

## Additional sources for Ida de Tosny

---

 [groups.google.com/g/soc.genealogy.medieval/c/OnRq0Br1xEA/m/jsKu-DqCcTkJ](https://groups.google.com/g/soc.genealogy.medieval/c/OnRq0Br1xEA/m/jsKu-DqCcTkJ)



**Paul**

---

unread,

Sep 5, 2005, 5:50:04 AM



to

After some brief exchanges off-list, I thought I should post both the material from the book and from the Pipe Roll entries so that all listers would have the benefit of this information in the discussion. Those not around for the last few years should understand that we had carried on extensive discussions about William Longespee, his birth, mother, Ida, the Toeni family, etc., including red herrings such as Auda de Chaumont. I think it should be pointed out that Hugh Bigod, 1st Earl of Norfolk, rebelled against Henry II in 1174 (CP 9:584-5: "On 24 July Henry encamped at Sileham, and next day Hugh surrendered and did homage...in 1176 the King destroyed Hugh's castles of Framlingham and Bungay, Hugh himself seems to have remained quiescent until his death in the following year.), so suffered the consequences of failure (he died in 1177), and it was not until 1189 that his son Roger was restored as Earl of Norfolk in 1189.

Marc Morris apparently concludes that the marriage of the royal ward Ida to one of the barons, Roger Bigod, about Christmas 1181 because the Pipe Roll at Michaelmas 1182 said he was holding the manors then for three-quarters of the year. It was the jurors of the Hundred Rolls who testified in 1275 (about 100 years after the fact) that Henry II gave Ida to Roger with the manors of Acle, Halvergate and South Walsham. Actually, there is no clear indication that Ida was in wardship, but that her marriage was definitely in the King's gift. Also remember that it was not until the Statute of Westminster I (1275) that abuses of keeping wardships of females and their marriages was curtailed. Therefore at this relatively early stage in

English legal history we cannot be certain there is any actual indication that Ida was a minor when given in marriage by Henry to his baron Roger. This means that if Ida were a little older, she could have been a younger child of Ida of Hainault, born near the end of her child bearing years, or a granddaughter, daughter of Margaret de Beaumont (Ray Phair discovered that the marriage date given in CP for her was in error, and this she could still chronologically be mother of Ida, in spite of her son and heir being a 'little boy' in 1162).

From Morris's book, page 2:

"They were also a family worth marrying into. Around Christmas 1181, at the start of his long road to recovery, Roger had just married Ida de Tosny, a royal ward.[8] In the years that followed, the couple had at least eight children - a resources which they used to good effect."

[8] "In 1275, jurors in Norfolk stated that when Henry II gave Ida to Roger, he also gave him the manors of Acle, Halvergate and South Walsham. The king had confiscated these manors after the death of Hugh I Bigod. At Michaelmas 1182, however, Roger had been holding them for three-quarters of the year. Rot. Hund., i, 504, 537; PR 23 Henry II, pp. 125, 137; PR 24 Henry II, pp. 26-7; PR 28 Henry II, p. 64."

On page 3, he says that when their son Hugh II Bigod died shortly before 18 February 1225, "he was only in his early forties, and his death looks to have been sudden...." Calculating back from 1225, early 40s would place his birth about 1182-4.

PR 23 Henry II, 1176-77 (London, 1905), PRS 26:125 [Norfolk and Suffolk]:  
[De prepresturis et excaetis.]

"Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de Eresham [Erisham, C.R.] cum pertinentiis. In thesauro .xlj. l. et ij. d. blancorum. Et comiti Hugoni .xviij. l. et .v. s. blancorum de quarta parte anni. Et in liberatione vinitoris postquam manerium rediit in manum regis .xxiiij. s. et .iiij. d. Et in custamento vinee .xviij. s. Et in defalta instauramenti ejusdem manerii .xij. l. et .viiij. s.

Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de .xxj. l. et .xiiij. s. et .iiij. d. numero de firma de Achelai [Akelay, C.R.]. Et de .xvj. l. numero de Berkeria [Bercheria, C.R.]. Summa .xxxviiij. l. et .xiiij. s. et .iiij. d. In thesauro .c. et .viiij. s. numero. Et comiti Hugoni .c. et .viiij. s. numero de quarta parte anni. Et widoni Ruffo .xxvj. l. et .xviij. s. et .iiij. d. numero in eodem manerio per breve regis. Et Quietus est."

Earlier on the same page, in talking about other manors (Burgholt, etc.) it relates: "De his debitis summonendus est Rogerus le Bigot de quibus summonitus fuit comes Hugo pater ejus pro wasto quod fecit tempore werre."

Page 136: "De placitis Walteri filii Roberti et sociorum ejus.

"Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de .xix. l. et .x. s de exitu de Holeslea que fuit comitis Hugonis, de tribus partibus anni. In thesauro .xv. l. et .xiiij. s. et .vj. d. Et in liberatione servientum qui custodiunt domos que fuerunt ejusdem comitis et warennam .xlv. s. et .vj. d. Et debet .xxx. s.

Page 137:

Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de .viij. l. et .x. s. de exitu de Walesham hoc anno, quam idem comes tenuit. In thesauro liberavit. Et quietus est.

Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de .viij. l. et .xv. s. de exitu de Haluergata hoc anno, que fuit ejusdem comitis. In thesauro liberavit. Et quietus est.

[other manors are also mentioned here].

I guess that was just to demonstrate that Earl Hugh had held the manors before his death.

PR 24 Henry II, 1177-1178 (London, 1906), PRS 27:26-7 [Norfolk and Suffolk]:.

[other manors also mentioned here]

"Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de .xv. l. de exitu [Substituted for 'firma' in P.R.] de Walesham que fuit ejusdem comitis [Hugonis]. In thesauro liberavit. Et quietus est.

Idem vicecomes redd. comp. de .xv. l. de exitu de Haluergata que fuit ejusdem comitis. In thesauro liberavit. Et quietus est.

Page 27: I can't see that Acle is mentioned, though other manors are. Under the Honor of Eye, it says:

"Rogerus Bigot debet quarter .xx. et .xiiij. l. et .vj. d. qui remanserunt de firma honoris Eye pro wasto quod pater ejus fecit. Sed reddidit inde comp. supra post [For 'supra post', C.R. reads 'infra'.] summam comitatum."

PR 28 Henry II, 1181-1182 (London, 1910), PRS, p. 64:  
[Norfolk and Suffolk]

"et in terris datis Rogero de Toeni .c. s. numero in Holcham. ... Et Widoni Ruffo qui fuit decanus de Waltham .c. et viij. s. et .iiij. d. numero in Akelay de quarta parte anni. ... Et in eadem Achelay quam Rogerus le Bigot habet per Regem .xvj. l. et .v. s. numero de tribus partibus anni per breve regis. Et in Bercheria quam idem Rogerus habet per Regem .xij. l. numero de eodem termino per idem breve. Et in Haluergata quam idem Rogerus habet

.xvj. l. et .xvij. s. et .vj. d. numero de eodem termino per idem breve. Et in Walesham quam idem Rogerus habet per Regam .xv. l. de eodem termino per idem breve."

As we discussed long ago, there were overlapping holdings of the Toeni family and Earls of Norfolk in Norfolk and Suffolk, so they had already been associated simply because of feudal tenure. That Roger Bigod held it by the King, and was given it by the King's writ would indicate that it was at the King's gift, as the writ was the authority by which he held these manors that had been at one time hereditary. I didn't check the years between 1178 and 1181 to see if the manors were mentioned, but it does specifically state here at the accounting done Michaelmas 1182 Roger Bigod held it for three parts of the year.

Mr. Richardson should also not forget that he was going to publish that William Longespee was born about 1166-69, information for which he had no source, but which was derived from this group. His revision was also directly derived from the discussions on this group. I hope he will be kind enough to acknowledge all the help he received here, especially from the ground breaking research done by Ray Phair, who deserved great credit. It was Ray's discovery that the date CP had for the Beaumont marriage was in error that allowed for a placement a generation later (Ida could not be daughter of the second Toeni son, as his wife Auda was too young, as we had reported from the Rot. Dom.).

The given name Ida was not common at that period, and would indicate an origin in this Toeni family. Ray had also discovered a mention that might refer to William Longespee that would indicate he was older, rather than younger, as had been assumed lately, but that was not published or discussed here, so I am not at liberty to present his information. If William was a few years older, his placement as grandson or great-grandson of Ida of Hainault would be effected. Before everyone (or someone) begins slapping himself on the back, I think Ray should weigh in, as he has possible evidence that is not on the table.

For those with access to The American Genealogist, I had summarized things concerning William Longespee and the Bigod and Toeni families in an article published in April 2002, including much valuable information from members of this list (noted specifically therein). Ray published his article on William Longespee in TAG in October 2002 (this article, I don't think, was acknowledged in the new Magna Charta Sureties).

One last note before signing off, there was the statement that Henry did not begin his affairs before Eleanor had finished bearing his children. John was born in 1167. Henry and Eleanor began their concentual separation in March 1168. Henry was 36 in 1169 (Eleanor 45). I birth for William of about 1168-70 would fit known facts, but Ida's marriage to Bigod was not until 1181, after which she had eight children (until possibly about age 45). Richard I gave William income from land in Kirton in Lindsey in 1191. If he had achieved majority by 1196, when Richard I gave him the Earldom of Salisbury, that would indicate a birth by no later than 1175 (and William was acting as sheriff in 1199). Even Henry III refused to acknowledge acts done in his minority (under age twenty-one), until he had again ratified them after attaining majority, and though one might be given lands during minority, one could not sue or be sued or act officially in court under age twenty-one because whatever was done might later be denied or objected to by any party.

Paul C. Reed

"Peter Stewart" <p\_m\_s...@msn.com> wrote in message  
news:GHTSe.23693\$FA3....@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

