

Honours and baronies : barony of Port : lordship of Newnham

Newnham was a lordship subordinate to the barony of Port in Kent (Flight 2010, ch 9). Because they held no lands directly from the king, the twelfth-century lords of Newnham did not come into regular contact with the agencies of central government; but they wrote themselves into the historical record in the surest way they could, by making donations to some of the religious communities in their neighbourhood.

Two communities especially are known to have benefited from their generosity: the nuns of the priory of St Mary Magdalene of Davington, and the monks of the priory attached to the cathedral church of St Andrew of Rochester.

Davington. Nineteen documents from the Davington archive were copied into the register of archbishop Warham (fos 154v-7v, 158*r-v, 158r).* I have given a full list of them in a separate file.* These are the charters which relate to the donations made by the lords of Newnham, numbered as in that list:

* <http://www.kentarchaeology.ac/digiarchive/ColinFlight/davington-priory.pdf>. My thanks again to Clare Brown and Shanine Salmon for letting me have copies of these pages.

(1) Fulco de Newenham - he has given the church of Harty to the nuns of Davington, on the advice of archbishop Theobald (154v)

(2) Theobald archbishop of Canterbury, primate (Anglorum primas) and legate - he has confirmed all the possessions of the nuns of Davington (154v) - date 1150x61 *

* Harty church is mentioned; Newnham church is not; so I take it that this confirmation is later than doc 1, earlier than doc 7.3.

(7.3) Fulco de Newenham to archbishop Theobald, primate (tocius Anglie primati) and legate - he has given Newnham church to the nuns (155v)

(3) Juliana de Newenham - she has confirmed the donations made to the nuns by her father, Fulco de Newenham, and has also given them a rent of two shillings for supplying light (154v) *

* I am assuming that this charter dates from an interval when Juliana had control of her inheritance - after the death of her father and her first husband (Robert de Campania's father), before her second marriage. It appears that she also gave the nuns a half-share of the domain tithes of Norton; but I find no mention of that donation except in a schedule of the nuns' possessions as they stood in 1343: "Item dicunt quod ... habent apud Norton medietatem decimarum proueniencium de toto dominio quod fuit Juliane de Newenham, que ualent per annum sexaginta solidos" (Stevens 1722:218). The parish church had been given to the monks of Rochester (see below).

(5) Willelm fiz Philip and Juliana de Newenham his wife - they have granted Newnham church to the nuns, after the

decease of master R(adulf) of Sarre (155r)

(4) Ricard archbishop of Canterbury - he has confirmed the grant concerning Newnham church made to the nuns by Willelm fiz Philip and Juliana de Newenham his wife (155r) - Cheney and Jones 1986, no 121, dated 1181×4

(6) Robert de Campania - he has confirmed the grant concerning Newnham church made to the nuns by Willelm fiz Philip and Juliana de Newenham, Willelm's wife, Robert's mother, and has had the same grant confirmed by archbishop Baldwin (155r)

(7.5) archbishop Baldwin - he has confirmed Newnham church to the nuns, as it was granted to them by Willelm fiz Philip and his wife Juliana and confirmed by archbishop Ricard, and as it has now been confirmed by Juliana's son, Robert de Campania (155v-6r) - Cheney and Jones 1986, no 267, dated 1186×7

(7.6) archbishop Hubert - having inspected charters of Fulco de Newenham and of archbishops Ricard and Baldwin, he has confirmed Newnham church to the nuns, as it was granted to them by Fulco, and afterwards by Willelm fiz Philip and his wife Juliana (156r) - Cheney and John 1986, no 429, dated 1193×5 or 1198

(9) archbishop Hubert - having been invited to settle a dispute between the monks of Faversham and the nuns of Davington concerning Newnham church, he has awarded the church to the nuns, subject to the payment of an annual pension of 2½ marks to the monks (157r) - Cheney and John 1986, no 430, dated 1198×1205

Rochester. These are the relevant documents from the Rochester archive.

Hugo son of Fulco - with the assent of his wife Emma and his sons, Fulco and the others,* he has given the monks of Rochester some land of his at Southgate next to their granary, for a rent of twelve pence a year (original DRC_T310_1; *Privilegia*, fo 191v; Domitian, fo 135r-v; Thorpe 1769:531, from Domitian) - date 1115×24 (Ernulf bishop of Rochester)

* Implying, I suppose, that this was gavelkind land, on which all his sons would have a claim, not the eldest alone.

Radulf archbishop of Canterbury - he has confirmed to the monks of Rochester the church of Norton, as it was given to them in his presence by Hugo de Niweham with his son Fulco's assent (Domitian, fo 184v; Brett and Gribbin 2004, no 55) - date, if genuine,* 1114×22

* I still have my doubts about that.

memo - Hugo de Niweham gave us Norton church, with all the land belonging to it, and half of the tithes; from it we get one mark of silver a year (*Privilegia*, fo 190v) - Hugo's wife and son Fulco are mentioned

Fulco son of Hugo de Niweham - he has granted to the monks of Rochester ten shillings a year from the land of Blecchemere, to be paid to them by Alexander and his heir, if he has one; if not, the monks are to have the land itself (Domitian, fo 133v-4r; Thorpe 1769:176; Bandinel 1813:178) - mentions his wife and children

memo - Fulco son of Hugo de Niweham, with the assent of his wife, gave us ten shillings a year from the land of Blecemere, to be paid to us by Alexander and his heir, if he has one; if not, we are to have the land itself (added by another hand, *Privilegia*, fos 201v-2r)

Fulco de Niweham - he has remitted to the monks of Rochester the rent of twelve pence a year which they used to pay for the land at Southgate enclosed by their wall, next to their vineyard, where their bakehouse stands; he has also granted them the land of Blecchemere (original DRc_T310_2; Domitian, fo 135v; Thorpe 1769:531, from Domitian)

Fulco de Niwenham - he has granted the church of Norton to the monks of Rochester, after the decease of his chaplain, Nicholas, who, with the archbishop's approval, is to pay the monks ten shillings a year meanwhile (Domitian, fo 134r; Saltman 1956:452) - mentions his wife

Theobald archbishop of Canterbury - he has confirmed the donation of the church of Norton made to the monks of Rochester by Fulco de Niwenham, after the decease of Nicholas the priest, who is to pay the monks ten shillings a year meanwhile (Domitian, fos 134v-5r; Saltman 1956, no 224) - date 1145x50 (Theobald primate, not legate) *

* Possibly 1159x60, when Theobald's legation may have lapsed; probably not so, however, since Norton church is listed among the monks' possessions in the privilege of Hadrianus IV, 8 March 1155 (Holtzmann 1936, no 88).

Ricard archbishop of Canterbury - he has confirmed Norton church to the monks of Rochester, as it was granted to them by the lord of the manor, Fulco de Niweham, whose charter he has seen (Domitian, fo 135r; Thorpe 1769:508; Cheney and Jones 1986, no 188) - date 1174x5 (Benedict the archbishop's chancellor) *

* Apparently Fulco's priest Nicholas had finally died, and the monks had their chance to take possession of the church.

Final concord made in the king's court at Westminster between the prior and monks of Rochester and Juliana, daughter of Fulco de Niweham, and Robert de Champaines, her son - Juliana and her son Robert have given and conceded to the prior and

monks the advowson of the said church and have conceded the donation of it to them made by Juliana's father Fulco (Domitian, fo 184v-5r; CKS-DRb/A/r/2 (Registrum temporalium), fo 47v; Madox 1711:144, from Reg temp; Thorpe 1769:508, from Reg temp) - dated 30 Oct 1183

Robert de Campania - with the assent of archbishop Ricard, with the assent also of his mother Juliana and of his wife and heirs, he has confirmed Norton church to the monks of Rochester, as it was granted to them by his grandfather Fulco de Niweham, whose charter he has seen and handled; with the assent of his mother, he also confirms to the monks their land in Blecchemere, and their land in Rochester (Domitian, fo 134r-v; Thorpe 1769:507) - date 1182×4 (Waleran bishop of Rochester) - mentions his wife and children

Hubert archbishop of Canterbury - he has instituted Gilbert bishop of Rochester and the prior and convent of Rochester as parsons of Norton church: from now on the vicar is to be jointly presented by the bishop and the prior and monks, and is to pay a pension of twenty shillings a year to the church of Rochester (original DRc_L10_2; Cheney and John 1986, no 589) - date 1195×8

The name of Fulco de Newenham turns up in one other archive. The monks of Faversham owned some land in Boardfield and Kingsdown given to them by queen Mathildis (d 1152), bought by her from Fulco. Those facts are first recorded in a charter of Henric II, dating from 1155×8 (Davies 1960:76-7).*

* The monks of Faversham had a claim on Newnham church which brought them into dispute with the nuns of Davington (doc 9 above). Both parties asserted that the church had been given to them by Fulco de Newenham. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the case, the Faversham evidence tells us nothing about Fulco's family; so I say no more about it.

When we try piecing the evidence together to make a family tree, this is what we get. Though the dating is rather loose, we can at least be perfectly sure about the shape of the tree.

```
      Emma = Hugo fiz Fulco
          |   de Niwenham
          |   occ c.1120 (1)
          |
Fulco fiz Hugo = .....
  de Niwenham   |
  occ c.1150    |
                |
(2) ..... = Juliana = Willelm fiz Philip
          |   occ 1183       occ 1166 (3)
          |
          |
Robert de Campania = .....
  occ 1183         |
                  |
```

(1) Hugo occurs in 1108 as the first witness to a dated charter of his overlord Henric de Port (*Privilegia*, fo 198v); it is probable – not certain – that he was already in possession of Newnham at the time.

(2) It is clear enough that Juliana was married twice; but I have no clue to the identity of her first husband beyond a note of Sir Edward Dering's quoted by Willement (1862:8n3) as follows: "Domin' Fulco de Newenham miles habuit exitum Iulianam quae coepit in virum Dominum Paganum de Campana armigerum." Dering says that he got the information from "fol 139" of one of the Christ Church registers. Evidently this lead would need to be checked out before one could think of trusting it.

(3) The date is from the "Cartae baronum" (see below). (A man of this name occurs as joint sheriff of Kent in 1183–4. If that is the same man, it would seem to follow that he and Juliana were divorced. By 1183, Juliana is in control of her own inheritance: she consults with her son, but has no husband to answer to.)

From time to time, central government exerted itself to gain knowledge of some range of facts with which it would not become acquainted in the normal course of events. Three initiatives of this kind are specially relevant; I deal briefly with each in turn.

The survey of the whole of England (1086). For Kent, almost the only surviving record of the survey is the shortened version of the final report produced by the DB scribe (Flight 2010, ch 4). In chapter 5, "Land of the bishop of Bayeux", under Faversham hundred, this paragraph occurs:

Hugo de Port holds from the bishop (of Bayeux) NORTON. It is assessed at four sulungs. There is land for four ploughs. There are three ploughs on the domain, and (the men of the manor) – eighteen villains plus six bordars – have five ploughs. There are three churches there, and three mills paying no rent, and three fisheries paying twelve pence. Woodland (paying) forty pigs. In king Edward's time it was worth eight pounds; afterwards six pounds. Now (it is worth) twelve pounds. Oswald held it from king Edward. (DB-Ke-10ra19–24)

It is a recognized quirk of DB that the description of one named place may cover some number of unnamed places as well. This entry should be taken to refer, not just to Norton itself, but to all the land in Faversham hundred held from the bishop of Bayeux by Hugo de Port. The "three churches" can, I think, be identified with confidence as Norton, Newnham and Harty – i.e. the same three churches which were subsequently given to the monks of Rochester (Norton) or the nuns of Davington (Newnham and Harty). For reasons explained elsewhere, I have come round to thinking it unlikely that the lords of Newnham were the founders of Davington priory, but they certainly did own some property in that parish. As we discover later, there were two domain mills here, one of which (the one further downstream, "closer to the sea") was also given to the nuns of Davington. Possibly these were among the "three mills" reported in DB. To the south, there was a place

called Boardfield (Hasted 5:539) which belonged to the lords of Newnham. Under the name of Blecchemere, it or part of it was given to the monks of Rochester.* From the Rochester documents it also transpires that the lords of Newnham owned some land in the southern suburb of the city: this is a fact which probably ought to be mentioned in DB (Flight 2010:196) but is not.

* Around 1220 this land was held by Henric de Cobbeham, for a rent of 10 shillings paid to the cellarer (BL Cott Vesp A xxii, fos 95v, 98r, Thorpe 1788:16). Boardfield was a parish by itself in the thirteenth century, and remained so till 1498, when it was annexed to Otterden; the church has vanished, but the site of it is known.

It appears to be true that Norton, not Newnham, was the most important of these places in the eleventh century. I would not want to argue that from this DB paragraph alone, which might have been garbled by a copyist, somewhere along the line; but there is, as it happens, one item of corroborative evidence. The previous owner is found referred to elsewhere, not just as Oswald, but as Oswald of Norton (B-Ke/xAug/A4-25r16, DB-Ke-1va6). This is not strong evidence, but I take it be sufficient. By around 1120, so it seems, the centre of gravity had shifted south, and the lords of the manor took their surname from Newnham, not Norton.

Another quirk of DB is perhaps not so well understood. In making his one-volume digest of the survey text, the DB scribe had to decide what information could be omitted. He decided, for example, to leave out all the livestock statistics. Everyone knows that; perhaps not everyone knows that he also decided to stop at the second rung of the tenurial ladder. In the present instance, therefore, he would tell us that the manor was held from the king by the bishop of Bayeux, and from the bishop by Hugo de Port – but he would tell us no more than that. Hence, if we want to know which manors the bishop had kept for himself and which he had distributed among his men, we can expect to find the information in DB; but if we ask the same question about Hugo de Port, we are not going to get an answer. Taking DB at face value, we might think that every single manor in Kent held by Hugo from the bishop was held by Hugo in domain; looking at the later history of these manors, we might think – as I would be inclined to think – that every single one had been granted out.* As for Norton, my guess would be that Hugo had given it to one of his men – an ancestor either of Hugo or of his wife Emma – long before 1086. The point is, however, that we have no means of knowing. B-Ke or D-Ke might have told us how things stood; DB-Ke does not.

* The only manor in Kent which continued to be held in domain was Erheth (later called Erde, later still called Crayford), and that is in a different case because it was held from the archbishop (Flight 2010:161). Henric de Port, Hugo's son, is known to have been in possession in 1108, when he donated twenty shillings a year, payable out of the profits of this manor, to the monks of Rochester (*Privilegia*, fo 198v). This is the same charter in which Hugo fiz Fulco occurs as a witness (see above).

Certificates of the king's barons (1166).* The certificate sent in by Johan de Port (Hugo's grandson) includes this entry: "Willelm son of Philip, 3 knights." From the Davington evidence

(see above) we know that Willelm fiz Philip was Juliana's husband: here we find him in possession of his wife's inheritance.

* <http://www.kentarchaeology.ac/digiarchive/ColinFlight/knights-LBB-text.pdf>

Aid for the king's crossing the sea to Gascony (1242).* These are the entries which refer to the lordship of Newnham:

(4046) Robert de Campania holds one fee in Norton' and in Newenham from Robert de Sancto Johanne.

(4047) The same Robert (de Campania) holds half a fee in Herteye from Robert de Sancto Johanne.

(4048) Willelm de Vyane holds one quarter in Northene from the same Robert (de Campania), and he holds from Robert de Sancto Johanne. <Provenders TQ 9760 in Norton (Hasted 6:405)>

(4050) Mabilia de Mares holds one quarter in Ruggeston' from the said Robert (de Campania), and he holds from Robert de Sancto Johanne. <lost>

(4051) Thomas de Phisburn' holds half a fee in the same (Phisburn') from the same Robert (de Campania), and he holds from Robert de Sancto Johanne. <Fishbourne (lost) in Davington>

(4052) Galfrid de Sconynton' holds one quarter in Scoland' from the same Robert (de Campania), and he holds from Robert de Sancto Johanne. <Sholand TQ 9457 in Newnham (Hasted 6:416)>

* <http://www.kentarchaeology.ac/digiarchive/ColinFlight/aid-1242-text-A.pdf>

Robert de Campania's name turns up once elsewhere in the same list, in connection with the manor of Pising in East Langdon (Bewsborough hundred).

(2018) The abbot of St Radegund's, Robert de Caloys, and Radulf Talebot hold one fee in Pisinges from Robert de Campania, and he holds from Robert de Sancto Johanne.

There are two good reasons for thinking that Pising had only quite recently become attached to the lordship of Newnham. (1) The 1166 certificate has a separate entry for this manor: "Willelm de Pesinges, 1 knight." (2) A list of the Dover castle-guard rents compiled in about 1232 also has an entry for Pising: "Philip de Pisinges, 1 knight."* In this respect Pising was aligned with the rest of the barony of Port in Kent, in opposition to Newnham: for some (to me) mysterious reason, the lords of Newnham were not required to contribute towards the guarding of Dover castle.

* <http://www.kentarchaeology.ac/digiarchive/ColinFlight/dover-text-A.pdf>

References

Bandinel 1813 B. Bandinel (ed.), *Monasticon Anglicanum*, new ed., parts 1–3 (London, 1813). Subsumed into Caley, Ellis and Bandinel (1813–30). (Part 3 ends at vol. 1, p. 264.)

- Brett and Gribbin 2004 M. Brett and J. A. Gribbin (eds.), *English episcopal acta – 28 – Canterbury 1070–1136* (Oxford, 2004).
- Caley, Ellis and Bandinel 1813–30 J. Caley, H. Ellis and B. Bandinel (eds.), *Monasticon Anglicanum*, new ed., 6 vols. in 8 (London, 1813–30).
- Cheney and John 1986 C. R. Cheney and E. John (eds.), *English episcopal acta – Canterbury 1193–1205* (Oxford, 1986).
- Cheney and Jones 1986 C. R. Cheney and B. E. A. Jones (eds.), *English episcopal acta – Canterbury 1162–1190* (Oxford, 1986).
- Davies 1960 J. C. Davies (ed.), *The Cartae Antiquae rolls 11–20* (Pipe Roll Society NS 33, 1960).
- Domitian British Library, Cotton Domitian x, fos. 92–211 (Rochester cartulary).
- Flight 2010 C. Flight, *The survey of Kent: documents relating to the survey of the county conducted in 1086* (British Archaeological Reports, British Series 506, Oxford, 2010). <http://www.kentarchaeology.ac/digiarchive/ColinFlight/survey1086/Survey1086.html>
- Holtzmann 1936 W. Holtzmann, *Papsturkunden in England*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1935–6).
- Madox 1711 T. Madox, *The history and antiquities of the exchequer of the kings of England* (London, 1711).
- Privilegia* Strood, Medway Archives, DRc_R1, fos. 119–235 (Rochester cartulary). <http://www.kentarchaeology.ac/digiarchive/ColinFlight/privilegia-plus.pdf>
- Saltman 1956 A. Saltman, *Theobald archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1956).
- Stevens 1722 John Stevens, *The history of the antient abbeys, monasteries, hospitals, cathedral and collegiate churches*, 2 vols. (London, 1722–3).
- Thorpe 1769 J. Thorpe, *Registrum Roffense* (London, 1769).
- Thorpe 1788 J. Thorpe, *Custumale Roffense* (London, 1788).
- Willement 1862 T. Willement, *Historical sketch of the parish of Davington in the county of Kent and of the priory there dedicated to S. Mary Magdalene* (London, 1862). <http://archive.org/stream/historicalsketc00willgoog#page/n10/mode/2up>