

## STANHOPE

243

became *extinct*. Will dat. 17 July 1666, pr. 12 Feb. 1675/6. His widow, who was *b.* about 1621, was *bur.* (with her mother) 14 Aug. 1686 at St. Margaret's, Westm. Will dat. 10 Aug., pr. 1 Sep. 1686.

## STANHOPE OF MAHON

*i.e.* "STANHOPE OF MAHON, in the island of Minorca," Viscountcy (*Stanhope*), *cr.* 1717; see STANHOPE, Earldom, *cr.* 1718.

## STANHOPE OF SHELFORD

*i.e.* "STANHOPE OF SHELFORD, co. Nottingham," Barony (*Stanhope*), *cr.* 1616; see CHESTERFIELD, Earldom, *cr.* 1628.

## STANLEY

*Observations.*—By a charter summarised by Dugdale,<sup>(a)</sup> pr. by Round from Dugdale's copy of a copy,<sup>(b)</sup> Adam, s. of Liulf de Audley, granted to William de Stanley, s. of Adam de Stanley, the grantor's *avunculus*, the whole of Stanley (co. Staffs), free from all the grantor's rights, for a yearly rent of twelve pence, to be paid by William and his heirs to Adam and his heirs; and Adam further gave William one half of Balterley, and the service of Liulf in respect of all that he held from the grantor, to hold to William and his heirs from the grantor and his heirs by the performance of forinsec service. The grants were stated to be made in exchange for Talk (o' the Hill); and Adam, doubting whether he could warrant Stanley, added the usual covenant.

The places concerned lie in Staffordshire, on, or not far from, the Cheshire border, in a district known as the Moorland, which, because

Lord Stanhope is "not like to have issue, and the Lady hath wrought him settle ye estate on her, and likely on Newbrough afterwards," *i.e.* her br. the Earl of Newburgh [S.] (*Her. and Gen.*, vol. ii, p. 118). After his death Lady Stanhope sold Nocton, Nov. 1676, for £18,000 to Judge Ellis, *i.e.* Sir William Ellis, Justice of the Common Pleas (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, Rutland MSS., vol. ii, p. 31), who, in 1680, left the property to his great-nephew, Sir William Ellis, 2nd Bart., whose mother, Anne Stanhope, was da. of Sir John Stanhope, of Elvaston, great-grandson of Sir Michael, father of the 1st Lord Stanhope of Harrington. See Norgate and Footman, "Some Notes for a history of Nocton," in *Papers*, Lincs and Notts Arch. Soc., vol. xxiv (1898), pp. 362-64, with ped. of Stanhope and Ellis. The estate of Harrington, however, devolved on the Tollemache family (afterwards Earls of Dysart [S.]) in right of their descent from Elizabeth, sister of the 2nd Lord Stanhope, who *m.* Sir Lionel Tollemache, 2nd Bart.

<sup>(a)</sup> Dugdale, *Baronage*, vol. ii, p. 247.

<sup>(b)</sup> Round, *Peerage and Pedigree*, vol. ii, p. 29.

it was rough and apparently unprofitable, had not attracted the Normans. Balterley and Talk adjoin Audley; Stanley is some eight or nine miles further into Staffordshire.

In 1086 Audley, half Balterley, and Talk, were held in chief by an Englishman, Gamel, (who was not the T.R.E. holder), and were assessed at 2 virgates, half a virgate, and one virgate respectively.<sup>(a)</sup> Stanley does not appear in Domesday Book, but it was in Leek, and was probably included in Endon (one of the Audley holdings), which was among the King's wastes. There was there land for one or two ploughs.<sup>(b)</sup>

Round, who discusses the charter at length,<sup>(c)</sup> remarks on the ambiguous nature of the word *avunculus*, which strictly meant "mother's brother," but quite early and quite frequently came to be used as a synonym for *patruus*. He suggests that Liulf de Audley and Adam de Stanley were brothers, because, as he thinks, Gamel's holding had been divided between them.<sup>(d)</sup>

That they were brothers is probable. If Adam de Stanley had been brother of the mother of Adam de Audley, the latter could have had no interest in or claim to Stanley. In fact, however, the Audleys were lords of Stanley, and the Stanleys held it from them at a rent. That the two were descended from Gamel is, on the existing evidence, incapable of proof.

It seems possible that Round omitted to attach sufficient weight to two facts; namely, that the Stanleys were tenants of the Audleys; and that the Audleys were tenants of the Verdons. There is no very early evidence; but when Henry de Audley died in 1275-76, it was found that he held in Staffs. of Theobald de Verdon the castle and park of Heighley, with the town of Balterley, for a half knight's fee; and, in addition, Endon, Talk and Audley (then subject to dower);<sup>(e)</sup> and a later inquisition in the same year discloses that he held in Rudyard (which is in Leek) 2 sh. rent of assize, and (not explicitly in Rudyard) 12 pence from Walter de Stanley;<sup>(f)</sup> which can only be the rent provided by the charter. In 1391 William de Stanley is recorded as a tenant of Audley in the manor of Audley.<sup>(g)</sup> Therefore in respect of these lands the Stanleys were never, so far as record evidence goes, anything more than tenants of the Audleys; and the Audleys were never more than tenants of the Verdons. In 1227 Henry de Audley, then becoming powerful, obtained from the King a confirmation of his title to his

(a) *Domesday Book*, vol. i, f. 250 b.

(b) *Idem*, f. 246 b.

(c) Round, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 22, 26, 30.

(d) *Idem*, p. 30.

(e) *Cal. Inq. p.m.*, vol. ii, no. 196.

(f) *Idem*, no. 285.

(g) *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389-92, p. 514.

lands, including Audley, which, he said, he held of the gift of his then lord, Nicholas de Verdon.<sup>(a)</sup> Now it is clear from the charter cited above that the Audleys and the Stanleys were in possession of their lands at least a generation before the date of that charter; which, upon the evidence as to Adam de Audley's activities, may have passed about 1170-1190.<sup>(b)</sup> Therefore the gift cited by Henry de Audley can refer only to the latest recognition by the overlord of a feoffment of many years earlier. In 1280-81 William de Audley was sued by his mother for one-third of 12 pence rent in Stanley, as dower.<sup>(c)</sup> In 1316 the lord of the vills of Audley, Balterley and Endon was recorded as Nicholas de Audley.<sup>(d)</sup> Endon, Talk and Audley were not held of Verdon by knight service, and the Audleys are not named in Bertram de Verdon's 1166 *Carta*.<sup>(e)</sup> These returns are comparatively late; but Norman de Verdon was in possession of his Staffordshire lands at least so early as 1130, in which year he appears in the Pipe Roll as pardoned 2 sh. for Danegeld.<sup>(f)</sup> His original lands in the county, namely Audley, Talk, half Balterley, and Stanley, do not together exceed a hide.

The Audleys and the Stanleys had clearly been settled in their lands for some time before the charter, because they took their names from their holdings; and, since they bore different names, it is quite likely that the father of Liulf and Adam had no territorial surname. As Round remarks, Liulf's name is evidence that he was of English stock; and it is possible that the family was on the land before Verdon became its lord. Perhaps Gamel's lands were Liulf's "estate of inheritance," Stanley being an addition by favour of the new Norman lord, without a recorded feoffment. If so, Audley's inability to warrant would be explained; but the evidence hardly carries the enquirer even so far as this.

Putting these speculations aside, the charter reads like the record of a final concord terminating proceedings, perhaps begun by an assize of *mort d'ancestor*, the object of which was to obtain for William de

(a) *Cal. Charter Rolls*, vol. i, p. 36.

(b) Adam de Audley was a witness to a charter of Bertram de Verdon, for which the date "c. 1160" is suggested (*Hist. Collns. Staffs*, vol. iii, pt. 1, p. 225). Perhaps this is a little early. He seems to have been a member of the retinue of Bertram de Verdon, and he acted as his deputy when he was sheriff in 1179-80, being actually described as sheriff among the witnesses to a charter for Kenilworth Priory (Harl. MS. 3650, f. 22d). He was living in 1194-95, when he witnessed a charter of Hervey Bagot, with Adam his son and Henry, br. of Adam junior (*Hist. Collns. Staffs*, vol. ii, pt. 1, p. 266).

(c) *Idem*, vol. vi, pt. 1, p. 113; cf. p. 59.

(d) *Feudal Aids*, Staffs, pp. 11, 13.

(e) *Red Book of the Exchequer*, Rolls Ser., vol. i, p. 271.

(f) *Pipe Roll*, 31 Hen. I, p. 76.

The complete Poemage  
Vol XII

Stanley and his heirs a definition of his precise rights as Audley's tenant. As for Talk, if there was indeed any exchange of Talk for Balterley, it can only have been an exchange of sub-tenancies. If Adam de Stanley and his son had ever held it independently of Audley, they must have held of Verdon; and then they could have had no power to substitute another tenant for themselves.

The Robert de Stanley, who in 1130 owed 20 mks. of silver for having held the office of sheriff for 5 years,<sup>(a)</sup> does not seem to be connected in any way with the ancestors of the Earls of Derby. In the same year he was pardoned 6 sh. for Danegeld, so that it appears that he was a tenant-in-chief.<sup>(b)</sup> His lands have not been identified, but in 1156 "Maurice the sheriff" was similarly pardoned 6 sh. for Danegeld.<sup>(c)</sup> Robert may have been of the Stanleys of Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Warwickshire, Yorkshire, Derby, Notts, or Essex, or the other Stanleys of Cheshire.

ADAM DE STANLEY, of Stanley, in Leek, Staffs, and possibly of Talk (o' the Hill), which he held from Liulf de Audley, was living *temp.* Stephen.<sup>(d)</sup>

WILLIAM DE STANLEY, s. and h.; party to a charter whereby the lands which he held of his cousin Adam de Audley and the terms on which they were held were defined.<sup>(e)</sup>

WALTER DE STANLEY, heir to the land in Stanley.<sup>(f)</sup> A recognitor for Staffs 1271-72;<sup>(g)</sup> sued for disseisin in respect of a wood appurtenant to his free tenement in Stanley, 1282.<sup>(h)</sup> He was dead in Trin. Term, 1285.<sup>(i)</sup>

(a) *Idem*, p. 73; cf. Round, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 31.

(b) *Pipe Roll*, 31 Hen. I, p. 76.

(c) *Idem*, 2 Hen. II, p. 30.

(d) See Observations above.

(e) See Observations. This William is not found again. There was a William de Stanley, presumably of Stanley near Derby, who appears on the *Pipe Roll* for Notts and Derby for 1168-69 (*Pipe Roll*, 15 Hen. II, p. 61).

(f) Although the descent of the Stanley holdings makes it certain that the Earls of Derby are of the male line of Adam, there is, as Round remarks, a gap in the pedigree. In Henry de Audley's foundation-charter to Hilton (Milton) Abbey, Dugdale (*Mon.*, vol. v, p. 716) prints among the witnesses a William "de Stant," who, as he occurs in the company of Henry's lord and neighbours, can hardly be other than an abbreviated *Stanle*. This is confirmed by Randle Holme's copy of Dugdale's transcript in Harl. MS. 2060, f. 4d. The charter is dated 1223, and this William may perhaps be s. of the William of Adam de Audley's charter, and father of Walter; but without further evidence the precise descent remains uncertain.

(g) *Hist. Collns. Staffs.*, vol. iv, pt. 1, p. 204.

(h) *Idem*, vol. vi, pt. 1, p. 154.

(i) When William, s. of Walter de Stanley, was suing for an assault at Stanley