

Zeroing in on Countess Ida: the Scottish Tony connection

 groups.google.com/g/soc.genealogy.medieval/c/C9MTUBMtnVs/m/rL17flnaumUJ

39 views

[Skip to first unread message](#)



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Dec 28, 2002, 12:37:08 PM



to

Dear Newsgroup ~

In previous posts, I've discussed the important of the escorts who accompanied William the Lion, King of Scotland to England, as a clue to the identity of Countess Ida, wife of Roger Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, and mother of William Longespee, Earl of Salisbury. Likewise, I've stated that the people who witnessed William the Lion's homage in 1200 at Lincoln were chiefly related to him by blood or marriage through either Isabel de Vermandois or Countess Judith, including Saher de Quincy and Roger de Huntingfield. The Scottish connection of the Bigod and Longespee families is further illustrated by their inclusion in the medieval record, *Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmenis*, published in 1928 by the Surtees Soc., vol. 136 [see folio 63b], which document features the names of many of the Scottish king's relations including the Earls of Fife. Beyond that, it can be noted that if Countess Ida was a Tony, she would presumably be sister-in-law to Constance de Beaumont, whose sister, Ermengarde de Beaumont, was the wife of William the Lion, King of Scotland.

A previously undetected and unknown Scottish connection of the Tony family, however, is the marriage of Malcolm, 6th Earl of Fife (died c. 1228) to Margaret de Tony, daughter of Roger IV de Tony (died c. 1209), and his wife, Constance de Beaumont. Margaret de Tony is not named in either *Complete Peerage* 5 (1926): 373 (sub Fife), nor in *Scots Peerage*, 4 (1907): 8-9 (sub Ancient Earls of Fife). Her existence, identity, and parentage are proven in a series of charters published in an obscure French source, *Généalogies Féodales Mayennaises du XI au XIII Siècle* (1942), by Abbé A. Angot. On pp. 98-99, 103 of this source, Abbé Angot presents a series of charters which show conclusively that Margaret, Countess of Fife, who occurs in the period, 1235-1247, was the daughter of Constance de Tony, lady of Conches, sister of Raoul VI de Beaumont, vicomte of Beaumont. I have copied five of these charters below:

CCLX. - 1235. - Raoul VI, vicomte de Beaumont, approuve le don du parc d'Orques, fait à sa nièce, fille de sa soeur Constance de Thooneio, dame de Conches, et le fait approuver par ses fils Richard et Guillaume (Bibl. nat., lat., 17048, p. 269).

CCLXII. - 1235. - Philippe de Landivy, chevalier, abandonne à Marguerite, comtesse de Fiff, fille de Constance de Thooneio, dame de Conches, ses droits sur le bois et la terre du parc d'Orques (Bibl. nat., lat., 17048, p. 369).

CCLXVII. 1236, juin. - Marguerite, comtesse de Fiff, notifie que son oncle le vicomte Raoul VI de Beaumont lui a donné le parc d'Orques, suivant qu'il est contenu dans ses chartes et celles de ses fils, pour y fonder une Chartreuse (Bibl. nat., lat., 17048, p. 273).

CCLXX. - 1236. - Richard de Beaumont approuve la donation faite par son père à sa cousine la comtesse de Fiff, pour la fondation d'une Chartreuse au Parc d'Orques, l'exempte de toute exaction et renonce à tous droits (Bibl. nat., lat., 17048, p. 273).

CCLXXII. - 1236. - Raoul, vicomte de Beaumont, qui avait donné à sa chère nièce Marguerite, comtesse de Fiff, fille de Constance, sa soeur, dame de Conches, approuve le don qu'elle en a fait aux Chartreux (Bibl. nat., lat., 17048, p. 272).

It should be noted that Malcolm, Earl of Fife, the husband of Margaret de Tony, was the head of the most important family in Scotland, after the royal family. Malcolm was himself kin to William the Lion through

his mother, Ada or Ela de Warenne (a descendant of Isabel de Vermandois). Consequently, the intermarriage between the Fife and Tony families shows the importance of the Tony family in this time period in Scotland. This hitherto unnoticed Fife-Tony marriage helps illustrate why Countess Ida's Scottish connection is an important clue in establishing her identity as a Tony.

Abbe A. Angot, pg. 103, notes that in 1246, Margaret, Countess of Fife, was joined by her first cousin, Agnes, vicomtesse of Beaumont (wife of Louis de Bienne) in sending a letter to Pope Innocent III about the deplorable condition of Perray-Neuf Abbey. Abbe A. Angot cites as his source: Galliana Christiana, t. XIV, col. 733 "d'après une charte des Arch. d'Angers").

Agnes, vicomtesse of Beaumont, mentioned here was daughter of Raoul VI de Beaumont and his wife, Agnes. Agnes and her husband, Louis de Brienne, were the parents of Henry de Beaumont, Knt., of Folkingham, Barton on Humber, and Heckington, co. Lincoln, who was Earl of Buchan in Scotland. I show that in 1297 Agnes de Beaumont conveyed of the barony of Caral in Fifeshire in Scotland to her daughter, Isabel de Vescy [Reference: Calendar of Close Rolls, 1296-1302 (1906), pg. 10]. As such, the Beaumont family also had important Scottish ties, as did the Tony family.

My good friend and colleague, Andrew MacEwen, the resident authority of all things Scottish, tells me that the evidence I have presented above is the first time documentation has surfaced to prove that Malcolm, Earl of Fife (died c. 1228), had a wife named Margaret de Tony.

Lastly, I might mention in passing that Abbe Angot suggests on pg. 42 that Agnes, wife of Raoul VI de Beaumont, might well have been an illegitimate daughter of either King Henry II, Richard I, or John. The evidence he cites is slim but deserves further study.

Comments are invited.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

copyright



Tim Powys-Lybbe

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 12:51:40 AM



to

In message <5cf47a19.02122...@posting.google.com>

royala...@msn.com (Douglas Richardson) wrote:

<snip>

> A previously undetected and unknown Scottish connection of the Tony
 > family, however, is the marriage of Malcolm, 6th Earl of Fife (died c.
 > 1228) to Margaret de Tony, daughter of Roger IV de Tony (died c.
 > 1209), and his wife, Constance de Beaumont. Margaret de Tony is not
 > named in either Complete Peerage 5 (1926): 373 (sub Fife), nor in
 > Scots Peerage, 4 (1907): 8-9 (sub Ancient Earls of Fife).

<snip>

> My good friend and colleague, Andrew MacEwen, the resident authority
 > of all things Scottish, tells me that the evidence I have presented
 > above is the first time documentation has surfaced to prove that
 > Malcolm, Earl of Fife (died c. 1228), had a wife named Margaret de
 > Tony.

<snip>

Yet in CP Vol XIV, p. 323, we find under FIFE:

"delete from 'Maud' to '1228' and replace by 'Margaret, da. of Roger
 DE TOSNY by Constance, da. of Raoul, VICOMTE DE BEAUMONT. He d.s.p.
 1229 or 1330 and was bur. in the Abbey of Culross.' [See G. W.
 Watson, Misc. Gen. et Herald., 5th ser., vol vii, pp. 329-32.]"

It would be interesting to know which source G. W. Watson found for his
 discovery.

--

Tim Powys-Lybbe t...@powys.org

For a patchwork of bygones: <http://powys.org>



B.M. Kamp

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 10:37:47 AM



to

Subject: Zeroing in on Countess Ida: the Scottish Tony connection

Douglas Richardson wrote:

>

> snip

>

> A previously undetected and unknown Scottish connection of the Tony
> family, however, is the marriage of Malcolm, 6th Earl of Fife (died c.
> 1228) to Margaret de Tony, daughter of Roger IV de Tony (died c.
> 1209), and his wife, Constance de Beaumont. Margaret de Tony is not
> named in either Complete Peerage 5 (1926): 373 (sub Fife), nor in
> Scots Peerage, 4 (1907): 8-9 (sub Ancient Earls of Fife).

This connection was already published in 1989 in the Europäische Stammtafeln III-4 table 706, (Tosny): Marguerite 1235 widow, + 16 or 17 Jan. after 1246 x Malcolm 4th earl of Fife + 1228.

As source Schwennicke mentions (among others): Abbé Alphonse Angot: Généalogies féodales Mayennaises du XIe au XIII, Laval, 1942, page 38.

Regards,

Bert M. Kamp



B.M. Kamp

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 10:37:50 AM



to

In his posting on Countess Ida: the Scottish Tony connection,
Douglas Richardson mentioned also Agnes Vicomtesse de Beaumont:

- > Abbe A. Angot, pg. 103, notes that in 1246, Margaret, Countess of
- > Fife, was joined by her first cousin, Agnes, vicomtesse of Beaumont
- > (wife of Louis de Bienne) in sending a letter to Pope Innocent III
- > about the deplorable condition of Perray-Neuf Abbey. Abbe A. Angot
- > cites as his source: Galliana Christiana, t. XIV, col. 733 "d'après
- > une charte des Arch. d'Angers").
- >
- > Agnes, vicomtesse of Beaumont, mentioned here was daughter of Raoul VI
- > de Beaumont and his wife, Agnes. Agnes and her husband, Louis de
- > Brienne, were the parents of Henry de Beaumont, Knt., of Folkingham,
- > Barton on Humber, and Heckington, co. Lincoln, who was Earl of Buchan
- > in Scotland. I show that in 1297 Agnes de Beaumont conveyed of the
- > barony of Caral in Fifeshire in Scotland to her daughter, Isabel de
- > Vescy [Reference: Calendar of Close Rolls, 1296-1302 (1906), pg. 10].
- > As such, the Beaumont family also had important Scottish ties, as did
- > the Tony family.
- >
- > My good friend and colleague, Andrew MacEwen, the resident authority
- > of all things Scottish, tells me that the evidence I have presented
- > above is the first time documentation has surfaced to prove that
- > Malcolm, Earl of Fife (died c. 1228), had a wife named Margaret de
- > Tony.
- >

- > Lastly, I might mention in passing that Abbe Angot suggests on pg. 42
- > that Agnes, wife of Raoul VI de Beaumont, might well have been an
- > illegitimate daughter of either King Henry II, Richard I, or John.
- > The evidence he cites is slim but deserves further study.
- >

I have two remarks:

According to Europäische Stammtafeln III table 683 (Brienne) Agnes vicomtesse de Beaumont married Louis de Brienne on 12 febr. 1253. Agnes was a daughter of Vicomte Raoul (VIII says ES III-687 Beaumont du Maine), mentioned 1177, who died 13 April 1238 or 1239. She had a brother Richard II, who succeeded his father as Vicomte de Beaumont. This Richard married in April 1221 Mahaut d'Amboise, but they had no issue. Richard died in 1242, and his sister Agnes succeeded him as Vicomte(ss). That is in agreement with Agnes being Vicomtesse in 1246, when she sent a letter to the Pope. This seems to indicate that she was of age(16 or more?) at that time. As she married in 1253, she must then have been at least in her early twenties in 1253. She bore Louis de Brienne (at least) 7 children, so it seems unlikely she was over thirty when she married. In that case she was borne in the period 1223-1230, that is well after the marriage of her brother Richard II.

ES indicates another Agnes, who died before 1218, as mother of both Richard and Agnes. Now the elder Agnes may well have been the mother of Richard II, but most probably not of Agnes the younger.

Now Père Anselme does indicate two marriages for Raoul: firstly to a Lucy, who died before 1227, and secondly to an Agnes. To make things even more complicated Raoul's mother was another Lucy (de l'Aigle). Incidentally: Raoul's Beaumont-grandmother was Constance, a natural daughter of king Henry I of England.

The second remark: Louis de Brienne, the bridegroom of 1253, was a younger son of King Jean de Brienne of Jerusalem by his third wife Berenguela of Castile, whom he married in 1224. I presume that Louis was born around 1230.

This Berenguela was a granddaughter of Eleanor of England, herself a daughter of Henry II. This makes Louis de Brienne a great-great-grandson of Henry II. If his wife Agnes de Beaumont should have been a daughter of Agnes and this Agnes a daughter of either Henry II, Richard I or John, a dispensation for this marriage would have been necessary.

If anybody can shed some light on the maternal ancestry of Agnes (the wife of Louis de Brienne) I would love to hear it.

Regards to all,

Bert M. Kamp

>
> Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah
>
> E-mail: royala...@msn.com
>
> copyright
>

> _____



Bob New

unread,
Dec 29, 2002, 11:50:08 AM

☐

☐

☐

to

>Lastly, I might mention in passing that Abbe Angot suggests on pg. 42
>that Agnes, wife of Raoul VI de Beaumont, might well have been an
>illegitimate daughter of either King Henry II, Richard I, or John.
>The evidence he cites is slim but deserves further study.

I offer this:

Henry I King of England

I

(nat dau)

I

Constance ==

Roscelin, vicomte de Beaumont la Maine

I

Richard, vicomte de Beaumont la Maine

I

I I

Ermengarde == Constance ==

William "the Lion" Roger IV de Tony

King of Scots

Bob New



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 1:01:31 PM



to

Dear Tim ~

Thank you for pointing out that Margaret de Tony is named as the wife of Malcolm, 6th Earl of Fife, in the corrections volume of Complete Peerage (volume 14). As best I understand the modern correction, though, the editor has entirely removed Earl Malcolm's other marriage to Maud, daughter of Gilbert, Earl of Strathern, by which marriage Earl Malcolm obtained lands in Glendovan, Aldie, and Fossoway.

Scots Peerage 4 (1907): 9, footnote 1, gives the following citation as its source for the marriage of Earl Malcolm and Maud of Strathern:

Liber Insule Missarum, Appendix xxiii., Bannatyne Club.

Does anyone have access to Liber Insule Missarum? Andrew MacEwen says this is an important source, which unfortunately he has never been able to locate. I'm puzzled that the accepted marriage to Maud of Strathern would be removed and replaced by the other one to Margaret de Tony without any comment. Perhaps the removal is explained by Mr. Watson in his material which Complete Peerage cites as its source.

Curiously, I see Complete Peerage 14 gives no particulars on the life of Margaret de Tony, Countess of Fife, which information can be easily obtain from Abbe Angot's book which I cited. It appears Margaret returned to France following the death of Earl Malcolm. Her obit was kept by two religious houses in France.

Thanks again for checking on this, Tim. Much appreciated.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

Tim Powys-Lybbe <t...@powys.org> wrote in message news:
<8ca848a...@southfrm.demon.co.uk>...



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 1:55:33 PM



to

Dear Bert ~

Thank you for posting this information. I have doubtless seen the Tosny chart in Europäische Stammtafeln some time in the past. Margaret's appearance on the chart evidently didn't register with me. In more recent time, I've read the accounts of the Fife family in Scots Peerage and Complete Peerage and no mention is made of Margaret de Tony there. Also, I don't believe Margaret is recorded in a chart of the Tony family which appears in Emma Mason's recent Beauchamp Cartulary. I'll check that when I have a moment this next week.

Elsewhere, I see Tim has posted that Margaret de Tony is identified as the wife of Earl Malcolm in the recent corrections volume of Complete Peerage. However, in an unusual twist, Earl Malcolm's accepted

marriage to Maud of Strathern is removed, and replaced by his marriage to Margaret de Tony. I'm not sure if the editor really intended to do this, as Scots Peerage gives a source for the earl's marriage to Maud of Strathern, which is probably sound. My guess is that Earl Malcolm had both marriages.

The marriage of Earl Malcolm to Margaret de Tony illustrates the point I made this past month about high born nobles alternatively marrying wives descended either from Isabel de Vermandois or Countess Judith. Earl Malcolm's mother was a descendant of Isabel de Vermandois. His wife, Margaret de Tony, was a descendant of both Isabel de Vermandois and Countess Judith.

Thank again for your post. Much appreciated.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

bm...@wanadoo.nl ("B.M. Kamp") wrote in message news:
<3EoF247D.28865.107FAE@localhost>...

☐



Dolly Ziegler

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 2:58:26 PM

☐

☐

☐

to

Hello, Doug and others interested. The Peabody Library of the Johns Hopkins University has Liber Insule Missarum but (a) the Peabody is closed for remodeling, and (b) I don't read Latin, more's the pity. However! Abebooks.com lists a copy of the 1847 publication for sale by a Scottish bookseller, at US\$72.17.

If Library of Congress or Family History Library has this, I don't find it.

FHL has, on microfiche, two volumes _Registrum episcopatus aberdonensis_, photocopies of originals published Edinburgh 1845.

LOC has _Charters, bulls and other documents relating to the abbey of Inchaffray_, Edinburgh 1908.

Love these online catalogs. ;-)

Cheers, Dolly Ziegler in Maryland USA

On Sun 29 Dec 2002, Douglas Richardson wrote:

(snip) > Scots Peerage 4 (1907): 9, footnote 1, gives the following

☐



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 5:43:32 PM

☐

☐

☐

to

Dear Dolly ~

Thank you for your post. I've relayed this information onto Andrew MacEwen, who indicates he plans to contact the Scottish bookseller who has Liber Insule Missarum for sale. Andrew is quite familiar with the bookseller and has ordered from him many times.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

d...@bcpl.net (Dolly Ziegler) wrote in message news:<Pine.GSO.4.50.0212291445130.15895-100000@mail>...



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 6:34:46 PM



to

Dear Bert ~

In my earlier post, I stated that in 1297 Agnes de Beaumont, vicomtesse of Beaumont (widow of Louis de Brienne) conveyed the barony of Caral in Fifeshire to her daughter, Isabel de Vescy, which information I found in the Close Rolls.

Andrew MacEwen tells me the modern spelling of this barony is Crail. He states that this barony was given in marriage or dower to Ada de Warenne, wife of Henry of Scotland. If correct, I suppose it is entirely possible that Ada de Warenne is a remote ancestress of Agnes de Beaumont.

Reviewing the Beaumont family chronology, it's certainly possible that Agnes de Beaumont's mother was of Scottish descent. Agnes' mother, also Agnes de Beaumont (living 1226), may have been a younger second wife of Raoul VI de Beaumont, who occurs in the records as early as 1196. If so, then Raoul VI and Agnes, Sr., could have married long after his sister, Ermengarde de Beaumont, married William the Lion, King of Scotland, in 1186.

Abbe Angot supposes that Raoul VI de Beaumont had only one wife, Agnes, who occurs in 1226. However, I see Raoul VI's son and heir, Richard, was clearly of age in or before 1226, whereas Raoul's

daughter, Agnes, Jr. (later wife of Louis de Brienne), was an adult in or before 1246 but not married until 1253. If nothing else, there was surely a good number of years between the ages of Richard, Raoul' son and heir, and Richard's younger sister, Agnes, Jr., who subsequently became his heiress.

Comments are invited.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

bmk...@wanadoo.nl ("B.M. Kamp") wrote in message news:
<3EoF247E.32297.1082F5@localhost>...



John P. Ravilious

unread,

Dec 29, 2002, 7:11:57 PM



to

Sunday, 29 December, 2002

Dear Douglas, Tim, et al.,

Yet another extremely interesting series of posts. Your bringing this material to our attention (together with the relevant cites) is greatly appreciated.

In the posts concerning the Beaumont connection, you noted Abbe Angot had theorized that Agnes, wife of Raoul VI (elsewhere Raoul 'VIII') de Beaumont might have an illegitimate daughter of Henry II of England or of one of

his immediate issue. I think there is a good possibility she was actually an illegitimate daughter of William the Lion, king of Scots:

1. In your post you noted:

' I show that in 1297 Agnes de Beaumont conveyed

the barony of Caral in Fifeshire in Scotland to her daughter, Isabel de Vescy [Reference: Calendar

of Close Rolls, 1296-1302 (1906), pg. 10].'

This would have actually been Crail, co. Fife.

Concerning Crail, I find the following:

' It was anciently called Caryle or Carraile, and is mentioned by old historians as a town of considerable note, as early as the middle of the 9th century. Ada, mother of Malcolm IV., gave to the monks of Dryburgh a toft of houses in her burgh of Crail.' [1]

The manor or lands of Crail which you found to be in the hands of Agnes de Beaumont in 1297 appears to have then been held by the royal family of Scots, probably from the time of King David [2] or at least from the time of his daughter-in-law, Ada de Warenne [wife of Henry, Earl of Huntingdon and Northumberland, and as noted, the mother of Malcolm IV, William the Lion, and others].

2. G. W. S. Barrow, in his history of Robert the Bruce, wrote concerning the men who joined Bruce in 1306,

' Sir John, laird of Cambo in the East Neuk of Fife, was another man whom English rule threatened to deprive of property. Although his name is on the list of homagers to Edward I in 1304, he had been prevented from doing homage by Sir Henry de Beaumont, probably because he had acquired the revenues of the prosperous

fishing town of Crail, to which Beaumont's sister, the lady de Vesci, claimed an hereditary right.' [3]

It is certainly possibly that Raoul de Beaumont could have received Crail, co. Fife as a grant from his brother-in-law, William the Lion; it seems quite likely, however, that such a gift could have been connected to his marrying into the family of William the Lion (although the chronology re: his daughter Agnes seems to indicate a later marriage).

I would recommend looking for Agnes, wife of Raoul (or the mother of his daughter Agnes, if not the same wife) amongst the illegitimate issue of William the Lion.

Hope this is helpful. Again, thanks for the great contributions.

John *

NOTES

[1] The Topographical, Statistical, and Historical Gazetteer of Scotland (A. Fullarton & Co., 1856: Edinburgh, London and Dublin), Vol. I, p. 257.

[2] Ibid., p. 258.

[3] G.W.S. Barrow, Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland (2nd ed., 1976: Edinburgh University Press), p. 221. Barrow cites "Cal. Docs. Scot., ii, No. 730."

* John P. Ravilious



Peter Sutton

unread,
Dec 30, 2002, 5:16:52 AM



to

Douglas

I think you could obtain a copy from the British Library through the Inter-library Service, at least in the UK.

At the British Library Web Site <http://blpc.bl.uk/> you will find the following references:

1. Liber Insule Missarum: Abbacie canonicorum regularium B. Virginis et S. Johannis de Inchaffery registrum vetus: Premissis quibusdam comitatus antiqui de Stratherne reliquiis. [Edited by C. Innes.] - EDINBURGH. Bannatyne Club - Publication details: Edinburgi, 1847. 40. Shelfmark: Ac.8248/85.

2. Liber Insule Missarum: Abbacie canonicorum regularium B. Virginis t S. Johannis de Inchaffery registrum vetus. - Main heading: INCHAFFERY Shelfmark: Ac.8248/85. (Notes: In . Edinburgh.-Bannatyne Club. Inchaffery. Liber, etc. 1847. 40.)

3. Liber Insule Missarum: Abbacie Canonicorum Regularium ... de Inchaffery registrum vetus, etc. [Edited by C. I.] - Main heading: INNES. Cosmo. Antiquary - Publication details: 1847. - Shelfmark: Ac.8248/85. - Notes: In. Edinburgh.-Bannatyne Club. Liber Insule Missarum, etc. 1847. 40.

Regards

Peter Sutton



Alex Maxwell Findlater

unread,

Dec 30, 2002, 10:11:57 AM





to

> I think you could obtain a copy from the British Library through the
> Inter-library Service, at least in the UK.
>

I tried to borrow through the inter-library loan a copy of the Book of Kelso, published at about the same time. The BL were not willing to lend it. So I think you will have to go to them to look at what you want. On the other hand it might be on the open shelves in a local library in Scotland and it is certainly in the National Library.

In the circs, good luck.

Alex



Alex Maxwell Findlater

unread,
Dec 30, 2002, 10:33:41 AM



to

>
> Agnes, vicomtesse of Beaumont, mentioned here was daughter of Raoul VI
> de Beaumont and his wife, Agnes. Agnes and her husband, Louis de
> Brienne, were the parents of Henry de Beaumont, Knt., of Folkingham,
> Barton on Humber, and Heckington, co. Lincoln, who was Earl of Buchan
> in Scotland. I show that in 1297 Agnes de Beaumont conveyed of the
> barony of Caral in Fifeshire in Scotland to her daughter, Isabel de
> Vescy [Reference: Calendar of Close Rolls, 1296-1302 (1906), pg. 10].

> As such, the Beaumont family also had important Scottish ties, as did
 > the Tony family.
 >

I understand from CP that the manors of Folkingham, Heckington and Barton were held by Gilbert de Ghent (fl 1060-?) and descended to his heirs of his second marriage to Alice daughter of Count Hugh de Montfort-sur-Risle. They were held by Sir Gilbert de Gaunt in IPM of 26 Jan 2 Edw I (File 6, No 5) per CP under Gaunt. The last Sir Gilbert de Gaunt died in 1297/8 (IPM 26 Edw I). CP states that being childless he surrendered them to the King in 1294, and received them back for life only.

Does that suggest that Beaumont was granted them when he was dispossessed of his Scottish inheritance?



Jay Cary

unread,

Dec 30, 2002, 6:33:39 PM



to

Doug & list,

For what it worth, I see another possible Ida/Scottish connection - Mary Bigod, dau of Countess Ida and Roger Bigod married Ranulph fitz Robert who was grandson of Agatha de Brus.

1 Ribald of Middleham & Spennithorne (ca1050 - ~1121)

& Beatrice Taillebois (- <1121)

1.1 Ralph Fitz Ribald of Middleham & Spennithorne (ca1080 - >1168)

& Agatha de Bruis (- 1142)

1.1.1 Robert Fitz Ralph of Middleham & Spennithorne (~1110 - 1185)

& Helewise de Glanville (- 1195)

1.1.1.1 Ranulf Fitz Robert of Middleham, York, England (-
<1252)
& Mary Bigod

Jay Cary
Lyme, NH



Douglas Richardson

unread,
Dec 30, 2002, 10:24:34 PM



to

Dear Jay ~

Thank you for your good post. I'm glad you brought up the subject of Mary Bigod's marriage to Ranulph Fitz Robert. The evidence I've seen in print of her marriage is rather sketchy. While doing research for the forthcoming Magna Carta Ancestry book, I came across conclusive evidence of Mary's marriage in the medieval source, Book of Fees. An abstract of this record reads as follows:

A.D. 1198-1199

"Ranulphus filius Roberti est in custodia domini archiepiscopi, et duxit filiam Comitis Roger, et terra eius valet in Houton' et Pikeham xxv I") [Reference: Book of Fees, 2 (1920): 1324].

Basically, this record shows that Ranulph Fitz Ralph was a minor in the custody of the Archbishop in 1198-9, and that he had married the daughter of Earl Roger [Bigod].

The fact that Ranulph Fitz Robert was still a minor in wardship in 1198/9, I think alerts us that the chronology of the Longespee and Bigod families has been greatly misunderstood. Mary's eldest legitimate brother, Hugh Bigod, married before Lent 1207 to Maud Marshal [see Complete Peerage, 9 (1936): 589-590 (sub Norfolk)]. The date 1207 must be very close to the actual date of Hugh's marriage, as following Hugh Bigod's death in 1225, his widow, Maud, is known to have remarried William de Warenne, Earl of Surrey, and had further issue.

Given that Hugh Bigod married c. 1207 and Mary Bigod's husband was a minor in 1198/9, I find it impossible to accept that Hugh and Mary Bigod's mother, Countess Ida, was the child of Roger de Tony, by Ida of Hainault, which couple are known to have been married back in the reign of King Henry I (died 1135). Rather, it seems appropriate to assign Ida as a child in the next generation of the Tony family, that is, as daughter of Ralph de Tony (died 1162) and his wife, Margaret de Beaumont. Also, it seems a virtual certainty than the birthdate of 1170 assigned to William Longespee in the recent article in *The American Genealogist* is off the mark. I suspect a birthdate of 1180 for William Longespee fits the facts much better.

Bringing Countess Ida down a generation helps explain the Scottish Tony connection, as Ida would then have been sister-in-law to Constance de Beaumont, whose sister was the wife of William the Lion, King of Scotland. We know that King William and his wife, Ermengarde de Beaumont, were married in 1186. I know of nothing which would preclude Countess Ida and Earl Roger Bigod from having a similar marriage date, say 1180/5. Moreover, as a child of Ralph and Margaret de Tony, Countess Ida would have had a double kinship to King William the Lion, one through her father by shared descent from Countess Judith, and one through her mother by shared descent from Isabel de Vermandois. This then explains the Scottish Tony connection. This also explains the appearance of the given names, Ralph and Margaret, among Countess Ida's children, she having named these children in honor of her own parents.

Comments are invited.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

copyright

Jay Cary <j...@dartmouth.edu> wrote in message news:<3E10D7D3...@dartmouth.edu>...

□



ADRIANC...@aol.com

unread,

Dec 31, 2002, 9:23:16 AM

□

□

□

to

In a message dated 31/12/02 03:34:58 GMT Standard Time, royala...@msn.com writes:

Doug Richardson wrote;

<snip>

> Given that Hugh Bigod married c. 1207 and Mary Bigod's husband was a
> minor in 1198/9, I find it impossible to accept that Hugh and Mary
> Bigod's mother, Countess Ida, was the child of Roger de Tony, by Ida
> of Hainault, which couple are known to have been married back in the
> reign of King Henry I (died 1135). Rather, it seems appropriate to
> assign Ida as a child in the next generation of the Tony family, that
> is, as daughter of Ralph de Tony (died 1162) and his wife, Margaret de
> Beaumont. Also, it seems a virtual certainty than the birthdate of
> 1170 assigned to William Longespee in the recent article in The
> American Genealogist is off the mark. I suspect a birthdate of 1180
> for William Longespee fits the facts much better.
>

<snip>

It seems to me that one of the few solid facts we have about the early life of William Longespee is the release to him of Kirton manor, Lindsey on 5 Feb

1191, suggesting that he probably had just attained the age of 21 years old. The evidence that William's mother was from the Tony family is much weaker, based on the use of the Christian name Ida. I think it was Paul who first suggested this, and stated it was one of a number of possibilities — or words to that effect. To use this theory to imply (which in any event, I don't believe it does) that William was born around 1180 does not appear logical to me, certainly not "a virtual certainty"

Adrian



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Dec 31, 2002, 2:11:21 PM



to

Dear Adrian ~

Thank you for your good post. You've raised an excellent question.

You are correct that William Longespee was granted land in 1191 by his brother, King Richard I. What is NOT solid fact is that William was "probably ... 21 years old" (your words) when that grant was made.

A little history lesson would do us well I think. Surviving records tell us that King Henry II wanted to granted the castles of Chinon, Loudun, and Mirebeau in France to his son, John, in 1173. These castles formerly formed the "appanage" of his brother, Geoffrey. Likewise, in 1177, King Henry II had his son, John, declared king of Ireland. King Henry's son, John, was born in December 1167. This would make John at most age six when his father attempted to grant him the lands in France and age 10 when his father had him named king of Ireland. This being the case, I think it is clear that William Longespee can have been virtually any age when his brother, King

Richard I, granted him lands in 1191. As such, the granting of lands in 1191 can not be used to approximate William Longespee's date of birth.

Rather, a better indicator of William Longespee's birthdate would be to see when he first appears in the records as an "adult." For people of this rank, this usually occurred around the age of 16, when they entered military service and started witnessing charters. My notes indicate that William Longespee was with his brother, King Richard, in Normandy from 1196 to 1198. If we use the date 1196 as an indication, it would suggest a birthdate of 1180 for William Longespee. By favorable comparison, I find that King Henry II sent his son, John, to rule Ireland in 1185, when John was 17.

If we suppose that William Longespee was born as early as you suggest (1170), I find it impossible to believe that William Longespee's eldest legitimate brother, Hugh Bigod, married 37 years after the birth of William. All the more so, when we realize that Hugh Bigod was the eldest of four half-brothers of William Longespee. It takes an incredulous leap of faith to accept such a wide span dates as you have suggested.

Given these considerations, I recommend that we nail down William Longespee's exact appearance in the records acting as an adult. In 1196 is that date, then the chronology will have to be revised accordingly. Perhaps our good colleague and fellow poster, Linda Jack, who is researching the life of William Longespee's wife, Countess Ela, can tell us specifically when William Longespee surfaced in records acting as an adult. If Linda is following this thread, I'd certainly appreciate hearing her comments.

I believe collegiality, mutual cooperation, and free association are the keys to solving most of the genealogical puzzles which confront us. This is especially true with William Longespee and Countess Ida.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

ADRIANC...@aol.com wrote in message news:<14c.19a27f...@aol.com>...

> In a message dated 31/12/02 03:34:58 GMT Standard Time, royala...@msn.com
> writes:



Douglas Richardson

☐

to

Dear John, Tim, etc.

Andrew MacEwen has kindly informed me that the barony of Crail in Fifehire was granted by King Alexander II to Richard de Beaumont. As such, it would appear that it afterwards fell by inheritance to Richard's sister and heiress, Agnes de Beaumont (wife of Louis de Brienne), who in turn conveyed it to her daughter, Isabel de Vescy. As such, the ownership of this barony by Agnes de Beaumont would not have come by descent from Ada de Warenne.

King Alexander II of Scotland was a 1st cousin on his mother's side to Richard de Beaumont, which would explain the grant of the barony I think.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

The...@aol.com wrote in message news:<145.66013d...@aol.com>...

☐



John P. Ravilious

unread,

Dec 31, 2002, 2:58:30 PM

☐

☐

☐

to

Tuesday, 31 December, 2002

Dear Douglas, et al.,

A reasonable answer, if perhaps not quite what I was hoping for. However, as that noted scholar Mick Jagger noted, we do not always get what we want...

In readying to trot off for the New Year's celebrations, I did want to thank you and the rest of SGM for an interesting and rewarding 2002. Happy New Year to one and all, as we look forward to an interesting (and hopefully happier) 2003.

All the best,

John



Reedpcgen

unread,

Dec 31, 2002, 7:51:48 PM



to

Doug,

May I remind you that it was I who put forward the hypothesis that Countess Ida was a Toeni back when you believed she was Ada de Chaumont?

It was only after the Chaumont hypothesis was realized to be impossible that you jumped on the Toeni bandwagon. Now you seem to have made it another one of your 'discoveries' (entirely ignoring all the posts you had made teasing us that you knew her identity with certitude).

As it is, other than the given name Ida appearing in both families, and the social status being acceptable, all other connections to date are entirely circumstantial.

You are now revising the chronology of William Longespee's birth by assuming the 1191 grant of land was the first appearance by William Longespee in record. That is not correct.

But I cannot reveal details to your fishing as they are crucially important and will appear in print in the future. (I do not feel you properly acknowledged the import of Ray Phair's discovery in what you had previously posted would

appear in your book, and have seen no proper revision from you, so there is no motivation to reveal more until the information is securely in print.)

Paul



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 11:54:20 AM



to

Dear Paul ~

I find it impossible to believe that William Longespee's eldest

legitimate half-brother, Hugh Bigod, married 37 years after William's birth, as you have suggested in your article. I also find it impossible to believe that Hugh Bigod, married in 1207, was the grandson of a couple married prior to 1135. To use one of your own expressions, a child could see that there is something wrong with this chronology. I think you've made a major goof in your article, Paul. We expect better of you than this.

As for Mr. Phair, I received a very cordial e-mail from him this past week. He asked me to cite his article in TAG, which reference I have since added to the Plantagenet manuscript. He wished me well with the book. Mr. Phair is a gentleman and a scholar. I have the highest regard for Mr. Phair. Please don't make wild allegations and insinuations for which there is no substance. And don't use Mr. Phair's name and reputation to attack me. If you have something you wish to say to me directly, I'm available anytime at (801) 680-5811. I'll be more than happy to talk to you.

The mantra in 2003 is keep it friendly and keep it on topic. Your post is not friendly, Paul. Please pull it up a notch.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

reed...@aol.com (Reedpcgen) wrote in message news:<20021231195148...@mb-fe.aol.com>...

☐



Kevan

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 3:49:07 PM

☐

☐

☐

to

I've been rebuilding my database over the past number of months and have been relatively silent on SGM. I must say, however, that I am delighted with some of the recent threads on SGM. This is just one of them.

I think all of you as a group deserve the "most helpful person of the year 2002", for these wonderful threads and discussions would not happen with any of you absent. Thank you so much for your sharing the data you have. I am always indebted.

I'd have to say, however, that Paul's snub to the thread threw cold water on the synergy built via the topic. I hope that does not reflect ill will from him towards anyone. We've heard him say many times now that he was responsible for suggesting the Tony connection. Good on him. Let's keep the ball rolling and not stop for spot lights. ;-)

Cheers,

Kevan



Vickie Elam White

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 4:28:39 PM



to

Douglas Richardson wrote -

>You are correct that William Longespee was granted land in 1191 by his
>brother, King Richard I. What is NOT solid fact is that William was
>"probably ... 21 years old" (your words) when that grant was made.

Actually, Adrian said the land was *released* to William LONGESPEE in 1191, not granted to him. Two entirely different things under the law, the former requiring the male to have attained the age of 21. Or am I missing something?

Does anyone know for sure which it was -- release or grant?

Vickie Elam White



Sutliff

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 4:49:30 PM



to

""Kevan"" <kevan...@adelphia.net> wrote in message

news:ECELJLLKGANJMKHGAID...@adelphia.net...
<snip>>

> I'd have to say, however, that Paul's snub to the thread threw cold water
on
> the synergy built via the topic. I hope that does not reflect ill will
from
> him towards anyone. We've heard him say many times now that he was
> responsible for suggesting the Tony connection. Good on him. Let's keep
> the ball rolling and not stop for spot lights. ;-)
>
> Cheers,
> Kevan
>

Sorry, Kevan, but could you please elaborate? Are you suggesting that it is
petty or unimportant for Paul Reed or Ray Phair to be given appropriate
credit for their work, just as long as the information keeps coming to you?
I sincerely hope that is not what you meant.

HS



D. Spencer Hines

unread,
Jan 1, 2003, 5:19:25 PM



to

Yep.

That seems to be precisely what he is saying, Henry.

He just wants something for nothing ---- and the more the better.

That's the data miners attitude.

Deus Vult.

"For we must consider that we shall be a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us, so that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken, and so cause him to withdraw His present help from us, we shall be made a story and a byword through the world."

John Winthrop [1588-1649] A Model of Christian Charity [1630], A Sermon Delivered aboard Arbella, enroute to the New World; First Governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Ubique Quo Fas Et Gloria Ducunt --- Motto of the Royal Artillery

All replies to the newsgroup please. Thank you kindly. All original material contained herein is copyright and property of the author. It may be quoted only in discussions on this forum and with an attribution to the author, unless permission is otherwise expressly given, in writing.

D. Spencer Hines

Lux et Veritas et Libertas

Vires et Honor.

"Sutliff" <ss...@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:KnJQ9.8244\$9N5.8...@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

☐



Reedpcgen

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 5:19:42 PM

☐

☐

☐

to

[Doug wrote:]

<I find it impossible to believe that William Longespee's eldest legitimate half-brother, Hugh Bigod, married 37 years after William's birth, as you have suggested in your article. I also find it impossible to believe that Hugh Bigod, married in 1207, was the grandson of a couple married prior to 1135. To use one of your own expressions, a child could see that there is something wrong with this chronology. I think you've made a major goof in your article, Paul. We expect better of you than this.>

I'm sorry you are expressing difficulty with these events. The bottom line, however, is that even if things do not fit in a standard way (they sometimes don't - sometimes people get married later, etc.),

we have to work with FACTS and DOCUMENTS. You do not seem to be wanting to insert another generation in this case, so lets look at the basics a moment.

Hugh Bigod, William's half-brother, received the grant of a manor in 1199 for which the record states he gave homage (Rosie had posted this some time ago). This act of homage would imply he was at least of an age to perform the services required of it. If we presumed that Hugh was about the age of majority, he would be born about 1178.

In the article in question, you state that I said Hugh Bigod married in 1207. (Please at least be accurate in your criticism, lest it mislead readers.) What it says, in a quote of CP, is that he married "probably before Lent" and that his son and heir was not born until 1212-13. It is possible Hugh married earlier, and I did not state that he could not have. There may have been female issue born first.

If one assumes Hugh Bigod was born about 1178, appeared many times as witness to various grants with his father, and paid homage for the manor of Staverton in 1199, that does not create a great chronological difficulty for his brother William Longespee being born about 1170, especially if Hugh Bigod had elder sisters.

As to William Longespee, from the wording appearing in record, he appears in record during the reign of his father Henry, and then is granted a very important manor (Kirton) in 1191, two years after his brother Richard came to the throne. But Richard had, immediately after coming to the throne, granted his mother Eleanor and brother John lands in 1189. So why this two-year gap, and why bother sending the order from Messina, instead of waiting until closer to home? I think Richard anticipated William's age of majority.

We had already disposed of the false statement that William Longespee was granted the manor of Appleby in 1188, so we have made headway in that as well.

If one suggests that William Longespee was born some years after 1170, it removes the chronological impediment to Countess Ida belonging to the family of the Counts of Eu. I still do not see a valid reason for suggesting he was born later than 1170, however. The wording of Richard's order suggests that the manor of Kirton was turned over to William, and then he is immediately accounted for in the Pipe Rolls in that year. John Sharp even checked the original writ.

<As for Mr. Phair, I received a very cordial e-mail from him this past week. He asked me to cite his article in TAG, which reference I have since added to the Plantagenet manuscript. He wished me well with the book. Mr. Phair is a gentleman and a scholar. I have the highest regard for Mr. Phair. Please don't make wild allegations and insinuations for which there is no substance. And don't use Mr. Phair's name and reputation to attack me. If you have something you wish to say to me directly, I'm available anytime at (801) 680-5811. I'll be more than happy to talk to you.>

I do agree that Ray is a very careful scholar and a gentleman. I thought you should have added his reference to your book as soon as I made you aware of it some weeks ago, but am glad to hear that this has been rectified. I hope you have emphasized the import of his discovery in this problem.

<The mantra in 2003 is keep it friendly and keep it on topic. Your post is not friendly, Paul. Please pull it up a notch.>

I will do my best to post in a more friendly manner, and keep to the facts. Your post made some specific criticisms of an article. Your post stated things that weren't accurate. When you wrote (concerning the chronology discussed above), "I think you've made a major goof in your article, Paul. We expect better of you than this." It does not sound like cordial criticism, but rather a slap at either the evaluation of the facts or a personal swipe at me. I don't really care, but I do not feel the sentiment is either accurate or cordial.

I hope in this new year that instead of attempting to claim this or that novel way of twisting a thing to make it one's own public discovery, we will all act in a way that will foster people contributing to problems and research. Chris has been an example of dispassionate aid.

In the future, please be accurate in the statements of what you criticize. I think that will help keep people from being misled of the facts, and foster a better spirit of discussion of facts.

Paul



D. Spencer Hines

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 5:28:59 PM



to

Recte:

Yep.

That seems to be *precisely* what he is saying, Henry.

He just wants *something for nothing* ---- and the more the better.

That's the data miners' attitude ---- quite consistently.

And everyone has forgotten about Finton again ---- which is just what he wanted.



Reedpcgen

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 5:40:05 PM



□

to

>Sorry, Kevan, but could you please elaborate? Are you suggesting that it is
>petty or unimportant for Paul Reed or Ray Phair to be given appropriate
>credit for their work, just as long as the information keeps coming to you?
>I sincerely hope that is not what you meant.

I would just state publicly that I do not care if credit is given to me for pointing out the possible connection between Ida of Hainault's family and Countess Ida.

I do care that Ray be given proper credit, and it had not been immediately apparent that it was done (though I hope it is now properly rectified).

The reason I stated what I did was because earlier on in this thread, Doug had seemed to take credit for this association, and justified it by claiming he'd seen an undocumented statement published in the Register over a century ago [!] which called her Thouy, though was flawed in other aspects.

Claiming credit for this, after I'd pointed it out for some time when Doug had a different candidate in mind, seemed absurd. My comments were not meant to direct credit to me, but just to point out the absurdity of making something one's own 'discovery' well after the fact.

I have been disturbed this last year by this spirit of "I have discovered this" or that small tidbit, and the way it fosters keeping a score card. It does not, in my mind, really foster collegiality or a collaborative spirit. It reminds me of a Daffy Duck cartoon where in the end Daffy finally found the treasure and was screaming "Mine, mine, mine!" at the same time he was shrunk to a miniscule size by an angered jinn.

I hope that in this new year that the push to make everything "my discovery first" will abate and people will be given information when proper, but not in a spirit of one-upsmanship.

That does not detract from when proper credit should be made for scholarly discoveries. But it does not mean the tone must be a certain way.

Paul



Kevan

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 7:07:02 PM



to

Henry asks:

"Sorry, Kevan, but could you please elaborate? Are you suggesting that it is petty or unimportant for Paul Reed or Ray Phair to be given appropriate credit for their work, just as long as the information keeps coming to you? I sincerely hope that is not what you meant."

I reply, "Nope, though I can certainly see how I gave the wrong impression. Sorry, folks. I have always believed that it is very important to give credit where credit is due and this I do not question."

What I have a problem with is the apparent bad spirit that Paul conveyed with his language in the post, and it was directed, at least I believe, at Douglas. Paul had already reminded the list that he was the first to come up with the Ida/Tony connection. The first time he reminded the list, I went and read what he had to say. It was clever stuff. This time, however, Paul's "May-I-remind-you-that-it-was-I....?" statement was not needed, but apparently ego centric, quite contrary to the spirit of those that had been offering their thoughts to the thread. He essentially stole the spotlight from the discussion by focusing on himself. It was not necessary that he do so.

Personally, the process of getting to the conclusion is always more fascinating to me than the conclusion itself. I am in awe at what data and talent SGM folks have at their fingertips to apply against the puzzle at hand. The analytic techniques, i.e. age at majority vs. one's level in society, crossed with "when one gets his hands on the family property" are really great logical trails to follow. I for one learn much. Anyway, I hope that answers your cogent concern to my earlier posting.

Cheers and have a Happy New Year!

Kevan



Reedpcgen

unread,

Jan 1, 2003, 7:47:18 PM



to

< This time, however, Paul's "May-I-remind-you-that-it-was-I....?" statement was not needed, but apparently ego centric, quite contrary to the spirit of those that had been offering their thoughts to the thread. He essentially stole the spotlight from the discussion by focusing on himself.>

Kevan, my post was poorly worded, and I am sorry for that. It may have led you to overlook the factual content it included that not all records were being taken into account in Doug's statements or conclusions, and my worry was that we would needlessly be dragged off into a long thread of speculation. It is not a new direction of discovery if it ignores factual documents that should have been taken into account which lead one to conclude otherwise.

I hope that in my response you will see that it is reasonable to conclude that Hugh Bigod may have been born about 1178, which would make William Longespee's birth about 1170 quite reasonable, especially if Hugh had older sisters.

All this was clearly and carefully explained in the article. Doug's wording couched things in such a way as to be heavily prejudiced in one direction, a presentation which loaded the dice and would mislead those who have not seen the article or have not read it recently. His tone of "you've made a major goof" and "We expect better of you than this" is stated in such a way as to make people think his statements are accurate and conclusive (not statements to foster further dialogue).

It seemed to be the same type of misleading criticism that had been presented in the interminable Amie discussion. Things were not presented in a way to accurately reflect both sides of the discussion.

I hope my posts have conveyed that my attempt was not to be egocentric, but to keep a needless thread from being formed to lead people away from the factual record in the same way it occurred with Amie de Gaveston. Doug did not present things plainly stated in the article, and ignored by him in his post.

Paul



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Jan 2, 2003, 3:48:04 AM



to

Dear Kevan, etc. ~

Reading Paul Reed's claims, counterclaims, putdowns, allegations, and insinuations, one gets the distinct impression that he thinks he is the only person who ever came up with an original idea. One also gets the impression if you tell a lie often enough, people will believe you.

The truth is that I've been working on Countess Ida for years before I ever had any acquaintance with Mr. Reed. As far back as 1993, Gary Boyd Roberts in his book, *Royal Descents of 500 Immigrants*, identified William Longespee's mother as "Ida later wife of Roger Bigod 2nd Earl of Norfolk." This identification was based on my research. Mr. Roberts properly credited me for this identification on page 347 of his book. For what appear to be petty personal reasons, Mr. Reed displays total amnesia when it comes to the subject of Mr. Roberts' book.

In my own forthcoming book, Plantagenet Ancestry, Countess Ida will be further identified as the presumed daughter of Ralph de Tony (died 1162), Baron of Flamstead, co. Hertford, by his wife, Margaret de Beaumont. This parentage was rejected in toto by Mr. Reed in his recent article. He likewise rejected it here on the newsgroup in repeated posts made in 2000 and again in 2002. I believe the record speaks for itself.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

kevan...@adelphia.net ("Kevan") wrote in message news:
<ECELJLLLKGANJMKHGAIID...@adelphia.net>...

> Henry asks:

>

> "Sorry, Kevan, but could you please elaborate? Are you suggesting that it is
> petty or unimportant for Paul Reed or Ray Phair to be given appropriate
> credit for their work, just as long as the information keeps coming to you?
> I sincerely hope that is not what you meant."

>

> I reply, "Nope, though I can certainly see how I gave the wrong impression.
> Sorry, folks. I have always believed that it is very important to give
> credit where credit is due and this I do not question."

>

> What I have a problem with is the apparent bad spirit that Paul conveyed
> with his language in the post, and it was directed, at least I believe, at
> Douglas. Paul had already reminded the list that he was the first to come
> up with the Ida/Tony connection. The first time he reminded the list, I
> went and read what he had to say. It was clever stuff. This time, however,
> Paul's "May-I-remind-you-that-it-was-I....?" statement was not needed, but
> apparently ego centric, quite contrary to the spirit of those that had been
> offering their thoughts to the thread. He essentially stole the spotlight
> from the discussion by focusing on himself. It was not necessary that he do
> so.

>

□



Reedpcgen

unread,

Jan 2, 2003, 5:24:33 AM

☐

☐

☐

to

[Doug wrote:]

<Reading Paul Reed's claims, counterclaims, putdowns, allegations, and insinuations, one gets the distinct impression that he thinks he is the only person who ever came up with an original idea.>

Who was it that was calling for me to be more collegial and friendly? You are twisting what I said into something it wasn't, and then decrying it. I think this is a tactic to sidestep the pertinent discussion of facts and proper credit. Dispassionate it ain't.

Again, in this specific case, you had posted what you said was going to appear in your book concerning Countess Ida. You didn't even make reference to Ray Phair's original post, which even had "copyright" marked on it!

Even after I called your attention to that, and to Ray Phair's article in TAG, it was not until Ray Phair emailed you directly last week that you made the proper change, as far as I can tell. In a post you just made you stated that you added Ray's TAG citation AFTER he emailed you directly ("since"), rather than (a) when you first read it on this group, or (b) when I called it to your attention.

I express again that I feel this continued barrage of claims that someone is the FIRST to discover this or that, even if it is a snippet from a book on a shelf without any further research, does not foster collaboration, so much as score keeping. (In several of these cases your claim to be FIRST has shown you to have been at least second by many decades.)

< One also gets the impression if you tell a lie often enough, people will believe you. The truth is that I've been working on Countess Ida for years before I ever had any acquaintance with Mr. Reed. As far back as 1993, Gary

Boyd Roberts in his book, *Royal Descents of 500 Immigrants*, identified William Longespee's mother as "Ida later wife of Roger Bigod 2nd Earl of Norfolk." This identification was based on my research. Mr. Roberts properly credited me for this identification on page 347 of his book. For what appear to be petty personal reasons, Mr. Reed displays total amnesia when it comes to the subject of Mr. Roberts' book.>

Truth? Petty?

You've again overlooked a great deal to smear my character (a distraction from the facts). What appeared in RD500 was a GUESS, and did not in any way mention Ida of Hainault OR the Toeni family. (It merely said that Countess Ida, mother of William Longespee, was wife of Ida, wife of the Earl of Norfolk.) There was NO citation to a document or source, and Doug has never made any such claim to citation since. The assumption, based on the name's the same game, was proven to be factual by Ray Phair. Who Countess Ida's parents were is STILL a mystery.

<In my own forthcoming book, *Plantagenet Ancestry*, Countess Ida will be further identified as the presumed daughter of Ralph de Tony (died 1162), Baron of Flamstead, co. Hertford, by his wife, Margaret de Beaumont. This parentage was rejected in toto by Mr. Reed in his recent article.>

My not placing her in that generation of the Toeni family (though, again, it was I who brought this hypothesis forward when you thought she was Ada de Chaumont) was a result of the statement in CP that Margaret de Beaumont had married too late to be her mother. That information has since been revised, but not in time for the article. At the time Doug first put forward the thought that Ida might fit into the next generation, rather than the first, he was oblivious of the statement in CP. When it was brought to his attention by someone else, Doug also dropped the claim. It is only since that it has been brought back.

But, AGAIN, the association is entirely circumstantial. No Ida is known to be born to Margaret de Beaumont.

< He likewise rejected it here on the newsgroup in repeated posts made in 2000 and again in 2002. I believe the record speaks for itself.>

It does, and the correction of the chronology also speaks for itself. But we are still left with only circumstantial connections between the Toeni family and that of either William Longespee and the Bigods. Given that the Earl of Norfolk was powerful and well connected, as were the Toenis, and that the caput

of the Toeni family at Flamstead, Herts., was not far removed from the Earl of Norfolk, and both families were of the highest rank of social class in England, this is not in any way surprising. It would be stunning if such circumstantial connections were absent!

But it is still a fact that Doug teased members of this group repeatedly when he held that Countess Ida was Ada de Chaumont. Doug still does not seem to be able to state in public that I had put forward the Toeni hypothesis before he did. I do not care to gain the credit, but it is interesting to see how it sticks in the throat. He has again made this to be a battle for credit. I am not battling to gain credit, but to point out who absurd it is for him to claim was the one who came up with it.

As to the record, here are just two examples of what we had to endure when Doug thought Countess Ida was Ada de Chaumont:

From: Dcrder4<dcr...@aol.com >

Message-ID: <19990204203015...@ng28.aol.com>

<Hi Sophie:

William Longespee, Earl of Salisbury, was the son of King Henry II by a woman named Ida, not by Rosamond Clifford. Proof of this may be found in Bradenstoke Cartulary now in print in which William Longespee specifically names his mother as Ida. For the identification of this Ida, please consult my forthcoming book, Magna Carta Ancestry, where Ida's ***parentage will be revealed for the first time***[emphasis mine]. The book is scheduled for publication about April by Genealogical Publishing Company of Baltimore, Maryland. >

From: Dcrder4<dcr...@aol.com >

Message-ID: <19990125203254...@ng06.aol.com>

Subject: Re: Countess Ida

<Sorry, no, she isn't Anna Baliol. Good try, though. Next guess? DR>

Doug, you still do not seem to be properly crediting material as you should. I have taken you to task not to claim something for myself, but to try to influence you to do what you should have been doing in the first place. I hope you have emphasized, now, the import of Ray Phair's discovery in this matter.

As I have said many times before when you call the rest of us to be friendly and collegial, do so thyself, kettle. It is by your acts that the sincerity of your words will be judged. ;)

<Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah>

How can you in one breath smear me and in the next wish me "Best always"? It bewilders me.

Paul



D. Spencer Hines

unread,

Jan 2, 2003, 10:58:40 AM



to

The reported allegation that Richardson did not credit Ray Phair until he had been dunned by Phair in email is appalling.

Richardson, like Clinton, only seems to admit transgressions when he has been caught in flagrante delicto.

And even then, only under severe duress and repeated complaints.



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Jan 2, 2003, 4:36:09 PM



to

Dear Mr. Hines ~

Mr. Phair contacted me last week by private e-mail and cordially asked that I add a citation to his FORTHCOMING article in The American Genealogist. I didn't know of his planned article's existence until two weeks ago. Mr. Phair obviously couldn't supply me with the page numbers, as the issue in which his article was appearing HADN'T YET BEEN PUBLISHED!!!! As soon as the page numbers became available two days ago, I added the citation to my manuscript.

You're brain dead Spencer to think that either Mr. Phair or I could cite page numbers for an article that doesn't yet exist. You owe Mr. Phair and myself a huge apology. You've been caught "in flagrante delicto." The charge is cerebellum mortus (brain dead). The jury finds you guilty. We await your immediate apology.

You're a bright guy, Spencer, but, to be honest, sometimes I wonder if you're really all there.

Remember the new mantra in 2003 is: Keep it friendly, keep it on topic. Your post fails on both accounts. Please bring it up a couple of notches.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

"D. Spencer Hines" <D._Spenc...@usa.yale.edu> wrote in message news:<lbZQ9.951\$Ie4....@eagle.america.net>...

☐



Reedpcgen

unread,

Jan 2, 2003, 7:44:26 PM

☐

☐

☐

to

Doug wrote:

<Mr. Phair contacted me last week by private e-mail and cordially asked that I add a citation to his FORTHCOMING article in The American Genealogist. I didn't know of his planned article's existence until two weeks ago. Mr. Phair obviously couldn't supply me with the page numbers, as the issue in which his article was appearing HADN'T YET BEEN PUBLISHED!!!!!! As soon as the page numbers became available two days ago, I added the citation to my manuscript.>

That is crap. (a) Ray W. Phair made a copyrighted post to this group on Date: Wed, 3 Jul 2002 17:06:16 +0000

You used this material, but made no reference to it in the account you made public. You merely "thanked" Ray, me and Rosie without indicating we contributed anything specific. Your wording made it sound as if we had merely added commentary or looked at your work. Your statement giving credit made no reference to posts or articles, and merely read:

<Special thanks go to Rosie Bevan, Ray Phair, and Paul C. Reed, all of whom made material contributions to this discussion.>

That does not in any way reflect the import of Ray's discoveries.

You SHOULD have made reference to Ray's post in your initial work as soon as you USED his material and amalgamated it into your work. You should have been doing this throughout your manuscript as you used material from this forum.

As to the pagination of October TAG, it has been set for months. TAG is only awaiting the yearly index to be completed.

I brought your attention to Ray's article in TAG on Date: 2002-12-06 13:03:16 PST .

I could have given you the pagination immediately. You did not ask for it, contact me, and you did not contact Ray Phair. You should also have added the material provisionally immediately, EVEN IF you did not know the exact pagination (though you made no effort to obtain it).

Doug continued:

<You're brain dead Spencer to think that either Mr. Phair or I could cite page numbers for an article that doesn't yet exist. You owe Mr. Phair and myself a

huge apology. You're been caught "in flagrante delicto." The charge is cerebellum mortus (brain dead). The jury finds you guilty. We await your immediate apology.>

The jury does not find Spencer guilty. His criticism and observation here was valid. And why would he owe Ray Phair an apology? The article has existed for months, and Ray's post, which he manually added "copyright" to, has been available to you since July 3.

<You're a bright guy, Spencer, but, to be honest, sometimes I wonder if you're really all there.

Remember the new mantra in 2003 is: Keep it friendly, keep it on topic. Your post fails on both accounts. Please bring it up a couple of notches.>

Yes, keep it friendly, keep it on topic,
don't be hypocritical.

Doug, someone of your stature, publishing a book which you hope will attain high standards, should therefore follow standard standards. These are things ANY publication (article or book) should do.

The old Magna Charta Ancestry/Ancestral Roots series was scantily scattered with references and indexed only by surname and line. I made a detailed essay review of changes that should be made if a future edition was planned. This was before David Faris's first publication.

David Faris wrote me a letter shortly thereafter thoroughly thanking me for bringing those things to the public so that he was aware of it. He added citations to each generation and a complete index. He was wanting to make his book what it should be.

I would hope, Doug, that you will attempt to live up to David Faris's standards and follow his example in working hard to do things the way they should be done. I wish he were still here, but we have to work on ourselves.

<Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah>

[this, after you attack Spencer]

Paul



Douglas Richardson

unread,

Jan 7, 2003, 1:53:11 PM



to

Dear Tim ~

Since making your good post below, I've had the opportunity to examine the information on Margaret de Tony, Countess of Fife, in the article by G.W. Watson in *Misc. Gen. et Heraldica* which source you cited in your post. The information contained there is virtually identical with the information found on Countess Margaret in *Généalogies Féodales Mayennaises du XI au XIII Siècle* (1942), by Abbé A. Angot, pp. 98-99, 103. In his usually thorough coverage, Mr. Watson states that Margaret "appears to be altogether unknown to Scottish antiquaries." This explains why Mr. MacEwen had never heard of her.

Curiously, I see Mr. Watson makes no reference Malcolm, Earl of Fife's other known wife, who is mentioned by both *Complete Peerage* and *Scots Peerage*. If so, I fail to see why the editor of the corrections volume of *Complete Peerage* (vol. 14) removed the first wife. Mr. MacEwen feels the first marriage is quite valid. If correct, then it would appear that a correction of a correction is in order and the first wife should be restored.

As for other gleanings, I understand there is further mention of Margaret, Countess of Fife, in the following source: Didion, "Les seigneurs de Fresnay", in *La Province du Maine* (1965), 204ff. I have a copy of this article buried someplace in my files. If Countess Margaret is indeed mentioned in this source, it can be added to the list of places where Countess Margaret is mentioned in the secondary literature. If someone has easy access to this source, perhaps they can post the information pertinent to Margaret contained therein.

Thanks so much for your post, Tim. Your eagle eye never ceases to amaze me.

Best always, Douglas Richardson, Salt Lake City, Utah

E-mail: royala...@msn.com

Tim Powys-Lybbe <t...@powys.org> wrote in message news:

<8ca848a...@southfrm.demon.co.uk>...

> In message <5cf47a19.02122...@posting.google.com>

> royala...@msn.com (Douglas Richardson) wrote:

>

> <snip>

>

> > A previously undetected and unknown Scottish connection of the Tony

> > family, however, is the marriage of Malcolm, 6th Earl of Fife (died c.

> > 1228) to Margaret de Tony, daughter of Roger IV de Tony (died c.

> > 1209), and his wife, Constance de Beaumont. Margaret de Tony is not

> > named in either Complete Peerage 5 (1926): 373 (sub Fife), nor in

> > Scots Peerage, 4 (1907): 8-9 (sub Ancient Earls of Fife).

>

> <snip>

>

> > My good friend and colleague, Andrew MacEwen, the resident authority

> > of all things Scottish, tells me that the evidence I have presented

> > above is the first time documentation has surfaced to prove that

> > Malcolm, Earl of Fife (died c. 1228), had a wife named Margaret de

> > Tony.

>

☐

☐ Reply all

☐ Reply to author

☐ Forward