henry III.

But if counties and baronies affected us but little, the lesser fiefs held by knight service, by sergeancies or by rents are in a different class altogether, since their holders have dominated the Island until quite recent times, more completely in fact in the XVI, XVII, and XVIII centuries than in the Middle Ages. I will deal with this class by giving an account of those fiefs which are confiscated because of the adherence to the French King of their holders, who held lands on both sides of the sea, and then proceed to deal with the fiefs whose holders remained loyal to John and Henry III.

The Fief PINEL in the parish of St. John, with a valuable mill called Moulin de Tesson in that of St. Peter, was stated to have been held by Guillaume Pinel, knight, who adhered to Philip in 1204 so that his Jersey fief was confiscated by John. He was probably the heir to, perhaps the son of, Guillaume Pinel who appears with his brother Hamelin in a charter of c. 1160-70 and was the son of another Guillaume Pinel who gave the church and land at *Turgisvilla* to St. Sauveur ante c. 1136. The Continental lands were in the Duke's hands in 1195, 1198 and in 1203 ; indeed I know of no contemporary proof that the Jersey fief was restored before it was confiscated, so that the Extente jury of 1274 may have been mistaken. It was regranted in 1244, confirmed in 1253, by Henry III to Guillaume de Chesney for the annual payment of a pair of gilt spurs, and passed by marriage to the Walsh family. On the death of Geoffroi Walsh in battle at Barnet in 1471 it reverted to the Crown, but was sold by Charles II and remains in private hands. It is curious that for about three centuries past the fief has been called Chesnel, a name compounded of Chesney and Pinel, and further has been confused with the distinct Fief Paynel.⁽¹⁴⁾

The Fief d'ORGLANDRES in the parish of St. Ouen, district of Le Marais, was stated to have been held by a knight who adhered to Philip at the separation, so that his fief was confiscated ; his name is not given, but there can be little doubt that he was of the family who took their name from their fief of Orglandres near Néhou in the Cotentin. In the Duke's hands in 1105 we find the land of Roger d'Orglandres, but his son Guillaume made grants in Orglandres to Blanchelande c. 1200, so may well have held the Jersey fief in 1204 (*Inventaire de la Manche*, Blanchelande, p. 82). The Crown before the end of the Middle Ages seems to have regranted the fief, retaining 45 s. of *firma*, since the Dumaresq family in 1607 claimed that it had been theirs for 120 years ; it has remained in private hands.⁽¹⁵⁾ After many corruptions the

name Orillande is now usual. It is to be noted that the holder before 1204 had the court of his tenants, which court the King continued to hold after the confiscation.

The Fief des MOURIERS *alias* d'Ouville, which seems to be the correct title, has had its name corrupted even to a worse extent than those of other confiscated fiefs whose holders' names had been forgotten. It has been called Dorville *alias* Le Mourier, Dunville or Donneville. Since d'Ourville, de Hoville, d'Oville, and de Donville were Norman surnames as well as d'Ouville, the choice would be confusing except for the fact that the original XII century charter gives *de Ouville* as the name of the holder. The fief was in the western part of the parish of St. John with an outlying portion in that of St. Peter. By charter of c. 1170 Richard d'Ouville gave to St. Sauveur the tithe of his land of Morers and St. Peter with one acre in Jersey; the names of the witnesses, among whom was the priest of St. John, show that this charter was passed here. It appears likely that it was his son Guillaume who adhered to Philip and was the Guillaume de Dunville, knight, from whom the fief was confiscated according to the XIII century accounts. This Guillaume witnessed a charter in 1202 and probably another in 1203; the latter exists in a copy only and *Gilberto* may be a copyist's error for *Guillelmo*. If he was the Guillaume de Hovill who had a fief in Jersey and died in or before 1214 he must have been faithful to John all his life, as the widow was allowed her dower, so that the confiscation must have been later. This identification is not unlikely, as we have no other evidence of a separate fief de Hoville. But against this there is a charter of a grant by a Guillaume Douville in 1219, probably in Normandy. On the Continent we find a Guillaume d'Ouville and his brothers owing a fine of 100 li. in the Bailiwick of Caux in 1195, and a man of the same name 66 s. 8 d. for one third of a knight's fee in the Bailiwick of Auge in 1198. From the Extente of 1331 one gathers that the fief of Richard le François or Les Arbres had been a dependency of the Jersey fief, though then and ever since held *in capite* from the King by full relief and suit of court.⁽¹⁶⁾ It is not clear what happened to the fief of the Mouriers after 1331; part has remained in the King's hands to the present day under the title of Fief d'Orville, but the larger part in St. John seems to have been granted in the early XV century to a man called Thomelin Lulague, probably Thomas Lulague, a jurat in 1433, and is still in private hands under the title of Fief de Lulague dit Le Mourier.⁽¹⁷⁾

The Fief d'ANNEVILLE in the southern part of the parish of St. Martin was stated in 1331 to have been confiscated from Raoul d'Anneville, knight, in the reign of John. Other than this late evidence we only know of a Thomas d'Anneville who had died in or before 1220, and had apparently been faithful to Henry III, as his widow got her dower on his lands in Guernsey and Jersey, but the holders of the Fief d'Anneville in Guernsey were Jean and Sampson d'Anneville, and this fief was confiscated at the separation. Colonel de Guérin has shown that these men were probably all members of the family of Anneville-en-Saire near Barfleur. In any case the Jersey fief was confiscated before 1274 and remained in the King's hands until 1649, when it was regranted, together with the adjacent carucate of Everard, the escheat of Nicolas

de
wh
the

der
fief
stat
my
pos
Mo
Gui
as d
rem

nort
nam
de F
land
shov
the s
sons
held
Phili
but l
in 12
]
Warc
lands
Drog
parish
desce
their
family
and h
early
to hav
Ouen
Rosel
Warra
de Foi
to ride

de la Hougue, priest, a bastard in 1274, and the petty Fief Lempriere in the same parish which had been held by a Lempriere. The united fief remains in private hands under the title of Fief d'Anneville Everard and Lempriere.⁽¹⁸⁾

The Fief de MORVILLE in the western part of the parish of St. Ouen may have derived its title from the family of that name who attested de Vernon charters and their fief of Moreville near Néhou in the Cotentin, but we have no proof of this. It was stated to have been held in 1204 by Guillaume de Comandas or Cumandas, a somewhat mysterious name which I have not been able to find elsewhere in Normandy. It is possible that he was the witness to a charter Guillaume, the son-in-law of Guillaume de Moreville of the above family. The fief was confiscated and regranted in 1241 to Guillaume de Chesney, passing to the Walsh family and sharing the fate of their fiefs as described under the Fief Pinel above. In 1649 it was regranted by the Crown and remains in private hands.⁽¹⁹⁾

The Fief de ROSEL, one of greater importance than those discussed above, in the northern part of the parish of St. Martin, belonged in the late XII century to a family named de Fornet or Furnet, but it may well have taken its name earlier from a family de Rosel who had a fief of that name in the Cotentin and two in Guernsey, as well as lands in the Bessin. The de Fornet family held lands in the Cotentin and Oximin as shown by the Exchequer Rolls of 1195 and 1198, and were represented in Jersey at the separation by two brothers, Silvestre and Enguerrand, who it seems likely were the sons of Richard de Fornet who witnessed a charter passed in Jersey *ante* 1172. Silvestre held Rosel until about 1207 when it escheated, presumably because he adhered to Philip, but was regranted to Enguerrand, who was faithful until May 1226 at least, but by 1233 the fief had again been confiscated, and was called land of the Normans in 1247.⁽²⁰⁾

In 1247 Henry III granted Rosel to Drogo (Drouet or Dreux) de Barentin, then Warden of the Channel Islands, a member of a loyal Norman family who had held lands in the Pays de Caux before the separation. This was the first of many grants to Drogo and his family; Drogo also received sixty librates of Demesne land in Trinity parish, lands in England and the important office of Seneschal of Gascony. His descendants were not such influential personages, and seem to have made Rosel Manor their headquarters; they continued to acquire Jersey fiefs and were the dominant family in the Island for over a century. So that we find Drogo, grandson of the above, and his son Guillaume called first among the lords temporal owing suit of court in the early XIV century, though before St. Ouen, Samarès and probably Vinchelez seem to have ranked above Rosel. But with the decay of the de Barentin dominance St. Ouen again became the first lay fief and Rosel has continued to rank second.⁽²¹⁾ Rosel was regranted to Drogo subject to the services due thereon, and in the Quo Warranto pleas his descendants claimed that these services were the same as Enguerrand de Fornet and his ancestors owed. The tenure was by homage, relief of 60 s. 1 d., to ride into the sea up to the girths of the horse when the King arrived in or departed

from the Island, to be butler to the King while in Jersey, and by suit of court. The fief had all of the usual rights of a seigneur and the rare one of having gallows. It will be seen that the tenure is by grand sergeanty. The same conditions hold good to the present day.⁽²²⁾

In 1367 Philippe de Barentin sold all of his Jersey fiefs to Raoul Lempriere and Guillaume Payn, and in the subsequent division Rosel fell to the former ; his descendants held it until 1625 when it was sold, but a junior branch of the same Lempriere family recovered it by marriage in the XVIII century and hold it to this day.⁽²³⁾ A romantic story was told about the reason why Philippe de Barentin sold, based upon a pedigree and notes in Latin compiled c. 1540. One is amazed to find this document quoted as authoritative and contemporary evidence, though a comparison with real contemporary sources shows that it contains a mere tradition with serious errors of fact. In the first place Lempriere and Payn were not "Bretons and foreigners" but jurats of the Royal Court and members of old Jersey families established here before 1204. Then the only Jehannet de St. Martin we know of at the time does not appear to have had his tongue torn out. Then Pierre Payn was the son, not the brother, of Jourdain Payn, and was the brother, not the son, of Raulin Payn. Then the whole account of the Payn family's attempts to upset the sale is based upon the wrong assumption that they acted as heirs to the de Barentins ; on the contrary they had been in litigation long before 1367 and continued for a century thereafter to contest the title of the de Barentins and their successors the Lemprieres. We know that in 1247 heirs to the de Fornets existed because the King specially provided for the possibility of having to restore Rosel to them. In 1305 Guillaume son of Raoul Payn was suing the de Barentins for Rosel, which fact is possibly the origin of the note in the pedigree that a Jean de Furnet brought a similar action in 1316. So late as 1462 the Payn family took advantage of the occupation of Jersey by the Comte de Maulevrier to bring their claim to Rosel again before the Court. I consider that the only probable explanation of these facts is that the Payns were descended from the de Fornets and believed themselves to be the rightful heirs to Rosel.⁽²⁴⁾ The branch of the Payn family making this claim was that holding the Fief de Jourdain Payn mentioned below ; Guillaume Payn the joint purchaser was probably a connection, but we do not know how, and he was a joint defendant in some of the proceedings.

The Fief de HENOT in the parish of St. John was stated in 1274 to have been the escheat of Guillaume de Henot, knight ; the name has been corrupted into various forms such as Henout, Henaud, Hennodoit, Haynos, Heynous, and for some three centuries has been assimilated to the Jersey surname Esnouf, though there is no reason to believe that this last is the correct original. I find in Normandy the surname Hunout in the Oximin, but I cannot trace the above knight ; it is possible that the name comes from the country, Hainault. The fief since its confiscation has been kept by the Crown. In the Middle Ages it had a measure of its own for cereals which was exactly one third less than the King's measure.⁽²⁵⁾

The Fief de BOUTVILAIN in the parish of St. John has had its name corrupted to Botevileyn, Butvileyn, Butt William, and Boutvillon, which last has become the accepted name. It was stated in 1274 to have been the escheat of Botevileyn, a Norman, and was then held by Guillaume de St. Helier. In Normandy I find a Raoul Bote Vilain at Bayeux in 1180. It is clear that the fief was confiscated after the separation and later granted with others to Robert de Melesches for his life; it has been and is a dependency of the Fief de Melesches though owing 30 sols annually to the Crown. It would appear that the fourth part of the mill of Dannemarche in St. Laurence belonged to the fief. In the XVI and XVII centuries this fief was held by a family called Sarre and their heirs, a branch of the Lemprieres, who built thereon a house known as Le Vieux Manoir de St. Jean, a title to which it has no right.⁽²⁶⁾

The nine lay fiefs discussed above were confiscated as a result of the separation and, with the single exception of Rosel, no record seems to have survived of the terms by which they were originally held; it would be unsafe to assume that the terms of new grants of these fiefs were the same as the old lord owed unless this is clearly stated, because the conditions of regrants varied according to the benevolence of the grantor between a nominal or a heavy charge. In the case of four of these fiefs, viz. Orglandres, Les Mouriers, Anneville and Henot, we know the terms on which the tenants of the original lords held from them, and these have been discussed in chapter V. The two following fiefs were not confiscated but were allowed to be sold or exchanged by the heirs of the holders.

The Fief d'ESCRAQUEVILLE in the northern part of St. Mary was held in 1204 by Richard d'Escrakkeville, knight; in 1274 it was held by Marguérite, the widow of Jourdain de la Hougue, who had got it from Richard's son in exchange for her Norman lands, with the consent of Drogo de Barentin, the Bailiff (1235-1252). Though the Extente states that Richard had taken the part of the Normans, Marguérite proved to a jury that he had been faithful to the Kings of England all his life, and she was allowed to keep the fief. It is likely that Guillaume le Petit of Trinity parish held it in 1309, and certain that Drogo de St. Martin held it in 1331, paying 4 s. 6 d. greverie and 15 s. relief. The fief has remained in private hands and is now called Fief de Craqueville or ès Craquevilles. The name occurred in the Cotentin, e.g., Geoffroi d'Escrakeville in 1180.⁽²⁷⁾

The Fief de GRAINVILLE in St. Saviour was held in 1204 by Eustace de Grainville or Greinville, who for long remained loyal to John and Henry III. He was probably the same man who was recorded as owing 12 li. in 1200, and as having been pardoned for the death of Richard Fils Osbern by letters patent of 8 November, 1207. Eustace evidently had trouble about his Jersey fief, for he obtained an order to the Warden to give him seisin on the 24th January, 1217/8. Afterwards he gave the fief to his brother Gilbert de Grainville, who sold it in 1239 to Guillaume de Chesney with the consent of Henry III. It went by marriage to the Walsh family and suffered the fate of their fiefs as described under the Fief Pinel. Regranted by the Crown in 1643, it

has since been in private hands. The surname de Grainville seems to have been connected with Upper Normandy.⁽²⁸⁾

In addition to the above fiefs held by persons who lost or sold them at or after the separation owing to the greater attractions of their Continental properties or connections, there is some evidence from place-names of ancient holdings in Jersey by Norman families who are not otherwise known to have held fiefs here. But we do not know whether these fiefs were lost by sale, inheritance or by confiscation. Such fiefs are those of GORGES in St. Saviour, now usually called Bagot from the name of later medieval holders, and LA GRUCHETTERIE in Trinity, derived from the Norman surnames de Gorges and de Gruchet; the latter must not be confused with the distinct surnames de Gruchy and Grossier. A Jeanne de Gorges, widow of Guillaume de Chesney, bought Grainville in 1356, but she was of the Dorset branch of the name.⁽²⁹⁾

We now deal with the Jersey fiefs whose holders remained loyal at the separation and thereby lost such Continental lands as they may have possessed.

First and most important of these fiefs is the Fief Haubert of SAINT OUEN in the southern part of the parish of that name. This fief has been held by the family of de Carteret from before the time of the earliest records, and, though once in the XVIII century divided among co-heiresses, the Manor House and one share have been held continuously by the senior female line, who have acquired the other shares and taken the name and arms of de Carteret by Royal warrant. Wace tells us that Onfroi and Mauger de Carteret fought at Hastings in 1066; Mauger received grants of five manors in Somerset, held from the Conqueror's half-brother Robert, and Onfroi probably kept the ancestral fiefs, for in the early XII century we find Renaud de Carteret, believed to have been his son, holding the fiefs of St. Ouen in Jersey and of Carteret in the Cotentin. Renaud's son Philippe lived until nearly 1180, and was recorded in 1172 as owing the service of one knight in the Cotentin to the Duke. Philippe's son Renaud in 1180 still owed arrears of 64 li. in the Bailiwick of the Cotentin for fine on his father's land. It was probably this Renaud, but just possibly a son also named Renaud, who held the fief in 1204 and lost the Continental fief owing to his loyalty to John. His son and heir Philippe had spent part of his boyhood in England as a hostage for his father, but was released with the other Island hostages by John in recognition of the loyalty of the Islanders. Philippe, like all of his successors, remained loyal, but he had not given up the hope of recovering the Continental lands for his family in 1235, when he made an unsuccessful attempt, with the consent of Henry III, to get the French King to allow them as dower to his two sisters. Various charters of the two Renauds and two Philippes survive in original or in *vidimus*. In chapter VII I give some information on the grants to the Church made by this family.⁽³⁰⁾

An examination of these charters and other sources for the early history of this fief shows some unusual features. For one thing it is notable that the eldest son on succeeding to his father on at least two occasions repudiated his father's grants, and eventually obtained a substantial sum of money from the grantee abbey as the price

of his confirmation. Then the feudal court of the Fief of St. Ouen, first mentioned in a charter of 1135, is shown by the Rolls of the Assizes of 1299 to have had a very unusual form, quite unlike that of the normal seigneurial court but having remarkable analogies with the old Scandinavian court of the *goði* or priest-chief called the *tólfstærkviðr*. (V. Icel. Diction. under *kviðr*, *óðal*, and *goði*.) I cannot but think that these facts point to the fief having been an original *óðal* land-take, held from no lord and inalienable within the family, though in process of being feudalized. In 1299 the de Carterets could produce no Ducal or Royal warrant for the holding of this court, indeed if the above explanation be correct no such warrant could exist, and they had to submit to the remodelling of the court on a normal feudal basis.⁽³¹⁾

We have seen that the de Carteret of 1172 owed to the Duke the service of one knight only; the fact that this was due in the Bailiwick of the Cotentin does not necessarily imply that it was not due on the Jersey fief, which we shall see was later two-thirds of a knight's fee and owed military service as such. If, as seems probable, the fine on his father's land due by this Philippe's son Renaud, the arrears of which amounted to 64 li. at the beginning of 1180, was really relief, this implies that Philippe had held over four knights' fees; perhaps he had held some from intermediate lords as well as the one *in capite*. Then again the Fief of St. Ouen, though first in dignity of the Island fiefs, is of lesser area and value than some others, and there is some evidence of varying degrees of force that this may have been due to division in earlier times. We know that the distant fiefs of La Motte in St. Helier and St. Saviour, and Ponterrin in Trinity, had been enfeoffed by the Seigneur of St. Ouen, and the former retains to this day the right to licence taverns which is otherwise the exclusive privilege of St. Ouen.⁽³²⁾ Then there is the fief called "de Philippe de Carteret" in 1274 and 1331, though since named Luce de Carteret, probably from Lucie, one of Philippe's heirs, in St. Peter and St. Brelade. Also there is the fief called Fille de Carteret, whose manor house was in St. Martin, though it extended over other parishes and had a substantial revenue, which appears for the first time in 1528 as in the King's hands and so has since remained. The names of these two fiefs suggest that they may have been separated from St. Ouen. These facts lead me to believe that the present fief is the remnant of a larger one which may well have been a full knight's fee.⁽³³⁾ The country people to this day call the fief "Le Fief Haubert", as if it were the only one with a right to that title, and I consider that they are correct. Without any ancient warrant, I believe, the four fiefs of Rosel, Samarès, Melesches and La Trinité have in more modern times claimed to be fiefs de haubert, a claim which appears to be unsustainable. The whole question of tenure by knight service in Jersey is further complicated by the Stuart Kings in regranting fiefs having lavishly conceded tenure by knight service to fiefs such as Melesches, Grainville, Noirmont, Avranches, Anneville, Everard, Lempriere (St. Martin), Abbessé de Caen, St. Germain, Morville and Robillard, and further by the Extente of 1668 having recorded as held by the same tenure those of Rosel, Samarès, La Trinité and Les Augrès.⁽³⁴⁾

The conditions under which the fief was held after 1204 were first clearly stated in 1309, as follows:—"Philippe de Carteret holds his manor of St. Ouen from the Lord King by the service of two parts of a knight's fee and he is bound in time of war with two squires and horses to serve the Lord King under arms for the space of two parts of forty days. And the relief of the said manor is 10 li., to wit, for two parts of one knight's fee". The Extente of 1331 adds that the manor was held by homage, suit of court, relief of 10 li., and the above military service, which it states was due within the Island in Gorey Castle at the expense of the Seigneur; it further adds that the Lord King had the custody or wardship worth £50 sterling in an average year, equal to 200 li. tournois then. The amount of this latter sum shows that more land than the present fief was involved. "Two parts" means here two-thirds, the normal relief of a knight's fee being 15 li. The tenure has remained the same ever since, though the military service has become obsolete.⁽³⁵⁾ The holder enjoyed all of the usual rights of a Jersey seigneur, and some exceptional rights confined to a few fiefs, also rights unique in Jersey such as the holding in severalty of St. Ouen's Pond, still called by the country people La Mare au Seigneur, and that of licensing taverners; I know of no medieval warrant for this last, however.⁽³⁶⁾

The family of de Carteret in the course of its long history has given many distinguished members to the service of the Island, and two men, Sir George and John Earl Granville, who rose to high distinction in England.

The Fief of VINCHELEZ in the vingtaine of that name in the northern part of the parish of St. Ouen has its early origins lost in obscurity. It seems certain that it is a local place-name from which the holders derived their surname, not *vice versa*, because I cannot find any bearer of this name in Continental Normandy. In 1156 Alain de Vinchelez gave his chapel in Jersey to Mont St. Michel, and there figure among witnesses to charters the same Alain in c. 1168, Guillaume de Vinchelez in c. 1180 and Thomas de Vinchelez in c. 1218, among others of the most important Jersey families. These three Christian names continued to be borne by others of the family in Jersey later. In the Extente of 1274 we find the fief mentioned with St. Ouen as in a class apart from lesser lay fiefs, and specifically as held by Royal wardship, but some time before this the fief had suffered from division, probably among co-heiresses; the senior branch was then represented by a woman, Lucie de Vinchelez, the wife of Jean de Carteret, who obliged the holders of the junior portions, Philippe de Vinchelez, Guillaume Soyn or Song, and others to do homage to him for them, as the jury found they had done to many lords of the fief.⁽³⁷⁾ The Extente of 1331 gives more details of the divisions; the portion of Philippe de Vinchelez was held then by Thomas Fondan in right of his wife (Philippe's heiress), a Guillaume Song held his namesake's portion which we learn was the petty Fief de Portinfer, and minor parts were held by Philippe Hascoul, Guillaume Dumaresq and Robert Norman. The 10 s. stated to be due to the Crown is now seen to have been composed of 5 s. *firma* payable half each by the first two men and 5 s. greverie payable 5 d., 5 d., and 2 d. by the last three, with

a b
fatl
stat
sori
a n
Bre
fief
Gue
chie
som
it w
Jean
de V
had
de H
her 1
Long
a set
law,
made
name
since,
respec
I
of a J
claims
very c
this w
family
T
of whi
is not
suit, th
other f
more o
is statec
1274 to
that of
the Fief
was the
de Vinc

a balance of 4 s. due by the chief portion, now held by Guillaume de Chesney, whose father Nicolas had bought it from the de Carterets in c. 1323. All of these shares are stated in the Extente to have been held *cum participibus*, which would make them vavassories rather than fiefs nobles, but, as regards the senior portion at least, this is probably a mistake of the scribe. An interesting dependency of the fief was the island of Brecqhou near Sark, but this became separated when Eléonore de Chesney sold the fief in 1363; Brecqhou then went to her sister Jeanne, wife of Denis le Marchant of Guernsey, whence this island takes its alternative name of Ile aux Marchants. The chief portion of the fief was sold to Jacquet Hascoul in 1363, and later was held for some generations by a family of le Fèvre. On the death of the last of these in 1479 it was divided among his three daughters, the grandson of the eldest of whom was Jean Dumaresq, who eventually bought out most of his co-heirs. Meanwhile the de Vinchelez family had bought back in 1362 that portion of the original fief which had been held by Philippe de Vinchelez in 1274, apparently that now called Vinchelez de Haut, and they ended up in a childless woman, Catherine de Vinchelez, the last of her name; in 1484 she gave her fief by deed to her godson Richard de Carteret. Long litigation resulted between the various claimants for portions of the fief. In 1512 a settlement was made by which the claims of Richard de Carteret, though bad at law, were recognised, but litigation dragged on until 1605 when a final settlement made two equal fiefs comprising most but not all of the original fief. Under the names of Vinchelez de Haut and Vinchelez de Bas these have been in existence ever since, held by the successors in title of Richard de Carteret and Jean Dumaresq respectively.⁽³⁸⁾

I have given a sketch of this history at some length because it shows the vicissitudes of a Jersey fief and its holders. Miss J. M. Marett, a descendant of the Dumaresq claimants, has published a valuable study of the family and fief of Vinchelez and their very complicated history in the *Bulletins of the Société Jersiaise*, Vol. XI, pp. 337-356; this work is based on the original sources, some of which belong to the Marett family.

The tenure of this fief and of its divisions presents some unusual features, the chief of which is that they seem never to have owed suit of court to the King. This however is not certain as regards the de Chesney seigneurs, who in 1323 and 1331 performed suit, though for which of their fiefs is not stated; it may have been for one of their other fiefs, but we do not know that any one of these owed it.⁽³⁹⁾ We do not hear more of the wardship mentioned in 1274, but after the final division into two fiefs it is stated in 1607 that these were held by fealty and homage. The relief is stated in 1274 to be "full relief", but no relief is stated to be due in the Extente of 1331; in that of 1607 we find a relief of 6 li. due on Vinchelez de Haut with an agreement for the Fief de Bas to be freed and discharged from it. A deed of 1371 shows that this 6 li. was the old relief, but then it was due on the minor part of the fief in the hands of the de Vinchelez family, who were at that time claiming the eldership (*aînesse*) and the

right to recover half of the relief from Jacquet Hascoul and other holders. One gathers that the early fief may have suffered in dignity from its sub-divisions about 1200. The fief enjoyed all the usual franchises and the two halves have succeeded to these.⁽⁴⁰⁾

The family of de Chesney mentioned above and elsewhere were an important loyalist Norman family, originating apparently in the Pays de Caux and Oximin, who received lavish grants in England, Jersey and Guernsey from Henry III. They were powerful in Jersey in the XIII and XIV centuries and in Guernsey for a century later. They are now represented by the Earl of Warwick, whose family archives are one of the sources of Island history.⁽⁴¹⁾

The Fief of SAMARÈS in the vingtaine of that name in the parish of St. Clement evidently takes its name from a saltmarsh, only drained about a century ago, near the Manor. The Fief was held before and after 1204 by a family of de Salinelles, named Guillaume from father to son for at least three generations, and two of these men are called knights. Salinelles means little salt pans, and it has been suggested that there has been confusion between the names Samarès and Salinelles, but this is not an admissible explanation as they are correctly distinguished, e.g. in a Papal Bull of 1186. The surname occurs also in Continental Normandy in the Bessin, a Gervaise de Salinelles in 1195 and a Guillaume de Salinelles in 1198; the latter owed 12 li. as pledge of the Constable and may have been one of our Jersey Guillaumes, who would thus have had Continental lands. There was a Fief de Salinelles in Guernsey held by Mont St. Michel. But such names as Samarès and Salinelles might arise independently wherever saltmarshes or salt pans existed.⁽⁴²⁾ The first Guillaume of whom we have knowledge in Jersey attested a de Carteret charter of c. 1180, and gave a tithe to the Abbey of St. Helier *ante* 1186. His son Guillaume II attested with others of the chief men of Jersey and Guernsey two letters of Philippe d'Aubigny the Warden in 1218 and 1219, and he gave a tithe of his windmill in Jersey to St. Sauveur in 1218. It seems certain that he would have been obliged to give a hostage to John, as the chief men of Jersey did, so that his son Guillaume III may well have been the Guillaume who was one of the Island hostages released in 1214. Guillaume III had succeeded his father in 1221 when he restored to the Abbess of Caen a vavassorie; in 1226 he received from the King a gift of 3 marks for his expenses; it is quite possible too that he was the Guillaume de Saumarais or Saumareis, knight, the name of the fief being used for the surname, who was present in Guernsey in 1254 in a jury of notables of both Islands, and again in 1263 as Justicier, but the possibility that this man was of the important Guernsey family of de Sausmarez must be admitted. Guillaume III had a son, but whether he was also Guillaume we are not told, though it is highly probable. We have no later records of the de Salinelles family in Jersey.⁽⁴³⁾

For about a century Samarès was next held by the family of de St. Helier, which had been established in Jersey before 1204; Guillaume de St. Helier had attested a charter here in c. 1180 among others of the chief men including Guillaume I de Salinelles, and Richard de St. Helier (*de Sancto Helerio* in both cases) was a priest

owni
and i
knov
heire
had b
this
passe
is rec
died
de St
and S
and c
spelli
the X
reason
their
the Is
threat
of the
de Ca
it is n
the Pl
King.
was se
S
then p
their f
family
since l
It
of the
allegec
to hav
King c
la con
impro
Rufus
for the
to elap
Crusac
any re

owning property here in 1180. Guillaume de St. Helier was a jurat in Jersey in c. 1267 and in 1274 we find Pierre de St. Helier holding Samarès; how he got it we do not know but there is a strong probability that it was by marriage with a de Salinelles heiress, because in the *Quo Warranto* pleas the de St. Heliers claimed that their franchises had been held from time immemorial by their ancestors, even though we cannot take this word too literally. Also we should probably have had a record had the fief passed by sale or by confiscation and regrant. Pierre de St. Helier, son of Pierre I, is recorded as holding the fief at various dates between 1299 and 1323 and probably died shortly before 1329 when his relief was paid. In 1331 it was held by Guillaume de St. Helier, probably son of Pierre II, but about 1340 he went over to the French and Samarès was confiscated to the Crown. As in the case of Les Augrès, Handois and other Jersey fiefs, the holders were sometimes called de Samarès (in its various spellings) instead of by their surname; this practice however was far more used in the XVIII and XIX centuries than in the Middle Ages.⁽⁴⁴⁾ We can only surmise the reasons why an old loyal family who had held high offices should have abandoned their allegiance. But in the first half of the XIV century the traditional loyalty of the Islanders was wearing thin under the long drawn out *Quo Warranto* pleas, which threatened both their property and their cherished liberties, and under the exactions of the Justices Itinerant and the Wardens. When in 1343 we find the heads of the de Carteret and de Barentin families, with other chief men of Jersey, in exile in France, it is not surprising that other families had given up the hope of living in peace under the Plantagenets and took the tempting bait of lands in France held out by the French King. Edward III however was learning wisdom and the heavy hand of the Crown was soon lightened.⁽⁴⁵⁾

Samarès was twice granted to Englishmen who held it for a short time, and it then passed, probably by purchase, to the de Barentins, and was sold with the rest of their fiefs in 1367, as described above under Rosel. It went in the division to the Payn family and remained in the hands of their descendants until the XVIII century. It has since been in various private hands.

It is desirable to deal here with the myth of a family named St. Hilaire, a branch of the well-known Continental Norman family of St. Hilaire de Harcouet, which is alleged to have held Samarès from the XI to the XIV centuries.⁽⁴⁶⁾ This myth seems to have originated in an absurd faked charter, purporting to have been made by a King of England and attributed to William Rufus, dated "l'an vingt neuvième depuis la conquête de l'Angleterre", by which the fief is granted to a St. Hilaire with the improbable name of Rodolphe. In the first place there is no reason to believe that Rufus had any power to grant land in Normandy in 1095, at a time when his schemes for the conquest of his brother Robert's Duchy had gone wrong, and a year had yet to elapse before Rufus took the Duchy in pledge while Robert went on the First Crusade. Then the charter is in XVIII century French, and its form does not bear any resemblance to that of charters of the end of the XI century, even ending in a

"témoin moi-même" before the date ! So that the contention of its apologists that it is a translation of a genuine Latin charter cannot stand. The forger of this document evidently knew nothing of the de Salinelles, and he in all probability got the name St. Hilaire from the French version of the Extente of 1331.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Saint Hilary was a saint known to all western Christendom, but our St. Helier had renown in a much more restricted territory, so that, though the two saints were perfectly distinct persons, the name of the well-known St. Hilary has been applied to the parish, town and surname of St. Helier not only in the Middle Ages but right down to the present day by people who did not know the true facts. The surname de St. Helier is as well established as any other in Jersey at the same period, and this by contemporary evidence ; we find it correctly given in charters and in such documents as the Rolls of the Assizes of 1309, where it occurs very often, though in others, such as the Extente of 1331, the name of the better known St. Hilaire is substituted therefor by the scribes. If there is a particle of proof that the family of St. Hilaire de Harcouet ever held land in Jersey, the advocates of this myth have failed to produce it ; in fact the connection with that family seems to be the merest assumption, except for the three stars on a broken seal of 1291 ; heraldry however was then in too fluid a state to make it a safe guide to genealogy.⁽⁴⁸⁾ When I compiled the index to the Cartulaire des Iles Normandes I thought that the "Petrus de Sancto Hillario" who was given various Royal commissions between 1285 and 1291, and his son, also Petrus, were members of the English family of Saint Hilaire sent over to the Islands, but it is evident now that they were Pierre I and Pierre II de St. Helier, above mentioned.

In 1331 the tenure of the Fief of Samarès was by homage and suit of court, also by the payment of 10 s. for greverie ; the relief was 10 li., equal to that of St. Ouen and higher than that of any other Jersey fief, being equal to that on two-thirds of a knight's fee. It is clear that the fief once had had rights of wreck and free warren far to the westward of its present limits, so probably was then larger and may have been a knight's fee ; but if so it can hardly have been held *in capite* or else it should appear in the Red Book. Wardship is mentioned as due only in the Extente of 1607. On the other hand the jury in 1309 deposed that the holder had to ride into the sea to meet the King, and perhaps to act as his butler (the Roll is mutilated) which appears to be tenure by grand sergeanty. The fief had all the rights and franchises of the higher class and one that was rare, that of having gallows.⁽⁴⁹⁾

The Fief of HANDOIS, called Hundevaus, Hondevoys or Hundeweys in 1274, in the parish of St. Laurence was held from the latter part of the XII to the early part of the XIV centuries by a family of some local importance called Gallichan or le Gallichan. The name implies that the first holder came from Galicia in Spain ; it is likely that he was one of the mercenaries of many races employed by Henry II. Guillaume Gallichan granted 4 acres in Jersey to the Abbey of St. Helier *ante* 1186, and he was probably the same man who in 1180 owed 6 li. for relief in the *Ministerium de Grocio*, so that the father for whose soul he made the grant had held the fief before him. It

was probably his son Raoul who was one of the Island hostages liberated in 1214. The Guillaume le Gallichan who got leave in 1236 to be tried by a jury of 24 on a charge of disloyalty, the verdict of the petty jury having gone against him, would have been old if the same man, though not impossibly so.⁽⁵⁰⁾

Raoul Gallichan was no doubt the "R. Galletto" who witnessed a charter in c. 1218 among others of the chief men of Jersey.⁽⁵¹⁾ Raoul married Jeanne, of a noble Norman family, she being the niece of Adam de Sottevast and of Guillaume de Briquebec or Briquebosc; her uncles gave her as dower, the former a fief in St. Laurence worth 10 *summae* of wheat (equal to 14 quarters 6 cabots Jersey) the latter one in Grouville worth 16 s. The Crown looked upon this dower as an attempt to deprive the King of land of the Normans, and Raoul and Robert, the sons of the marriage, spent their long lives in trying to hold it. Raoul got an order for restitution in 1240-1 on the plea that his wife's uncles were seised of the fiefs the day they gave her in marriage, but this was upset and the Crown retained the dower in the end, though Robert Gallichan was still trying to get it back in 1305.⁽⁵²⁾ Among other chief men of the Islands Raoul served on an inquest in Guernsey in 1254, as a jurat at the Assizes in Jersey in 1269, and he held Handois in 1274. His son Robert still held the fief in 1309, but by 1323 it had got into the hands of Pierre de Garis, a Basque financier, how we do not know. The de Garis family held it for three generations, and on the death of the last without near kin in c. 1396 many claimants appeared; eventually the fief went to the Walsh family and shared the fate of their fiefs as described under the Fief Pinel.⁽⁵³⁾

It seems likely that the farmhouse of Handois in the St. Laurence's Valley is on the site of the old Gallichan manor house, but the de Garis certainly lived in the Bello-sanne Valley at the place called Les Saints Germain, the old manor house of which was demolished in 1639, and from this the Fief began to be called Saint Germain.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Regranted by the Crown in the XVII century the fief has since been in private hands under the title of "Fief et Seigneurie de Saint Germain, Handois, les Quatorze Quartiers ou Garis"; it is typical of the Islanders' persistence in old claims that this title should still include the fourteen quarters confiscated seven hundred years ago.

In 1331 Handois was stated to be held by suit of court and by payment annually of a pair of white spurs, worth 12 d. if commuted. The relief, which we have seen was 6 li. in 1180, was full relief in 1274 and was not expressly stated in 1331, but was probably then 60 s. 1 d. as in 1607. In 1309 the tenants of the portion in the King's hands paid relief at the rate of 12 d. per acre on 30 acres and at 6 d. per acre on the rest "because of the higher rent." So that it is clear that the relief on this portion had been passed on to the cultivating tenants, who also paid the rent of 14 quarters 6 cabots of wheat and pullages. This portion was the "Fief des Quatorze Quartiers", part of the dower of Jeanne confiscated by the Crown, and the portion in private hands was sometimes called "the other fief of Handois" or the "fee of Garis"; so that it is evident that the fief had been divided into two portions after 1180, and the marriage

of Raoul and Jeanne looks like a family arrangement to reunite them. The sources are not explicit, but the fief probably had the usual franchises with one notable exception; the holder in 1662 declared that his predecessors had not the right of holding court of their tenants, and Charles II granted him this right on his petition. This incident is a warning not to assume the antiquity of feudal rights in all cases. We know that not all Jersey fiefs had courts, but it is surprising that such a one as Handois, once important, had not this right.⁽⁵⁵⁾

The Fief de MALET or ès Malets, now called La Malletière, in Grouville was held before the separation by Robert Malet, who had been in trouble before 1180 when the fruits of his garden and his chattels had been sold for the benefit of the Duke. After 1204 his son Guillaume was a hostage for him in England and was released in 1214, but meanwhile Robert had died and the Warden confiscated the fief of the absent hostage, who only in 1223 succeeded in getting an order for an inquest to establish the facts and to give Guillaume seisin if the verdict were favourable. It seems certain that the Moulin de Malet in Grouville was the seigneurial mill of the fief; the Abbess of Caen had a rent secured on this mill in 1180, granted by and due to the Duke for culture of Demesne tenants. As this Duke was probably the Conqueror, this would put back the history of mill and fief into the XI century.⁽⁵⁶⁾ It is remarkable that the important Continental family of Malet of Gravelle in Upper Normandy had as favourite Christian names Robert and Guillaume alternatively for father and son, which suggests relationship with the Jersey family.⁽⁵⁷⁾

The holder of the fief in 1274 is not stated, though Olivier Malet held land in Grouville in that year, but in 1309 it was held by Hamelin de la Hougue in right of his wife, probably a Malet, and in 1331 by Guillaume de la Hougue. The fief and mill had become separated before 1433. The fief has remained in private hands, held by various families, including one of Mallet in the XVI and XVII centuries.⁽⁵⁸⁾

The fief paid relief of 30 s., but otherwise we know no details of the conditions of tenure; it did not owe suit of court and seems to have been of little importance, though the fact that a hostage was exacted by John would seem to imply that its status was higher at that time.⁽⁵⁹⁾

The Fief of SURVILLE in St. Helier and St. John was held by Guillaume de Sureville before 1204, having been mentioned as forming the northern boundary of the Fief de Bellosanne granted by John in a charter of 1200, confirming a charter of a few years earlier. It seems likely that the fief of Mathilda de Sulleville on which she owed 40 s. for fine and relief in the *Ministerium de Grocio* in 1180 was the same, as I cannot trace this fief otherwise, nor the surname de Sulleville in Normandy, so that it may be a scribe's or transcriber's error for de Sureville, which does occur elsewhere there. The owing of relief would then imply tenure *in capite*.⁽⁶⁰⁾

We have very little contemporary evidence about the fief and family after 1204. In the Extente of 1274 there is mention of Nicolas the heir of Thomas de Sureville as a tenant of Robert de Melesches in St. Helier, accused of extorting relief illegally, but

it is not expressly stated that he held this fief. The word Surville on page 29 of that Extente is a mistake for Sauvalle. The brothers Robert and Colin (Nicolas) de Surville gave to the Priory of Escréhou at some unrecorded date the tithe of their mill called Moulin de la Haye in St. Laurence. The name of Maître Nicolas de Sureville, clerk, occurs in documents of 1291 and of 1305, and his heir, also Nicolas, is recorded by the jury of St. John in 1309 as not coming on the first day of the eyre. The surname seems to have become extinct in Jersey shortly after. The fief from 1399 onwards has been in various private hands.⁽⁶¹⁾

It would seem that the overlordship of Surville must have been granted by the King in the XIII century to Robert de Melesches, or perhaps to his predecessor in title Thomas Paynel, for it has since been held from the Fief de Melesches, owing suit at the court of the Seigneur of Melesches. It is difficult to explain the above finding of the jury of St. John.

The six fiefs last described were all held by loyalists in 1204, and the holders of the next three fiefs were also loyal, but a doubt arises as to their status because some of the sources relate that the holders held *cum particibus*, which would seem to debar them from the higher class of fief. We have not good evidence that these fiefs were actually so shared by parceners, but rather much evidence that they were not. It is quite possible that the scribes, used to writing *cum particibus* after long lists of bouvées and petty fiefs, put in the words automatically where not justified.

The Fief de LEMPRIERE in St. Helier was called *Willelmi Imperatoris* or W. Emperur in 1274 and took its name from the early holders; the name Lempriere is a corruption of L'Empereur and no doubt a nickname in its origin, as is Le Ray (*Rex*). It is found elsewhere in western Normandy. In Jersey we find in 1180 60 s. due by Gilbert Lemprière (*Imperator*) forming part of a balance of old fines in the *Ministerium de Groceio*; seeing that full relief was due on this fief in 1274 and that fines and reliefs are lumped together elsewhere in the Great Rolls of the Exchequer, it is highly probable that this was the relief then overdue on the fief.⁽⁶²⁾

In 1274 the fief was held by Guillaume Lemprière, a jurat, and in 1309 by Raoul Lemprière, probably his son, who lived until at least 1323, but by 1331 Thomas the son of Raoul had succeeded his father. Meanwhile between 1309 and 1331 the fief had been reduced from one carucate to 30 acres and paid half the relief, 30 s. It retained the name Lempriere and was held by Thomas Lempriere by suit of court and payment of the whole greverie of 40 s. due on the undivided fief. It is possible that the rest was called Fief de la Godelière, which was held by Jourdain Payn, owing relief of 30 s. and apparently also suit of court but without greverie. The two fiefs remained separate under these names and La Godelière so remains to this day. How the division of the fief arose we do not know, but it may have been connected with the obscure settlement between Guillaume the son of Thomas Payn and the above Thomas Lemprière son of Raoul, described in the Rolls of 1309 pp. 205-6. The name Godelière implies that it was once held by the Godel family, who certainly held land in

this parish in 1331.⁽⁶³⁾ It is possible that the division was made much earlier and that the Lemprieres had continued to be responsible for the full relief until it was agreed to divide this liability. That might explain the use of *particibus*? (But v. under Fief ès Godeus below.)

Raoul II Lempriere seems to have succeeded to the fief before 1342, when he was a jurat and remained one until his death in c. 1380, also acting as Bailiff of Jersey for some time. It was this Raoul who created the importance which this family has enjoyed ever since by buying part of the de Barentin fiefs in 1367, as described under Rosel above. The later history of the Fief Lempriere is badly documented, unless indeed a sale by Raulin Lempriere in 1476 of the Manoir de St. Helier really refers to the manor house of this fief, but evidently the Lemprieres parted with the fief in the later Middle Ages, and eventually it became incorporated in the Fief de Melesches and has no separate existence today.⁽⁶⁴⁾

The tenure of the fief was by suit of court, greverie and relief, in addition to which it was charged in 1309 with the rent of a pound of pepper, later commuted at 42 s., for a dovecot which Raoul Lempriere had erected on his fief without the King's leave; this shows that the fief had no right to a dovecot. When the fief ceased to be a separate entity these charges were left due upon the tenement of one of the free tenants and his successors in title acquit them to this day.⁽⁶⁵⁾

The Fief ès HORMANS in St. Peter measured one carucate or 60 acres. I do not know of direct proof that the Horman family held it before 1204, but the names make this highly probable. Roger Horman attested a charter in c. 1180 among others of the chief men of Jersey, and Robert Horman was one of the Island hostages liberated in 1214; it seems probable that the former held the fief and that the latter was his son.⁽⁶⁶⁾

Documentary evidence on the fief in the XIII century seems to be lacking, but Thomas Horman served on an inquest in 1254 among other chief men and may have held the fief. Philippe Horman was a jurat in the first quarter of the XIV century, and he had a son Jourdain who almost certainly was the Jourdain Horman who did suit for the fief in 1323. In 1331 Roger Horman held the fief. In 1392-1401 another Jourdain Horman was a jurat, but it would seem that the main branch must have ended in the male line shortly after, as we hear no more of Hormans in high office in the Middle Ages. At the end of the XV and in the XVI and XVII centuries the fief was held by a family named Fondan, and it has since been in various hands.⁽⁶⁷⁾

The fief was held by suit of court and the payment of 10 s. for *firma* and 60 s. for relief. In the Extente of 1274 it is stated that only half relief was due, but this must be an error in view of the later Extentes. The fief never seems to have had a court.⁽⁶⁸⁾

The Fief de SAVAL in Trinity seems to have had no name in the Middle Ages but that of its holders, the family of le Petit, but later acquired that of Saval, perhaps from some later holder. There appears to be no definite proof that the le Petits held it before 1204, but the fact that Colin le Petit (*Parvus*) was one of the hostages released

in 1214 makes it highly probable that they held this, the chief fief of that influential family in later years, in the reign of John. It was held by Richard le Petit in 1274 and by Guillaume le Petit in 1309 and 1331, the latter man being also called le Petit de Rosel, whence probably the name of the little fief of Petit Rosel which seems to have been held by this family. The le Petit family gave to the Island service between 1292 and 1446 seven jurats, of whom two, Richard and Colin, acted as Bailiffs. The main line seems to have died out in the late XV century, as in the next two centuries the fief was held by the de la Rocque family. It is now annexed to Rosel. The petty fief *ès Verrants* in St. Saviour and St. Helier was held by the le Petits with Saval in the XIV and XV centuries.⁽⁶⁹⁾

The tenure in 1331 was by payment of 5 s. for greverie and 60 s. relief, but apparently the fief did not owe suit of court then or later. Yet Guillaume le Petit did suit in 1323 and in 1331 and is not known to have held any other fief owing suit. The fief seems to have had the usual franchises, including court. If not divisible among parceners, but the *Extente* of 1331 and *Rolls* of 1309 differ as to this, Saval ranks in the class of Fiefs Nobles.⁽⁷⁰⁾

It must not be supposed that the holders of the above nine fiefs were the only ones who remained loyal to John at the separation; on the contrary it is probable that many more were loyal, but the scanty records of the XII and XIII centuries do not allow us to prove it. Some indications of the holders of fiefs before 1204 may be gathered from the surnames of hostages liberated by John in 1214 because of the loyalty and good service of the Islanders. In addition to some mentioned above we find those of Colin Norman, Richard Tourgis, Richard Varin, Gervaise Becquet for Richard Becquet, and Renaud Gunewar (presumably) for Robert Gunewar; all of these bear regular Jersey surnames and we cannot doubt that all represented persons holding land. It is probable that the Gunewars held the small fief named Ganoire in St. Mary, as it was called Gounouare in 1331 when Jourdain de la Mare held it by payment of 5 s. greverie and 15 s. relief. Richard Norman owed 30 s. in the *Ministerium de Groceio* in 1180 for record of a duel, so he must have been a man of standing. The families of Tourgis and Varin have given their names to the *vingtaines* of Coin *ès* Tourgis and Coin Varin, and the former were influential in the later Middle Ages. Then there were the three administrators mentioned in the *Exchequer Rolls* of 1180, Roger Godel, Gilbert de la Hougue and Richard Burnouf, all bearers of regular Jersey surnames and all men who might have been expected to hold fiefs. The Fief of la Godelière already mentioned, that called *ès Godeaux* in Trinity, and that of la Hougue in Grouville and St. Saviour, may well be connected with these families, but I cannot trace how; the only fief called Burnouf seems to have been a petty agricultural holding held from Noirmont, while Hugues the son of Richard Burnouf (perhaps the *minister*) held in 1234 a small tenement from Jean de l'Epesse in St. Saviour. Then there is an indication of a large fief in 1180 in the payment in the *Ministerium de Gorroic* of 4 li. 14 s. for balance of relief of Roger Part Wastel; evidently this name is corrupt, though

Wastel is a Norman surname ; I cannot trace the fief, indeed the Fief Astelle or Hasteles in Grouville (the right district), which is now called la Fosse Astelle, is the only similar name.⁽⁷¹⁾

We have dealt with eight fiefs which were confiscated at or after the separation from Normandy on account of the disloyalty of the holders, two which the holders were allowed to sell or exchange, and nine the holders of which remained loyal. We now deal with those with any pretension to being fiefs nobles which were either created after 1204 or are not known to have existed earlier, though many of them may well have so existed.

The Fief of DIÉLAMENT is believed to be the largest fief in Jersey, and is in the northern part of Trinity ; this name does not appear in our sources before the later XIV century and the origin of the name is quite unknown, though very improbable guesses have been made about it. I consider that there is no doubt that this fief is part of sixty librates of land which Henry III gave to Drogo de Barentin, the Warden, in exchange for part of Alderney. This large grant was ceded by Guillaume de Barentin, son of Drogo, to Geoffroi de la Champagne, who held it in 1274, and received a commission to hold an inquest in 1286. From his name Geoffroi was probably a Norman refugee, as were the de Barentins. The proof that Diélament was part of this grant is triple, viz.—a) the port of Bouley was included in both ; b) the King's prévôt of the parish of Trinity was chosen from the tenants of Diélament and of the Abbess of Caen, and so, the whole of the Ancient Demesne in that parish having been used up in the grants of the Conqueror and of Henry III, it is clear that the liability for prévôté remained due by former tenants of the Demesne ; c) it is impossible to fit the grant into the parish on any other theory.⁽⁷²⁾

It seems that this grant was made free of all dues to the Crown, a typical example of the dissipation of the revenue under Henry III, and this must be the chief reason why the records tell us hardly anything about the fief ; also the Court influence of the de Barentins tempered the *Quo Warranto* proceedings to them, so that we know less about their fiefs than about those of lesser men. But evidently Geoffroi de la Champagne left no heirs and the fief reverted to the de Barentins, probably of a junior branch, since those who did suit of court for the fief in 1323 and 1331—unless it were for Diélament which owed then, and still owes, suit it is difficult to imagine for what fief it could be—had names other than those doing suit for Rosel. It was probably this fief which Jean de Barentin held in 1309. In 1367 it had come back to Philippe de Barentin of the main branch and was then sold with his other fiefs. Under the name of Diélament for the first time it went in the division of fiefs in 1382 to the Payn family, but the Lemprieres bought them out in 1413 and have held the fief to the present day. In the XIX century the manor house, now demolished, and demesne lands were sold away from the fief, and now only the huge, fortress-like, dovecot survives to attest its past importance. A mysterious Manoir de Dylament in the parish of St. Helier is mentioned in a deed of 1524 as having existed formerly.⁽⁷³⁾

The Fief enjoyed the usual franchises of the higher class, but in 1274 the right to *esperquerie* at Bouley was contested by the Crown ; in that year the Seigneur was reported by the jury to have usurped the pleas of the Crown and of *nouvelle dessaisine*, but this usurpation was not maintained. In the deed of sale of 1413 it is stated that the *firma* due to the holder by his tenants amounted to 38 li. 9s. 4d., so that the fief comprised about two-thirds, not the whole, of the sixty librates.⁽⁷⁴⁾

The Fief of LA TRINITÉ in the middle part of the parish of Trinity comes into history at the end of the XIII century, the first definite mention apparently being in the Rolls of 1309 when it is called the carucate held by Henri de St. Martin and his *participes*, which in this case means his brothers who were disputing the division of their father's estates until 1315. Their father was Drogo de St. Martin, who held land in Trinity in 1274 and appears from a deed of 1315 to have held the fief ; he held a fief in Guernsey in right of his wife Guillemine or Guillemote, the daughter and co-heiress of Henri le Canelly, knight. The descendants of this marriage in various male and female lines held La Trinité with many vicissitudes until the second half of the XIX century, when it was sold and remains in private hands. The family of de St. Martin gave Jersey three Bailiffs and a number of jurats. We are fortunate in having a valuable account of the Fief and family from original sources by the late Colonel de Guérin of Guernsey, printed in the *Bulletins of the Société Jersiaise*, Vol. IX, pp. 54-95, to which the reader is referred.⁽⁷⁵⁾

The surname de St. Martin occurs also in Continental Normandy ; we find Guillaume attesting two charters concerning Jersey in c. 1150 and 1155, and Auvray as witness to a charter of Henry II also concerning Jersey in c. 1185, but none of these were passed in Jersey. But in c. 1170 Roger de St. Martin attested a charter which the names of other witnesses show was almost certainly passed here, so that the family may well have been here before 1204. The origin of the Fief is unknown, but I hazarded a guess in Note B to Colonel de Guérin's paper that it was part of the grant of sixty librates to Drogo de Barentin, the Warden ; that note needs revision in view of the strong evidence that Diélament formed the greater part of that grant, but what was left over was more than enough to account for a fief of moderate size such as La Trinité. If correct, this theory would imply the probability of inheritance from the de Barentins by the de St. Martins ; arguments in support are : a) that both families used the not very common name Drogo ; b) it explains why the latter suddenly rose to influence during the domination of the former ; c) it explains why La Trinité was not involved in the *Quo Warranto* pleas ; d) if any faith can be placed in the tradition preserved in the late de Barentin pedigree discussed under Rosel, it would explain the interference of the de St. Martins in the de Barentin estates, otherwise inexplicable. But against is the fact that the tenants of La Trinité did not owe *prévôté* to the King.⁽⁷⁶⁾

The tenure of the Fief was stated in 1331 to be by suit of court and relief of 60 s. In 1607 there were added knight service, wardship and homage, also the presentation to the King of two mallards when he should visit Jersey ; these mallards were duly

presented to King George V. A deed of 1315, quoting a XIII century Assize inquest, mentions these mallards as being all that was due to the King except fealty ; it also declares the Fief to be not divisible among brothers and to have the usual franchises, chasse included. It seems that the ability and influence of the holders had greatly enhanced the status of this Fief between 1331 and 1607 ; it is now classed as one of the five chief lay fiefs.⁽⁷⁷⁾

The Fief des VINGT LIVRES in St. Ouen and St. Peter is another example of a private fief carved out of the Royal Demesne. As its name implies it consisted of twenty librates of land which were granted by Philippe d'Aubigny, the Warden, as a dower to his niece Marguérite on her marriage to Philippe de Carteret, Seigneur de St. Ouen, and confirmed by Henry III in 1227 to be held subject to the King's pleasure until other provision had been made for Philippe de Carteret. This grant was contested by the Crown in 1274, but in 1309 the claims of the de Carterets descended from this marriage seem to have been admitted, except upon a minor point of the right to free warren.⁽⁷⁸⁾ As in the case of other grants of this reign, the Crown surrendered all dues on this fief, not even reserving relief and suit of court, so that the sources tell us little about the Fief. The Seigneurs of St. Ouen parted with the Fief for a time, but recovered it and hold it today. It seems to have had the usual franchises, excepting free warren.⁽⁷⁹⁾

The large Fief of MELESCHES, now the most valuable in Jersey, has a constitution and history different from those of the other fiefs. It consists of a main portion in St. Helier and St. Laurence held by ordinary feudal tenants from the Seigneur, and of a number of subsidiary fiefs held from the Seigneur, the holders owing him suit of court as his free tenants and in most, if not all, cases owing him sums of money for *firma*. We do not know much about the conditions under which the agricultural tenants of subsidiary fiefs held from their mesne lords, but apparently these last enjoyed the usual franchises of a seigneur holding *in capite* from the King, including that of holding courts of their tenants in most if not all cases, so that the Seigneur of Melesches did not make a large revenue out of them. Two of the subsidiary fiefs, Surville and Boutvillain, now called Boutvillon, were of some importance and have been dealt with above ; I believe that the others, which were small, numbered nine, viz.—in St. Helier those of La Houquette, ès Debenaires, and Les Augrès à St. Helier now called Collette des Augrès ; in St. Saviour those of La Houquette and Besnard ; in St. John and St. Mary those of Les Hammonets and Le Castelet ; in St. Laurence that of St. Clair ; and in Trinity that called ès Cras. Before 1204 there seems to be no evidence about the Fief, but its origin, as now constituted, in the early XIII century is well documented. Fulk Paynel of Hambie in the Cotentin was inclined to favour the cause of John, though he adhered to Philip Augustus to save his estates, and he allowed his younger brother Thomas to go over to John. When Hasculf de Suligny, the Warden, was sent to the Islands in 1207 he took with him his cousin Thomas Paynel and Hasculf Paynel, also a relation. No doubt they were useful in John's negotiations

with their relatives, the Tessons, du Hommets, and other great lords of western Normandy. To these useful servants John granted, to Hasculf Paynel the whole of the revenues of the Norman clerks and monks in the Islands subject to the service of five knights and ten sergeants, and to Thomas the confiscated lands of his cousin Thomas du Hommet in Jersey subject to the service of one knight ; it seems probable that a number of other confiscated fiefs, or the overlordship of fiefs, was added to the latter grant. When the Paynels finally abandoned the cause of John after his defeats at La Roche au Moine and Bouvines these grants were resumed by the Crown.⁽⁸⁰⁾

Henry III then granted to Robert de Melesches for his life the group of fiefs confiscated from Thomas Paynel, but with some changes ; for instance the carucate of Thomas du Hommet in St. Clement was not included in the new grant but the Fief de Boutvillain was. I can find out nothing about Robert, who lived until about 1274, except that he also held land in Guernsey, but evidently Henry III was under an obligation to him, so perhaps he was a Norman loyalist refugee. At first named Fief Paynel the grant got to be called Fief de Melesches and retains this name to the present day. After the death of Robert Edward I granted the Fief in 1306, subject to the life interest of Otto de Grandison the Warden, to Renaud de Carteret of St. Ouen, free for his life and afterwards to pay 60 li. and one pound of carraway seed annually in lieu of all services. On the death of Renaud the Fief descended to his younger son Geoffroi who did suit for it in 1323 and 1331. In 1309 the revenue from fixed money rents was estimated at 50 li. 18 s. 8 d., chiefly from the *firma*, and the corn rents, champart, pullage and sundries were valued at 8 li. 14 s. 4½ d., so that the grantees were more in the position of perpetual farmers than that of beneficial owners of the Fief, since their profits were dependent upon the yield of casual dues, court and services. The de Carterets held the Fief until the middle of the XV century, but at the end it was back in the hands of the King—why, I cannot trace. It was regranted on new terms in 1643 and has since been in private hands. It is reckoned to be one of the five chief lay fiefs of Jersey.⁽⁸¹⁾ Long ago the manor house and demesne lands were sold away from the Fief, and more recently the warren and common have been alienated. The court has sat in the XX century.

The Fief had two peculiar features ; one that it paid the Crown a substantial money rent instead of the usual services and relief, the other that its court was and is composed of the holders of the dependent fiefs owing suit, so that it is quite a different body from the usual Jersey feudal court of cultivating tenants and more resembles the court of an English honour on a very small scale. It would seem that the ordinary tenants of the main fief were at a disadvantage compared with their neighbours in that they were not represented at the court. The Fief had the usual franchises of one of the higher class. It is strange that we know nothing of the origin of the main fief. The fact that the chief revenue was the 42 li. of *firma*, the other dues being of much less value and the champart confined to one outlying piece, resembles the tenure from the Demesne so closely that we may suspect an origin in a Ducal grant out of this Demesne.

It is possible that the du Hommets had held much more land here than the carucate bearing their name ; another theory is that the Paynels had held some of these lands before 1204. But the fact that the former gave one trifle and the latter nothing in Jersey to monasteries militates against these suppositions.⁽⁸²⁾

The Fief des AUGRÈS in Trinity does not appear to have been mentioned before 1274 when it was stated to owe full relief, and then seems to have been held by Guillaume des Augrès, a jurat. Raoul de Augrès was a jurat in 1292, as was another Guillaume des Augrès in 1308 and this last held the Fief in 1309. Thomas des Augrès did suit for it in 1323, but in 1331 Guillaume Brasdefer held, and did suit for, the Fief in right of his wife. In all probability she was the heiress of the des Augrès.⁽⁸³⁾

In the XIV and early XV centuries the Brasdefer family gave Jersey three Bailiffs and at least four jurats ; they appear to have held the Fief for about one hundred years. But by 1489 it was held by a branch of the Lempriere family and has since been in various private hands.⁽⁸⁴⁾

In the early XIV century the Fief was held by suit of court, the payment of the unusually large relief of 7 li., and by the grand sergeanty of the holder acting as the King's butler and of riding into the sea on the King's arrival and departure, as was due for Rosel. The office of butler is only stated in the Rolls of the Assizes of 1309. In 1607 fealty and homage were added, and in 1668 knight service and the service in wartime of a man and a horse. Here is another case of the holders getting the status of a fief enhanced. The Fief enjoyed the franchises of one of the higher class, and was declared to be indivisible in 1309, so that it was undoubtedly a fief noble.⁽⁸⁵⁾

The Fief de la HAGUE in the middle part of the parish of St. Peter is first mentioned in the Extente of 1274 as owing half relief, but this must be an error for full relief as later extentes show. In 1309 and 1331 Pierre de la Hague held the Fief, *cum particibus* is added in the latter year, and he did suit for it in 1323 and 1331. The name occurs elsewhere in Jersey, Guernsey and in Continental Normandy so that there is no reason to suppose that it is not a true surname. Hague means in place-names a hedged field or close, but the word in the Island dialects has come to mean the haw fruit, an exact parallel with the English word *haw*.⁽⁸⁶⁾

Though the Fief is first definitely mentioned in 1274 there is some reason to believe that it was connected with a fief in the same parish granted to St. Sauveur in c. 1140 by Simon de la Hague knight. In addition to the holders having the same surname, both fiefs were carucates, were adjoining to one another, and owed *firma* to the Crown. On the other hand Simon is stated to have granted all his land in Jersey, but if the present Fief was half of the original fief held by a relative this theory would agree with the known facts.⁽⁸⁷⁾

Information about the Fief and its holders in the later Middle Ages seems to be lacking until we find it in 1489 held by Jean Mallet in right of his wife, possibly a de la Hague. It long remained to the Mallet family and their heirs in female lines, and is still in private hands.⁽⁸⁸⁾

The tenure of the Fief, since 1309 at least, has been by suit of court, and the payment of 10 s. *firma* and 60 s. relief, while the petty dependent fief of Les Ricardais, now usually called Les Blancs Éperons, has owed one pair of white spurs worth 12 d. ; La Hague also owed the service of having a prison house, 12 feet by 12 feet in size, with one pair of fetters, and that of guarding the prisoners therein at the holder's peril. It must be made clear that, in the case of this and other fiefs owing service of prison, the service was due to the King for the King's prisoners, not in any way connected with the court of the fief. The nature of this service, and the allusion to *participes*, though there is no evidence that the Fief was actually divided among parceners, give the impression that the original status of this Fief was not high. It enjoyed the usual franchises.⁽⁸⁹⁾

The FRANC FIEF EN ST. BRELADE is in the northern part of the parish of that name, with a small dependency in St. Peter called the Fief de Bekalowe. It is first mentioned in 1274 under the title Fief ès Gerveys as owing half relief ; in that year Guillaume Gervaise held one acre in Bekalowe and probably the main fief also, though Bekalowe was held in 1309 by Renaud de St. Clement. Philippe Gervaise held the Franc Fief in 1309, and Ranulphe Gervaise did suit for it in 1323 and 1331. This family continued to hold the Fief until 1553. Nicolas Gervaise was a jurat in 1499-1506 but was apparently the only member of this old family to hold that office. The Fief was sold to Jean Langlois in 1553 and his daughter sold it to Helier Dumaresq in 1587 ; it has continued to be held to the present day by his descendants the Dumaresqs and Maretts of La Haule, the Seigneur now being Dr. Robert Ranulph Maret, the Rector of Exeter College, Oxford.⁽⁹⁰⁾

The tenure of the Fief was by suit of court, the payment of 15 s. *firma* to the Crown and of relief, and by the service of keeping the prisons and of supplying one pair of fetters therefor, the King to supply any additional fetters needed. Though in 1274 half relief is stated to be due, this is probably an error ; other medieval sources are vague on this point and it is only in the Extente of 1668 that the relief is clearly given as 61 s. 1 d. I cannot find a statement of the franchises except " Court et usage et dependances " in a record of 1645, but the Fief was evidently indivisible and had the usual franchises.⁽⁹¹⁾

The Fief des ARBRES in the north of St. Laurence was first mentioned in 1274 by this name ; in 1309 we learn that Richard le François held this Fief, containing 30 acres, together with 12 acres of the Fief de la Lande in Trinity and 18 acres which the Extente of 1331 shows were in St. John, making up the carucate of 60 acres. It would appear that these lands, or at least the part in St. John, had originally been held from the Fief des Mouriers alias d'Ouville, q. v. Richard le François had served on an inquest in 1306 ; he held the Fief in 1331 and did suit for it in 1323 and in 1331.⁽⁹²⁾ The surname le François occurs elsewhere in Jersey and Guernsey as well as in Continental Normandy. I cannot find out how long this family held the Fief—they seem to have had little importance—but in 1489 Guillaume Tourgis held it. After passing

through various hands it came in the XVII century to the Marett family by whom it has since been held, though not continuously. The Fief de la Lande has long been separated. An account of the Fief des Arbres and that of Avranches, with which it has been connected in the last three centuries, appeared in the Bulletins of the Société Jersiaise, Vol X, pp. 47-56.⁽⁹³⁾

The tenure was by suit of court, the payment of 60 s. relief, the payment of 5 s. greverie on part of the Fief only, and the providing of a dinner to the King on the feast of St. Michael which the Bailiff, Vicomte, Greffier, the prévôt of the Fief, with two servants and three horses (*sic*), attended; this dinner was estimated to be worth 12 s. in 1331 and was due on the part in St. John. The Fief was not divisible and seems to have had the usual franchises, but early evidence is lacking.⁽⁹⁴⁾

The Fief JOURDAIN PAYN, now often called Le Colombier, in St. Laurence is perhaps the oldest possession of the Payn family in Jersey, but early evidence about them is very scanty, and they also held the Fief ès Godeaux in Trinity, land in St. Helier and a dependency of Orglandres in St. Ouen in early times. This surname occurred in Jersey in 1180 and elsewhere in Normandy. Throughout the XIII century it is clear that this family was very influential; Hugues Payn with other notables witnessed charters of Philippe d'Aubigny, the Warden, in 1218 and 1219; Raoul Payn was appointed to report on the Warden's expenditure in 1227; Guillaume Payn with others of the chief Islanders served on an inquest in 1254; and a Hugues Payn, perhaps the same as the above, gave a rent to the Abbey of Cherbourg in the same century. Then of the few jurats recorded in the XIII century four were Payns—Raoul, Laurens, Henri and Thomas. It is certain that these Payns must have held land, but our sources do not tell us where it lay. Various branches of the family have given jurats to Jersey down to the XX century.⁽⁹⁵⁾

We first have a contemporary account of the Fief in 1331, when it was held by Jourdain Payn and described as his franc fief, though it is possible that Laurens Payn held it in 1274. It was probably the same Jourdain who held the Fief de la Godelière in St. Helier and was a jurat 1329-1348, but a Jourdain who was a jurymen in 1306 was probably a namesake. The Jourdain of 1331 did suit of court in 1323 and in 1331, but this was almost certainly for La Godelière. The Fief has been held to the present day by descendants in female lines of this Jourdain Payn. An account of the Fief and its holders has been published in the Bulletins of the Société Jersiaise, Vol. X, pp. 335-346, but the pedigree attached has been influenced by the late and erroneous de Barentin pedigree discussed under Rosel.⁽⁹⁶⁾

Of the old tenure we know little; the Fief owed neither suit of court nor relief but paid 5 s. *firma* in 1331. The information as to franchises is scanty and late, but evidently the Fief had the right to a dovecot. Its being indivisible seems to be its only title, and that a weak one, to be a fief noble.⁽⁹⁷⁾

The Fief LUCE DE CARTERET in St. Peter and St. Brelade is of considerable area but contains much waste land. The Fief has been mentioned under St. Ouen as having

possibly been once a portion of that fief. The Fief is first mentioned in 1274 under the name of the Fief of Philippe de Carteret, who was certainly not the Seigneur of St. Ouen. In 1331 we find that it was held by four co-heirs of Philippe, perhaps the descendants of four co-heiresses, Jacques de Vinchelez, Roger Horman, Lucie de Carteret and Jeanne Malzard, of whom the third probably gave the Fief the name it has since borne. It is not clear who did suit, if done, for it in 1323 and 1331; the only suitors whom I cannot identify otherwise are respectively Renaud and Roger de Carteret, so that if Roger died during the compilation of the Extente of 1331 these may have done suit for the Fief. What little later information we have shows that the Fief remained divided for a long period; in 1489 Guillaume de Hamptonne and others held it, and in 1607 we find two holders for the part in St. Peter and another for that in St. Brelade, but shortly after this the Bisson family, heirs to the de Hamptonnes, bought out the others and long held the Fief. It has now come into the hands of the Seigneur de St. Ouen.⁽⁹⁸⁾

The tenure in 1274 and 1331 was by suit of court, the payment of 4 s. *firma* and 60 s. relief; the Fief had its court then and seems to have enjoyed the usual franchises. In spite of the above divisions it does not seem to have been divisible among parceners in the sense that a vavassorie was.⁽⁹⁹⁾

The Fief of SAINT JEAN, LA HOUGUE BOETTE, in the south western part of St. John's parish presents a great contrast to the fiefs described above, in that we have here a fief which for many centuries has been of good standing, held from the King by suit of court, yet is totally ignored in the official records of the Middle Ages. So far as I can find it is first mentioned in a deed of 1367 under the name of St. Jean de la Hougue Boeste. In the division in 1382 of the de Barentin fiefs sold in 1367 Drouet Lempriere, son of Raoul the joint purchaser, took among the lesser parts of his share "la Court et le Service du fieu de St. John appelle la Hougue Boeste". From these deeds it is certain that the Fief was held by suit of court from 1367 at least, so that it is remarkable that it should be ignored in the extentes and rolls of the assizes. It is possible that the Guillaume de Barentin of the junior branch of the family who did suit in 1323 and 1331, almost certainly for Diélament, also held and answered for St. Jean.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

There is a confused statement in the presentation by the jury of St. John in 1309 which may throw some light upon the origin of this Fief. It shows that the de Barentins held land in St. John acquired in connection with the grant of sixty librates in Trinity, part of which we have seen constituted the fief of Diélament, so that there was some early connection between Diélament and de Barentin lands in St. John. But confusion is created by the further statement that these lands were held from the Fief Paynel, i.e. Melesches.⁽¹⁰¹⁾

The Fief went by inheritance to Raulin Lempriere, great grandson of Raoul above, and Raulin's great grand-daughter carried the Fief by marriage to the Journeaux family in the XVI century. It has since been in various hands.⁽¹⁰²⁾

We seem to have no early evidence on the tenure of the Fief except the deed of 1382 above mentioned. Evidently it paid no relief or other dues to the Crown ; it was not divisible among brothers. In more modern times it has enjoyed the usual franchises.

The Fief de LONGUEVILLE in the south eastern part of St. Saviour is one whose origin is uncertain. An early mention may be that in the Extente of 1331, where the Greverie ès Goons for the carucate of Longueville in *Grouville* was stated to owe 15 s. greverie ; this charge was still due in 1607, but it is clear was due by a tenant, not by the Seigneur, and it is far from certain that the carucate was the same as the Fief we are discussing. Later evidence is equally confusing ; in 1358 a deed shows that there was a lawsuit between Renaud de Carteret and Julianne de Vinchelez about their right to hold the court of " Longueville, Fief de Melesches," which makes it a dependency of Melesches ; but in 1367 the de Barentin family held a fief of Longueville, as apparently they had held it in 1299 according to the Rolls of the Assizes of that year, which fell to the Lemprieres in the division of the de Barentin fiefs in 1382, and is described in the deed of partition as follows :—" Le Maner de Longueville o ses appartenances comme Moulins Terres gaignables et les herbages Ferme poullailes Oefs froments Court Services tant audit fieu comme au fieu appelle le fieu Patier o toutes les autres appartenances et dix sols du fieu du Bisson ". Since in later times the little fiefs called Patier in St. Saviour and Buisson in St. Helier were claimed as dependencies of the present Fief de Longueville, though the position of Buisson was disputed for a time, we can take it that the de Barentin fief was the present one. It must be borne in mind that the district of Longueville is extensive, comprising two vingtaines in St. Saviour and one in Grouville with various fiefs in this area, so that it may well be that more than one of these fiefs bore the name of the district for a time ; the present Fief in fact covers but a small part of the district. This theory, or that of the division in the past of a much larger fief called Longueville, would explain the discrepancies in the evidence. In any case the Fief was held in the later Middle Ages by a family of de Carteret, believed to be a junior branch of the Melesches family ; it was sold in 1480 to John Nichol, a Cornishman, and has since been in various private hands.⁽¹⁰³⁾

Since the Fief did not owe suit of court nor pay relief, and because of the doubt if it was held *in capite* of the King, the original status of this fief may not have been high, though it was indivisible among brothers. In 1617 the then Seigneur got a grant of tenure *in capite* by suit of court and payment of the dues and performance of the services accustomed, he alleging that his predecessors had done suit of ancientry ; this claim is a doubtful one, and in fact suit of court is not done for the Fief in spite of the grant. This grant of 1617 shows that the Fief had then the usual franchises, and the deed of 1382 recites those then existing as quoted above.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

The Fief de QUETIVEL or QUETTEVILLE in St. Martin no doubt takes its name from the holders, de Quetteville, also stated as de Quetivel, being a regular Jersey surname ; but there has been great confusion between the forms Quetteville and

Quet
held
the l
divic
varic

not
1645
Ther
of ei

1274
Vinc
Arbr
Rich
whic
viz.,
calles

in 12
Herb
relief
and l
Pont
he a
1309

tion
of Pi
hold
tenar
assur
caruc

diffic
after
only
of th
this
to id
dove

Quetivel, though it is far from certain that they are of the same origin. The Fief was held by Richard de Quetteville in 1309 and by Philippe de St. Martin in 1331. In the later Middle Ages it was held by a branch of the Payn family, and in 1607 was divided between co-heiresses, the two daughters of Jean Payn. It has since been in various private hands.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾

The Fief did not owe suit of court but paid 15 s. *firma* and 60 s. 1 d. relief; it was not divisible among brothers. We have no early evidence about franchises, but in 1645 the Fief had "court et usage et appartenances" which implies the usual franchises. There was another Fief de Quetivel or ès Quetiveaux in St. Laurence, a petty tenement of eight acres held in 1331 by Raoul de Quetivel and parceners.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾

Of the twenty-one fiefs held by laymen listed as owing relief in the Extente of 1274 we have now discussed fifteen, namely those named in that list: St. Ouen, Vinchelez, Rosel, Philippe de Carteret, ès Hormans, de la Hague, ès Gerveys, des Arbres, Handois, Guillaume Lempriere, Saumareys, du Homet, Malet, des Augreys and Richard le Petit; we have also discussed eighteen lay fiefs, and mentioned two others, which do not appear on that list. This leaves six fiefs on the list to be dealt with, viz., the three carucates called Direvas, Pierre Hugon and Faldouet, and the three fiefs called ès Godeus, Hasteles and Robelinoys.

The carucate Ès DIRVAUS in St. Martin was mentioned in a charter of 1251, and in 1274 as owing half relief, and was held by Guillaume Dirvaud in 1309 and by Herbert Dirvaud in 1331, as chief tenants with parceners, subject to 9 s. *firma*, 30 s. relief, and the service of bringing to Jersey by sea from any place between Cherbourg and Mont St. Michel the timber and millstones for the mills called Moulins du Mourier, Ponterrin and Neuf Moulin, the chief tenant to grind at the mill free of multure and he and his tenants to be free of all other services. I have combined the accounts of 1309 and 1331.

The carucate of PIERRE HUGON in St. Martin, owing half relief in 1274, is mentioned in 1331 as half of a carucate held by Laurens Ugon and parceners from the fief of Pierre Ugon, paying the Crown only 5 s. *firma*, no relief being mentioned and the holding being apparently free from the services due by the ordinary agricultural tenants. The surname Hugon or Ugon was fairly common then, so that we need not assume that the Pierre Hugon who was a jurat and acting Bailiff 1324-1332 held this carucate; he certainly did not give his name to it.

As to the carucate of FALDOUET, owing full relief in 1274, its identification is difficult. It is clear that the list of 1274 groups fiefs by parishes and Faldouet comes after two fiefs in St. Martin; also the vingtaine de Faldouet is in St. Martin. Yet the only fief of this name recorded later appears to have been in Grouville, and the fiefs of the latter parish are grouped much lower down in the list. All we know about this Grouville fief is that in 1331 Renaud de Carteret, son of Renaud, a man not easy to identify but probably the tenant of two bouvées in Grouville, owed 4 s. rent for a dovecot erected on it; this implies that the fief was not of sufficient standing to have the

right to a dovecot. It seems likely that the carucate listed in 1274 was one in St. Martin not yet identified.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

The Fief ès GODEUS, owing full relief in 1274, is akin by name to the little Fief ès Godeaux in Trinity, held in 1309 by Raoul Godel and parceners and previously by Raoul Payn, and in 1331 by Guillaume Godel and parceners by payment of 20 s. greverie; but this fief did not owe relief and the grouping of fiefs by parishes points to St. Helier as the parish of the Fief ès Godeus. If so, the Fief must be the Fief de la Godelière, discussed above under the Fief Lempriere; in that case there must be a mistake in the sources as to the reliefs due on these two fiefs last mentioned.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

The Fief d'HASTELES, otherwise called Hastell, Astelles or Astelle, now de la Fosse Astelle, owed full relief in 1274, relief (amount not stated) in 1309, and half relief in 1331. In 1274 Renaud de Carteret of St. Ouen claimed homage from its tenants, a claim about which we hear nothing further. The Fief was held by Guillaume Asteyle in 1309 and by Jean Astele in 1331 by payment of 3 s. 6 d. greverie. In the late XV century it was held by the Lemprieres and then passed to the le Hardy family who long held it. In 1645 it had "cour et usage" and the usual franchises, and the tenants had to relieve their Seigneur when relief was due.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

The Fief de ROBELINOYS, later called de la Robeline, in St. Mary owed half relief in 1274. It was no doubt the *terra Robelinorum* which yielded 10 s., evidently the *firma* below, in the Ministerium de Crapout Doit in 1180. The surname Robelin continued to exist in the same parish but the bearers had lost the Fief at an early date. By 1331 it had got divided into two parts, each paying the Crown 5 s. *firma* and quarter relief of 15 s., the one held by Guillaume Levesque in right of Nicolas Levesque, the other by Guillaume du Buhot for Richard Levesque; this latter was contested by Guillaume Levesque, who claimed it by inheritance from his father Jourdain, who had bought it from Gervaise the daughter of Richard Levesque, who apparently had gone over to the French. This implies tenure for some time by the Levesques, a family very influential in Jersey in the XIII and early XIV centuries. The present Fief au Vesque is apparently the latter part of the Fief.⁽¹¹⁰⁾

To sum up: of the three carucates that ès Dirvaus seems to have been a typical vavassorie (v. chapter III), that of Pierre Hugon of little, if any, higher standing, and we have no information about Faldouet except that, if it be the one in Grouville, it could not rank as a franc fief. The three fiefs however, though not of high standing, can pass the test of indivisibility among brothers, always assuming that the first is la Godelière not ès Godeaux.

Then our chief medieval sources, the Rolls of the Assizes of 1309 and the Extente of 1331, mention thirteen fiefs held by relief which do not appear on the 1274 list. To take those of 1309 first: Guillaume du Vivier held a carucate in St. Peter by relief of 60 s. and service of prisons, which I cannot identify; Pierre de St. Helier, Seigneur de Samarès, held a carucate in St. Peter by relief of 60 s., one-eighth part of which is probably the Fief ès Naymes, now Nièmes, held by Jean de St. Helier in 1331 by relief

of 7 s. 6 d. ; in Grouville, Hamon (error for Hamelin) de la Hougue as a free tenant with his parceners held the carucate ès Philippes by full relief, which name survives in the house called Ville ès Philippes, but Olivier de la Hougue held it in 1331 without mention of relief ; in Grouville too we learn that Pierre Neel owed relief, because he and the Guillaume Asteyle and Hamelin de la Hougue, above mentioned, were exempt from paying fouage for this reason, and the Extente of 1331 shows that Pierre held the Fief ès Neaux by 30 s. relief ; also in Grouville, Philippe de Chesney by purchase of his father from Martin Barbey held half of a carucate by relief which we can identify with the later Fief des Monts or de la Carrière owing 30 s. relief in 1331 ; finally in Grouville half relief was due by Jean Gervaise and parceners on the Fief "Audesfubley" which I cannot identify. We can add from the Extente of 1331 : a minute Fief de Nicolas Angot in St. John, held by Philippe Angot by 6 d. greverie and 3 s. 9 d. relief, which I cannot identify ; finally in St. Laurence there were six petty fiefs, three held with parceners and three not, which owed 6 d. per acre for relief.⁽¹¹¹⁾ It is clear that some of the above holdings were vavassories at most, and it is probable that, in cases where the actual agricultural tenants owed the Crown relief at 6 d. per acre instead of the usual 1 s., this was the amount by which the tenants had relieved their mesne lord, who had now disappeared by escheat to the Crown.

We now deal briefly with a fief which evidently was of importance in the XIII century, though we know hardly anything about it, not even its name or situation, except that part at least was in St. Saviour. It was held by a family called de l'EPESSE (*de Spissa, de Lepessa*). In 1234 Jean, son of Guillaume de l'Epesse, knight, gave to the Abbey of Blanchelande tenements in St. Saviour yielding 21½ bushels of wheat. In 1244 Henri, nephew of Jean, on giving security for the relief due, got an order for seisin of the lands in Jersey and Guernsey which his uncle had held *in capite*. Henri was a jurat in Jersey 1267-1274, and his wife Agnes had land in St. John. We hear no more of the Fief or the family in Jersey, but in Guernsey this surname survived for at least a century longer. The name occurs in Continental Normandy, e.g. Robert de Spissa in 1220 held of the honour of Plessis a knight's fee at l'Epesse. Blanchelande seems to have lost or sold the above tenements, as we cannot trace them by that Abbey's records.⁽¹¹²⁾

The small Fief de GRUCHY or ès Gruchys in Trinity, though not owing relief, deserves a short mention here on account of the unusual tenure. It was held *in capite*, but owed the King nothing except the service of providing a house on the Fief where the King should have stocks for the keeping of the prisoners of the parishes of St. John, St. Laurence, St. Helier, and Trinity, the King to find the stocks but the King's tenants of those parishes to guard the prisoners. The onus of providing this house was thrown upon the tenants of the holder, but their other dues to their lord were trifling, a total of 5 s. and 2 hens in 1382, and these were the same in 1608.⁽¹¹³⁾ The service is interesting, because we have reason to believe that the four parishes constituted the *Ministerium de Groceio* in 1180, and *Groceium* is the regular Latinized form of Gruchy or Grouchy

in Norman place-names and the surnames derived therefrom. It looks therefore as if the Fief took its name from, or gave its name to, a farmer of the *ministerium* in the past.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Our records do not mention the early holders of the Fief, but it was acquired by the de Barentins and passed in 1382 to the Payns, by whose successors it was long held. Eventually it was acquired by the Lemprieres and now forms part of an indivisible group of fiefs of which Rosel is the head.⁽¹¹⁵⁾

The above detailed account of all of the principal lay fiefs in Jersey, and of some others, sufficiently proves, I consider, that the liability to the payment of relief does not afford a test of the status of a fief here. An attempt to classify fiefs by their liability to do suit of court does not present the same bewildering complications as does classification by relief, but anomalies also occur. It is impossible to take this liability as a safe test when we find that an important fief such as Vinchelez, and the great majority of the lands of the Normans regranted, apparently never owed, and do not now owe, suit. Then we have Jourdain de la Hougue and parceners recorded in 1309 as free tenants of the King in St. Saviour, owing suit of court for a fief which I cannot trace; evidently it was not a fief noble, and in fact no de la Hougue did suit in 1323 or in 1331. There is also the case of the small fief in St. John now called Fief MOTTIER DIT ÈS POINGDESTRES, which has owed suit since the XVI century at least to the present day, yet is not mentioned in our chief medieval records. It appears in a deed of 1419 by which Collette de St. Helier, widow of Pierre des Augrès, i.e., Pierre Brasdefer, Seigneur des Augrès, sold it to Jean Poingdestre, whose descendants in the male line held it for centuries and were influential people. I cannot trace how or when it became liable for suit of court.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ It is impossible to attribute a high status to such fiefs as the two last mentioned.

Then the fiefs might be classified into those which have, and those which have not, the right to a dovecot. Here at least we have a statement in the Rolls of 1309 which implies that this right belonged to a franc fief only, though it is not easy to define exactly what a franc fief in Jersey means.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ It has been alleged that the right to a round dovecot of masonry was the privilege of a fief de haubert, though a survey of the dovecots of Jersey shows that this theory has no basis here. It is clear that a fief that was not a franc fief, or a house that was not the manor house of such a fief, could only have a dovecot by Royal permission. Fiefs which got this permission, and therefore were not franc fiefs, were Lempriere in St. Helier and the two unidentified fiefs of Faldouet in Grouville and a fee farm (*feudo firmario*) in St. Laurence held by a Philippe de Carteret. In post-medieval times we find round dovecots still existing on the fiefs of Samarès, Rosel, Diélament (rebuilt 1573), La Hague (built 1634), Longueville, Jourdain Payn and Orglandres, remnants of similar ones on the fiefs au Vesque and La Malletière (built c. 1628), while St. Ouen and La Trinité have round ones built quite recently, but on the ancient plan it is believed; all of these seem to have had their dovecots by right. Except possibly that at Samarès none of the present structures appear to be medieval, but it is known that some of them have been rebuilt

in past centuries. An account, not quite complete, of these dovecots or colombiers of Jersey was published in the Bulletins of the Société Jersiaise, Vol. XI, pp. 90-94. So few of the fiefs are mentioned that it is obvious that the mere absence of a dovecot on the majority of fiefs is not proof that these were not francs fiefs.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ But, as we shall see in chapter VIII, the feudal right to a dovecot was neither general nor ancient. So again this test for the classification of fiefs fails us.

Having failed to find a reliable test for the status of a Jersey fief in relief, suit of court or the right to a dovecot, we are compelled to fall back upon the test of indivisibility among brothers. In cases where the fief was held by an aîné or chief tenant and his parceners it is clear that it had no claim to be a fief noble, but was a vavassorie or aînesse discussed in chapter III. Such a fief was Ponterrin in Trinity, owing service of prison to the King, as described in the Rolls of 1309; yet now this fief is held as indivisible and its holder is called a seigneur, which is an example of the enhancement in the status of fiefs.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ But all cases are not so clear, and that is why I have analysed the conditions of each fief, one by one, I fear at wearisome length, as only by the study of these conditions can we establish the probable status of each. As we have seen, doubts about the divisibility among brothers occur, but these may be due to partition among co-heiresses, or to the father's estates not having yet been distributed among the heirs, or to imperfections in the record.

From the above analyses one realises how few lay fiefs had qualifications of the highest class in the first third of the XIV century, when our records are fairly full. One only, St. Ouen, has satisfactory evidence of tenure by knight service, and that for part of a knight's fee only. Three were held by homage, St. Ouen, Samarès and Rosel. Wardship was only stated to be due by St. Ouen, though Vinchelez also had owed wardship in 1274. Military service was only stated to be due for St. Ouen, but this is far from being the whole story. Jersey apparently did not, as did Guernsey, compound with the Duke by paying an annual sum in lieu of certain liabilities for military service (v. chapter VIII, section on Aide.). We know that John in 1203 ordered an aide of one-fifth of the revenues of the Islanders to pay for their defence against the foreigners, and that in 1214 he gave an aide from Jersey of 50 li. to Thomas Paynel. The warm terms in which John in 1215 thanked the Islanders for their good and loyal service must surely mean personal military service. We know that Islanders were killed in battle in defence of their homes in 1294. We have accounts of the expenditure on the defence of the Castle in Jersey for the years 1337-1346 which give the names of the garrison for part of that time, and these prove that numbers of Jersey men were employed as knights, men at arms, lightly armed men, crossbowmen, archers, sailors or common soldiers (*servientes*), in fact the majority of the garrison were Jersey men until 1342. Among these names we can identify those of the holders of the fiefs of St. Ouen, Samarès, Rosel, Diélament, Les Augrès, Lemprière, Jourdain Payn, ès Dirvaux, au Vesque, parts of Vinchelez and ès Hormans, in addition to very numerous names of families holding fiefs which it is not easy to identify as being held by one

particular member in that year. Both Edward III and Edward IV also thanked the Islanders warmly for their sacrifices in person and fortune in defence of the Islands. Whatever may have been the liability for military service, the holders of fiefs and other classes of Jersey men certainly performed it.⁽¹²⁰⁾ Coming to tenure by grand sergeanty, we find Rosel, Samarès and Les Augrès held by the service of riding into the sea on the King's arrival and departure, with the service of acting as the King's butler while he was in Jersey owing by Rosel and Les Augrès and probably by Samarès also. Tenure by fancy rents included the two mallards due by La Trinité on the King's visit, and annually a pair of gilt spurs due by Pinel and pairs of white spurs due by Handois and the Fief ès Ricardais. Melesches was held by the substantial money rent of 60 li., and one pound of carraway seed. All of these were honourable tenures, but it is hard to believe that other fiefs, such as those which owed the service of keeping a prison, were, in their origin at least, entitled to the status of a fief noble.

On reviewing all of the evidence, I have come to the conclusion that some of our Jersey fiefs in the century and a half following the separation from Continental Normandy could fairly pass the test of a fief noble, but that many others have had their status raised to that rank by the influence and pertinacity of their holders in the Middle Ages and since. This process culminated in the Stuart Kings' lavish grants of tenure by knight service, a form of tenure which had by then become meaningless. It was reserved for the XX century to cap this edifice of new dignities posing as old on the occasion of the visit of King George V to Jersey in 1921. Then the Island authorities, presumably getting their history from a guide book, actually made the puerile error of confusing homage with suit of court, and admitted the holders of lay fiefs owing suit to do homage in person to the King. An interesting legal point might be raised as to the effect of this strange performance; if all of these fiefs are now admitted to enjoy tenure by homage are they not equal in rank? So has the Fief de St. Ouen any longer the right to be considered superior in dignity to the little Fief Mottier dit ès Poingdestres?
