


ANTIQUITIES  
OF  
SHROPSHIRE.

BY  
THE REV. R. W. EYTON,  
RECTOR OF EYTON.

————— Non omnia grandior ætas  
Quæ fugiamus habet.

VOL. VIII.

  
LONDON:  
JOHN RUSSELL SMITH, 36, SOHO SQUARE.  
B. L. BEDDOW, SHIFFNAL, SALOP.  
MDCCCLIX.



*Gift of*  
*William Endicott, Jr.*

PRINTED BY

JOHN EDWARD TAYLOR, LITTLE QUEEN STREET,  
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

### VOL. VIII.


---

- |     |                    |  |   |                             |
|-----|--------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 1.  | To precede page 1. | MAP OF PART OF SHROPSHIRE (triplicate).* | ✓ |                             |
| 2.  | To face page 18.   | CHILDS ERCALL CHURCH.                    | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 3.  | — —                | FONT, Childs Erroll.                     | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 4.  | To face page 124.  | CHANCEL ARCH, Stinchley.                 | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 5.  | To face page 150.  | FONT, Shawbury Church.                   | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 6.  | — —                | SOUTH DOORWAY, Shawbury.                 | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 7.  | To face page 216.  | LILleshall ABBEY, from the Nave.         | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 8.  | — —                | LILleshall ABBEY. West Front.            | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 9.  | — —                | DOORWAY, Lilleshall Abbey.               | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 10. | To face page 228.  | FONT, Lilleshall Church.                 | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
| 11. | To face page 244.  | ATCHAM CHURCH.                           | ✓ | Rev. J. Brooke, <i>del.</i> |
- 

\* This Map is given in triplicate, with Vols. VII., VIII., and IX. ; which all refer to portions of *Recordin Hundred*.

\_\_\_\_\_

1



\_\_\_\_\_

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

## Eaton Constantine.

Among the Manors held by Rainald Vicecomes in Recordine Hundred, Eaton is described in *Domesday* as follows :—" The same Rainald holds Etune of the Earl. Wenesi held it in King Edward's time. Here are 11 hides. In demesne are 11 ox teams, and (there are) 1111 serfs, 11 female serfs, 1 villain, and v boors with 1 team ; and still there might be 11 more teams. Here is a Fishery in the Severn, yielding no rent ; and a small wood, yielding 5*d*. In King Edward's time (the Manor) was worth 50*s*. (*per annum*) : now it is worth 40*s*.; he (Rainald) found it waste."<sup>1</sup>

To what I have said, under Oldbury and Fulwardine, of the Anglo-Norman family of Constantine,<sup>2</sup> I have much to add here, inasmuch as that family became Fitz-Alan's Feoffees at Eaton. An Antiquary of the last century, who had an estate in this Parish, tells us in somewhat pompous style that "the Constantines were originally Vassals of the Earls Montgomery, but afterwards of the Fitz Alans of Clun-Castle."<sup>3</sup> Whatever of this may be true as regards the Constantines and their Norman antecedents, I do not find that they, or their presumed ancestor, Radulf, ever held anything *immediately* under the Palatine Earls. The Fitz Alans, or their Predecessors, or else the Barons of Pulverbatch, were Mesne-lords of every Shropshire estate, in which the Constantines appear to have acquired any interest.

Passing from Radulf and Hugh de Constantine to Helyas de Constantine, who was head of the family in 1165, I should say that his tenure of Eaton represented only one-half of the feoffment (of one knight and two muntators) which he then held in Fitz Alan's

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 254, b, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. I. pp. 133 et seqq.

<sup>3</sup> "Constantinorum Familia a primis Normannorum temporibus in clientela fu-

erat Comitum Montgomeriorum ; postea vero Alanidarum de Coloniaco Castello." (Vita Willielmi Baxteri a seipso conscripta : inter *Reliquas Baxterianas*.)

Barony.<sup>1</sup> It was in fact held by service of half a knight's fee. Richard de Constantine, the successor of Helyas, was deceased in 1196, when he was represented by his son,—

THOMAS DE CONSTANTINE (I.). Of this Thomas and his wife Isabel, sister and eventual coheir of Robert de Girros, I have spoken under Burwarton, and under Broughton.<sup>2</sup> I find him amerced one merk for trespass, in 1203. Soon after this a Perambulation was ordered to be made between the lands of Thomas de Constantine and the King's Forest. A Jury of twelve Knights seems to have been empanelled for the occasion, and to have discharged the duty with partiality. Hence at the Forest Assizes of March 1209, we find the justiciars ordering the names of these Jurors to be returned into Court, and commanding Guy Venator and the Verderers "to seize the land of Thomas de Costentin and also his *bosc*, which *bosc* had by falsehood of a jury (*per falsam juratam*) been abstracted from the Forest." The Pipe-Roll of 1212 shows that the Knights-Jurors who were concerned in this affair were amerced in the enormous penalty of 100 merks and 2 palfreys, and that the whole debt, except £3, had been paid. Thomas de Constantine's forfeiture on this occasion was probably reversed for some less serious consideration, but we are not surprised to find him afterwards in rebellion against King John, and his estates at Eaton and Oldbury granted to John fitz Philip by the same Writ as that which confiscated the lands of his neighbour at Leighton.<sup>3</sup> About this time Thomas de Constantine made an extensive feoffment to Robert de Woodcote, his neighbour at Eye. The particulars I will give in a future chapter.

On November 3, 1217, the Sheriff of Shropshire is certified by a Writ of King Henry III. that Thomas de Constantine had returned to his allegiance.<sup>4</sup> An Inquest of the year 1220 exhibits Thomas de Constantine as one of the Verderers of the Shropshire Forests. At the Assizes of 1221 he appears as a Knight, sitting on Juries of *Grand Assize*. He was himself subjected to damages of 10 merks for having disseized one Richard fitz Geoffrey of a free tenement in Etton. His securities in this matter were Hugh de Upton, Herbert Manveisin, Robert fitz Aer, and Walter de Huford.

A Writ of October 2, 1224, exempts Thomas de Constantine, as a Verderer, from serving on Juries and Assizes.<sup>5</sup> In 1231, Thomas de Constantine was amerced 20s. "because his hounds had coursed

<sup>1</sup> *Liber Niger*, I. p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. pp. 32, 33, 78, 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 329.

<sup>4-5</sup> *Claus.* I. 373, 623.

without license." He was at the same time security for similar fines set upon Gilbert de Bukenhull and William, a Chaplain. An occurrence of 1237, associating him with Sir Richard de Leighton, has been already noticed;<sup>1</sup> but whether it was he or his son Thomas who is registered about 1240 as holding a knight's-fee in Eton and Oldbury under Fitz Alan, I cannot say. It will appear elsewhere that Thomas de Constantine (I.) had four brothers, viz. Helias, William, Ralph, and Richard; but I here proceed to speak of his son and heir, viz.,

THOMAS DE CONSTANTINE (II.), who between the years 1244 and 1250 appears as a Knight and as a frequent witness of local Charters. In 1251, we have seen this Thomas de Constantine recognized as one of the coheirs of Rôbert de Girros.<sup>2</sup> He was in fact his nephew, the son of his sister Isabel.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 describes the *status* of Eaton as follows.—"Heton, a Manor of two hides, pays *8d. motfee* and *8d. stretward*. Thomas de Costantin holds Heton as Lord, for a knight's fee, and of the fief of John fitz Alan. The Manor does ward at White-Minster (Oswestry) by service of one knight for 40 days, in war-time, at the knight's own cost. It also does due suit to County and Hundred, and is geldable."<sup>3</sup>

At the Assizes of 1256, Thomas de Constantine appears in various capacities, viz. as nephew and coheir of Robert de Girros, as a Knight empanelled to try causes of *Grand Assize*, and as one of the four Coroners of Shropshire. In June 1259 he is the first-named of a number of Knights who sat on a Forest-Inquest at Sheriff Hales, and this seems to be his latest appearance in public life. In November 1268 I find Adam de Montgomery (his son-in-law) fining 20s. "for license to accord in a *plea of convention* with Thomas de Costentin." The Fine which resulted was levied at Bristol on January 14, 1269. Thereby Thomas de Costentin, Deforciant, acknowledged that the Manors of Aldeby (Oldbury) and Etone and half the Manor of Fyttes (Fitz) were the right of Adam de Montgomery and his wife Isabella, Plaintiffs in a *Plea of convention*. In turn, Adam and Isabella conceded the premises to Thomas, for his life, to hold under themselves at a rent of *1d.*, or a pair of white gloves. The premises were then to revert to Adam and Isabella, to hold of the Lords of the respective fees; but if Adam and Isabella died without heirs, the heir of Adam was to inherit.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 329; IV. p. 22.

Constantine was Foreman of the Jury which made this Return.

Thomas de Constantine was still living in October 1277; but, having nothing further to say of him, I proceed to speak of—

ADAM DE MONTGOMERY, whom we have seen attesting a Chetton Deed<sup>1</sup> at the precise period when the above Fine was levied. At the Assizes of 1272 Sir Adam de Montgomery was one of the Jurors who tried several causes of *Grand Assize*, and on March 2nd of that year Robert, his only son by Isabella de Constantine, appears to have been born. Two Feodaries, drawn up about 1284, concur in giving Adam de Montgomery as Lord of Eaton Constantyne, and as holding the same under Richard fitz Alan, by service of one knight's-fee. On May 18, 1285, Adam de Montgomery obtained a Charter of Free Warren in his Manors of Eton-Constantyn, Fittes, Sandford, and Borewarton.<sup>2</sup> On the death of Sir Adam de Montgomery, which, as I have stated under Burwarton, took place in 1290, his tenure of Eaton Constantine, Oldbury, a moiety of Fitz, and of land at Sandford (near Knokin), is duly recorded. All these estates were held of the Barony of Fitz Alan, and all had devolved to him by his second marriage with Isabella de Constantine. His heir in respect of the Manor of Lydham was his son Thomas, who, having been 30 years of age at Christmas 1289, was of course his son by a former wife. Robert, his son by Isabella de Constantine, was still in minority.<sup>3</sup>

I have inadvertently stated under Burwarton that Isabella de Constantine died before her husband. The Assize-Roll of October 1292 disproves this in two ways. In the first place it records that Edmund de Mortimer is indebted in a sum of £7 to Alexander de Montgomery, and to Isabel, widow of Adam de Montgomery, which Alexander and Isabel were Executors of the said Adam's Will. In the next place it exhibits the Earl of Arundel, as Custos of Adam de Montgomery's heir, rendering her thirds to Isabel, Adam de Montgomery's Widow. These thirds were,—a third of 2 carucates of land, 10 acres of bosc, one Weir and 100*s.* rent in Eton Costentyn,—of 2 carucates of land and 11 merks rent in Oldbury,—and of 1 carucate of land, 10 acres of bosc, and 40*s.* rent in Fytisho (Fitz).<sup>4</sup>

It is not easy to understand how only a third of these estates accrued to Isabella. Whether as heiress of the Constantines, or as

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. I. p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Chart.* 13 Edw. I., No. 107.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquis.* 18 Edw. I., No. 5. Oldbury and Sandford are called members of Eaton

Constantine, and the collective tenure is stated to be by a knight's fee and 40 days' castle-guard with a barbed horse.

<sup>4</sup> *Assizes*, 20 Edw. I., mm. 6 *dorso*, 12.

jointly seized with her husband by the fine of 1269, I should have expected her to be entitled to the whole of these estates for her life. It appears that her son—Robert de Montgomery, died without issue. In the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316, William de Leghton is enrolled as Lord of Eton Constantyn. I cannot account for this, except on the supposition that William de Leighton had married Adam de Montgomery's Widow.

Another difficulty now presents itself. After the deaths of Isabella de Constantine and her son Robert, we should, according to the remainder fixed by the Fine of 1269, expect to see Eaton passing to the heirs of Adam de Montgomery. I have no proof of such a result. I will not however here inquire how one Maculine is stated to be Lord of Eaton Constantine in 1331, or how the Manor afterwards passed to the Thornhills.

OF UNDERTENANTS in this Manor, I may name John de Constantine of Eaton, who occurs on a local Jury in July 1278, and also in the years 1298, 1300, 1302, 1304 and 1312. In December 1298 William le Despenser and William Fisher of Eaton occur on a Berwick Jury. In September 1331, Walter le Spenser and John Constantyn, both of Eton, attest a Wombridge Charter.

LILLESALL FEE. In the time, as I think, of Henry III., Robert de Constantine gave to Lilleshall Abbey half a virgate and a capital messuage in the vill of Ettun, which had been held by his father. He also gave 7*d.* rent to the same, viz. 1*d.* arising from an assart near *Foleford*, 4*d.* from a house near the capital messuage, and 2*d.* from two acres of land, one of which is described as lying near *The Stanibrug*.<sup>1</sup> The Canons are held to pay a chief-rent of 12*d.*, due on this tenement, which I take to have been the estate of a younger branch of the Constantines. In November 1265, Henry III.'s confirmation to Lilleshall describes the above grant as *donacionem et concessionem quas Robertus Constantyn fecit de und virgatâ terræ cum pertinentiis in Gatton Constantyn*. I find no later proof of the Abbey continuing in possession of this estate.

## THE CHURCH.

That this was a Chapel, originally dependent upon Leighton Church, I have already given proof.<sup>2</sup> The antiquity of its foundation is however considerable, whether we judge from the Norman Font, which is still preserved, or from the fact, that *Walter Chap-*

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 76.

| <sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 337.

*lain of Eton* appears early in the thirteenth century attesting a Charter of Thomas de Constantine.<sup>1</sup> The *Taxation* of 1291 gives the Church of Eton Constantine (in the Deanery of Salop) as worth only 80s. per annum.<sup>2</sup> In 1341 the Assessors of the Ninth rated this Parish at 10s., and no more, because it was small and poor, and because there had been a general murrain among the sheep.<sup>3</sup> The *Valor* of 1534-5 combines the account of this *Free Chapel*, as it is called, with that of the Collegiate Churches of St. Chad and St. Mary, Shrewsbury. I cannot account for this association. Eton Constantyne was now worth only £1. 6s. 2d. per annum to its Incumbent.<sup>4</sup>

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

On January 31, 1301 this *Chapel* was vacant and under Episcopal sequestration. Bishop Langton commits the custody of such sequestration to—

RICHARD SON OF WILLIAM LE DESPENSER of Eton, till Michaelmas next. On December 27, 1349, the presentation to this benefice had lapsed to the Bishop. He collated—

WILLIAM TANDY, Chaplain, thereto. Tandy seems to have held this Church for a few weeks in conjunction with Little Buildwas.<sup>5</sup> He resigned Eaton on March 29, 1350, and on June 15 following—

HUGH BOLDYNG, Chaplain, was admitted here at the presentation of Sir Walter de Hopton, Lord of Eaton Constantine. The Presentee was bound by oath to resign, if any trouble should accrue to the Bishop in consequence of this institution. I presume the right of Sir Walter de Hopton to present was in question, and I cannot account for his being Lord of the Manor. Boldyng, as we have seen, came hither from Little Buildwas.<sup>6</sup> On June 24, 1384, *Hugh Boldyng, Rector of the Church of Eyton Costantyn*, quit-claims to William Corbronde of Uppington all right which he had to a mesuage in Uppington by gift of John Golde of Uppington.<sup>7</sup>

WILLIAM OPYNTON, Priest, was instituted to this *Chapel* on January 16, 1393, at the presentation of Richard Thornhull and Florence his wife. In October following Opynton was presented to the Vicarage of Wroxeter, and on December 18, 1393—

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. I. p. 136.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nick. Taxation*, p. 244.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> *Valor Eccles.* III. 183.

<sup>5, 6</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 325.

<sup>7</sup> Womb. Chart. Upinton, No. cxxviii.

ROBERT THORNHULL, of the Diocese of York, was instituted here. He resigned in 1403, when, on October 15,—

SIR JOHN CORBYN, Chaplain, was instituted to Eaton, at the presentation of William Thornehull, Domicell.<sup>1</sup> This Incumbent appears as *John Corkyn, Rector of Eaton Constantine*, in Deeds of September 1409 and March 1411.

## Little Ercall, now Childs Ercall.

THE *Domesday* account of this Manor is as follows:—

“The same Rainald (Vicecomes) holds Arcalun of the Earl. Senuard held it (in Saxon times). Here are III hides. In demeane are II ox-teams; and IIII Neat-herds, VII Villains, x Boors, a Priest, a Smith, and a Frenchman, have, among them all, seven teams and a half; and yet there might be one team more here. Here half a league of wood yields 3*d.* (yearly). In King Edward’s time the Manor was worth 45*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 60*s.* He (Rainald) found it waste.”<sup>2</sup>

Little Ercall continued to be held in demesne by Rainald’s successors till the time of the first William fitz Alan, who granted a portion of the Manor to the Cistercian Abbey of Combermere. This gift, which probably dates before Fitz Alan’s expulsion from Shropshire in 1138, is not embodied in any original charter, known to be extant, but is thus described in Henry III.’s Confirmation to Combermere. *Et Doddecotam in Feld cum suis pertinentiis, et illam terram et brueriam quæ est inter Tiverton et Hulam, et illud pratum adjacens juxta aquam de Mees, ex dono Willielmi filii Alani, cum communione bosci de Herkall.*<sup>3</sup> In other words, William fitz Alan gave Doddicote, an outlying member of Ercall, to the Monks of Combermere, and therewith he gave certain land and heath lying between Tibberton and Howle, and a meadow on the River Mees, and a right of common in Ercall-Wood. The estate thus separated from Ercall shall form the subject of a separate chapter.

<sup>1</sup> *Domicellus* or *Domnicellus*;—a diminutive of *Dominus*, sometimes applied to youths of gentle birth who were in the King’s Court. Usually however the title

is given to any youth of knightly family, not yet knighted.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 254, b. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Monasticon*, v. 324, No. III.

On William fitz Alan's restoration to his Shropshire estates in 1155, he seems to have enfeofed Hamo le Strange in the residue of this Manor.<sup>1</sup>

OF HAMO LE STRANGE, Lord of Cheswardine by gift of Henry II., and of Betton Strange by feoffment of the Abbot of Shrewsbury, I have spoken more than once.<sup>2</sup> At Michaelmas 1160 he was deceased without legitimate issue. The short period during which he held Little Erccall was distinguished by his grant of Nagington, a member thereof, to Haughmond Abbey. This grant was forthwith confirmed by William fitz Alan (I.) as Lord of the Fee, and in the following terms:—

*Willielmus filius Alani omnibus hominibus suis, presentibus et futuris, salutem. Notum sit omnibus vobis me dedisse, in perpetuam elemosynam, Nagintonam Deo et Sancto Johanni Hamonensis Ecclesie, et Canonicis ejusdem Ecclesie, pro salute anime mee et antecessorum meorum et pro salute anime Hamonis Extranei, qui illam prius eidem Ecclesie, pro salute anime sue, divisit;—liberam et quietam ab omni servicio quod ad me vel meos pertineat;—liberam dico et in pastura communii et in bosco et in plano et in aquis et in semitis. Hiis testibus Johanne Extraneo, Widone Extraneo, Engelardo, Willielmo filio Odonis, etc.*<sup>3</sup>

On the death of Hamo le Strange, his eldest brother, John, was undoubtedly his heir-at-law, but—

RALPH LE STRANGE, the younger brother of both, was permitted to succeed to Little Erccall, obviously with the concurrence of John; and without any cotemporary limitation of his tenure, such as, according to feudal usage, would have made him Tenant-in-fee, and made John Mesne-Lord, at least, of Little Erccall. This compromise of a principle, led, as we shall see, to after-litigation between the heirs of John and Ralph; but the matter was kept in abeyance for a time. Hence it is that, in the *Liber Niger* of 1165, Ralph le Strange appears as holding half a knight's-fee of *new feoffment*, immediately under Fitz Alan.<sup>4</sup> The half-fee was undoubtedly Little Erccall, but subsequent Records prove that it should have been added to the two fees which John le Strange is stated to have held of the same Barony, and that Ralph's name, he being *de jure*, only an Undertenant of John, should not have appeared at all.

<sup>1</sup> On a former page (Vol. V. p. 253) I identified Hugh de Lacy's Manor of Arkhulle with Childs Erccall. This was a mistake. Arkhulle was in Herefordshire.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 125; Vol. VII. pp. 174, 183.

<sup>3</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 148.

<sup>4</sup> *Liber Niger*, I. 144.

There are other Records, besides the *Liber Niger*, which prove that, during Ralph le Strange's life, his tenure of Little Erccall was reputed to be independent of his brother John. Here, for instance, is his confirmation of Nagington to Haughmond Abbey, which I will give in the words of the Charter itself:—

*Omnibus filiis Sancte matris Ecclesie, Radulfus Extraneus salutem. Notum sit universitati vestre me concessisse et hâc presenti cartâ confirmasse Deo et Ecclesie Sti Johannis Evangeliste de Haghmon et Canonicis ibidem Deo servientibus donacionem, scilicet Naggitonam cum pertinentiis suis, quam Willielmus filius Alani pro salute suâ et animâ Hamonis fratris mei in perpetuam elemosinam prefate ecclesie dedit, cum omnibus libertatibus in bosco et plano et pratis et pascuis, in viis et semitis et in omnibus locis. Et sciendum est quod ex propriâ donacione meâ pannagium ejusdem ville liberum et quietum predictis Canonicis in perpetuam elemosinam concedo, et hâc cartâ confirmo. Testibus, Johanne Extraneo, Widdone Extraneo, Marscoto, etc.*

Ralph le Strange also made a grant to Wombridge Priory. He gave a meadow and moor, evidently in Erccall Manor and on the banks of the Mees. The land is described as extending "from the Fishery of Richard, Lord of Cherrington, up to the Ford."<sup>1</sup>

This Ralph appears to have had some feoffment in the Norfolk Manor of Litcham; but I doubt his being the person who was called *Ralph le Strange de Lucheham*.<sup>2</sup> A cotemporary of that name follows Guy le Strange, in attesting a grant of John le

<sup>1</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> In 4 John (1202-3) Philip de Burnham and Emma his wife were impleading Fulk d'Eiry and Maud his wife for a moiety of East Winch and for certain messuages in *Litcham* and Ringsted. (See Blomefield's *Norfolk*, Vol. IX. p. 149.)

Emma and Maud, thus mentioned, were daughters and coheirs of Ralph le Strange of Erccall, who is hereby shown to have had some interest at Litcham.

It was also Ralph le Strange of Erccall who in the time of Henry II. gave the Advowson of East Winch (Norfolk) to Carhow Nunnery. (Blomefield, IX. p. 150.)

It is of importance to keep distinct whatever is known of Ralph, brother of John le Strange (I.). Blomefield's notices of the Manor of Litcham, and of those Stranges, who in the 13th century

were usually called "of Litcham," are quite fragmentary. The elder House of Le Strange (that of Ness) retained in the 13th century a great estate in Litcham, and there are several instances of a Strange of Ness portioning a younger child in land at Litcham. But the Stranges who were distinguished as "of Litcham" were according to Blomefield descended from Durandus, son of Ralph, son of Siward. Nor was this Durandus le Strange an imaginary person. I know him to have been cotemporary with John, Guy, Hamo, and Ralph,—the four brethren who settled in Shropshire between 1154 and 1160; but how Roland le Strange, the father of these four brethren, was related to Siward, the grandfather of Durandus, I have never been able to discover.

Strange (either Guy's elder brother or nephew) to Haghmon Abbey. But I have no doubt that it was Ralph le Strange of Ercall who had a feoffment in Hunstanston, Norfolk, from his brother John, and who, after John's death (in 1178-9) granted Hunstanston-Mill to Haghmon Abbey. The following Charter<sup>1</sup> certainly passed between 1182 and 1194, and I give it entire because of its important bearing on the early genealogy of the family of Le Strange:—

*Omnibus sancte Dei ecclesie filiis tam presentibus quam futuris Radulphus Extraneus salutem. Notum sit omnibus vobis me concessisse et dedisse et presenti carta confirmasse Deo et ecclesie Sti Johis Evangeliste de Haghmon et Canonicis ibidem Deo servientibus in perpetuam elemosinam, pro salute anime mee et patris mei et matris et Johannis fratris mei, qui feudum mihi dedit, et filii mei Rolandi, omniumque antecessorum meorum et successorum meorum, molendinum de Hunstanston, quod est de hereditate patris mei,<sup>2</sup> cum sede sud et omnibus pertinentiis suis, libere et quiete de me et heredibus meis ab omnibus terrenis consuetudinibus et exactionibus, tenendum et habendum imperpetuum. Hiis testibus, Widone de Thichewelle, Willielmo de Bruna,<sup>3</sup> Radulpho, Widone de Schawburia, Roberto fratre ejus, Elia fratre Jone Sacerdotis, etc.*

In June 1194 I find that Ralph le Strange of Ercall was dead. It is probable that his son Roland, mentioned in the above Deed, was his only son, and died in Ralph's lifetime, in fact was dead at the date of the above Deed. It is certain that Ralph le Strange of Ercall was succeeded by two daughters and coheirs, one of whom, Matilda, was the wife of Fulk d'Oirri, while the other, Emma, was married to Philip de Burnham. These facts are illustrated by a long series of litigation which now ensued. On June 6, 1194, Fulk de Oiri presented himself before the Courts at Westminster as suing Hugh de Say of Stokes (Stoke upon Tern) for two parts of the bosc of Renhal. The Defendant neither appeared, nor was he essoigned, so that the Court ordered that the said two parts should

<sup>1</sup> Haghmon Chartulary, fo. 124 *dorso*.

<sup>2</sup> This expression is singular, and requires at least an attempted explanation. There were two distinct Manors in Hunstanston, one which John le Strange (I.) inherited from his Father, Roland, another which he inherited through his Mother,—Matilda le Brun. Probably there was a Mill in each Manor, and Ralph le

Strange may have been enfeoffed in both Mills. If so, it is easy to see that in granting one or other Mill to Haghmon it was advisable to distinguish it.

<sup>3</sup> He was Rector of Hunstanston Church at the time (1178) when John le Strange (I.) gave the Advowson thereof to Haghmon Abbey.

be seized *in manu Regis*, and the Defendant again summoned to hear judgment *in adventu Justiciorum*, i. e. when the Justices-in-eyre should visit Shropshire.<sup>1</sup> In November 1194 I find Hugh de Sai excusing his attendance at Westminster in a *placitum bosci* against William fitz Simon, Attorney of *Fulco de Aili* (Oiri). His *Essoign* was that known as *de malo veniendi* and William Franc was his *Essoignor*.<sup>2</sup> I hear nothing more of this suit, which perhaps was unsettled at the time of Hugh de Say's death, not three years later.

In Easter Term 1198 a Suit was pending between Fulk de Oirri and Philip de Burnham, as husbands of Matilda and Emma, daughters of Ralph le Strange. It related to their shares of Ralph's inheritance. The Court decided that a partition, to which the parties had agreed before the Archbishop of Canterbury, should now be made;—saving to the husband of the elder Sister, the *esnevy*, and saving to both parties their reasonable costs.<sup>3</sup> Norfolk is the only county named with reference to this cause, but Shropshire was undoubtedly concerned. The matter remained unsettled in May 1199, when Fulk d'Oirri was beyond sea, in the service of the Earl of Albemarle.<sup>4</sup>

But the suit most illustrative of feudal usages was that whereby John le Strange (II.), as heir of his Uncle Hamo, endeavoured to establish those mesne rights at Erccall on which we have seen that his Father had never insisted. He sued each of the Coparceners under Writ of *mort d'ancestre* for a fourth part of a knight's fee in *Arkelaui*;—by which I understand that he sued for the services and seignery of each moiety of the Manor, not for the fee-simple. The suit against Fulk and Matilda de Oirri was settled by the following verdict of a Jury on April 23, 1200, viz. that Hamo, John's Uncle, had died seized of the said fourth part of a fee in *Arkelaui*, and that John was Hamo's next heir. The Court accordingly decided that John should recover his seizin.

John le Strange's correspondent suit against Philip and Emma de Burnham had commenced in May 1195, was renewed in August 1199, and was still unsettled in October 1208, owing to the shifts and essoigns of Philip de Burnham.<sup>5</sup> The result we know to have

<sup>1</sup> *Placita incerti temporis Regis Ricardi*, No. 62, memb. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Cur. Regis*, I. pp. 122-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 147; and *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Cur. Regis*, I. 274; II. 188.

<sup>5</sup> Alexander de Buch, or de Rutham,

John de Heggewerh, William de Holbech, William fitz Simon, and Jordan de Hakeford, are named as Attorneys or Esoigners in these suits; Holbech first acting for D'Oiry, and afterwards for John le Strange against Burnham.

been in favour of Le Strange, viz. that he and his heirs were ever afterwards reputed to be Mesne Lords of half a fee in Little Ercall.

Fuller particulars of Fulk d'Oirri and his family are, I apprehend, to be gathered from other counties than Shropshire. At Holebech in Lincolnshire I know him to have had an interest.<sup>1</sup> In May 1215 he joined in the short-lived disaffection of the Earl of Albemarle. On March 5, 1216, Fulco de Oyry gives up Geoffrey his son and Fulco his nephew or grandson (*nepotem*), as hostages for his good conduct, and fines 500 merks for the King's favour. The King accordingly orders the Sheriffs of Lincolnshire, Norfolk and Suffolk, Shropshire, and Hampshire, to restore his lands.<sup>2</sup> It seems that John le Strange (II.) had made the most of his Tenant's disaffection, by seizing his share of Ercall. However on January 5, 1217, King Henry III. orders John le Strange to restore to "our faithful Fulk d'Oiry, his land of Erkal, which was of Le Strange's Fee, and whereof Le Strange had disseized the said Fulk, as an adherent of the Earl of Albemarle."<sup>3</sup>

I have not been able to ascertain whether it was by descent from Burnham or from D'Oiry that Elyas de Fancourt succeeded to a moiety of Little Ercall. About the years 1230-40, Elyas de Fancourt mortgaged, according to one account, but gave, according to another, his share of the Manor to Combermere Abbey. Nearly at the same period the other moiety fell by some means, to me unknown, into the hands of John le Strange (III.), as Mesne-Lord. Elyas de Fancourt died while the term which he had granted to Combermere Abbey was still current. He left a son, Gerard, who, being in minority and a tenant by Knight's-service under John le Strange, fell to the custody of that Baron. Le Strange first seized upon Fancourt's moiety of Ercall, but afterwards demised it to Combermere Abbey (together, I think, with the other moiety), for a term, and for a sum of money.

Of the *Feodaries* of 1240 one says that John le Strange holds Middle, and Little-Ercall under Fitz Alan for 2 fees, another that he holds the same by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  fees.<sup>4</sup> The last is undoubtedly the more correct statement, but John le Strange's tenure by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  fees involved many more Manors than the two thus specified.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 shows the Abbot of Combermere as in possession of the whole of Ercall, but the mode in

<sup>1</sup> Vide *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Finium*, p. 582.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Claus.* I. p. 295.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 45, 48, 49.

which he is stated to hold Fancourt's moiety is, as we shall see presently, inaccurate. The statement of the Hundred-Roll is substantively as follows.—“Hercalewe Parva, a Manor of 2 hides, pays 8*d.* for *motfee*, and 8*d.* for *stretward*. The Abbot of Cumbermere holds a moiety of the vill *by gift of Elias de Fanecin*, and the other half, for a term, of John le Strange, paying 5 merks *per annum* to the said John. And he (the Abbot) finds one horseman, with a hauberk, a *chapel-de-fer*, and a lance, in time of war, for forty days at his own cost: and he does suit to the Hundred every three weeks; and holds half a knight's-fee. In the same fee Geoffrey Griffin (he was former Lord of Howle) made a certain *pourprespature*, three acres in extent, which he bought from *Fulk Douli* (D'Oiry) twenty years ago: and it lies barren (*frisca*).”<sup>1</sup>

Soon after this, John le Strange (III.) made over to his son Roger, “whatever he had in Ercall,” by which expression I understand, not the mesne-lordship, which in fact could not be thus alienated, but such reversionary rights to the fee-simple as would accrue whenever the Abbot of Combermere's term or terms expired. It seems that on the arrival of that period Roger le Strange took peaceable possession of one moiety, but was obliged to eject the Abbot from Fancourt's moiety. Hence in Easter-Term 1263 we find the Abbot suing the said Roger for half the Manor of Parva Erkalewe, as sometime the seizin of a former Abbot, William de Waresley. The Defendant of course called his father to warranty.<sup>2</sup> It is evident that this suit was suspended during the period of political convulsion which now set in. In Easter Term 1271 it had assumed a new form, and was an action of *Quare impedit*, brought by Roger le Strange against the Prior of Combermere (the Abbacy being, I presume, vacant).<sup>3</sup> In the same term I find Robert de Caumpeden, Prior of Combermere, naming an Attorney in a *plea of land and of Quare impedit*, against Roger le Strange.<sup>4</sup> The cause eventually tried at the Assizes of October 1272, shows the new Abbot of Combermere suing Roger le Strange for half the Manor of Parva Erkalue, the Advowson of the Church excepted, into which half Roger was alleged to have had no ingress save at a time when the Abbey was vacant after the decease of William de Waresley, a preceding Abbot. Roger le Strange's defence was that

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 55. It was apparently the abstraction of Dodicote which reduced the Manor of Ercall from three hides, as it stood at *Domesday*, to two.

<sup>2</sup> *Placita*, Pasch. Tm., 47 Hen. III. m. 19 *dorso*.

<sup>3</sup> · <sup>4</sup> *Placita*, Pasch. Tm., 55 Hen. III. mm. 2, 48 *dorso*.

Elyas de Fanacurt, his Father's Feoffee by knight's service, had mortgaged the said moiety, for a term, to Robert, a former Abbot of Combermere: that on the death of the said Elyas, John le Strange, as Custos of his infant heir, Gerard, seized the premises, but afterwards demised them (for the residue of the heir's minority) to the Abbot, for a sum of money:—that then John le Strange made over his remaining interests in Ercall to the Defendant, Roger, who now insisted that Abbot Robert's only interest had been in the nature of mortgage or of wardship. The Abbot replied that his Predecessor, Robert, had been *enfeoffed* by Elyas de Fanacurt; that Abbot William had been seized of the premises;—and that Roger le Strange had intruded himself therein. The Juror found for Roger le Strange, saying that Elyas de Fanacurt had never enfeoffed Abbot Robert.<sup>1</sup>

Roger le Strange thus became Tenant-in-fee of Little Ercall, holding the same by service of half a knight's fee, under his elder brother, John le Strange (IV.) of Nesse and Cheswardine. It will have been this Roger le Strange who is recorded to have given to Wombridge Priory 4 acres of his waste in Erchelewe.<sup>2</sup> The gift was doubtless in augmentation of the estate which the Canons had at Cherrington.

For some cause or other, an *extent* of Roger le Strange's estates at Cheswardine, Childs Ercall, and Ellesmere, was taken in October 1280. The Commissioners only valued a *moiety* of Ercalewe as belonging to Sir Roger le Strange. I cannot explain this. Sir Roger's gross receipts from the said moiety were 15s. 8d. *per annum*. Thomas Bosse, tenant of half a virgate, and William de la Leye, paying 4s. rent for a virgate in Leye, were among the Feoffees.<sup>3</sup>

The *Feodaries* of 1284-6 make Roger le Strange to be Lord of Little Ercall and its members, viz. Atton (Hungry Hatton), Leyes (The Lee), and Golston (Goldstone). They further describe him as holding under John le Strange,—meaning John le Strange (V.) of Nesse, &c., who was his Nephew. But one of these *Feodaries* incorrectly states the tenure to be a whole knight's-fee, and both are wrong in classing John le Strange's tenure as immediate under the Crown. Fitz Alan was still Seignorial Lord. At the Assizes of 1292, Roger le Strange, Thomas Bosse, and William de la Leye

<sup>1</sup> *Assizes*, 56 Hen. III. m. 11 *dorso*.

<sup>2</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 389.

<sup>3</sup> *Forest Rolls*, Salop, No. 14. Extente

medietatis villæ de Ercalewe de parte Domini Rogeri Extranei.

were entered as Defaulters in respect of attendance. In March 1306, William de Leye appears on a Hinstock Jury.

Roger le Strange, of whom I have been speaking, though a younger son, was a successful and a great man. Dugdale has said much of him as Lord of Ellesmere and Cheswardine, as Sheriff of Yorkshire, and as Justice of the Forests South of Trent.<sup>1</sup> I have made or shall have to make mention of him in some of these or in other capacities. He had summonses to Parliament as a Baron in 1295 and 1296. For a list of his military and civil employments, commencing in 1277 and ending in 1303, I refer elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

In February 1300 as "Rogerus Lestrangle Dominus de Ellesmere" he joined in the well-known letter of the Barons of England to Pope Boniface VIII.

He died on July 31, 1311, but the King having had a false report of his death had issued a writ of *Diem clausit* six days before. It is all but certain that he died without lawful issue. His wife had been Maud, widow of that Roger de Moubray who died in 1266-7. This Maud was coheir of the Barony of Beauchamp of Bedford, and by *courtesy of England*, her second husband, Roger le Strange, enjoyed her estates for his life. On his death the Inquest states that "the heir of the said Maud was her son John de Moubray, son and heir of Roger de Moubray." John de Moubray was however her grandson, *i.e.* son of her son Roger. He was now 22 years of age and upwards.<sup>3</sup>

John le Strange of Ercall, as he was called, appears to have obtained an interest at Childs Ercall long before Roger le Strange's death, but I have no proof how he was related to Roger. He sat as a Knight of the Shire in several parliaments of 1305, 1306, 1307, and 1309, being always styled "of Ercall."

The Feodary of 1316 gives the Earl of Arundell as Lord of Ercall, which looks as if the Manor, or part of it, was at that time an Escheat.

By some means or other John le Strange of Cheswardine (so called in 1306) became John le Strange of Cheswardine and Ercall. He was illegitimate, as we have already seen.<sup>4</sup> He lived till 1330. It then appeared that he had settled Cheswardine by Fine, on

<sup>1</sup> *Baronage*, I. p. 666, b.

<sup>2</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, I. 849, 850; IV. 1471.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 5 Edw. II., No. 67.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 282. I have no doubt that Roger le Strange was father of this John, if not also of the John who preceded him at Ercall.

Hamo son of Fulk le Strange. But it is not less clear that John de Leybourn, aged 30, was found to be right heir of John le Strange, viz. son of his sister Lucia.<sup>1</sup>

And John de Leybourn seems actually to have inherited whatever John le Strange had at Ercall; for immediately after the death of the latter, that is on October 20, 1330, a Fine was levied between John de Leybourne and Beatrix his wife (Plaintiffs) and Hugh Burnel and Thomas de Wynnesbury, junior (Deforciant) of the Manor of Berewyk and half the Manor of Childes-Ercalwe. John de Leybourne first acknowledges Hugh Burnel's right to the premises by his (Leybourne's) gift. Hugh and Thomas then settle the premises on John and Beatrix, and the heirs of their bodies; with remainder to the right heirs of John; to hold of the Lords of the Fee.

By agreement dated January 20, 1339, John de Leybourne, "Lord of Childes Ercalwe," conceded to the Abbot of Haughmond and his tenants at Nagington, certain common rights in the Heath between Childs Ercall, Tibberton, and Caynton.<sup>2</sup>

DODICOTE.—We have seen how this member of Little Ercall passed to Combermere Abbey by grant of William fitz Alan (I.). Thenceforward it became a separate Manor and requires a distinct account. In October 1199 the Abbot of Cumbermare had a suit of *novel disseizin* against Fulk de Oirri, in which Bernard, a Monk of his House, was his Attorney.<sup>3</sup>

In October 1200 and April 1201, the Plea-Rolls contain allusions to a suit between the Abbot of Combermere and Richard de Lecton (Plaintiff) concerning land in Dodecot. The deposition of the existing Abbot, Thomas, caused a *remanet sine die*, but I find the matter settled, by a Fine of October 13, 1201. Thereby Richard de Lecton (Plaintiff) quitclaims half a hide in Dodecote, to Thomas Abbot of Cumbermare (Tenant) and his Successors for ever. The Abbot paid 100s.

The earliest Shropshire Inquisition, that is extant, concerns this locality. On May 7, 1220, King Henry III., then at Shrewsbury, desires John Mareschall (then Justice of the Forest) to make Inquest, by the Foresters and Verderers and by oath of twelve men of the *vicinage* of Bradford, as to the acreage of certain land called Ruecroftes, which lay between Tiberton and Hule (Howle) and which the Combermere Monks wanted to bring into cultivation.

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 4 Edw. III., No. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Cur. Regis*, II. 58.

<sup>3</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 148.

The Inquest was further to state what was growing on the land, whether thick timber or underwood, and whether its cultivation would injure the King's Forest of Wombridge. The Inquest was to be returned to Hubert de Burg, Justiciar, before the *Quinzaine* of John the Baptist (July 8, 1220).<sup>1</sup> Hence we know the date of the, itself undated, Inquest which resulted. John Marescal forwarded the King's Writ to Henry de Audley (then Deputy-Sheriff to Ranulf Earl of Chester). Audley held the Inquest and enclosed it in a Letter to Hubert de Burg, Justice of England. The persons who officiated were Hugh fitz Robert, Forester; Thomas de Constantine and Hamo Marescot, Verderers; and twelve Bradford Jurors whom I shall name in other chapters. They reported that the Monks' proposition would be non-injurious to the King's Forest, that neither thick timber nor underwood grew on the land, but only heath.<sup>2</sup> On receipt of this Inquest the King addressed a mandate to John Marescall allowing the Monks to clear the said land, viz. 20 acres. John Marescall forwarded the Writ to the Sheriff of Shropshire, and before the Assizes of November 1221 the Monks of Combermere had cleared 3 or 4 acres of the land in question. At those Assizes the Abbot and another were sued by Fulk d'Oiry for disseizing him of common pasture in Arcalun. The Abbot showed that the few acres cleared were Forest-land of the King's, and appealed to the above Writs and Inquest. The Court decided to give judgment at Westminster in Hilary Term following.

In 1255 the Bradford Hundred-Roll says most accurately that "the Abbot of Combermere holds Dotecote by gift of William fitz Alan, in pure almoign, and that it is not *hidated*." An Inquisition seems to have been taken in 1286, relative to the Abbot of Combermere disforesting a grove (*nemus*) at Dodecote, which was within the Forest of Mount Gilbert; but the document is lost. In 1291, the Abbot's estate here is estimated at 2 carucates, each yielding 10s. *per annum*.<sup>3</sup>

The *Valor* of 1534-5 gives the Abbot's Rents and Temporalities at Dodcote as £4. 6s. 8d. The Glebe of Little Arcall also yielded him £1. 9s. 4d.<sup>4</sup>

NAGINGTON. This member of Little Ercall fell, as we have seen, to Haughmond Abbey about the year 1159. Pope Alexander's Confirmation of 1172, describes the gift as *ex divisâ Hamonis Ex-tranei assensu Willielmi filii Alani domini sui et Radulfi fratris et*

<sup>1</sup> *Claus.* I. 436.

<sup>2</sup> *Calend. Inquis.* Vol. I. p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 261.

<sup>4</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, V. 216.

*heredis sui*. The Confirmation of William fitz Alan (II.) I have given elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> In 1255 the Hundred-Roll says that "the Abbot of Haymon is Lord of the vill of Naghinton" and that "it is *hidated* with the Manor of Herculwe." The Abbey had it in pure alms by gift of Hamo le Strange. It owed suit to the Hundred twice yearly, at the *Sheriff's Tourn*.<sup>2</sup> In 1284 John de Nagington held this Manor under Haughmond Abbey. The *Feodaries* erroneously state *Wydo le Strange* to have held it *in capite*, as a member of Little Ercall, and to have given it to Haughmond. The *Taxation* of 1291 gives 8s. 3d. as the Abbot's income from Nagington, such being, I suppose, the service due on John de Nagington's feoffment. We have seen the purpose to which this rent was assigned by Bishop Langton in 1315.<sup>3</sup>

On October 15, 1474, John Abbot of Haghamon demises to William son of William Horne, late of Childes-Ercall, the Grange of Nagington with three parcels of land within the demesne of Howle for 60 years, reserving a rent of 22s. and Suit of the Abbot's Court at Downton.<sup>4</sup> The *Valor* of 1535-6 gives the Abbot's collective receipts from Cheswardine and Nagington as £10. 18s. 4d. *per annum*. The *Ministers' Accounts*, six years later, give the ferm of Nagington Grange as £1. 5s. 10d., and the receipts from Cheswardine as £10.

Of the Abbot of Haughmond's Feoffees here, I can only name Alan de Nagington, who occurs as early as 1230 and who was living in 1253;—William de Nagington, who occurs on local Juries in 1264 and 1274; and John de Nagington, who similarly occurs in 1284, 1290, and 1306.

GOLDSTONE. The *Feodaries* of 1284-5 concur in making Goldstone a member of Ercall. I have no later proof of the fact. In after times it was considered as a member of Cheswardine, in which Parish it was at all times situated. The manorial change might easily arise from the tenure of Cheswardine and Ercall having been for a time nearly identical. I have nothing to say of the place except that a Richard de Goldston occurs about 1240 and a Thomas de Goldston in 1306.

#### CHILDS ERCALL CHURCH.

I suppose that the *Domesday* mention of a Priest, resident at Little Ercall, indicates the pre-existence of a Church of Saxon foun-

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 276.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Hundred*. II. 55.


<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 297.

<sup>4</sup> Haughmond Chart., fo. 148 *dorso*.



CHILDS. ERCALL CHURCH.





**FONT, CHILDS-ERCALL.**



dation. The *Survey* of 1291 gives the Church of *Erkalwe Parva*, in Newport Deanery, as worth £3. 6s. 8d. *per annum*.<sup>1</sup> When or how this Advowson was obtained by Combermere Abbey I cannot say. It was already the Abbot's in the 13th century.

In 1341 the Assessors of the *Ninth* rated the Parish of *Erkalewe Parva* at 48s. They said that the *Church-Taxation* was much too high, for that, in the current year, the Glebe and all other income of the Church would hardly realize 14s.<sup>2</sup> The *Valor* of 1535-6 does not mention this Church. It would almost seem that the Monks of Combermere had succeeded in suppressing its parochial existence for the sake of the petty revenue which they derived from its glebe. I have no evidence of its having ever been *appropriated* to Combermere Abbey; but inasmuch as it is at this day reputed to be a Perpetual Curacy, while according to its known antecedents it should be a Rectory, I conclude that such a spoliation must have sometime obtained the sanction or connivance of the See of Lichfield.

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

The undermentioned Incumbents of Little Erccall were uniformly presented by the Abbot and Convent of Combermere:—

WILLIAM DE PRAYERS, Acolyte, instituted October 27, 1308, is called Rector in a *licencia studendi* of May 1, 1309; and died on August 19, 1332.

WILLIAM DE BLORTON, Clerk, admitted to the Church of *Childes-Erahwe*, on Nov. 5, 1332, resigned January 19, 1339, when—

NICHOLAS DE HOPTON (juxta Stafford), Priest, was admitted. On April 20, 1346, he exchanges preferments with—

MASTER RICHARD DE TUNYBURGH, late Vicar of Webbeleye (Heref. Dioc.), who is called Rector of Erccall in a license of non-residence dated May 7, 1353. *Tynnebury* vacated Childs Erccall about January 25, 1356, by accepting the *curative* Living of Po-kilchirche (Bath and Wells Dioc.); and on September 8 following—

WILLIAM PARENT, Chaplain, was admitted here. On March 28, 1357, this Rector exchanged with—

JOHN DE HOLCHAM, Chaplain, late Vicar of Aldelym (Lichf. Dioc.).

WILLIAM SOLITO, instituted May 30, 1362, exchanges preferments on November 17, 1365, with—

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 245, a.

| <sup>2</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 192, b.

WILLIAM DE HERDEWYK, who on September 18, 1867, again exchanges with—

ROGER DE ASTON, late Rector of St. Andrew's, Worcester,<sup>1</sup> who on October 25, 1874, again exchanges with

RICHARD DE ERCALWE, Priest, late Rector of Berrington.<sup>2</sup>

---

## Hinstock.

---

HAVING completed a survey of those eleven Manors of Recordine Hundred which were held at *Domesday* by Rainald Vicecomes, I proceed with nine Manors in the same district, which were held, under the Norman Earl, by William Pantulf and his Undertenants. I commence with Hinstock, because that Manor was usually held in demesne by the Pantulfs and their successors; but I must postpone any general account of the Barony of Wem, till I come to Wem itself, which was in the *Domesday* Hundred of Odenet.

Hinstock is described in *Domesday* as follows:—

"The same William (Pantulf) holds Stocche (under the Earl), and Sasfrid holds it of him. Algar held it (in Saxon times). Here are two hides and a half, geldable. There is (arable) land, enough for five ox-teams. In demesne there is one Team, and two Neat-herds and one Boor. Here is a league of wood. The Manor used to be worth 40s. yearly; now it is worth 8s."<sup>3</sup>

After *Domesday* I find no mention of this Manor till about the year 1240, when Ralph le Botyler, holding it and Wem in demesne, is said to hold "one knight's fee in Hinestok and Wemme, of the Barony of Wemme;"<sup>4</sup> a curious mode of expressing the thing, since he was Baron of Wem at the time. The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says that "Ralph le Butiler holds the Manor of Hinstoke as included in the service due on the Barony of Wem. His Seneschal did suit for Hinstoke to County and Hundred, as he did for the Manor of Wem. The said Ralph exercised rights of Forest and Warren in Hinestoke, the Jurors knew not by what warranty."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Previously a Portioner of Burford.  
(Vol. IV. p. 326.)

<sup>2</sup> *Vide supra*, Vol. VI. p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, a. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Hundred*. II. 58.

Ralph le Butiller, deceased on July 3, 1281, was found by Inquest to have held the Hamlet of Hynestok, *inter alia*, of the inheritance of Matilda (Pantulf) his wife. Among the items of income a sum of 2*s.* is said to arise from a small weir (*stagnum*), and one merk from another weir and a Mill.<sup>1</sup> Matilda Pantulf, Ralph de Butiller's Widow, remarried with Walter de Hopton. Hence the Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) states the said Walter and Matilda to be holding Hynstoke, with Wem and its members, *in capite*, and by a collective service of three knights'-fees. At the Assizes of 1292 Walter de Hopton was found to be exercising Free-Warren in Hinstock. In January, 1306, William le Botiler, Grandson of the above-named Ralph and Matilda, wished to convey 60 acres of heath and the Advowson of the Church of Hinstock to Alcester Abbey. An inquest having been held on the subject, a Patent of King Edward I., dated November 22, 1306, allows the transfer.<sup>2</sup> Sir William le Butler's Charter, which, as printed elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> I need not repeat here, conveys the premises, with certain rights of common in Hinstock, to the Alcester Monks. The Deed makes mention of Beatrix, the Grantor's wife, and is attested by Sir Fulk le Estrange, Lord Le Estrange; John le Estrange of Ercalouwhe (Ercall); John le Estrange of Cheselwarthyn (Cheswardine); Adam de Mekeleston; and Richard Hord, the Grantor's Seneschal. An Inquest of May 12, 1327, incidentally values two-thirds of the Manors of Wem and Hinstock at £60 *per annum*, William le Botiler being then seized of the said two-thirds. The King's Writ of *Diem clausit*, on the death of William le Botiler of Wem, issued on Sept. 14, 1334. Hinstock was one of the Manors of which he died seized. William, his son and heir, was found to have been 36 years of age and upwards, on Sept. 8, 1334.<sup>4</sup>

In June 1343, William le Botiler proposes to enfeof two Trustees in the Manors of Hinstock and Tyrley, and in one-third of Wem, and that the reversion of two-thirds of Wem, then held in dower by Ela widow of William le Botiler deceased, should devolve on the same Trustees. The Trustees, being seized, were to settle the premises on the said William, their Feoffor, and the heirs of his body;—with remainder to his right heirs. An Inquest held on this subject found the proposal to be non-injurious to the Crown.<sup>5</sup> The Inquest taken in January 1362, on

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 9 Edw. I., No. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Monasticon*, IV. 178, No. XII.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 176, No. III.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquisitions*, 8 Edw. III., No. 85.

<sup>5</sup> *Inquisitions*, 17 Edw. III., 2nd Nos., No. 39.

William le Botiler's death, says accordingly that Hinstock, which he had held *in capite* for half a knight's fee, had been entailed on the heirs of his body by certain Trustees and by Royal license. William, son and heir of the deceased, was now 30 years of age.<sup>1</sup>

With this William, who died on August 14, 1369, the elder male line of Botiler of Wem expired. Wem and Hinstock were entailed on the heirs of his body, and so passed to his only daughter Elizabeth, who at the time of his death was aged 24 years and upwards.<sup>2</sup> She conveyed the Barony of Wem to her husband, Robert de Ferrers. Their eldest son, Robert de Ferrers, died in 1410, his mother Elizabeth still living. He left two daughters and coheirs, Elizabeth born about 1393, and Mary, born about 1394. On the death of their Grandmother (June 19, 1411), Elizabeth was wife of John son of Ralph Baron Greystock, and Mary was wife of Ralph son of Ralph Nevill, Earl of Westmoreland.<sup>3</sup> The Barony of Wem is now in abeyance between the descendants of these two ladies.<sup>4</sup>

#### HINSTOCK CHURCH.

This was clearly nothing more than a Chapel, originally founded by the Lords of the Manor. To what Saxon Parish it originally belonged I cannot say. Childs Ercall has the claim of proximity.

The Church is not mentioned in the *Taxation* of 1291, but Sir William le Butler's Deed, conveying the Advowson in 1306 to Alcester Abbey, calls it "the parochial Church of the Vill of Hinstock." In 1341 the Assessors of the *Ninth* taxed this Parish at 20s., placing it in the Deanery of Newport, but not quoting any valuation of the Church.<sup>5</sup>

The *Valor* of 1535-6 gives the Income of John Holwey, Rector of Hynstoke, as £6 per annum, less 4s. for Procurations and Synodals.<sup>6</sup> The Prior of Alcester's cotemporary return of the income of his House, names no receipt from Hinstock, except 20s. rent of lands and tenements there.<sup>7</sup>

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

SIR WILLIAM DE BRUGGE, Rector of Hinstock, died October 16, 1320. The following were all presented by the Abbot and Convent of Alcester:—

<sup>1</sup> *Inquis.* 35 Edw. III., No. 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquis.* 43 Edw. III., No. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquis.* 12 Hen. IV., No. 21.

<sup>4</sup> The qualifications of this statement,

as laid down by Sir Harris Nicolas, are founded on a misconception.

<sup>5</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 193, b.

<sup>6,7</sup> *Valor Eccles.* III. pp. 187, 88.

ROBERT DE BUDIFORD, Priest, was admitted Feb. 1, 1321, and resigned July 6, 1337, when—

WILLIAM DE STOKE, Priest, was admitted. He died August 3, 1349 (probably of the pestilence); and, on Sept. 26, following,—

RICHARD DE FLADEBURY, Chaplain, was admitted. On July 30, 1354, this Rector exchanged preferments with—

HENRY DE COPPENHALL, late Rector of Wolwardington (Wygorn. Dioc.). On his resignation, June 23, 1357—

WILLIAM, son of Robert HUWET, was instituted Rector. On May 12, 1364, this Church was resigned by—

JOHN DE PILATTON and—

SIR NICHOLAS HENRY, Priest, was instituted. As *Sir Nicholas Henry de Eyton* this Rector resigned on July 20, 1398,<sup>1</sup> having exchanged preferments with—

SIR JOHN ATTE BOURNE, Priest, late Vicar of Rotteley. This Rector returned to Rotteley, on January 16, 1399, when—

JOHN late Vicar of Rotteley (whose real name seems to have been Gryte or Crit) was instituted to Hinstock.<sup>2</sup> This erratic Priest, whom we find to have occupied five<sup>3</sup> successive Livings in less than 6 years, exchanged Hinstock on April 12, 1403, for the preferment of—

JOHN LUGGER, Chaplain, late Rector of Sondon. Lugger resigned Hinstock in 1404.

PIXLEY, or rather that moiety of Pixley which was not a member of Sambrook, was probably a member of Hinstock, in which Parish the whole vill remains. I am unable however to distinguish the tenants of the two moieties of Pixley, and so will name them promiscuously under Sambrook.

SHACKLEFORD, now Shackford or Shacksford, was I suppose a member of Hinstock Manor. The locality was notorious as the haunt of freebooters, and for the fees which the Barons of Wem exacted from travellers towards guarding some pass in the neighbourhood. Particulars of this will transpire under Newport.

In the reign of King John, Ivo Pantulf, a younger son of Hugh Pantulf, then Baron of Wem, seems to have had a feoffment in Shackford. As "Ivo Pantulf, knight, son of Hugh Pantulf," he

<sup>1</sup> In December 1398 Sir Nicholas Henry migrated from Rotteley to Hope Baggot. (Supra, Vol. IV. p. 366.)

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. IV. p. 365.

<sup>3</sup> Viz. Llangadok, Hope Baggot, Rotteley, Hinstock, and Sondon.

gives, with his body, to Lilleshall Abbey all the tithes of his land of Sakelford, and the tithes of eels taken in the Vivary there, but excepting the tithes of the Mill, which were bestowed elsewhere. He further gives the Canons license to fish five times a year in his Vivary of Sakelford, viz. against Christmas and Easter Days, Pentecost, the Assumption, and the Nativity of the Virgin.<sup>1</sup>

In June 1272 I find Adam de Chetwynd taking out a Writ of disseizin against Ralph le Botyler (then Baron of Wem) concerning a tenement in Sekelford. Also Thomas fitz Ivo has a like writ against the said Ralph and others for a tenement in *Stakeford*.

---

## Corselle.

---

This Manor is thus described in *Domesday* :—

“The same William (Pantulf) holds Corselle (of the Earl), and Sasfrid holds it of him. Godwin held it (in Saxon times). Here are 11 hides, geldable. The (arable) land is enough for 1111 ox-teams. Here is one Boor, having nothing (in the way of a team, I presume). In King Edward’s time the Manor was worth 20s. (*per annum*). Afterwards it was worth 40s. Now it is worth 12d.”<sup>2</sup>

That this was the Manor, known in the thirteenth century as *Culce*, *Culshis*, or *Cuneshasel*, I cannot doubt. That we should look for its modern representative to be near Hinstock, is suggested by *Domesday*, for, not only does Corselle follow next after Hinstock in the *Record*, but Sasfrid was Pantulf’s Tenant in these two, and in no other Manors. There is a place now called Cross-Hill, about a mile south of Hinstock. Though it has long been unknown as a distinct Manor, I look upon it as representing in situation and partially in name the Corselle of *Domesday*.

William de Culleshasel, doubtless a tenant here, attests a Sandford Deed about the year 1230.

We have seen that, about the year 1237, the estate of Roger de Culshis, or de Cuneshasel, an Outlaw, was escheated: that Fulk fitz Warin, then Guardian of Maud Pantulf, heiress of Wem, accounted to the Crown for the *year and waste*, which was the King’s

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 64.

| <sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, a, 2.

prerogative in regard to the estate of any Outlaw, and that then Fulk fitz Warin enfeoffed Ralph de Hodnet in the premises.<sup>1</sup> I take Ralph de Hodnet to be identical with *Ralph le Gras*, whom a Feodary of 1240 inserts as holding half a knight's fee in *Colsnek*, of the Barony of Wem.<sup>2</sup> On November 2, 1242, we have *Adam* (it should be Ralph) le Butiller and Matilda (Pantulf) his wife suing Ralph de Hodnet for half a knight's fee in *Cummeshal*, as the escheat of Matilda.<sup>3</sup> In Trinity Term 1243 and Easter Term 1244, the Rolls supply other notices of this suit as one for *two-thirds* of *half* a knight's fee in *Cunseshasel*, in which Fulk fitz Warin, while Custos of Maud Pantulf's estates, had unjustly enfeoffed Ralph de Hodnet. The latest notice of the active suit leaves Ralph de Hodnet calling Fulk fitz Warin to warranty. Moreover a Fine of November 3, 1244, shows the result. Thereby Ralph de Hodnet, Tenant of two-thirds of a *whole knight's fee* in *Cuneshasel*, quit-claims the same to Ralph de Butiler and Matilda his wife and the heirs of Matilda; but the Plaintiffs pay 40 merks for the surrender.

About 1260-70 I find repeated mention of one Roger de Coleshasel. It will presently appear that his heir, Lucia, was also heir of one Henry de Coleshasel, and married Richard de Okeleye.

In 1271 Roger Waldyn had a Writ of novel disseizin against Ralph le Botyler and others concerning a tenement in Sambrok. The cause was tried at the Assizes of 1272, when William de Tyttenelegh and Ralph le Botyler, being Defendants, disproved the alleged disseizin, on the ground that Roger Waldyng had never been seized of the 40 acres which he now sought.

I have introduced this matter here, because I think that William de Titley was already acquiring an interest at Cross-Hill, and that the question was one of boundary between Cross-Hill and Roger Waldyng's estate at Sambrook.

About 1285 the Bradford Tenure-Roll gives the *Vill of Culsis* as a distinct member of the Barony of Wem, and as held by William Tittley for half a knight's fee.

A Fine of June 20, 1289, exhibits William de Tytneleye as buying up an Undertenant's interest in a considerable estate here. The parties to the Fine are the said William (Plaintiff), and Richard son of Stephen de Okeleye and Lucia his wife (Deforciant). The latter acknowledge a gift to the Plaintiff, of one messuage, one mill, and two carucates of land in Coleshasel, whereof was *plea*

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 45-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Placita*, Mich. Tm., 27 Hen. III., m. 18 *dorso*.

*of convention.* Moreover, for themselves and for the heirs of Lucia, they concede that a messuage and two virgates which Margery widow of Roger de Coleshasel now held in dower, and which were of Lucia's inheritance, should remain to the Plaintiff and his heirs. Also they concede that a messuage and  $1\frac{1}{4}$  virgates which Petronilla, widow of Henry de Coleshasel, held in dower, of Lucia's inheritance, should remain to the Plaintiff, who is to hold the whole by a *clove-rent* payable to the Deforciant and by rendering all services due to the Lord of the Fee. For this the Plaintiff gives a *sore sparrow-hawk*; whilst the two widows, Margery and Petronilla, appear in Court and do fealty to William de Tytneleye.

Of William de Tytneleye I shall have more to say under Waters Upton. A Tenure Roll of Bradford Hundred, drawn up in February 1348, has *Colsesul* as half a knight's-fee, held of the Barony of Wem.<sup>1</sup>

NICHOLAS ABBOT OF BUILDWAS acquired for his House a rent of 12*s.* in *Culce*. This was by Fine, levied at Shrewsbury, in January 1256. The Grantor, Thomas de Sambrok, and his wife Alice, and their heirs were promised participation in the prayers and intercessions of the Buildwas Monks for ever.<sup>2</sup> The Tenant who was to pay the said rent, viz. Thomas son of John de Culce, was present when the Fine was levied, and was agreeable thereto.

---

## Exton on the Wealdmoors.

---

*Domesday* describes this Manor among those held by William Pantulf under the Norman Earl.

"The same William holds Etone, and Warin holds it of him. Wighe and Ouet held it (in Saxon times) for two Manors. Here are III hides, geldable. In demesne there are II ox-teams, and there are IIII Neat-herds, II Villains, and I Boor with half a team; and yet there might be a team-and-a-half additional here. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 23*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 20*s.*"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In possession of T. H. Sandford, of Sandford, Esq.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Vol. VI. p. 318.

<sup>3</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b, 1.

Warin was William Pantulf's chief Feoffee in Shropshire. Besides Eyton he held Bratton and Horton under the same Baron. The next known Lord of these three Manors was Robert de Eyton, living in the reign of Henry II. The probability that Robert de Eyton was Warin's direct descendant and heir is not the mere average probability that the Tenant of three distinct Manors a century after *Domesday* was the lineal representative of the Tenant of those same Manors at *Domesday*. Pantulf's Barony was exempt from all probability of being disturbed as to its constituents by that great Shropshire catastrophe, the fall of Earl Robert de Belesme. We know in short that it was then or afterwards enlarged rather than diminished, and we may fairly presume that this was in reward of the loyalty of its Chief, and his services at the siege of Bridgnorth.

Again, it is probable that Warin was himself a Cadet of the House of Pantulf, for the Descendants of Robert de Eyton, his presumed heir, have uniformly quartered the Arms of Pantulf. It has been suggested that this quartering of the Arms of a Suzerain might have been merely in token of feudal dependence. The alternate theory seems to be that, when a Vassal is found bearing the Arms of his Suzerain, as a quarter, and without any difference, he was his Suzerain's relation by blood as well as tenure.

I should now observe that the Lords of Eyton are found to have obtained feoffment from the Barons of Wem in four Manors, in which *Domesday* does not state that Warin or any other Tenant had as yet acquired investiture. That this change was soon after *Domesday* is clear, for the whole Fief held by De Eyton under Pantulf was of *old Feoffment*. The four Manors in question were Buttery, Half-Lawley, and Sutton, all in Shropshire, and Cresswell, in Staffordshire.

It is with respect to Buttery, and Robert de Eyton's disposal thereof in the reign of Henry II., that the history of this family recommences, nearly a century after *Domesday*. Robert de Eyton gave Buttery to Shrewsbury Abbey, with the consent of Ivo Pantulf his Suzerain. As usual in such early grants, the confirming Deed of the Suzerain is the only one preserved, perhaps the only one executed at the time. Ivo Pantulf addressing his sons, acquaints them that "he has *conceded* in almoign to the Monks of Shrewsbury a certain estate (*unam terram*) which is called *Buttereia*, which Robert de Eiton had *given* to the said Monks. Witnesses, Alured Abbot of Hageman, Ivo Chaplain, Ralph Pantulf, Walter

Meverel, Roger de Bethesloua, John de Eppelcia, Helias de Jai, Robert Christian, &c."<sup>1</sup>

The above Deed probably passed between 1170 and 1175, and so was coeval with the close of Robert de Eyton's life.

PETER DE EYTON, his successor and I presume his son, is known chiefly by his attestations of the earlier Charters of Wombridge Priory. The Benefactions of Madoc ap Gervase, Lord of Sutton, of Walter de Dunstanvill, Lord of Idsall, of John de Cambrai Lord of Lee-Gomery and of Alan de Hadley Lord of Hadley, range between the years 1180 and 1194, and they are nearly all attested by Peter de Eyton.<sup>2</sup>

In 1191, as I infer from the names of the Justiciars who tried it, a suit about land in Cheswell was decided by verdict of twelve Recognizors. Peter de Eiton was one of them, and the matter having been re-opened in June 1200, he attended at Westminster with six other Recognizors (survivors, I presume, of the twelve), to certify what had taken place in 1191.<sup>3</sup>

In 1207 a number of amercements (probably inflicted at a recent Forest-Assize) are entered on the Shropshire Pipe-Roll. One of half a merk is charged on Peter de Eaton. The Pipe-Roll of 1212 contains a Fine of 100s. which Peter de Hetton had proffered and paid for having the land of his Father (*pro habendâ terrâ patris sui*). It is not known that the Eytons were *Tenants-in-capite*, nor was the Barony of Wem likely at this period to have been in custody of the Crown. Still I cannot help thinking that this Fine indicates the succession of an Eyton of Eyton to his Father. If so, both Father and Son were named Peter, and what I have further to say about a Peter de Eyton must belong to—

PETER DE EYTON II. About the year 1220, as I think, Peter de Eyton, calling himself "son of Peter de Eyton, made a *concession* to Lilleshall Abbey. His Charter is entitled in the Chartulary of that House as *Carta Petri de Eyton de stagno de Lubersty et molendino ibidem firmando*. He concedes for the souls' health of himself, his ancestors and successors, and in pure alms, a stank for the Abbot's *Vivary* on the rivulet called *Holebroch* in the Moor of *Hordbur*, and allows that the Canons may establish such stank on his land, and that the water may thus be made to *back-pound* on his land.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. II. pp. 112, 279, 280; Vol. VII. pp. 341, 355.

<sup>3</sup> *Placita*, Trin. Tm., 2 John, m. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 70.

A similar and, I presume, cotemporary concession by the Tenants-in-fee of the adjoining Manor of Preston was sanctioned by the Deed of their Suzerain, viz. Baldwin de Hodnet, who died in December 1224. This gives the probable date of the transaction. Some local peculiarities are worth observation. The spot where the Abbot of Lilleshall intended to establish a *Vivary*, or Mill, or both, is still known as *Lubstree Park*. The Brook, then called *Holebrook*, but now *Humber-Brook*, here divided the Abbot's Grange of Honington on the East, from Peter de Eyton's Manor of Horton and Baldwin de Hodnet's Manor of Preston on the West. Such a brook could not be dammed up or impounded without the consent of the landholders on the opposite bank. Hence the above concessions to Lilleshall.

In Trinity Term 1222 and again in Easter Term 1226, Peter de Eyton and Thomas de Constantine were the only two Recognizors who attended at Westminster, in a great cause between Giles de Erdington and Elena Princess of Wales, concerning the Manor of Wellington.

Between the years 1216 and 1224 we have seen Peter de Eyton attesting a Deed of Alan, Abbot of Lilleshall.<sup>1</sup> This conjunction of names may serve to date an agreement which resulted after some dispute between the said Abbot Alan and Peter de Eyton relative to the right of common in their respective woods. The Canons and their men were now to have the same entire common-right in Peter's Wood as they had enjoyed of old. Peter was to have similar right in the Canon's wood, except in the Park called *Gubald's Haye* and in other places enclosed with ditch or fence. Moreover Peter's men of Buterey were to have housebote and haybote in the Canons' moor of The Wildemoor, without question or view of the Canons' Foresters, but they were to give or sell nothing of the said easements, nor indeed to use them themselves, except when Peter's own land could not fully supply their needs. And the said men of Buterey were to make oath to keep faith with the Church of Lilleshall both with respect to that moor and other places. Each Party sealed a counterpart of this agreement and the Writings were exchanged.<sup>2</sup>

The above agreement affords some presumption that Peter de Eyton had not as yet recognized his Ancestor's grant of Buttery to Shrewsbury Abbey. We happen however to know that he did so subsequently. The years 1225 and 1227 are the certain limits of a

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 103.

| <sup>2</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 71.

Deed whereby "Peter de Eyton gives to the said Abbey the whole land of Butherey and acquits it of all services to himself." This purports to have been done for a nominal sum of 2s. paid by the Monks, and the Deed was attested by Sir John le Strange, William Pantulf, Ralph de Picheford, John Boneth then Sheriff of Salopshire, William Thaleboth, Hugh fitz Robert, Hugh de Hedlega, John de Chetewind, Roger Sprengnose, William Chaplain of Wrocestre, Thomas de Eston, Wido de Glesseg (Glazeley), Ralph Marescall (of Boreton), and Hugh de Kynsedeleg.<sup>1</sup>

The Pipe-Roll of 1231 has Peter de Eytun as amerced 20s. for not producing one, for whom he was Surety, at a recent Forest-Assize.

An agreement between the Abbot of Shrewsbury and William de Ercalwe bears date May 13, 1234, and is attested by Peter de Eyton as second, and by William de Eyton as fifth witness. Peter and William were, perhaps, father and son, though, as we shall see, Peter had a brother named William. The latest notice which I have of Peter de Eython as he is called, bears date October 13, 1237, when with twelve other Recognizors of knightly degree, he attended a great Trial concerning Shawbury, taken before the King himself at Worcester. At his death, which must have taken place within three years after this, Peter de Eyton left his wife Alice surviving. On February 3, 1249, the said Alice *quitclaimed* to Adam Abbot of Shrewsbury all her right in *Botereye*, in the way of dower, the Abbot undertaking to pay her an annuity of half a merk. Witnesses, Richard de Preston and Robert de Rodinton.<sup>2</sup> In or about January 1250, Geoffrey de Langley set an arrentation of 9d. on an acre at Eyton, taken from the Forest by "Alice, Relict of Peter de Eyton." William de Eyton, the brother of Peter, already mentioned, was seated at Eaton upon Tern. He occurs as a Juror or a Surety in June 1220 and August 1226, his name being written Eton or Ethon; but in a grant which about 1223 he made of a meadow at Eaton, he calls himself "William son of Peter de Eton," son that is, as I think, of Peter de Eyton (I.). I shall recur to him and his successors at Eaton, when I come to that place. Peter de Eyton (II.) was succeeded at Eyton by his son and heir,—

WILLIAM DE EYTON, whom the *Feodaries* of 1240 enter as holding one fee in Eyton, and one fee in Kereswall (Cresswell),<sup>3</sup> of the

<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> Salop Chartulary, Nos. 280, 402.

<sup>3</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 45, 48, 49, 50, 51.  
A sixth entry (p. 47 *ibidem*) has Thomas

de Cressewelle as the immediate Tenant of Cressewelle; but he was in fact William de Eyton's Tenant there.

Barony of Wem. Though so great a Feoffee, it does not appear that this William ever obtained the honour of knighthood. We have had double proof that in November 1240 he had married an heiress or coheiress, Matilda by name.<sup>1</sup> Her interest at Leonards-Lee seems to have been in part sold, while that at Rochull (near Wall-Town) was established against certain disputants.

It is probable that William de Eyton was for a time cotemporary with his Uncle of the same name, and it is certain that a third William de Eyton was resident near the Wrekin about this period. I can hardly distinguish the Lord of Eyton and these cotemporaries, by their position in certain testing-clauses and jury-lists.

Between the years 1242 and 1248 William de Eton was the third of twelve Recognizors who attended the Sheriff, Forester, and Verderers of Shropshire to decide what were the Abbot of Lilleshall's rights in a question of forest-law. In 1248 William de Eton was fourth juror on a Withyford Inquest. Again William de Eton was Foreman of the Jury which about February 1249 attended at Shrewsbury to make Inquest as to the estate of Hugh Fitz Robert, late Forester of Shropshire. This William I take to have been surely the individual now under notice. As William de Ethon he again sat Foreman of a Jury which on January 30, 1251, decided a dispute between the Abbeys of Buildwas and Lilleshall. In 1255 he was deceased, his widow Matilda surviving him, but his son and heir, Peter, being an infant, probably under ten years of age. Hence the Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says as follows.—“Peter de Eiton is Lord of Eiton and is in ward to Peter Peverel by gift of Ralph le Butiler (then Baron of Wem). And he (Peter de Eiton) holds the said Manor by service of one knight at Wemme, in time of war, for 40 days, at his own charges. And the Manor used to do suit to County and Hundred, but it has been withdrawn these ten years; and the said suit is worth 2s. yearly.”<sup>2</sup>

Matilda, widow of William de Eyton, remarried to Walter de Pedwardine and took with her in dower one-third of two parts of the estate of Eyton. The remaining part had never come to William de Eyton's hands, for it was held at the time of his death by his mother Alice, who survived him. Alice however died before 1256, and at the Assizes of January in that year a curious point in the Law of Dower had its solution. Walter de Pedwardine and Matilda his wife, having already one-third of two-thirds of two carucates in *Eyton in Wydemore* as Matilda's dower, sued Peter

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II. p. 315; Vol. IV. p. 275. | <sup>2</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 58.

Peverel and Ralph de Kent for a third of that remaining third which had now lapsed to the general estate by death of Alice. The Plaintiffs asserted that William de Eyton had given dower to Matilda out of this remaining third. This the Defendants denied, saying that William had never been seized of the said third except *in tenancy* and during the period between his father Peter's death and the allotment of the said third as his mother's dower. The facts were not in dispute. They were, that Peter de Eyton died seized of the whole estate, that William his son and heir instantly afterwards gave one third to his mother Alice in dower, and had never been otherwise in seizin of such third;—obviously because his mother survived him. The question was one of law, viz. whether Walter de Pedwardine and Matilda could *demand dower out of dower*, i.e. take thirds in such part of William de Eyton's estate as had reverted since his death? The Court decided in the negative, dismissed Peverel and Kent *sine die*, and pronounced the Plaintiffs *in misericordid* for a false claim.<sup>1</sup>

WALTER DE PEDWARDINE, Lord of Ingwardine in 1255 and 1284, has already been noticed.<sup>2</sup> His distinctive career rather belongs to the localities now under notice, where he was resident for years. As early as 1253 he was foreman of a Jury which made Inquest as to estates in Uppington and Newport. He took the Royalist side during the civil wars of 1264–5, and it was probably for some measures against a political opponent that he was impleaded in 1266 and 1268 as before noticed.<sup>3</sup> We must remember however that the scene of his alleged trespass was Rochull, a place where very probably he had an interest in right of his wife. A Patent of June 24, 1267, makes him Fermor for life of the King's Hundred of Bradford. This was in reward of his *faithful services*; but the Rent of 8 merks which was retained by the Crown is known to have been a full and fair value of the office. We have seen Sir Walter de Pedwardine attesting a Charter of Walter de Dunstanville about 1269 and of Petronilla his daughter about 1274.<sup>4</sup> He died apparently in 1297, but without any recorded interest remaining in North Shropshire. His tenure under the Bromptons of Brompton Brian will have notice elsewhere. He was succeeded by a son Roger, of full age at his decease and perhaps his son by Matilda de Eyton. Meantime—

PETER DE EYTON (III.) had arrived at man's estate. The first

<sup>1</sup> *Assizes*, 40 Hen. III., m. 7 *dorso*.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. IV. pp. 190, 276.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. pp. 298, 300.

mention of his name, otherwise than as an infant, is early in 1272, when Hugh Burnell had a Writ against him for disseizing the said Hugh of common-pasture in Eyton, and John de Appele had a Writ against him for disseizing the said John of a tenement in Eyton. At the Assizes of September 1272 Peter de Eyton was third Juror for Bradford Hundred. His position on a Jury of March 1276 is not among the knights who composed it, but in an Inquest of December 2, 1277, he takes precedence of several whom I know to have been knights at the time. In July 1278 he appears as one of the Verderers of the Shropshire Forests, and in January 1283 he is expressly styled a knight on a Newport Inquest. From this period till his death his occurrences as a Verderer, a Juror, or a Witness, are very frequent. The *Feodaries* of 1284-5, when collated, show that Peter de Eyton was then holding two knights'-fees under Walter de Hopton and his wife Matilda (Baroness of Wem). The Manors named as constituting this Fief are Eyton, Brochetone (Bratton), Sutton, and half Lawley, in Shropshire, and Cresswell in Staffordshire. The latter was held under him by Henry de Cresswell. At the Assizes of 1292 he was one of the two Elisors, sworn to elect the Jury for Bradford Hundred. In the same year he was one of the Knights who tried several of those Pleas of *Quo Warranto* to which I am so often referring. He was returned for Salop as a knight of the Shire to the Parliament held at York on May 25, 1298, and again to the Parliament held at Lincoln in January 1301. The latter he attended, and obtained his Writ of expenses for so doing. His Manucaptors were Roger le Wodeward of Eyton, and Richard his Brother.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile, on June 5, 1300, as one of the Verderers of Shropshire, he attended the great Perambulation then made, and afterwards ratified by Edward I.

Peter de Eyton (III.) had settled his estate, or at least the Manor of Eyton, by a Fine levied at Westminster on January 27, 1292. He first gives it to his son Peter (the Plaintiff), who returns it to his father, to hold for life, under the Lords of the Fee, with remainder to Peter junior and the heirs of his body, or in default of such heirs to Margery, sister of Peter junior and the heirs of her body, with remainder to the right heirs of Peter senior quit of any other heirs of Margery.

PETER DE EYTON (IV.), who, in October 1302, March 1303, January 1305, and March and May 1308, occurs as a prominent witness of Wombridge Charters, is in no instance styled a knight.

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 580.

He was, I doubt not, the above-named son of Peter (III.), now in possession of his estate. On May 21, 1311, he is styled "Lord of Eyton," and either under that style or as merely Peter de Eyton, he is a frequent witness of Wombridge Charters, the latest of which bears date January 20, 1324. A charter which I have ventured to date in 1320 speaks of him as Peter son of Sir Peter de Eyton and as having granted to the Canons of Wombridge a right of road through his land of Lega.<sup>1</sup>

This estate at Leonards Lee, whatever its extent, probably came to him in right of his grandmother, Matilda. On April 28, 1325, he was appointed a Commissioner for the purpose of raising Hobelers and Archers in Shropshire and Staffordshire, in place of Alan de Cherleton.<sup>2</sup> Three Writs of the same year, the latest dated Sept. 20, instruct him concerning the marching and inspection of these levies;—but nothing further do I learn certainly of him.<sup>3</sup>

JOHN DE EYTON, presumed to have been son and heir of Peter de Eyton (IV.), occurs as John de Eyton on August 13, 1328, and as John, Lord of Eyton, on Sept. 21, 1331, and as John de Eyton on Jan. 6, 1333;—and from thence till July 25, 1344, when he is styled *Dominus Johannes de Eyton super le Wildmore*, but it is evident from the context of this Deed<sup>4</sup> that he was not a knight, and I take it that neither he nor his father nor yet his son ever attained that dignity. On May 7, 1339, a Fine was levied whereby Richard de Tatenhall and Margery his wife (Deforciant) quitclaim for themselves, and the heirs of Margery, to John de Eyton (Plaintiff) 100s. rent in Eyton super le Wyldmore. For this, John de Eyton paid 60 merks.

PETER DE EYTON (V.), presumed son and heir of John, occurs as a witness on March 25 and May 3, 1354.<sup>5</sup> On April 2, 1366, he presented to Eyton Church, and on May 21, 1377, he occurs

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 317.

<sup>2</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 805.

<sup>3</sup> Dugdale (MS. 39. fo. 82) gives an abstract of a Deed, whereby "Peter de Eyton de Wyldemor gives to Sir Nicholas Beek, Chevalier, the wardship and marriage of Margaret, daughter and heir of John de Leye, deceased, till the full age of the said Margaret, gives (namely) the Manor of Cressewall and the reversion of such land as Dame Jone, widow of Sir Henry de Cressewall, held in Cressewall in the name of Dower." This Deed pur-

ports to have been dated at Stafford in 8 Edw. III. (1334-5). Henry de Cresswell was certainly living in 1316, and so far Dugdale's date is plausible; but I strongly suspect some error in the said date when I refer it to the known era of Peter de Eyton (IV.). The grant, whatever its date, surely implies the continued mesne-lordship of Peter de Eyton (IV.) or (V.) at Cresswell.

<sup>4</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, Tit. Upinton, No. CCV.

<sup>5</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 362.

again as witness of a Deed already quoted, but not as a knight.<sup>1</sup> Peter de Eyton (V.) was succeeded by his son and heir,—

JOHN DE EYTON (II.), who served the office of Sheriff of Shropshire in 1394. With him I must conclude an account which has already extended later than my usual limits.

## EYTON CHURCH.

This Church must have been originally a Chapel, founded indeed by the Lords of the Manor and always bestowed at their presentation, but founded nevertheless within the limits of some ancient and adjacent Parish, probably that of Wellington.

The Church is dedicated to St. Catherine, and Tradition says that one Catherine de Eyton vowed its foundation in the event of the safe return of her husband, then absent on a Crusade. The motto of the Lords of Eyton—*Je m'y oblige*, or, *I bind myself*, is further said to have reference to this vow and its pious accomplishment.

This Church is not mentioned in the *Taxation* of 1291, and the earliest dated Record which indicates its existence is the admission of a Rector thereto in 1336.

Again Eyton is not recognized as a distinct Parish in the Inquisition of 1341; but in the Valor of 1534-5, *Eyton super Wyldmor* is entered as a Rectory, in the Deanery of Newport;—whose Rector, Roger Gerves, derived a clear income of £2. 4s. 8d. from this preferment.<sup>2</sup>

## EARLY INCUMBENTS.

ROGER DE LYE, Rector of Eyton super Wyldmore, being deceased on Sept. 3, 1336, the Bishop institutes—

WILLIAM DE KYNARDESEYE, Priest, at the presentation of John de Eyton, Lord of Eyton. On October 28, 1336, Kynardeseye exchanges preferments with—

SIR WILLIAM DE LA BROKE of Leominster, late Perpetual Vicar of Much Wenlock.<sup>3</sup> *William de Lymenstre*, as he is in the next instance called, resigned January 26, 1342, and on February 1st following—

THOMAS PATITON of Wenlock, Acolyte, was admitted.—Patron, John de Eyton, Lord of Eyton. On April 2nd, 1366,

WILLIAM DE WYLLEYNTON, Priest, was instituted to the *Church of St. Catherine of Eyton* at the presentation of Peter de Eyton.

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 362.

<sup>2</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 186.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. III. p. 270.

THOMAS NEWPORT occurs as Rector on June 12, 1391.<sup>1</sup>

SIR JOHN CARTWRIGHT dying in 1534,—

ROGER GERVAS was instituted on August 2nd of that year. Patron, Henry Eyton, Esq. On November 21, 1548, Gervas being dead,—

SIR JOHN GEYTE was instituted.

## Buttery.

THIS place, now a township in the Parish of Edgmond, is described in *Domesday* as one of William Pantulf's Manors. "The same William holds Buterei. Turchil held it (in Saxon times). Here is one hide, geldable. The (arable) land is (sufficient) for 11 ox-teams: there are only three oxen here. The old value of the Manor was 6*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 2*s.*<sup>2</sup>

The feoffment of Warinus or of one of his successors, the Eytons, in Buttery, has been already assumed. Robert de Eyton's transfer of the Manor to Shrewsbury Abbey has also been recorded. The remaining history of the place should be as an estate of the said Abbey. However neither the Taxation of 1291 nor the Valor of 1535-6 take any notice of Buttery as thus held. The only Document which does notice it is a Rent-Roll of Shrewsbury Abbey, drawn up at the close of the fifteenth century. Therein it appears that the Abbey was in receipt of a rent of £2 *per annum* for *Boterey*.

## Bratton.

"THE same William (Pantulf) holds Brochetone. Erniet held it (in Saxon times). Here is a hide and half, geldable. The (arable)

<sup>1</sup> Vide *supra*, Vol. VI. p. 204, whence it would appear that Newport had been Rector of Bolas from 1366 to 1377. He

probably went from Bolas to Eyton, and thence, in 1395, to Pulverbatch.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b, 1.

land is (enough) for IIII ox-teams. Here are v Boors and they have nothing (in the shape of a Team). In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 24s. (*per annum*). Now it is nearly waste. Warin holds it (under William Pantulf)."<sup>1</sup>

I have stated under Eyton nearly all that is known of Bratton. It became thus associated with Eyton, by reason of the tenure of the two being identical, and they were usually reputed to be one Manor. It is a township in Wrockwardine Parish, and is wholly in the possession of the present Representative of the Eytons. I think it probable from the following Deed that Sibil wife of Sir Hugh and mother of Sir Philip Burnell was an Eyton, and had her marriage portion in Bratton.

On February 16, 1299, Sibil, late wife of Hughe Burnel, gives to Master William Burnel, her son, all her tenement in *Brocton pres de Welinton*, to hold for his life;—with remainder to Walter Beisin and Alice his wife and to William de Ercalwe and Petronilla<sup>2</sup> his wife and the heirs of said William and Petronilla,—rendering all capital services. Witnesses, Robert Corbet, Thomas Corbet, Richard de Harley and Richard de Leghton, Knights. Dated at Eudon Burnell.<sup>3</sup>

---

## Lawley.

---

LAWLEY was at the time of *Domesday* a divided Manor. William Pantulf's share (with which alone we are now concerned) is described as follows.—

"The same William holds Lauelei. Erniet held it (in Saxon times). Here is half a hide geldable. There is (arable) land, enough for one ox-team. It (the said land) was and is waste."<sup>4</sup>

This part of Lawley afterwards constituted one of those Manors which were held by the Lords of Eyton under the Barons of Wem. In the thirteenth century the Lords of Eyton had a Feoffee here, one Ralph de Stanton. This Ralph, who probably took his name from Stanton near Shiffnal, has been seen attesting Deeds, which

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Alice and Petronilla were Sibil Burnel's daughters.

<sup>3</sup> In possession of Mr. George Morris of Shrewsbury.

<sup>4</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b. 1.

concerned land at Grindle and at Hatton, in the middle of the thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> About the same time he appears as Juror in a Lilleshall Inquest, and in 1249 on a Leegomery Inquest. The Hundred-Roll of 1255 says that "Radulf de Stanton holds two virgates in Laueleg of the Fee of Wem." Here the mesne-lord (Peter de Eyton) is not mentioned.

About 1284-5 two *Feodaries* of Bradford Hundred concur in stating that "Radulf de Stanton held half the vill of Laneleye under Peter de Eyton, who held under the Lord of Wem, who held *in capite*." Walter de Stanton (son and heir of Ralph as I suppose) occurs on a Wellington Jury in 1284. Subsequently he enfeoffed Robert Corbet of Morton and his wife Matilda in certain tenements in Laneleye which were held under Peter de Eyton by a rent of 5*s*. Robert Corbet and his wife were conjointly seized of this tenement (which was in fact the moiety of Lawley now under notice) in 1300, when the said Robert Corbet died.<sup>2</sup> For proof that the Eytons retained their mesne interest in Lawley nearly four centuries later, I refer to a note.<sup>3</sup>

---

## Horton.

---

THIS Manor, now a Township of Wellington, is described in *Domesday* as follows.—"The same William (Pantulf) holds Hortune, and Warin holds it of him. Erniet held it (in Saxon times). Here are three virgates of land, geldable. The (arable) land is enough for one ox-team. It is waste. Here is half a league of wood and one haye."<sup>4</sup>

That Horton, like Eyton and Bratton, descended from Warin, the

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. pp. 92, 172.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquis.* 29 Edw. I. No. 45.

<sup>3</sup> About the year 1684 three tenements in Lawley (constituting, I presume, the above parcel of the Manor) were held by Messrs. Langley and Cludde, by a chief-rent of 5*s*., payable to the Mother or Guardian of Philip Eyton of Eyton, then in minority. In that year Messrs. Langley and Cludde sold their fee-simple to Tho-

mas Burton, Esq., of Longner. There is a receipt at Longner, dated April 26, 1686, wherein Charles Eyton, Uncle of the minor, Philip, acknowledges the payment by Mr. Burton of £2. 5*s*. or nine years' arrears of the said chief-rent. (Extracts from the muniments at Longner, by the late John Eyton, Esq.)

<sup>4</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b. 1.

*Domesday* Tenant, to Peter de Eyton (II.), I cannot doubt. The concessions which the latter made to Lilleshull Abbey in respect to *Lubstree Vivary* about 1220 show him, I think, to have been Lord of Horton.<sup>1</sup> It is also certain that an interest in Horton, though not the sole interest, has remained with Peter de Eyton's descendants to this very day.<sup>2</sup>

With respect however to the bulk of Horton, the history of the Manor is much more associated with that of Preston on the Wealdmoors than with that of Eyton. In short the Horton which we usually hear of in the thirteenth century was held of the Fee of Hodnet by Tenants, some at least of whom held in Preston, of the same Fee. This tenure was quite independent of any mesne interest of the Lords of Eyton, who I conclude must have lost something in Horton, though something they retained. Without vain speculation on this anomaly I proceed to state what I find about the Tenants of Horton.—

Roger de Preston, younger brother of that Baldwin de Hodnet, who died in 1224, gave half a virgate in Horton to Lilleshall Abbey, and Odo de Hodnet, son and heir of Baldwin, confirmed the grant.<sup>3</sup>

Sabina de Horton, daughter of Pagan de Preston, was I know a Coparcener in Preston and wife first of William and then of Roger de Preston. She, in one of her widowhoods, gave with her body to Lilleshull Abbey, a messuage, a croft and a meadow in Horton. Witnesses, Adam de Preston, Ralph de Preston, William Urse of Mokeleston, William de Tyrne, John de Horton, Robert fitz Denys, Roger de Monte, and Roger le Harpur.<sup>4</sup> It was in respect, I presume, of the above grants, that an early Rent-Roll of Lilleshull Abbey gives 20*d.* receivable annually *de terrâ de Horton*. William fitz Eustace, a Juror in a neighbouring Inquest of 1249, was I know of Horton. In 1250 Geoffrey de Langley assessed Matilda, relict of Eustace de Horton, and Helewise, relict of Reginald de Horton, for assarted lands at Hadley.

In 1255 the Bradford Jurors presented Odo de Hodnet as receiving 4*d.* *per annum* from John de Horton, for *advowry*.<sup>5</sup>

Richard de Horton, Juror on a Wellington Inquest in 1264, occurs on no less than seven local juries between that year and

<sup>1</sup> Vide *supra*, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> T. C. Eyton, Esq., now (1859) of Eyton receives two chief-rents of 3*s.* 6*d.* due annually at Christmas from two farms at Horton.

<sup>3</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 67.

<sup>4</sup> Original Deed at Trentham; sealed with a fleur-de-lys, surrounded by this Legend—SIGILLUM SABINE DE HORTUN.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 59.

1301. Between the years 1275 and 1285 Luke Abbot of Lilleshull grants a life lease, at a rent of 6s. 4d., to Sibil relict of Ralph, son of Eustace de Horton, viz. of that half-virgate in Horton which her late husband held, and of that *place* of land which Sabina de Horton gave to the Abbey. Witnesses, Sir Thomas Lyart, Perpetual Vicar of Welinton and the Lord Rector of the Chapel of Preston, Peter de Eyton, Adam de Preston, Pagan de Preston, Richard de Horton, John de Horton, and Robert Silion.<sup>1</sup>

In the Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1286) Preston, Horton and half the vill of Lawley are put down as members of Hodnet, and as held under William de Hodnet as Mesne-Lord. I do not doubt the general accuracy of the statement, though how to account for it in the cases of Horton and Lawley I know not.

William de Horton who occurs on a local jury in 1281, will hereafter appear as a Coparcener of Preston in 1292.

PAROCHIALLY, Horton is now reputed to be a member of Wellington; but a Terrier of Eyton, drawn up in 1625, shows that Horton had then a parochial status just as divided as its previous manorial condition. Sir Philip Eyton paid two-thirds of his tithes to Eyton and one-third to Wellington (I presume as the Mother Church of Eyton). But twelve cottagers in Horton's Wood paid part of their tithes to Eyton and part to Wellington. Also the people of Horton's Wood received the Communion at Eyton and paid their *duties* there, but christened and buried at Wellington.

The inference from all this is that when Eyton Church was founded by the Lords of the Manor, they endowed it, as far as they could, with tithes of their estates at Horton and Eyton, making some composition with the Mother Church of Wellington. In 1625 the ratio of the case was forgotten, and litigation was impending as to the then current practice. Not wishing to insist on any view of the matter as a question of ecclesiastical law, long since settled, I only quote the data of the dispute as reminiscences of the partial connection which has existed between Horton and Eyton ever since *Domesday*.

---

## Beslow.

---

"THE same William (Pantulf) holds Beteslawe. Godwin held

<sup>1</sup> Charter at Trentham.

it (in Saxon times). Here is half a hide, geldable. The (arable) land is enough for 11 ox-teams. In demesne there is half a team, and one Serf and one Free Man with two Boors. It used to be worth 11*s.* (*per annum*): now it is worth 5*s.*"<sup>1</sup>

After *Domesday* we find Beslow held under William Pantulf's descendants by a family which took its name from the place. The first of these is Roger de Bethesloua, whom we have seen, about 1170-5, attesting Ivo Pantulf's confirmation of Buttery to Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>2</sup> Next comes Richard de Beszelawe, whose name appears on the Pipe-Roll of 1176 as owing an amercement of one merk, because he had failed to produce Robert de Wudecote for Trial. Roger de Besselawe occurs as a Witness about 1220.<sup>3</sup> From about 1240 to 1255 I find occasional mention of Robert de Besse-lawe as a Juror or a Witness. In the latter year, though the Bradford Hundred-Roll omits all mention of Beslow, the Pimhill Hundred-Roll notices this Robert as holding part of Slepe under the then Baron of Wem.<sup>4</sup> Robert de Beslow I think was a Juror for Bradford Hundred at the Assizes of January 1256, but the name is written *Esselawe*. From about 1256 to 1283 I find Hugh de Beslow acting as a Juror on four different Inquests, and attesting several Charters of the same period. About 1285 the Bradford Tenure-Roll says distinctly that "Beslow is held as a member of Wem, under Walter and Matilda de Hopton, by Hugh de Beslow, and for half a knight's-fee."

This, or another, Hugh occurs on a local Jury in December 1298, and again in 1315, but after him I find no mention of the family or Manor for a considerable period. Eventually an heir female of the Beslows took the estate into the family of Poynor.

BESLOW CHAPEL. Tradition and the existence of a field called "Chapel Yard," are the authorities quoted for the former existence of this Chapel. The district belongs parochially to Wroxeter.

---

## Dawley Magna, *alias* Dawley Pantulf.

---

*Domesday*, after describing Earl Roger's great Demesne-Manor

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 133, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 75.

of Wellington, notices Dawley as a member thereof, but not held in demesne by the Earl.—“Of the land of this Manor, William holds of the Earl one hide, Dalelie, for a Manor. Grim held it before. Here is one ox-team, and VII Villains have one team. Its old value was 30s. (*per annum*). It is now worth 10s.”<sup>1</sup>

Wherever, in the Shropshire or Staffordshire *Domesday*, a certain *William* is spoken of as Earl Roger's immediate Tenant, we are to understand William Pantulf; for all the Manors, whose tenure is thus curtly described, are found afterwards as members of the Barony of Wem. So it was with Dawley; but a younger branch of the Pantulfs held Dawley under the elder, and, together with Dawley, Tibberton, and Great Norton, the last of which has been already treated of.<sup>2</sup> The first of this younger line of Pantulfs, of whom I have any notice, was Ralph Pantulf, probably more distantly related to Ivo Pantulf, the cotemporary Baron of Wem, than as a son or a brother. We have seen this Ralph, about 1170–5, attesting Ivo's confirmation of Buttery to Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>3</sup> The Pipe-Roll of 1180 registers Ralph Pantulf as owing a fine of half a merk for license to construct a mill and stank in his own arable field. This was obviously because the premises were within jurisdiction of the Forest.

We have seen Ralph Pantulf attesting a Deed of Walter de Dunstanvill, about 1188,<sup>4</sup> and about four years later, we observe that in a similar attestation by Ralph Pantulf, his name is followed by that of William his son.<sup>5</sup> Before 1199 the said William had apparently succeeded to his Father, for the Pipe Roll of that year exhibits William Pantulf as fining one merk for license to assart 3 acres of *Riflet*. This William is followed in the testing clauses of certain grants to Wombridge Priory by his brother Philip. In October 1203 William Pantulf was deceased, for at the Assizes then held, “Felicia his widow sued Alan Pantulf for her reasonable dower,” viz. for a third part of William's whole tenement in *Dalilea*, and in *Tibricton* and in a third place, unintelligibly written, but which I take to mean Norton. Alan Pantulf assented to the claim, and the Sheriff was ordered to apportion the said thirds.<sup>6</sup>

I cannot determine whether Alan Pantulf was the son or the brother of William, but on March 18, 1218, he in turn was dead, leaving an heir in minority. A Writ-Close of that date assigns the

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 253, b, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. p. 300.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> <sup>5</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. pp. 279, 290.

<sup>6</sup> *Assizes*, 5 John, m. 5 dorso.

custody of the land and heir of Alan Pantulf to Hugh Pantulf (then Baron of Wem) under whom the said Alan *held a fee*.<sup>1</sup>

The heir of Alan Pantulf was probably Adam Pantulf; but he too was deceased in 1240 and his estates divided among four Coparceners, but whether these Coparceners were daughters or sisters of Adam I cannot say, nor can I give their names. It is to these Ladies that reference is made in the Feodary of 1240, where it is said that "the heirs of Adam Panton hold one fee in Dalileg and Tibberton of the Barony of Wemme."<sup>2</sup>

The four coheireesses of Pantulf of Dawley and Tibberton were in 1255 represented by William de Cavereswelle, Richard le Irishe, Michael de Morton, and John de Chavernes. "These four held the *vill* of Dalileg by service of one *Montar* at Wem, in time of war, to wit, for 40 days at their own cost. The Seneschal of Wem did suit to County and Hundred for the said Vill."<sup>3</sup> In describing the Coparceners of Tibberton the same Record substitutes Christiana de Dalileg for John de Chavernes.<sup>4</sup> The truth is that John and Christiana were man and wife.

WILLIAM DE CAVERSWALL, one of above Coparceners in Dawley, was representative of a family long seated at Caverswall in Staffordshire. He occurs as a Coparcener in Dawley in a Fine of the year 1256, which I shall quote in its place. All that I shall further say of him here is, that between the years 1256 and 1260 he sold his share of Dawley and Tibberton to Michael de Morton, reserving however a rent to himself as Mesne-Lord. His Deed, relating to this transaction, purports to be a *grant* by William de Kaverswall to Michael de Morton of all the land which he (William) *had and held* in Dalile and Tubrinton with all homages, suits, &c., of Tenants:—to hold in fee, at a rent of £3. 13s. 4d. payable at Morton to the Grantor, and by performing all suits and other services (to the Seigneurial Lords). Witnesses, Robert de Haluton, Adam de Brinton, William de Lechā, Bertram de Burgo, Henry Mauvessin, \* \* \* Mauvessin, Adam de Preston, John de Apele (Apley), and John Clerk.<sup>5</sup>

This transfer put an end to William de Caverswall's immediate connection with Dawley, and increased the importance of his Coparcener,—

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Claus.* Vol. I. p. 356.

<sup>2</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 45.

<sup>3, 4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 58. 56. Richard le Irishe was one of the Jurors who made

this return. His name is printed *Leyres*.

<sup>5</sup> Abstract of Deeds in possession of Philip Yonge of Caynton, Aug. 4, 1656. (Harl. MS. 2063, fo. 5, b.)

MICHAEL DE MORTON. This Michael was also a Staffordshire man. He held a share of the Manor of Morton, in that county, under Fitz Alan. I shall often have to speak of his acquisitions in Shropshire. In 1285 the Bradford Tenure-Roll makes Dawley and Tibberton to be members of Walter and Matilda de Hopton's Barony. Michael de Moreton (he was son of the first Michael) and Reginald de Charneus are said to hold the two Manors by service of half a knight's-fee, but the Coparcenery of Irish was, as we shall see, still existent. A Patent dated at York on Nov. 17, 1316, allows William de Morton, Clerk, to surround his mansion of Dalileye with a wall of stone and lime and to embattle the same. Master John de Cherlton is said to be the *nuncios* of this Writ. It shows us the origin of *Dawley Castle*. I now return to—

JOHN DE CHAVERNES, who, with his wife Christiana de Dawley, was one of the Coparceners of 1255-6.<sup>1</sup> He too was of a Staffordshire family, long seated at Charnes, a Manor which they held under the See of Lichfield. Reginald de Charnes occurs as a Juror for Bradford Hundred in 1272, on a Wem Jury in 1281, and as a Coparcener in Dawley in 1285, and in June 1300, as one of the Jurors who made Perambulation of the Shropshire Forests.<sup>2</sup>

This Reginald de Charnes was, it seems, a Tenant of some woodland at Parva Legh, a member of Idsall.<sup>3</sup> An Inquest of Sept. 24, 1310, found it to be non-injurious to the Crown that the said Reginald should bestow ten acres of the said woodland on Buildwas Abbey. The Tenants over Reginald were Peter de Eyton and Hugh de Say of Morton, but to them he owed no service. They again held under Thomas Tochet (Lord of Leegomery), who held *in capite*, so that it would seem a part of Parva Legh was a member of Leegomery. Reginald's proposed grant was worth 2s. *per annum*, and if it should take effect he would still have one-fourth of the Villis of Dalileye and Tibriton, which he held under William le Botiler, Baron of Wem, by services of rendering 6 arrows, barbed and feathered with peacock's plumes, and of appearing twice yearly at his Suzerain's Great Courts at Hinstock. He would also retain estates at Prees and at Charnes, held under the Bishop of Chester.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is possible that one Robert de Chavernes preceded John as a Coparcener in Dawley. An Inquest taken in Michaelmas Term 1253 in a full County-Court was attended by Robert de Chaves (*Ab. brev. Placitorum*, p. 129).

<sup>2</sup> Reginald de Charnes was perhaps

identical with Reginald de Dawley who occurs on local Inquests in May 1264 and January 1283.

<sup>3</sup> Vide *supra*, Vol. II. p. 314.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquis. ad quod damnum*, 4 Ed. II. No. 52.

RICHARD LE IRISHE, the remaining Coparcener of 1255, had appeared ten years earlier as Richard de Hibernia and as Juror on a Lilleshall Inquest. Whether Philip le Hyreis who appears on a Bradford Inquisition in May 1264 was of Dawley I cannot say.

On June 16, 1292, Richard le Yreis of Dalileye gives to Johanna his wife and to William their son, and the heirs of William, all his lands in Dalileye and Tybriston, together with the reversion of the dower of Alina, the Grantor's Mother, when it should lapse;—to hold to Johanna and William, and the heirs of William, with remainder to Reginald, brother of William. Witnesses, Sir Walter de Huggefod, Fulk de Penebrugge, Reginald de *Charles*, William de Caynton, Peter de Eyton, Richard le *Yrieys*, and William de Caleweton. Dated at Daliley.<sup>1</sup>

#### DAWLEY CHURCH.

This was originally a Chapel, subject to the great Saxon Church of St. Andrew at Idsall. William Priest of Dalilea, who has been noticed as occurring about 1186-7,<sup>2</sup> was probably the officiating Priest of this Chapel, whose foundation we thus fix as early as the twelfth century. We have seen that Walter de Dunstanvill (II.) recovered the Advowson of Idsall from Shrewsbury Abbey, in 1219.<sup>3</sup> In 1256 Walter de Dunstanvill (III.), as Patron of the Mother Church, was equally successful in recovering the Advowson of Dawley from the joint lords of the Manor, who fined 20*s.* with the justices-in-eyre for license to accord. Their Agreement is preserved.—“Michael de Morthon, Richard le Ireys, John de Chavernes and his wife Christiana and William de Cavereswell, defendants of the Advowson of the Chapel of Dalileye-Paunton, recognized Walter de Dunstanvill's right thereto as an appurtenance of the Mother Church of Ideshall, which was of his patronage. For this quitclaim Dunstanvill paid 18 merks.”

Dawley is never mentioned as a distinct or independent Church in the early Diocesan Registers or in Ecclesiastical Surveys. The Advowson went with that of Idsall to Battlefield College, which obtained an appropriation of both.

In 1535-6 the Master of Battlefield stated his receipts from the Tithes of Dalley Chapel to be £3. 6*s.* 8*d.* *per annum*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Harl. MS. 2063, fo. 6.—

I have some doubts whether this deed is accurately dated in 20 Edw. I.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 112, note 14.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 333.

<sup>4</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 195.

## Tibberton.

---

HAVING now accounted for the nine Manors of Recordine Hundred which were held under Earl Roger by William Pantulf, I proceed to speak of the Fief of Roger de Curcelle, not on account of its size or importance, but because the five Manors which composed it were afterwards annexed to the Barony of Pantulf. I suppose that Richard de Curcell, who appears to have lived in the time of Earl Hugh (1093-8),<sup>1</sup> was Roger de Curcell's successor. Whether the line ended in a sole heiress who took the estates to Pantulf of Wem, or whether the Fief of De Curcell was one of those which were forfeited by the rebellion of 1102, I cannot say. William Pantulf's loyalty on the latter occasion makes it very supposable that his Barony was augmented at the expense of some of Belesme's adherents.

Roger de Curcelle held two Manors in Recordine Hundred under Earl Roger. One of these, Tibberton, is thus described in *Domesday*.—

“The same Roger (de Curcelle) holds Tetbristone. Ulgar held it (in Saxon times). Here are v hides, geldable. In demesne there is one ox-team, and (there are) two Neat-herds and four Boors with one team; and there might be seven teams more. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 60s. (*per annum*); and afterwards it was waste. Now it is worth 10s.”<sup>2</sup>

The earliest Tenant of Tibberton, whom I can name, was one Gilbert de Conedour (Condover); but whether he held under De Curcelle, or under Pantulf, or under both in succession, I cannot show. He belonged to a family of which my notices are very scattered.

In the time of Hugh Earl of Shrewsbury (1093-8) we hear of one Ralph de Conedour. He attests that Earl's undoubted Charter to Salop Abbey,<sup>3</sup> and he was surviving in May 1121, and then attested Henry I.'s general confirmation to the same House.<sup>4</sup>

Gilbert de Conedour, with whom we are now concerned, was cotemporary with Ralph, that is, he was living in the time of Earl

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 256, a, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, No. 35.

Hugh and was surviving at the end of Henry I.'s reign, when Pagan Fitz John, Sheriff of Shropshire, gave him land described as *Uptune*, in compensation for lands elsewhere. King Henry II. in July 1155, confirmed to Shrewsbury Abbey two gifts which had probably accrued during the usurpation of Stephen: viz. "of the gift of Richildis wife of Gilbert de Conedover, a hide in Becchebery, and, of the gift of Baldwin, son of the said Gilbert and Richildis, a hide in Tibrihton." These grants were also included in Henry III.'s confirmation of 1227, and we have good evidence that the monks retained such estates in Tibberton and Beckbury, for by Beckbury we must understand, not the manor and parish which bears that name, but a suburb of the Abbey Foregate of Shrewsbury.

Of Baldwin son of Gilbert de Conedover I know nothing further. In 1165 one Hugh de Cunedoure was holding a *Muntator's* fee in the Barony of Fitz Alan, but this, so far from being at or near Tibberton, was probably at Detton, in South Shropshire.<sup>1</sup>

After Baldwin de Conedover's grant in Tibberton to Shrewsbury Abbey, four hides of the Domesday Manor remained in lay hands. We know that Pantulf of Wem had the Seignury of all four, and that Pantulf of Dawley was Tenant-in-fee of three out of the four.

Between the years 1175 and 1180 Ralph Pantulf, for the souls' health of himself, his wife, his friends, and ancestors, gave a *forendell* in Tibberton to Wombridge Priory. Witnesses Hugh Panton (the Baron of Wem I presume), Alan de Hadley, William de Ercalew, Pagan de Hadley, William de Tibbriton, Drio Priest of the same Vill, Adam de Chorleton (read Horleton), Richard de Cherleton, Pagan de Cherritone (Cherrington), Walter de Clotlegge (Clotley), &c.<sup>2</sup>

Alan Pantulf, who, as we have seen, succeeded to William, son of the above Ralph, in 1203, and died in 1218, conceded to Wombridge Priory 6 acres in Tibberton for the souls' health of himself, his wife, &c. Witnesses, Robert de Wodecotte, Walter de Stircheleg, Philip Parson of Madeley, William Chaplain of Dawley, Walter and Leonard de Leis, Robert de Cheteleia (Ketley), &c.<sup>3</sup>

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 is explicit on the divided state of this Manor. "Tibrihton is 5 hides, and pays 8*d.* *stretward*, and pays the said 8*d.* at Wem, by warranty unknown.<sup>4</sup> William de Caverswell, Michael de Morton, Richard de Ires (le Irish) of

<sup>1</sup> Vide *supra*, Vol. IV. p. 281.

<sup>2, 3</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tib. Tibbriton*, Nos. xiiij. xiv.

<sup>4</sup> This charge of 8*d.* for *stretward* is exceptional. It would (*per se*) indicate a Manor of two hides.

Dalileg, and Christiana de Dalileg, have three hides, and they do ward at Wem Castle, in time of war, with a horse, a hauberk, a *chapel de fer*, and a lance at their own cost. And the Abbot of Salop has in Tibberton one hide, viz. two virgates of land, in almoign. Item John de Hales holds one hide, to wit, two virgates, of the Fee of Wem, by service of doing ward at Wem, for one month, with bow and arrows."<sup>1</sup>

I have, under Dawley, marked some points in the descent of the chief estate at Tibberton as shared by the coheirs of Pantulf of Dawley. All I have to quote further is relative to the share of the second Michael de Morton. By Deed, dated at Morton on June 15, 1804, Michael de Morton concedes to William son of William Hugh of Tybritton and to Sibil his wife that messuage and half-virgate in Tybritton which *William Huve* and Alan de Cherleton had held for their lives. A rent of 5*s.* and a heriot are reserved. Witnesses, William de Caynton, Walter de Morton, William de Morton, &c.<sup>2</sup>

SHREWSBURY ABBEY FEE. At the Assizes of November 1286 Alice de Tibberton recovered by process of *novel disseizin* a virgate in Tibberton from Robert de Aspele and Alice his wife. The Defendants had called the Abbot of Shrewsbury to warranty, but, on their losing the land, the Abbot gave them 2½ merks, which they acknowledge in a Deed, attested by Gilbert de Weston, Ralph Marescall and Richard Meverel, Clerk.<sup>3</sup>

Possibly the successful litigant in this suit was identical with Alice de Mumerville (Morville), whose grant of a virgate in Tibberton to Lilleshall Abbey is recited in Henry III.'s confirmation of 1265.

Between the years 1283 and 1290 Ralph Abbot of Lilleshall grants to Adam surnamed Garleck, a virgate in Tybrigton, which William Fitz Geoffrey sometime held. A rent of 10*s.* and a heriot are reserved.<sup>4</sup>

I have no further evidence of any estate in Tibberton being retained either by the Abbey of Shrewsbury or of Lilleshall: unless indeed in a Rent Roll of the fifteenth century Tibberton be written *Tylton*. In that case Shrewsbury Abbey had rents of 17*s.* 10*d.* issuing from the Ville.<sup>5</sup>

SOME OTHER UNDERTENANCIES in Tibberton I will notice in order of date, without anticipating the question whether they be-

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 56, 57.

<sup>2</sup> Harl. MS. (ut supra), fo. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 80.

<sup>4</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 132.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. Shrewsbury*, II. 508.

longed to the Fee of Pantulf of Dawley or to the Fee held in 1255 by John de Hales.

At the Forest Assize of 1180, Edric, Huctred, and William, three freeholders in Tibreton, were assessed 1*s.* each for pourpresture. Cadugan de Tybriton occurs as a Surety in 1226.

About the year 1245 Reginald de Hales enfeoffs William de Morton (read Meston, *i.e.* Meeson) in two-thirds of a virgate in Tibberton, being part of the free tenement which the Grantor had in that Vill. The Grantor reserves all forinsec service, due on such a quantity of land, and also a proportion of Castle-guard at Wem, that is, the Tenant was to provide one *serviens* on foot, in time of war, with bow and arrows for two-thirds of a week. The Grantor further reserves an annual rent of 5*s.* 4*d.* and a similar sum for Relief. For this the Grantee paid 3 merks. Witnesses, Hugh fitz Robert, John de Hales, Adam fitz Pagan.<sup>1</sup> The same Grantor, whom I take to have been an Undertenant of John de Hales, seems also to have enfeoffed Adam Garlec in one-third of a virgate, at a rent of 2*s.* About the year 1255,—

The son of the above Grantee, calling himself "William son of Reginald de Parva Hales," sold, for 4 merks, to James son of William de Morton, the rent of 5*s.* 4*d.* which he was entitled to receive from William de Morton (read Meston). Witnesses, Robert de Wodecote, Jurdan de Pivelesdon, Hugh de Eton, William de Mokeleston, Michael de Morton, Richard de Cherinton, Richard Bernard, John de Parva Hales, &c.

The same William son of Reginald sold to the same James the rent of 2*s.* which he was entitled to receive from Adam Garlec. Witnesses, Hugh de Eton, Michael de Morton, Richard Bernard of Cherinton, Robert de Wodecote, &c.

About 1270-80, James son of William de Morton gave to Wombridge Priory the above rents of 5*s.* 4*d.* and 2*s.*, which he had purchased from William fitz Reginald. For this the Canons of Wombridge received him into their fraternity and into participation of all benefits of their House for ever. Witnesses, Sir Odo de Hodnet, Sir John fitz Hugh, Sir John de Ercalew.

By another Deed, probably of the same date, the same James gives to the Priory the virgate itself which he had bought from William son of Reginald de Halis. Witnesses (in addition to the last), John fitz Aer, Master John de Cherleton, John de Appeleg, John de Stevinton, &c.

<sup>1</sup> This and the Deeds which follow are from the Wombridge Chartulary, Tit. Tibbriton.

It would seem that Reginald de Hales's original right to enfeof William de Meston and Adam Garlec was subject to some after-question. However William de Morton (Meston) and Adam Garlec gave respectively 3 merks and one merk for quitclaims to one *nocate* and one-third of *half a virgate* in Tibberton which they had respectively purchased from Reginald de Haylis. These Quitclaims bear date at Wellington on Nov. 8, 1293. The *Quitclaimants* are Richard de Trilwardyn, John de Buldewas, and Richard son of Thomas de Horton. Their Deeds are attested by Michael de Morton, William de Kaynton, William Rondolf of Newport, and William de Pixley.

William de Meston's tenure of  $\frac{1}{3}$  virgate descended to William Mille, who on August 1, 1383, gave it to Sir Henry Moday, Vicar of Leighton, subject to the Wombridge rent of 5s. 4d. On August 27, 1383, Henry Moday transferred the same, liable to the said rent, to Sir Bartholomew de Grenhull, Chaplain.

Adam Garlec's tenure of  $\frac{1}{3}$  virgate descended to Richard Garlec, who on October 21, 1383, gave it to Sir Bartholomew de Grenhull, Chaplain, subject to the Wombridge rent of 2s.

Thus, on the whole, Wombridge Priory had the Seignury, or 7s. 4d. rent from a virgate in Tibberton, of which Bartholomew de Grenhull became the sole tenant.

In the Valor of 1534-5 the Wombridge receipts from Tibberton are classed with those from Cherrington and Sherlow, as will appear elsewhere.

It would have interfered with the sequence of the above Deeds to have quoted in order of date a Fine of Trinity Term 1283, whereby Robert de Tibberton enfeoffs Richard Byde in a messuage and half-virgate in Tibberton, for an annual rent of 15d.

TIBBERTON CHAPEL. Parochially Tibberton was a member of Edgmond, and so its Chapel was a mere dependency of Edgmond Church. The antiquity of this Chapel was however considerable, for I take it that Drio, Priest of Tibberton, who attests a Deed between 1175 and 1180, was Chaplain here. There is no mention of this Chapel or its Curates either in the early Diocesan Registers or the Ecclesiastical Surveys.

---

## Sutton.

---

THIS Manor was held by Roger de Curcelle and is thus described in *Domesday*.—"Roger de Curcelle holds Sudtone of Earl Roger. The Countess Godeva held it (in Saxon times). Here are IIII hides, geldable. In demesne there is one ox-team; and 11 Neat-herds & 1x Boors with 1 Radman have two teams; and still there might be IIII teams more here. Here is a Mill, rendering 8 measures of corn. The (annual) value (of the Manor) was and is 25s."<sup>1</sup>

The ancient division of the Hundreds of Recordine and Odenet was, in this instance, the River Tern. Thus Sutton, though it was parochially a member of Market Drayton, was not, like Market Drayton, in Odenet Hundred, but in Recordine. The Mill noticed in *Domesday* was probably on the Tern, a little North-East of Buntingsdale.

Opposite to Sutton and North of the Tern was the Manor of Little Drayton, also held by the Countess Godiva in Saxon times. It was perhaps with reference to Little Drayton that *Sutton* or *South town* was so called.

It is necessary to mark these particulars: for the once important Manor of Sutton could hardly otherwise be identified with the modern Township. The probable reason of its changed importance is to be found in the fact of Roger de Corcelle's Manors passing to Pantulf of Wem. These Barons were Seigneurial Lords of Market Drayton and were occasionally resident at their adjacent Manor of Tirley, where they had a Castle. Sutton seems gradually to have lost its distinct status as a Manor, and its four *Domesday* hides to have been nearly absorbed by adjacent Manors. That which was recognized as Sutton in 1284-5, was probably but a section of the original territory. Whatever its extent, we have seen that it was part of the great feoffment which Peter de Eyton then held under the Barons of Wem.<sup>2</sup> Of Sutton in any later or more distinct relation, I cannot say a word.

### BUNTINGSDALE.

This was originally a member of Sutton, but owing to the dis-

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 256, a, 2.

|    <sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 33.

ruption of that Manor, it grew into a Manor of itself, held immediately under the Barons of Wem by Knight's service.

Philip de Buntanesdene sat as a Juror on that Inquisition of 1220 which has been noticed under Dodicote.<sup>1</sup> Alan de Buntanesdale occurs on a Chetwynd Inquest in April 1281. The Bradford Tenure-Roll of 1285 mentions Buntansdale as a member of the Barony of Wem. The said Alan held it by knight's service, viz. by service of half a knight's-fee.

Thomas de Buntansdale occurs as a Juror in an Inquest of 1300.

#### CLIFF GRANGE.

This member of Sutton was anciently called Clive. Under that name it was given by Ivo Pantulf and his son, Brice, to Combermere Abbey,<sup>2</sup> and in the time of Henry II. Other particulars, involved in the grant, will appear under Wem.

About the year 1235 the Monks of Combermere increased their estate here by purchasing from Yvo Meverel, a Tenant of the Pantulfs, all the land which the said Yvo had between Clive and Sutton. The Monks gave in exchange to Yvo Meverel, half a virgate which they had at Longford, near Moreton Say. The Deed of exchange shall be fully set forth under Longford.

On October 6, 1242, Simon Abbot of Combermere having apparently impleaded Ralph le Butiler and his wife Matilda (Baroness of Wem) for warranty of the "Manor of Clyve," a Fine was levied at Westminster, whereby Ralph and Matilda conceded the Abbot's demand, and were made participators in the *benefits* of his House for ever. The Abbot was to be responsible for all royal services due on the land.

John de Clive, who occurs about 1270, was perhaps a Tenant here under the Abbot of Combermere. The estate remained with the Abbey till its Dissolution; but the Valor of 1535 seems to include it with Chesthill or Ternhill.

---

## Waters Upton, or Upton Parva.

THIS Manor is described in *Domesday* as follows.—

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 16.

| <sup>2</sup> *Monasticon*, Vol. V. p. 324.

"The same Roger (de Laci) holds Uptone (of the Earl), and Seuuard holds it of him. Gamel held it (in Saxon times). Here are III hides. In demesne are II ox-teams, and (there are) IIII Neat-herds, IIII Villains, I Boor and I Radman with II Teams, and there might be II other teams. Here is a Mill of 12*s.* 1*d.* (annual value). In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 40*s.* 4*d.* (*per annum*), and afterwards it was waste. Now it is worth 30*s.* 2½*d.*"<sup>1</sup>

My reason for treating here of the Recordin Manors which were held by Roger de Laci is because this one was subsequently annexed to the Barony of Pantulf. Conversely, we have seen that two of Pantulf's Manors in South Shropshire (Middleton Higford and Upper Ledwich) fell to the fief of De Laci.<sup>2</sup> I am far however from thinking that there was any direct exchange between Pantulf and De Laci, or that Pantulf's gain of the seignery of Waters Upton was cotemporary with his surrender of certain Manors in South Shropshire. It must be remembered, according to what has been said under Ludlow, that, for a great part of the interval between 1108 and 1155, De Laci's Barony was an Escheat, and that Henry II.'s Charter to Hugh De Laci does not give or restore Upton Parva. Again it must be remembered how, during the later years of Henry I., Pagan fitz John seems to have had the dominant interest in Laci's Fief. Now we are told that Pagan fitz John gave "Uptune" to Gilbert de Conedoure, in consideration of the said Gilbert having resigned some Prebendal lands to St. Alkmund's, of which lands Pagan fitz John had since obtained reversionary possession.<sup>3</sup> It is very probable, all things considered, that Upton Parva was the Manor here spoken of, for it adjoined Tibberton, which we know to have belonged to Gilbert de Conedoure, or at least to his son after him. If so, Pagan fitz John was Seigneurial Lord of Upton Parva at the close of Henry I.'s reign, and Gilbert de Conedovre was his Tenant. That Seuuard, the *Domesday* Tenant, should have ceased to be represented at Upton is far from surprising. Seuuard was probably a Saxon, or rather one of those Freeholders of the Præ-Norman æra, whose few *Domesday* estates are never to be traced to their heirs.

How Pantulf obtained the Seignery of Upton Parva, or how all probable descendants of Gilbert de Conedoure disappeared from the tenancy, I will not surmise. The first fact is certain, viz. that Pantulf did obtain the Seignery; the last fact is rendered probable by

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 256, b, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. V. pp. 84, 85.

<sup>3</sup> *Monasticon*, VII. 750, Num. XVI.

Vide *supra*, p. 47.

analogy; for Gilbert de Conedoure's heirs disappeared also from Tibberton; and Pantulf enfeoffed a relation of his own there.

This brings us to the inquiry as to who became Pantulf's Feoffee at Upton Parva?

WALTER FITZ JOHN, whom we have seen following Ivo Pantulf, then Baron of Wem, in the testing clause of a Charter,<sup>1</sup> was I believe the individual in question. I further believe that it was he who gave to this place its distinctive name of *Walter's Upton*, now corrupted into Waters Upton. The Deed alluded to passed about 1155-58, but, as I have said under Great Lyth,<sup>2</sup> Walter fitz John was living in October 1200 and deceased in April 1201. By his wife Richildis, who predeceased him, Walter fitz John obtained an estate at Whittingslow, of which more shall be said hereafter. He left two children, Matilda wife of Herbert fitz Alan, *alias* Herbert de Abacun, and a son and heir,—

WILLIAM FITZ WALTER, who occurs in 1200, 1201, and 1203, in various relations,<sup>3</sup> but not in connection with Upton. In the last year he appears as a Knight. The Pipe-Roll of 1207 records an amercement of half a merk against William fitz Walter. I think that he was deceased in 1223, and that the following grant to Haughmond Abbey was made late in his life. As William son of Walter de Uptone he gave to that House a certain meadow in Uptone, called *Longeie*, bounded in one direction by a meadow belonging to Uptone Chapel. He also gave tithe of all tolls taken in his Mill of Uptone. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodenet, William de Ercalew, Hugh Forester (of Bolas probably), Reginald de Tirne, Ralph son of Hugh de Seynton; Walter, Philip, and Nicholas, the Grantor's sons, &c.<sup>4</sup>

WALTER DE UPTON, son and heir of William fitz Walter, occurs as a Witness as early as 1223. His position in 1226-7 has been noticed under Great Lyth and under Pulverbach.<sup>5</sup> The Pipe-Roll of 1231 records an amercement of 5 merks against him for hunting without license in the Forest. I suppose it to have been him who, as *Walter de Hupiton*, is recorded to have given a meadow of his demesne, called Eilmersheia, to Wombridge Priory.<sup>6</sup> The *Feodary* of 1240 enters Walter de Hopton or Upton as holding a knight's-fee in Hopton or Upton, of the Barons of Wem.<sup>7</sup> The interest of the family at Whittingslow would seem to have gone to his younger

<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vols. VII. p. 275; VI. p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. VI. pp. 93, 241; Vol. III. p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> Harl. MS. 446. Quatern. XII. fo. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. pp. 23, 195-6.

<sup>6</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 389.

<sup>7</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 45, 48.

brother, for a cotemporary Tenant-Roll give Nicholas de Opton and his Coparceners as holding half a fee under Cantilupe in that Manor.<sup>1</sup> It is evident, I think, that—

NICHOLAS DE UPTON, Walter's brother I presume, succeeded him about this time at Waters Upton. Calling himself "Nycholas de Upton juxta Crugelton, he concedes to Haghmon Abbey, Longeye meadow, which William son of Walter de Upton had before given. He adds a piece of ground, five feet in width, between the said meadow and his own land, to enable the Canons to make a boundary ditch. Witnesses, Sir William de Hedleg, Hugh fitz Robert, Madoc de Sutton, William de Tirne, Reginald de Tirne, William Wiscard, William Crasset of Halecton (Haughton)."<sup>2</sup>

Nicholas de Upton was also a benefactor to Shrewsbury Abbey. For the souls' health of himself and his wife he bequeaths together with his body to that House, an annual rent of 5*s.*, receivable from Robert son of the Parson of Bolas and his heirs;—the said rent to be applied to the use of the Convent kitchen. He further bequeaths 3 acres of his own demesne and the right of patronage of his Chapel of Upton. Witnesses, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Sir William de Erkelowe, Ralph de Crugelton, and John de Salop, Clerks.<sup>3</sup>

It is certain that the above Deeds passed between 1240 and 1248, in which interval we therefore conclude Nicholas de Upton to have died.<sup>4</sup> I cannot tell in what way Waters Upton now went to Coparceners, for it would appear that persons of the name of Upton succeeded to Nicholas de Upton at Whittingslow. The following Deeds, if I am right in dating them about 1250, show who Nicholas de Upton's immediate successors were at Waters Upton.—

1. Reginald de Hupton son of Reginald de Tyrne and William de Tyrne son of William de Tyrne confirm and ratify to Shrewsbury Abbey the donation and concession which Nicholas, formerly Lord of Hupton, had made, viz. the Advowson of Hupton Chapel in the Parish of Erkelowe, with 3 acres of land in Hupton and 5*s.* annual rent. Witnesses, Sir William de Erkelowe, knight; Reginald de Tyrne; Richard de Tyrne.<sup>5</sup>

2. Reginald son of Reginald de Tyrne gives three acres in the vill of Uptone to the same Abbey. Witnesses,—as the last, except

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 46, a.

<sup>2</sup> Harl. MS. (ut supra), fo. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 121.

<sup>4</sup> There is a Writ of August 18, 1245, showing that a Nicholas de Upton was then dead, his chattels being forfeited

to the Crown, and he leaving a widow, Juliana. (*Rot. Fin.* I. 442.) This affair seems to have belonged to Worcester-shire. Possibly the names and dates have no other relation than accidental coincidence.

<sup>5</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 118.

that Sir William de Erkelowe is here called Sir William de Hedley.<sup>1</sup>

3. William son of William de Tyrne makes a like grant in Tirne.—Same witnesses.<sup>2</sup>

In the above Reginald fitz Reginald and William fitz William we have clearly two Coparceners in Upton. They were probably Cousins and had married two Sisters, in whose right one at least of them was thus seized of property before his father's death.<sup>3</sup>

It is clear that some one of the documents which should enable us to trace the mode of this Coparcenery is erroneous. I suspect it to be the Hundred-Roll of 1255, which instead of *Reginald fitz Reginald* gives *William fitz Reginald* as a Coparcener in Upton. I think that Reginald fitz Reginald was living 16 years afterwards, and that *William fitz Reginald* was a fictitious personage.

The said Hundred-Roll says that Ralph le Botiler did suit to both County and Hundred, through his Seneschal, for the whole of his Barony except Upton and Eiton. It is further stated with regard to *Hopton* (i.e. Upton) that, "*William fitz Reginald* held one moiety of the Manor and William de Tirne the other moiety. They held it by service of one Knight at Wem, for 40 days, at their own cost in time of war." The wonted Suit of the Manor to County and Hundred was deemed to be worth *2s. per annum*; but it had been withdrawn 9 years before;<sup>4</sup> that is, I think, soon after Nicholas de Upton's death.

There was a William de Upton, Juror on a Rodington Inquest in 1274, and on a Withington Inquest in 1283. That he was the second of the Coparceners named in 1255 seems certain. In a Fine of July 1283 he is, I think, the person called William de Tyrne of Opton, whose wife, here called Agatha, was evidently a Coheiress, and had brought him some property at Eaton-upon-Tern. Before this, William de Tytnele had obtained ingress into the Manor of Upton; for, by a Fine of November 1272, Thomas de Honton, having claimed, under a Writ of *mort d'ancestre*, a messuage, a virgate, and *3s.* rent, in *Upton Water*, against William de Tytnele (Tenant thereof), renounced his said claim for 7 merks. The Bradford Tenure-Roll (*circa* 1285) gives Upton as a member of the Barony of Wem, and William Tyteley as holding the same by service of one knight's-fee.

<sup>1, 2</sup> Salop Chartulary, Nos. 120, 122.

<sup>3</sup> An Inquest of 1249 was attended by Reginald de Tirne, William de Tirne, and

Reginald de Upton. The third was obviously son of the first.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 58.

I have spoken of William de Titley already, under Corselle. He accounts as Sheriff of Shropshire for the year ending Michaelmas 1290, and thenceforward till about Midsummer 1295, when, he being dead, his son, Thomas, takes up the current year's account as his heir.<sup>1</sup>

Whatever it was, whether mesne-estate, or fee-simple, or both, which William de Titley had obtained in Upton, it is clear from the Assize-Roll of 1292, that the previous Coparceners were still represented there. The Jurors of Bradford Hundred stated how King Henry III. had sometime been seized of *2s. per annum* for the *stretward* and *motfee* of the vill of *Upton Water*;—how the said due had been withdrawn;—and how the present tenants of the Vill were profiting by the withdrawal. The said tenants were William de Upton and Agnes his wife, Richard de Upton and Dionysia his wife, and Adam de Upton and Emma his wife.

These persons, not appearing, were summoned to be at Lichfield on January 27, 1293. How these Coparceners of 1292 represented those of 1255, it is difficult to say. I suspect that Richard de Upton had been all along a coparcener in right of his wife Dionysia, and that he was the person who attests the Deeds of 1250, and who occurs in 1271, as Richard de Tyrne. I further think that William de Upton was identical with "William de Tyrne son of William de Tyrne" of 1250, with "William de Tirne" of 1255, and with "William de Tyrne of Opton" of 1283. His wife Agnes too, who is so called in 1256 and 1292, must be identical with her who is called Agatha in 1283.

The third Coheiress, Emma, I take to have been wife of Reginald fitz Reginald from 1250 to 1271, secondly of William Bolace of Eaton in 1283, and thirdly of Adam de Upton in 1292.

Some facts justifying at least a part of these surmises will appear under Eaton and under Tern.

I may name among Undertenants of this Manor, or perhaps cadets of the family of Upton, the following.—

Peter de Upton attests a Pulverbach Deed about 1190.<sup>2</sup> Another Peter de Upton sat on a Lee-Cumbray Inquest in 1249,<sup>3</sup> and on an Inquest as to the value of Bradford Hundred in 1264.

#### THE CHURCH.

The Church of Waters Upton was originally a Chapel, founded

<sup>1</sup> *Sheriffs of Shropshire*, pp. 8, 9 (corrected from the Pipe-Rolls).

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. p. 190.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 343.

in the Saxon Parish of High Ercall, and founded probably by the Lacies while yet they had the seignury of the Manor. Under no other supposition can I account for this Church being subject to a Pension to the Priory of St. Guthlac at Hereford. This association of ideas has already been explained.<sup>1</sup>

We have had mention of this Chapel about 1220, and have seen its Advowson given to Shrewsbury Abbey about 1245. The Abbey, be it observed, had already the patronage of the Mother Church at High Ercall.

The Church-Taxation of 1291 does not value this Chapel at all, but gives St. Guthlac's Pension of 2*s.* as receivable therefrom.<sup>2</sup> In 1341 the Chapelry of Upton Parva was assessed at 16*s.* to the *Ninth*. There had been a murrain among the sheep and a failure of corn-crops.<sup>3</sup>

In the *Valor* of 1534-5 the Preferment of Roger Henson, Rector of Upton Parva, is put at £4, chargeable with 2*s.* for procurations and 10½*d.* for synodals.<sup>4</sup> It is remarkable that this Church should have been reputed as in the Deanery of Newport, whilst the Mother-Church of High Ercall was in the Deanery of Shrewsbury. This is a strong argument against the antiquity of the Ruri-decanal divisions of the Diocese, an argument which I shall be able to strengthen by other considerations in future chapters.

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

PETER, Parson of Upton, was found dead in his bed, as reported by the Bradford Jurors at the Assizes of 1256. He had been buried without *View* of the Coroner, an omission for which the Villis of Upton, Crudgington, Rowton, and Cold-Hatton were answerable.

JOHN LE ENFAUNT, being dead on January 27, 1310,—

MASTER JOHN DE BRUNESHOPPE was instituted to Opton at presentation of the Abbot and Convent of Salop;—who likewise presented in the following instances.—

SIR ROBERT RIDEL resigning the *Curative Chapel* of Upton Parva, on June 29, 1318,—

SIR JOHN DE HATTON, Chaplain, was admitted on July 14 following. He is probably that "John, Parson of Upton Waters," who occurs in 1345-6 as having been disseized of a considerable estate in High-Hatton.

SIR JOHN DE HODYNET, Rector, dying on April 23, 1350,—

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 245, a.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 187.

WILLIAM DE WALSCHE, Chaplain, was admitted on May 11, following. He died in 1382, when, on June 27,—

JOHN SON OF THOMAS GECH, having the first tonsure, was instituted to this *Free Chapel*. He died in 1387, when on May 23,—

WILLIAM DE RODENHURST, Priest, was admitted. He resigned in 1389, and, on July 3 of that year,

NICHOLAS DE PESHALE was instituted.

THOMAS HARLYNG, being Rector of Upton Parva, died in 1423.

## Stoke upon Tern.

"THE same Roger (de Laci) holds Stocche (of the Earl). Edmund held it (in Saxon times). Here are vii hides. In demesne there are iiii ox-teams and vi Serfs and iiii Female Serfs. There are a Church, a Priest, xi Villains, iiii Radmans, and i Frenchman, with x teams, amongst them all; and yet there might be iiii additional teams. Here is a Mill of 12s. (annual value), and a third part of one league of wood. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth £6 (*per annum*). Afterwards it was waste. Now it is worth £7."<sup>1</sup>

The large value thus assigned by *Domesday* to Roger de Lacy's great Manor of Stoke, included, as we are elsewhere told, his receipts from *Hotune*, a Berewick of half a hide in Odenet Hundred, and his receipts from half a hide in Little Withyford.

I have said much under Stokesay, of that family of Say which was so largely enfeoffed in the Shropshire Manors of De Lacy.<sup>2</sup>—

THEODORIC DE SAY, the first of this family, was Lacy's Tenant at Stoke upon Tern. This we know from his having made a grant to Shrewsbury Abbey of land in this Manor and from the terms in which that grant was confirmed by King Henry I. in 1121.<sup>3</sup> The said Confirmation having described Hamo Peverel's grant of Woolerton to the Abbey proceeds as follows.—"Theodoric de Sai gave certain land in his Manor of *Stoca*, near to the same vill (*i. e.* Woolerton), but on the other side of the River. He gave it out of

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 256, b, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. V. p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Salop Chartulary*, No. 35. The Confirmations of Henry II. and Henry III.

describe the situation of Theodoric de Say's grant in Stoke as in *Burhulld*. The latter name is now lost, but it will recur to our notice under Chesthill.

his demesne, free and quit of all geld and other customs." The River here alluded to was The Tern, the land given was the estate now known as Stoke Grange, and the date of Theodoric's gift, like that of Hamo Peverel, was between 1108 and 1121.

It seems to have been Theodoric de Say who is mentioned only by his Christian name in another affair of Shrewsbury Abbey. The Abbey had demised to one Elieth a hide of land, probably at Woolerton or Stoke. On Elieth's death, his son Rainald surrendered this land to Abbot Godfrey, so frankly and entirely that the Abbot gave him £10. 10s. in the presence of many witnesses, to wit, in the presence of his (Rainald's) Lord, Theodoric, by whose good offices the above agreement had been brought about;—also of Hamo Peverel and Warin his Sewer, of William, a knight of the aforesaid Theodoric, of William Cook, and of Meriet, and Weret, servants of the Abbot.<sup>1</sup> The date of this transaction was probably between 1121 and 1127, and it is the last authentic notice which I can adduce of Theodoric de Say. He has been erroneously represented as successor of Picot de Say, Baron of Clun (with whom he had nothing to do hereditarily), as also a Grantor of land in Stokesay to Salop Abbey (whereas his grant to that House was in Stoke upon Tern), and further as Ancestor of the SAYS of Richards Castle<sup>2</sup> (of which there is no existing evidence and no probability). Theodoric was in fact only a Tenant under De Lacy, though a very considerable one.

HELIAS DE SAY (I.) (probably son and successor of Theodoric) occurs, as we have seen under Stokesay, from 1138 to 1165, when Stoke upon Tern undoubtedly constituted a part of the knight's-fees which the said Helias held under Hugh de Lacy. Before the year 1172 Elyas de Say with consent of Hugh his son gave half a hide in *Hoppton* to Haughmond Abbey, and was otherwise a benefactor to that House. The grant in Hoppton is certified in Pope Alexander's Bull of 1172. The place alluded to was Hopton near Hodnet, and the land given was undoubtedly that same half-hide which *Domesday* had described, under the name of *Hotune*, as a Berewick of Stoke upon Tern.

HUGH DE SAY, son and heir of Helias, occurs from 1174 to 1194. The Shropshire Pipe-Roll of 1176 records against him an amercement of 5 merks, because one, for whose appearance he was bail, was not forthcoming. In November 1194 Hugh de Say's name appears on the Essoign-Rolls in a significant way. He had, it seems,

<sup>1</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Dugdale's Baronage*, I. 453.

a dispute about some woodland with Fulk *de Ori* or *de Aili*. The dispute was evidently with his neighbour, Fulk d'Oiri of Childs Er-call. William French and William fitz Simon were Attorneys in the Suit.<sup>1</sup>

HELIAS DE SAY (II.), son and heir of Hugh de Say by his wife Olympias, occurs from about 1195 till 1216 or after. The Fine, whereby he settled the dower of his mother, bears date on September 26, 1199. Olympias first renounces all her claim in Sudstok (Stokesay), Nordstok (Stoke upon Tern), Morton (Moreton Say), and other estates of her late husband. Helias in return commits to his mother, the whole Manor of Nordestok,—to hold of him and his heirs by the free service of 2s., in lieu of all, except forinsec, services, and in the name of dower. Two-thirds of the Bosc called *La Haie* are reserved by Helias; but Olympias and her men were to have easements in the whole of that Bosc. Also Olympias was to have a full third part of the Bosc of Morton and of the pannage receivable from both Boscs. Helias de Say died about the year 1222. Calling himself "son of Hugh de Say," with the consent of his heirs he grants to Haughmond Abbey together with his body, for the souls' health of himself, his wife Avice, and all his relations, a rent of one merk receivable yearly at Michaelmas, viz. 12s. 4d. from the land of Blecheslee, held by William fitz Nicholas of Blecheslee, and 12d. from land which Hugh de Stuche held. Witnesses, Laurence and Walter, Priests of Stoke; Robert de Say; Master Philip, Physician; Baldwin de Hodnet and Odo his son; Robert de Hespeler (Espley); William, Clerk of Hodnet; William fitz Denis, and many others.<sup>2</sup>

Another form of this Deed is attested by five of the same witnesses differently arranged and described, viz. by Master Philip, Parson of Madelee; (William Griffin;) Walter, Chaplain of Stoke; Robert the Parson, brother of the Grantor; William fitz Denis; and William Clerk of Hodnet.<sup>3</sup>

I have given under Stokesay an extract from Helias de Say's Will, translated. I here give the original extract<sup>4</sup> as written in a coeval hand, and with all its peculiarities of expression.—

*Hoc est testamentum Elye de Say de Stoke. Inprimis Deo animam suam, et corpus suum Ecclesie de Hagemon, et cum corpore suo*

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Cur. Regis*, pp. 122, 123.

<sup>2</sup> The Original of this Deed is among the Muniments of Richard Corbet, Esq., of Adderley. The seal is of green wax, with the effigy of a knight on horseback,

armed with a shield and drawn sword. The Legend is SIGILLUM HELIE DE SAY.

<sup>3</sup> The Original (*ibidem*), similarly sealed, but with white wax.

<sup>4</sup> The Original, at Adderley.

*1 marcam per annum, scilicet XII sol. et IIII d. de W. filio Nicholai de Blechelee et XII d. de terrâ Hugonis de Stuche, et VI boves de Suthstoke et 1 equum, et apud Northstoke x summas de segle in terrâ, et x summas avene in horeo de Suthstoke.*

ROBERT DE SAY, brother and heir of Helias, was not, what the above Charters seem to imply, and what I have inadvertently<sup>1</sup> stated him to have been,—a Clerk in Holy Orders. Helias de Say (II.) left two brothers named Robert, one a Clerk, the other a knight, and his heir. It was the knight who as “Robert de Say” confirmed to Haughmond the donation which Helyas de Say his brother made of a merk rent in Norstoke, with his body. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet; Stephen his brother; Vivian de Roshall; Thomas his son; William de Herchalew; Stephen de Pimbel; Philip de Penintun, &c.<sup>2</sup>

This confirmation, being of date about 1224, is followed by a Patent of August 29, 1228, when it appears that the Abbot of Combermere was suing Robert de Say for common-pasture in Stoke.

WALTER DE SAY, brother and heir of Robert, was succeeded, as I have before shown, by his nephew, Hugh. The Fine by which, in 1250, Walter entailed the two Stokes on Hugh, has also been given,<sup>3</sup> but there is an indorsement to that Fine, stating that Odo de Hodenet *opposed* his claim in regard of 62 acres of land and the Advowson of North-Stoke; and that Hugh de Pecchesey, Rees, and Egelina de Kungûnde similarly *opposed* their claim. With respect to Hugh de Say and his alienation of Stoke upon Tern to John de Verdon, the Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 speaks thus.—“Stoke with its appurtenances is four hides, and pays 16*d. stretward*, and 16*d. motfee*. John Verdon, Lord of the Vill, holds Stok by exchange (with) Hugh de Say in Ireland; and it is one knight's fee, of the Fee of Ludlow; and it provides one knight, with his charges, in time of war at Shrawardine Castle. And in the same Fee, Hugh de Heton provides one horseman for 40 days at Shrawardine Castle, at his own charges. And Stoke is geldable and Heton (Eaton upon Tern) is geldable; and they perform due suit to County and Hundred.”<sup>4</sup> There is much to be explained here.—The service to the once Royal Castle of Shrawardine must have been laid upon Stoke during the forfeiture of De Lacy in the

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. V. p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> The Original at Adderley. This Deed is sealed with a Seal of green wax, smaller and better executed than that of Helias de Say (II.). The Seal is charged with

the usual device of the period,—a knight on horseback, armed with a square helmet, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. V. p. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Rot. Hundred. II. 55, 56.

reigns of Henry I. and Stephen. Again, when Stoke is said to be "of the Fee of Ludlow," nothing more is meant than that it was a member of the Barony heretofore held by Lacy of Ludlow. John de Verdon was a Coheir of that Barony and already Seigneurial Lord of Stoke, when he purchased the Tenant-interest of Hugh de Say by an equivalent of lands in Ireland. The falling-off from seven hides (the *Domesday* contents of Stoke) to four hides, I cannot explain. Perhaps the early conveyance of Stoke Grange to Shrewsbury Abbey may account for part of the discrepancy.

The Inquest held on Nov. 7, 1274, on the death of John de Verdon, was, as I have explained, held at Stoke upon Tern, though the Manor is described as *Stokesay*.<sup>1</sup> John de Verdon's interest in the capital Manor was only £6. 12*s.* *per annum*, arising from 2 carucates of land, a messuage and curtilage, a Mill and diverse rents. The Advowson of the Church, worth 30 merks *per annum* to its Incumbent, was his also.<sup>2</sup>

The Feodaries of 1284-5 give a full list of the members of Stoke upon Tern,—called in one instance *Stoke-Say*, in the other *Stoke-Lacy*. The members were Allerton (now Ollerton), Eton, Wystaneswyk, Stoke-Aubry, Wodehus, Heselschawe (Helshaw), Pechesay (now Petsey), Morton Say, Stuche (Stych), Blecheley, Aldcley, Oldefeld, Hull, Waranshall, and Parrok (now Park).<sup>3</sup> Theobald de Verdon held the whole, of the King *in capite*, as a member of his Barony of Ludlow. At the Assizes of 1292 Theobald de Verdon's exercise of Free-Warren in Stok was noticed by the Bradford Jurors.

THEOBALD DE VERDON (I.) died at his Castle of Alveton on Sunday, August 24, 1309; and was buried at Croxden Abbey on Oct. 12, following. His eldest son John had died in Ireland, without issue, on June 13, 1297.

THEOBALD DE VERDON (II.), who now succeeded to his Father, had been knighted by King Edward on June 24, 1298, in which year he came into England from Ireland. On July 29, 1302, he had been married at Wigmore to Matilda daughter of Edmund, Lord Mortimer.

In the *Nomina Villarum* of March 1316, Theobald de Verdon stands as Lord of *Stoke super Tyrne*. For the short but brilliant

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. V. p. 35, note 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquisitions*, 2 Edw. I., No. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Of these, Moreton Say, Stych, Bletchley, Audley Brow, Oldfields, and Waranshall were not original members of Stoke,

but constituted the *Domesday* Manor of Moreton. It is easy to see how Moreton and Stoke came to be thus rearranged. Both were De Lacy's, and both were held under De Lacy by De Say.

career of this great man I refer elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> Having served as Chief Justice and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he died at Alveton Castle on July 27, 1316, and was buried at Croxden Abbey on Sept. 19 following. The Inquest on his death values the Manor of Stoke upon Tern, at £9. 15s. 10d. *per annum*, out of which 13s. 4d. was payable to the Abbot of Haghmon and 5s. to the Parson of the Church of Stoke;—leaving a net value of £8. 17s. 6d.<sup>2</sup>

In the division of the Verdon estates, Stoke upon Tern fell to Elizabeth, second daughter of Theobald de Verdon (II.), by Matilda de Mortimer his first wife. The said Elizabeth was only ten years of age at the time of her Father's death. Hence an Escheator's Roll of 19 Edw. II. (1325-6) gives Stok super Tyrn as *in manu Regis*. But in 1328 it was allotted to the aforesaid Elizabeth, then the wife of Bartholomew de Burghersh. In 1329 the said Bartholomew had a grant of Free Warren in all his demesne lands here. However there must have been subsequently a redistribution of the Verdon estates or else an exchange among the Coheirs, for Stoke upon Tern is found soon afterwards in possession of Henry Lord Ferrers of Groby, who died seized thereof in 1343. This Henry Lord Ferrers had married Isabel fourth daughter and co-heir of Theobald de Verdon (II.). The said Isabel's mother was Elizabeth, daughter of Gilbert de Clare Earl of Gloucester (by the Princess Joan of Acres), and widow of Richard de Burgh, Earl of Ulster. Elizabeth de Clare had become the second wife of Theobald de Verdon in February 1316, and the above Isabel, his posthumous daughter, seems to have been born on March 21, 1317. With the descendants of Henry Lord Ferrers and the said Isabel, I must now leave the Seignury of the Manor of Stoke.

THE ONLY UNDERTENANT whom I shall name here, as associated with the central Manor, was Elyas de Stoke who occurs on various Jury-lists and Testing-clauses from 1253 to 1274. At the Assizes of 1256 he was a Juror for Bradford Hundred, and shortly before the year 1264 he was Bailiff of the said Hundred, ferming it under the Sheriff for a rent of 15 merks *per annum*, whilst he is said to have realized only 8 merks himself.<sup>3</sup> He married, about the year 1263, Petronilla widow of Roger de Leaton.<sup>4</sup> He was succeeded by a son, Robert.

#### EATON UPON TERN.

This member of the *Domesday* Manor of Stoke lies more than

<sup>1</sup> *Dugdale's Baronage*, I. 474.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquis.* 10 Edw. II., No. 71.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquis.* 48 Hen. III., No. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 106.

three miles south of the central Manor. The earliest Feoffee here, of whom I have any note, was William, apparently a younger son of the first Peter de Eyton of Eyton. In addition to what I have said of this William under Eyton, I here give an abstract of the Deed which connects him at once with Eaton upon Tern, and which must have passed about 1223.—“*Sciant presentes, &c. ego Willielmus filius Petri de Eton dedi, &c. Galfrido Griffin pro homagio, &c. totum pratum meum et terram, et totam moram meam quæ vocatur Sperleyhe super ripam de Tyrne, &c. Habendum, &c. Reddendo unum par albarum cirotecharum, &c. Hiis testibus, Hugone filio Roberti, Baldwino de Hodenet, Willielmo de Hedley, Willielmo de Stanton, Roberto de Day (probably Say), Waltero de Upton, Radulfo de Tyrne, Reginaldo fratre ejus, Roberto de Kamyton (probably Kaynton), Nicolao clerico et multis aliis.*”<sup>1</sup>

Geoffrey Griffin, the Grantee in the above Deed, had a considerable interest in the neighbouring Manor of Cherrington, which interest he bestowed upon Wombridge Priory with other benefactions. Among the items thus granted was the “meadow which he had from William de Eton.” I find this *William de Eyton*, with his name so written, attesting a Wombridge Deed which must have passed before 1224. In August 1226, as William de Eton, he appears as Surety for one Syward de Wythiford. At the same Assizes William Hodinet was adjudged to pay 5*s.* damages for having unjustly disseised William de Ethon of a free tenement in Ethon.<sup>2</sup> William de Hodnet, I should observe, was at this time Guardian of his infant nephew, Odo son of Baldwin de Hodnet.<sup>3</sup> We have several subsequent hints of a Tenant-interest possessed by the Hodnets in Stoke, so that the above collision with William de Ethon would seem not to be too arbitrarily assigned to the locality now under notice. The Pipe-Roll of 1231 exhibits Hamo de Etun-juxta-Boelwas as amerced 4*s.* for some default. I must leave it a question whether the William de Eton who occurs so frequently as a Juror or Witness between the years 1242 and 1249 was of Eaton upon Tern. I incline to think that William, Lord of Eyton, nephew of William de Eaton, was the person who thus appears. My reason is this. A Bolas Inquest and a Lee Cumbray Inquest, both taken in the year 1249, were attended, the first by William de Etun as Juror, the last by Hugh de Eyton. We are sure that Hugh de Eyton was son and heir of William de Eaton, and Lord

<sup>1</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tt.* Eton |  
super Tirne, No. iij.

<sup>2</sup> *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 103.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 66.

of Eaton upon Tern. His father therefore was probably dead at this time, and his cotemporary Juror must needs have been his Cousin, the Lord of Eyton.

In 1255 we have seen on the clearest evidence that Hugh de Heton was Lord of Eaton upon Tern. His service too for this member of Stoke has been set forth.<sup>1</sup> We have seen him attesting Tibberton Deeds of the same period.<sup>2</sup> At the Assizes of 1256 he was one of the Elizors for Bradford Hundred. In June 1260 he occurs as a Juror in an Inquest at Sheriff Hales. At the Forest Pleas of 1262, as Hugh de Eton, he appears as a Regarder of the Wrekin Forest. The latest-dated mention of his name is in May 1264, when he was second of the Jurors who reported as to the value and previous disposal of the King's Hundred of Bradford.

We are now in a condition to assign the date and to estimate the relevance of the following Deed, it being remembered that Dodicote, the next estate to Eaton, belonged to Combermere Abbey.—“Hugo fitz William, Lord of Eton, gives to the Blessed Mary of Cumbermere and to the Monks thereof, a piece of ground, near their meadow of Plachay, sufficient to dry their hay upon, whenever they should choose to mow the said meadow. He also gives them the free and customary right of road, through his land, for carrying the said hay. Witnesses, Master Robert de Stokes, William Krynerant, Alexander Bosse, Richard Porter, Robert de Blunham.”<sup>3</sup>

This Deed probably passed between 1248 and 1270, but I cannot trace anything further of the Tenant-in-fee at Eaton for some years. I therefore revert for the present to notices of some minor tenancies.

There was a Hugh de Bosco, Juror on a Bolas Inquest in 1249. He was, I believe, of Eaton.

On October 27, 1262, Richard son of Dionysia de Lega and Matilda his wife, acknowledge themselves, by Fine, to have given half a virgate in Eton to John de Whethamsted, who is to hold the same under the Lords of the Fee. For this, which was probably a mere sale, John paid 5½ merks. There is no reason to doubt that a second sale<sup>4</sup> of another parcel of land by the same parties was cotemporary. In this case the purchaser was their own Suzerain.—“Richard de Lega of Eton, with assent of Matilda his wife, sells and concedes to Sir John de Verdon, Lord of Stoke, the whole moiety of a half-virgate in the vill of Eton which Hugh Clerk formerly held; likewise a meadow called Croftmedewe, when a current

<sup>1, 2</sup> Supra, pp. 62, 49.

| <sup>3, 4</sup> Charters at Adderley.

term of 4 years should have expired:—to hold of the Grantor and his wife and their heirs at a rent of one halfpenny. For this John de Verdon paid 2 merks. Witnesses, Robert de Heselsawe (Helshaw), Henry de Pech (Petsey), Elyas de Stoke, Hugh de Eton, William fitz Gilbert of Wistaneswik, &c.”

Between the years 1270 and 1280 Thomas Corbet of Hadley was in receipt of the glove-rent, due to the heirs or assigns of William de Eaton, from the heirs or assigns of Geoffrey Griffin, for that meadow in Eaton which was now held by Wombridge Priory. Thomas Corbet quit-claimed the said rent to Walter Prior of Wombridge, in a Deed attested by Sir John de Ercalew, Sir John fitz Hugh, Robert de Heselwawe (Helshaw), Hugh de Bolinhall, Peter de Eyton, Adam de Preston and Ranulph le Bret. This Deed further gives the Prior facilities for enclosing the said meadow, and carrying the hay thereof through any adjoining land of the Grantor.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious I think that Thomas Corbet of Hadley was at this period Lord of Eaton and representative of William de Eaton and his son Hugh; but whether this position was Thomas Corbet's by purchase or by inheritance, and how he lost it, I cannot say.

By a Fine of November 1272, Robert fitz Mabel and Margery his wife acknowledge themselves to have given a virgate in Etone, to William fitz Robert, who is to hold the same of Robert and Margery and the heirs of Margery by a rose-rent, and by performance of all capital services. For this a sore sparrow-hawk was the ostensible consideration.

I take the above William fitz Robert to be identical with *William fitz Robert of Eyton* who in July 1274 sat upon a Longford Inquest together with John de Bosco of *Eyton*. Who William de Eyton, a higher Juror on the same Inquest, can have been I will not attempt to decide. William fitz Robert of Eton occurs again as a Juror at Hatton Hyneheath in 1300.

By a Fine of May 16, 1283, William Bolace of Eton and Emma his wife, acknowledge themselves to have given two-thirds of half a virgate in Eton to John fitz Adam of Derlaston and his wife Alina;—to hold to John and Alina and the heirs of John, under William and Emma and the heirs of Emma, at a rose-rent and by performance of all capital services. Moreover William and Emma allowed that the remaining third of the above half-virgate, being now held by William Dun as the dower of his wife Margaret, and being of

<sup>1</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tw. Eton super Tirne*, No. ij.

Emma's inheritance, should remain to John and Alina, as part of the present concession. William and Margaret Dun were present and acknowledged their interest to be merely that of dower. For this Fine John and Alina paid 12½ merks.

By another Fine of July 1, 1288, William de Tyrne of Opton and Agatha his wife, acknowledge themselves to have given to Thomas Aleyn of Rode two-thirds of a messuage and half-virgate in *Eton juxta Bolewas*, together with the reversion of another third, now held by William and Margaret Dun (as in the last Fine), and which would ordinarily revert to William and Agatha. A rose-rent to William and Agatha and the heirs of Agatha is reserved, and all capital services.

Emma and Agatha, named in the above Fines, were obviously coheiresses of the deceased first husband of Margaret Dun.<sup>1</sup>

The Feodary of *circa* 1285, enumerates Eton among the members of Stoke, and says further that William de Molventon held it under Theobald de Verdon. From William de Molventon the mesne-lordship passed to William de Heselshawe (Helshaw), who in the Inquest of 1317 is stated to hold half a knight's-fee in Eton, worth £4 *per annum*, and of the estate of Theobald de Verdon (II.), deceased.

OLLERTON. Though this place is often mentioned as a member of Stoke I have very scanty notices of its tenure, and one such notice (presently to be mentioned) seems to associate it with Hopton near Hodnet, or rather with that part of Hopton which was of the Fee of Lacy.

Henry Moryce and Robert Forester of Alverton were reported by the Bradford Jurors as not in due attendance at the Assizes of 1292. I suppose it was Robert Forester's son who occurs about this time as "Elyas son of Robert le Wodeward of Alvertone." To him did William Knotte of Alvertone give six seylions in the fields of Alvertone and half an acre of meadow,—charged with a penny rent to the Lord of the Fee. Witnesses, William de Wistaneswyke, Robert Elye (*i. e.* fitz Elyas) of Stoke, Henry de Pechesey, William Parker (Parcario), and Henry Morisse of Alvertone.<sup>2</sup>

The Inquisition of 1317, just now quoted, states that "the Tenants of Alverton and Hopton held of Theobald de Verdon (de-

<sup>1</sup> I think too that the said first husband of Margaret Dun, whatever was his name, was the person from whom the Co-heirs of Waters Upton derived their title to that Manor (*vide supra*, pp. 55, 56).

<sup>2</sup> Charter at Adderley.—[Hulfurlong, Radelford, Crowmreesamers, Edemorforlong, Le Heweorles, the boundary towards Peppelowe, and Hoverwothale, are localities named in this Deed.]

ceased) half a knight's fee in Alverton and Hopton which was worth 60*s. per annum*." Who the Tenants alluded to were, I cannot say, but conjecture that the cotemporary Lords of Hodnet and the Abbot of Haughmond were meant. We have had several allusions to some tenure of the Hodnets under the Lords of Stoke, and I do not see why Ollerton or Alverton may not be taken to have been part of that tenure.

WOODHOUSE. This member of Stoke adjoined Ollerton. At the Assizes of November 1221, Baldwin de Hodnet and Laurence de Stoke, Chaplain, were found to have disseized William de Dounton and his wife Emma of a tenement in Wudehus. Damages of one merk were given; but the *misericordia* of Laurence was pardoned, on account of his holy office, and on condition of his saying thirty masses for the soul of King John.<sup>1</sup> Isabel de la Wodehouse, reported as failing in attendance at the Assizes of 1292, was apparently of this place.

PARROK, now PARK, was a member of Stoke. Henry del Parrok was a Juror on the Inquest taken in March 1317 as to the Fees of Theobald de Verdon, deceased.

PETSEY. This member of Stoke also gave name to a family which held it. We have had notice above of Hugh de Pecchesey in 1250. Henry de Pechesey occurs in 1256-7, on a local Jury in 1284, and as a witness, later.

HELSHAW. Robert de Helshaw, apparently Verdon's tenant here, occurs on jury Lists and Testing Clauses from 1253 till 1278. The Westminster Plea-Roll of Easter Term 1271 exhibits Walter de Heselshawe as fining one merk *pro licentia concordandi* with Robert de Heselshawe. Their Suit, which was *conventional*, was settled by Final Concord. Thereby Robert de Heselshawe, deforciant, acknowledges himself to have given a messuage and a carucate in Heselshawe to Walter de Heselshawe, Plaintiff. The latter restores the premises to Robert, to hold for life at a rent of 20*s.*, with remainder to Walter, to hold of the Lords of the Fee. This remainder probably took effect between the years 1278 and 1285, for about the latter period we are told that "Master Walter de Helshaw holds the vill of Helshaw under Theobald de Verdon." At the Assizes of 1292 the Bradford jurors presented Walter de Heselshawe as not in due attendance.

William de Helshaw, who as we have seen, held Eaton upon Tern in 1317, probably held Helshaw also.

<sup>1</sup> Assizes, 6 Hen. III., m. 3 verso.

**WISTANSWICK.** Of this member of Stoke the following Tenants occur. Gilbert de Wistanswick appears on a Jury-List in 1220. William son of the said Gilbert, has been named above under the date of 1262, or thereabouts. He is called William de Wistaneswick in Jury-Lists of 1274, 1300, and 1306.

#### CHURCH OF ST. PETER AT STOKE UPON TERN.

This Church existed at *Domesday* and was probably one of the original Saxon Churches of the district.

The next notice of this Church is implied in the Fine of 1250, wherein we see that the Hodnets had some claim to the Advowson.<sup>1</sup> Such a claim, however it arose, was settled by a second Fine on October 13, 1254. Thereby Odo de Hodeneth renounced all claim to the Advowson of *Northstokesay*, in favour of John de Verdoun, who paid 10 merks for the concession. In 1274 we have seen that this Church was reputed to be worth 30 merks *per annum*. The *Taxation* of 1291 places it in the Deanery of Newport and describes it as the *Church of Stokesay*, but only values it at 10 merks *per annum*.<sup>2</sup> On the death of Theobald de Verdon (II.) in 1316 the Advowson was found to have been his, and the same value of the Rectory was returned by Inquest. The Assessors of the Ninth in 1341 quoted the Church Taxation of *Stoke super Teyrn* as 10 merks.<sup>3</sup> They rated the Parish only at 8 merks, because 2 merks of the *Taxation* arose from glebe land and other Church profits, not computable in the current assessment.

The *Valor* of 1534-5 gives the preferment of William Hille, Clerk, Rector of Stoke upon Tyrn as £21 *per annum* (viz. Glebe land—£1, Corn and Hay-Tithes—£12, Wool and Lamb-Tithes—£4. 10s., Oblations and *Decimæ privatae*—£3, and other small-tithes—10s.) He paid 8s. 4d. for Procurations, 6s. 8d. for Synodals, and 5s. for Procurations at Visitations.<sup>4</sup>

#### EARLY RECTORS.

LAURENCE, Chaplain or Priest of Stoke and—

WILLIAM, Priest of Stoke, who occur about 1221-2, were, I imagine, Officiating Ministers or Chantry Priests rather than Incumbents of the Church.

MASTER HENRY DE BRAY was instituted to this Church on March 24, 1304, at the presentation of Sir Theobald de Verdon Senior.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nick. Taxation*, pp. 245, 248.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 184.

<sup>4</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 187.

SIR NICHOLAS DE VERDOUN, Acolyte, was instituted June 13, 1307, Sir Theobald de Verdoun presenting him. On March 20, 1313, the Church fell vacant and on Oct. 4, 1313—

SIR GEOFFREY DE THYRENEBY, Chaplain, was instituted, at the presentation of Sir Theobald de Verdoun, knight. He died September 3, 1357, and on the 6th of the same month—

ROGER BANASTRE, Clerk, was admitted, at the presentation of Sir John de Lodelowe, knight.<sup>1</sup> He died in 1367, when on March 23—

EDMUND DE STEBBYNG, Priest, was instituted at the presentation of Sir William de Ferrars, knight. He died in 1386, when on February 27—

RICHARD DE HUMBURSTON was instituted at the presentation of Sir Henry de Ferrars, Lord of Groby. On April 30, 1394—

THOMAS CORBET, Rector of Stoke, exchanged preferments with—

WILLIAM HAMYNET, Priest, late Vicar of Ercall. The King was Patron of Stoke on this occasion. Hamynet died in 1413.

## Little Withiford.

THIS was a divided Manor at *Domesday*. De Laci's share is thus spoken of in that Record.—

“The same Roger (de Laci) holds Wideford (of the Earl), and Robert (holds it) of him. Leuenod held it (in Saxon times). Here is half a hide and half an ox-team; and there might be an additional half-team. The former value (of the estate) was 2*s.* (*per annum*); now its value is included in the ferm of Stocche.”<sup>2</sup>

Little Withiford is not known to have had any other connection with Stoke upon Tern, than the mere coincidence that at *Domesday* Roger de Laci was Seigneurial Lord of both Manors. Their subsequent history is very distinct. During the forfeiture of the House of Lacy, and while this moiety of Little Withiford was at the disposal of the Crown, it happened that the adjacent Manor of Shawbury was in the Crown also. So Lacy's estate was annexed to Shawbury, and was never afterwards restored to Lacy.

<sup>1</sup> Sir John de Ludlow was heir of the Hodnets, the ancient claimants of this Advowson. This does not however in any

way account for his thus presenting to Stoke upon Tern.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 256, b. 1.

It is observable that *Robert*, Lacy's *Domesday* Tenant at Little Withiford, was also Gerard de Tornai's Tenant in Besford and in part of Preston Brockhirst: and that Besford and part of Preston Brockhirst subsequently escheated to the Crown and became parcels of Shawbury, as granted to Thomas de Erdington by King John. The inference is that *Robert* or his successors were involved in the forfeitures of Henry I.'s time or else that his tenure lapsed in some other way to the Suzerain.

When King John granted Shawbury *cum pertinenciis* to Thomas de Erdington, Lacy's share of Little Withiford seems to have accompanied the grant as a matter of course.

In 1227, as we shall see under Shawbury, the Widow of Thomas de Erdington, disposing of her dower in Shawbury and Besford, disposed also of her dower in Little Withiford as part and parcel of the same estate.

In or about the year 1285 Ivo de Sulton was holding half Little Withiford, as a member of Shawbury. He held it under Matilda widow of Henry de Erdington who then had Shawbury in dower. I have nothing further to say of Laci's share of Little Withiford, except what will be stated or implied in my general account of Shawbury. As to Ivo de Sulton he will recur to us under another locality.

I now revert to the other share of Little Withiford. This, together with Withington, was held at *Domesday* under Earl Roger, by Fulcuius.—“The same Fulcuius holds Wideford. Godric held it (in Saxon times). Here is half a hide. The (arable) land is (enough) for 11 ox-teams. Here is one team; and it (the Manor) pays a ferm of 3s. (*per annum*). In King Edward's time it was worth 8s.”<sup>1</sup>

I have already said who Fulcuius was,<sup>2</sup> if indeed this *Domesday* Lord was identical with *Fulcoius Vicecomes*, who was living at least 35 years after *Domesday*. We have seen that Fulcoius Vicecomes had a son Henry, living in the latter part of Henry I.'s reign. However it is clear that from eventual failure of heirs, or some other cause, the two *Domesday* estates of Fulcuius escheated to the Crown, and that the Seignury over both (with a slight reservation in one) was afterwards bestowed on Fitz Alan. It is further apparent, as regards half Little Withiford, that Fitz Alan's tenant there was that Hamo le Strange, who, as we have seen under Childs Ercall, died in the first six years of Henry II.'s reign, without legitimate issue. Whether the estate under notice then reverted to Fitz

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 259, a, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 304.

Alan, as Seignorial Lord, I cannot say, but Fitz Aer became Fitz Alan's Tenant thereof, nor do I find any sure indication that Hamo le Strange's heirs ever stood *mediate* between Fitz Alan and Fitz Aer in the tenure of Little Withiford. At Great Withiford however, where Fitz Aer was also Tenant-in-fee, he held under Le Strange of Knokyn, who held under Fitz Alan. This would hardly establish the probability of a parallel scale of tenure in the case of Little Withiford, for we do not know that Hamo le Strange was ever Lord of Great Withiford; consequently we do not know that his right heirs, the Stranges of Knokyn, derived their mesne interest in Great Withiford from him.

I take it that Reginald de Rughelton or de Rowelton, who in 1221 was Tenant in fee-simple of this estate, held it under Fitz Aer. That however did not transpire in the proceedings which I am about to detail.—At the Assizes of November 1221, Reginald de Rughelton was sued for 2 virgates (equivalent to the *Domesday* half-hide) in Little Withiford, by Stephen Walsh (Wallensis). The said Stephen claimed as Nephew and heir of Hamo le Strange, and under writ of *mort d'ancestre*. The formal questions were whether Hamo Extraneus the Plaintiff's Uncle (*avunculus*) had died, seized in demesne of the said two virgates, and whether Stephen was his heir. The first issue was decided by the Jury in the affirmative, but there was a technical flaw, fatal to a suit of *mort d'ancestre*. It was that Hamo le Strange had died three reigns previously, viz. in the time of "Henry father of King Richard." The Plaintiff of course took nothing and was pronounced *in misericordia* for a false claim.<sup>1</sup>

It is much to be regretted by the genealogical inquirer that the Jury were not obliged to come to any finding on the question of Stephen Walsh's heirship to Hamo le Strange; for though I am well satisfied that he was not his heir, I should rejoice to know how he was related to him.

It would seem that Stephen Walsh renewed his action in some other form. A suit concerning 2 virgates in Parva Wicford was pending at Westminster in Michaelmas Term 1223, the Plaintiff and Defendant being described as Stephen le Waleis and Reginald fitz Reginald.

A Fine levied on October 13, 1224, shows that the new form of procedure had been by *grand assize*. The result was that Stephen Walsh (Plaintiff), acknowledged the right of Reginald de Reuulton

<sup>1</sup> *Assizes*, 6 Hen. III., m. 4.

(tenant) to two virgates in Parva Wyford: but Reginald and his heirs were to hold under Stephen and his heirs at a rent of 3*s.*, and were to discharge all dues to the Chief-Lords of the Fee. Reginald further paid 100*s.* down for this concession. It is evident therefore that Stephen Walsh's claim to the tenancy was a substantial one. The Pipe-Roll of 1225 records how Stephen Walensis owed one merk to the Crown for license to accord with *Reginald de Wyford*. At the Assizes of August 1226 Reginald de Parva Wideford appears in a new cause, and this time as Plaintiff. He got damages of 6*s.* against Siward de Wydeford for disseizing him of a tenement in Wydeford. By a Fine of May 18, 1242, Reginald de Wythiford, Plaintiff, renounces all right to take *estovers* in Giles de Erdinton's wood of Hemmesle, and all right of *pesson* for the swine of Reginald himself, or his men of Wythiford. For this quitclaim Erdinton paid 10 merks.

In 1256 I find Reginald de Withiford sitting on an Uppington Jury. Before 1267 the person whom we may describe as Reginald fitz Reginald de Rowlton or de Parva Withiford, was deceased, leaving two sons and a daughter. Reginald, apparently the younger son, was sued in August of that year by Sibil, the daughter, for disseizing her of a messuage and half-virgate in Withiford. Reginald pleaded that his Father, while living, had handed over the premises to himself, during pleasure, and for a sum of money, and that on his Father's death he entered the premises, so that Sibil had never been seized thereof. Sibil on the other hand affirmed herself to have been in seizin for half a year after her Father's death. This the Jury affirmed: and Reginald was amerced one merk for disseizin and had to pay 36*s.* damages.

A Fine of April 7, 1269, introduces another son, I think the heir, of Reginald de Wythiford. William fitz Reginald de Wythiford was Plaintiff, and Reginald de Wythiford (his brother I presume) was Defendant in a suit of warranty concerning one virgate in Parva Wythiford. Reginald (by his Attorney, Roger de Preston) renounced his claim, and William in return conceded the premises to Reginald;—to hold for life, at a rent of 1*d.* payable to William, and by performance of all capital services due from William and his heirs. Reginald was bound not to alienate the premises: they were to revert to William and his heirs. A mutilated indorsement of this Fine gives another son or perhaps daughter, of Reginald fitz Reginald de Wythiford as *apposing* his or her claim.

The *Feodary* of 1284 describes the Manor under notice as *half*

*the vill of Parva Wythinton*, and adds that John fitz Aer held it of Richard fitz Alan, who held it *in capite*. The Bradford Tenure-Roll is nearly cotemporary and more explicit. It states that William fitz Reginald held half Parva Whetheford under John fitz Aer, who held of Richard fitz Alan, who held *in capite*.

The Inquisition, taken 12 February, 1293, on the death of John fitz Aer, contains a puzzling statement. It says that the deceased had held 5*s.* rent in Parva Wythyford of the Fee of Robert de Halcheton. A similar thing is stated in the Inquest taken in December 1313, on the death of Hugh fitz Aer.—“The deceased had held 5*s.* rent in Parva Wythyford under Thomas de Halghton (then in ward to the King), and he had held it by service of receiving the homage and service of a certain William Reynald.” This is tantamount to saying that Hugh fitz Aer was mesne-lord of a part of Little Withiford, holding under De Haughton and over William fitz Reginald. Singularly enough we have another and earlier indication that the Haughtons had an interest in Little Withiford.<sup>1</sup> I think however that in both instances there has been some confusion between Little Withiford and Withington, the latter of which was undoubtedly held by De Haughton. And as to Thomas de Haughton’s being in ward to the Crown so late as December 1313, that I am nearly sure is inaccurate.

---

## Withington.

---

THIS Manor is so associated with Little Withiford that I will not separate them. *Domesday* says as follows.—

“Fulcius holds Wientone of Earl Roger. Uluuin and Uluric held it (in Saxon times) for two Manors. Here are two hides and a half. The (arable) land is (enough) for 1111 ox-teams. In demesne there are 11 ox-teams, and 1111 Serfs and 1 Female Serf; and (there are) 111 Villains and 1 Boor with a team and half. In King Edward’s time the Manor was worth 15*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 21*s.* He (Fulcius) found it waste.”<sup>2</sup>

The fact that Fulcius left no permanent successors and that his estates escheated to the Crown is made clear in the case of Withington; for though the Seignury of half the Manor was annexed to

Vide *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 47, 49.

| <sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 259, a. 2.

the Fief of Fitz Alan, the other half was made a Serjeantry, and the occupant thereof owed his service immediately to the King. But though the Seignury of the Manor became thus divided, it happened that one Tenant held each moiety. The King's Tenants and Fitz Alan's Tenants were those Haughtons, whose possessions and history I have briefly sketched under Cleobury North.<sup>1</sup>

ROGER FITZ HENRY, the earliest known representative of the family, occurs from 1165 to 1190. Before the year 1172 he made the following grant to Haughmond Abbey, which supplies us with the names of his wife and brother.—*Notum sit omnibus tam presentibus quam futuris me Rogerum filium Henrici et uxorem meam Leticiam et meos heredes concessisse et donasse Deo et Ecclesie Sancti Johannis Evangeliste de Haghmon molendinum Withentunie, cum xi acris et duobus pratis et cum omnibus pertinenciis suis, in perpetuam elemosynam, et quandam piscariam que ad predictam villam pertinet, ita libere et quiete sicut prescriptum est de molendino, pro animâ patris mei et pro animâ Philippi fratris mei et pro animâ matris et uxoris mee et pro animabus omnium parentum nostrorum et benefactorum. His testibus, Siwart Presbitro, Edrico clerico.*<sup>2</sup>

Pope Alexander's Confirmation of 1172 describes the above grant as that of Roger fitz Henry, and as consisting of the Mill of Withinton and a Fishery on the Tern. It also confirms a meadow under the Mill of Withinton which the Canons had acquired by purchase.

It appears from the Pipe-Roll of 1182 that Roger fitz Henry, though he had now been at least 17 years in possession of his estates, had hitherto escaped paying the Relief due to the Crown on the succession of a Tenant by Serjeantry. He is accordingly charged 40s. "for his Relief and for concealing the same." He paid the charge in this and the following year. He must have died about March 1190, for at Michaelmas 1190, Ralph Archdeacon of Hereford, as Escheator for Shropshire, renders account of 8s. arising from Widinton, a recent escheat of half a year's standing. The Escheators for the years ending Michaelmas 1192 and Michaelmas 1193 render similar account of 16s. arising in each year, viz. "for the rent of Witinton which was Roger fitz Henry's, whose land is in the King's hand together with the heir." The said heir came of age soon afterwards; for among the *Nova Oblata* proffered on King Richard's return from Captivity, and registered in the Pipe-Roll of 1194 is this one.—*Tomas filius Rogeri reddit compotum de v marcis pro habendo redditu 16 solidorum et 1 nisi per annum de*

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. III. pp. 25-28.

| <sup>2</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 221.

*terra de Widiton, quam tenet de Rege in capite per serjanteriam inveniendi unum militem ad conducendos Walenses de Powis ad Curiam Regis. In thesauro liberavit. Et quietus est.*

Hence it would appear that the moiety of Withington which Thomas fitz Roger held of the King was underlet for rents of 16s. and a hawk.

His Serjeantry was to provide a knight who should conduct the Welshmen of Powis-land whenever they had to visit the English Court. The great feudal position which, as I shall show elsewhere, the Haughtons sometime occupied on the Shropshire Border, rendered such a service appropriate.

In Easter Term 1201 I find Thomas fitz Roger on a jury of Staffordshire Knights. In the same Term William fitz Robert and Robert Scitte of Salop had each a Suit concerning lands against Thomas fitz Roger. The latter is in one instance called Thomas de Halton. Richard le Parmunter, Alan fitz Berenger, Reginald Nich of Salop, Richard Saddoc and Richard de St. Edmund, appeared as Essoignors of the two Plaintiffs. In 1204, like other Tenants by Serjeantry, Thomas fitz Roger was assessed to the fifth Scutage of King John. He seems to have compounded for the same by payment of one merk.

In 1211 we have a Roll of Shropshire Serjeantries with the following entry.—“Thomas filius Rogeri debet de servitio invenire unum servientem peditem ad conducendos Wallenses de Powis ad *custum* domini Regis.”<sup>1</sup> Here for the word *custum* I should propose to read *Curiam*. The Testing clause of a Deed in the Salop Chartulary exhibits Thomas de Halechton as Constable of Shrewsbury Castle, but I find no other proof of his having held that office. I have said under Cleobury North that he was deceased in 1240. He must have died long before, for in the summer of 1226 Robert de Halechton (his son) appears as Lord of the Staffordshire Manor of Hull and as unjustly withholding the same from Robert son of Philip Noel, his rightful tenant.<sup>2</sup> In the Pipe-Roll of 1227 Robert de Halton is named as though he had held some Escheatorship or Bailiwick in Shropshire.—He owed 7s., the value of the chattels of some outlaw. Patents of September 1235 and June 1237 name Robert de Haleghton and others as Justices to try causes of *novel disseizin*. Another Patent of October 1237 names him and some of his former colleagues as Justices to deliver the Gaols of Brug and Shrewsbury.

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 55.

| <sup>2</sup> *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 103.

The *Feodary* of 1240 gives Robert de Halleton as holding  $\frac{1}{4}$ th of a knight's-fee in Withinton, Knitteleg, and Parva-Wytheford, of the Barony of Fitz Alan.<sup>1</sup> His tenure of half Withington and of Knightley (Staffordshire) under Fitz Alan is confirmed by numerous documents; but whether he had any mesne interest in Little Withiford is a question which I have already discussed. In January 1254 Robert de Halleton would appear to have accompanied his Suzerain, Fitz Alan, on foreign service. A Patent dated on the same day (January 28) as that granted to Fitz Alan, allows that Robert de Halleton shall not be put on any Assize, nor serve as Coroner, Escheator, Forester or Verderer against his will.<sup>2</sup> In March 1255 he was appointed Receiver of all moneys arising from the sale of timber in the King's Forests of Shropshire, Staffordshire, and Worcestershire. The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says nothing about Little Withiford, but treats of Withington very explicitly.—“Robert de Halhton holds the vill of Wythinton, half of John fitz Alan, and half of the King, *in capite*, by service of conducting the Welsh to conferences (*parliamenta*) from Shrewsbury Castle to Moneford Bridge. The Manor is 111 hides, geldable, and pays 10*d.* *per annum* for *motfee*, and 10*d.* for *stretward*, and does due suit to County and Hundred.”<sup>3</sup> It is probable, that Robert de Haughton's charge was to provide safe-conduct for Welsh embassies between Montford-bridge and Shrewsbury, whether going to or returning from the English Court.

The above estimate of three hides is, I should observe, inconsistent with the payment of 10*d.* for *stretward* and 10*d.* for *motfee*. The latter would indicate a Manor of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  hides, the exact counterpart of the *Domesday* Withington.

Of Sir John de Haughton, Robert's supposed successor, I find no notice in connection with Withington. I am very doubtful about the succession of the family at this period, and whether Agnes, who occurs with her son Thomas in 1282, was really widow of Sir John. I must leave the evidence as I find it: but that part of it which has been given under Cleobury North is inconsistent with the apparent fact that a Robert de Haughton was Lord of Withington in 1267. In September of that year I find that a Writ was taken out by Thomas de Wythinton against Robert de *Haston* for disseizing the said Thomas of common-pasture in Wythinton.<sup>4</sup> Again, a Patent of January 10, 1269, appoints Robert de Halwton

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 47, 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 254.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 57.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Finium*, II. 518.

as a Justice to deliver the Gaol of Brug. Lastly Agnes de Halinton, a Staffordshire Lady, who in July 1270 fines half a merk for a Writ of *Pone*, was widow of Robert de Halinton, not of Sir John, as the account given under Cleobury North shows me to have once supposed. That Thomas de Haughton, the next known successor to Withington, was married in or before 1264 and died in 1282, we are quite sure. Also when we find that his mother's name was Agnes I cannot doubt that his Father was Robert. How John and Robert were related I cannot say, nor have I more than the single Deed quoted under Cleobury North<sup>1</sup> to show that one John was head of this family about 1260-3.

Thomas de Haughton (II.), as he may be called, was deceased before Nov. 25, 1282, when the Writ of *Diem clausit* announces the fact. The Shropshire Inquest, taken on February 1, 1283, says that the deceased had held nothing *in capite* in that county: and indeed it appears that the Withington Serjeantry was ere this extinct, and that the whole Manor was held under Fitz Alan. The service due thereon was half a knight's-fee, viz. to provide one Esquire with a barbed horse &c., at Oswestry for 40 days. Agnes mother of the deceased held part of the vill in dower. Cleobury North, already noticed, and Longner, to be noticed hereafter, were also Manors held by the deceased. In Staffordshire he had held Offley and Schelbeden under the Lord Stafford, for a knight's-fee. Knightley (which he held under Fitz Alan) was held under him by Sir Robert de Knightley for one-fourth of a fee. He, conversely, had held the hamlet of Hulle under Sir Robert de Knightley at a rent of 5s. He had also held Tunstal and La Lee under the Bishop of Chester for one-fourth of a fee.<sup>2</sup>

Robert de Haughton, son and heir of Thomas, though not 18 years of age at his Father's death, appears in the Feodaries of 1284-5 as holding Withington for half a knight's-fee under Richard fitz Alan. At the Assizes of 1292 under the head *De Valettis*, Robert de Halenton was returned by the Bradford Jurors as holding a Knight's-fee, and as not a Knight. His exercise of Free Warren in Wythynton was also noticed. As Robert de Halghton and as holding £20 of lands and rents, he was summoned from the County of Salop to perform military service in parts beyond the seas; and to attend muster at London on July 7, 1297. On January 14, 1300, he was one of the Commissioners appointed to summon the knights of Shropshire and Staffordshire for service against the

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. III. pp. 27, 28.

| <sup>2</sup> *Inquisitions*, 11 Edw. I., No. 30.

Scots. On June 24, 1301, he was himself to be at Berwick-upon-Tweed for the same object.<sup>1</sup> The Inquest held at Withington on his death, in 1304, I have already quoted.<sup>2</sup> It states him to have held a messuage and half-virgate there, under the heir of Richard fitz Alan, by service of two appearances yearly at the Court of Upton (Magna). It further states that he held 4 carucates in the same vill, under Philip Nugent, in whose behalf he was bound to do monthly suit at Salop County-Court, and suit every three weeks to Bradford Hundred. This mesne-interest of Philip Nugent I cannot reconcile with what has transpired above as to the tenure of Withington: and yet it will be shown under Uckington that, a century earlier, a previous Philip Nugent had interests in this quarter.

Robert de Haughton's Fief in the Barony of Stafford is stated to have been 2½ Fees in Haughton and Offley, and to have been worth £40 *per annum*. Thomas de Haughton (III.), son and heir of Robert, was 15 years of age on August 29, 1303. In the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316 he is entered as Lord of Whytinton and Cleobury North; and also of Maer and High Offley in Staffordshire. In 1322 the armorial bearings of Sir Thomas de Haluton were entered on the Roll of the Battle of Boroughbridge, but the Record is indistinct. Between 1322 and 1325 he occurs frequently as a Commissioner of levies in Staffordshire; and in 1325 he was ordered to attend the Earl Warren then setting out for Guienne.<sup>3</sup> I now return to take some notice of the—

UNDERTENANTS of Withington. At the Assizes of 1203 one Roger de Withinton appeared to essoign the attendance of Philip de Nugent. About 1234–6 Thomas de Haleton and Thomas de Withinton appear as consecutive witnesses of a grant to Haughmond Abbey. The first was perhaps of Haughton, near Haughmond.<sup>4</sup> Henry de Withington occurs on an Uppington Inquest in 1246. I must quote very briefly some grants to Haughmond, but which I have no means of dating with certainty.—

1. Thomas de Withinton gave to the Abbey all his part of the meadow of Benerei. Witness, Osbern Chaplain of Lega.

2. Alice de Withinton, his widow, quit-claimed her third of the same meadow. Witness, Thomas de Withinton her son.

3. Thomas called "Le Eyr" of Withinton released all right in that land in the field of Withinton called "Charite-buttres," with all the adjacent moor. Witness, Sir John fitz Aer (1256–1292).

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, I. 654.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 966, 967.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide supra*, Vol. VI. p. 107.

4. Thomas son of Thomas de Withenton confirmed his Father's donation of Lechemedowe, together with the Charite-buttess and the meadow and moor adjacent. Witness, Thomas de Erleton.

To return;—In Easter Term 1243 Robert de Whittenton had a suit against the Abbot of Lilleshall concerning *estovers*. Thomas de Withington has been named already as at issue with Robert de Haughton in 1267. He, or another of the same name, was first Juror on the Inquest of 1283, after the death of Thomas de Haughton. Thomas de Withington also occurs on Jury Lists or Testing clauses in 1277, 1283, 1285, 1290, and 1292. I have already said something of him under Pimley.<sup>1</sup> On the whole, an important person of this name may be said to occur from 1267 till 1318.

One Walter de Wythynton occurs on a Jury List in 1290. On February 9, 1307, Nicholas le Bonde of Tyrne and Agnes his wife (Plaintiffs) *quitclaim* to Richard son of Richard de Wythinton (Tenant) a messuage and half-virgate (less 6 acres) in Wythington, whereof was suit-at-law. For this the Plaintiffs had 10 merks.

HAUGHMOND ABBEY FEE. I have two notes of the Abbey's continued interest in Withington.

On August 2, 1340, Peter Cort of Withinton releases to the Abbey all right in a meadow called Hertesbilet. Witness, John de Clone.

On May 3, 1477, the Abbot demises to William Onnyslowe of Rodington, Gentleman, and Marione his wife, and the heirs of their bodies, the Mill of Withinton, called *Liemulle*, for ninety-nine years, at a rent of 12s.

WITHINGTON CHURCH. This has been already identified as a Chapel of Upton Magna,<sup>2</sup> but as existent at least as early as the time of Bishop Durdent (1148–1159). The Advowson of course belonged to Shrewsbury Abbey, but the Records which I usually quote in respect of Parish Churches are altogether silent about the Chapel of Withington.

---

## Chetwynd.

---

I HAVE given under Willey a full account of the Fief held by Turolde Verley at *Domesday*, and have stated that the Seignury of most

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. pp. 307, 308.

| <sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 264.

of his Manors passed to Fitz Alan. Turolde had six Manors in Recordine Hundred. Chetwynd is described in *Domesday* as follows.—

“The same Turolde hold Catewinde (of the Earl). The Countess Godeva held it (in Saxon times). Here are 111 hides, geldable. There is (arable) land for viii ox-teams. In demesne there are 111 teams; and vi Neat-herds, 11 Villains, and 111 Boors, with 1 team. Here is a Priest; and a Mill, with two Fisheries, pays 5s. and 64 sticks of eels (annual rent). Here is a little wood. In King Edward’s time the Manor was worth 25s. (yearly); now it is worth 50s. He (Turolde) found it waste.”<sup>1</sup>

This Manor became the caput of what was ordinarily known as the *Fee of Chetwynd*, a term which included ten out of the thirteen *Domesday* Manors of Turolde. The said ten Manors were all held under Fitz Alan by the family of Chetwynd, but in some of them the Chetwynds had their Undertenants or Feoffees. It is uncertain at what period this augmentation of Fitz Alan’s Barony took place. It was later than the compilation of 1165, known as the *Liber Niger*: for no Feoffee in that Record can be identified with the Lord of Chetwynd, whose military service to Fitz Alan was the service of two knights’-fees. I take it then that the Lord of Chetwynd, at the time of the *Liber Niger*, was a Tenant *in capite*, whose return is not preserved. His fealty and service was probably bestowed on the second William fitz Alan by Henry II. or Richard I.

ADAM DE CHETWYND, the first Lord of Chetwynd whom I can discover, occurs on the Forest-Roll of 1180 as compounding for a pourpresture by payment of 3s. In June 1200 he occurs as Visor in a case of *Essoign*, a business always at that time entrusted to knights. At the County Assizes of October 1203, Adam de Chetwynd essoigned his attendance at the *common summons*, his *Essoign* or being Nicholas Crasset.

JOHN DE CHETWYND, son of Adam, probably succeeded his father before 1210. We have had a hint to that effect,<sup>2</sup> but at the same time it is certain that he attested Charters as early as 1202–3, and so in his father’s lifetime. At all events he appears among the Knights of Shropshire at the Assizes of November 1221, but his only concern was as a Juror in causes of *Grand Assize*. At the Assizes of 1226 one William fitz Robert sued John de Chetwynd for disseizing him of a free tenement in Chetwynd, viz. half a virgate which Adam de Chetwynd, father of John, had given to Robert fitz Wonram, father of the Plaintiff, to hold in fee and inheritance at a rent

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b, 2.

| <sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 375.

of 26*d. per annum*. John de Chetwynd allowed his Father's Charter, but showed, that the Plaintiff's father had been a Villain and had been redeemed from Serfdom by Adam de Chetwynd, but that the Plaintiff had been born before such redemption. On this the Plaintiff withdrew his suit, but being poor was excused amercement, and was presented with 3 merks by John de Chetwynd, who further allowed him complete manumission (*ibit quocunque voluerit*) and acquitted him of all serfdom (*servitute*). Of course the Plaintiff lost the land.<sup>1</sup> The *Feodaries* of 1240 agree in representing John de Chetewind as holding Chetewind and its appurtenances, for two knights'-fees in the Barony of Fitz Alan.<sup>2</sup> In 1250 John de Chetewinde was amerced 5 merks by Geoffrey de Langley for venison-trespass, but the King excused him by special writ. A Patent of August 22, 1251, exempts John de Chetewind from liability to serve on Assizes, Juries, &c. A Charter dated at Windsor on Nov. 3, 1252, gives John de Chetwynd Free Warren on his lands in Shropshire, Staffordshire, and Warwickshire. Chetwynd, Weston, and Howle are the estates particularized.<sup>3</sup> Another Patent of 1253 includes him among those, whose estates were entitled to protection and immunity so long as the owners should be serving the King in Gascony.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says as follows.—“The Manor of Chetewynde is of the Barony of Sir John fitz Alan of Whiteminster (Oswestry). And it is ix geldable hides, and one whole knight's-fee. And it pays 3*s. per annum* for *motfee* and 3*s.* for *stretward*, and makes due suit to County and Hundred. And John de Chetewinde holds the said Manor *in capite* of the said John fitz Alan. And the said John de Chetewinde shall provide three *Mountores* at his own cost at White-minster.”<sup>4</sup> The different estimates which we are constantly meeting with of the military service due on a particular tenure are perhaps to be reconciled. I take it that when John de Chetwynd is said to hold under Fitz Alan by service of one knight, it is forinsec service that is alluded to,—the exact service which he as a knight had rendered in 1253 when he accompanied Fitz Alan to Gascony. When again his service is described as two knights'-fees I conclude that he was assessable in that proportion to the scutages and aids charged on his Suzerain. Lastly the service of 3 Mountores, equivalent to 1½ fees, was a different thing, not necessarily bearing any proportion to the other kinds of liability. It was the amount of Castle-guard service,

<sup>1</sup> *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 44, 47, 49.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Cart.* 37 Hen. III., m. 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 57.

reserved by a Suzerain, when he first enfeoffed his Tenant, or agreed upon subsequently.

The above extract from the Hundred-Roll requires explanation on another point. When Chetwynd is said to be a Manor of nine hides, it is taken to include at least the following *Domesday* Manors, viz. Chetwynd proper—3 hides, Pilson—1 hide, Sambrook—1½ hides, Howle—2 hides, and Bearstone—1 hide. How the remaining half-hide was supplied I cannot say.

John de Chetwynd's appearance at the Assizes of 1256 as Mesne-Lord of Willey has already been noticed.<sup>1</sup> On the same occasion he impleaded James de Audley, Adam Provost of Edgemond, and many others, for disseizing him of 100 acres of heath in Chetwynd. The question was one of boundary. Audley denied that the premises were in Chetwynd, and maintained that even if they were, he had not disseized the Plaintiff, for his own Father, Henry de Audley, had died seized of the premises as appurtenant to his Manor of Edgemond.<sup>2</sup>

I suppose that about this time there was a change in this succession, and that one John de Chetwynd was succeeded by a son and heir of the same name. At all events we may safely conclude that it was—

JOHN DE CHETWYND (II.) who in April 1263 was serving with John fitz Alan in Wales.<sup>3</sup> About the same time I find Sir John and Sir Philip de Chetwynd attesting a Charter of Robert Earl Ferrers. The eventual son and heir of John de Chetwynd was, as we shall see, born about 1264-5,—another proof that the John of that date was a young man. It was this Sir John de Chetwynd who, with Philip de Chetwynd and others, was commissioned to deliver the Gaol of Brug in July 1269, and whom we have seen attesting a Lilleshall Charter about 1272-7,<sup>4</sup> and who is followed by Sir Philip his Brother in a Staffordshire Deed of the same period.<sup>5</sup> I should here say a word about a matter which has been stated with some inaccuracy by other authors.—

SIR PHILIP DE CHETWYND, though a younger son, had acquired a great property in Staffordshire by marrying Isabella the heiress of the Muttons. He was in fact ancestor of the Chetwynds of Ingestre, Gratwich, and Mutton, now represented by the Earl of Shrewsbury. The following dates may be of use. Ralph de Mutton, whose

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> *Assizes*, 40 Hen. III., m. 5 verso.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 255.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 19, note 39.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 398.

sister Isabella became his heir, was deceased in 1241. Philip de Chetwynd, Isabella's husband, was deceased in 1285, and Isabella herself died in 1291, when on March 1, the King as Guardian of the young Lord Stafford, accepted the fealty of Philip her son and heir.

But there was another cotemporary of Sir John and Sir Philip de Chetwynd, possibly their brother, whom I must now notice.

This was—

ADAM DE CHETWYND, of whom I have some memoranda conveying the idea that he was a very wealthy man. At the Assizes of October 1272, Robert de Munford (Lord of Idsall, I presume) acknowledged before the Justices, a debt of 50 merks to Adam de Chetwynd. Thomas Corbet of Tasley acknowledged a debt of 100s., and Ralph le Bolyter (of Wem) a debt of £10. 8s. to the same. Bolyter's securities were Peter de Eyton, Thomas de Ellerton, Robert de Helshaw, Elyas de Stoke, and Robert de Ford. Adam de Chetwynd was also Creditor of Thomas Botterel in one merk, of John de Lee in one merk, of John de Erkalu in 36s., and of Robert de Staunton in 18s.

In March 1274 I find Adam de Chetewinde acting as the King's Escheator in Cheshire and North Shropshire.

On October 24, 1275, King Edward appoints Adam de Chetewinde to assess the current tax of the *Fifteenth* in Gloucestershire. On the Pipe-Roll of 1278 Adam de Chetwind is charged 100 merks which he had received three years before from Reginald de Grey;—probably in trust for the King. A Writ of March 12, 1279, appoints Adam de Chetwynd a Commissioner to inquire into the conduct of the Sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire in distraining persons to take the degree of Knighthood, and, in case the Sheriff had been negligent, to enforce the King's orders on the subject with strictness.

JOHN DE CHETWYND (II.) to whom I now recur, is stated by Dugdale to have had a grant of rents in Baxterley (Warwickshire) from his kinsman, John son of William Lovel. Dugdale places this early in Edward I.'s reign, and with great probability, for John de Chetwynd was deceased before February 13, 1281. There were several Inquests on his death. The first was held pursuant to a Writ of *Diem clausit* dated Feb. 13, 1281, which Writ shows that the King's interference arose as having the wardship of John de Chetwynd's Suzerain, young Richard fitz Alan. The Shropshire Inquest states that the deceased had held Chetwind and its appurtenances for 2 knights'-fees, of the Barony of Fitz Alan. Barkis-

ford, Conishill, Stockton, and Howle are considered members of Chetwynd. There was a Park here. The Advowson of the Church was valued at 20s., the Incumbency at 20 merks *per annum*. The whole of Chetwynd, thus *extended*, was estimated to yield the goodly sum of £32 per annum to its Lord.

The Staffordshire Inquest states John de Chetwind to have held the Manor of Weston, by service of *one lesser fee of Morteyn*, under Robert de Staundon, who held under the Barons Stafford. A Warwickshire Inquest states him to have held certain rents in Baxterley, under Richard de Harcourt, by service of 1lb. of pepper.<sup>1</sup> This Inquest, taken in July 1281, states Philip to be son and heir of John de Chetwind and to be 18 years of age. All the other Inquests make Reginald to be the name of the heir and agree in stating him to be 16 years of age, but vary as to his birthday having been Oct. 9, 1264, or Feb. 22, 1265.<sup>2</sup>

Before I discuss these discrepancies I will notice some other documents, which, although they somewhat encumber the narration, are of intrinsic importance.—

On December 28, 1282, King Edward I., then at Rhuddlan, had received a complaint from Eva de Oswaldestre to the effect that she, having had custody of certain Manors by gift of Adam de Chetwynde, had been deprived thereof upon Adam's death, the Manors having been seized into the King's hand. The King now orders the Sheriff of Salop and Staffordshire to inquire into this matter, and meantime to keep custody of the Manors, allowing Eva a competent sustenance out of the proceeds thereof. An Inquest held at Stafford on January 9, 1283, found that by gift of Adam de Chetwynd and long before his death, Eva had had custody of the Manors of Tixhall, Ypstones, Weston, and Chetwynd, and that, since Adam's death, Eva had retained the said custody, till the Sheriff had seized it for the Crown. Similarly it was found that the Sheriff had confiscated the Manor of Hartwell, of which John son of Adam de Chetwynd had been seized from the day on which he had been enfeoffed thereof by John fitz Philip, till the day of the said seizure by the Sheriff.<sup>3</sup>

Now we have seen Adam de Chetewinde attesting a Deed of John fitz Philip of Bobbington, which I ventured to date between 1270 and 1280.<sup>4</sup> The feoffment of Adam de Chetwynd's son must belong to the same interval. But what is more to our present pur-

<sup>1</sup> *Dugdale's Warwickshire*, p. 1054.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquisitions*, 9 Edw. I., No. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 11 Edw. I., No. 80.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 170, note 55.

pose is the apparent certainty that, on John de Chetwynd's death in 1281, Adam de Chetwynd must have obtained custody of his estates, viz. Chetwynd and Weston-juxta-Standon. As to Tixall and Ipstones they too were probably acquired by purchase of some other wardship. Adam de Chetwynd at once conveys these acquisitions to Eva de Oswaldistre, but dying within two years, the Sheriff seizes upon the estate of his son and the wardships of his Assignee, as though he had been a Tenant *in capite*, and had died seized of the whole.

A Writ of January 16, 1283, orders that restitution be made to Eva de Oswaldestre,<sup>1</sup> and that Adam de Chetwynd's credits and debts with the Crown should be put in a proper course of settlement.

I now pass to the *Feodaries* of 1284-5, because they exhibit the three branches of Chetwynds much in the position which the foregoing arguments would lead us to expect. At this time—

John son of Adam de Chetwynd was Mesne Lord of Hilderston (Staffordshire), that is, he was in possession of an estate, though not the particular estate before noticed. Again—Philip de Chetwynd was Lord of Mutton and Ingestre, and Mesne-lord of Salt, all in Staffordshire. Lastly—Reginald de Chetwynd was Lord of Weston-juxta-Standon in Staffordshire, and of Chetwynd in Shropshire. The latter Manor is noticed as follows.—“Reginald de Chetwind holds the Manor of Chetwind with its members, viz. Stocton, Pynelesdon, Ethelarton (Ellerton), Sambrok, Bardeston, Howeleye (Howle), and half the vill of Pykesleye (Pixley), under Richard fitz Alan, by service of two knights'-fees; and he (Fitz Alan) holds of the King, *in capite*, and the Manor is geldable.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is a curious question who this Eva de Oswaldestre may have been. Perhaps the following is a clue to the mystery.—The Fitz-Warin Chronicle tells us of an Eva fitz Warin who after the death of Joan, Princess of North Wales, became second wife of Lhwelyn ap Iorweth. After Lhwelyn's death (which we know to have happened in April 1240), Eva, who had only been his wife a year and a half, remarried. Her second husband, says the Chronicle, was the “Sire de Blanc Mostiers,” a knight of great breeding, courageous and bold.

Supposing Eva de Oswaldistre and Eva

de Blaneminster to have been one person, we conclude her to have been in her second widowhood in 1282. The difficulty, which remains, is,—to identify her second husband, the “Sire de Blanc Mostiers.” We should expect to find some head of the house of Fitz Alan leaving a widow Eva between 1240 and 1282, but we know from evidence already given (Vol. VII. p. 228) that such was not the case.

<sup>2</sup> Bradford Tenure-Roll (*penes me*), compared with Kirby's *Quest.* The former document writes the names Reginaldus and Rogerus without any distinction except the hardly perceptible one

After this we suddenly and unaccountably find a third John de Chetwynd as Lord of Chetwynd.

JOHN DE CHETWYND (III.) was presented by the Bradford Jurors at the Assizes of October 1292, as claiming rights of Free-Warren in Chetwynd. An Inquest, taken in 1293, states that a quarter of a fee in Baxterley was held of Richard de Harcourt, deceased, by the *heir* of John de Chetwind, a proof I think that John de Chetwynd (III.) had not long been in possession. Again, an Inquest of the year 1300, already quoted, names John de Chetwynd as then Mesne-Lord of Evelith. On June 30, 1314, John de Chetwinde was included in a military summons against the Scots. In the *Nomina Villarum* of March 1316, he is returned as Lord of Chetewind. On June 27, 1318, Sir John de Chetewynde, Knight, presented Reginald de Chetwynde, an Acolyte, to Chetwynde Church. On July 17, 1318, John de Chetwind obtained the King's Charter empowering him to hold a weekly Market, on Tuesdays, at Chetwind, and a yearly Fair on the vigil, day, and morrow of All Saints (Oct. 31, Nov. 1 and 2).<sup>1</sup> The Arms of *Sir John Chedewynt* appear on the Roll of the Battle of Boroughbridge (March 1322). They were *Azure, a Chevron between three Mullets or*. I suppose that he was on the Rebel side. Nevertheless he attests a Deed at Shrewsbury on April 25th following<sup>2</sup> and he was summoned to attend a general Council to be holden at Westminster on May 30, 1324. In that and the two following years several Writs were addressed to him as a Commissioner of array in Cheshire, Shropshire, and Staffordshire.<sup>3</sup> On January 3, 1326, the Bishop of Lichfield gives license of non-residence till August 1, to Reginald de Chetwynd, Rector of Chetwynd, that he might be in personal attendance on Sir John de Chetwynd. On March 1, 1326, we have seen that Sir John de Chetewinde was at Clun in company with his Suzerain, Edmund Earl of Arundel.<sup>4</sup>

I may conclude this part of my subject with stating that John de Chetwynd (III.) was living in 1351, but that his eldest son, Reginald, was deceased seven years previously. The said Reginald left an only daughter, Joan. This Lady took the great inheritance of the Chetwynds to her husband Richard son of Adam de Peshale,

between the second letters of each name. Hence I have inadvertently read the name as Roger in one instance (Vol. II. p. 307). Bardeston is named as a member of Chetwind, only in *Kirbey's Quest*. It is Bearstone, a place at the North-Eastern extre-

mity of Shropshire. It was held by Turold at *Domesday*. *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 308.

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Cart.* 12 Edw. II., No. 91.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 668, 669.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 267.

and transmitted it to her descendants by him. The Lady Joan must have lived to a great age, and after Sir Richard Peshale's death she was twice if not thrice remarried.

There may be a doubt whether William Slepe, who occurs in 1397-8, with some appearance of being Joan's husband, was really so: but certainly she was the wife of Robert de Heywode in 1404 and of Robert Tiptoft in 1409-10.

OF UNDERTENANTS in Chetwynd proper, I shall only name Thomas fitz Eustace of Chetwynd who occurs on a local Jury in 1283.

## CHETWYND CHURCH.

This Church existed at *Domesday*, if we may take the mention of a resident Priest, in that Record, as an indication of such a fact. Its proximity to the now important Church of Newport, the Caput of a Deanery, is no disproof of the greater antiquity of Chetwynd Church, for Newport was non-existent at *Domesday*. We have seen Chetwynd Church valued by a Jury in 1281 at 20 merks (£13. 6s. 8d.) *per annum*. The *Taxation* of 1291 lowers it to £4. 13s. 4d., placing it in the Deanery of Newport (*Novum Burgum*).<sup>1</sup> In 1341 the Assessors of the *Ninth* rightly quoted the Church-Taxation of Chetwynd as 7 merks. They deducted from this two merks, being the average value of the glebe and hay-tithes;—things which were not computable in ascertaining the value of the wheat, wool and lamb of the Parish. The latter were accordingly rated at 5 merks.<sup>2</sup>

The *Valor* of 1534-5 gives the preferment of Ralph Grene, Rector of Chetwynd, as £11 *per annum*, less 3s. 10d. for Synodals and Procurations.<sup>3</sup>

## EARLY INCUMBENTS.

WILLIAM, Parson of Chetwynd, occurs in October 1272. Petronilla widow of Robert Day had a writ *de ingressu* against him, but failed to prosecute. The same Incumbent appears as W. Parson of Chetwynd in a Deed, which I shall set forth elsewhere.

MASTER JOHN DE UPHAENE, Rector of Chetwynd, died May 2, 1318, and on June 27 following—

REGINALD DE CHETWYND, Acolyte, was instituted at presentation of Sir John de Chetwynd, Knight. This Rector occurs in 1319, 1326, and 1343. On January 13, 1351, he exchanged Livings with—

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, pp. 245, 248.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 185.

<sup>3</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 186.

MASTER JOHN DE DOUNTON, Chaplain, late Incumbent of Ky-nardeseye (Kynnersley). Sir John de Chetwynd was still Patron of Chetwynd.

WILLIAM ELYS or ELKYNNE, Priest, was presented by Sir Richard de Peshale, Knight, in January 1363, and resigned in 1365, when, on April 25,—

REGINALD DE CAYNTON, Priest, was instituted. Same Patron. On January 7, 1389, the Rector being dead,—

WILLIAM DE RODENHURST, Priest, was instituted at the presentation of Johanne Lady of 'Chetwind. On May 27, 1391, this Rector exchanged preferments with—

WILLIAM SCHEVYNDON, late Rector of Donyton.

JOHN SHEYNTON, as he is afterwards called, exchanges on Sept. 19, 1393, with—

WILLIAM COWPER, Priest, late Rector of Moxley, who is presented to Chetwynd by Johanna, Relict of Richard Pesshale, knight. On August 3, 1401, Cowper exchanged preferments with—

RICHARD WALLEFORD, late Vicar of the Prebendal Church of Eccleshall. This Rector would seem to be identical with—

SIR RICHARD GARDEYN, Rector of Chetwynd, who has a license of non-residence on Feb. 1, 1403.

Walleford died in 1404, when on August 20,—

SIR WILLIAM FITZ JOHN, Chaplain, was presented by Robert Heywode, entitled *Domicellus*.

---

I shall now notice such members of Chetwynd as may be taken to have been constituents of the *Domesday* Manor. Other villis, though reputed in later times to be members of Chetwynd, were distinct Manors in *Domesday* and must so be treated.

STOCKTON, though now associated manorially with Woodcote, and though in the Parish of Longford, was once a member of Chetwynd. In 1201 there was an Agnes de Stocton alleging herself to be sister of, and coheir with, Eva the heiress of Longford. Agnes' husband had perhaps been Chetwynd's Tenant here, but nothing in Stockton was disputed between the alleged Sisters.

In 1281, 4½ virgates in Stocton are enumerated among the adjuncts of Chetwynd, held in demesne by John de Chetwynd deceased. There was a Robert de Stocton, doubtless Chetwynds Feoffee here, who appears as a Juryman on neighbouring Inquests in 1281, 1283, and 1294.

BARKISFORD seems to be lost. The Inquest of 1281 says that Robert de Chetilton paid 10*s.* rent for Barkisford and Conishill, members of Chetwynd.

CONISHILL. This member of Chetwynd already named, is now lost. The first Adam de Chetwynd gave to Lilleshall Abbey an annual rent of 10*s.* receivable from the Vill of Blacford and Coneshill, and this grant was specified in Henry III.'s Confirmation to Lilleshall, dated Nov. 29, 1265.

---

## Howle.

---

"THE same Tuold holds Hugle, and Walter holds it of him. Batsuen held it (in Saxon times). Here are 11 hides, geldable. Here is (arable) land (enough) for v ox-teams. In demesne are 11 teams and 1111 neat-herds, and a Mill of 64*d.* (annual value). In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 20*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 16*s.* He (Tuold) found it waste."<sup>1</sup>

About the beginning of Henry III.'s reign, Geoffrey Griffin, whom I have noticed under Long Stanton, held this Manor as Feoffee of the Chetwynds. About the year 1250 "Geoffrey Griffin gives to the Abbey of St. Mary of Lilleshall and to the Abbey of St. John the Evangelist of Haghmon, all the vill and all his land of Howle, to be divided equally between the said Abbeys, together with the dower of Sigherit widow of Adam de Howle, when she should die. The Abbeys were to render all services due to the superior Lords. Witnesses, Sir Odo de Hodenet, Baldwin his son, Sir Madoc de Sutton, Hugh de Lega, Robert de Wodecote."

Between the years 1249 and 1257 Master Simon de Wauton, one of Henry III.'s Justiciars, was constantly deputed to try causes of *disseizin* and *mort d'ancestre* in Shropshire. A curious letter or certificate is preserved in the Haughmond Chartulary from Geoffrey Griffin "to his noble and most dear friend Simon de Walton, Justiciar of the King." He informs the said Simon how the Writer, being of sound mind, memory, and sense, had disposed of Howle to the two Abbeys aforesaid, for the health of his soul. He further

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b, 2.

certifies that on the day of St. Alban, Protomartyr of England (June 22), he had given the two Abbots seizin of Howle, by the hand of Thomas de Pikestoke, his Seneschal. He now ratifies the gift by these his Letters Patent, which are attested by Thomas de Pikestoke, Richard son of Thomas de Cherinton, and Richard Bernard of Cherinton.

It would seem that the Canons of Haughmond forthwith surrendered their moiety of Howle to John de Chetwind, already the Suzerain. There is a Deed in the Chartulary, which must have passed between 1250 and 1255, whereby John de Chetewinde binds himself and his heirs to pay a rent of 2*s.* to the Abbey for a moiety of Howle. He further covenants to acquit the Vill of Howle of the service of one *Munitor* and all other service which it owed in war-time at John fitz Alan's Whiteminster,<sup>1</sup> and of all tallages, scutages, &c., due to the King. The Abbey was to have homage and wardship of Chetwynd's heirs, in respect of the said moiety, saving however all that was due of this kind to Sir John fitz Alan (the Lord Paramount) and his heirs. Chetwynd ratified the undertaking with his seal and his corporal oath, in the presence of Robert de Grendon, then Sheriff; Sir William de Hedley, Sir Robert de Halechton (Haughton), and Robert Corbet (of Moreton.)<sup>2</sup>

The Inquest on the death of John de Chetwynd (II.) in 1281, estimates his tenement of Howle at 8 virgates and a Mill (exactly the *Domesday* contents of the Manor); it treats the Vill as a member of Chetwynd, but notifies with signal accuracy how the deceased had held half thereof under Haughmond Abbey, at a rent of 2*s.*, the Abbot being further entitled to homage and wardship in respect of such estate. The other moiety was held by the deceased under Lilleshall Abbey, exactly for similar rent and conditions. These particulars were elicited by a special Writ of March 29, 1281, ordering the Sheriff to ascertain the nature of John de Chetwynd's tenure under the two Abbeys.

The whole affair shows us how completely the Lord and Feoffee changed their feudal relations, when the former took a sub-feoffment under his previous Vassal.

<sup>1</sup> *Apud Album Monasterium Johannis filii Alani*;—the intention being to mark

Oswestry as distinct from Whitchurch.

<sup>2</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 126.

## Sambrook.

"THE same Tuold holds Semebre (of the Earl). Ulgar held it (in Saxon times). Here is a hide and half. There is (arable) land (enough) for vii ox-teams. A knight holds it under Tuold and has one ox-team; and there are v Boors with ii teams; and a Mill, paying a rent of 64*d*. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 45*s*. (*per annum*). Now it is worth 16*s*. Tuold found it waste."<sup>1</sup> This Manor became a mere member of Chetwynd and was held under the Chetwynds by a family named Waldyng. In 1262 Roger Waldyng was one of the Regarders of the Forest of Mount Gilbert. His litigation in 1271-2 with Ralph le Botyler and William de Titley has been noticed under Corselle.<sup>2</sup> It was probably a question as to the boundary between Cross-Hill and Sambrook. About this time we have *Roger Walding de Sambro'* attesting a Calvington Deed. He was one of the Jurors for Bradford Hundred at the Assizes of 1272. Again, Roger Waldyng occurs on a Woodcote Jury in 1278, a Withington Jury in 1283, and a Hodnet Jury in 1284. In December 1285 he is named again as a Regarder of the King's Forest.

Henry de Sambrok, who occurs on a local Jury in 1281, was perhaps of this place.

**SAMBROOK CHAPEL.** Such a structure exists only in Tradition. It must have been immediately subject to the Church of Cheswardine.

ELLERTON probably became a member of Chetwynd from having been originally a member of Sambrook. It is still associated parochially with Sambrook, for both are in the Parish of Cheswardine.

De Chetwynd's Feoffees at Ellerton bore the name of the place. In 1191 and 1200 Adam de Alarton appears as a Recognizor in that Chesswell suit which I have noticed under Eyton.<sup>3</sup> He was I think a knight, for in June 1200 he was one of four Visors sent to ascertain whether the Abbot of Lilleshall's alleged illness was sufficient plea for an essoign in a cause then pending at Westminster. At the Assizes of 1203 Adam de Alarton was amerced half a merk for trespass. On the Pipe-Roll of 1212 Adam de Alarton is recorded

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b, 2.

| <sup>2, 3</sup> *Supra*, pp. 25, 28.

as owing 20s., which he had fined for license to attain 12 Jurors who had decided some suit against him. In 1220 he was one of the Jurors in the Inquest which I have noticed under Dodicote.

The next of this family who occurs was Thomas de Edelarton, Athelarton, or Allarton, as he is variously described. In 1253 he was Juror on a Newport Inquest,<sup>1</sup> in 1260 on a Sheriff-Hales Inquest, and in 1262 was a Regarder of the Forest. He occurs in similar positions in 1272, 1278, 1281, and 1283.

Roger de Ethelarton, Juror on a Wellington Inquest in March 1304, is the next whom I find of this name.

PIXLEY. Half the vill of Pixley is uniformly set down as a member of Chetwynd. The other half was, I presume, appurtenant to Cross-Hill, or to Hinstock, in which Parish the place is situated. Whatever here belonged to Chetwynd was probably at first a member of Sambrook. The Tenants here were Walter de Pikesley, Juror in the Dodicote Inquest of 1220;<sup>2</sup>—Adam de Pikesley, Juror on a local Inquest in 1253;—Henry de Pikesley, Juror on two occasions in 1274, and also in 1283;—and William de Pikesley, a Juror in 1281, and Witness of a Deed (already quoted) in 1293.<sup>3</sup>

In Hilary Term 1283 a cause was tried at Shrewsbury which indicates that part of Pixley was held, or presumed to be held, under the existing Lord of Sambrook. William de Kaynton, as son and heir of Robert de Kaynton, deceased, sued Richard Byde of Tibberton, as Tenant in possession of a messuage and virgate in *Picleslgh*. Richard Byde called Roger Waldyng (of Sambrook) to warranty, who appeared in warranty, and took a technical objection to the suit (one of *mort d'ancestre*), viz. that Robert de Kaynton had not died seized of the premises, having made them over to the present Plaintiff long before his death. The Jury found otherwise, viz. that Robert de Kaynton had died seized, and that since his death his son had never been in possession. So the son recovered the estate and one merk damages. Moreover Roger Waldyng had to provide an equivalent for his ousted tenant.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Elyas de Edelarton also occurs on a Jury of 1253.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, p. 50.

<sup>4</sup> *Placita apud Salop.* 11 Edw. I., Hilary Term, m. 23 verso.

## Pilson.

---

"THE same Turolde holds Plivesdone (of the Earl). Earl Eduin held it (in Saxon times). Here is one hide, geldable. There is (arable) land (enough) for 1111 ox-teams. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 8s. (*per annum*). Turolde found it waste; and so it remains."<sup>1</sup> Such is the *Domesday* account of a Manor which has always since been considered a mere member of Chetwynd, but was held under the Chetwynds by a family of distinction.

HAMO DE PIVELEDON, a Recognizor in the Chesswell Trial of 1191, was surviving in June 1200, and then gave evidence as to what passed on the former occasion.<sup>2</sup> In the same month of June he was a Visor appointed to ascertain the validity of an *essoign de malo lecti*, whereby the Abbot of Lilleshall was avoiding an appearance in the Courts of Westminster. Such an office as Hamo de Pivelesdon's was usually assigned to knights only.

RICHARD DE PIVELEDON occurs between the years 1225 and 1240, but only as a Witness of two Wombridge Charters.

ROGER DE PIVELEDON, the next of this family, occurs as Clerk of the County on April 10, 1241, at which time John le Strange (III.) was Sheriff, and Nicholas de Wililey Under Sheriff.<sup>3</sup> After this it is probable that Roger de Pivelesdon succeeded to the superior office of Nicholas de Wililey, and became John le Strange's immediate Deputy. It was not uncommon for such a Deputy to be styled simply Sheriff; and though Roger de Pivelesdon never appeared at the Exchequer as Sheriff of Shropshire, he is twice called Sheriff in matters which probably occurred between the years 1241 and 1248. The first is as witness of a Haughmond Charter, the next as presiding over an Inquest concerning the Forest immunities of Lilleshall Abbey, in which instance he is styled *Roger de Pynelesdon then Sheriff of Salop and Stafford*.

There are instances of Roger de Pivelesdon attesting Charters before he was Clerk of the County. I refer to one such.<sup>4</sup> It would be vain to recapitulate his various attestations in different parts of the County, and after he ceased to be Deputy-Sheriff. The probability is that he was a stirring man of business. In 1255 we see

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Blakeway's Sheriffs*, Preface, p. v.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 16.

him with the custody of two Manors, Detton and Hulle,<sup>1</sup> a custody which he had probably purchased with the wardship of the heirs. We see him with landed interests at Donington and Farlow, the latter given in marriage with his daughter Alice to Robert de Harley.<sup>2</sup> In Michaelmas Term 1253 he was second Juror on an Inquest concerning the Patronage of Haughmond Abbey. In January 1256 he occurs as a Surety for a Fine proffered by the Prior of Wenlock. That he was a knight is certain; and I think that he had attained the dignity before 1254. The latest attestations of Sir Roger de Pivelesdon belong to the interval between 1260 and 1265. He was deceased in 1272, leaving a widow, Agnes, and a son and heir, Thomas. I have as yet said nothing that will connect Roger de Pivelesdon with Pilson; and indeed I doubt whether he had as much interest there as either of the two following persons, who were his cotemporaries and probably his relations.—

WILLIAM DE PYVLESDON has been mentioned as witness of a Charter about 1253,<sup>3</sup> and I have little doubt but that he was the person who as William de Pulleston was presented in 1256, by the Sheriff of Salop and Staffordshire, among those who had 15 librates of land and yet were not knights.

JORDAN DE PYNELESDON, another cotemporary of Roger, follows him in attesting a High Ercall Deed which certainly passed in 1256. And this Jordan had clearly some concern in Pilson, as the following Fine, levied Feb. 9, 1256, will prove. Odo de Hodenet had claimed a carucate of land in Wyletowe against the said Jordan, Tenant thereof, and by writ of *mort d'ancestre*. He now renounces his claim, and Jordan in turn conceded half the premises, to hold to Odo and his heirs, under Jordan and his heirs, at 12*d.* rent. The residue of the premises was to remain with Jordan,—to hold of the superior Lords of the Fee.

That the locality here described as Wyletowe, was part of Pilson, and is the place still to be recognized under the name of *Whitley Barn*, is very evident: for the Fine itself enumerates the parcels of land which were thenceforth to be held by Odo de Hodenet. They were “half of the field towards Forton, half of the field towards Pykestok (Pickstock), half of the field towards Flotesbrok (Flashbrook), half the capital messuage, half Whyletowemor (Whitley-moor), half the meadow in Le Clun, and the whole meadow near the bridge of Pywesdon (Pilson).”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. IV. pp. 282, 344.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 336.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 177; Vol. IV. p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> *Ita quod dimidium illius campi ver-*

MASTER THOMAS DE PULESDON was, as I shall show under Storchley, son and heir of Roger. In 1272 he was in the King's prison for some offence undeclared. He attests a charter of Shrewsbury Abbey which must have passed between 1272 and 1278. He occurs also in 1292, as will presently appear.

We may now pass on to notice several other cotemporaries of this family.—

ROGER DE PYWELEDON was in 1279 put on a commission to inquire into the conduct of the Sheriff of Herefordshire. In 1283 he was an Assessor and Collector of the tax of the *thirtieth* in Staffordshire.<sup>1</sup> In 1293–4 the taxes necessary for the French war were attempted to be levied in Wales. This caused the well-known *insurrection of Madoc*; and the Welsh Chronicle assures us that Roger de Peuelesdon, a Collector of this tax and a commander of certain Welsh Soldiers, was hanged and beheaded by the insurgents.<sup>2</sup> It is very probable that this Sir Roger was of Pilson, for I find him attesting Newport Deeds between 1285 and 1292.

On July 26, 1288, at Assizes held at Newport,—

ROGER SON OF MASTER THOMAS DE PYWELEDON sued ROGER SON OF JORDAN DE PYWELEDON, Alice his wife, Richard son of Jordan, and Adam de Legh for disseizing him of half an acre of waste in Pywelesdon. The person here called Richard fitz Jordan was, I think, identical with MASTER RICHARD DE PYWELEDON, whom Master Thomas de Pywelesdon, Hugh de Beaumes, and others, undertook, at the Assizes of 1292, to produce at the further mandate of the King or his Justiciars. Master Richard de Pillisdon, be it further observed, is entered in the *Feodary* of 1285 as holding Waranshall (a member of Stoke upon Tern or rather of Moreton Say) under the Lords thereof. There we shall hear more of him. Again, in the year 1292, we have seen Roger son of Thomas de Pulesdon and Master Richard de Pulesdon, joining in an act of

*versus Forton et versus Boream, et dimidium campi versus Pykestok et Austrum, et dimidium campi versus Flotesbrok et Austrum, et dimidium totius capitalis messuagii versus Aquilonem, et dimidium Whyletowemor versus Boream, et dimidium prati in le Clun versus occidentem, simul cum toto illo prato iuxta pontem de Pywesdon, remanebit Odoni.*

Here it must not be understood that Forton was to the north, and Pickstock and Flashbrook to the south, of any com-

mon centre. The map will show such geography to be impossible. What I imagine to be intended is the northern half of the field towards Forton, the southern halves of the fields towards Pickstock and Flashbrook, and so forth: but it is never easy to understand the land-surveying of the 13th century, neither do I know what was the distinction between *Boreas* and *Aquilo*, taken in the above document.

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, I. 785.

<sup>2</sup> *Powell's Chronicle*, p. 278.

Suretiship.<sup>1</sup> In the same year we have Roger son of Jordan de Pivelesdon demising a curtilage in Pivelesdon to Roger son of Master Thomas de Pivelesdon:<sup>2</sup> and the last Roger was one of the Jurors for Bradford Hundred at the Assizes of 1292.

After this, Roger son of Jordan de Pivelesdon occurs in the following capacities:—viz. as second Juror in a Bolas Inquest taken about June 1301, and as Assessor and Collector, in Shropshire, of the tax of *the fifteenth*, granted by Parliament in January 1301, and still in course of collection in 1302, and as witness of a Newport Deed in 1315.

I have further to notice of Roger son of Thomas de Pivelesdon, that in June 1300 he was one of the Jurors on the great Perambulation of the Forests of Shropshire, and that in May 1304 he was second Juror on a Donington Inquest.

Meanwhile and down to a later period we have frequent notice of a ROGER DE PIVELESDON, or PEULESDON, without any patronymic distinction to identify him with either of the above. He attests a Deed dated at Newport, April 5, 1293; was fourth Juror on a Tong Inquest in July 1296; second Juror on a Bolas Inquest in May 1302; fourth Juror on a Little-Buildwas Inquest in December following; fifth witness of a Donington Deed about 1312;—last witness of a Tong Deed in June 1314;—and first witness of a Donington Deed in April 1324.

RICHARD DE PEULESDON, who occurs in 1309 and 1310 as a Commissioner of Levies in North Wales and the Marches, was perhaps the same with Master Richard, son of Jordan. There lived in the same reign—

THOMAS DE PEULESDON, of Staffordshire, styled *Valettus* in 1311, when he was addressed as Commander of certain Shropshire levies. He occurs again in 1322 as Manucaptor for an adherent of the Rebel Earl of Lancaster. Also there was one—

PHILIP DE PEULESDON, a Leader of Levies, raised in the Lordship of Ellesmere in 1316. Lastly there was a—

HUGH DE PEULESDON, a man-at-arms, summoned from Shropshire to attend a Great Council at Westminster in May 1324.<sup>3</sup>

PICKSTOCK. That part of Pickstock Township which is now in Chetwynd Parish, was originally a member of Pilson.

I give extracts of two Deeds in illustration of this—

About 1290–1300, “Roger son of Thomas de Pyvelesdon gives

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 346.

<sup>2</sup> *Blakeway's Sheriffs*, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 1285.

to Roger de Flossebroc, Tanner (Bercario) and Amice his wife, three parcels of waste in the fields of Pixtok, whereof one, measuring 220 feet by 55 feet, lay in the field between Pyxtok and Pyvlusdon, and adjoined land which Roger-on-the-Grene of Pixtok was holding under the Grantor. Another parcel adjoined lands of Roger de Pixtok and Roger fitz Ralph. The Grantees and their heirs were to hold the whole, not under the Grantor, but under the Lords of the Fee. Witnesses, John Lord of Chetewynde; Roger son of Jordan de Pyvelesdon, Roger de Ethelarton, Roger de Pixtok, and Robert de Pixtok."

A somewhat later transaction between precisely the same parties shows us, how much a man's name might vary with the place of his residence. "Roger de Flossebroc, Tanner," is now "Roger fitz William of Pyestoke." To him and Amice his wife, Roger son of Master Thomas de Pywelesdon gives all that messuage and land which Roger-on-the-Grene of Pyestoke had previously held under the Grantor for a term. He gives also all his own arable land in the fields of Pyestoke with a parcel of land called *Le Aspes*, reserving to himself and his heirs two pieces of land in Hare-medewe-heth, and all his share of unreclaimed land in Pyestoke, and an acre of land lying nearest to the vill of Pywelesdon. He concedes also all his meadows and moors in Picstoke;—the whole to be held by the Grantees and the heirs of Roger fitz William, with all such privileges in the township of Pycstoke as had been enjoyed by the Grantor's Ancestors, by payment of 16*s.* annual rent to the Lords of the Fee. The Grantor received for this 4 merks, and (apparently as an after-thought) reserved to himself a messuage and land which Richard Scachard of Pycstoke held under him. Witnesses, John Lord of Chetewynde, Roger Jurdan (*i.e.* Roger son of Jordan de Pilson); William de Caynton; Roger de Ethelarton and Roger Waldyn.<sup>1</sup>

---

## Lawley.

---

ONE moiety of this Manor has been already noticed. The other

<sup>1</sup> Deeds, in possession of Robert Gardner, Esq., of Leighton. The second Deed has a rude seal of white wax, charged with

a sort of fleury cross of eight points. The rank of the Grantor was evidently far less than knightly.

is described in *Domesday* as part of the Fief which Turolde held of the Norman Earl.—“The same Turolde holds Lauele, and Hunnit holds it of him. Here is one hide geldable. There is (arable) land enough for 11 ox-teams. In demesne is one team, and there are 1111 Serfs and 1 Villain here. Its value (in King Edward’s time) was 12s. (*per annum*). Now it is worth 10s.”<sup>1</sup>

This estate followed the usual course of Turolde’s Manors, viz. that what Turolde held under the Earl, came to be held by De Chetwynd under Fitz Alan. As regards the Under-tenure too of Hunnit, the general rule, already laid down,<sup>2</sup> holds good with respect to Lawley. It passed from Hunnit to the descendants of another Saxon, viz. Toret; and from Toret to Corbet of Moreton.

In 1180 Peter fitz Thoret was amerced half a merk by Justices of the Forest for waste in *Lauele*.

Bartholomew Toret, who lived in the reigns of John and Henry III., gave a virgate in Lawley to the White Ladies of Brewood. The gift was “with his Sister Gundred,” who evidently became one of the Sisterhood.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 describes the whole of Laueleg as a hide and a half,—exactly the *Domesday* estimate. It adds that Robert Corbet holds a moiety (he really held two-thirds) *under the fee of John de Chetewind*. Then (after giving the tenure of the 2 virgates which were of the Fee of Wem as before noted) the Record proceeds to state how the White Nuns of Brewood had acquired and still held one virgate under Robert Corbet. The Manor did suit to the Hundred twice a year at the Sheriff’s *Tourns*, and paid 4d. *stretward*.<sup>3</sup>

The *Feodary* of 1284, known as *Kirby’s Quest*, would indicate an unaccountable change in the mesne-tenure of this Manor, for the Chetwynds would seem now to have no concern here, and with them Fitz Alan’s Seignury to have vanished also. “Robert Corbet,” says the Record, “holds half the Vill of Laueley under William de Hodnet, and he holds it of the King *in capite*.” The Bradford Tenure-Roll, about the same period, repeats the above statement verbatim; and actually enumerates “half the vill of Lawley” among the members of Hodnet, when that Manor is in its turn described. There is no mistake therefore here; but I know

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 258, a, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. pp. 48, 49, 304-5, 308-9.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 56. The propor-

tion of *Stretward* for 1½ hides was (in Bradford Hundred) 6d.: but the non-payment of *motfee* indicates some special immunity.

nothing of the mode of this change, and can only refer to the parallel case of Horton, where the Hodnets acquired a mesne-interest, quite irreconcilable with any known or ordinary right of succession.

The Inquests taken in 1301 on the death of Robert Corbet of Moreton rightly make him to have had both shares of Lawley. We have seen how he purchased the one share from Walter de Stanton :<sup>1</sup> but of the share now under notice, the Inquest says that "Robert Corbet had had 3*s.* assized rent in Laueleye, receivable from seven Villains; and that these tenements were held by the deceased under William de Hodnet by service of 3*s.* (*per annum*)."<sup>2</sup>

OF UNDERTENANTS here I may name Hugh Faber, assessed, in 1180, at 4*s.* for a smithy (*fabrica*) in *Laueleia*; such an erection being, I presume, a *pourpresture*. The men of *Laueleia* were at the same time assessed 3*s.* 6*d.* for imbladements of 3½ acres of wheat. In 1209 *Laueleg* is named as one of the Villis which were within Regard of the Forest of Mount Gilbert, and its Freeholders were assessed accordingly.

One Alan de *Laueleg* occurs as a Witness about 1220–30.<sup>3</sup> At the Forest-Assize of 1262 one Thomas de Lawley is entered on the list entitled *Essonia mortis*. He was dead, I presume. Ralph de Lawley appeared in his stead. Previous to the Assizes of 1272, Richard de Cherleton had been suing Robert fitz Reginald for one-fifth of a virgate in *Lauele*. His suit had been under a *Writ de recto*, and before the County Court. His title rested on the sometime seizin of his mother, Matilda. The Tenant appealed to a trial by *Grand Assize*, but the result does not appear.<sup>4</sup>

---

## Longford.

---

THE history of this Manor is one of some uncertainty, but involving points of exceeding interest. In Saxon times it was of the inheritance of the Earls of Mercia. In *Domesday* it appears as the chief of those thirteen Manors which Tuold de Verley held under the Norman Earl.—"Tuold holds Langeford of Earl Roger. Earl

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquisitiones*, 29 Edw. I., No. 45.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 327, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Assizes*, 56 Hen. III., m. 14.

Eduin held it (in Saxon times). Here are vi hides with iiii Berewicks, and they pay geld. In demesne are ii hides: and viii Villains have iiii ox-teams there (*i. e.* in the demesne). Under him (Turolde), two Knights hold iiii hides, and have iiii ox-teams thereon; and there are iiii Neatherds, vii Villains, iiii Boors and i Radman with  $3\frac{1}{2}$  teams, and still four more teams might be employed. Here is a Mill. In King Edward's time the whole Manor was worth £9 (*per annum*). Now it is worth 44s. He (Turolde) found it waste."<sup>1</sup>

Any attempt to identify the *Domesday* Berewicks of Longford must be partly conjectural. I take it that Cheswell, near Longford, was certainly one, and that Stirchley, though eight miles distant, was certainly another. Perhaps Culmayre, a place anciently annexed to Stirchley, was a third. If Evelith, near Shiffnal, was not the fourth, I know not where the fourth was. Supposing this identification to be right, the following analogies are observable. Longford with three of its members, viz. Cheswell, Stirchley, and Culmayre, are found associated at a later date in such a way as to make it quite credible that they were originally one, as to tenure. But they formed an exception to the usual descent of Turolde's Manors, that is, they never passed to the Chetwynds, nor to the Fief which Chetwynd held under Fitz Alan. But with Evelith it was otherwise. That estate, as I have already shown,<sup>2</sup> did continue to be of the Fee of Chetwynd, and was considered a member of Moreton Corbet rather than of Longford. This was perhaps because Moreton Corbet remained in the Fee of Chetwynd, while Longford did not. The Undertenancy of Stirchley and Evelith renders it very probable that they were originally members of the same Manor, for Fitz-Toret first, and Corbet afterwards, held them both,—held, that is, Stirchley of the Fee of Longford, and Evelith of the Fee of Chetwynd.

Again, it is remarkable that while we suppose Longford to have lost its *Domesday* member, Evelith, we find the loss balanced by the gain of a member, which had constituted a distinct Manor at *Domesday*. This was Brockton, which, except in *Domesday*, always appears as a mere member of Longford.

King Henry I. is said on good authority to have granted 100 *solidates of land in Longeford* to a Feoffee unnamed, but who was ancestor of Eva de Longford, living in the reigns of Henry II., Richard I., and John. Now such a grant of 100 *solidates of land* may easily have led to that partial dismemberment or rearrange-

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, b. 1.

| <sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 304 et seqq.

ment of *Domesday* Manors and Berewicks, which I have supposed. But the question here arises as to how Longford, a part of Turolde's Fief, came into the hands of Henry I.? I have endeavoured to answer that question already,<sup>1</sup> and can say nothing further on the point.

Either Hamo was the name of the person to whom Henry I. granted 100 *solidates of land in Longford*, or else that person was succeeded by Hamo, Lord of Longford. Hamo Lord of Longford was deceased in 1165, leaving two daughters, Eva and Agnes. Longford went to Eva and to her husband, Robert de Brimpton, by direction and express gift of Henry II. Of Sibil *alias* Basilia Fitz Odo, whose husband I now know to have been the above Hamo, I have spoken before under Rushbury.<sup>2</sup> Her estate there passed, like her husband's estate at Longford, to their daughter Eva. Besides his Shropshire estates Hamo de Longford seems to have held the following, viz. one knight's-fee at Church Eaton and Orslow (Staffordshire), under the Barons Stafford; two-thirds of a knight's-fee at Mid-Aston (Oxfordshire) under the same Barons; and half a knight's-fee in *Ywerne*;—but where *Ywerne* was, or who was Seigneurial Lord thereof, I have not inquired. Eva de Longford, daughter of Hamo, was given by Henry II. in marriage to Robert de Brimpton. This person took his name from Brimpton, in Berkshire, a manor which he held under the Mortimers of Wigmore. As Lord of Longford, in right of his wife, Robert de Brimpton became a Tenant *in capite*. Hence the *Feodary* of 1165, called the *Liber Niger*, contains a *Carta* or return from Robert de Brimpton. He acknowledges himself to hold one knight's-fee, of *old feoffment*, "which," says he, addressing the King, "thou gavest me with a certain gentle woman (*liberâ muliere*), named Eva, who is heir thereof, by service of one knight, my service being to be performed at thy charges."<sup>3</sup>

This *Carta* must be taken to allude to Longford and its adjuncts. It is repeated in duplicate under Shropshire and Staffordshire, but one tenure *in capite* is its only subject. Another folio of the *Liber Niger* would indicate Robert de Brimpton's tenure under the Baron Stafford to have been only one-fourth of a knight's-fee; but the passage is self-contradictory, and probably corrupt.<sup>4</sup> The allusion is doubtless to Robert de Brimpton's tenure of Church Eaton and Orslow. I think that his service thereon was a whole knight's-fee.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. IV. p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> *Liber Niger*, I. pp. 140, 148.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 138.

Robert de Brinton, with consent of his wife Eva, gave the Church of Eaton to Polesworth Nunnery (Warwickshire).<sup>1</sup> This he is expressed to have done as *heir of Edelina*; but I conceive that his wife Eva was the heiress of Eaton, and that she derived it from her father, Hamo. That Hamo may have derived from some Edelina, I can only suggest generally, knowing nothing of the circumstances.

It appears that Robert de Brinton gave the Church of Longford to Shrewsbury Abbey. His gift is the last and perhaps the most recent of those enumerated in Henry II.'s Confirmation of July 1155.<sup>2</sup> As the King had then been only a few months on the throne, it is hereby proved that Robert de Brimpton's marriage, and investiture in Longford, must belong to that interval.

Robert de Brimpton seems to have subsequently quarrelled with the Monks of Shrewsbury. In the *time of hostilities*, by which I understand the rebellion of 1173-4, he violently wrested the Chapel of Kinardeshey (Kinnersley) from the Monks. In or before the year 1185 Robert de Brimpton died. He left issue at least two sons, Adam and John; and his wife Eva survived him. She of course continued in seizin of all which she had derived from her Father, Hamo, and therefore of Longford. On October 22, 1185, a Fine (one of the earliest on Record) was levied at Westminster, between Eva de Longeford, as she is styled, and the Monks of Shrewsbury. Geoffrey Bishop of Ely, John Bishop of Norwich, and Ranulph de Glanvill were the presiding Justices. By this Fine the Abbot of Shrewsbury renounced all claim to the Church of Longeford, his title to which had been disputed by Eva. Eva in return restored the Chapel of Kinardeshey to the Abbey, which *Robert de Bruminton*, her husband, had in time of hostilities so violently wrested from the Monks.<sup>3</sup>

In 1190 or 1191 Eva de Longeford took a second husband; for the Pipe-Roll of the latter years exhibits Walter de Witefeld accounting for a Fine of 15 merks by which he had obtained Eva de Langeford and her land. The last instalment of this Fine was paid in 1194.

It was with reference to his tenure-*in-capite* of a knight's-fee in Longford, that we find Walter de Witefeld assessed to the following

<sup>1</sup> *Dugdale's Warwicksh.* (Thomas), p. 1108. Robert de Stafford's grant of the Church of Etton to Pollesworth was probably the confirmatory act of the Suzerain.

It is expressed to be "*quantum in ipso fuit*" (Pat. 21 Rich. II., p. 3, m. 22).

<sup>2</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 36.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, No. 281.

scutages, viz.—in 1194, to the Scutage for King Richard's redemption, £1; in 1195, to the scutage of Normandy, £1; and in 1197, to the second Scutage of Normandy, £1. The last payment is expressed as relieving Walter de Witefeld from *transfretation* in the army of Normandy. Again, in 1199 Walter de Whitefeld fined 40*s.* *ne transfretet*; but he was at the same time assessed at two merks, for one fee, to the cotemporary scutage. He paid 20*s.* only, the sum proportioned to three-fourths of a fee, and the abatement was allowed at the Exchequer, because of his Fine, and because the other fourth of his knight's-fee was held by him in demesne. In 1201 Walter de Witefeld was assessed 2 merks to the second scutage of King John. In 1202 his proper assessment, of two merks, to the third scutage, was covered by a Fine of 5 merks. In 1203 a Fine of 6 merks, in composition of the fourth scutage, was treble the ordinary assessment. In 1204 a Fine of 10 merks was in fact paying fourfold the average assessment of 2½ merks per fee to the fifth scutage. To the sixth scutage of King John, in 1205, Walter de Witefeld was not assessed; but in 1206, to the seventh scutage (of 20*s.* per fee) he paid 2 merks. To the scutage of Poitou in 1214, Walter de Whitfeld paid the average assessment, viz. 40*s.* on one fee, *quod fuit Roberti de Brinton*.

Leaving for the present this matter of scutages, I must recur to other portions of my subject.—In Easter Term 1198 a suit commenced between the Abbess of Polesworth on the one hand, and Walter de Witefeld and Eva his wife on the other, concerning the Advowson of Church Eaton. The particulars do not belong to Shropshire History, but in Michaelmas Term 1203 the Abbess got definite sentence in her favour, on the ground that the Abbess had had the Advowson *by grant of Eva's ancestors*.

At the very commencement of King John's reign, that is before Michaelmas 1199, Walter de Witefeld negotiated a Fine of 15 merks, for having the King's Confirmation of the Charters of Henry I. and Henry II. concerning 100 solidates of land in Longeford, and also for having a Charter of Free-warren in the same Vill.<sup>1</sup> The Shropshire Tenure-Roll of the year 1211 is in perfect keeping with this, for it records how Walter de Wytefeld, Knight, was a Tenant *in capite*, and owed the King the service of one knight, and how his land was worth 100*s.* (*per annum*).<sup>2</sup>

Walter de Whitfield seems to have been the subject or mover of many litigious proceedings concerning his wife's inheritance. One

<sup>1</sup> *Oblata*, p. 16.

| <sup>2</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 55.

matter, in which he was mixed up, commenced indeed before his marriage. It related to Cheswell, a member of Longford, and was as follows. In 1191, as I infer from the Pipe-Roll, Ralph Archdeacon of Hereford and Robert de Witefeld were in eyre at Shrewsbury. They seem to have had Robert de Shrewsbury and Robert de Haselec as associates. The four decided a case of *novel disseizin*, moved by Robert de Huntiland against Robert de Wodecot, in favour of Huntiland; and Wodecot was left in *misericordiâ*. Thus much was recollected nine years afterwards by seven out of the twelve Recognizors who tried the cause; but they did not recollect what seems to have been a material part of an after-question, viz. "whether Eva de Langford came into court and warranted the premises to Huntiland on this occasion." The seven Jurors should be named. They were Adam de Chetewind, Peter de Eiton, Hamo de Pivelesdon, Adam de Alarton (Ellerton), Philip de Buterey, Walter de Elpole (probably Epley or Apley), and Pagan de Cherinton.

I suppose the fact was that Eva de Longford did warrant the premises to Huntiland, and that Robert de Woodcote conceiving himself entitled to a similar Warranty or an equivalent, sued the said Eva to obtain the same. I cannot otherwise account for an *oblatum* of one merk recorded on the Pipe-Roll of 1193. It was proffered by Eva de Langeford, its object being to obtain a *recognition* (a trial by Jury) in a cause pending between herself and Robert de Wudecote. I suppose Woodcote was now successful, but that his success was evaded by the Defendant and her husband. A Plea-Roll of Trinity Term 1194 would seem to show him endeavouring to secure an advantage gained.—"Robert de Wudecot, as opposed to Walter de Witefeld (acting for his wife Eva), moves for his *Record* and *Judgment* concerning warranty of his Charter of Corshal, as it remained on a former occasion in the *Curia*." Walter de Witefeld also seems to have moved for a new Writ, admitting him as a party to the suit.<sup>1</sup>

On November 25, 1194, Walter de Witefeld essoigned himself by Brien "his man," and Eva de Langeford essoigned herself by Bernard de Eston, in the *Plea of land* which they had against Robert de Wodecot. The Court adjourned the case to the Quinzaine of Hilary (January 27, 1195).<sup>2</sup>

The Curial Records of 1195 are lost, and we can only guess at the

<sup>1</sup> *Robertus de Wudecot petit versus Walterum de Witefeld, positum loco Eve uxoris sue, recordum et judicium suum de warrantia carte sue de Corshal, sicut*

*remansit aliâ vice in Curia. Et Wallerus petit breve per quod implacitet.*

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Cur. Regis*, I. 126; II. 239.

phases through which this Suit passed before it recurs again to view. I presume then that, at some adjourned hearing, and in the reign of Richard I., Robert de Woodcote established his right to have a warranty of the premises from Whitfield and his wife, and that they were consequently obliged to proceed against Huntiland as tenant in possession. Huntiland also seems to have reverted to the former decision in his favour. I consider it as a sequence of some such intervening steps that,—

On April 23, 1200, it is recorded on the Plea-Roll how the Sheriff had had certain orders on the subject. He had been ordered to ascertain, through the inquiries of lawful knights of the County, “who were the Recognizors and Justiciars in the old case of Huntiland *versus* Wodecot concerning the land of Chershal,” and to send two of the said knights with a report to Westminster and to send the Recognizors also. It now (April 23) appeared that neither Knights nor Recognizors were in attendance: so the Court made a more stringent order to the same effect, returnable on June 18 following.<sup>1</sup>

On that very day the seven Recognizors, already named, appeared at Westminster. The Record calls them, by mistake, Recognizors in the case of Wittefeld *versus* Huntingeland. That was the case now pending. They, in their account given to the Court, described what had occurred in the case of Huntiland *versus* Woodcote; I have already repeated their statement, and assigned the year 1191 as the probable date of the trial which they had to remember. I happen to know that two of the Justiciars who tried it were now dead, whilst the Recognizors themselves stated that a third, Robert de Shrewsbury, was now Bishop of Bangor. Had it been otherwise, reference would probably have been made to the Justiciars themselves. As to their Rolls, we have here, by the way, a curious indication that the Curial Records of the early years of Richard I. were non-existent in the first year of John.

On July 8, 1200, an order was made by the Court in the above case, but I cannot think that it is accurately recorded. I give it however as it stands, marking the suspected expression in *Italics*.—A day (in three weeks of Michaelmas) is given to Robert de Huntiland, *acting for his wife*, and to Walter de Wittefeld, acting for his wife Eva, in a plea concerning an assize of novel disseizin. A duplicate Roll is perhaps more correct. It says—“A day (in three weeks of Michaelmas) is given, by request of the parties, to Walter de Wittefeld and Robert de Huntiland, to hear judgment at West-

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Cur. Regis*, I. 126; II. 239.

minster concerning a hide of land in Chershall, in a plea of assize. And their pleadings (*loquela*) are enrolled on the Rolls of Trinity Term."

I suppose that an order of April 15, 1201, was an adjourned order in this case. Its terms are however hardly reconcilable with such an idea. The entry runs thus.—"Dies datus est Waltero de Hwitefeld et Roberto de Huntele *de inquisitione facta de dote Eve uxoris ejusdem Walteri*,—a die Sti. Michaelis in xv dies." The last that I hear of this Suit is on October 13, 1201, when Joceline Clerk, Attorney of Robert de Huntland, having a Plea *de audiendo judicio suo*, against Walter de Witefeld, essoigns his attendance at Westminster.—

Another Suit, which Walter de Whitfield had against the Abbot of Lilleshall, is indicated by the following entries on the Plea-Rolls of Westminster.—

January 27, 1200. A day (in three weeks of Easter) is given to the Abbot of Lilleshall (essoigning himself by Robert Burell) in a *Placitum averiorum*, against Walter de Witefeld.

June 18, 1200. Adam de Chetwind, Pagan de Cherinton, Hamo de Pivelesdon, and Adam de Alartun, who had been sent to the Abbot of Lilleshall to ascertain whether the infirmity, by which he was essoigning himself, in a suit against Walter de Witefeld, was real sickness (*languor*) or not, report that he is sick (*languidus*), and that they (the Visors) had given him a day, viz. in one month from the morrow of St. Dunstan, at the Tower of London.

Oct. 13, 1201. A day (in one month of Easter) is given to the Abbot of Lilleshall (represented by Benjamin, his Canon) and to Walter de Witefeld and Eva his wife, to hear their sentence in a Plea of Convention concerning the Bosc of Lilleshall.

Again, an important suit was at this same time pending between Walter de Whitfield and Eva his wife on the one hand, and Agnes, sister of the said Eva, on the other. Agnes is sometimes called "de Stockton," I suppose with reference to a deceased husband. First we have a Fine of 20 merks, given to the Crown in 1195 by "Agnes daughter of Hamo de Langeford," that she might have trial concerning a fair portion of her Father's lands, in Langeford, Eaton, Horslage, Eston, and Iwerne, against Walter de Witefeld and his wife Eva. The following entries on the Westminster Plea-Rolls relate to this Suit.

Oct. 27, 1199. The argument (*Loquela*) in a plea of land between Walter de Witef' and Eva his wife and Agnes de Stokton

is adjourned *sine die*, because Walter has compounded by Fine for his transfretation.<sup>1</sup>

Oct. 13, 1201. Staffordshire. Agnes de Stocton owes the King (a further fine of) half a merk, for having her cause argued (at Westminster I presume) against Walter de Witefeld and Eva his wife, which cause had been adjourned till the arrival of Justices (itinerant).

Nov. 12, 1201. A day (January 27) is given to Walter de Witef and Agnes de Stokton.

On January 20, 1203, a Fine was levied at Westminster between Agnes de Stokton, Plaintiff, and Walter de Witefeld and Eva his wife, Tenants, of half a knight's-fee in Langeford, half a knight's-fee in Eiton (Church Eaton), a fourth part of a knight's-fee in Ywerne, a moiety of two-thirds of a knight's-fee in Eston (Mid-Aston, Oxfordshire), and a moiety of 1½ hides of land, &c., in Cotes and in Walles (Coates and Eastwall, near Rushbury), whereof was Suit-at-law between the parties. Agnes now *quitclaimed* all her right in the aforesaid lands and fees, and in the inheritance of Hamund, father of herself and Eva. She quitclaimed the same in favour of Walter and Eva and the heirs of Eva. In return Walter and Eva conceded to Agnes that half-hide less one bovate, in Bracton (Brockton), which Agnes had previously held, also one bovate, which laid between the two Coppices (*bruilia*) of *Haresden* and *Witheges*, so as to make up a full half-hide. Also they conceded to Agnes that half-virgate in Bracton which Roger fitz Ralph held, with the messuage and appurtenances thereof, saving the Vivary and Coppice of the said vill of Bracton to Walter and Eva, and the heirs of Eva. Further, they conceded to Agnes half a hide in Horslawe (Orslow), saving to themselves the Vivary and Mill of Horslawe and one croft near the Vivary, which Adwin held:—the whole to be held by Agnes and her heirs, under Walter and Eva and the heirs of Eva, the Tenants doing the forinsec service proportionate to the land. Lastly, Walter and Eva gave Agnes 20 merks in money.

It is evident that Agnes de Stockton, though *de jure* a Coheireess with her sister Eva, was all but disinherited. The original partition, so favourable to Eva, had been made early in Henry II.'s reign: and the question remains as to how far it was the practice of that æra to abridge the rights of younger coheireesses.

<sup>1</sup> Vide supra, p. 105. It would seem that, on the levy of any Scutage, a Military Tenant of the Crown was protected

against all Lawsuits, whether he actually embarked for foreign service, or compounded for not doing so.

The Shropshire Pipe-Roll of 1205 shows Agnes de Stocton fining half a merk that some (new) trial between her and Walter de Whitefeld might proceed.

In the same year I find notice of a Staffordshire Suit, where Walter de Witefeld and his wife Eva, represented by Adam de Brimton (Eva's son I think), were opposed to *Alice de Hopeton*, concerning  $1\frac{1}{2}$  knight's-fees in Hopeton and Thene, but I can hardly decipher the Record, much less suggest its bearing on our present subject.<sup>1</sup>

In Easter Term 1208, Robert de Wodecote and Milisent his wife and *Agnes wife of Robert*<sup>2</sup> acknowledged at Westminster that, in regard of their Villain-tenants, they owed suit to the Mill of Horse-lawe, as required by Walter de Witefeld and his wife Eva on the strength of a previous Fine.<sup>3</sup>

We have seen that Walter de Whitfield was assessed to a Scutage in 1214. Within two years of that time it is evident that his stepson, Adam de Brimpton, had succeeded to his maternal inheritance and was in rebellion against King John. A Writ-Close of September 15, 1216, requires the Sheriff of Salop and Staffordshire to give Adam de Brimpton's lands to his Brother John, seeing that Adam was with the King's enemies.<sup>4</sup> On Nov. 4, 1217, a Writ of King Henry III. orders the Sheriff to reinvest Adam de Brimton with his lands, he having returned to his fealty.<sup>5</sup> At the Assizes of 1221 Adam de Brimton was one of the knightly Jurors who tried cases of *Grand Assize*. His assessments to scutages in respect of a knight's-fee in Shropshire were as follows.—

In 1218, to the first scutage of Henry III., 2 merks; in 1221, to the scutage of Biham, no assessment; in 1224, to the scutage of Montgomery, 2 merks; but to the scutage of Bedford, an acquittance; in 1229, to the scutage of Keri, 2 merks; in 1230, to the scutage of Brittany, an acquittance; in 1231, to the scutage of Poitou, an acquittance; in 1232, to the scutage of Elvein, an acquittance.

On January 26, 1236, Adam de Brimpton (I.) being dead, the King orders the Sheriff of Shropshire to take security for 100s., the Relief due from his son Adam, whose homage the King had accepted. The Sheriff is forthwith to give seizin to the heir of all such lands as his father had held *in capite*.<sup>6</sup> The Pipe-Roll of 1236

<sup>1</sup> Robert de Boc appears as Alice de Hopeton's Attorney. A family named Boc afterwards held Hopton and Thene under the Barons Stafford. Jordan de Toke, William de Ipstones, William de Grealey, and Thomas de Halghton, were

Recognizors in the cause.

<sup>2</sup> Identical with Agnes de Stockton.

<sup>3</sup> *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 56 (verified from the Original).

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Claus.* I. 288, 341.

<sup>6</sup> *Rot. Finium*, I. 296.

shows Adam de Brimton paying the whole Fine at once. This change, or succession, may perhaps account for Longford not having been assessed to the Aid of 1235-6.

In or about the year 1240, various *Feodaries* record Adam de Brimton's different Tenures. In Shropshire he held 1 fee *in capite* in *Langeford*; in Staffordshire, 1 fee of the Baron Stafford in Eyton (Church Eaton) and Orselawe; in Oxfordshire, half a fee of the Baron Stafford in Middel-Eston; and in Berkshire, 1 fee in Brimton under Ralph de Mortimer.<sup>1</sup>

The Shropshire Pipe-Roll of 1242 records Adam de Brimton as paying 1 merk, *de fine pro passagio*. I suppose he had obtained quittance from foreign service.

In 1254 Adam de Brimton was returned among those who held 20 *librates* of land in Salop and Staffordshire. The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 speaks thus of Longford.—“Adam de Brimton holds the Manor of Longheford, with its appurtenances, *in capite* of the King, by service of a knight's-fee in time of war, at his own charges. He does suit neither to County nor Hundred; by what warranty of exemption the Jurors know not.”<sup>2</sup>

Adam de Brimpton (II.) was assessed to Aids and Scutages as follows, in respect of his Shropshire fee, viz.—in 1245, to the Aid on marriage of the Princess Royal, £1; in 1246, to the Scutage of Gannok, an acquittance; in 1254, to the Aid for knighting Prince Edward, £2; and in 1260, to the Scutage of Wales, an acquittance.

The Pipe-Roll of 1261 shows a sum of £7. 10s., paid by the Sheriff to Hoel ap Madoc, Thomas de Roshal, and Adam de Brimton. This was for their expenses in proceeding to the Ford of Montgomery as Commissioners to treat about a truce with Lewellyn.

The Writ of *Diem clausit* on the death of Adam de Brimpton (II.) bears date June 20, 1274. The Oxfordshire Inquest found him to have held 1½ hides in Middel Eston under the Baron Stafford, and a messuage there, under Thomas de Clare. Adam, his son and heir, was 30 years of age and more. The Staffordshire Inquest found him to have held Eyton (Church Eaton) under the Baron Stafford, by service of a knight's-fee and certain suits of Court. The Shropshire Inquest, held at Newport on July 3, 1274, found him to have held Longford *in capite* by service of one knight's-fee. He was bound at his own cost to provide a Guard with a barbed horse

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 45, 46, 102, 109. | <sup>2</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 55.

for 40 days whenever the King in person approached Wales. The total annual value of the Manor was £8. 13s. 10d.<sup>1</sup>

It was Adam de Brinton (III.) who, having obtained livery of his Father's lands on July 10, 1274, was summoned for service against Lewellyn in the summer of 1277. He acknowledged his tenure at Longford in the usual form and, being a knight, proposed to discharge his service in person.<sup>2</sup> The *Feodaries* of 1284-5 register Adam de Brinton's service for Longford as only half a knight's-fee. Brockton and Chrestill (Cheswell) are reckoned as members of the Manor. Adam de Brinton held his *free court* here, twice in the year, and judged pleas of bloodshed and hue-and-cry. He had gallows and warren, and exercised his rights in these respects.

In January 1287 Adam de Brinton was put in commission as a Conservator of the peace for Berkshire. In October 1292 he was one of the knightly Jurors who tried several Pleas of *Quo Warranto* in Shropshire. In 1297 he was summoned for foreign service as a Tenant of 20 librates of land and upwards in Berkshire and Shropshire. In 1298, as a Staffordshire landowner, he had military summons against the Scots. In 1300 he sat in Parliament as a Knight of the Shire for Berkshire. In 1301 he had military summonses against the Scots in respect of his tenure in Oxfordshire, in Berkshire, and in Shropshire.<sup>3</sup>

The Writ of *Diem clausit* on the death of Adam de Brinton (III.) bears date May 10, 1315. The subsequent Inquests notice only his tenures at Church Eaton and Longford. Of the latter Manor it is said that the deceased held it *in capite* of the Escheat of Earl Roger (read Robert de Belesme) by service of half a knight's-fee, and also of providing one armed horseman with a barbed horse for 40 days, at his own cost, to accompany the King's army in any Welsh war. Among the items of the estate, the capital messuage and garden are valued at 3s. 4d. *per annum*; a carucate of land containing 60 acres at 20s.; 6 acres of meadow at 9s.; assized rents of free tenants, 9s.; of customary tenants, 40s.; and of cottagers, 3s. A water-mill yielded 6s. 8d. *per annum*; a parcel of moor-land, 2s.; and the Pleas of Court, 1s. 6d. John, son and heir of the deceased, was found to have been 27 years of age at Michaelmas 1314.<sup>4</sup> In the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316, Adam de Bruntone is erroneously entered as Lord of Longeford; but John de Brimpton duly occupies his place as one of the Lords of Brimpton and Wasing (Berkshire)

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 2 Edw. I., No. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, I. 501.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquisitions*, 8 Edw. II., No. 23.

and of Middle Aston (Oxfordshire).<sup>1</sup> From March, 1319, to March, 1322, I find John de Brompton serving as Sheriff of Oxfordshire and Berkshire. He held the same office in 1327 and 1328. In 1322 and 1325 he occurs as a Commissioner of Array in the same Counties. In 1327 he sat in Parliament as a Knight of the Shire for Berkshire.<sup>2</sup>

CHESSWELL, the only member of the *Domesday* Manor of Longford, which I should notice here, has no other facts connected with its early tenure than those already embodied under Longford.

How there came to be a *Grange* at Chesswell, I have no evidence. Under Lilleshall Abbey I shall show that *Chirshall Grange* was among its possessions at the Dissolution: but the Chartulary of that House does not give particulars of such an acquisition.

#### LONGFORD CHURCH.

Nothing in the *Domesday* notice of Longford indicates the then existence of a Church. The same may be said of Edgmond, but we know from other Records that there was a Church at Edgmond as early as *Domesday*, and that the said Church had several Chapels or affiliations. Among them I reckon Longford. We have seen the Advowson of Longford granted to Shrewsbury Abbey in 1155 and surrendered back to the Lady of the Manor in 1185. Probably the Monks had some original claim to the Advowson as Patrons of the Church of Edgmond.

The *Taxation* of 1291, placing the Church of Longford in the Deanery of Newport, values it at £2 *per annum*.<sup>3</sup> In 1341 the Assessors of the *Ninth* taxed the Parish at 30s., saying that 3s. of the Church-Income was derived from Glebe and Demesne of the Church, and 7s. from other sources (than those which were contemplated in the present assessment).<sup>4</sup>

The *Valor* of 1534-5 estimates the preferment of Robert Perynce, Rector of Longforde juxta Newporte, at £6. 13s. 4d. *per annum*. The Synodals and Procurations chargeable on that income were 10s. 8d.<sup>5</sup>

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

ADAM Parson of Longfort attests a Deed of the 13th century.

JOHN DE FORESTA, Acolyte, was instituted January 29, 1301, at

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 604.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 245.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 198.

<sup>5</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 186.

presentation of Sir Adam de Brimpton, knight. He died October 2, 1332, and on October 5,—

WILLIAM DE IPSTONES, Clerk, was admitted at presentation of Sir John de Brumpton, knight. On August 9, 1343,—

WILLIAM DE BRUMPTON, Clerk, was admitted to the Church of *Longford juxta Newport* at presentation of Dame Isabella, Relict of Sir John de Brumpton. On September 19, 1357, this Rector exchanged preferments with—

ELIAS DE BROMPTON, late Rector of Neuwenham (Linc. Dioc.). Elias died in 1394-5, and on April 25, 1395,—

JOHN HOPTON called BICKEDON, Priest, was instituted at presentation of Sir Robert Franceys, knight, and his wife Isabel. On Hopton's death, and on July 8, 1432,—

ROBERT MORWORTH, Priest, was instituted at presentation of Isabel, Relict of Robert Franceys. Moreworth died in 1452.

## Stirchley.

THIS, as I have already stated, was an outlying *Berewick* of the *Domesday* Manor of Longford. For the most part of two centuries after *Domesday* it continued dependent on Longford, though in some respects it attained such a manorial status as that I am induced to treat of it under a separate head.

I should be inclined to believe that Hunnit and his brother Uluiet were the two *Milites*, whom *Domesday* notices as holding four out of the six hides which constituted Turolde's Manor of Longford; and that part of the said four hides lay at Stirchley and perhaps at Evelith. The Fitz Torets succeeded to Hunnit's and Uluiet's tenures under Turolde in three known instances, viz. at Lawley, Moreton-Toret (now Moreton-Corbet), and Preston-Brockhurst. When I find that the Fitz Torets claimed to hold Stirchley under the Lords of Longford, and that they established their claim, I cannot but think that their title to all four tenures was of like nature, *i. e.* as representing Hunnit and Uluiet.

It will simplify what I have to say about Stirchley if I state that about the years 1160-70 it was held as follows. It was held *in capite* by Robert de Brimpton in right of his wife Eva. Peter fitz

Toret held it under De Brimpton. Under Peter fitz Toret, and by a rent of 8 dwts. of gold, Osbert de Stirchley was Tenant-in-fee of the Manor. I have said something about Osbert de Stirchley, *alias* de Diddlebury, in a former Volume.<sup>1</sup> On the Pipe-Roll of 1167, he is called Osbert de Stircheleg; and is entered as owing a sum of half a merk, in which he had been amerced by Alan de Nevill (Justice of the Forest). Again, the Pipe-Roll of 1176 records how Osbert de Stirchleg owed a Fine of 2 merks, because he had been present (at some Inquest probably) where the murder of one John had been hushed up (*ubi excusatio de morte Johannis facta est*). The Forest-Roll of 1180, under the head of *Surchley*, assesses one Osbert at 3*s.* for an *imbladement* of 6 acres of oats.

We now lose sight for a time of the Tenant-in-fee of Stirchley, and find the Manor litigated between the Mesne and Seignoural Lords. In 1185 Eva, wife (probably widow) of Robert de Brinton, fined 20*s.* that she might have trial concerning a hide of land in *Stirclea*. She paid the Fine in that and the following year. It appears that this Suit, which was ultimately a *Placitum Servitii*, descended to Walter de Whitfield (Eva's second husband) and to Bartholomew fitz Peter (Peter fitz Toret's son). A Fine is authentically alluded to, whereby, in the time of Richard I., it was agreed that Bartholomew should hold a hide in Stirchley under Walter and Eva for a rent of 20*s. per annum* in lieu of all services. It next appears that one or other of the parties would not adhere to this Fine, and that a *Placitum Cyrographi* was the result. On October 27, 1199, the parties are called upon to attend at Westminster in Hilary Term following, and hear judgment recorded in such a Plea. Eva de Longford was to be represented by her husband, and Bartholomew Turet makes William de Grenehill (Grindle) his Attorney.<sup>2</sup> In Hilary Term the Parties were resummoned for Easter Term; and then Judgment was pronounced, viz. that the Fine above described should hold good, and that Bartholomew should be *quit* by the specified service of 20*s.*<sup>3</sup> We know that this arrangement continued for the best part of a century.

The next Tenant-in-fee of Stirchley whom I can find, after Osbert de Stirchley, is Richard de Stirchley. How he was related to Osbert I have never been able to discover, nor will I assert that he was Osbert's heir. This Richard has occurred to us repeatedly under the dates of 1203 and 1206.<sup>4</sup> From one mention of his

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. V. p. 178.

<sup>2,3</sup> Rot. Curie Regis, II. 81, 239.

<sup>4</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 124, note; Vol. IV. p. 21; Vol. V. p. 32.

name we infer that he was a knight. At the Assizes of 1208 the Prior of Wenlock *essoigned* himself in a suit which he had with Richard de Stirkele, and the cause was adjourned. The latest that I find of Richard de Stirchesleg is on the Pipe-Roll of 1207, where an amercement of 6*s.* 8*d.*, apparently for some forest matter, is recorded against him. I suppose that he died soon after, and that it was he whose heir Walter de Stirchley claimed to be in 1208. The claim, it will be remembered, involved estates at Diddlebury and Stirchley, which Walter de Stirchley was already seized of. I should suppose therefore that he claimed to hold them independently of Osbert fitz William, the Plaintiff. The result as regards Diddlebury has been already stated, viz. that Walter became Osbert's Feoffee at a rent of 16*s.*<sup>1</sup> But the Fine of Nov. 5, 1208, settled the hide in Stirchley in a different way. Walter was to hold it only for life, under Osbert or his heirs, and to pay the before-mentioned services of 20*s.* and 3 dwts. of gold. These services were the chief-rents due from Osbert to the Seignorial and Mesne Lords (viz. Walter de Whitfield and Bartholomew Toret), and Osbert receiving them from Walter, covenanted to settle with the Superior Lords of the Fee. On Walter's death, the hide in Stirchley was to revert to Osbert and his heirs. Between this period and his death in 1232 Walter de Stirchley has recurred often on former pages.<sup>2</sup> His second Fine with Osbert fitz William was levied December 14, 1227. It made him Tenant for life, as before, of a hide in Stirchley, but it abridged the reversionary rights of Osbert fitz William; for, on Walter's death, half a virgate of land, one assart held by Alexander Carpenter, and one croft held by Maydusa, were to remain with Walter's heirs;—to be held under Osbert and his heirs at a nominal rent, viz. 2*d.*, or half a pound of cummin.

While Walter de Stirchley was thus holding Stirchley for life, Osbert fitz William appears more than once in the position of one who was more than a mesne-lord or yet a reversioner of the fee-simple. In November 1221 he had a suit of *mort d'ancestre* with the Abbot of Buildwas. In this instance he is called Osbert de Diddlebury. It is all but certain that the quarrel was concerning something in Stirchley previously granted to Buildwas by Richard de Stirchley. Again, Osbert Lord of Stirchley made a grant, already alluded to,<sup>3</sup> of a parcel of land in "his fee of Stirchley" to Wombridge Priory. The grant is attested by Sir Leonard de Ley,

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. V. p. 178.

| Vol. V. pp. 178, 179.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. II. pp. 115, 125, 133, 327; | <sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 315.

Robert de Brocton, Roger de Eppeleg (Apley), Robert de Haeman (probably Hamarse), Walter de Harpcote, and Walter, Chaplain of Stircheleg. It must have passed, I think, between 1220 and 1230, and so during the period of Walter de Storchley's life-tenure.

Again I find that Osbert de Storchleg granted a halfpenny rent in Storchleg to Lilleshall Abbey. This grant I have no means of dating, further than to say that it is recorded in Henry III.'s Confirmation of 1265. Walter de Storchley died as I have said in 1232, and Matilda, his widow, forthwith claimed a third of a hide in Storchley as her dower. The Fine by which she obtained for life that half-virgate only which Robert Pertrich held, bears date July 1, 1232. The point to observe therein is that instead of Osbert fitz William appearing as Tenant or Defendant, we have Osbern, Parson of Diddlebury, in that position. It is obvious either that Osbern the Parson was identical with, or the heir or assignee of, Osbert fitz William.

In Michaelmas Term 1233 I find notice of a Suit concerning *land*, between the Prior of Wenlock and Osbert de Storchleg. The Attorney of the latter was Robert de Diddlebury, but no further particulars transpire. The Pipe-Roll of 1234 exhibits Osbert de Storchleg as fining half a merk *pro habenda mencione*, a phrase which I know to relate to the form of a Writ in some pending suit, and think must have related to the suit with Wenlock Priory. On April 18, 1238, a Fine was levied at Westminster between Imbert, Prior of Wenlock (Plaintiff, through John Tece his Attorney), and Osbert de Dodelebyr, Deforciant, of the Advowson of Storchley Church, whereof was Plea of *Dernier presentment* between the parties. Osbert surrendered his claim, and was received, he and his heirs, into all benefits and prayers of the Church of Wenlock for ever.

Osbert de Diddlebury, *alias* Osbert fitz William, *alias* Osbert de Storchley, is said on good authority to have sold half the Manor to Buildwas Abbey. The Abbey had already a footing here under grants of "Richard, Uncle (*avunculus*) of the said Osbert," that is, I suppose, of Richard de Storchley. Osbert's sale must have taken place about the year 1243; for in that year the Abbot withdrew certain suits, due from Storchley to the Hundred of Bradford.

No Deed is preserved whereby we can determine further particulars of these grants of Osbert and his Uncle Richard; but in or after the year 1247, Osbern fitz William surrendered all his interest here to Buildwas, and of this fact we have threefold evidence, viz.

one Fine and two Charters. The Fine bears date July 1, 1247, and, as conveying a much more limited estate than the Charters, must be taken to have preceded them. Thereby Osbert de Styrcheleg (Impedient) acknowledges himself to have given to Nicholas, Abbot of Buildwas, two virgates in Styrcheleg, whereof had been *Plea of Charter-warranty*. The Abbot is to hold the premises under Osbert and his heirs, and to discharge forinsec services due thereon. But besides this Osbert conveys 2 virgates of land, 60 acres of bosc, and 2 Mills, which he had sometime held in demesne, also the capital messuage, half the garden belonging thereto, the great meadow between the two Mills, half Crumbwelle-meadow, 2 small parcels of Crumbwelle-meadow, half Nordwelle-meadow, one small parcel of the same, and the homage and service of Robert Aleyn;—all to be held in pure almoign, and to be recompensed by the prayers of the Monks in the Grantor's behalf.

The Charters which follow this Fine must be taken to confirm its grants, and to convey not only the residue of the Grantor's substantive interests in Stirchley, but to abolish his mediate and more nominal rights. The earliest of these Charters is printed elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> and is in substance as follows.—

“Osbert fitz William, Lord of Stirchelege, gives to the Monks of Buldewas in free almoign the capital messuage of his House in the vill of Stirchelege, together with all buildings and appurtenances, and with half the great garden, and with a certain garden situated without the gate of his Manor-house (*curiæ*). He also gives 60 acres of his demesne in the said vill, and 36 acres with the bosc growing thereon, viz. whatever lay between John de Pertone's bosc and the bosc of the aforesaid Monks. He also gives the homages and services of John de Pertone and his heirs, of Ranulph de Colnham and his heirs, of Julian, son of Walter de Stirchley and his heirs, of Robert Aleyn and his heirs, of William de Wodewall and his heirs, and of the widow Petronilla and her heirs, together with all rents, &c., which belonged to the Grantor, as Lord, or to his heirs, whether arising from the above tenements, from the tenement of the Prior of Wombridge, or from the tenements of any others, claiming to hold under the Grantor, or from other lands and tenements, which the Monks already had in Stirchley by gift of the Grantor and his ancestors. In short, he retains nothing to himself at Stirchley except the prayers of the Grantees: but the Grantees are to pay 20s. and 3 dwts. of gold *per annum* to Richard Corbet<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Monasticon*, V. 857, No. III.

| <sup>2</sup> Now representative of the Torots.

in lieu of all services, and Richard Corbet would acquit the Monks in respect of the item of 20s., which, in other words, he was bound to pay over to Adam de Brumton and his heirs. The witnesses of this Deed were, Sir Richard de Lectone; Robert de Actone, Clerk; John de Bekeburi; Clement fitz Peter; Reyner Ruphus; Richard de Grenhull; Hamo le Poer, and others."

Osbert fitz William's other Charter is perhaps a few days later than, but nearly a duplicate of, the above. Its differences are these.—It expresses the gift to be with the Grantor's body in burial (*cum corpore meo*). It describes "half the great garden" as "an orchard, already divided between the Grantor and John de Perton." It describes the "36 acres of bosc, &c.," as "a certain parcel of land together with the bosc growing thereon." It enumerates Mills, among the appurtenances of the estate. It alludes to, and ratifies, the previous gifts of the Grantor "and his Uncle Richard." It makes the reserved rents of Richard Corbet and Adam de Brumton to be payable by the Monks to each person immediately, viz. 3 dwts. of gold to the former, and 20s. to the latter. It is attested by Richard de Leghton; Richard de Grenhull; John de Bechebur'; Robert de Acton, Parson of Stheyle (probably Stirchley); and Ralph de Staunton.<sup>1</sup>

From a Fine of January 27, 1249, it would seem that, immediately after Osbert de Stirchley's death, the two daughters of Leonard de Legh (already spoken of under Parva Legh)<sup>2</sup> claimed possession of several parcels of Stirchley against the Abbot of Buildwas and his Tenants. They claimed under Writ of *mort d'ancestre* and therefore by inheritance. The Fine purports to be between Johanna de Legh and Nicholaha her sister (Plaintiffs) and Nicholas Abbot of Buildwas, concerning 2 messuages, 25 acres, a half-virgate and one noke in Stircheleg, held by the Abbot himself;—concerning 2 messuages and 7 acres which the Abbot was bound to warrant to his Tenant, Robert Aleyn;—and concerning 3 acres which the Abbot was called upon to warrant to John de Perton. The Plaintiffs surrendered their claim for 5 merks.

Of the family of *De Stirchley* alias *De Diddlebury* I have little more to say. It is impossible, without further evidence, to decide the exact mode of their descent; and I know that I am leaving several questions of identity unsolved. However, I have quoted, either here or under Diddlebury, all the documents which bear upon this genealogy, as they relate to each locality. Richard fitz Osbert

<sup>1</sup> Blakeway's MSS.

| <sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. II. pp. 315, 316.

de Diddlebury, who occurs late in the 13th century, was doubtless a Cadet of this family. I refer to what I have said of him in a former Volume,<sup>1</sup> where it will be seen that he was a Tenant at Longnor and Sheriff's-Clerk to Roger Sprengnose (III.).

I proceed with Storchley as mainly an estate of Buildwas Abbey, but in which the Abbot of Lilleshall and the Priors of Wenlock and Wombridge had each an interest. The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 describes Storchley as follows.—

“The Abbot of Buldewas bought half of *Scirleg* from Osbert de Scireleg, viz. half a hide, and it was wont to do suit to the Hundred every three weeks, and he (the Abbot) withdrew the said suit twelve years ago to the annual loss of 2*s.* to the King.

“Randulph de Coleham holds one virgate in the said vill under the Abbot of Lilleshull; Ranulf de Perton holds one virgate of the Abbot of Buldewas, and the Prior of Wenlock holds one noke of the same Abbot.

“After a while (*postmodum*) the said Abbot (of Buildwas) bought of the said Osbert the demesne of the whole vill, except the land and service of the said Ranulf de Colleham. And the said vill owes 4*d.* (*per annum*) for *stretward*. And the lands aforesaid, held by Ranulf de Colham and the others, contain another half-hide. The abstracted suit of the said Abbot of Buldewas is worth 2*s.* *per annum*, and he holds *in capite* of Adam de Brinton, who holds *in capite* of the King, and of Robert Corbet.”<sup>2</sup>

I need not stop to specify the errors, manifest or suspected, which are involved in the above account. The sequel will rectify most of them: for instance, the *Feodary* of 1284 says with admirable correctness that—“The Abbot of Buldewas holds the vill of Styrcheleye of Robert Corbet, and he of Adam de Brimton, and he of the King.”

So too the Bradford Tenure-Roll of nearly the same date describes the Abbot as holding Sturcheleg and Culmayre under Robert Corbet, who holds under Adam Brimton, who holds *in capite*. “Here,” adds the Record, “the Abbot holds his free Court by Charter of King Richard.” The allusion is to King Richard's general franchises vouchsafed to Buildwas, which extended to all its previous possessions and subsequent acquisitions.

The *Taxation* of 1291 gives the following account of the Abbot of Buildwas's estate at *Sirtheleye*.—

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. pp. 59, 60.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 55.

Two carucates of land realized yearly . . .	£2	0	0
The profits upon live stock were . . .	3	0	0
The assized rents were . . .	3	0	0
The Pleas and perquisites of Court were . .	0	6	8
One Mill was worth, yearly . . .	0	15	0
Total . . .	£9	1	8 <sup>1</sup>

At the Assizes of 1292 the Bradford Jurors recorded how Osbert de Styrchesle, formerly holding Styrchesle, had used to do suit every three weeks to the Hundred-Court and to pay 8*d.* yearly for *stretward* and *motfee*. The Vill had devolved "30 years back," said the Jurors to the Abbot of Buildwas, who had withdrawn the above dues. The Abbot now came forward, and acknowledging his liabilities, was assessed at 4 merks for arrears.

I have alluded under Cound to an exchange, contemplated in the year 1354, whereby the Manor of Stirchley would have passed from Buildwas Abbey to the Earl of Arundel.<sup>2</sup> Though such an exchange did not take place to the extent contemplated, it is clear that Thomas Earl of Arundel who died in 1415 held Stirchley *in socage* under the Abbot of Buildwas, and that it was entailed on the heirs male of the Earl's body.<sup>3</sup> It is further clear that the Earl had no such heirs, but what remainders there were in the entail, or how the Manor again reverted to Buildwas, I cannot learn. William Abbot of Buildwas granted a sixty years' lease thereof; and on Sept. 29, 1534, when the said lease was unexpired, Stephen, last Abbot of Buildwas, granted a further lease of 95 years, to commence on the expiration of the term of 60 years.<sup>4</sup> The reserved rent in Abbot Stephen's Lease is £5. 13*s.* 4*d.*, the exact sum which in 1534-5 he returned in the *Valor* as the *assized rent* receivable by the Abbey from Strycheleye.<sup>5</sup> The *Minister's Accounts*, two years later, also give £5. 13*s.* 4*d.* as the Ferm of Stirchley Grange.<sup>6</sup>

OF UNDERTENANTS in Stirchley, the documents already quoted, under the dates of 1247, 1249, and 1255, have supplied a partial list. The Forest-Roll of 1262 enters Roger fitz Isabel and Henry Bagg of Stirchley on the list entitled *Essonia Mortis*.

Robert Aleyn, a tenant here in 1248-9, was dead in 1272, leaving a widow Edith, who with her second husband, Henry le Car-

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 1 Hen. VI., No. 35.

<sup>4</sup> The original Lease at Badger.

<sup>5</sup> *Valor Eccles.* III. 191.

<sup>6</sup> *Monasticon*, v. 361, No. XXV.

penter, then sued Roger Parson of Stirchley for her dower, viz. a third of two messuages and one noke in Stirchley. Roger the Parson called Thomas de Pyvelesdon to warrant the Charter whereby Roger de Pyvelesdon, his father, had conveyed the premises to Roger the Parson. It was first stated in excuse of Thomas de Pyvelesdon's appearance that he was in the prison of *Doverya*, but afterwards that Agnes, Roger de Pyvelesdon's widow, had everything for life. The Court decided that the Plaintiffs should at once recover Edith's dower, but that Roger the Parson should be entitled to a further recovery against the heir of Thomas (*sic*) de Pyvelesdon, on the death of Agnes.<sup>1</sup>

At these same Assizes Ranulph de Colham (a tenant in 1248 and 1255) appears, as not prosecuting a suit against the Abbot of Haugmon for arrears of some annual rent. This was probably a Shrewsbury affair, but Ranulf's Sureties were John Bagge and Robert Dose of Stirchley.

In Michaelmas Term 1288 Walter son and heir of Walter de Stirchley recovered, under judgment given, his seizin of three messuages, one toft, 3 acres of meadow, 4 acres of pasture, 20 acres of wood, and 1½ carrucates of land, against Ranulph de Kolenham (Coleham), James his son, and Walter son of Reginald de Stirchley.<sup>2</sup>

**PERTON FEE.** This estate, though small, requires a distinct notice. The family of Perton was seated at Perton in Staffordshire, where it held lands by serjeantry from an early period. The Lord of Perton and Trescot was bound to attend the King in any Welsh expedition with two horses, for eight days at his own cost, and if he remained longer, then at the King's cost.

Ranulph de Perton who thus held Perton in 1211,<sup>3</sup> was deceased on Sept. 26, 1241, when John, his son and heir, obtained livery of his inheritance at Perton.<sup>4</sup> This was the John de Perton whose services for an estate at Strichley were assigned about 1247-8 by Osbert fitz William to Buildwas Abbey. John de Perton died towards the end of the year 1257.<sup>5</sup> His son and heir, Ranulph de Perton (II.), seems to have been seized of the Stirchley estate in 1255, that is in his father's life-time, and when he was only 21

<sup>1</sup> *Assizes*, 56 Hen. III., m. 4 *dorso*.

<sup>2</sup> *Abbrev. Placitorum*, p. 216, b.

<sup>3</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 54.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Finium*, Vol. I. p. 353

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*, Vol. II. p. 170.—

Juliana de Glazeley, widow of John

de Perton, was living in 1259, and holding one-third of Perton in dower. She was probably his second wife, and not mother of his children. When she married John de Perton she was, I take it, widow of Guy de Glazeley (*supra*, Vol. I. p. 213).

years of age. He had livery of his Staffordshire inheritance on January 27, 1258, but died without issue in the course of the next year;<sup>1</sup> for on Sept. 19, 1259, William brother and heir of Ranulph de Perton did homage and had livery, being then 22 years of age.<sup>2</sup> The Writ of *Diem clausit* on William de Perton's death bears date February 4, 1280. One of the subsequent Inquests reported the value of his estate at Perton as £8. 6s. 4½*d. per annum*. Another Inquest found him to have held a messuage and 59 acres of land in Strichleg, under the Abbot of Buildwas, at a rent of 32*d. per annum*. The value of the estate to the deceased was 20*s. per annum*. John his son and heir was now 17½ years of age.<sup>3</sup> A second Inquest ordered on July 8, 1283, calls the Stirchley estate a carrucate of land, values it at 40*s. per annum*, and makes the Abbot's rent to be 3*s. per annum*. John son and heir of William de Perton was now reported to be more than of full age.<sup>4</sup> With this John, who was living at the close of Edward II.'s reign, I quit the subject.

## STIRCHLEY CHURCH.

This was in its original state a Chapel, probably in the Parish of Idsall, and founded by the Manorial Lords of Stirchley in the twelfth century. Its architectural features are alone sufficient to prove this antiquity of foundation. The subjection of Stirchley to Idsall has long since vanished.

How or by whom the Advowson of Stirchley was given to Wenlock Priory I cannot say. We have seen that the Prior's Title thereto was ratified by a Fine in 1238. The *Taxation* of 1291 values the Church of Stucheley in the Deanery of Newport at £2. 13*s. 4d. per annum*.<sup>5</sup> In 1341 the Assessors of the *Ninth* taxed the Parish at 40*s*. There were no sheep here, and a third of the Manor was held in hand by the Abbot of Buildwas, who was not assessable to the current Tax.<sup>6</sup> In an Inquest of the year 1379 the Church of Stircheleye is valued at 100*s. per annum*, and certified to be in the gift of Wenlock Priory.<sup>7</sup>

The *Valor* of 1534-5 puts John Poynor's gross income as Rector of Stirchley, at £6. 13*s. 4d*. Procurations 6*s. 8d.*, and Synodals 1*s.*, were the only charges on that revenue.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ranulph de Perton left a widow, Margaret.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Finium*, II. 311; *Inquis.* 42 Hen. III., No. 14; and 43 Hen. III., No. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 8 Edw. I., No. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquisitions*, 11 Edw. I., No. 101.

<sup>5</sup> *Pope Nick. Taxation*, p. 245.

<sup>6</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 193.

<sup>7</sup> *Monasticon*, Vol. V. p. 78.

<sup>8</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 187.

## EARLY INCUMBENTS.

WALTER, Chaplain of Stirchley, has been seen attesting a Deed about 1220-30, but it is more probable that he was an Officiating Priest than Incumbent of the Church. The Living was vacant in 1238, and probably

ROBERT DE ACTON, Clerk, was the next Incumbent. It is he who apparently was styled Parson of Stirchley about 1248-9. I have said much of him on former occasions,<sup>1</sup> and shall have to recur to his name again. He probably quitted Stirchley for more lucrative preferment. In 1256 we have had mention of one—

ROGER, as then or recently Parson of Stirchley.<sup>2</sup> We have also seen the said Roger attest a grant to Wenlock Priory about the middle of the thirteenth century; and we know that he was living in 1272.<sup>3</sup> In Easter Term 1283 the Prior of Repindon charged John Prior of Wenlock and his accomplices, one of whom was—

RICHARD, Parson of Stirchele, with coming by night to Repindon and seizing goods to the value of 1000 merks. The Defendants appeared not. The Sureties for Parson Richard were Elyas and Roger de Ketley, brothers.<sup>4</sup>

ROGER DE ESTHOP, Rector of Stirchley, resigned January 13, 1310, and on March 17 following—

WALTER DE PERTON, Acolyte, son of John de Perton, was instituted at the presentation of the Prior and Convent of Wenlock. Sir Walter de Perton, Rector of Stirchley, died on Sunday, Feb. 22, 1349. The Alien Priory of Wenlock was now in the hands of Edward III. by reason of his war with France: so a Patent of February 25, 1349, presents—

RICHARD LE BRET, Chaplain, to this Living;<sup>5</sup> and the Bishop admitted him on March 10 following. Le Bret died on Monday, the day of St. Alban, the Protomartyr of England (June 22, 1349);—a fitting day for the obit of one who was doubtless a victim of that mighty Pestilence which found an Army of Martyrs in the Clergy of the Anglican Church. Again a Patent of July 8, 1349, presents—


THOMAS DE WYKY to the vacant benefice,<sup>6</sup> and he was instituted on the 23rd of the same month. On Sept. 14, 1349, Thomas, Rector of Stirchley, is allowed to be nonresident, for a year, that

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. V. pp. 118, 119; Vol. VI. pp. 126, 129, 137, 138.

<sup>2-3</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 316; Vol. III. p. 339 note.

<sup>4</sup> *Placita coram Rege, Pasch. Term*, 11 Ed. I., m. 2.

<sup>5-6</sup> *Patent*, 23 Edw. III. p. 1, m. 30; p. 2, m. 23.



CHANCEL ARCH, STIRCHLEY.



he may devote himself to the services of Sir Roger le Strange, knight: but in the course of the next month he vacated Stirchley by accepting the Vicarage of Ellesmere. A Patent of February 5, 1350, presents—

RICHARD DE COTON, Clerk, to Stirchley;<sup>1</sup> and he was admitted by the Bishop on March 8 following.

PHILIP DE HARLEY was instituted to Stirchley on Dec. 19, 1360, at presentation of Wenlock Priory. On Harley's removal to Stockton,<sup>2</sup> in 1369—

ADAM DE KNYGHTLEY, Priest, was instituted to Stirchley, the King presenting as having Wenlock Priory in hand. On this Rector's resignation, viz. on August 30, 1370—

JOHN WALSSH, Priest, was admitted under a Crown nomination. He died in 1377-8, and on Feb. 5, 1378—

JOHN LONG, Priest, was instituted. He died in 1382, and on Oct. 23 of that year—

JOHN BESSELOW, Priest, was instituted at presentation of the King.

---

## Brockton.

---

THIS Manor, small as it was, is the subject of a duplicate notice in *Domesday*. First it follows Ralph de Mortimer's Manor of Pep-low, and is spoken of thus.—

*"Ricardus tenet de Comite in Brochetone dimidiam hidam. Terra est 1 carrucæ. Aisil tenuit pro uno Manerio. Ibi est unus liber homo. Reddit xvi denarios."*<sup>3</sup>

The second notice places the Manor more clearly in Recordin Hundred, and runs as follows.—

*"Ricardus tenet de Comite Brochetone. Aisil tenuit. Ibi dimidia hida, geldabilis. Terra est 1 carrucæ. Ibi unus liber homo reddit xvi denarios de firmâ."*<sup>4</sup>

Thus it is that the redundancies of this noble Record, though they are in the nature of errors, do but serve to establish its general accuracy. The above two passages are minutely consistent as to

<sup>1</sup> *Patent*, 24 Edw. III. p. 1, m. 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, a, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, fo. 259, b, 2.

facts, though their verbal differences show that the *Domesday* Clerk never collated them.

I know nothing more of the Saxon Aisil, or of Earl Roger's immediate Tenant, Richard, than is related in the above passages. My only reason for identifying the Manor with Brockton near Longford, is that there is no other Brockton within the area of Recordin Hundred. As to tenure, I know of nothing in the later status of Brockton which can be called analogous to its *Domesday* condition. And yet there is no positive inconsistency between the two, for I suppose that Brockton escheated to King Henry I. by forfeiture of Ricardus or failure of his heirs; and that the King allowed it to be annexed to Longford, so as to make up those 100 solidates of land which he designed to bestow on Hamo de Longford or his ancestor.

Ever since, Brockton has been accounted a mere member of Longford, and as such I have, under Longford, said all that I know of it.

---

## Kinnersley.

---

It is fitting that I should now give account of five Manors in Recordin Hundred, which were part of the *Domesday* Fief of Gerard de Tornai. The first of these is described as follows.—

“Gerard holds Chinardeseie of Earl Roger. Wilegrip held it (in Saxon times). Here is one hide, geldable. The (arable) land is (enough) for IIII ox-teams. In demesne is one team, and (there are) III Serfs, IIII Villains, and III Boors with two teams. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 21s. (*per annum*); now it is worth 18s.”<sup>1</sup>

Gerard de Tornai probably took his name from the Norman Vill of Tournai-sur-Dive, which was, I think, a member of Earl Roger's Vicomté of the Oximin.

I have in a former Volume associated this Baron's forfeiture with the Western rebellion of 1088.<sup>2</sup> Such a theory is untenable, for Gerard de Tornai was apparently holding his own in the time of Earl Hugh, that is between 1093 and 1098. He follows the Earl

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 258, b, 2.

| <sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 104.

and his own son-in-law, Hamo Peverel, in the attestation of a Charter already recited.<sup>1</sup> Even the question of Gerard de Tornai's forfeiture at any time is, I think, a doubtful one. The chief proof thereof is that his estates were, in Henry II.'s time, usually described as the *Escheats of Gerard de Tornai*. Possibly that term may have implied no more than that Gerard's estates had lapsed to the Crown in default of heirs. Hamo Peverel had certainly enjoyed the bulk of those estates for life, and whether in right of his wife Sibil, daughter of Gerard de Tornai, or as Grantee of Henry I., I cannot determine. Having no issue by the said Sibil, Hamo Peverel attempted, and indeed contrived, to settle certain Tornai estates on his own, and not his wife's, collateral heirs. The Scheme was ultimately abortive, for Henry II. disallowed such a mode of succession, and resumed whatever could be found of these estates into his own hands, the Under-tenants thereof becoming *Tenants in capite*. Thus much I have said in qualification of a former statement.<sup>2</sup> The Rule, now laid down, did not hold good in respect of such estates as Hamo Peverel had given to Religious Houses. His grants in frank almoign were respected. This remark is very relevant to the history of Kinnersley.

The next notice which we have of this place after *Domesday*, is in one of Earl Hugh's Charters to Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>3</sup> The Charter is undoubtedly spurious,<sup>4</sup> but there is no reason to question one or two of the circumstances which it records. Hamo Peverel, it says, one of the Earl's Barons, and at the Earl's request, gave the tithes of his demesnes to the Abbey. Among the tithes said to be thus given are those of Cleya (read Sleaf), of Brugelton (read Crudgington), and of Kinardesey. I suppose that it was only the tithes of Kinnersley that Hamo Peverel really gave on this occasion.

It was probably immediately after Henry I.'s death that Hamo Peverel and his wife Sibil gave the fee-simple of these identical estates to the same Abbey. Their grants as described and confirmed in King Stephen's Charter, very early in his reign, I must give in the language of that Confirmation.—

*Defuncto autem Rege Henrico, cum venerabilis nepos ejus Stephanus in regno successit, supradictus Hamo Peurell, concedente Rege, dedit ecclesiæ Sancti Petri duas villas, id est Crugeltonam et Sclepam, et Sibilla uxor ejus aliam villam quæ vocatur Chinardesia, concedente viro suo et dono (read donum) super altare ponente.*

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. II. pp. 104-107.

<sup>3</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Vide supra, Vol. I. p. 33, note.

*Testibus, Willielmo filio Alani, Willielmo de Tornay, Alano filio Willielmi de Hedlega, Roberto filio Nigelli, Radulfo de Tirna, Richardo filio Baldwini de Lintlega, et pluribus aliis.*<sup>1</sup>

This Charter bears in itself a mark of undoubted truth; for we happen to know that Sleap and Crudginton were members of High Ercall, a Manor which belonged to Hamo Peverel in his own right, while Kinnersley was a Tornai estate. Hence the distinctive way in which each estate was granted. When in the above extract Hamo Peverel is said to have laid his wife's gift upon the Altar, some sign or token of the gift must be understood. In this case the token was probably a written Charter, that namely of which we have a copy in the Abbey Chartulary, and which is briefly as follows.—

*Notum sit, &c., quod ego Hamo Peverel et Sibilla conjux mea dedimus, &c., villam quæ vocatur Kinardeseia, sicut Gyrardus Tornay, Antecessor noster, et nos postmodum eam melius et liberius tenuimus. Testibus, Willielmo Peverel, Walchelino Maminot, Alano filio Willielmi de Hedlega, Roberto filio Nigelli, Ricardo de Linleya, Radulfo de Tirna, Willielmo de Tornai, Alano filio Thealdi, Roberto de Beche, Rogero de Haia, Henrico de Felgeres, Brien de Valle de Riul, Hugone de Leha, &c.*<sup>2</sup>

The next Confirmation to Shrewsbury Abbey was that of the Empress Maud, about 1141. Among lands given to the Abbey since her Father's death, it includes the grant of *Chinardeseia* by Hamo Peverel.<sup>3</sup>

But a more remarkable confirmation is that of William Peverel of Dover, nephew and heir, or coheir, of Hamo Peverel. Therein he treats of Wollerton and Kinnersley, both Tornai estates, as if they were subject to his arbitration as Hamo Peverel's heir. This Charter passed at Marlborough, probably in the year 1144, when we know that William de Dovre, as he is elsewhere called, was actively promoting the cause of the Empress in Wiltshire and the adjoining Counties.<sup>4</sup>—I give the document as it stands in the Monasticon.<sup>5</sup>

*Willielmus Peverellus de Dowria omnibus fideiibus sanctæ Dei Ecclesiæ salutem. Sciant omnes illi qui nunc sunt et qui venturi sunt, me concessisse plenarie totam illam terram quam Hamo Peverell patruus meus dedit Deo et Ecclesiæ Sancti Petri Salopesberiæ, scilicet Whuruntun, Einardeſeiam (read Kinardeseiam), Crugelton, pro salute animæ meæ et pro animabus amicorum meorum. Et volo*

<sup>1</sup> *Monasticon*, III. 519. No. II.

<sup>2-3</sup> *Salop Chartulary*, Nos. 32, 40.

<sup>4</sup> *Gesta Regis Stephani*, p. 106.

<sup>5</sup> *Monasticon*, III. 522, No. XIII.

*atque præcipio ut mei hæredes sicut ego concessi concedant. Huius rei sunt testes, Walchelinus Maminot, et Stephanus de la Leia,<sup>1</sup> et Brientius de Valle Rodolli,<sup>2</sup> et Alanus filius Teoldi, et Baldwinus de Sancto Georgio, et Radulfus filius Teoldi,<sup>3</sup> et Hamo filius Herfredi, et Willielmus de Musca, apud Marleberg.*

Henry II.'s Confirmation to Shrewsbury Abbey passed in 1155. It shows that he ratified Hamo Peverel's grants, whether taken out of his own estates or the Fief of Tornai. It confirms the following, viz. *ex dono Hamonis Peverel et Sibille uxoris ejus Wlurentonam et Chinardeseiam et Crugeltonam et Sclepam.*

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 does not recognize Kinnersley as a distinct Manor, but we know that the hidage which is attributed to the Abbot's Manor of Sleap, viz. 2½ hides, must have been inclusive of the hide assigned in *Domesday* to Kinnersley.

The Abbot of Shrewsbury's Charter of Free-Warren, dated May 21, 1256, extends to Wlfreton (Woolerton), Slepe, and Kynardesleye.<sup>4</sup>

The Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) notices the Abbot of Shrewsbury's tenure of the Manor of Slepe, and makes Crugulton (Crudgington), Kynnersley, and Butterley (that is Butterey), to be members thereof.

So too in the *Taxation* of 1291 the estate described as Sclep must have included Kinnersley and Crudgington, and whatever the Abbot had at Tern. In the *Valor* of 1534-5 the collective estate is described as *Slepe and Croginton*, but the *Ministers' Accounts* of 1541-2 call it the Lordship of "Slepe, Crogelton, and Kemsey," meaning, by the last name, Kinnersley. The various Valuations of the aggregate Manor shall be given on a future page.

AS TO THE UNDERTENANTS of Shrewsbury Abbey at Kinnersley, I have a few notes. Richard de Momerfield (or Morville) was one of them. He has been mentioned as a witness of a grant to the Abbey about 1250-1255.<sup>5</sup> He married one Agnes, whose mother was Isabella, a daughter of that Gilbert Sadoc who has also occurred on former pages.<sup>6</sup> In 1259 Agnes widow of Richard de Momerfeld mortgages 5 acres of land in Hundrethale, with the meadow belonging thereto, to Hugh le Vileyn, for a term of 12 years; and if at the end of that term the money advanced by the

<sup>1</sup> Probably a Tenant in William Peverel's Cambridgeshire Fief (Vide *Monasticon*, II. 601, No. x).

<sup>2</sup> Called *Brien de Valle de Riol* in a former Charter (p. 128).

<sup>3</sup> He and Alan fitz Teold were of Tern, in Shropshire.

<sup>4</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 63.

<sup>6</sup> Supra, Vol. I. pp. 63, 240.

said Hugh, viz. £1. 8*d.*, were not repaid, then he was to hold the premises in fee, at a rent of 2*d.* Witnesses, Gilbert fitz Clerk, then Provost of the Forystate; Adam Engleteu, and Alan Knotte.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps it was on the expiration of this mortgage, and if so about the year 1271, that "Agnes daughter of Isabella, daughter of Gilbert Sadoc, granted and sold for 5 merks, to Shrewsbury Abbey, that noke of land in Kinnersley which her mother had purchased from Richard de Momerfeld, formerly her husband;—also all the share which belonged to the said Agnes in the arable and untilled land, and in the meadows, moors, &c., which lay between the foss of Hunderhale and the River Severn;—also 8*d.* rent arising from the tenement of Nicholas de Haye in Astley Abbots. Witnesses, John de Prestecote, then Provost of the Foriete; Richard de Preston, Clerk; and David de Montgomery."<sup>2</sup>

It appears from another Record that Richard de Momerfeld had left a son and heir, Oliver. On May 24, 1259, Oliver son of Richard de Momerfeld takes out a Writ against William le Rusur for disseizing him of a tenement in Kinardesey. Again, at the Assizes of August 1267, Oliver de Momerfeld, as heir of his father, sued Robert de Buldewas as tenant in possession of half a virgate in Kinardeseye. The said Tenant called the Abbot of Shrewsbury to warranty, and the Abbot proved that Richard de Momerfeld had sold the premises, and further, that Oliver had since renounced all claim thereto. This determined the suit in favour of the Abbot and his Tenant.

#### THE CHURCH.

Bishop Peche (1161–1182) in his enumeration of tithes belonging to Shrewsbury Abbey, mentions the whole tithes of the Abbot's demesnes at Wolreton (Wollerton), Slepe, and Kynardeseye. As yet there was no Church at Kinnersley, and I take it that the Manor was in the Parish of Edgmond. In the next century, viz. about 1173–4, we have seen under Longford,<sup>3</sup> that there was a Chapel at Kynnersley, which the then Lord of Longford wrested from the Monks of Shrewsbury. It was afterwards restored by his widow.

The *Taxation* of 1291 values the Church of Kinardeseye (in the Deanery of Salop) at £1. 13*s.* 4*d.* (*per annum*), besides a Pension of 2*s.* which the Abbot of Shrewsbury took therefrom.<sup>4</sup>

In 1341 the Parish of Kynardesheye is more correctly placed in

<sup>1</sup> Salop Charters, No. 207.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, No. 112.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 104.

<sup>4</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 245.

the Deanery of Newport. It was taxed only one merk to the *Ninth*. The reasons for so low an assessment were, because the chief part of the Church-income arose from hay-tithes and oblations; because very little land in the Parish was under the plough; and because a great part of the said Church (read Parish) consisted of woods and marshes. The Abbot of Shrewsbury's Temporalities within the Parish were included in the assessment of one merk.<sup>1</sup> The *Valor* of 1534-5 places *Kynnasshey* in the Deanery of Newport. William Golborne, the Rector, had a gross annual income of £6. 13s. 4d., out of which he paid 6s. 8d. for Procurations, 1s. for Synodals, and a Pension of 4s. to Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>2</sup>

## EARLY INCUMBENTS.

WALKELINE DE NORTHAMPTON, Clerk, was presented to the Church of Kinardesey by a Patent of August 18, 1223, the King presenting because of an existing vacancy in the Abbacy of Shrewsbury.

HUGH DEVEROUS was Rector here in 25 Edw. I. (1296-7).

THOMAS, Rector of Kynardeseye, died on June 5, 1321, and on October 13 following, the Bishop instituted—

WILLIAM DE BAGGESORE, Priest, at presentation of the Abbot and Convent of Shrewsbury. A Patent<sup>3</sup> of the year 1343 sanctions an exchange between this Rector and—

WILLIAM DE GRETTON, late Vicar of Clifford (Heref. Dioc.), who is admitted to Kynardeseye on Nov. 13, 1343. This Rector died August 12, 1349 (probably of the Pestilence), and on Sept. 14 following, the Bishop admitted—

JOHN DE DOUNTON, Acolyte, at the presentation of the Abbot and Convent of Salop. On January 13, 1351, Dounton exchanges preferments with—

REGINALD DE CHETWYNDE, Priest, late Rector of Chetwynde.<sup>4</sup> On February 15, 1405,

THE REVEREND FATHER IN CHRIST SIR JOHN SERLES, entitled *Triburnensius Episcopus*, was instituted to Kinnersley on the usual presentation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 188.

<sup>3</sup> *Patent*, 17 Edw. III. p. 2, m. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Vide *supra*, pp. 89, 90.

<sup>5</sup> He was probably a Papal Nominee. He had resigned the Vicarage of Baschurch in 1404.

## Shawbury.

"THE same Gerard holds Sawesberie. Edric and Eliet held it (in Saxon times) for two Manors. Here is a hide and a half, geldable. The (arable) land is (enough) for viii ox-teams. In demesne there is one team and two Serfs. (Here are) a Church, a Priest, iii Boors, i Freeman,<sup>1</sup> and a Mill of 5s. (annual value). In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 12s. (*per annum*): now it is worth 16s."<sup>2</sup>

It thus appears that Gerard de Tornai had not at the time of *Domesday* enfeoffed any vassal in the whole of Shawbury. There is an appearance, but probably a delusive one, that Hugh Earl of Shrewsbury sometime held Shawbury in demesne. He is said, in a somewhat suspicious Charter of Shrewsbury Abbey,<sup>3</sup> to have granted two-thirds of his demesne of *Saubury* to that House. The Monks certainly had these tithes at a later period and by an ancient title. My idea is that the Monks did not themselves know how they obtained these tithes, and that Earl Hugh's Charter was invented or interpolated to account for this and some other similar acquisitions. It is clear that Hamo Peverel succeeded to Gerard de Tornai as Lord of Shawbury: and it was probably he who granted tithes thereof to Shrewsbury Abbey. In the reign of Henry I. Hamo Peverel had a Tenant here, viz. that—

NIGEL DE SAUBERY, who, with Robert his son, attests two Charters of the said Hamo and his wife Sibil.<sup>4</sup> The said Charters passed before the death of Henry I., as will appear under Betton-in-Hales and Woolerton,—the places to which they relate. Nigel de Shawbury's death and the succession of his son and heir,—

ROBERT FITZ NIGEL, are indicated by a twofold appearance of the latter as Witness of Hamo Peverel's Deeds, during the first two years of Stephen's reign.<sup>5</sup> The next that I hear of Robert fitz Nigel is his grant of Shawbury Church to Haughmond Abbey.

<sup>1</sup> There is probably an omission in this passage, viz. of the number of Teams possessed by the individuals enumerated.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 258, b, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 3. See some

remarks on this Charter, *supra*, Vol. I. p. 102.

<sup>4</sup> Salop Chartulary, Nos. 19, 24.

<sup>5</sup> Vide *supra*, Vol. VII. p. 353; and Vol. VIII. p. 128.

The date of this transaction would be very uncertain were I not able to prove that the earliest Episcopal Confirmation thereof is that of Walter Durdent, who was consecrated in October 1149 and who died December 7, 1159. As Charters of Bishop Durdent are of the rarest occurrence, I must give this one in its original form.—

*W. Dei gratiâ Coventrensis Ecclesiæ minister humilis, universis sacrosanctæ ecclesiæ filiis salutem. Universitas vestra noscat nos Ecclesiam de Sageburi cum omnibus suis pertinentiis Ecclesiæ beati Johannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ de Haghmon inperpetuum, salvo jure episcopali, concessisse et confirmasse. Sed quia hujusmodi pietatis beneficium immutatum et incussum manere volumus, tam scripti quam nostri sigilli auctoritate, aliquod<sup>1</sup> a nobis actum est canonice, communimus et corroboramus. Testes isti sunt, Helias Archidiaconus Stafford',<sup>2</sup> Magister Ricardus, Willielmus de Lega, Magister Thomas. Valet.*<sup>3</sup>

It is singular that this Confirmation should omit to name the actual Donor of Shawbury Church. That it was Robert fitz Nigel I know from the Confirmation of Bishop Peche (Durdent's Successor), whose Charter to Haughmond confirms the following, viz. *ex dono Roberti de Sageberia ecclesiam ejusdem villæ cum capellis de Mortone, Actone, et Wideford.*<sup>4</sup> I know it also from Robert fitz Nigel's own Charter, which, though it was written some years after the grant, expresses the said grant to be his, and was attested by that very Bishop Peche of whom we are speaking.—

As *Robert fitz Nigel* he gives to the Abbey, "for the souls' health of himself, his father, mother, and all his friends (*parentum*), the Advowson of the Church of St. Mary of Schawgesbury. Witnesses, Richard, Bishop of Chester; Roger, Archdeacon (probably of Salop); and Herbert, Dean.

But the history of Shawbury Church is too interesting to be thus mixed up with manorial details. I have further to say of Robert fitz Nigel that between the years 1161 and 1172 he follows Richard Bishop of Chester in the attestation of a Charter to Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>5</sup> Here he is called *Robertus filius Nichelli*. A nearly contemporary Deed he witnesses as *Robertus filius Nigelli de Schawberia*.<sup>6</sup>

Robert fitz Nigel, as Tenant of a Tornai-Escheat, was a Tenant

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps *quicquid* should be the reading.

<sup>2</sup> Helias Archdeacon of Stafford succeeded to Ralph, whom I know to have been in office as late as January 1155.

The date of the above Deed is therefore limited to 1155–1159.

<sup>3</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 197.

<sup>4</sup> Harl. MSS. 3868, fo. 9.

<sup>5, 6</sup> Salop Chartulary, Nos. 29, 30.

*in capite* of Henry II. In 1182 he was deceased, and the succession of his son and heir,—

WIDO DE SHAWBURY, is marked by the following entry on the Pipe-Roll of that year.—“Wido de Schauberia reddit compotum de 100 sol. pro relevio feodi unius militis,” in other words, Wido de Shawbury, for a fine of 100*s.*, had livery of a knight's-fee held *in capite* at Shawbury. Guy de Shawbury is a frequent witness of the Charters which passed during his time. His Confirmation of Shawbury Church to Haughmond Abbey is valuable in a genealogical point of view. Styling himself “Wydo de Scawbery, son of Robert, son of Nigel,” he gives to the Canons the “Church of Saubery, which Robert, his father, had previously given.” He gives also a virgate of land pertaining to the Church, and pannage for 30 swine; and rights of common, in wood and in pasture; and tithes of his Mill of Saubery. Moreover he releases all royal dues (*omne regale*) on half of the aforesaid virgate of the Church, about which there had been some litigation between him and the Canons, and allows that with the other half-virgate it shall be quit of all secular service for ever. Witnesses, Robert, Priest of Saubery, Adam de Arundel, William de Bykedon, Reginald de Tyrne, Roger de Donton, Warin fits Talun, Simon son of Roger de *Hjagedon*, Henry brother of Wydo de Saubery, Richard de Wythiford, and Robert and Thomas, his brothers, Richard de Muclitone, &c.<sup>1</sup>

In 1194 the Fees which had once been Gerard de Tornai's, were assessed collectively to the Scutage for King Richard's Redemption. The Pipe-Roll of 1195 gives £3. 10*s.* as received by the Sheriff on this account. It appears from another Record that Gwido de Shawbury withheld one merk, the whole or part of his liability in this matter. For this he was amerced 20 merks. For payment of the debt he found six Sureties, two of whom were resident in Buckinghamshire, one in Kent, one in Essex, one in Oxfordshire, and one (Reginald de Tirne) in Shropshire.<sup>2</sup> For the year ending Michaelmas 1197 Wido fitz Robert acted as Under Sheriff to William fitz Alan.

At Wido de Shawbury's death, which happened in 1200–1, £1. 13*s.* 4*d.* of his amercement of 20 merks remained due. I shall speak presently of its subsequent discharge.

In 1196 the Fief, once Gerard de Tornai's, contributed £3. 0*s.* 6*d.* to the second Scutage of King Richard, and a like sum in 1197 to the third Scutage. In 1199 to the first Scutage of John, when the

<sup>1</sup> Harl. MS. ut supra.

| <sup>2</sup> Rot. Curia Regis, I. 49.

assessment was two merks instead of £1., Gerard de Tornai's Fief was assessed in an exact proportion, viz. £4. 0s. 8d. This seems to have included the specific quota of Guy de Shawbury. The same Pipe-Roll of 1199 exhibits him as Wido fitz Robert, and as having fined 2 merks "not to be compelled to cross the seas." Within the next two years he was waylaid and murdered in the Forest of Haughmond. There was much contradictory evidence as to the mode of his death, but I shall do best to give the Trial of his supposed Murderer as it stands on the Assize-Roll of October 1203. I should premise that the suspected Murderer was heir apparent of a distinguished family in the neighbourhood, viz. the son of Sir Ralph Husee of Albright-Hussey.—

The judicial Record of this extraordinary case is worded as follows.—"William fitz John challenges (*appellat*) Walter, son of Ralph Hose, for that when his (William's) Lord, Wido de Scagebury, and William himself, were returning from Pleas of the Crown in the *Curia Comitatus*, held at Shrewsbury, five men came upon them in the Forest of Hageman, and there, in the peace of the King, and feloniously (*nequiter*) they attacked his Lord, Wido, so that he (Walter), being one of the five, did then and there wound the said Wido, and was with the others aiding and abetting, when Wido, his Lord, was slain. And after he (Walter) had dealt such wound upon his Lord, he came up to the Appellant, and held him, so that he could not succour his Lord. And all this he offers to prove (*dirationare*) against the Appellee, as the Court shall decide."

"And Walter Hose appears in Court and denies every word of the accusation, &c."

"The Court determines that the parties should be bound over to a *wager of battle*;"<sup>1</sup> and a day, the morrow of All Saints (Nov. 3) is given to them at Oxford, and "thither let them come armed."

"And Ralph Hose gives the King half a merk that he may have custody (meantime) of his son Walter, his Sureties (for producing him at Oxford) being John de Cnotton and Reiner de Acton. And the Court commits the accused to the custody (or suretiship) of Ralph Hose, Reiner de Acton, John de Cnotton, Reiner de la Lee, Adam de Mukeleston, William de Bromele, Stephen de Acle, and Eudo de Mere."

The Assize-Roll contains another, not very intelligible, entry on this subject. Ralph Hose seems to undertake to produce his son at Worcester on Sunday after St. Luke's day (*i.e.* on October 19);

<sup>1</sup> *Consideratum est quod duellum sit inter eos vadiatum.*

and the Son is further desirous that a son of Hamo Marescot should attend there.<sup>1</sup>

The Justices in eyre proceeded from Shrewsbury to Worcester, Hereford, Gloucester, and Oxford, but nothing occurs on the Roll of their proceedings to show why the Duel between William fitz John and Walter Hose was not *struck*. A Westminster Plea-Roll, of uncertain date, but which I suppose to belong to the year 1204, recurs to the subject, and shows that William fitz John eventually declined the contest. The entry is as follows.—

“Walter Hose presented himself on the fourth day against William fitz John in a plea of Duel, engaged to be fought concerning the death of Wido de Sauburi. And the said William neither appears, nor essoigns himself; and a day had previously been given him *in banco*, and since then (a day had been given him) through his Essoignor. Wherefore the Court decides that Walter Hose should depart *sine die*, and that William fitz John should have such recovery as he ought to have, and that he should be *attached* to appear in Court and hear (this) judgment.”<sup>2</sup>

I have fixed the period of Guy de Shawbury's death as in 1200 or 1201.<sup>3</sup> I had reason for so doing. In the first half of the latter year “Nigel fitz Robert fined 15 merks that he might have seizin of the land which had belonged to his brother Wido, and for his relief and passage.”<sup>4</sup> The latter expression is equivalent to the *ne transfretet* of other Fines, and appears to have covered Nigel fitz Robert's liability to the second scutage of King John: for the Sheriff accounts 4 merks and 8 pence for this year's scutage of the Fief of Tornai, specially noting that one knight's-fee, viz. Nigel fitz Robert's, was not assessed.<sup>5</sup>

NIGEL FITZ ROBERT appears again in 1202, on the third Scutage of King John. Six merks and 8*d.* formed the collective assessment of “the fees of Gerard de Tornay and the fee of Nigel fitz Robert.” The latter had clearly paid his quota of 2 merks, for the small arrear of 8*d.* is all that is certified to be due on the whole

<sup>1</sup> *Salop Assizes*, 5 John, mm. 3, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Placita Roll*, No. 7, m. 4 *dorso*.

<sup>3</sup> However the Pipe-Rolls, for the years ending Michaelmas 1202, and Michaelmas 1203, give Wido de Schawburi as accounting for, and paying two sums of 13*s.* 4*d.* and £1, the balance of a *misericordia* before spoken of. The inference is, not that he was living after Michaelmas 1201, but

either that the Sheriffs' Accounts are occasionally more retrospective than they appear superficially, or else, that the name of a deceased person was used, when his Executor or some one else really accounted on his behalf.

<sup>4</sup> *Oblata*, p. 170.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Canc.* 3 John, p. 128.

assessment. Before Michaelmas 1203 Nigel fitz Robert was deceased, and apparently without issue, for a third brother, viz.,

RICHER DE SHAWBURY OR RICHER FITZ ROBERT now succeeded to the estates of the family. The Pipe-Roll of 1203 exhibits Richer de Sagbir as covering his assessment to the fourth Scutage of King John by a Fine of 5 merks, the ordinary rate being 2 merks per fee. The same Roll shows Leticia, widow of Wido de Shawbury, fining 5 merks that she might be allowed to marry whom she would. At the Assizes of October 1203 (the very Assizes at which her husband's murder was investigated), "Leticia, widow of Guido," was suing Richer fitz Robert for disseizing her of a tenement in Schauberi. He had to pay half a merk damages, and an amercement of double the sum. His sureties were John and Richard de Withyford, Richard de Chesthull, and Baldwin Wischard.<sup>1</sup>

Richer de Shawbury's Fine for *Relief* was 10 merks. It does not appear on the Rolls till the Summer of 1204, and then it appears as if he fined as immediate successor of Wido de Shawbury, whose heir he asserted himself to be.<sup>2</sup> In the same year he paid a Fine of 6 merks in discharge of his liability to the fifth scutage of King John. To the sixth scutage, levied in 1205, Richer de Shawbury's assessment was the ordinary quota for a knight's-fee, viz. 2 merks. It seems to have been paid at once.

Before September 1206 Richer de Shawbury had suffered outlawry and forfeiture for the murder of Maurice de Shawbury. This does not appear directly from any cotemporary Record, but the fact is clear from later evidences, and its date is proved by the Scutage-Roll of 1206. King John's seventh Scutage was at the rate of 20s. per fee. Richer de Shawbury was neither assessed nor exempted; but—

THOMAS DE ERDINTON answers for a charge of 20s.;—and this must have been for Shawbury. This powerful favourite of King John was now holding office as Custos or Sheriff of the two Counties of Shropshire and Staffordshire. The Charter or other special Instrument by which the King invested him with Shawbury is not I believe extant.<sup>3</sup> A Tenure-Roll of the "Escheats of Gerard de Thurnay," drawn up I think about the year 1212, has the following

<sup>1</sup> *Assizes*, 5 John, m. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Finium*, p. 211.

<sup>3</sup> Dugdale (*Baronage*, II. 111) quotes a Chartulary or Charter, whereby King John would seem to have granted Shawbury

and Wellington to Thomas de Erdington in 1211 or 1212. Such a Charter, as regards Shawbury at least, must have been *ex post facto*, or confirmatory of a previous gift.

entry.—“Thomas de Erdinton holds Sachebur of the gift of King John, and owes the service of one knight.”<sup>1</sup>

The course of Erdinton's dealings with Shawbury is briefly but not quite accurately sketched in a retrospective presentment of the Bradford Jurors at the Assizes of 1221.—“The Vill of Shaubir' was an Escheat of the Lord King ; and King John gave it to Thomas de Erdinton, and Thomas gave it to his son Peter, who demised it for a term to Henry de Audley. It is worth 100*s.* (*per annum*).”

It will be sufficient to state here, in explanation of this account, that there was at least an intention on the part of Thomas de Erdinton to make over Shawbury to his eldest son Peter. Peter died without issue, while on a Crusade, and was succeeded by his brother Egidius. Both Peter and Egidius had in turn some transactions about Shawbury with Henry de Audley ; and Audley was seized of the Manor for a number of years. The nature and legality of these transactions were afterwards questioned, with what result we shall in due course see.

Thomas de Erdinton, it will be remembered, died on March 20, 1218, having been shorn a Monk.<sup>2</sup> It is not difficult to determine what Crusade of this period must have been the one in which his eldest son, Peter, perished. The year 1218 is the date given by Matthew Paris for the departure of the Earls of Chester, Arundel, and Winchester on that expedition which, in November of the year following, resulted in the capture of Damietta.

That Egidius or Giles de Erdinton was in minority at the time of his father's and brother's deaths there cannot be a doubt. We will however follow the course of events in the order of their occurrence.

On June 25, 1218, “Richer de Shagebury fined 5 merks to have pardon for his flight, and repeal of his outlawry, for the murder of Maurice de Shagebury.” The Sheriff of Salop having taken security for the Fine, was ordered to give him the King's letters patent of pardon.<sup>3</sup> The Writ containing such order was tested by the Earl Marshal ; but on July 8, 1222, Richer de Saghebiri fined 40*s.* for letters under the King's own Seal, similar to those which he had under Seal of the Earl Marshal during the King's minority. This Fine is entered on the Roll as belonging to Buckinghamshire.<sup>4</sup> Whatever was its effect, it worked no restitution for the Outlaw, in respect of his Shropshire estate.

On May 1, 1224, the King enjoins the Sheriff of Shropshire that

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 56, b.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Finium*, Vol. I. p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 90.

he should give to Henry de Audley such seizin of the Manor of Shaghebiry, as the said Henry had, before the rupture between the King and his Barons.<sup>1</sup> The allusion must be to the close of John's reign. Shortly after this, Giles de Erdinton appears with at least an asserted interest in Shawbury. A Writ of May 30, 1225, appoints him a day (viz. the octaves of Trinity Sunday) to appear before the King, wherever the Court may be, to have or produce his warranty of the land which he holds of the King in Sauebiry.<sup>2</sup> At this time then Giles de Erdinton's claim to Shawbury was only problematical. Henry III.'s confirmation of the various acquisitions made by his faithful Servant, Henry de Audley, bears date, May 2, 1227. *Inter alia* it confirms the following, viz. "Of the gift of Egidius de Erdington the whole Manor of Schagebury with all its appurtenances."<sup>3</sup>

On October 13, 1227, a Fine was levied whereby Roysia de Cokerfeld (Plaintiff) releases for 20 merks to Henry de Audley, all the right which she had in the name of dower to one-third of the Manors of Saghebiry, Besseford, and Parva Wytheford. Roese de Cokefeld was, I should explain, widow of Thomas de Erdington.

I think it was in Michaelmas Term 1236, that Giles de Erdinton first made an open move to recover Shawbury from Audley. He adopted the process of *mort d'ancestre*, the main specific question being "whether his Father Thomas had died seized of one carucate and 12 virgates in Shagebiry, whereof Henry de Audithley was now holding 1 carucate and 2 virgates, and Bertram Griffin was holding 10 virgates." At the day of Trial both the said Tenants appeared in Court at Westminster, but Bertram Griffin called his Co-defendant and Feoffor to warranty. Audley vouchsafed such warranty and took upon himself the whole defence. His Plea was that no *Assize* ought to be taken in this case, because Giles de Erdinton himself had enfeofed him in the whole premises by a Charter which he now produced. The Charter was read in Court. It contained words to the effect that "Giles gave and conceded and confirmed the whole Manor of Shaghebiry, to Audley, with all such advantages and circumstances as Thomas, the Grantor's Father, held it of King John; to hold to Audley by performing the service of one knight, with all forinsec services." Audley further deposed that "Giles de Erdinton had accepted his homage for Shawbury, and that since the sealing of the above Charter he had performed the specified service to Erdinton; that is, when the King had levied a scutage throughout

<sup>1-2</sup> *Rot. Claus.* I. 596; II. 73.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Chart.* 11 Hen. III. p. 1, No. 51.

England, he, Audley, had paid 40s. of such scutage to one William Fadir, a servant of Erdinton's, at Wellington."<sup>1</sup>

To all this Erdinton replied as follows:—"That when he executed the above Charter to Audley, he was under age, and had no seizin of his lands;—also that when he accepted Audley's homage he was a Minor. As to receiving the aforesaid service (the scutage of 40s.) he denied it altogether. He offered the King a Fine of 20s. that the truth of his assertions might be tested by Inquisition."

Audley rejoined, affirming that "Erdinton was of full age when he executed the Charter. This he offered to prove by wager of battle, and named one Henry Pigun as his Champion." A day (January 27, 1237) was given to both parties to appear and hear judgment at Westminster. Erdinton named William de Erdinton (his Uncle, I think) his Attorney, or else Robert de Brumwic.

On January 20th, 1237, Audley essoigned his attendance in a plea *de audiendo judicio*, against Giles de Erdinton. His *Essoignor* was Robert de *Hasewic* or *Hanwis*. The case was adjourned to the *Quinzaine* of Easter. On that day I presume (*viz.* May 3, 1237) a further day, *viz.* the octaves of Trinity (June 21, 1237), was given, in their suit of *mort d'ancestre*, to Erdinton and Audley. The Knights and others, who were to take the Inquest above alluded to, were to attend at Westminster, and report their findings on two issues, *viz.* as to Erdinton's age when he executed the above Deed, and, as to his receipt of 40s. scutage, as alleged by Audley. The names of Richard de Middelhope, Robert de Stapleton, Henry de Preme (Qy. Prene<sup>2</sup>), Nicholas de Willey, and John de Beckbury were specified as being on the Inquest.

Somehow the matter was transferred from Westminster to the hearing of the King himself. At Worcester, on October 15, 1237, the following Jury attended before the King, *viz.* Richard de Middelhop, William fitz Aer, Peter de Dudmaston, Richard de Leighton, Hugh de Upton, Peter de Eyton, Geoffrey de Overton, Robert de Haughton, Thomas de Constantine, Simon de Hauberccheyn, Robert de Gyrros, Adam de Beysin, and Ingelard de Acton. Their names are important as showing what a weighty matter this had become, for they were representatives of the chief knightly families in the County, and had been empanelled by consent of both Liti-

<sup>1</sup> The allusion must be either to the Scutage of Brittany in 1230, or that of Poitou in 1231. Both were at the rate of 3 merks or 40s. per fee. It is remarkable however that neither Giles de Erdin-

ton nor any other supposable Lord of Shawbury had been assessed to any Scutage since Thomas de Erdinton's assessment in 1206 (*supra*, p. 137).

<sup>2</sup> Compare Vol. VI. p. 81, note 6.

gants. The questions put to these Jurors were substantively what we have been led to expect by the preliminaries, except that Erdinton's Charter is described as conveying a carucate and 12 *acres* (not *virgates*) to Audley; and except that the scutage referred to is specified as that which followed the King's *return from Brittany*, by which we must understand the scutage technically known as that of Poitou, in 1231. The Jurors' answers are very curious and instructive. They said that "after *the death* (they meant the outlawry) of Richer de Shagebury, who had held the land in question, and who had suffered forfeiture, Thomas de Erdinton, then Sheriff, seized it into the King's hand, and held it till the King, John, gave it to the said Thomas *pro homagio*. Then Thomas promised the land to his son Peter, and actually gave it to him before he (Thomas) died; and Peter had sometime actual possession thereof, but whether this was before or after his father's death the Jurors could not determine. Afterwards Peter caused himself to be *signed with the cross*, but before he set out for the Holy Land, he demised (*tradidit*) the land to Henry de Audley, to farm for a certain term. Peter died during the Crusade. Afterwards Giles, Peter's brother, went and received Audley's homage, and the Jurors were fully assured that, at the moment, Giles was under 21 years of age. This they knew from a circumstance (given), viz. that, after the said act of homage, Giles, being called to warranty by one William de Norfolk (who was unpleaded for certain lands held under Giles), appeared before the *Justiciars de Banco* in the *Curia Regis*, but was found to be under age, so that the said suit had been a *remanet* till Giles did actually come of age."

Further the Jurors plainly declared (*bene dicunt*) that "they could not comprehend how Erdinton's servant could have received 40s. scutage from Audley, as alleged; for that Audley had personally served in the expedition in question,<sup>1</sup> and had had, as they believed, the usual letters of scutage."

As to whether Erdinton was seized of his other lands (and so was ostensibly if not actually of age) when he received Audley's homage, the Jurors knew not.

Here the cause seems to have been adjourned. On a subsequent occasion the Jurors were summoned to reappear on June 6, 1238; because they had not clearly stated (*nil certum dicunt*) whether Peter had had actual possession (*posuit se in terra*) before or after his father's death.

<sup>1</sup> We have had categorical proof of this (Vol. VII. p. 184).

It was not however till July 1, 1239, that the Jurors were again got together. They then certified on oath that Peter de Erdinton had had no seizin during his father's life, but that Thomas had died seized of the premises.<sup>1</sup> The judgment now given remains as a testimony of the majesty of the law, even when administered by so weak a monarch as Henry III. and in the case of a favourite like Audley.—*Consideratum est quod Egidius recuperat seisinam suam, et Henricus in misericordia.*

During the course of this Trial, Roger de Harpecot and Bertram Griffin had appeared in Court and declared that they staked nothing on the findings of the above Jurors. The former held Charters entitling him to the receipt of 7s. rent in Preston,<sup>2</sup> which was a sub-tenure involved in the disputed premises. The latter held a virgate of land and the abutment of a stank, in a similar ratio.<sup>3</sup>

A Tenure-Roll of the year 1240 is a useful supplement to the above proceedings. It gives Egidius de Erdinton as *Tenant in capite* of a knight's-fee in Schagebury.<sup>4</sup> One advantage seems to have resulted to Giles de Erdington from the length of time during which the status of Shawbury had been doubtful. The Manor had been omitted in the Scutage-Rolls; and the Officers of the Exchequer seem never to have thought of renewing its undoubted liability to such assessments.

On February 29, 1244, Giles de Erdinton obtained the King's Charter of Free-Warren in Schawebury and in Besford, then reputed to be a member of Shawbury. The Charter further allowed him to hold a weekly Market on Thursdays in his Manor of Wellington; and also a yearly Fair of three days' duration, viz. the vigil, the day, and the morrow of St. Barnabas (June 10, 11, and 12).<sup>5</sup>

The Bradford Hundred-Roll<sup>6</sup> of 1255 describes Shawbury as follows.—“Giles de Erdinton holds Chabur' with its appurtenances, viz. two hides, by doing for the King the service of one knight, in

<sup>1</sup> This proves that Peter de Erdinton's demise to Audley must have been between March 20, 1218 (the day of his Father's death) and November of the same year (when Peter must have left England for Palestine). His object was doubtless to raise a sum of money for his immediate uses.

<sup>2</sup> Preston Brookhirst is meant. Part of that Manor was now accounted a mere member of Shawbury.

<sup>3</sup> All these particulars have been co-ally extracted from the various Rolls to

which they properly belonged, and embodied in two membranes of a *Coram Rege Roll* (numbered “45” in the present official catalogue). The order however in which the different processes are recited on these two membranes is not that in which they occurred. I have restored the real order in the text, guided partly by duplicate and dated entries on the *Placita Rolls*, and partly by internal evidence.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Chart.* 28 Hen. III., m. 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. p. 56.

war-time, to wit, one knight for Sauburi and for Welinton. He has free-warren and a Park in Sauburi, by the King's gift and by Charter, since the last *iter* of the Justices at Salop, seven years ago.<sup>1</sup> Now this Manor was given by King John to Sir Thomas de Herdinton, father of the said Giles, as freely as the King himself held it."

When Shawbury is thus estimated to contain two hides, it must be taken to include half Little Withyford. Such a supposition would be an exact reproduction of the *Domesday* estimate, which gives 1½ hides to Shawbury and half a hide to the now annexed share of Little Withyford.<sup>2</sup>

What part Giles de Erdington may have taken in the Civil War of 1264-5 I do not know. The innumerable occasions on which he was put in commission as a Justice of Assize, or to try special causes, indicate an active and experienced Jurist. These commissions begin in 1250 and extend continuously till 1262. In 1263 and 1264 he was not thus employed, in Shropshire at least; but in 1265 his judicial services were put in requisition both by the Barons during the King's captivity, and by the King himself after his restoration. He was similarly employed till the middle of 1268.<sup>3</sup>

From all this I judge that a feud which he had with that noted Royalist, James de Audley, was personal rather than political. On January 20, 1266, Giles de Erdinton appeared before the King at Northampton, to prosecute a suit of trespass. Audley was accused of seizing corn and hay in Erdinton's lands at Shawbury and Besford, of arresting Erdinton's servant and carrying him off to Red Castle, of breaking the fence of Shawbury Park and the stank of Besford Vivary. James de Audley had already made several defaults in appearing to the charge. He was still absent, and the suit was pending in Hilary Term 1267, when Withyford is mentioned as one of Erdinton's pillaged estates, and William Burgylun and Robert de Wykeshal were impleaded as associates and instruments of Audley. After this I hear no more of it. Perhaps this is owing to Erdington's death, which must have taken place between June 1268 and March 1269. On March 15, 1269, the King orders that the Executors of Giles de Erdinton, "lately deceased,"

<sup>1</sup> The allusion is to Roger de Thurkelby's *Iter* in November 1248. I suppose the King's previous Charter was then produced, in warranty of Erdington's exer-

cise of the privileges which it conveyed.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, pp. 71, 72.

<sup>3</sup> See *Dugdale's Warwickshire* (Thomas), p. 889. *Baronage*, II. 111.

shall have possession of his goods, security being first taken for his debts to the Crown. In November 1269 and September 1272,—

HENRY DE ERDINGTON, son and heir of Giles, occurs as in possession of his estates.<sup>1</sup> In October 1272, Henry Gaithare acknowledges himself to have released to Henry de Erdington a rent of 3*s.*, which the said Henry and his heirs were bound to pay for a tene-ment in Osbornesmore and Polecroft.<sup>2</sup> Concerning Henry de Erdington I have little to add to what has been said elsewhere concerning both him and his family.<sup>3</sup> He was a Benefactor to Shawbury Church, long before impoverished by its Impropriators, the Canons of Haghmon.—As Henry de Erdinton, Knight, he gave to God and to St. Mary, for the sustenance of the Chaplain who should be celebrating divine services in the Church of St. Mary of Shawbury, in pure almoign and for the souls' health of himself, his ancestors, and successors,—he gave a messuage and curtilage which Robert the Miller had formerly held under him, together with one meadow, and a virgate of land, whereof 7 acres lay upon Crokeforlonge, towards Toret (Qy. Moreton Toret ?); and 9 acres lay between the Abbot of Lilleshall's land of Cherleton, and Cressewal-broke. Witnesses, Sir John de Ercalewe, Sir John fitz Aer, and Sir Robert Corbet of Moreton, Knights.<sup>4</sup>

Henry de Erdinton, Lord of Shawbury, quitclaimed to the Canons of Lilleshall all right of common which he had in their Grange at Cherleton. Witnesses, Sir Roger (read Robert) Corbet; Roger Tyrel, John fitz Aer, John de Erkelowe, knights; and Hugh de Bolvinghall.<sup>5</sup>

Henry de Erdinton died in 1282, when the Sheriffs of Shropshire and Warwickshire were ordered to seize his lands into the King's hand.<sup>6</sup>

MATILDA DE ERDINTON, widow of Henry, had Shawbury in dower. She was daughter and coheir of Nichola d'Albini by her husband, Roger de Someri of Dudley; and the said Nichola was one of the Coheiresses of the Albinis Earls of Arundel. The Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) speaks as follows of Shawbury.—

“Matilda widow of Henry de Erdynton holds the Manor of Schawbere with its members, viz. half Little Withyford as her dower; and she ought to hold of the King, *in capite sine medio*, by service of one Knight's-fee: and the said Manor was given by King

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Finium*, II. 484.

<sup>2</sup> *Assizes*, 56 Hen. III., m. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Dugdale*, ut supra.

<sup>4</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 197, b.

<sup>5</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 264, No. XI.

<sup>6</sup> *Originalia*, I. 40.

John, by his Charter, to Thomas de Erdinton, as an Escheat of the King's through forfeiture of *Richard Scawbere*, formerly Lord of the said Manor. And Ivo Sulton holds half Little Withyford of the aforesaid Matilda. And the Vill of Besford is a member of this Manor, but it is in Pymhill Hundred. And she (Matilda) holds her free court twice a year in the said Manor. And Roger Pride, a Burgess of Shrewsbury, holds the vill of Besford of the aforesaid Matilda."

At the Assizes of 1292 the Bradford Jurors represented *Egidius de Shawbury* as exercising free-warren in Shawbury. This must have been a mere mistake; for Matilda de Erdinton was still living and John de Bifield was her second husband. Her son and heir was—

HENRY DE ERDINGTON (II.), who coming of age in 1295, had livery of his Father's lands, and who succeeded to his Mother's estates in 1302. The said Henry is entered as Lord of Shawbury in the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316.

For further particulars of him and his descendants I refer elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

OF UNDERTENANTS in this Manor I have hardly any notices, which do not appear elsewhere. Besford too, though accounted a member of Shawbury, will hereafter be treated as originally a separate Manor. It appears that Robert Corbet of Moreton, who died in 1300, had been, jointly with his wife Matilda, enfeoffed, not only in Besford but in something at Shawbury. Their Feoffor in each case was Roger Pride, but the Record which I quote is too defaced to yield further information.<sup>2</sup>

Again, in the time of Edward II. (1307–1327), Henry de Erdington conveyed 3 messuages, 2 mills, a carucate and half virgate of land in Shawbury and Withyford to Robert de Staunton. This was without license of the Crown, and in 1328 John de Witheford, son and heir to Robert de Staunton, was questioned as to his tenant-right. An Inquest which sat at Newport on March 4, 1329, valued the messuages at 3s. 4d., the Mills at £1. 6s. 8d. and the land at £1. 6s. 8d. *per annum*, and found that the Crown would suffer no injury if these "parcels of the Manor of Shawbury" were suffered to remain with John de Witheford and his heirs, they rendering due services. The Manor of Shawbury, worth 100s. *per annum*, would still remain with Henry de Erdington.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dugdale's Baronage*, II. 112. *Dugdale's Warwickshire*, pp. 889–891. *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 817.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquisitions*, 29 Edw. I., No. 45.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 3 Edw. III.; 2nd Numbers, No. 35.

## CHURCH OF ST. MARY.

That this was a Saxon foundation, we conclude from the mention of a Church and a Priest in the *Domesday* notice of the Manor. It included in its Parish the afterwards distinct Chapelries of Acton Reynald, Moreton Corbet, Grinsill, and Great Withyford; and, in each of these villis, Chapels and Cemeteries were founded, in the reign of Stephen or Henry II., by the Lords of the respective fees. We have a very remarkable certificate of Bishop Roger de Clinton (1130–1148) showing that he himself remembered the time when three of these Manors were without Chapels, and that he himself had consecrated them. His object however was by this certificate to guard the rights of the Mother Church, and he specially records that such lands and increased endowment (*adcrementum*), as the Lords of the Fees had offered, when he consecrated the new Cemeteries, were offered to the Mother Church. It will be observed how exactly Bishop Clinton's views on these matters coincided with those of the cotemporary Bishop of Hereford, in the parallel case of Morville and its Chapels. Other remarks as to the time and causes of these great parochial changes I refer to, rather than reiterate.<sup>1</sup> Bishop Clinton's Certificate I must give as I find it.—

*Rogerus, Dei gratiâ Episcopus Cestriæ, omnibus filiis Sanctæ Ecclesiæ, salutem. Testimonium perhibemus quod antequam fierent Cimiteria vel Capellæ apud Actonam et Withiforde,<sup>2</sup> utraque villa fuit matris ecclesiæ de Shawsberia. Et quando cimiteria consecravimus, terras et adcrementum, quæ Domini feodi fecerunt, matri ecclesiæ de Shawsberia concesserunt, et nos ei confirmavimus. Valete.*

Another certificate by the same Prelate is equally important, though it relates only to the subjection of Moreton to Shawbury.<sup>3</sup>

*Rogerus, Dei gratiâ Cestriæ Episcopus Archidiacono, qui pro tempore fuerit, Decanis, Sacerdotibus, atque universis Sanctæ Dei Ecclesiæ filiis, salutem et perpetuam benedictionem. Qui pastores in clero, judices in populo, vocamur et sumus, ut ratio et equitas naturalis exigit, unicuique jus suum conservare debemus. Eapropter ecclesiam de Mortona et Cimiterium cum omnibus eorum pertinentiis suæ matri ecclesiæ de Shauburia omnino et ejus possessori committimus, et, ut filiam matri, debitè submittimus, adjicientes et nostrâ auctoritatè confirmantes ut de cetero, pro paupertate suâ, consuetudines et*

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. I. pp. 36, 37, 207; Vol. VI. p. 319.

<sup>2</sup> Another Copy adds *Mortonam* here.

<sup>3</sup> Haughmond Chart., fos. 145, 197; whence also are taken the other Charters quoted in the Sequel.

*auxilia nostra, more capellæ, annuatim persolvat.*<sup>1</sup> *Precipimus etiam ut nulli homini liceat hoc, a nobis testificatum et nostro scripto confirmatum, turbare, minuire, sive in aliquo mutare. Hiis testibus ;— Ronñ Abbate,<sup>2</sup> Guilelmo Priore,<sup>3</sup> Rogero Decano.<sup>4</sup>*

The next Document which I shall quote is undoubtedly a Letter of Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury to Walter Durdent Bishop of Coventry. Its date must therefore be between 1149 and 1159.

*T. Dei gratiâ Cantuar. Arch., totius Angliæ Primas, et Apostolicæ Sedis Legatus, venerabili fratri et amico, W. Coventrensi Episcopo, salutem. Quæ divinis sunt mancipata servitiis, justum est ut ea ipsis locis, quibus rationabiliter concessa sunt, auctoritate quâ fungimur confirmemus. Quare Actonam et Withiford, super quibus testimonium Rogeri quondam Episcopi Cestriæ in litteris suis inspeimus, (quod antequam Cimiteriæ sive Capellæ fierent apud Actonam et Withiford, ambæ villæ predictæ fuerunt de parochiâ de Sachesburia,) juxta ejus testimonium, ecclesiæ de Sachesburia in elemosynam perpetuam concedimus et presentis scripti munimine confirmamus, prohibentes sub anathemate ne quis ausu temerario irritare seu infirmare presumat quod tantâ est auctoritate roboratum. Valet.*<sup>5</sup>

It is probable that this interference of the Primate was elicited by the Canons of Haughmond, who, as we have seen, obtained the Advowson of Shawbury from Robert fitz Nigel in the time of Bishop Durdent, and who were naturally anxious to preserve the rights of the Mother Church.

I have already quoted one of Bishop Peche's Confirmations of Shawbury Church to Haughmond Abbey.<sup>6</sup> I now give an abstract of another Confirmation by the same Prelate, which I conceive to have passed soon after his consecration, that is in 1161.

*Ricardus, Dei gratiâ Coventrensis Episcopus, &c. Sciatis me concessisse (to Haghmon Abbey) ecclesiam de Sagesbur' sicut predecessor noster bonæ memoriæ Walterus Episcopus eam concessit et cartâ suâ confirmavit. Testibus, Rogero Archidiacono Salop', Willielmo Decano, Richard de Curam (probably Curzun), Nigello Capellano,*

<sup>1</sup> Moreton Chapel was to pay such Episcopal dues as its slender endowment would allow.

<sup>2</sup> Doubtless Ranulf Abbot of Shrewsbury, whom we thus conclude to have succeeded before 1147, when Bishop Clinton joined the Crusade in which he died. He has occurred to us twice before under the presumed dates of 1138-9 and 1147,

which are exactly the limits of the above Deed. (Supra, Vol. V. p. 170; Vol. VII. p. 353.)

<sup>3, 4</sup> Probably the Prior of Shrewsbury, and the Rural Dean of Salop Deanery.

<sup>5</sup> Compare a Letter from the same to the same (*Hist. Shrewsbury*, II. 108, note 3).

<sup>6</sup> Supra, p. 133.

*Magistro Roberto de Haid, Magistro Terrico, Magistro Waltero de Tilebid* (read *Tilburid*), *Ricardo de Dallam*,<sup>1</sup> *clericis domini Episcopi.*

A third Certificate of the same Prelate relates more especially to the Chapel of Moreton, but shall nevertheless be cited here. Its grammatical inaccuracies (probably due to some Transcriber) will not destroy its meaning and purport.—

*Ricardus, Dei gratia Coventrensis Episcopus Archidiacono et Decanis Salopesburie et omnibus tam clericis quam laicis in Episcopatu suo constitutis, salutem. Sciatis quod Capella* (read *Capellam*) *de Mortuna, de feodo Petri filio Terreti (i. e. Toreti), quæ, sicut ex multorum assertione et testimonio credibilium virorum dedicimus, et<sup>2</sup> Cantariam habuit temporibus predecessorum nostrorum, et<sup>3</sup> ab episcopilibus consuetudinibus inperpetuum liberam et quietam fore concedimus, salvo in omnibus jure matris ecclesiæ de Shauburia, in cujus parochiâ prædicta fundata est Capella. Hanc autem concessionem nostram, quia firmam et stabilem fore decrevimus, ipsam in presenti scripto confirmamus. Hiis testibus, Edmundo Coventriæ et Rogero Salopesbury Archidiacono, Abbate de Haghmon, &c.*

Pope Alexander III.'s Confirmation to Haughmond, dated May 14, 1172, enumerates the "Church of St. Mary of Schahebury" among the possessions of the Abbey.

A fourth Charter of Bishop Peche indicates a fourth Chapel (Grinsill) as subject to Shawbury Church; and shows that that Prelate granted an appropriation of the Mother Church and its Dependencies to Haughmond Abbey. This Charter has been already quoted under Condober and Lee Botwood,<sup>4</sup> and been assigned to a late period in Bishop Peche's Episcopacy. Of Shawbury it treats as follows.—

*Ricardus, Dei gratiâ Coventrensis Episcopus, &c. Noverit universitas vestra nos de expreso assensu Capituli nostri appropriasse Monasterio de Haghmon, et actualiter tradidisse Abbati et Monachis ejusdem, ecclesiam de Sagesbury cum omnibus Capellis suis, scilicet de Acton, Grineshill, Morton, Wideford, cum omnibus pertinenciis suis inperpetuum.*

It appears that Bishop Hugh de Novant ratified the act of his predecessor in allowing the Canons of Haughmond to appropriate the Rectories of Shawbury and Cheswardine. His Charter bears date "Apud Lichfeld' in crastino Sancti Clementis anno quo Rex Angliæ Ricardus Jerusalem profectus est:" in other words, it passed

<sup>1</sup> Became Dean of Lichfield in succession to William, before the close of Bishop Peche's Episcopacy.

<sup>2, 3</sup> The word *et* seems in each case redundant.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. pp. 28, 246.

on November 24, 1190. There were present R. (Robert) Archdeacon of Chester, A. (Alan) Archdeacon of Stafford, R. (Richard) Archdeacon of Salop, Master Robert de Salop, Ralph Chaplain, Master H., Philip de Welinton, Master Philip Sanson, Philip de Hereford, Richard de Budof, and Philip de Runton. The Bishop allows the appropriation of the Church of Saubury, which the Canons had "by perpetual concession of Robert fitz Nigel, lord of the fee," and the Church of Cheswordin, which they had by perpetual concession of John le Strange.<sup>1</sup>

Another copy of this Charter appropriates Shawbury Church, "together with its Chapels." It provides that the Canons shall present fit Chaplains to the Church, and shall assign them a proper sustenance. The residue they may appropriate to their own uses, and the "entertainment of guests."

Early, as I think, in the thirteenth century, Alice daughter of Robert de Shawbury gave to Haughmond Abbey a noke of land in Shawbury, for the behoof of the Sexton of Shawbury (*ad opus Sacristæ de Shawbery*). Witnesses, William de Ercalew, Stephen de Stanton, Robert fitz Aer, Baldwin de Shawbury, and Stephen de Pimley.

About the middle of the same century there was an agreement between the Abbot of Haughmond and the Vicar of Shawbury of the one part, and Sir Giles de Erdinton of the other part. Sir Giles gives the Church and a virgate of land to the Vicar, for the time being, as Wido de Shawbury had given the same. He also allowed the Vicar pannage for 30 swine, and common pasture for 6 oxen in the bosc of Hemmerleg and The Heymore. The Abbot quitclaimed all right in the latter. Witnesses, Sir Thomas Corbet (of Caus I presume), Robert his brother, Thomas de Rossall.

All this time the Abbot of Shrewsbury had been entitled to two-thirds of the tithes of Shawbury demesne-lands. The origin of this right was perhaps not definitely known, even to the Monks themselves,<sup>2</sup> but analogy teaches us that it must have been by grant of one of the early Lords of the Manor. We have here then an instance of that power which the Normans undoubtedly exercised on their first arrival, viz. of alienating the tithes, or parts of the tithes, of a Saxon Parish Church, and bestowing them arbitrarily on some Norman Foundation.<sup>3</sup> The earliest Episcopal Confirmation,<sup>4</sup> which treats fully and exhaustively of the tithes due to Shrewsbury Abbey

<sup>1</sup> Harl. MS. 3868, fo. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, p. 132.

<sup>3</sup> Vide supra, Vol. VI. pp. 278, 279.

<sup>4</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 329.

in Lichfield Diocese, is by Bishop Peché. It mentions distinctly "two parts of the tithes of the demesnes of Saubury" as due to the Abbey; and it mentions them in such a sequence as would incline me to think that they had been originally granted by Hamo Peverel.

About the middle of the thirteenth century the Abbot of Shrewsbury executed a perpetual lease of these tithes of Shawbury, and of other tithes, to the Abbot of Haughmond.—He conceded, viz. two-thirds of the great and small tithes of all demesnes of Shawbury, which he had from time immemorial, and other tithes at Gulidon;—to hold to the Abbot of Haughmond in *perpetual farm* and for an annual rent of 17*s.* 4*d.* Witnesses, Sir Ranulph Pain then Official of Salop, Master Alan Cox, Master Alan Corbet, and Master Richard de Kagworthe.<sup>1</sup>

Sir Henry de Erdington's grant to Shawbury Church has been already cited.<sup>2</sup> It passed about 1272–82, and must be taken as an augmentation of the Vicarage.

On June 4, 1290, Adam Schappe, Priest, quitclaimed to the Church of Shawbury all right to *half a virgate* which "Henry de Erdinton, formerly Lord of Shawbury," gave to the aforesaid Church "towards the maintenance of one Chaplain, celebrating divine services in the same Church." Witnesses, Roger de Preston, Jevon de Mocleton, William Horde, and William Crasset.

The *Taxation* of 1291 values the Church of Schawebur', in Salop Deanery, at £6. 13*s.* 4*d.* *per annum*.<sup>3</sup> This was the Rectory. The Assessors of the *Ninth*, in 1341, quoted this *Taxation*, but reduced the parochial tax to £6. They said that the Church was rather highly taxed (*satis alte taxata*), and that the Glebe and hay-tithes (not now computable) constituted 13*s.* 4*d.* of the *Taxation*.<sup>4</sup> The Abbot of Haughmond, be it observed, was head of the Commissioners on whose information the Assessors decided the amount of these assessments. Hence probably the unusual remark about the Church-Taxation being high.

In the *Valor* of 1534–5, Leonard Pontesby, Vicar of Shawbury, is set down as having a gross income of £7. 10*s.* *per annum*, chargeable with 2*s.* for Synodals, and 6*s.* 8*d.* for Procurations. The Abbot of Haughmond received £8. 6*s.* 8*d.* for the ferm of Shawbery Rectory.<sup>5</sup> I find no notice of any set-off or charge on this item, as paid to or received by the Abbot of Shrewsbury. Probably the

<sup>1</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 398. Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 198, b.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 144.

<sup>3</sup> *Pope Nick. Taxation*, p. 247, b.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 184.

<sup>5</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 185, 192.



FONT, SHAWBURY.





SOUTH DOOR, SHAWBURY.



fee-farm rent, above alluded to, had been bought up or become obsolete.

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

ROBERT, PRIEST OF SHAWBURY, who occurs late in the twelfth century,<sup>1</sup> may have been last Rector or first Vicar.

ADAM, VICAR OF SHAWBURY, occurs as a Witness of Deeds in the last half of the thirteenth century.

RICHARD, Vicar of Shawbury, died Sept. 3, 1322, and on Oct. 21 following,—

ROBERT DE EDELTON, Priest, was admitted at presentation of the Abbot and Convent of Haghmon. On July 28, 1336, certain disputes between the said Abbot and *Sir Robert, perpetual Vicar of Shawbury*, were settled. It was agreed that the Vicar should have for life all heriots pertaining to the Church, and tithes of all gardens cultivated by the spade, but the Abbot was to have the tithes of all gardens, and the hay-tithes of Welmedowe, at Cherleton, and of all meadows hereafter enclosed.

HUGH PARROK was Vicar in 1359 and died in 1367, when, on Oct. 5, the Bishop instituted—

ROBERT DE HASTON, Priest, at the presentation of Haughmond Abbey.

SIR WILLIAM LOPINTON occurs as Vicar from 1415 to 1427, when he died.

---

## Uppington.

---

"THE same Gerard holds Opetone. Goduin held it (in Saxon times). Here are 11 hides, geldable. The (arable) land is (enough) for v ox-teams. In demesne are 11 teams; and (there are) vi neat-herds, v Villains, and 1111 Boors, with 11 ox-teams. Here is a Wood, a league in length, and therein is one Haye. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 25*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 31*s.* He (Gerard) found it waste."<sup>2</sup>

In dealing with the early history of Uppington it is necessary to repeat that Hamo Peverel, in right of his wife Sibil de Tornai, succeeded to the *Domesday* estates of Gerard de Tornai, and held them during the reign of Henry I. Among these estates was Uppington.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 258, b, 2.

Among the vills which Hamo Peverel gave to Shrewsbury Abbey was Crudgington, a member of High Ercall. It was not therefore a Tornai estate, but was held *in capite* by Hamo Peverel, in his own, not in his wife's right. Hamo Peverel, while yet living, destined William Peverel (his nephew) and Walcheline Maminot to be his heirs. He died about 1138, and these youths, acting in concert, seized on all his estates, whether held in his own or his wife's right. Walcheline Maminot, evidently aware of the unsoundness of his title to Uppington, and depending rather on his right to Crudgington, had it not passed to Shrewsbury Abbey, negotiated an exchange with the Monks. In short he gave them Uppington for Crudgington, as the following curious and coeval memorandum certifies.—

*Notum sit &c. quod Hamo Peverel dedit Abbatie villam quæ dicitur Crucheltuna, sicut ipse eam de Rege tenebat, Walchelino et Willielmo Peverel concedentibus. Post mortem vero Hamonis requisivit Walchelinus Maminot Abbatem et Monachos ut sibi concederent supramemoratam terram in excangium de Upetund, concedente Willielmo Peverel, tali conditione quod si aliquis eam calumniaret, Walchelinus eam de calumniâ adquietaret, sui<sup>1</sup> autem excangium ad valens ad commodum monachorum daret. Quod si prædictam Oppitonam Monachis adquietare non posset, nec excangium dare, prædictam terram, scilicet Crucheltonam cum Slepâ, sine labore et calumniâ redderet. Testes, Willielmus Peverel, et Milo de Belchamp, et Paganus frater ejus, et Willielmus de Belchamp, et Fulco de Lisures, et Hugo de Lisures, Rogerus de Felgeres, Rogerus de la Haia et Stephanus frater ejus, Bernerus Cappellanus, Rogerus filius Warini, Willielmus de Hetlee, Robertus de Meoleburne et multi alii.<sup>2</sup>*

The Empress Maud saw nothing objectionable in an exchange which was negotiated by one, and approved by another, of her most resolute Partisans. In her Confirmation of 1141 to Shrewsbury Abbey she says,—*Lecangium vero quod Monachi et Walchelinus Maminot fecerunt de Crugeltona pro Optund, concedente Willielmo Peverel, confirmo, et præcipio ut firmum sit et stabile.*<sup>3</sup>

It is next observable that Henry II.'s Confirmation of 1155, though it concedes to the Monks of Shrewsbury whatever had been *reasonably* given to them since Henry I.'s death, and though it is attested by Walcheline Maminoth himself, does not mention, much less sanction, the above exchange.

<sup>1</sup> *Sui excangium ad valens*, that is an equivalent, of, or in, his own fief.

<sup>2</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, No. 40.

This silence has its meaning, and I venture in this instance, with confidence, to supply the want of positive evidence by something of conjecture. I know for certain that King Henry II. ignored the claims of Hamo Peverel's heirs to the estates of Sibil de Tornai. Consequently I assume that neither Walcheline Maminot, nor the representatives of William Peverel (Hamo's now deceased Nephew), could warrant the above exchange to Shrewsbury Abbey. The next step is not a conjecture but a fact, viz. that the Abbey recovered Crudgington, and that Uppington lapsed to the Crown, like other Tornai Escheats, from failure of any right heir of Gerard de Tornai. To show what Henry II. eventually did with Uppington, I must trace the career of one who may be considered as the type of a class.

From the employments and services of—

ROGER MUSSUN we gather what kind of character and person was ordinarily selected by our early Kings as a Tenant by Serjeantry.

The Shropshire Pipe-Roll of 1162 introduces *Roger Mushunte* as a Landholder in the County and as favoured by the King. He is excused by Writ Royal his quota (4s.) of the Danegeld then levied, but what was his specific estate at that period we do not know. In 1166 the Sheriff of Shropshire had paid 20s. in the Livery or maintenance of Roger Mussun who had been employed in conveying horses,—doubtless those horses which had been purchased from the stud of Gervase Goch for the King's use, and sent to Normandy.<sup>1</sup> Again in 1173 the Sheriff had paid £2. 13s. 4d. to Roger Muissun, towards conveying the King's horses over sea, and by the King's direction.

About June 1175 Roger Mussun was appointed Fermor of the Staffordshire Manor of Mere, then in the King's hand. At Michaelmas he rendered account at the Exchequer of 40s., being a quarter's ferm of the said Manor. He also accounted 40s. more for certain receipts from Trentham. In this same year, as I suppose, Roger Musson attests two Confirmations of William fitz Alan (II.) to Buildwas Abbey. And it was doubtless in this or the following year that the King, visiting Shropshire, rewarded Roger Mussun's services by that grant of lands which I have before alluded to,<sup>2</sup> and which I now set forth verbatim.—

*Henricus Rex Angliæ et Dux Normanniæ et Aquitaniæ et Comes Andegaviæ, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, &c., salutem. Sciatis me dedisse, &c., Rogero Mussun, servienti meo, et heredibus suis, terram de Upitona pro 100 solidatis terræ, quæ est sub Monte Gilberti, quæ*

<sup>1, 2</sup> Vide supra, Vol. II. pp. 110, 132.

*fuit Hamonis Peverell, et in Heddintonâ 50 solidatas terræ quæ fuerunt ejusdem Hamonis Peverell, quæ sunt juxta Burgam, ad tenendum eas de me et heredibus meis pro uno espervario soro annuatim reddendo pro omni servicio, &c. His Testibus, Osberto Clerico de Camerâ;<sup>1</sup> Ricardo de Humet, Constabulario; Willielmo de Curci, Dapifero;<sup>2</sup> Ricardo Giffard; Widone de Sancto Walerico; Randulfo Poerio;<sup>3</sup> Hugone Pantulf; Eustachio filio Stephani Camerario; Roberto Mauduit Camerario; Thoma filio Odonis; Roberto Monacho filio Henrici de Damfront. Apud Salopiam.<sup>4</sup>*

The relevance of fixing Roger Mussun's service for Uppington and Harrington as a *Sore Sparrow-Hawk*, will be evident when we consider that Uppington was near the hawk-eyries of Mount Gilbert. At Michaelmas 1177 he accounts at the Exchequer for a sum of £2. 3s. 11d., which he had received for pannage of the King's Forests in Shropshire. In 1185 he and Robert de Broc had acted as Justices of the Forest and had held Pleas in Shropshire. In 1188 he accounted at the Exchequer for £2. 4s. 5d., received for pannage of the Shropshire Forests, and in 1189 he accounted for £4. 4s. 4d. received in like manner. All this time he had been *Fermor* of Mere (in Staffordshire), accounting regularly £8 *per annum* at the Exchequer.

The Pipe-Roll of 1190 exhibits no renewal of former trusts, but proves that Roger Mussun must have fallen under the displeasure of King Richard. He had fined, and had paid, a sum of 15 merks for the King's goodwill,—*pro habendâ benevolentiâ Regis*. His disgrace and his death will have followed hard on one another, for before Michaelmas 1191,—Galiens widow of Roger Mussun, had fined 100s. with the Chancellor (Longchamp) for license to marry her daughters to whom she pleased. She had paid 40s. and owed 60s. of the sum.

But before I proceed with any account of Roger Mussun's successors I should notice his two grants to Wombridge Priory,—grants which gave the Canons such power in Uppington, that they rested not till they had acquired the bulk of the Manor.

"For the souls'-health of his Lord King Henry the Second, and himself and his wife," Roger Mussun gave to the said Priory "the

<sup>1</sup> Osbert de Camera left England in August 1176 with other persons who were to escort the Princess Johanna to Sicily. The escort did not return till December.

<sup>2</sup> William de Courci, Seneschal or Chief Justice of Normandy, died there in 1176,

apparently before September.

<sup>3</sup> Randulf Poer, Sheriff of Herefordshire from Michaelmas 1175 till Easter 1182.

<sup>4</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tit. Upinton*, No. cxxvi.

Chapel of Uppington" as that which was of his demesne and table (*sicut domini et mensæ meæ.*)<sup>1</sup> Witnesses, Richard, Archdeacon of Salop; Walter de Dunstanville, Clerk; Richard, Dean of Salop; Gilbert Mussun, the Grantor's brother; Philip, Parson of Wellington; William de Hedley and his brothers,—Alan, Hamund, and Richard; Pagan de Preston, and his brothers,—Eustace and Roger.<sup>2</sup>

Assigning the year 1189 as the proximate date of the above Deed I cannot but view the following as cotemporary. "Roger Mussun for the souls'-health of himself, his wife, Galiena, and his children, gave to the same Priory all his waste and wood-land in Wichele, as enclosed by a headland or furrow (*forred*). Witnesses, Richard, Archdeacon of Salop; Walter de Dunstanville, Clerk; Gilbert Mussun, the Grantor's brother; William de Hedley, and his brothers,—Alan, Hamund, and Richard."<sup>3</sup>

We have a curious account of the seal which was originally appended to the first of the above Charters. It was round, of white wax, and charged with the figure of a bird (*pascaris*), stretching out its head and wings. Of the Legend, only the letters Rog'i MUSSUN were apparent in the year 1346, when the seal was accidentally broken.<sup>4</sup>

GALIENA MUSSUN, to whom I now return, paid successive instalments of her Fine with the Chancellor, till in 1194 the whole was discharged. It does not appear however that this Fine was considered sufficient. On King Richard's return from captivity, she fined 5 merks more, "for having possession of 100 solidates of land in Oppinton and Addinton (Harrington) and Wutton and Hulle,<sup>5</sup> and for marrying her *nine* daughters, in which behalf she

<sup>1</sup> A strange expression; but meaning probably that the Chapel was endowed out of the Grantor's demesne.

<sup>2</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. cxiij. This Charter passed after Pope Urban's Bull of June 1187, which does not include the specific grant (see Vol. VII. p. 364), and apparently in the lifetime of King Henry, that is before July 6, 1189. If the latter limit be doubtful, I may add that Bishop Novant allowed the Canons to appropriate the Chapel in 1190, and that it had ere then fallen vacant.

<sup>3</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. clxxx.

<sup>4</sup> Ibidem, No. ccxv. The Charter was on July 1, 1346, sent to Lichfield and exhibited at the Deanery in the course of some legal proceedings affecting Wom-

bridge Priory. The fracture of the Seal, by accident, occasioned a Notary Public, then present, to be employed in drawing up a certificate of the disaster, and of what the seal had been. The Wombridge Canons embodied this Certificate in their Chartulary. The whole affair is curious, and important,—as showing how essential to the validity of a document was the preservation of its seal. Probably Roger Mussun's device was a hawk. Such a bird would hardly be distinguishable from a sparrow on a Seal of the 12th century.

<sup>5</sup> By "Wutton and Hulle" I understand an estate which Roger Mussun had held at Hill Wotton in Warwickshire. It seems to have gone to his daughter Alina, the wife of Hugh de Beckbury.

had previously fined 100s. with the Chancellor." This second debt she discharged before Michaelmas 1195.

I have noticed Galiena Mussun's grant to Wombridge Priory, under Harrington.<sup>1</sup> It probably passed about 1195. Two of the witnesses (Richard de Chesthull and Alexander de Novo Burgo) were her sons-in-law, which proves that she had taken partial advantage of her first fine with the Chancellor. I have shown under Bourton that a third son-in-law, Roger Boschart, died about Easter 1194, leaving two infant daughters.<sup>2</sup> He then, it is probable, had been married, at least as early as 1191.

No story of feudal coheirship can be more intricate than that of the descent of Roger Mussun's nine daughters. Though it is illustrated by evidences of great numerical fullness, the facts are not always clear. This arises partly from the inaccuracies of the Wombridge Chartulary which contains about 200 instruments relating to the grants and acquisitions which the Canons obtained at Uppington from the said coheiresses, their husbands, their descendants, or their tenants. Another difficulty is that two of the Ladies are occasionally described by different names. Thus Isolda Mussun is sometimes called Cecilia, and one of the other eight daughters is sometimes called *Meidus* or *Madousa*, as well as by her ordinary name. As every daughter of Roger Mussun became necessarily a *Tenant-in-capite*, a number of authentic Records treat of their descendants. To give the Monastic and these latter documents *in extenso*, would fill a Volume. I cannot hope even to epitomize the subject in any reasonable manner, unless my Readers will give me credit for a diligent study, of which I narrate merely the results.

I will first quote such documents as bear upon this descent as a whole, and then give some distinct account of each of the nine Coheiresses and their descendants. Some tabular pedigrees will further elucidate the subject.

In 1211 it is recorded that Hugh de Beckbury, Alexander Fisher (Piscator), Richard de Brug, Robert de Losford, William de Longner, Adam de Cherlton, Richard de Chesthull, William Mareschall and Walter de Beckbury, were *Tenants in capite* by Serjeantry and owed the King yearly one sore hawk.<sup>3</sup> Now six of these were the first husbands, and three were the second husbands of Roger Mussun's nine daughters.

In 1255 the Bradford Hundred-Roll tells us precisely how the

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 133, note 98.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 175.

<sup>3</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 55.

nine shares of Uppington were then held. The Manor maintained its *Domesday* hidage, viz. 2 hides. The Sore Hawk payable to the King by the nine Coparceners was stated to be due on the feast of *St. Peter ad vincula* (August 1). The Manor did suit neither to County nor Hundred, and was not geldable. The nine shares of the Manor I will take in the order suggested by the Record of 1211, not as they stand in the Hundred-Roll.

1. Philip son of John de Beckbury held one-ninth.
2. Alexander fitz Roger of Newport held one-ninth.
3. Richard de Brug held a ninth.
4. The Prior of Wombridge held a ninth by grant of Alianore (Mussun) in pure almoign.
5. Ralph de Burton and Henry de Burton held a ninth between them.

6. 7. The son of William de Buri of Uppington was under age and in ward to John Mansell by gift of the King. His share was two-ninths. He had already married a daughter of Hugh de Wlonkeslow, the Jurors knew not by whose license.

8. William *Boch* (read Dod) held a ninth.

9. Richard *Surbrunt* (read Corbront) held a ninth. He too was a Minor in ward to John Mansell.<sup>1</sup>

At the Forest Assizes of 1262, it was presented how the Bosc of Uppington having been long wasted by the *Lords of the vill*, had been seized into the King's hand at the previous eyre of John Biset, and was still an escheat.

In Michaelmas Term 1282, Richard de Bury, John Coly, Richard de Bruges, Richard Corbrond, and William de Eyton, were found to have disseized the Prior of Wombridge of a tenement in *Uppington juxta le Wrokene*. Two of these were only Feoffees in the Manor. The Lords of the Manor as enumerated in the *Feodary* of 1284, were William de la Sale,<sup>2</sup> Richard de Bruges, The Prior of Wombridge, Richard del Bury, and Richard Curbrant. They were still jointly responsible for the old service due to the Crown. At the Assizes of 1292 it was presented how Roger Muisun had once held Uppington by service of a sore-hawk, and how the said service was now changed to an annual rent of 4s.—Richard Corbrond, Richard de Bruges, and Richard de Bury, were now the only repre-

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 56.

<sup>2</sup> He was son of Alexander fitz Roger, but was deceased in November 1283; —a circumstance which must not be allowed to invalidate the date (1284)

which I usually assign to this *Feodary*.

The truth is that these *Feodaries* are compilations from not quite coeval notes. In the present instance 1284 is the best average, not the unexceptional, date.

sentatives of three of the original coheirs. They each held 5 *nocates* in that capacity. Richard de Bury held a second 5 *nocates* by purchase. Other 5 *nocates*, also purchased, were held by John Coly. The residue (stated to be 15 *nocates* of land) was held by the Prior of Wombridge. I suppose then, that the Prior had three-ninths of the Manor.<sup>1</sup> Other statements affecting this coheirship have been given under Harrington, where it may be seen how Bishop Burnell's heir was really at this moment (November 1292) Mesne-lord of Uppington, and holding over the Coparceners.<sup>2</sup>

Hence in the Inquest taken in 1294 on the death of Philip Burnel, he is said to have held certain rent in Opynton of the King, by payment of a hawk.<sup>3</sup> But in another Inquest, taken in February 1301, as to the tenements of the late Philip Burnel, *Opynton* is said to have been held in socage of the King, and Gunceline de Badlesmere to be now tenant thereof till Philip Burnel's heir should be of full age.<sup>4</sup> In the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316, John de Haulowe (then Baron of Holgate) stands as Lord of Hopynton.

An agreement, probably drawn up early in the fourteenth century, states that sundry disputes had arisen between the Prior of Wombridge, on the one part, and Richard Corbrond, Richard de la Buri, and Roger de la Sale, on the other part, concerning nine portions (*particulis*) of Uppington Bosc. The Prior now conceded 4 portions to the said Coheirs, so that it would seem that the Prior had now five-ninths of the Manor. Each of the parties bound himself to observe this agreement under a penalty of 20 merks, to be applied in *Aid of the Holy Land*. It was attested by Sir Fulk le Strange, Sir Robert de Stepulton, Sir John le Strange, and William Rondulf.<sup>5</sup>

A document of the year 1341 shows Uppington under a very different combination of tenures. The tax of the *Ninth* had been assessed at 10 merks on the whole Parish of Wroxeter. It was agreed to apportion this assessment at so much on each half-virgate in the Parish. Uppington was found to contain 18 half-virgates. As far as I can judge, not one of the ancient tenants-*in-capite* was now represented hereditarily.—The Prior of Wombridge held 8 half-virgates, John Coly had 2 half-virgates, and one *nocate* (*i. e.* 2½ half-virgates), Richard de Lithe, 1 half-virgate, Philip Clerke, 1 *nocate* (*i. e.* ½ a half-virgate), John Wodewart, 1 half-virgate,

<sup>1</sup> The name and share of one Coparcener is evidently omitted. I conclude it to be Roger de la Sale's. He was only 12 years of age at the time.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. pp. 133, 134.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 22 Edw. I., No. 45, c.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquisitions*, 28 Edw. I., No. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Wombr. Chart., Tit. Upinton, No. ciiij.

William Bridde, 1 nokate (*i. e.*  $\frac{1}{2}$  a half-virgate), William Wroth, 1 half-virgate, William Coke, 1 half-virgate, and William Mandelove, 2 half-virgates and one nocate (*i. e.*  $2\frac{1}{2}$  half-virgates.)<sup>1</sup>

As some of these were probably Undertenants of the Prior of Wombridge, we are not to conclude that the eight half-virgates which the said Prior farmed himself, represented his whole interest in the Manor.

I now return to say something of each of the nine co-heiresses of Roger Mussun, and their respective descendants.—

1. ALINA MUSSUN married Hugh de Beckbury, who occurs as early as 1196, and who died towards the close of 1226. His interests at Harrington, Beckbury, Golding, and Sundorn, have been already sketched. The following extracts from the Wombridge and Lilleshall Chartularies will show what became of his interests in Uppington.

About the year 1200, Alina, wife of Hugh de Beckbury, with assent of her heir, gave her share of Wycheley to Wombridge Priory, reserving a rent of 12*d.* Witnesses, William Pantun (of Dawley, I presume), Philip, his brother, William de Hadley, &c.<sup>2</sup> At the same time apparently, because with the same witnesses and for the same rent, Hugh de Beckbury did the same.<sup>3</sup> These two Deeds might have been combined in one, but the Canons of Wombridge preferred separate Vouchers from husband and wife. The transaction was in confirmation, but the reserved rent was in diminution, of Roger Mussun's grant of Wicheley.

About the year 1220 "Hugh, Lord of Beckbury" (for the souls' health of himself and his wife Alina), and "Alina, wife of Hugh, Lord of Beckbury," expedited a second pair of Deeds to the Priory, conveying a share of Wichley, but without any reserved rent. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley, &c.<sup>4</sup> At the same time and with the same witnesses, Hugh, Lord of Beckbury, in exchange for half a virgate in Golden (before alluded to,<sup>5</sup>) gave the Priory a half-virgate in Uppington, held by Robert the Anjovin, under feoffment of Roger Mussun, and for which a rent of 12*d.* was due to Roger Mussun's heirs.<sup>6</sup>

Hugh de Beckbury, with assent and will of his wife Alina, gave to Lilleshall Abbey all his bosc of Mount Gilbert, to wit, the ninth part of the bosc which pertained to the vill of Uppinton, outside the hedge of the arable land;—to hold under himself and his heirs in perpetual almoign.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 158.


<sup>2, 3, 4</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, 7*th*.  
Uppinton, Nos. 59, 71, 69, 70.

<sup>5</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> Chartulary (*ut supra*), No. 72.

<sup>7</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 55.

## COHEIRS OF ROGER MUSSON OF UPPINGTON.—TABLE I.



Between the years 1227 and 1237 Alina, late wife of Hugh de Beckbury, gave the same, with ingress and egress to the said *bosc* and to common pasture.<sup>1</sup>

I can hardly reconcile this grant with Alina's subsequent grant to Wombridge Priory.—Between the same years (1227 and 1237) we have two Deeds whereby Alina, daughter of Roger Mussun and widow of Hugh de Beckbury, gives to Wombridge her share of Wichley, and concedes her share of the *bosc* and waste of Uppington, and of the Mill and Vivary; and gives two acres more, reserving only a rent of 4*d.* on the Mill, towards the annual purchase of a hawk for the King's use. Witnesses, Sir Walter de Hugford, John de Prees, and John Walsh (of one deed), Benedict de Eston, Adam de Chorleton, Robert de Chorleton, Herbert, late Bailiff of Idsall (of the other deed), and Sir Richard de Grenhull, and Sir Philip, Chaplain of Sutton (of both deeds).<sup>2</sup>

In the year 1236-7 *Alicia* (read Alina), late wife of Sir Hugh de Beckbury, gave to Sir Philip de Lutley in frank marriage with Amabel, her daughter, three nokes in Uppington, of which a Fine had been already levied at the Eyre of William de Eboraco and his associates (that is, in November 1236). A rent of a pair of white gloves is reserved on this grant. Witnesses, John de Beckbury (son and heir of the Grantress), Adam de Costarde, and Hugh de Beckbury (her second son).<sup>3</sup>

I believe that the rest of Alina Mussun's share of Uppington continued to be held in-fee by the families of Coli and Drayton. All that remained in the fourteenth century to John de Beckbury, great-grandson of Alina Mussun, was a penny rent, receivable from Richard de la Lythe (who lived at Drayton Abbots) on half a virgate, and a pair of white gloves, receivable from the lands late held by John Coli. About the year 1345 "John de Beckbury, son and heir of Philip de Beckbury, gave these rents to Wombridge Priory. Witnesses, Sir Roger Corbet of Hadley, Sir John, his eldest son, Robert, son of the same (Sir John)."<sup>4</sup>

2. PETRONILLA MUSSUN is only named once in the Wombridge Chartulary. She gives her share of Wichley to the Priory at 12*d.* rent. This was about 1200, being attested by William Pantun, Philip, his brother, and William de Hadley.<sup>5</sup> I only know negatively, that the person called Alexander Piscator in 1211 must have been Petronilla's husband, that is, I know that he was not the

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 56.

<sup>2</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, 7*th*. Upin-

ton, Nos. 168, 169.

<sup>3, 4, 5</sup> Ibidem, Nos. 107, 111, 185.

husband of any one of the other eight coheireesses. He occurs as Alexander de Novoburgo about 1195.<sup>1</sup> As Alexander, son of Reiner de Novo Burgo, and for the souls'-health of himself, his wife, &c., he made an independent grant of his share of Wichley, at 12*d.* rent, his Deed being attested like that of Petronilla Mussun.<sup>2</sup> He sold his share of Uppington Mill to William Sibern.

"Roger, son of Alexander de Novo Burgo," confirmed his father's grant to Wombridge. Witnesses, Sir Hugh fitz Robert and William de Ercalew."<sup>3</sup> This was before 1249, and in 1252 Roger de Novo Burgo, deceased, was found by Inquest to have held one virgate and three nokes in demesne at Uppington, and to have received 4*d.* rent of the Mill there. He had also held half a virgate in Newport under Sir James d'Audley. His son and heir, Alexander, was 28 years of age at the date of his father's death.<sup>4</sup>

Alexander fitz Roger had livery on December 27, 1252, paying a Relief of 40*s.*<sup>5</sup> The King's Writ of *Diem clausit*, on the death of Alexander de la Sale (as he is called), bears date February 22, 1275. An Inquest, held at Newport on March 12 following, calls him *Alexander de Aula, de Novo Burgo*.<sup>6</sup> His tenure *in capite* at Opiton was found to have been by service of a ninth part of a Sore Sparrow-hawk, or a rent of 6*d.* He had held something at Kemessey (Staffordshire) under Thomas de Haughton; and something at Newport under Henry d'Audley. He had 16*d.* rent from the vill of Akilor; and rents of 5*s.* 4*d.* and two-thirds of a pound of cummin from Shrewsbury. William de Aula, his son and heir, was 19 years of age on November 30, 1274.<sup>7</sup>

The latter, as William de la Sale, has been named as one of the Coparceners of Uppington in 1284. The persons who drew up that *Feodary*, though they were aware of some more recent events, seem not to have known of William de la Sale's decease. The King's Writ of *Diem clausit* on the death of William de la Sale de Neuport, bears date November 15, 1283, and the consequent Inquest was held on Tuesday, December 7, 1283. His *tenure in capite* at Uppington is put at 40 acres; his service at a rent of 6*d.* He had held a messuage and half a mill at Newport under Nicholas de Audley, an assart and 16 acres at Kemesseie under Sir Thomas de Haughton,<sup>8</sup> and 5*s.* 4*d.* rent in Shrewsbury. A parcel of land

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 156.

<sup>2-3</sup> *Chartulary* (at *supra*), Nos. 82, 83.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquisitiones*, 37 Hen. III., No. 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Finium*, 37 Hen. III., m. 20.

<sup>6</sup> *De Aulá* is the Latin equivalent of

the Anglo-Norman *De la Sale*. *Atte Halle* is the English form.

<sup>7</sup> *Inquisitiones*, 3 Edw. I., No. 25.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas de Haughton had died more than a year before.

in the *fee of Someri* (i. e. Dudley) was held under him by William, son of William de Akilott. Roger, his son and heir, was 3 years of age on October 18, 1283.<sup>1</sup>

Roger de la Sale has been named above as one of the Coparceners in Uppington early in the fourteenth century,<sup>2</sup> but in a Deed, dated June 15, 1320,—

William de Aula de Newport is named as a Landholder in Uppington. This appearance, if not delusive, indicates that Roger had been succeeded by a brother rather than a son, but the latter is possible. Which of the Tenants of 1341 held this share of Uppington I cannot say, nor whether such tenure was under, or independent of, the Sales.

3. SIBIL MUSSUN was the wife of Richard de Brug. He, I take it, was son of another Richard de Brug, for, at the Assizes of 1203, Richard, son of Richard de Brug, fined half a merk *pro licentia concordandi*. It was probably 30 years after Roger Mussun's death before Richard and Sibil de Brug concurred in giving up their share of Wichley to Wombridge Priory, and even then they got an equivalent. Their three Deeds may be dated as between 1220 and 1224.—

“Richard de Brugge, with assent of Sibil, daughter of Roger Mussun, his wife, and of his heir, gives his share of the land of Wichelee in exchange for that half-virgate which the Canons had obtained from Sir Hugh de Beckbury. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodenet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley, Clement fitz Peter o Shrewsbury, and Gilbert de Coleham.”<sup>3</sup>

Sibil, daughter of Roger Mussun, with assent of Richard de Brug, her husband, and of her heirs, gave the same, in exchange for half a virgate. Witnesses, the three first witnesses of the last Deed.<sup>4</sup>

In a third Deed, Sibil Mussun conveys not only her share of Wichley, but of Uppington Mill, and of Bradmedewe, and Bertelamedewe, in exchange for the aforesaid half-virgate. She binds herself and her heirs in a penalty of 20 merks to observe this Deed. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodenet, Hugh fitz Robert, Philip de Penynnton, Adam de Cherleton, and Herbert Mauveysin.<sup>5</sup>

Between 1226 and 1240 Richard de Brug and Sibil his wife give two Seilions in the field of Uppington to the Priory. Witnesses, Sir William de Dreyton, Chaplain; Sir Herbert de Ethingham,

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 11 Edw. I., No. 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 158.

<sup>3</sup> · <sup>4</sup> · <sup>5</sup> *Chartulary* (ut *supra*), Nos. 160  
50, 189.

Chaplain; Richard de Pivelesdon; Benedict de Eston; Robert de Brocton; Roger de Eppeleg; and Adam de Cherlton.<sup>1</sup>

Within the same interval, Richard de Brug, with Sibil's assent, gives to the Priory his share of Brethawellesmedwe and of a meadow lying near the road from Uppington Chapel to Wichley Grange. Witnesses, Adam de Cherlton, William Marshall, and Benedict de Aston.<sup>2</sup>

Between 1236 and 1241, Richard de Brug being dead, his widow repeats the last grant, and adds a *scilion* at Gatehelle. Witnesses, Adam de Cherleton, William his son, Reginald Corbront, Robert de Cherleton, and Robert de Brocton.<sup>3</sup>

In the year 1241 "Sibil Mussun, widow of Richard de Brug, commits and concedes to Hamo, then Client of Master John Bacon,<sup>4</sup> a meadow (lying between the croft, which Hamo now held of the Lessor for a term, and the rivulet);—to hold for a term of 25 years, commencing October 28, 1241, at a rent of  $\frac{1}{2}d$ . Witnesses, Robert de Cherleton, William fitz Adam, Alan fitz Yvo, and John Clerk."<sup>5</sup>

Immediately after this, the same "Sibil, with assent of her heir, concedes to the same Hamo all the land within and without the vill of Uppington, which Richard, her late husband, had delivered to the said Hamo for a term, viz. 18 acres of field-land, and a messuage and *croft* adjacent. Witnesses, Robert de Cherlton, William fitz Adam (de Cherlton), Reginald Corbronde, Alan de Sogedon, and John Clerk of Cherlton."<sup>6</sup>

In this same year (1241), Sibil Mussun died, for on January 16, 1242, the King received the homage of William, her son and heir, for a Fine of half a merk.<sup>7</sup>

William de Bruges attests a Wombridge Charter in 1243, but died about two years after, without issue. An Inquest, held pursuant to a Writ of *Diem clausit* dated January 16, 1246, found his tenure *in capite* at Uppington to have been 2 virgates and 1 noke, which, inclusive of his wife's dower, was worth £1. 4s. 5d. *per annum*. His brother Richard was his heir. On the Jury which took this Inquest were Robert de Cherleton, Richard de Birche, Alan de Sogedon, Walter de Cherleton, Alan fitz Yvo, and William fitz Chaplain.

<sup>1. 2. 3</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 223, 27, 204.

<sup>4</sup> I cannot satisfactorily make out who this John Bacon was. Twenty years before this Deed, a Patent of July 6, 1221,


gives him the custody of Shrewsbury Abbey during a vacancy.

<sup>5. 6</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 130, 129.

<sup>7</sup> *Rot. Finium*, I. 366.

# COHEIRS OF ROGER MUSSUN OF UPPINGTON.—TABLE II.

Roger Mussun of Uppington. Occurs 1166-1190 = Galiens, *Superstes* 1191-1196.



The first notice which I can find of Richard de Brug (II.) is in a Deed which I date about 1250.—As “Richard son of Richard de Brugge of Opinton,” he enfeoffs Hamo de Aldreschote<sup>1</sup> in 3 seylions at a half-penny rent. Witnesses, Richard Ruston, Clerk, and William fitz Chaplain.<sup>2</sup>

Two grants, which Richard de Bruges made to Wombridge, belong, I think, to the interval between 1259 and 1262. By one he gives his share of Holemere meadow and two acres, adjacent to lands of Hamo de Aldrescote and Richard del Buri. Witnesses, Sir Madoc de Sutton, Saer de Berwick, Henry Mauveysin of Berwick, Thomas his brother, Hamo de Aldrescote, William de Eyton, Roger son of Ulger de Sugdon.<sup>3</sup> By the other Deed, “Richard de Bruges gives to the Priory 3 acres in the field towards Beslow, adjoining lands of Richard Corbrond and William the Parson. Witnesses, John de Ercalew, John fitz Hugh of Bolas, Ralph de Erleton, Hamo de Aldrescote, and William de Eyton.”<sup>4</sup>

By another Deed Richard de Brug gives to Wombridge his share of Brodemedowe (long before given by his Mother), under Uppington Church. Witnesses, John fitz Hugh of Bolas, John de Ercalewe, and William de Dreiton.<sup>5</sup>

I take it that the person who about 1264 sold his share of Harrington, as before noticed,<sup>6</sup> was son of this Richard, though I have no other evidence of the fact than his calling himself “Richard son of Richard de Bruges,” a style which probably applied to at least three individuals of this family. At all events I may safely call him—

Richard de Brug (III.), who has occurred to us as a Coparcener of Uppington in 1282, 1284, and 1292,<sup>7</sup> and who occurs on local Juries in 1274, 1284, and 1285.

About 1290, as “Richard, surnamed de Brug, one of the free Tenants of Uppington,” he gave his share of Mose meadow to Wombridge Priory. Witnesses, Sir Peter de Eyton, Sir Thomas Corbet, Sir David de Montgomery, Sir Richard de Leighton, Knights, Master John de Cherleton, Hugh de Beslow, and Henry de Garmeston.<sup>8</sup> I find Richard de Bruges named as an Uppington Landowner in 1309, but not later. What became of his share of Uppington, or which of the Tenants of 1341 held it, I cannot say.

<sup>1</sup> Identical with “Hamo, Client of Master John Bacon” (*supra*, p. 164).

<sup>2-3-4</sup> Chartulary (*ut supra*), Nos. 121, 155, 165.

<sup>5</sup> Chartulary (*ut supra*), No. 6.

<sup>6</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 133.

<sup>7</sup> *Supra*, p. 157.

<sup>8</sup> Chartulary (*ut supra*), No. 191.

4. ALIANORE MUSSUN was in 1211 the wife of Robert de Loskesford (*i. e.* Losford). She was left a Widow before 1221, for at the Assizes of that year the Jurors of Bradford Hundred presented how Alianora de Opiton (written *Capiton*) was in the King's gift, and yet to be married. Her land in that Hundred was worth one merk (*per annum*). I think that it was as a Widow and about the year 1220 that she, as "Alianore, daughter of Roger Muisun," gave her share of Broadmeadow to Wombridge Priory. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley, and Adam de Cherlton.<sup>1</sup>

Using the same style, and between the last deed and the year 1224, she gave all her land in Uppington to the Priory, binding herself and heirs in a penalty of 40 merks to warrant the same to the Canons. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Walter de Hugford, and Walter Mareschall.<sup>2</sup>

Something or other made this Deed inoperative, as we are assured by Alianore's later and far less comprehensive grants to the Priory. First however I must quote a Deed which may have been earlier than the last, as it certainly passed before the year 1227. Thereby the same Alianore gives the Priory her share of La Mare and 4 seilions in Uppington. Witnesses, Hugh de Beckbury, Adam de Cherleton, Walter Mareschall, Richard de Brugge, and Walter de Beckbury.<sup>3</sup>

In 1227 Alienore de Opinton, as she is called, was reported of, as in the King's gift; *i. e.* in respect to any second marriage. Her land in Bradford Hundred was worth 3 merks *per annum*, together with the land of John fitz Richard.<sup>4</sup> The latter I take to be John de Chesthul, Alianore's Nephew and perhaps Ward. Between this period and her death, which took place in or before 1241, the following grants of Alianore Mussun are to be dated. I mention them with some attempt at their probable sequence.

With consent of her heir she sells to Wombridge Priory, for half a merk, a croft adjacent to William Marshall's house. Witnesses, Richard de Leighton, Thomas de Constantine, Thomas de Eston, Robert de Brockton, Richard de Brugg, and William Marshall.<sup>5</sup>

With consent of William, her son and heir, she concedes for 40s. to Alan de Sugdon a virgate in Uppington, to hold for his own life, and for the life of one assignee after him. Witnesses, Thomas de

<sup>1</sup>·<sup>2</sup>·<sup>3</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 114, 98, 115.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 110.

Constantine, Richard de Leighton, and William, Canon of Wroxe-  
ter.<sup>1</sup>

As a widow, she exchanges an acre of the said virgate for another acre, to be held like the virgate. Witnesses, William de Stanes of Norton, Benedict de Eston, Robert son of William de Cherlton.<sup>2</sup>

She gives to Wombridge 8 acres in Uppington, viz. one at Doda's Cross, &c. Witnesses, Robert de Bealow, Adam de Charlton, Robert fitz William of Charlton.<sup>3</sup>

As "widow of Robert de Loxefford," she gives 4 acres to Wombridge. Witnesses, Adam de Charlton, Benedict de Eston, Richard de Brug, Walter de Beckbury (deceased in 1236).<sup>4</sup>

She gives to the same her meadow adjacent to the head of Wichley Vivary. Witnesses, Alan Chaplain, Richard de Brugg, William Marescall.<sup>5</sup> She gives to the same two *Seilions* adjacent to the head of Uppington Vivary, and also her meadow near the road from Uppington to Wichley. Witnesses, Adam de Cherlton, William Marshall, Richard de Brugg, Robert de Brokton.<sup>6</sup>

She gives to the same an acre under Wichley, an acre at Hayrastane, her meadow at Stepelhol, her share of Mount Gilbert, whether land or bosc, and her share of Mose meadow. Witnesses, William de Draiton, Chaplain; Herbert de Etingham, Chaplain; Richard de Pewelesdon, Benedict de Eston, Robert de Brokton, Roger de Epeleg, Adam de Cherlton, Robert de Cherlton, and Richard son of Philip de Cherlton.<sup>7</sup>

She gives three seilions to the same, in Beche, towards Wekinton. Witnesses, Adam de Cherlton, Richard de Brugge, Benedict de Eston.<sup>8</sup>

With assent of her heirs, she gives to the same, all her parts of Broadmeadow, of Longmere, and of the meadow at the head of the Vivary (repetitions, I think, of former gifts), also a croft, and 12 several seilions and one acre of land, and her share of Barderwelle meadow, and of Uppington Mill, saving only that the Canons shall subscribe 4*d.* annually, on August 1st, to purchase that hawk which the Vill was bound to provide for the King. Witnesses, Robert de Beslow, Adam de Cherlton, Richard de Brugge, William Marescall, Benedict de Eston (deceased 1240), Walter, Deacon of Wike (identical with Walter Mareschall).<sup>9</sup>

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 154, 183, 116, 109, 107.

6. 7. 8. Ibidem, Nos. 108, 106, 112.

9. Chartulary (ut supra), No. 117.

The following Deed, notwithstanding one expression therein, passed some little time before Alianore Mussun's death.—She gives, *with her body*, to Wombridge Priory, 3 acres (*jugera*) of land. Witnesses, Adam de Cherleton, Richard de Brugge, William Marescall, Robert de Bealow.<sup>1</sup>

The following Deeds passed between 1236 and 1241.—

Alianore, daughter of Roger Mussun, in her widowhood, gives to Hamo, then *Client of Master John Bacon*, at Aldrescote, 3½ acres in the fields of Uppington, for 11*s.* paid down, and at a rent of ½*d.* Witnesses, Thomas de Erleton, Adam Clerk of Erleton, Richard de Brugge, Reginald Corbrond, Alan de Sugdon, John Clerk of Cherlton.<sup>2</sup>

The same Alianore enfeoffs Robert fitz Roger (read Reginald) in two half-acres, for one merk paid down, and at a rent of 1*d.* Dionisia and William Dod are named as adjoining landholders in this Deed, which is attested by Hugh (Qy. Herbert?), Chaplain of Hettingham (Atcham), by Benedict de Eston, and Adam de Cherleton.<sup>3</sup>

The same Alianore enfeoffs William Sibern in 9½ acres of her demesne, for 20*s.* 8*d.* paid down, and for a rent of 2*d.* She further concedes by this Deed some small parcels of land, adjoining to lands of William Cherlton and Reigner Corbrond. Witnesses, T. Clerk of Herleton, R. de Cherlton, Richard de Brugg, R. Clerk of Ruston, Alan de Sugdon, Alan de Opinton.<sup>4</sup>

The same Alianore enfeoffs Hugh Sibern in 2 acres, near land of Philip de Lutley and Ralph Marshall of Burton, at a rent of a pair of white gloves or ½*d.* Witnesses, Reginald Corbrond, William Drayton, Clerk, William de Apley, William Syvern, Robert fitz Reginald.<sup>5</sup>

The same enfeoffs the same in one acre, for 3*s.* paid down. Witnesses, Richard de Bruges, Reginald Corbrond, William de Apley, Robert fitz Reginald, William Syvern.<sup>6</sup>

The year 1241 must be proximately the date of Alianore Mussun's death. It is clear that her son William was previously deceased without issue, and that Alianore was now represented by five daughters, viz. Dimota, Dionisia, Amicia, Sibil, and Isabella. From each of these Ladies did the Wombridge Canons obtain an acknowledgment, sooner or later, and more or less complete, of their mother's grants.—

Dimota, the eldest, about the year 1245, gives to the Canons all

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6 Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 113, 152, 148, 118, 158, 159.

her share in the land held by Alan de Sugdon, and all her right in any land in Uppington or in Shropshire. She retains however, for her life, certain rent payable to herself by William the Parson (*i. e.* William de Drayton, Canon of Wroxeter), and by Hamo de Aldrescote. Witnesses, Sir William de Ercalew, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Thomas de Constantine, Thomas de Erleton, Robert de Clotleg, Robert de Cherlton, William de Bruge (died Dec. 1245), and Richard de Byrch.<sup>1</sup>

Dionysia, another daughter of Alianore de Uppington, gives up, about the same time, all her share in lands held by Alan de Sugdon, Roger de Bule, Robert fitz Renier (or Reginald) and William Forester, and all her rents or rights in Uppington or even in Shropshire. Witnesses, William de Ercalew, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Sir Geoffrey, Clerk.<sup>2</sup>

A third daughter, Amicia, seems to have surrendered earlier, that is in 1241. As "Amicia, daughter of Alianore, late wife" (read daughter) "of Roger Moysun" she gives to the Priory her share in the land held by Alan de Sugdon, and 2*d.* rent payable by William Syvern, and all her right in Uppington. Witnesses, Sir William de Ercalew, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Sir Walter de Opton (Waters Upton).<sup>3</sup>

Sibil, a fourth daughter, also surrendered in the same year and before the same witnesses. Her grant extended only to land held by Alan de Sugdon.<sup>4</sup> A fifth daughter, Isabel, was the wife of Philip, son of Richard de Huntington. With her, and her husband, the Canons seem to have had more trouble.—

In 1242–3 Philip, son of Richard de Huntiton, and his wife Isabel fitz Alianore, give the Canons, for 8*s.* paid, two specific acres of land: and Isabel provides good Sureties [*viz.* Reginald Corbrond (who was deceased in July 1243), William, son of Richard de Brug (who had livery in January 1242), Alan de Sugdon and Richard de Huntington] who bound themselves under a penalty of 10 merks, if she, outliving her husband, or her heirs, should ever molest the Canons in their possession of the said two acres. Witnesses, Thomas de Erleton, Robert de Clotleg, Radulf Provost.<sup>5</sup>

Between 1241 and 1248 the same Philip and Isabel give to Wombridge, for the health of their souls, &c., an acre of land on *Le Old* with the house thereon, held by Richard Scobein. Witnesses, Sir William de Hadley, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Sir Odo de Hodnet.<sup>6</sup>

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6 Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 177, 110, 106, 74, 34, 18.

The following Agreement passed between 1243 and 1245.—Philip, son of Richard de Huntiton, and his wife Isabella, deliver to the Canons of Wombridge all their share of the land held by Alan de Sugedon in Uppington. In return, the Canons give to Philip and Isabella a shilling rent, heretofore paid by Richard the Miller, and another shilling rent which Reginald Corbrond had bequeathed to the Canons, with his body. Philip and Isabella are to pay a rent of 1*d.* to the Canons, and to undergo a penalty of 20 merks if they swerve from this agreement. The Canons give them one merk down. Witnesses, Sir William de Ercalew, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, William de Bruge, Robert de Besselow, William de Constantyn, Thomas de Erleton, Robert de Clotley, Robert de Cherleton, Richard de Byrch, and Richard de Huntiton, &c.<sup>1</sup>

The following Deed passed about 1250, or at all events before the year 1255. The same Philip and Isabel give to Wombridge 3 seilions in Uppington, and their share in 3 other seilions and in a meadow lying between Longmere and Uppington. Witnesses, Robert de Beslow, Roger de Apley, Robert de Clotley.<sup>2</sup>

Between the years 1256 and 1262 the same Philip, with consent of his wife Isabel, gives the Canons a messuage and croft in Uppington. Witnesses, Sir Madoc de Sutton, Hugh de Beslow, William de Eyton.<sup>3</sup>

At last, and within the same interval, the said Philip and Isabel, with consent of Richard their son and heir, give a seylyon in Le Oold and the messuage built thereon, and moreover all the lands and tenements which could in any way accrue to them and their heirs, within and without the vill of Uppington. Witnesses, Sir Madoc de Sutton, John de Ercalew, and John fitz Hugh.<sup>4</sup>

The Wombridge Chartulary enables me to descend one generation later in this family.—Between the years 1276 and 1300 “Richard, son and heir of Philip, late son of Richard de Hunditon and (son and heir) of Isabella, daughter of Alianore Moussoun his (the said Philip’s) wife” concedes to Wombridge all his right in all lands and tenements and escheats, which the Canons had from his Parents, within and without the vill of Uppington. Witnesses, Sir Thomas Corbet of Hedlege, Sir Peter de Eyton, Master John de Cherlton.<sup>5</sup>

Thus was the Wombridge title to the whole of Alianore Mussun’s share of Uppington finally established.

5. DIONISIA MUSSUN was, as early as 1191, the wife of Roger Bocharte of Bourton and Pulley. He died about Easter 1194, leav-

<sup>1</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 161.

<sup>2. 3. 4. 5</sup> Ibidem, Nos. 32, 89, 97, 108.

ing her the mother of two infant daughters, Isabella and Alice, whose fortunes I have in great part related already.<sup>1</sup> Before 1199 Dionisia Mussun remarried with William fitz Geoffrey of Longner. Hence about the year 1202-3 we find that "Dionisia Muisun wife of William Logenhalreh, with the assent and will of her heir (probably *heirs*), gives to Wombridge Priory all her share of Wichley. Witnesses, William Pantulf, William de Hadley, John de Chetwinde."<sup>2</sup>

In October 1223 I know that William de Longner was recently deceased, for his wife Dionisia was suing for her dower in Longner. The following Deed passed, I think, in 1223, but certainly between 1222 and 1227.—"Dionisia daughter of Roger Mussun, late wife of William de Longenalre, grants to Wombridge Priory all her share of the land in Wichelee. Witnesses, Adam de Cherleton, William Mareschall, Richard de Bruges, Thomas de Eston, Robert de Cherleton, Alan Chaplain."<sup>3</sup>

In October 1227, Dionisia Mussun was apparently deceased, for her daughters, Alice and Isabel, are then registered as each holding lands of 10s. annual value in Bradford Hundred;<sup>4</sup>—obviously at Uppington.

Alice Bochart was at this time the widow of a second husband, Elias de Bourton. She is known to have enfeoffed Thomas de Erleton in half a virgate in Uppington. As "Alice de Burton, daughter of Roger Boscard," and as a widow, she enfeoffed William Sibern in all the land which remained in her demesne at Uppington and in all her part of Bulthmere meadow; reserving a rent of 12*d.* Witnesses, Sir William de Drayton, Rector of the Church of Wroxeter, Richard de Bruges, and William Marescall of Uppington.<sup>5</sup> This was between 1227 and 1241.

In 1255 (as we have seen) Henry de Burton was Lord of a moiety of one-ninth share of Uppington. He was son and heir of Alice Bochart. We have seen under Bourton that he was living in 1261, and that very soon afterwards he, with the concurrence of Edelina his wife, made grants in Bourton to Shrewsbury Abbey. He made one grant only to Wombridge, and that apparently about 1260. As Henry son of Alice de Bourton he releases, for 10*s.*, to Brother S., then Prior of Wombridge, all his right (*i. e.* mesne in-

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. pp. 175 et seqq.; 207 et seqq.

<sup>2</sup> *Chartulary* (*ut supra*), No. 104. Though Dionisia Mussun's daughters were probably under 12 years of age, one

of them certainly, and perhaps both, were now married (*vide* Vol. VI. p. 176).

<sup>3</sup> *Chartulary* (*ut supra*), No. 173.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> *Chartulary* (*ut supra*), No. 150.

terest) in that half-virgate which Thomas de Erleton bought of his mother Alice. Witnesses, Master John de Cherlton, Richard de la Buri of Uppington, William de Eyton.<sup>1</sup>

I think it possible that Henry de Burton was identical with a person who about the year 1237 had attested an Uppington Deed as Henry de Clotley. If so, he had a daughter, Felicia, to whom he made over parts of his estate at Uppington, and she was the widow (of a husband unnamed) some time before Henry de Burton's decease. At all events there was, about 1253, one Felicia de Uppington, evidently a Landowner in the Manor, and how she obtained such an interest, unless from Henry de Burton, I know not.

As Felicia de Upinton, and as a widow, she gives to Wombridge all her share in the demesne meadow of Upinton, viz. Beethelamesmedewe, and in Holemaresmedewe. She also gives a rent of 12*d.*, which William Sybarne sometime held under her in Uppington. Witnesses, Walter de Hugford, Madoc de Sutton, William de Leighton (died 1263), Walter de Kemberton, Herbert de Hydeshall (Idesall), Robert de Bealow, Robert de Cherleton, Richard de Byrohes, William de Eyton.<sup>2</sup>

About the same time Felicia, daughter of Henry de Clotleg, in her widowhood, enfeoffed William, son of William Sibern in that half-virgate in Uppington, which Robert *Trasc* formerly held. This was for one merk paid down and for 4*d.* annual rent. Witnesses, Sir Madoc de Sutton, Sir Herbert de Ideshall, Walter de Kemberton, Hamo de Aldrescote, Richard de Bruges, William de Eyton, Hamo de Uppington.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps this Felicia was she who afterwards (about 1260) appears as wife of William Sibern (II.), *alias* William Constantine, her own Feoffee. About that time the said William resigned all his tenures in Uppington to Wombridge Priory; the Canons undertaking to provide a certain maintenance and annuity for him and his wife Felicia for their lives.<sup>4</sup>

I now return to Isabella Bochart, the other daughter and coheir of Roger Bochart and Dionisia Mussun. She, before the year 1209, was wife of Ralph Marshall (I.) and mother of Ralph Marshall (II.). Her husband was living in November 1236, and is named as an Uppington Landholder in a Deed somewhat later. He was however deceased in 1240, for before that year "Isabella, Relict of Ralph surnamed Marescall of Burton" gives to her daughter Alice all her land in Uppington, to hold by a rent of a pair of gloves. Witnesses, William Dreiton, Chaplain; Benedict de Eston, and Robert de Cherleton. Hugh and William Sibern were apparently tenants in possession of the said land.<sup>5</sup>

About the year 1243 "Alice daughter of Isabella de Burton," whilst yet unmarried (*ab omni marito soluta*), enfeoffs William Si-

<sup>1</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 85.—

In one version of this Deed, B. is given as the initial letter of the Prior's name. I have alluded to this before (Vol. VII. p. 371).

<sup>2-3-4</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 172, 225, 174.

The last Deed purports to have passed

in 5 Hen. III., but the witnesses' names (John de Ercalowe, John fitz Hugh, William Pilrin of Dreiton, William the Parson, his brother, Hugh de Besselow, William fitz Chaplain of Hopinton, and Richard de Brugg) make 45 Henry III. a more probable date.

<sup>5</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 12.

bern in her part of the messuage which the said William held, in Uppington, and in the croft pertaining thereto, for 6*s.* paid down and a rent of 1*s.* Witnesses, Thomas Clerk of Arlton (Orleton), Alan de Sugdon, and Robert de Cherleton.<sup>1</sup>

Within the next five years the same Alice, now wife of Henry Panton, joins her said husband in giving a half-virgate and half-noke in Uppington (held by Hugh and William Sibern, brothers) to Wombridge Priory, and also the 1*s.* rent arising from the messuage late held by William Sibern. Witnesses, Sir William de Ercalew, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Sir Odo de Hodenet.<sup>2</sup>

As Alice daughter of Ralph Marshall of Burton, and as now a Widow, she afterwards renews this grant in the presence of Sir Odo de Hodnet, Sir Madoc de Sutton, and Thomas de Cherleton (probably Erleton).<sup>3</sup>

This passed about 1262, nor do I think a tantamount grant to be much later, which is tested by Sir John de Ercalew, Sir John fitz Hugh, Sir John fitz Aer, Hugh de Beslow, William de Eyton, and Master John de Cherleton.<sup>4</sup>

Another grant by the same, to the same, is attested by the three first witnesses of the last, but it conveys a virgate, a half-virgate, and 12*d.* rent, and so, if correct, will have been a grant of double the previous quantity of land.<sup>5</sup>

I suppose that thus the Wombridge Canons became possessed of all that Alice Marshall had to give. Though her brother Ralph Marshall (II.), of Burton, had appeared in 1255 as Lord of a moiety of one-ninth of Uppington, his was only a mesne tenure, consisting of the glove-rent reserved in Isabella Bochart's grant to Alice. It is not likely that such a right would reappear in his descendants.

6. ALICE MUSSUN was the wife of that Adam de Cherleton who appears among the Coparceners of Uppington in 1211. About the year 1220, Adam de Cherlton, at the request and advice of his wife Alice, and with consent of his heir, gives to Wombridge that share of Wichley which accrued to him in right of the said Alice, and on which the Canons (in virtue, I presume, of Roger Mussun's grant) had begun to build houses. In return the Canons gave to Adam that half-virgate in Harrington which Philip the Chaplain held. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley.<sup>6</sup>

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 64, 68, 90, 193, 22.

6 Chartulary (ut supra), No. 55. Compare also Vol. II. p. 133, note 99.

Another Deed, of nearly the same date, is by Adam de Cherlton with consent of his *heirs*, and is attested by Robert de Hamarse, Roger de Apley, and Philip de Paynton. In this Deed nothing is said about the half-virgate in Harrington, but the share of Wichley is simply conveyed.<sup>1</sup> A third Deed by Alice Mussun, "wife of Adam de Cherlton," is with assent of her *heirs* and sets forth the full exchange. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, William de Hadley, and Robert de Cherlton.<sup>2</sup>

Roger de Chesthul, sister's son of Alice Mussun, conveyed his whole interest in Uppington to the said Alice and her husband Adam. Hence, after some disputes with Roger de Chesthul's heirs, the descendants of Adam and Alice will be found seized of two out of nine shares of the Manor. Again, Adam de Charlton bought a share of Wichley from *Meidus* daughter of Roger Mussun, and conveyed it, about 1220, in frank almoign to Wombridge Priory. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley, Walter de Stirchley, Roger de Apley, Philip de Penynton.<sup>3</sup>

Before 1225 Adam de Cherlton was deceased, and Alice his widow, with assent of her heirs, made again a grant to Wombridge of her share of Wichley. Witnesses,—the three first witnesses of the last Deed.<sup>4</sup>


About the year 1225–6, Alice daughter of Roger Mussun, still a widow, enfeofs William son of Edward de Drayton and Cecilia his wife in half a virgate in Uppington, for 4 merks paid and at a fixed rent. Witnesses, Sir Thomas de Constantine, Richard de Leighton, William Chaplain of Drayton, Robert de Broughton (Brockton), Thomas de Erleton.<sup>5</sup>

Adam and Alice de Cherlton seem to have been succeeded by a son and heir whom I will call Adam de Cherlton (II.). He attests a dated Deed of 1230, and before 1236 he had enfeofed his own son William, in 3 bovates (or  $\frac{3}{4}$  virgate), and Richard de Byrche, in half a virgate, in Uppington. These lands seem to have been part of those which Adam de Cherlton (I.) had purchased from Roger de Chesthul. Now, the said Roger and his brother John being dead without issue, their three sisters, Isabella, Petronilla, and Mabel, calling themselves daughters of Isabella de Chesthull (that is of Isabella Mussun), impleaded William fitz Adam and Richard de Byrche as tenants in possession of the aforesaid lands. The two tenants, of course, called Adam de Cherlton (II.) to warranty. A

1. 2. 3. 4. 5 Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 56, 51, 190, 88, 200.

## COHEIRS OF ROGER MUSSUN OF UPPINGTON.—TABLE III.

Roger Mussun of Uppington. Occ. 1166-1190 = Galiena, *Superstes* 1191, 1195.



Fine was the result, levied November 21, 1236, whereby the three Plaintiffs renounced their right in favour of Adam de Cherlton for one merk.

Adam de Cherlton (II.) died between 1237 and 1241, and was succeeded by his aforesaid son, William. William de Cherlton must have been very young, at the time (1236), when he appears above as his Father's Feoffee. However, his son and heir was born, according to one account, in 1237, and according to another, before 1240. And further, in the interval between 1236 and 1241, we find—

William de Cherlton, following his father Adam as a witness, appearing as himself a landholder, and, under the name of William fitz Adam, attesting Charters in which his father is not named. It is clear that this William de Cherlton was the same person with him who is called *William de la Curt* in a Writ ordering his lands to be extended, and bearing date July 10, 1243. An Inquest was forthwith held, and among the Jurors were Thomas de Erleton, Robert de Beslow, Robert de Cherleton, Robert de Clotley, Robert Bras, Richard de Rushton, Richard, Clerk of Rushton, and Alan fitz Yvo. They said, that *William de la Cort*, deceased, had held 6 bovates (*i. e.*  $1\frac{1}{2}$  virgates) in demesne, at Uppington, besides rents amounting to £1. 9s. 5d. and a pair of gloves. His wife was entitled to a third of this estate. His son, Richard, was now three years of age and over. All this is perfectly reconcilable with what we should expect to find, viz. that *William de la Cort* or *de Cherlton* had been Lord of two-ninths of Uppington.<sup>1</sup>

It so happened that Reginald Corbrond, another of the joint Lords of Uppington, was dead at the same time as William de Cherlton, also leaving a son in minority.

Three shares of Uppington were therefore now in the custody of the Crown, but the Inquests taken in 1243 seem to have been mislaid or misunderstood. Hence, in a Writ dated March 2, 1249, the King informs his Escheator (Henry de Wingham) that "custody of certain land in the vill of Upton was in the King's hand; that it was worth more than 40s. *per annum*; but that the King was ignorant of the circumstances of this escheat (*unde nescimus rationem*) and wished to be more fully informed." Another Inquest (attended by Robert de Cherlton, Ralph de Erleton, William de Eyton, Hamo de Alderiscot, and Robert de Clotley) was the result. It was reported by them that the land which was *in manu Regis* at

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 27 Hen. III., No. 26 (a).

*Upiton* was held *in capite* by service of three out of nine parts of a sore sparrow-hawk, and that it was worth yearly £2. 4s. 5d. and a pair of white gloves.<sup>1</sup>

It is evident that soon after this the King granted the custody of these three shares of Uppington to John Mansel, of whom I have spoken on other occasions.<sup>2</sup> Hence it came to pass that in 1255 John Mansell appears with the wardship of three-ninths of Uppington, and that, in two of the said three-ninths, the son of William de Buri was his ward, and was already married to a daughter of Hugh de Longslow.<sup>3</sup> So then William de Cherlton alias William de la Court had had a third name, viz. William de Buri; and we shall see that his descendants were usually called De Buri. This was because their residence was built on a spot in Uppington, called *The Bury*, which is frequently mentioned in the Wombridge Chartulary. Being further the chief Coparceners in Uppington, the Cherltons probably had the best house of residence. To that I attribute the fact of William de Cherlton having been called *De la Court*.

But it is a most extraordinary fact that a third Inquest had yet to be held on the estate of William de Cherlton (deceased in 1243), and that the Writ ordering this third Inquest is dated May 11, 1259, and calls him *William de Uppinton*. A much fuller Inquest, taken on June 13 following, was attended by Robert de Cherleton, Henry Panton and ten other Jurors, not connected with Uppington. This Jury found that William de Uppinton had held *in capite*, 4 virgates in Uppington and Harrington,<sup>4</sup> by services of two out of nine parts of a sore sparrow-hawk. He had also held two virgates in Drayton-subtus-Lyme, under the Abbot of Shrewsbury, for a rent of 8s.; and one virgate in the vill of Cherleton, of the Church of St. Mary at Shrewsbury, for a rent of 1s. Richard son and heir of the deceased had attained the age of 22 on June 11, 1259 (two days before the Inquest).<sup>5</sup>

From this time till his death (about 1307) Richard del Buri of Uppington, as he is usually called, is constantly occurring. To say nothing of his attestations of undated Deeds, he appears on Jury Lists of 1274, 1284, and 1285; accompanied in the last instance by Reginald de la Buri. Other notices, already given, show him under the dates of 1282, 1284, and 1292, with a prominent interest in

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 33 Hen. III., No. 54.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I. p. 339; Vol. VII. pp. 344-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 157.

<sup>4</sup> He had half a virgate in Harrington

which, we have seen, went to Richard de la Buri, and was held by him in 1284 and 1292 (*supra*, Vol. II. p. 133).

<sup>5</sup> *Inquisitions*, 43 Hen. III., No. 31.

Uppington.<sup>1</sup> It would appear from the Wombridge Chartulary that he made very many grants to that House. This appearance is in part fallacious, for some of the Deeds which are dated as having passed in the time of "King Edward" belong to the reign of Edward II. and to the son of this Richard. However it is Richard de la Bury (I.) who on March 31, 1303, concedes to Philip Prior of Wombridge all his shares in the Mose meadow, and releases all service due on certain land which his Tenant, John son of Hugh (Noyse) of Uppington, had delivered up to him. Witnesses, Roger Corbet, Peter de Eyton, Pagan de Preston.<sup>2</sup> On September 30, 1304, Richard del Buri acknowledges a debt of £17, due to the Priory, and if it be not repaid at stated periods, gives the Canons power to proceed against him according to the *Statute of Acton Burnel*.<sup>3</sup> Probably the following Deeds of Richard del Bury of Uppington belong to this Richard, and, if so, passed about this time.

He gives to Wombridge an acre in the field towards Wichley. Witnesses, John de Stivinton, Roger de Mokeley, Richard Corbrond.<sup>4</sup> He gives to the same Priory, the whole upper part of Broadmeadow, and to the lights of the Church of St. Leonard at Wombridge, and of the Chapel of St. Nicholas, at Uppington, he gives a seylion of land at Uppington. Witnesses, Master John de Cherlton, John Coli, Richard Corbrond of Uppington.<sup>5</sup>

The only other Deed which I shall assume to be that of Richard de la Bury (I.) is his Will. It is undated, but was executed probably in anticipation of his end and between the years 1304 and 1308. It was attested by William Cay of Wombridge, John Coli, Richard Corbrond, John son of Hugh (Noyse), and John Hugh of Eyton (or Hugh de Eyton), the two last being Executors. He directs that his body be buried in the Cemetery of Wombridge, and with his body he bequeaths the upper part of Broadmeadow, and his best ox. He also gives for the lights, &c., a seylion, &c. (as already specified in a distinct Deed). Of his goods, chattels, and live stock, some part is bestowed on the poor. The oblations in Uppington Chapel, the Friars Juniors (Minorites, I presume), the Preaching Friars, the Augustine Friars, and one or two Legatees are named for benefactions. Of the residue of his goods some part is to be bestowed for the good of his soul, some part is to go to Christiana his wife, and a third part, to be divided into three equal portions and given to his three sons Adam, John, and Richard.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, pp. 157-8.

<sup>2-3</sup> *Chartulary* (ut *supra*), Nos. 78, 156.

<sup>4-5</sup> *Ibidem*, Nos. 3, 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*, No. 212.

Richard de la Buri (II.), though mentioned last in his Father's Will, was the eldest of his three sons. His Mother was apparently the first wife of his Father, and so a Longslow. In his Deeds he frequently mentions Christiana as his stepmother (*noverca* or *matrtera*), and as Christiana de Harrington. On May 3, 1308, he expedites the first of his dated concessions to Wombridge Priory. It is a 40 years' lease to Prior Philip of half a virgate in Uppington, and a concession of his shares of Mose meadow.<sup>1</sup> His cotemporary or subsequent concessions and grants to the same House are too numerous even for an abstract. On July 8, 1323, he makes provision for his son and heir, Richard, then married to Matilda, daughter of William son of Robert de Sutton. The lands or interests which he transfers to them and their heirs, are held by Adam le Qu (or Cocus) and his wife Matilda, John le Rider and his wife Isabella, Christiana de Harrington, John de Buri, Roger Hod, and William Wyoth.<sup>2</sup>

On July 15, 1323, the young couple re-grant part of the premises, viz. a messuage and 20 acres, to Richard del Buri, Senior, for life.<sup>3</sup>

On May 13, 1325, Richard de Buri the younger was deceased; and Margery, his sister, transfers a tenure under Wombridge Priory to Matilda his widow, Richard de Buri, senior, attesting the transaction, as Margery's father.<sup>4</sup>

Richard de Buri the younger died without issue, but Matilda his widow, though his father and sister were living, became Tenant in fee-simple of all that had passed under the said father's Deed of 1323. By a Deed dated September 21, 1331, she transfers the whole of her estates, rents, and reversionary rights, thus and otherwise acquired, both in Uppington and Harrington, to Sir Roger Corbet of Hadley,—to hold to him and his heirs, of the Lords of the Fees.<sup>5</sup> A Fine of March 15, 1333, further secured the premises to Sir Roger Corbet, the ostensible consideration being £100 sterling.<sup>6</sup>

Thus the main interest of the Buri family seems to have been alienated; but Richard de Buri (II.) was still living. By Deed of January 6, 1333, Richard del Buri, Senior, actually acknowledged himself to have done fealty to Sir Roger Corbet for the messuage and 25 (*sic*) acres which he now held under Sir Roger for life. He further quitclaims all right in the premises already conveyed to Corbet by his daughter-in-law.<sup>7</sup>

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 210, 119, 120, 146, 194, 217, 199.

Richard del Buri (II.) was deceased in 1339. He left a widow Margery, a daughter Margery, and a son Adam, surviving him, but with very slender estates, which they appear to have speedily surrendered.—

On April 1, 1339, Margery, the widow, quitclaims to Richard Crow her right as of dower in one acre at Uppington.<sup>1</sup>

On July 25, 1344, as "Margery, widow of Richard, son of Richard del Buri," she concedes to Richard, Prior of Wombridge, all her right in 18 acres, which her late husband had held (I presume under the Priory) in Uppington.<sup>2</sup>

On August 1, 1344, using the same style, she quitclaims to Sir Roger Corbet, of Hadley, all her right of dower or otherwise in any tenements which her late husband had at any time held in Uppington.<sup>3</sup>

By another Deed of the same date she quitclaims to the same, her right in 2 messuages and 31 acres in Uppington.<sup>4</sup>

Meantime, on May 3, 1344, Adam, the son, and I presume the right representative, of Richard del Buri, quitclaims to Richard, Prior of Wombridge, all his right in the estates of his late father at Uppington and Harrington; and this was attested by Sir Roger Corbet.<sup>5</sup>

Again, on June 29, 1344, Adam, son of Richard del Buri, quitclaims to Sir Roger Corbet all right in the lands and tenements which had belonged to his late father in Uppington and Harrington.<sup>6</sup> The quitclaim related in each case, I think, to whatever Richard de Buri deceased had held under the respective Grantees.

Lastly, on March 19, 1346, Margery daughter of Richard del Buri, quitclaims to Richard Prior of Wombridge, a messuage and half-virgate in Uppington, which her father had given her.<sup>7</sup>

7. ISABEL MUSSUN was married as early as 1195 to Richard de Chesthul, who was living in 1211 and 1214, but dead in 1218.

About the year 1203 Isabel, daughter of Roger Mussun, grants her share of Wichley to Wombridge Priory, reserving a rent of 12*d.* Witnesses, William Panton and Philip his brother, William de Hadley and William his son, Hugh fitz Robert, John de Chetwind, Herbert Malvoisin, Philip de Penynton.<sup>8</sup>

The concurrent grant of Richard de Chesthul conveys the same land, and asserts the consent of his wife and his heir. Witnesses, the three first of Isabel's Deed.<sup>9</sup>

About the year 1220, and apparently after the deaths of both

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. Chartulary, Nos. 122, 205, 196, 196, 41, 197, 93, 184, 57.

his father and mother, "Roger son of Richard and Isabella de Chestul," with the advice and assent of his friends, gives to Adam de Cherlton and to Alice his wife, the Grantor's Aunt, all his land in Uppinton, viz. the principal Court-house, with three nokes of land which Isabel his mother had held in demesne, and a ninth part of Uppington bosc, and of Hunechell Mill, and all the right he had in Uppington or elsewhere of the inheritance of his mother, to wit, in half a virgate at Harrington. Witnesses, Thomas de Constantine, Richard de Leighton, William de Eyton.<sup>1</sup>

I think that Isabel Mussun was the second wife of Richard de Chestul, and not mother of his undoubted heir Robert, who never had any concern in Uppington. Soon after the above Deed, Roger de Chestull probably died without issue, and perhaps under age; so that his grant to Adam de Cherlton can hardly have been final.

John fitz Richard, whose minority in 1227 has been already pointed out,<sup>2</sup> was, I take it, brother of the whole blood, and heir to Roger de Chestull. He was also, I think, in ward to his Aunt Alianore. But before October 1228 he also seems to have died without issue. At that period Isabel de Chestull's 3 nokes in Uppington were being held for a term, of which 8 years had to run, by Engelard son of Robert de Pichford. The said Engelard conceded them, for the remainder of that term, to Wombridge Priory, at a rent of 7*s. per annum*. His Deed of Transfer expressly states that he, Engelard, had held the premises under "Roger and John sons of Ysabella daughter of Roger Mussun." It is attested by Thomas Corbet, Roger de Apley, Robert de Brockton, Richard de Bruges, and William Scrivener (*Scriptor*).<sup>3</sup>

It will be remembered that in November 1236, Isabella, Petronilla, and Mabel, daughters, and now coheirs, of Isabel Mussun, were impleading Adam de Cherlton (II.) for 3 bovates and half a virgate in Uppington.<sup>4</sup> Doubtless the 3 bovates were the 3 nokes above-mentioned; and, on expiration of the term held by Wombridge, Adam de Cherlton (II.) had seized them under Roger de Chestull's grant to his father, and enfeoffed his own son William therein. Certain it is that, whether by Roger de Chestull's grant, or by the Fine with Roger de Chestull's sisters in 1236, Adam de Cherlton possessed, and transmitted to his heirs, Isabel Mussun's ninth share of Uppington.

<sup>1</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 127 (b).

<sup>2</sup> Supra, p. 167.

<sup>3</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 182.

<sup>4</sup> Supra, p. 175.

8. ISOLDA, *alias* CECILIA, another of the nine daughters and co-heirs of Roger Mussun, married \* \* \* Dod of Alveley, and having had by him a son, William, was in 1202 a widow. In that year, between May and September, William de Daventre fines 40s., that he may have to wife Ysolda, daughter of Roger Mussun, with her inheritance. He it is who appears as William Mareschall in 1211, and with a ninth share of the Uppington Serjeantry.

In 1202-3, *Isowde Muissun*, wife of William Mareschall, for the souls' health of herself and her husband, and with consent of her heir (probably under 10 years of age), gave her share of Wichley to Wombridge Priory. Witnesses, William Pantulf, Herbert Malvoisin, Roger de Apley.<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, I think, William Marescall, for the souls' health of himself and his wife, and with assent of his wife and his heir, gave the same. Witnesses, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley, John de Chetwynd.<sup>2</sup>

Again, about 1220, William Mareschall of Uppinton, with the assent of Isout his wife, gave his and his wife's share of Wichley to the same. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley.<sup>3</sup>

About the same time William Mareschall of Uppinton, with assent and by will of Isoot his wife, gives half a virgate, held by Wintwine, to Wombridge Priory. Same three witnesses and Philip de Paynton.<sup>4</sup>

Also, Isoot daughter of Roger Muissun, gives the same half-virgate, but *together with her body*. Witnesses, Walter de Styrchley (deceased 1282), Ralph de Tyrne, Baldwin Wischart.<sup>5</sup>


It is clear to me that the two last Deeds were coeval, and that Isolda Mussun survived this grant *cum corpore* for near 20 years. But, what is more remarkable, she reappears under the name of Cecilia. For instance.—

About the year 1239 William Moraell (read Marshall) of Oppinton, with assent of Cecilia his wife, and for 30s. paid down, and a rent of 4d., enfeoffs William Sibern in a ninth part of Uppington Mill, and in 4 sey lions of land, and in a meadow called Bonewelle. Witnesses, Sir Robert de Beverlawe (read Beslawe), William Poyner, Roger (read Reginald) Corbrond.<sup>6</sup>

About the same time, Cecilia daughter of Roger de Mussun, gives with her body to Wombridge, the whole croft which she and William Marescall her husband held. Witnesses, Richard de

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6 Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 53, 48, 49, 47, 52, 11.

## COHEIRS OF ROGER MUSSUN OF UPPINGTON.—TABLE IV.

Roger Mussun of Uppington. Occ. 1166-1190 = Galiena, *Superstes* 1191-5.

Bruges, Adam de Cherlton, Robert de Cherlton.<sup>1</sup>

Also, William Marshall, husband of Cecilia daughter of Roger Mussun, made the same grant with his body, the same witnesses attesting.<sup>2</sup>

Immediately after this, Isolda, or Cecilia, Mussun will have died. William Marshall survived her, but was himself dead on February 21, 1244, when the King received the homage of William Dod, as son and heir of Isolda Mussun. The Sheriff was to take security for William Dod's relief (half a merk), and then to give him seizin of all lands which William le Marescal, Isolda's husband, had held of her inheritance the day he (Marescal) died.<sup>3</sup>

It is probable from this that William Mareschal had had issue by Isolda Mussun, and had held her lands, after her decease, by custom of England.

William Dod had occurred more than twenty years before his stepfather's death as witness of an Uppington Deed. In fact he must have been at least 42 years of age in 1244. In 1244 or 1245 William Dod enfeoffed (or rather renewed the feoffment of) William Sibern, in a share of Uppington Mill, but reserving a rent of 12*d.* Witnesses, William de Brug, Richard de Brug, William de Eyton.

On June 18, 1245, a Fine was levied between William Dod, Plaintiff, and Baldwyn Prior of Wombridge, Tenant, of half a virgate in Uppinton and half a virgate in Wychley, whereof was Plea. William acknowledged the Prior's right "under gift of his mother Isolda," whose heir he was. In return he was to have the benefit of monastic prayers in the usual form.

Another half-virgate in Uppington was at this time held under William Dod, by Howel, son of Griffin de Sutton. Howel, in 1244-5, sold the same for 3 merks to Wombridge Priory, reserving a rent of 5*s.*, payable to himself at Alveley (and which was in fact his own rent due to William Dod). Witnesses, Sir William de Hercul, Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Sir Madoc de Sutton, Geoffrey Clerk (probably Geoffrey Griffin), Richard de Grenhul, John de Gret, Thomas de Erleton, Robert de Besselawe, Robert de Cherleton, William de Brug, Robert de Clotleg.<sup>4</sup>

About this time, and certainly between 1244 and 1248, William Dod enfeoffs Hamo de Alderescot in three nokes of his demesne in Uppington, for 20 merks paid down and at a rent of 2*s.* Witnesses,

<sup>1, 2</sup> Ibidem, Nos. 39, 46.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Finium*, 28 Hen. III., m. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Original, in possession of Mr. George Morris of Shrewsbury.

William de Hadley, Hugh fitz Robert, and Richard de Leighton.<sup>1</sup>

We now know exactly how 2½ virgates of William Dod's inheritance were circumstanced. They probably constituted the whole of his Estate at Uppington. When I add that within the next 20 years, his Tenants, Hamo de Alderiscot and William Sibern (II.) conveyed their interest in all that they held under William Dod to Wombridge Priory, it will be seen that nothing remained to William Dod but his reserved rents. He eventually surrendered everything to the Priory, that is between the years 1256 and 1272 he gives all his share of Uppington Mill (which share was really 12*d.* rent) and 5*s.* rent which he was used to receive from Howel de Opinton (that is from Howel fitz Griffin). Witnesses, John fitz Hugh, John de Ercalew, John fitz Aer, knights; William Pilrin of Dreyton, William the Parson, his brother; Hugh de Beslow, and Nicholas (read Richard) de Brug.<sup>2</sup>

We also know that William Dod surrendered to Wombridge "the 2*s.* rent which he used to receive from Hamo de Hopiton," that is from Hamo de Alderiscot.<sup>3</sup>

Thus then did the Prior of Wombridge obtain the whole of a second ninth share of Uppington.

I should here remark that one William de Opiton, a Tenant-*in-capite*, was deceased on April 24, 1265, and that the Escheator *citra* Trent was ordered to seize his lands.<sup>4</sup> I cannot tell whether it was William Dod who was thus deceased or not, but I can assign the circumstance of the Writ to no other cause. It is probable that William Dod left descendants at Alveley,<sup>5</sup> but he being not really a Tenant-*in-capite* at his death, the above Writ of *diem clausit* resulted in no Inquest.

9. JULIANA MUSSUN, another of the daughters and coheirs of Roger Mussun, was first the wife of \* \* \* Corbrond, by whom she had a son Reginald, born before 1203. In 1203 \* \* \* Corbrond was dead, and Juliana was the wife of Walter de Beckbury. The two following Deeds probably passed during Juliana's widowhood, and about the year 1200—

Juliana daughter of Roger Muisun, with consent of her heir, gives her part of Wicheley to Wombridge Priory, reserving 12*d.* rent. Witnesses, William Pantun, Philip his brother, William de Hadley.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> · <sup>2</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 13, 179.

<sup>3</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. p. 389, a.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Finium*, 49 Hen. III., m. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Vide supra, Vol. III. pp. 144, 145.

<sup>6</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), No. 87.

The same, with consent of her heir, gives the same. Witnesses, William Pantun, Philip his brother, William de Hadley, William his son; Hugh fitz Robert, John de Chetwind, Herbert Malvoisin, Philip de Paynton.<sup>1</sup>

Again, in or before the year 1203, Walter de Beckbury and Juliana his wife repeat the grant, the same eight witnesses attesting except that in this instance, the second William de Hadley, is called brother of the first.<sup>2</sup>

In the year 1230, William (read Walter) de Beckbury and Juliana his wife, daughter of Roger Muisun, *commit* to Wombridge Priory their share of Broad-meadow for 12 years, commencing with *the year of King Henry's transfretation*; but the Canons were not to begin to receive the produce of the said meadow till the year following (*i. e.* 1231). Witnesses, Adam de Cherlton, William Marescall, Roger (Query, Richard?) Brug.<sup>3</sup>

Between 1230 and 1236, Juliana Mussun, with consent of Walter de Beckbury her husband, gives to Wombridge all her share of Berthewelle meadow. Witnesses, Adam de Cherleton, Benedict de Eston, Richard de Bruges, Robert de Cherleton, Thomas de Erleton, Ivo de Erleton.<sup>4</sup>

On August 27, 1236, Juliana Mussun being dead, the King received the homage of Reginald Corbrond her son and heir. His Relief was half a merk.<sup>5</sup>

About 1236-7 Reginald Corbrond, as son and heir of Juliana Mussun, confirmed her grant of a share of Wichley to Wombridge, reserving 12*d.* rent. Witnesses, Sir William de Ercalewe, Hugh fitz Robert, Walter de Upton, Thomas de Erleton, Henry de Clotley, Robert de Clotley, Adam de Cherleton.<sup>6</sup>

Reginald Corbrond enfeoffed Henry Malvoisin in his ninth share of Uppington Mill at 4*d.* rent. He also bequeathed *cum corpore* to Wombridge a rent of 12*d.* in Uppington.

He also enfeoffed Hamo (de Aldrescot), servant of Master John Bacon, in 3½ acres in Uppington, at a rent of 1½*d.* Witnesses, Sir Richard de Leighton, knight, Sir Robert de Bealow, Robert de Cherleton.<sup>7</sup>

On July 25, 1243, the Sheriff of Shropshire was ordered to *extend* the lands of Reginald Curtbraunt, deceased. An Inquest, which resulted, found him to have held 5 bovates (1½ virgates) in demesne, worth 15*s.* 4*d.* *per annum*, and to have been in receipt of

<sup>1-2-3-4</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 187, 170, 58, 163.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Finium*, 20 Hen. III. m. 4.

<sup>6-7</sup> Chartulary, Nos. 186, 102.

10s. rent in Uppington. His Widow had her thirds of this estate, and Richard son and heir of the deceased was now 8 years of age and over.<sup>1</sup>

About August 1, 1243, Isabella, widow of Reginald Corbrond, renounced to Hamo de Aldrescote her thirds in 3½ acres which the said Hamo had purchased from her late husband; and further, for 3s. paid and at a ½d. rent, she gave the said Hamo a three-years' term in a part of Long meadow, commencing on the said 1st of August. Witnesses, Robert de Cherlton, William de Bruges, William de Eyton.<sup>2</sup>

About the year 1244, the Canons of Wombridge gave to Philip de Huntiton the rent of 12d. which they had by bequest of Reginald Corbrond.<sup>3</sup> The Inquest which I have before alluded to<sup>4</sup> as taken in 1249, concerning escheated lands in Uppington, included the estate of Richard Corbrond. He was then in minority. He was soon afterwards given up to the custody of John Mansell, whose ward he still remained in 1255. A third Inquest, taken apparently in 1256, found Richard Corbrond to be still in ward to Sir John Mansel, but 21 years of age. His late Father's estate at Uppington is now put at 2 virgates and one noke, held by service of a ninth-part of one sore sparrow-hawk, and worth £1. 9s. 4½d. *per annum*. He had held nothing except *in capite* said the Jurors, among whom were William de Cherlton, Hugh de Beslow, William de Uppington, and Ralph de Clotleg.<sup>5</sup>

About the year 1265, as I guess, Richard Corbrond of Uppington gives to Wombridge 4d. rent, receivable from that ninth of Uppington Mill which Henry Mauveysin of Berwick, deceased, had held under feoffment of Reginald Corbrond, the present Grantor's father. He also gives 1½d. rent arising from land which we know to have been held under him by Hamo de Alderiscote, and to have been given by the said Hamo about the year 1257, to the Priory. Richard Corbrond's cession of these mesne rights is attested by Master John de Cherleton, Robert de Cherleton, and Richard del Buri.<sup>6</sup>

About 1280, the same Richard Corbrond, with consent of Richard his son and heir, gives to Wombridge all his share of Longemar meadow and of Holemar, in the territory of Opinton. Witnesses, Sirs

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 27 Hen. III., No. 26 (b).

<sup>2</sup> Chartulary (ut supra). *Tit.* Brocton, No. 18.

<sup>3-4</sup> Supra, pp. 187, 177.

<sup>5</sup> *Inquisitions*, 27 Hen. III. (by error), No. 26 (c).

<sup>6</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), *Tit.* Uppinton, No. 91.

Thomas Corbet, Adam de Montgomery, and Richard de Leighton, Knights.<sup>1</sup>

I assume that the Richard Corbrond, who occurs as a Coparcener in Uppington in 1282, 1284, and 1292, was—

Richard Corbrond (II.), but of this there can be no certainty. About the year 1300, Richard Corbrond grants 4 acres to his son Alan. His Deed makes mention of his (the Grantor's) brother, Adam, of their father Richard, and of a William Corbrond, whom I take to have been a brother of the first Richard. It is attested by Richard del Buri of Uppington, Richard Bras of Donington, and Hugh Garmeston.<sup>2</sup>

About the same time, Richard Corbrond enfeoffs Robert fitz Reyner of Belwardine in a messuage and 3 acres in Uppington for 24s. paid, and a rent of 1d. Witnesses, Richard del Buri, Richard de Bruges, Robert de Cherlton, Alan de Aston.<sup>3</sup>

We must date the succession of—

Richard Corbrond (III.) as very soon after this, for his grant of 3 acres to his brother Alan is, in part at least, a repetition of their Father's grant of 4 acres, and is attested by two of the same three witnesses.<sup>4</sup> It reserves a rose rent to the grantor, who was doubtless the elder brother. In lieu of Hugh Garmeston it is attested by Hugh de Beslow. From this time till 1322 Richard Corbrond of Uppington is a frequent witness of local Deeds; but in 1341 none of his name retained any fee-simple in Uppington, though the family was by no means extinct. Cotemporary with him was another Richard, son of William Corbrond.

As to Alan, younger brother of Richard Corbrond (III.), he obtained, besides the grants of his own family, certain feoffments from Richard son of Robert de Wykys, and from Richard de Bury (II.), in all of which he enfeoffed his own wife Alice and her heirs in November 1336. Witnesses, Hugh Lord of Beslow, Walter le Spencer, William de Hanleye.

There were Corbronds of Uppington, bearing the Christian name William, and living in 1323, 1339, 1356, 1371, 1378, 1399, and 1405; but I know nothing of their relation to the parent stock.

I should now state what is known of one of Roger Mussun's co-heirs who bore a different name to any of the above nine, though she was doubtless identical with one of them.—

MEIDUS MUSSUN sold her share of Wichley to Adam de Cherlton (I.) and he transferred it to Wombridge Priory. So says a Deed

<sup>1</sup> · 2 · 3 · 4 Chartulary (ut supra), Nos. 109, 14, 153, 23.

already quoted,<sup>1</sup> but we have two Deeds of about the same date (1220) which show this Lady making independent grants of her share of Wichley to the Priory.—

As Meidus daughter of Roger Muisun, and *with consent of her heirs*, she gives the said share, and also her share of Robert the Anjovin's rent in Uppington. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, William de Hadley, and Robert de Cherleton.<sup>2</sup>—

As "Meydous daughter of Roger Mussun," and with assent of her heirs, she gives the same shares of Wichley and of Robert Anjovin's rent, and also of her share of the boesc, waste, and Mill of Uppington. Witnesses, Baldwin de Hodnet, Hugh fitz Robert, William de Hadley, Adam de Cherlton, and William Dod.<sup>3</sup>

Again, Maydus sometime one of the heiresses (*dominarum*) of Uppington, is recorded to have sold a croft near The Bury to William Sibern (I.), which croft together with two shares of Uppington Mill, similarly sold by William Dod and Alexander de Novo Burgo, were afterwards given by William Sibern (II.) to Wombridge Priory.<sup>4</sup>

I will not hazard a guess or enter on an argument as to which of Roger Mussun's nine daughters was thus frequently called Meidus. It is certain from Edward II.'s Confirmation to Wombridge, that the Canons of that House knew not, in 1319, how this question of identity really stood. We are still less likely to determine it now.

WOMBRIDGE PRIORY FEE. The Taxation of 1291 summarily describes the Wombridge acquisitions in Uppington as "three carucates in Wycheley," worth 36*s. per annum*.<sup>5</sup>

The *Valor* of 1535-6 gives £9 as the Prior's receipts from 5 messuages and one cottage in Uppington. Out of this he paid a chief-rent of 20*d.* to Sir John Dudley, and 6*s. 8d.* to a local Bailiff.<sup>6</sup>

In 1536-7 the following Assets of the Dissolved Priory belong to Uppington.—Rents of Tenants-at-will, 11*s. 4d.*; Ferm of the pasture called Wycheley, £2; Ferm of lands and tenements in Uppington, £8. 9*s. 4d.*; Ferm of a tenement and pasture in Wycheley Magna, £1. 18*s.*; Total, £12. 18*s. 8d.*<sup>7</sup>

#### UPPINGTON CHAPEL.

The whole Parish of Uppington was originally but a part of the Saxon Parish of Wroxeter. Consequently the Portioners of Wrox-

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 175.

<sup>2, 3</sup> *Chartulary* (ut *supra*), Nos. 54, 203.

<sup>4</sup> *Chartulary* (ut *supra*), No. 202.

<sup>5</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 261.

<sup>6</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 194, 195.

<sup>7</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 391.

ter had and maintained a general right to the tithes of Uppington : I say a *general* right, because there was a particular exception. Whoever founded Uppington Chapel, whether Gerard de Tornai, Hamo Peverel, or Roger Mussun, endowed it with the tithes of his demesne. Demesne-tithes then, could be, and were, in this instance, separated from the Mother-Church, and bestowed on the Daughter. This very fact gives a high antiquity to Uppington Chapel, for such arbitrary consecration of tithes was only exercised in the first century after the Conquest.

We have seen that about the year 1188, Roger Mussun granted the Advowson of Uppington Chapel to Wombridge; and have observed an expression in his Charter implying that the Chapel was endowed out of his demesne. No less than three Charters of Bishop Hugh de Novant allude to this gift.<sup>1</sup> The first, dated November 24, 1190, merely concedes the Chapel. The next passed in the same year 1190, that is, before Lady Day 1191, and, pronouncing the Chapel to be vacant, appropriates it to the Priory, reserving a competent maintenance for an officiating Priest. The third confirms the Advowson, naming "Roger Lord of the Fee" as the original Grantor thereof. It gives also to the Wombridge Canons a *beneficium* or annual pension of half a merk, to be paid out of the profits of the Chapel, by any Clerk whom the Canons might present.

G. (Geoffrey de Muschamp) Bishop of Coventry, confirms the right of R. (Roger) Prior of Wombridge, to the said pension. Witnesses, William Abbot of Buildwas, R. (Richard or Ralph) Abbot of Haughmond, and the Prior of Lilleshall.

This Charter was expedited at Lichfield by hand of Master Robert de Sandon on September 26, and in some year between 1198 and 1208.<sup>2</sup>

Bishop Muschamp further confirmed his predecessor's act of appropriation. His Charter, as applicable to the Church of Sutton, has already been recited.<sup>3</sup> It speaks of Uppington Chapel, *mutatis mutandis*, in the same way. I have, under Sutton, quoted other confirmations which relate to this Advowson.

I think it must have been Pope Gregory IX., whose Bull, dated at Anagnia, in the sixth year of his Pontificate (that is February 27, 1233), speaks of certain Tithes claimed by M. Rector of Wroxeter against Wombridge Priory. The Tithes were doubtless part of

<sup>1</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tit.* Brockton, No. 102; *Tit.* Upinton, No. 226; *Tit.* Lega Prioris, No. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tit.* Upinton, No. 43.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. pp. 138, 139.

the tithes of Uppington, and the plaintiff in question must have been the then Incumbent of the third Portion of Wroxeter. The matter had been already before the Chancellor of Oxford and other Delegates of the Pope; but their decision being accounted unjust, the Canons of Wombridge had appealed, stating that, by Papal Bulls granted to their House, they were free from payment of the tithes sought by the Plaintiff. Pope Gregory now commits the cause to Delegates, viz. the Dean, the Chancellor, and Master W. de Lychfield a Canon, of London.<sup>1</sup> The result of this Suit I do not find, but the question was renewed in after years, and, as we shall see, definitely settled.

A Bull of Pope Martin IV., dated at Civita Vecchia, on June 1, 1283, and addressed to the Archdeacon of Exeter (who was then in Italy), dwells on the spoliation of that Portion of Wroxeter Church which was then held by Robert de Warrewyk. The said Portioner as well as his predecessors are ostensibly charged with unlawful alienations of Church property. The Archdeacon is now directed to take such measures as shall restore to the Wroxeter Prebend its ancient rights and Properties. A second letter of the same Pontiff, with the same date and address, shows that Robert de Warrewyk himself was at the Papal Court, and was the real procurer of the above Bull, though it seemed to reflect on his own conduct. This second Letter orders the Archdeacon of Exeter to quash all proceedings which might have been taken in England against Robert de Warrewyk since he left for the Papal Court.

On June 15, 1283, Robert de Evesham, Archdeacon of Exeter, being then the guest of a Cardinal, received Pope Martin's Letters, and instantly appointed the Prior of St. Sepulchre (Warwick) and the Sacristan of St. Mary (Warwick) his Commissioners in the above business, he himself being occupied with other affairs. Robert de Warewyk, it would seem, now set out for England with the Archdeacon's Letter, which had been delivered to the Prior of St. Sepulchre at Warwick before September 14, 1283. The Prior on that day wrote to the *Dean of Christianity* at Shrewsbury. The latter was to cite the Prior of Wombridge to appear at St. Mary's, Warwick, on a stated day in October, and there to answer the complaint of Robert de Warrewyk. On September 21, 1283, the Dean of Christianity certifies that he has served the Prior of Wombridge with the said summons. This cause was before the Prior of St. Sepulchre for nine years. Robert de Warrewyk, it seems, claimed

<sup>1</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, Tit. Upton, No. 44.

against the Prior of Wombridge the tithes and oblations of certain dwellings (*mansorum*) and of 3 carucates of land at Uppington, and also of the land and Grange of Wicheley, and of Mose-meadow. The proceedings are not extant, but the Commissioner having in 1292 pronounced the Wombridge Canons to be contumacious, the latter appealed to the original and immediate Delegate of the Pope, viz. to the Archdeacon of Exeter. We have two Letters of the Archdeacon, both dated September 12, 1292. In one he suspends the Prior of St. Sepulchre from his functions in the cause, and orders that the appellants be cited to appear, on a stated day in November, in the Conventual Church of St. Werburg, Chester, and there prosecute their appeal before the Archdeacon himself or his Commissaries. In the other letter the Archdeacon appoints such Commissaries, viz. the Prior and Sacristan of St. Werburg's.

The Parties, it seems, appointed their Proctors, and the Proctors duly appeared at Chester. The new Commissaries, after hearing the complaints against their Predecessors, held the appeal of Wombridge Priory to be good, and decided upon annulling all the acts of the Prior of St. Sepulchre. The *principal cause* (that between Wombridge and the Prebendary) was adjourned. When at length the Commissaries heard it, its nature was as follows.—

Robert de Warrewyk complained that the tithes before specified, though they belonged to his portion of Wroxeter Church, had been usurped by the Prior of Wombridge as Rector of Uppington. The Prior's defence was, that the tithes sought did not belong to the Wroxeter Prebend, for that, in great part, they were tithes of the former demesnes of Hamo Peverel and Roger Mussun, successive Lords of Uppington; but, as regarded Wichley, that was newly cultivated land (*novale*) and tilled by the Canons themselves, and they produced Papal Privileges exempting them from any tithes chargeable on lands so cultivated.<sup>1</sup>

In May 1293 the Chester Commissioners gave sentence. They decided every point in favour of Wombridge, and imposed *perpetual silence* on the Wroxeter Portionist. In the following year Roger (de Molend), Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, sealed the said sentence with his Seal, *ad æternam rei memoriam*.<sup>2</sup>

I have alluded elsewhere to a Suit which in 1346 was moved by the then Incumbent of the third Portion of Wroxeter, against the

<sup>1</sup> Vide supra, Vol. VII. p. 365.

<sup>2</sup> These particulars are from the Wombridge Chartulary, Appendix No. 6; and the Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 157, b.

Canons of Wombridge, and concerning Uppington Chapel.<sup>1</sup> The exact nature of the suit does not transpire. On February 6, 1346, the Proctor of the Prior appealed to the protection of the Apostolic See and of the Court of Canterbury, in general terms. On June 25, 1346, William de Wroxeter, the Mover of the Suit, got a Writ or "Inhibition" from the Court of Canterbury to the Rural Dean of Salop on the subject. On June 30, 1346, the Proctor of Wombridge made a second appeal, in Lichfield Cathedral, to Rome and Canterbury. On October 20, 1346, the Archbishop's Official dismissed William de Wroxeter's action (on the ground that he had not duly prosecuted it) and cancelled the *inhibition* of June 25. I may add that John Faber of Donington, and Nicholas Coke, John Clerk, and Robert le Synger of Uppington, were Co-Defendants with the Prior and Canons of Wombridge in the above affair.

In 1535-6 the Prior of Wombridge was in receipt of 40*s. per annum* for a moiety of the tithes of Uppington Chapel.<sup>2</sup> The other moiety went, I presume, to the Abbot of Haughmond as Rector of Wroxeter.

We shall consult the Diocesan Registers in vain for any early Institutions to Uppington Chapel. When Bishop Novant allowed the Wombridge Canons to appropriate the Rectory, he made no reservation for a Vicar, nor did he provide that the officiating Priest should be presented to himself. Consequently the Church became Donative, and continued so till the present century.

The Officiating Priest employed by the Canons of Wombridge at Uppington was probably removable at pleasure, and was merely entitled "Chaplain of Uppington." Of these humble functionaries, one named—

ERNALD, attests Galiena Mussun's Deed, about 1195.<sup>3</sup> Another, unnamed himself, had a son William, who occurs as a Freeholder in Uppington from 1246 to 1266.<sup>4</sup>

SIR WILLIAM DE LA COKES, of Uppington, Chaplain, occurs about 1300, and—

BARTHOLOMEW, Chaplain of Uppington, in 1394 and 1402.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 318.

<sup>2</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 194.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 133, note 98.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide supra*, p. 166.

## Cherrington.

---

THIS was one of Gerard de Tornai's *Domesday* Manors.—

"The same Gerard holds Cerlinton. Uliet held it (in Saxon times). Here are *iii* hides, geldable. The (arable) land is enough for *vi* ox-teams. In demesne there is one team and a half; and *iii* Neat-herds, *ii* Villains, and *iii* Boors, with one team. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 23*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 22*s.* He (Gerard) found it waste."<sup>1</sup>

Radulf de Erleton was perhaps a Feoffee of Hamo Peverel in the whole or a part of Cherrington. Between the years 1141 and 1155 he is recorded as having given half a hide in Cherinton to Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>2</sup> This grant, though subsequently confirmed by King Henry III. as a matter of form,<sup>3</sup> had no real permanence; for the Monks of Shrewsbury retained nothing at Cherrington.

It is probable that Hamo Peverel's illegitimate daughter, Seburga, had some feoffment in Cherrington, which was in due course inherited by Alan de Hadley, her son and heir. Alan de Hadley is said to have given a hide in Cherinton to Wombridge Priory.<sup>4</sup> It is observable that Henry II.'s confirmation to that House, passing in the Autumn of 1181, mentions Alan de Hadley's grant in Cherinton to have been of a *fordell* (*i. e.* a virgate) only;—and that Alan de Hadley's own Deed, already set forth,<sup>5</sup> uses the same expression;—but that Pope Urban's Bull of 1187 confirms the grant as that of a whole hide, and attributes it to William de Hadley and his son and heir, Alan, jointly. This would make it part of the original foundation of Wombridge Priory, and so early as the close of Henry I.'s reign.

I cannot find that either Erleton's or Hadley's heirs retained anything in Cherrington. We have Adam de Horleton and Richard de Cherrington attesting a Deed which passed between 1174 and 1181,<sup>6</sup> and we have Adam de Horleton and Pagan de Cherrington attesting a Deed which passed in the same interval, but later than the first-named Deed.<sup>7</sup> Now of these three persons I can only say

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 258, b.

<sup>2-3</sup> Salop Chartulary, Nos. 36, 37.

<sup>4</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 390.

<sup>5-6-7</sup> Vol. VII. p. 355; Vol. VIII. p. 47.

that Richard was Lord of Cherrington and that Pagan had an interest there, but I cannot say that Pagan was Richard's son and heir, though he followed him in point of time.

Pagan de Cherrington was a Knight and a surviving member of that Jury which having determined a Chesswell suit in 1191 was summoned to record the particulars in 1200.<sup>1</sup> In June 1200 he has also appeared as Visor in an *Essoign* of the Abbot of Lilleshall.<sup>2</sup> Pagan de Cherrington also gave half a virgate in Cherrington to Wombridge Priory.<sup>3</sup>

After this we come to Thomas, Lord of Cherrington, who was certainly son of Richard, Lord of Cherrington, and possibly brother and heir of Pagan. I append to this account a table of the various Scutages which were assessed on Cherrington and on other Manors, reputed to be of the Fief of Tornai. It will there be seen that in 1204 Thomas de Cherrington was Lord of Cherrington and responsible for scutage as a *Tenant-in-capite*. In 1206 this Thomas de Cherrington is assessed to scutage as Thomas de Eslege, but in 1214 he is again called Thomas de Cherrington. A *Feodary* of 1212 confirms the Scutage-Rolls, and says under the *Escheats of Gerard de Tornai* that Thomas de Cherinton holds of the King by service of one-fourth of a knight's-fee.<sup>4</sup>

"Thomas, Lord of Cherrington, son of Richard, Lord of Cherrington," gave to Wombridge Priory his Fishery of Cherrington, which was in the River Mees (*super aquam de Mees*), with a little meadow there. Thomas, Lord of Cherrington, was deceased in April 1234, when the King accepted the homage of William, his son and heir, in respect of one-fourth of a Knight's-fee which Thomas had held *in capite* of the *Honour of Shrawardine*.<sup>5</sup> William de Cherrington's *Relief*, viz. 25*s.*, appears as paid on the Pipe-Roll of Michaelmas following.

I should here explain what is meant by the tenure above described. Shrawardine Castle had at a previous period been garrisoned and held by the Crown, though it belonged hereditarily to Fitz Alan. The necessary services of Castle-guard had not, during this period, been apportioned on Fitz Alan's Tenants, but on the Vassals of the Crown, and particularly on the Tenants of Tornai Escheats. When Shrawardine Castle was restored to Fitz Alan, the services of Castle-guard, due thereto from the Crown Vassals,

<sup>1-2</sup> Supra, pp. 106, 108.

<sup>3</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 389. That portion of the Wombridge Chartulary which re-

lated to *Cherinton* is lost.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 56.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Finium*, I. 256.

**SCOUTAGES AND AIDS ASSESSED ON TORNAL FEES.**

Soutages and Aids.	Year of Account.	Assessment per fee.	Cherrington, $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.	Chesthill, $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.	Cold Hatton, $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.	Sandford, $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.	Longlow, $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.	Ightfield, $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.	Loppington,* $\frac{1}{2}$ fee.
4th Soutage of K. John.	1203	2 merks.	Not assessed.	Richard de Chesthill, 2 merks.	Baldwin Wischard, 1 merk.	Not assessed.	Not assessed.	Not assessed.	Richard de Loppington, 2 merks.
5th Soutage of K. John.	1204	2½ merks.	Thomas de Cherrington, 20s.	3 merks.	½ merk.	Ralph de Sandford, 3 merks.	Not assessed.	Ralph Hose, 3 merks.	6 merks.
6th Soutage of K. John.	1205	2 merks.	Not assessed.	1 merk.	5s. 4d.	Not assessed.	Not assessed.	Not assessed.	2 merks.
7th Soutage of K. John.	1206	20s.	Thomas de Kialage, 20s.	5s.	4s.	Ralph de Sandford, 10s.	Not assessed.	Not assessed.	20s.
Poitou . . . . .	1214	3 merks.	Thomas de Cherrington, 10s.	20s.	40s.	Quittance.	Hugh de Longlow, 20s.	Roger de Ightfield, 20s.	40s.
1st Soutage of Henry III.	1218	2 merks.	½ merk.	Robert de Chesthill, 1 merk.	5s. 4d.	1 merk.	1 merk.	1 merk.	2 merks.
Biham . . . . .	1221	10s.	2s.	Richard de Chesthill, 5s.	2s.	5s.	5s.	5s.	10s.
Montgomery . . . . .	1224	2 merks.	½ merk.	Robert de Chesthill, 1 merk.	5s. 4d.	1 merk.	1 merk.	1 merk.	2 merks.
Bedford . . . . .	1224	2 merks.	½ merk.	1 merk.	Quittance.	Quittance.	1 merk.	1 merk.	2 merks.
Keri . . . . .	1229	2 merks.	½ merk.	Richard de Chesthill, 1 merk.	5s. 4d.	1 merk.	1 merk.	1 merk.	2 merks.
Brittany . . . . .	1230	3 merks.	10s.	20s.	8s.	20s.	20s.	20s.	3 merks.
Poitou . . . . .	1231	3 merks.	10s.	20s.	8s.	20s.	20s.	20s.	3 merks.
Elvein . . . . .	1232	20s.	5s.	10s.	4s.	10s.	10s.	10s.	20s.
Aid for the Marriage of Princess Isabella . . . . .	1235	2 merks.	William de Cherrington, ½ merk.	Abbot of Combermere, 1 merk.	5s. 8d.	Richard de Sandford, 1 merk.	1 merk.	1 merk.	2 merks.
Aid for the Marriage of the Princess Royal . . . . .	1245	20s.	Thomas de Cherrington, 5s.	Richard de Chesthill, 10s.	4s.	Ralph de Sandford 10s.	10s.	10s.	20s.
Gannock . . . . .	1246	3 merks.	10s.	20s.	8s.	20s.	20s.	20s.	40s.
Aid for Knighting . . . . .	1254	40s.	10s.	10s. (sic).	8s.	20s.	20s.	20s.	Not assessed.
Prince Edward . . . . .	1260	40s.	10s.	20s.	8s.	20s.	20s.	20s.	Not assessed.
Scutage of Wales . . . . .									

\* Loppington was not really a Tornal Fee, but is usually treated as one in Records.

were discontinued, and were *attorned* or diverted to the Royal Castle of Montgomery.

Thus in 1231 when the great Justiciar, Hubert de Burgh, had custody of Montgomery Castle for the Crown, the Scutages due on Cherrington and other Tornai fees were charged, indeed, on the Pipe-Roll, against the several Tenants, but the Justiciar is specially certified to be responsible for the whole, because these fees were in his hand. In 1232 the same thing recurred in respect of the Scutage of Elvein; but in this case the Justiciar had quittance of the whole, under the general letters which he had, entitling him to gather his own scutages. When therefore in 1234 Cherrington is said to be held of the *Honour of Shrawardine*, the *Honour of Montgomery* is really meant.

At Michaelmas 1235 and Easter 1236 William de Cherrington paid in even instalments his assessment of 6s. 8d. chargeable on one-fourth of a Tornai Fee held by him *in capite*.<sup>1</sup> Before the year 1253 William de Cherrington had been succeeded by—

Richard de Cherrington (II.). The latter, as "Lord of Cherrington," figures on an important Inquest taken in that year. The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 states that,—“the Vill of Cherinton is 4 hides, geldable, and pays 16d. *per annum* for *stretward*, and 16d. for *motfee*; and does due suit to County and Hundred. Richard, Lord of the said vill, held it *in capite* of the King for one-fourth of a knight's-fee. The Prior of Wombridge had 3 carucates in the Manor worth £2 *per annum* each. One of these carucates he had by gift of Alan de Hadley. In the two others he had been enfeoffed about 1251 by Geoffrey Griffin. By gift of the same Geoffrey, the Prior had 4½ acres of forest-land,—a *pourpresture* for which he had to pay 8d. *per annum* to the Exchequer, to exempt it from *Regard*.<sup>2</sup>

The increase of one hide on the *Domesday* hidage of Cherrington is not to be passed over in silence. It may possibly indicate, that a Manor, called *Cerlitone* in *Domesday*, and consisting of one hide, had been originally a part of Cherrington, and that the two had been reunited. When I come to speak of Charlton-near-Shawbury, this question must be re-opened.

A long interval now occurs in which I find no mention of any Lord of Cherrington. At length in 1284 we have the Manor in the hands of an heiress, called in one *Feodary* Isabella, and in another, Sibilla de Cheryngton. The tenure too is increased to that

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 61, 60.

| <sup>2</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 57.

of half a knight's-fee, but was still a *tenure-in-capite sine medio*. I cannot trace this succession any further, nor yet account for the obscurity which befell it.

OF UNDERTENANTS in Cherrington, Geoffrey Griffin was the most important. His feoffment must have been, at least, as early as 1230, for in that year I find him first accounting for that annual ferm of 8*d.* to the Exchequer for a *pourpresture*, which we have seen to have been in Cherrington. On the Pipe-Roll the *pourpresture* is said to be of 4 acres of meadow-land, which thus became quit of Regard. Geoffrey Griffin's grants to Wombridge were stated above to have taken place in 1251. They are fully enumerated in Edward II.'s confirmation to that House. He gave all his land, with buildings, rents, and men, which he had within and without the vill, in the whole tenement of Cherinton, and with the meadow which he had from William de Eton;<sup>1</sup> and with the meadow plough-land and pasture which he had in the fee of Ercall, and with the fishery above the bridge, and with the meadow and plough-land in Gorstes, and with the meadow of Menemedewe, and the plough-land of Sidenhale and of Wetebuttes and of Yvenedich, with all appurtenances within and without the vill of Cherinton.

It appears that Bertram Griffin, brother and heir of Geoffrey, confirmed all this; for Edward II.'s Charter specifies a Quitclaim made by Bertram Griffin of all his right in Cherrington and in all lands which Geoffrey Griffin had given to Wombridge.

Other Undertenants in this Manor were as follows.—

Dionisius de Cherinton occurs on a Jury in 1220.

Richard Bernard of Cherrington occurs as a witness or a Juror from 1249 to 1274.

Richard de Cherinton stands after Richard Bernard on the Jury of 1249, and is perhaps the same with *Richard, son of Thomas de Cherrington*, who attests a Deed about 1250.<sup>2</sup> In 1253 we have Thomas de Cherinton on the same Inquest as Richard, Lord of Cherrington. Perhaps this was the Thomas de Cherinton who is recorded to have given half a virgate in Cherinton to Wombridge Priory.

Again, William, son and heir of Adam de Cherinton, is recorded as having given two virgates, together with all his right in the fee of Cherrington, to Wombridge Priory. John le Bret son of Ralph le Bret similarly gave one virgate, with an *increment* of 3 acres. Lastly, Thomas de Mere conceded to Wombridge all his share in

<sup>1,2</sup> Vido *supra*, pp. 65, 92.

the common-pasture of Cherrington which Geoffrey Griffin had occupied, and of all his land wherever situated and occupied by the said Geoffrey.<sup>1</sup>

**WOMBRIDGE PRIORY FEE.** It is apparent from the above details that the Canons of Wombridge must have sooner or later obtained the best half of this Manor. However the Taxation of 1291 gives them only 3 carucates (worth 80*s. per annum*) here.<sup>2</sup>

In the *Valor* of 1535 the Prior's receipts from Cherrington are mixed with those from Tibberton, Podford, and Sherlow.

In 1536-7, the following assets of the dissolved Priory belong to Cherrington.—Rents of Tenants-at-will £2. 1*s.* 8*d.* Ferm of the Grange and other lands £9. 5*s.* 4*d.* Total £11. 7*s.*<sup>3</sup>

## Chesthill.

THIS was a divided Manor at *Domesday*; the Bishop of Chester holding one part and Gerard de Tornai the other part, as the following entries suggest.—

“The same Bishop holds Cesdille, and held it (in Saxon times). Here is one hide and one virgate of land. The (arable) land is enough for 11 ox-teams. Its former value was 8*s.* (per annum). Now it is waste.”<sup>4</sup>

“The same Gerard holds Cestulle. Leduui held it (in Saxon times). Here are one hide and three virgates, geldable. The (arable) land is enough for v ox-teams. In demesne there is one team; and (there are) 11 Serfs, 11 Boors, and 1 Radman with one team. In King Edward's time it was worth 15*s.* (per annum). It is of the same value now.”<sup>5</sup>

The Bishop of Chester lost or ceded his interest in Chesthill; and the whole Manor, estimated to contain three hides, passed to Gerard de Tornai or his heirs, and was at length reputed to be a *Tenure-in-capite* by service of half a knight's-fee.

The name Chesthill is now lost, but the situation of the Manor can be nearly determined. It occupied the angle formed by the confluence of the Bailey Brook and the River Tern. It therefore

<sup>1</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. p. 389.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 368.

<sup>3</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 391.

<sup>4, 5</sup> *Domesday*, fos. 252, a, 2; 258, b, 2.

included the place now called Tern Hill, but anciently *Hulle*. It extended also in a southerly direction, down along the eastern or opposite bank of the Tern, being limited by Stoke Grange on its east and Helshaw on its south.

The first Tenant *in capite* of Chesthill whom I can name was Richard de Chesthull. I have noticed under Uppington that he occurs from 1195 to 1214, but was deceased in 1218. The Scutage-Rolls, already given, exhibit him as paying scutages on Chesthull from 1203 to 1214 inclusive. A *Feodary* of 1212 tells us that Richard de Chesthull holds half a knight's-fee *in capite* of the Escheats of Gerard de Tornai.<sup>1</sup> Before 1218 Richard de Chesthull was apparently succeeded at Chesthull by a son Robert, who must have been his son by an earlier wife than Isabella Mussun. But Robert de Chesthull, though he paid the charge on the scutage of 1218, does not seem to have survived long. The accountant to the Scutage of Biham, in 1221, is a second Richard de Chesthull. Nor can the inaccuracies as to the names of *Tenants-in-capite*, which pervade the later scutage-rolls of Henry III.'s time, be suspected to exist here, for we have corroborative proof that the Lord of Chesthill in 1221 was named Richard. At the Assizes, held in November of that year, Richard de Chesthul appeared and withdrew a suit which he had moved against the Abbot of Shrewsbury, concerning a stank erected by the Abbot in *Winlinton* (meaning Woolerton).<sup>2</sup> His Sureties were Thomas de Estleg (probably identical with Thomas de Cherrington<sup>3</sup>) and Hugh Budell.

The Scutages of 1223 and 1224 are both entered on the Pipe-Roll of the latter year as chargeable on Robert de Chesthull. I believe this to be a mere mistake, the result of the Clerk of the Pipe copying his entries from the Roll of 1218. To the Scutage of Keri, in 1229, Richard de Chesthull is again the person assessed, and his name is the one used on seven subsequent Scutage-Rolls. This is however in turn erroneous, for, in or about the year 1228, Richard de Chesthull sold this estate to Combermere Abbey. Hence the Aid-Roll of 1235-6 duly certifies that the Abbot of Combermere had paid one merk on half a Tournai-fee in Chesthull.<sup>4</sup> The Abbot was, in short, the real accountant in all Scutages subsequent to 1229.

The sale of Chesthull taking place, as I have said, in 1228, re-

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 56.

<sup>2</sup> *Assizes*, 6 Hen. III., m. 6. Woolerton was on the opposite bank of the Tern to

Chesthull, and in Odenet Hundred.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 196.

<sup>4</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 61, 60.

quired the Confirmation of Hubert de Burgh, who in that very year was created Chief Justice of England. On November 25, 1228, the Charter passed the Great Seal, which conferred on the Earl the Castle and Honour of Montgomery;<sup>1</sup> and on January 2, 1229, another Charter annexed to the said Castle and Honour all the services and wards which had previously been returnable at Shrawardine, viz. that all knights and free tenants previously accustomed to do ward at Shrawardine should do tantamount ward at Montgomery Castle for the said Hubert and his heirs, whose tenement at Montgomery the King thus wished to augment.<sup>2</sup>

Hubert, Earl of Kent, may be taken then as Seignorial Lord of Chesthull from 1229 till his downfall and forfeiture in 1232. His Charter confirming Richard de Chesthull's grant of Chesthulle and Hulle (Tern Hill) to Combermere is extant. He styles himself "Earl of Kent and Justiciar of England." He acquits the Monks of that service of castle-guard which Richard de Chesthull had been used to perform yearly at Montgomery for Chesthulle and Hulle, and of all other earthly service or secular exaction. They were not to be distrained for any default in respect of any ward, scutage, relief, or murage, belonging to the Earl or his heirs.<sup>3</sup>

It is probable that on the Earl's downfall, a great part of this Charter was deemed to be *ultra vires*. On May 6, 1232, King Henry III. (now re seized of the Honour of Montgomery and of the Seignury over all Tournai fees), simply confirmed Chesthull and Hull to Combermere as given by Richard de Chesthull, not as enfranchised by Hubert de Burgh, whose name is not even mentioned.<sup>4</sup> The King's Charter sets forth the boundaries of the grant as follows.—From the ford of Stratforde<sup>5</sup> along the King's highway to the road called Grymbaldeswey; along Grymbaldeswey to the Bromhock; thence down to the boundaries of Burnhull,<sup>6</sup> and along the said boundaries to the boundaries of Haselsewe,<sup>7</sup> and along the said boundaries to Wolverton-Ford<sup>8</sup> in the River Tern, and along

<sup>1-3</sup> *Rot. Chart.* 13 Hen. III. p. 2, m. 14; p. 1, m. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Monasticon*, V. 326, No. vii.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 324, No. II.

<sup>5</sup> The road between Bletchley and Hinstock is most probably a portion of a Roman Road. The place where it crosses the Tern, a little south-east of Tern Hill, seems to have been called Stratford, that is, the ford of the *strata* or street. The Road itself was called "The Longford."

<sup>6</sup> Burnhull, Borwhull, or Burhull, I take to be identical with Stoke Grange (vide supra, p. 59, note 3), which belonged to Shrewsbury Abbey.

<sup>7</sup> Haselsewe, a member of Stoke upon Tern;—now Helshaw.

<sup>8</sup> Wolverton (or Woolerton) Ford seems to have been considerably below the confluence of the Tern with the Baileybrook. Woolerton itself was a mile below the point of junction.

the River Tern to Bulebrock (now Bailey brook), and up along Bulebrock to Redehull, and from Redehull straight to *the Longeford*,<sup>1</sup> and thence going up and following along the highway towards Stafford<sup>2</sup> to the first-named ford of Stratforde.

I have endeavoured in the notes to identify some of the localities here named, but enough has been said before<sup>3</sup> as to the general situation of Chesthull Manor and its member of Hulle.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 describes Chesthul as a Manor of three geldable hides. It records how Richard Lord of Chesthul had held it *in capite* for half a knight's-fee, and how he had been used to do 40 days' service at Shrawardine Castle in war-time with horse, lance, cuirass, and chapel de fer; how also the Abbot of Combermere had purchased it from the said Richard and held it for 27 years past, and had a Charter thereof from the King. The Abbot had 6 carucates in demesne, worth 20*s. per annum* each, also a Fulling-mill worth 30*s.*, and a grinding-mill worth 24*s. per annum* (total £8. 14*s.*). The Manor paid 12*d. stretward*, and 12*d. motfee per annum*, and did suit every three weeks to the Hundred.<sup>4</sup> This entry concludes with an estimate of the damages which would result to the Crown in 10 years from *loss of ward*. It does not appear whether loss of *Castle-guard*, or loss of the *wardship* of any heir, is meant. The context does not tally with either supposition, for the passage closes with an allusion to an annual loss of 13 merks and 8 pence<sup>5</sup>;—a sum exactly equal to £8. 14*s.*, the Abbot of Combermere's gross annual receipts.

The Tenure-Roll of 1285 calls this Manor *Chistill Grange*, and says that "the Abbot of Cumbermayre holds it *in capite sine medio*, for half a fee."

In 1291 the following possessions of Combermere Abbey, include its receipts from Chesthill.—

Rents of Mills at Longeforde and Hull (Tern Hill) . . . . .	£3	0	0
Five carucates of land at Chesthull and Borwhull, <sup>6</sup> worth . . . . .	2	10	0

<sup>1</sup> Not the Vill of Longford, which was far to the North-east. The road between Bletchley and Hinstock was called "The Longford." The vill of Longford probably took its name from its proximity to this road.

<sup>2</sup> That is, I presume, the road from Bletchley to Hinstock, which, being pro-

duced through Newport and Gnosall, led to Stafford.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, pp. 200, 201.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 55.

<sup>5</sup> "Unde Rex dampnificatus est quando volunt wardam habere per x annos quolibet anno xij marc' et viij d."

<sup>6</sup> Borwhull must here be taken for that

A Mill there, worth yearly . . . . . £2 0 0  
 Profits on the stock of all the Abbot's estates  
 in the Archdeaconry of Salop . . . . . 10 0 0<sup>1</sup>

At the Assizes of 1292 the Bradford Jurors presented that the Abbot of Combermere held the vill of Chesthull by Sergeantry of Castle-guard at Montgomery. It was worth £5 *per annum*. The Abbot fined 20s. that he might have respite as to a question of his title to Chesthull and to the Mill of Wlonkeslowe, till next Parliament. The Abbot was further questioned for having, 80 years past, withdrawn the *stretward* and *motfee* due on Chesthull, viz. 2s. *per annum*. He denied the charge, and affirmed that the King was in seizin of the due. He affirmed the same of his suit to the Hundred, which he was accused of having withdrawn, and allowed that the Vill of Chesthull was bound to attend the Sheriff's *Tourns* twice a year, by four men and a Provost, and that the Lord of Chesthull owed suit to the lesser Hundred Court every three weeks. The complaint was dismissed *sine die*.

By Inquest held November 4, 1814, it was found that the Abbot of Combermere had given William Ostgate a 24 years' lease of this Manor, commencing March 12, 1307, had also given Ralph Clerk a 30 years' lease of 12½ acres, commencing May 27, 1305, and had given William le Walkere a 24 years' lease, of a parcel of land called Monekeshalstede, commencing September 21, 1305. The collective rents reserved on these leases were 24 measures of hard corn, 24 measures of oats, and £3. 15s. 8d. in money.<sup>2</sup> In the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316 the Abbot stands as Lord of Chesthull.

The *Valor* of 1534-5 gives £8. 10s. 4d. as the Abbot of Combermere's receipts from Chesthull, and £9. 8s. 10d. as his receipts from Tirnhull.<sup>3</sup> The rent of Ulverton (Woolerton) Mill was 3s. 4d. *per annum*; and the Abbot had a free rent of 6d. *per annum* at Longford.<sup>4</sup>

part of Chesthill which adjoined Stoke Grange, and which had thus obtained the very name which Stoke Grange had lost.

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 261.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquis. A. Q. D.*, 8 Edw. II., No. 97.

<sup>3</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, V. p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> This rent of 6d. had been retained by the Monks of Combermere, when they conveyed a half-virgate in Longford (near Moreton Say) to Ivo Moverel (*Vide supra*, p. 52).

## Longner upon Sebern.

THE Bishop of Chester had another Manor in Recordine Hundred, a Manor of which his successors retained the Seignery for at least two centuries after *Domesday*. And even to this day does Longner retain a strongly marked feature of its ancient *status*. It is an isolated portion of the Shrewsbury Parish of St. Chad. Now, St. Chad's Church was founded, endowed, and for ages governed, by the Bishops of the Mercian Diocese; and they threw their Manors into the Parish of St. Chad, wherever distance would permit such an arrangement.<sup>1</sup>

*Domesday* speaks of Longner as follows.—“The same Bishop (of Chester) holds Languenare and Wigot holds it of him. Here is one hide. The (arable) land is (enough) for 11 ox-teams. In demesne there is 1 team; and 11 Serfs and 11 Villains have 1 team. The Manor was and is worth 8*s.* (*per annum*).”<sup>2</sup>

I don't find that the Saxon Wigot held any other of the Bishop of Chester's Staffordshire or Cheshire Manors. Probably he was soon dispossessed of Longner.

The *Feodary* of 1165, known as the *Liber Niger*, tells of one—

GEOFFREY FITZ REGINALD, who held half a knight's-fee of *old feoffment* under Richard Peche, then Bishop of Coventry.<sup>3</sup> There are very good reasons for assuming that Geoffrey fitz Reginald's tenure consisted of the Staffordshire Manors of Norton-under-Cannock, and Little Wyrley, and of the Shropshire Manor of Longner. Moreover we infer that Geoffrey fitz Reginald's ancestors had been thus enfeoffed at least 80 years before.

Geoffrey fitz Reginald was living in or after the year 1203. Between that year and 1206, he, as “Geoffrey, son of Reiner de Wirley,” gave to Haghmond Abbey half a virgate in *Longenholre*, of which Godwin was tenant. He gave it in exchange for a whole virgate in Wirley (Staffordshire), which his Aunt (*amita*) had previously given to the Abbey. This grant was attested by William fitz Alan; John le Strange; Hamo, his brother; Stephen de Stanton; William de Hadley; Reginald de Tirne; Richer de Shau-

<sup>1</sup> Vide *supra*, Vol. VII. p. 361.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 252, a, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Liber Niger*, I. 133.

bury ; Guimar de Redinton ; Philip de Peninton ; by William, the Grantor's heir ; and by Thomas and Jordan, the Grantor's sons. In this grant the Donor covenants to provide an equivalent, if he should prove unable to warrant the half-virgate in Longner to the Abbey.<sup>1</sup> The consent of the Grantor's heirs is also alleged, and it would seem that William, his eldest son, was already resident at Longner. He, as "William fitz Geoffrey of Longenhalre," confirmed his Father's grant of half a virgate to Haghmon, by a Deed which, from the close similarity of its testing-clause, must have followed immediately after the original grant.

WILLIAM FITZ GEOFFREY, on succeeding to his father's estates, probably continued to reside in Shropshire. As early as 1199 he had married Dionisia, one of the coheireesses of Roger Mussun of Uppington, and widow of Roger Bochart of Bourton and Pulley. The story of this marriage has been amply told already.<sup>2</sup> William fitz Geoffrey, at his decease in 1223, left no issue ; but his wife Dionisia survived him. In October of that year Dionisia, widow of William fitz Geoffrey, was suing William de Duston for one-third of the vill of Longenhalre, which third she claimed in dower. William de Duston not appearing, the said third was, as usual, seized *in manu Regis* till the following Law-term.<sup>3</sup>

I must now turn back some years to say who William de Duston, or rather who William de Duston's father was, and to show that it was as Tenant-in-possession of Longner, that the son was sued by Dionisia Mussun.

WILLIAM DE DUSTON (I.) had been a person of some notoriety and some success in the reign of John. I find him in the immediate employment and pay of that King in 1213, and thenceforward till August 1215, when he lost his most important office, viz. that of Custos of Scarborough Castle. In this trust he was succeeded by William de Harcourt, under whom, as we shall see, he held several estates in Staffordshire. In December 1215 we find that William de Duston was in rebellion, and his Suzerain, Harcourt, was empowered by King John to take seizin of his lands at Ranton and Halop (Staffordshire). His estates in Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Leicestershire, and Warwickshire, were entrusted to Hugh de Nevill. I find a Writ of April 28, 1216, empowering William de Harcourt still to hold the vill of Mes (Milnmeese, Staffordshire), and other fees,

<sup>1</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 207.

<sup>3</sup> *Placita*, Mich. Tm., 7 Hen. III., m. 10.

which William de Duston had held under him. William de Duston continued in rebellion till the end of John's reign, but on October 13, 1217, a Writ of Henry III. certifies that he had returned to his allegiance and was to be repossessed of his estates in several of the Counties already named, and also in Kent, Cambridgeshire, Surrey, Wiltshire, and *Shropshire*.<sup>1</sup> From thence till May 1218 several Writs show William de Duston to have been in favour with the young King, but on September 7, 1218, he was dead. He left a son and heir, William, and a daughter, Joan.

Thus much I have said of William de Duston (I.), in amplification of a former note on the same subject.<sup>2</sup> The estates which he held in Shropshire and Staffordshire fall under two classes, viz. those which he acquired by feoffment of Thomas Noel, and held under William de Harcourt (Noel's Coheir), and those which he acquired by feoffment of William fitz Geoffrey, and held under the said William fitz Geoffrey at his decease in 1218. Of the former class were Ranton, Milnmeese, and Holm, of the latter were Little-Wyrley, Norton, and Langenorle (*i. e.* Longner).

On September 7, 1218, the King seized on these six estates, till such time as the Crown-debts of William de Duston, deceased, should be satisfied.<sup>3</sup>

In October 1218 an estate in Nottinghamshire, bequeathed to Joan de Dunston by her late Father, was given up to her.<sup>4</sup> A Writ of June 1219 shows that William de Duston's son and heir was, as yet, under age.<sup>5</sup> However the said heir was identical with that William de Duston whom we have seen impleaded in 1223, by his Suzerain's Widow, for a third of Longner. We conclude therefore that—

WILLIAM DE DUSTON (II.) was now of age. I must here quote a very remarkable statement which, whether I can explain it or not, belongs undoubtedly to our present subject. I find an *alleged* copy of a Deed wherein *Alicia Mauvesin* is said to have *quitclaimed* to William de Duston all the claim which she had made against him concerning the land of her husband, viz. "a third part of *Nortune*, a third part of *Wiwell*", and a third part of *Longnobre p' Nortune*." The *quitclaim* is only for her life, the premises being heretofore claimed by her, only as dower.<sup>6</sup>

That this Deed has been most inaccurately transcribed will be

<sup>1</sup> *Claus.* I. 329, b.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 136, note 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Finium*, 2 Hen. III., m. 2.

<sup>4, 5</sup> *Claus.* I. 370, b, 393, b.

<sup>6</sup> *Shaw's Staffordshire*, Vol. I. p. 173.

evident to any one who will choose to peruse it further. That the explanation offered of it by its Transcriber is most inadequate, and in some parts most mistaken, I am fully convinced. It is a daring liberty to take with a professed transcript, even if inaccurate;—but I cannot help suggesting that the Lady called *Alicia Mauvesin* was Dionisia Mussun, and that the estates concerned were, Norton under Cannock, Little Wirley, and Longner. On any other supposition I cannot explain this Deed.

WILLIAM DE DUSTON (II.) certainly succeeded at some time to the fee-simple of Longner;—holding it however under Thomas fitz Geoffrey, as next brother and heir of William fitz Geoffrey, its former Lord, while the said Thomas held immediately of the see of Lichfield. We shall presently see that Thomas fitz Geoffrey abrogated his mesne rights at Longner and Wirley, so that the heirs of Duston came to hold both Manors immediately of the Bishops of Lichfield.

On August 1231, William de Duston (II.) was deceased. Stephen de Segrave gave the King £100 for custody of his lands and heirs, and for the disposal of the latter in marriage.

As to William de Dunston's heirs I can say little of my own knowledge. I will therefore copy what Erdeswick has said of this family and succession, merely enclosing in a parenthesis the one statement which I know to be erroneous.—

“William Dinston had issue (by Joan Noel, his wife) William Dinston, who had issue one daughter and heir, Roisia, married to Sir John D'Oyley, who had issue by her John D'Oyley, who had issue Joan, his daughter and heir, married to Sir Thomas Lewknor, knight.”<sup>1</sup>

Accepting then Roisia as the eventual sole heir of William de Duston (II.) we shall now hear what occurred during her minority with respect to the two Manors of Longner and Wirley.—

By a Deed or Deeds, which must have passed between September 22, 1231, and November 12, 1234, Thomas fitz Geoffrey of Longenarre quitclaims to his Lord Alexander, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, the whole service which William de Duston had been bound and accustomed to render to his (Thomas's) father and to himself, for the land of Longenarre which they (Thomas and his father) had held of the Bishop *in capite*. He further quitclaims the whole service which the said William de Duston had rendered for the land of Wyrley, which land Thomas and his father had used to hold of the Bishop *in capite* by one-fourth of a knight's-fee. He

<sup>1</sup> *Erdeswick* (edition 1844), p. 135.

further quitclaims the homage of William de Duston's heirs who are henceforth to hold *in capite* (that is immediately) of the Bishop, paying rents of one pound of pepper for Longenalre, and one pound of cummin for Wyrley. Witnesses, Master William de Manchester, Dean of Lichfield; Master R. de Maydeneston, Dean of Hereford (he was Archdeacon of Chester also); Master William of York, Archdeacon of Stafford; Master Alexander de Hales, Archdeacon of Coventry; Master Alexander (de Swereford), Archdeacon of Salop; Geoffrey de Greselee; John de Acton; Robert de Eslington (*i. e.* Essington); John de Tamenhorn; Geoffrey Poun; Robert del Wal.<sup>1</sup>

I can say nothing of Sir John D'Oyly and Roisia de Dunston his wife, in connection with Longner. They probably held both Longner and Wyrley of the See of Lichfield, and both were living in October 1255. At Longner they enfeoffed that family of Haughtons, of whom I have made mention under Cleobury North and under Withington. This feoffment was probably immediately after Roisia obtained possession of Longner, for I suppose the Deed must have passed between 1227 and 1236, whereby "Ralph, Abbot of Haghmon, gives to Robert, Lord of Halichton, a life-lease of that half-virgate which the Abbey had in Longenalre, for 6s. rent. Witnesses, Hugh Forester; William de Ercall, Robert de Knihtell' (Knightley), William de Bromley, and Richard de Hecstall."

In 1280, Sir John D'Oyley (I.) was dead and his wife Roëse a Widow. This I learn from a Deed whereby Michael de Burgo releases to Dame Roese D'Oylly, and to John her son, all his right in a virgate at Raunton.<sup>2</sup>

The Inquest on Thomas de Halghton's death in 1282, has been already set forth.<sup>3</sup> Well and intelligibly does it state that he had held Longenholre under Roës D'Oyly, for a rent of 12*d. per annum*. The Manor was estimated to contain 2 carucates of land.

So too the Inquest taken in 1304, on the death of Robert de Halghton (III.), says that he had held 2 carucates in Longenolre under *John de Doyle*, by service of 12*d. rent*.

I shall conjecture nothing, for I know nothing, of any subsequent interests of the Bishops of Lichfield as Seignoural Lords, of D'Oyley or Lewknor, as Meane Lords, or of De Haughton as Tenant-in-fee of Longner.

<sup>1</sup> Dugdale's MSS. (Ashmol. Libr.), No. 1527, fo. 30, collated with *Registrum Chartarum* (at Lichfield), p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> *Edeswick* (ut supra), p. 136 note.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> Inquis. 32 Edw. I. No. 19.

That the Burtons were seated here long before any extant account<sup>1</sup> of that family would lead us to suppose, I know from the best authority; but I presume that they held under the Haughtons and their successors the Greys. Be that as it may, a Deed is still preserved at Longner, which bears date at Leighton, May 28, 1346. By this Deed *Edward Burton of Longner* gives to Thomas Cresset of Leighton an acre of land at Garmeston in exchange for 1½ acres there, and also concedes to the same Thomas license to enclose, and build upon, a parcel of ground in the said Edward's common-pasture. This Deed mentions John le Costantyn and Thomas Alemon of Garmeston, as existing, and William de Harley as former, occupants, of adjacent lands. It also mentions adjacent lands of Edward Burton, and is attested by John Lord of Leighton, John le Constantyn, Walter le Spencer, Henry de Garmeston, and Ivo Cresset,—names which are very consistent with its ostended date.

---

## Lilleshall.

---

I AM now to treat of those five Manors of Recordine Hundred, which having been held in Saxon times by the Collegiate Church of St. Alkmund at Shrewsbury, continued to be so held at the time of *Domesday*. "The same Church held and (still) holds Linleshelle. Here are x hides. In demesne are 11 ox-teams, and (there are) x Villains, v Boors, and 111 Serving Frenchmen, with viii teams amongst them all; and ix more teams might yet be (employed). Here are 1111 Neat-herds, and a Mill, but it pays no rent. There is one league of Wood. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth £6 (*per annum*). Now it is worth £4. Godebold the Priest holds it."<sup>2</sup>

Of Godebold the Priest, Earl Roger's friend and adviser, I have already spoken more than once.<sup>3</sup>

His occupation of so many of the *Domesday* estates of St. Alkmund would suggest that he was something more than a Canon, or even Dean, of that Collegiate Church. It savours strongly of that

<sup>1</sup> See *Blakeway's Sheriffs*, pp. 164, 165.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 253, a. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. I. p. 111; Vol. II. p. 201; Vol. VI. p. 224.

Norman despotism which, while it allowed the continuance of Saxon Foundations, remodelled them to suit the views and interests of the conquerors.

Godebald's Church-estates will have been held by an extraordinary tenure, if, as there is reason to believe, they passed at his decease to his (necessarily illegitimate) son, Robert. From Godebald and his said son they went to the first Richard de Belmeis;—to him, whose career, as Bishop of London and Viceroy of Shropshire, we have already traced under Tong. What now concerns us is that at his death, on January 16, 1127, the Bishop was seized of the Deanery or chief Prebendal interest in the Church of St. Alkmund.

The Bishop's elder Nephew and temporal heir, Philip de Belmeis, became at his death, Lord of Tong. His younger Nephew, Richard, was not yet of age, but was already destined for the Church.

We have seen that about the year 1139 Philip de Belmeis was interested in the prosperity of the Savigniac Abbey of Buildwas, recently founded by Bishop Roger de Clinton.<sup>1</sup> The manner in which he encouraged that establishment, and his own personal admission into the fraternity of Savigni, preclude all idea of his having a cotemporary admiration for any other Religious Order.

Before many years had passed, specifically before the year 1145, Philip de Belmeis was of another mind. The introduction into England of Regular, as distinct from Secular, Canons, belongs to no earlier period than the reign of Henry I., and, according to one account, the elder Richard de Belmeis had been instrumental, about A.D. 1108, to their first settlement in this country.<sup>2</sup> During the next thirty years, many Colleges of Secular Canons were changed into Regulars, and many Houses of Regulars were newly founded.

In the Lateran Council of 1139, all Regular Canons, throughout the dominions of St. Peter, were subjected to the specific rule of Saint Augustine; but there was a sect of Regulars which had long previously professed an improvement on its fundamental ordinances, and which, from its first House having been dedicated to St. Nicholas of Arras, and having been situated near that city, was called Arroasian. A number of these latter Canons are said to have been introduced into England in 1140, under the auspices of *Alexander the Magnificent*, Bishop of Lincoln. They were domiciled at Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, once the episcopal seat of Alexander's pre-

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 325.

<sup>2</sup> Viz., at Christ Church, within Aldgate London. Vide *Monasticon* (Caley & Ellis), Vol. VI. pp. 150-165.

decessors, and where probably a College of Secular Canons made way for these Arroasians.

Within five, probably within three, years of this date, the Dorchester Canons were ready to increase their influence by emigration. Some of them found their way into Shropshire, where Philip de Belmeis was their first Patron. I have already given the Charter of the said Philip, and described the locality which it assigned for the residence of these Canons,<sup>1</sup> viz. that part of the Manor of Tong which is now known as the Lizard Grange.<sup>2</sup>

#### LILLESALL ABBEY.

The Arroasian Canons, though introduced into Shropshire under no greater patronage than that of an influential Knight, were destined for greater things. Before I pass to the next event which befell them, I must resume my account of—

RICHARD DE BELMEIS (II.), brother of the Lord of Tong and younger Nephew of Richard de Belmeis (I.), Bishop of London. When that Prelate had been dead about seven months, that is, in August 1127, King Henry I. is known to have been waiting on the coast of Hampshire for a favourable opportunity of crossing the Channel. Doubtless to this period belongs the Charter, dated at Portsmouth, whereby the King granted to Richard de Belmeis, nephew of Richard Bishop of London, "all the Churches, Lands, and things," which having in the first instance been held by Godebald and Robert his son, had since been held under the King by the late Bishop.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. II. pp. 204, 205.

<sup>2</sup> It seems that the Lizard Grange was not so clearly in Tong Manor as my former account would imply. At all events the Canons of Lilleshall thought it necessary to get an independent grant thereof from the first Walter de Dunstanville, Lord of Idsall. As Walter de Dunstanville he gives to the Abbey "all his land of *Lusard* which was between Watling-street and Meredich and the two rivulets." This he did "for the souls of his father and mother." He gave it "wholly, with the Vivary and Mill which were between the aforesaid land and the forest." (Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 60.) It is remarkable that the Bull of Pope Innocent III. (1159-1181) though it confirms Philip de Bel-

meis's Leicestershire grants to Lilleshall, says nothing about his grant of the Lizard Grange, but treats the latter as the gift of Walter de Dunstanville;—*Ex dono Walteri de Dunstanville, terram de Lusard cum molendino et vivariis inter duo nemora de Lusard et Brewud* (Ibidem, fo. 87).

<sup>3</sup> Printed *Monasticon*, VI. 262, No. II.

Mr. Blakeway (*Hist. Shrewsbury*, II. 264, note 8) dates this Charter in August 1128; but Simeon of Durham's Chronology of the period (which Mr. Blakeway followed) is erroneous by a year.

The Charter is attested by G. (Geoffrey) the Chancellor; N. (Nigel) de Albini; W. (Walter) de Gloucester; P. (Pagan) fitz John; and W. (William) Feverell.

There is every presumption that we rightly define the gift thus conveyed, if we say that it consisted of the Prebendal estates of Lilleshall, Atcham, Uckington, and Preston-Gubbalds, with the Churches thereon, and that the whole constituted a preponderating interest in the Collegiate Church of St. Alkmund, Shrewsbury.

Richard de Belmeis, whom we may now call Chief Prebendary of St. Alkmund's, was at this time hardly of age. He was nevertheless a Dignitary of St. Paul's, London, and had actually been appointed Archdeacon of Middlesex by his Uncle, several years before. His extreme youth, however, had induced an arrangement, whereby one Hugh, a Chaplain, had custody of the Archdeaconry, to hold, *in commendam* as it were, till Belmeis should attain a fitting age. This period arrived during the episcopacy of Gilbert the Universal (January 1128–August 1134);—but the Archdeacon in possession forgot or evaded his oath; and his refusal to resign his trust was countenanced by Bishop Gilbert. The death of the latter Prelate was followed by a long vacancy in the See of London. In 1138 Anselm had been elected to the See, but his election was opposed by the Chapter of St. Paul's, and Belmeis was sent to Rome as the Representative of the said Chapter's opposition. The appeal succeeded, and now Belmeis brought under the consideration of the Pontiff (Innocent II.) his own personal grievance in regard to the Archdeaconry of Middlesex. This matter the Pope referred back to the scrutiny and decision of two English Bishops (Hereford and Lincoln), and they, before the end of the year, gave sentence in favour of Belmeis. In apparent connection with his induction to the Archdeaconry, Belmeis was ordained Deacon in December 1138, by Henry, Bishop of Winchester, at command of the Papal Legate, Alberic, who was then visiting England.

In June or July, 1141, we have seen that Richard de Belmeis, Archdeacon of Middlesex, was in the Court of the Empress at Oxford, and attested her Charter to Haughmond Abbey.<sup>1</sup> It was the era of her pride and triumph; for Stephen was then her prisoner. The release of Stephen, towards the close of the same year, again set the kingdom in a blaze. Political parties were once more revived or confounded, and each man readjusted his allegiance as duty, interest, or passion might direct. Amidst all the turmoil and distrust we may again notice, and again wonder, at the impulse which was given to religious institutions. The deadliest of foes, Stephen and Maude, vied in their patronage of the Church, not

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 287.

indeed befriending different Orders in opposition to each other,<sup>1</sup> but more commonly lavishing cotemporary and jealous favours on some common object. Meantime there were men whose conduct, favourably interpreted, would indicate that they kept clear of political parties, and of whom the worst that can be said is that they adhered to each party in turn, according as it might suit their designs;—designs, I mean, not of rapine or bloodshed, but of peace and benevolence. These men pursued their ends without apparent molestation, nay, often with double encouragement.

Among them was Richard, Archdeacon of Middlesex, who, whether at the suggestion of his brother Philip, or in sympathy with the Bishop of Lincoln, selected the Arroasian Order for his munificent favour. His first step, taken, I doubt not, in 1144, was to transfer the Dorchester emigrants from the Lizard-Grange to Donnington-Wood,—a part of his prebendal estate of Lilleshall, not six miles distant from their first abode. This he did, doubtless, with a full assurance of those consents, temporal as well as ecclesiastical, which followed upon, and were necessary to, his act.

We know that, in the spring of 1145, Stephen was occupied in Norfolk and Suffolk; we know that, at the same time, Imarus, Bishop of Tusculum, was in England as Legate of Pope Lucius II., who died during his deputy's embassy, viz. on February 26, 1145. This then is the proximate date of a Charter,<sup>2</sup> whereby King Stephen, then at Bury St. Edmund's, "consenting to the prayer of Archdeacon Richard, grants and concedes to the Canons Regular of Duninton, the Prebend which the said Richard had in the Church of St. Alchmund at Salopesbury, and all his demesnes and stock (*res*); and moreover all the other Prebends of the aforesaid Church, whenever they should fall vacant."<sup>3</sup> The first witness of this Charter was "Imarus Bishop of Tusculum, Legate," the second Robert (de Betun), Bishop of Hereford. Besides them, Rotroc, Bishop of Evreux; Robert de Gant, Stephen's Chancellor; Earls William de Warren, Gilbert de Clare, and Alberic (de Vere); also William de Ipres and Henry de Essex attested the Charter.

It is obvious to me that the consent of the Diocesan Bishop

<sup>1</sup> The eleemosynary charters of Stephen and the Empress are usually found in pairs. Often too, *mutatis mutandis*, they are verbal copies of each other. The policy of the rivals in this respect being once made known, of course the chartered bodies availed themselves largely of it.

<sup>2</sup> Printed *Monasticon*, VI. 263, vi.

<sup>3</sup> Or "be surrendered" (by the existing Prebendaries);—for I take it that the original, but defaced, reading was *quando deliberabuntur*. Perhaps however *quando dilabantur* (whenever they should lapse) was the expression used.

(Roger de Clinton) to this enormous transfer of Church property was as yet wanting. I know not that it will be extravagant to associate his nonconcurrence with a very natural feeling of jealousy in behalf of his own foundation of Buildwas, which had already been brought into a kind of rivalry by Philip de Belmeis's adoption of the Arroasian Canons in preference to the Savigniac Monks. The further course of feelings and events must be deduced from general observations. In March 1145, Eugenius III. succeeded to the chair of St. Peter. Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, the great Patron of the Arroasians, was in especial favour with that Pontiff. He visited him at Rome, in 1145-6, and again at Auxerre in 1147. Within this interval (1145-7) Roger Bishop of Chester received and obeyed the Pope's *Order* to confirm Richard de Belmeis's endowment of the Donnington Canons. Bishop Clinton's Charter is not preserved, but we know the facts of its passing and of its passing in obedience to a Papal mandate, from a succeeding and further confirmatory Charter of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, which is preserved, and which records both circumstances.<sup>1</sup>

Archbishop Theobald's Charter bears no appearance of having been written in exile. Probably therefore it passed before April 1148, when Stephen banished him for attending the Council of Rheims. The way in which Bishop Clinton is mentioned by the Archbishop is further auxiliary to determining this question of date. He is mentioned as if living. Now Bishop Clinton died at Antioch on April 16, 1148, and Theobald must have first heard of the event during his own exile.

The Charter of Archbishop Theobald, written then in or before the year 1148, indicates one, if not two changes, which had taken place since Stephen's Charter of 1145. It speaks of Belmeis's endowment as intended for the building of an *Abbey* in honour of the Holy Virgin and in the *Wood of Lilleshull*. Thither therefore had the Arroasian Canons at length removed, viz. to a site three miles distant from their second abode in Donnington Wood. In this third domicile they remained. Lilleshall Abbey was therefore commenced between the years 1144 and 1148.

Archbishop Theobald's Charter also calls Richard de Belmeis *Dean of St. Alkmund's*,<sup>2</sup> and describes his prebendal estate as that

<sup>1</sup> The original Deed, with a perfect and probably unique seal of Archbishop Theobald, is among the Duke of Sutherland's muniments at Trentham. A copy thereof is printed *Monasticon*, VI. p. 263.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the Dean of St. Alkmund's at the close of Henry I.'s reign, and probably at the commencement of Stephen's, was Adam (see *Monasticon*, VII. 750, No. XII.).

of *Lilleshull and Hetingeham* (Atcham). If Belmeis had only recently been made Dean of St. Alkmund's, and such probably was the case, it was obviously that he might have every facility for converting the Secular into the Regular establishment, a business which we know to have been substantively and eventually completed. Thus, whether in Belmeis's time or later, all the prebendal estates of St. Alkmund's became the property of the Canons of Lilleshall.

The next Charter which I should notice, is the Confirmation of the Empress Matilda to *Lilleshall Abbey*. This interesting document seems to me to have passed very soon after she quitted England, that is in 1148; but I must speak of it with caution, as its nearly obliterated condition makes some of the words, which I fancy myself to have deciphered, somewhat problematical.—

"Matilda the Empress, daughter of King Henry," addresses William fitz Alan and Walter (perhaps his brother) and all her faithful of Shropshire, with greeting. She receives "William Abbot of Lylleshull, and the Canons there serving God, for the souls of Henry her Father, Matilda her mother, &c. &c., and for the welfare of himself and hers, under her tuelage and protection. Wherefore her will and mandate is that the aforesaid William and his Canons should hold all their possessions freely and peaceably, viz. the Church of St. Alkmund of Salop, with its appurtenances and franchises, already confirmed to them by Episcopal authority. The witnesses seem to be H. (Hugh) Archbishop of Rouen; Joceline Bishop of Sarum; Philip Bishop of Baieux; Richard the Empress's Chancellor; Robert de Curcy; William de Ansgervill." The Deed is dated, I think, at Falaise.<sup>1</sup>

We now pass to the Confirmation of Walter Durdent, Bishop of Coventry (consecrated October 2, 1149). It seems to me to have passed soon after his consecration, and before September 1152,<sup>2</sup> when Richard de Belmeis, whom it names as Dean of St. Alkmund's, became Bishop of London. His conversion of the Secular Prebends is spoken of as a thing done. The building of the Abbey of St. Mary in the wood of Lilleshull has commenced. The previous sanctions of King Stephen, Pope Eugenius, Archbishop Theobald, and Bishop Clinton, are each alluded to. The Charter is attested

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary (in possession of the Duke of Sutherland), fo. 44.

<sup>2</sup> There is an objection to this early date. One of the witnesses is Geoffrey Abbot of Cumbermere. Now William, *first* Abbot of Cumbermere, is said to have been living

in 1153, viz. "when Pelton Abbey was founded." There is however a strong counter-presumption that the foundation of Pelton was earlier than 1153. If so, the objection to dating Walter Durdent's Charter earlier than 1153 is invalid.





LILLESBALL ABBEY, FROM THE NAVE.






LILleshall Abbey, West Front.





**DOORWAY, LILLESBALL ABBEY.**



by William, Abbot of Radmore; Geoffrey, Abbot of Combermere; Ranulf, Abbot of Buildwas; Richard, Abbot of Roucester; Radulf, Prior of Kenilworth; Richard, Prior of Tutbury; and Roger, Archdeacon of Salop.<sup>1</sup> Next follows the Charter of Henry, Duke of Normandy,<sup>2</sup> sought and obtained by the prudent Canons of Lilleshall while that Prince was yet an exile. It merely confirms to the Canons the Church of St. Alkmund with *soc* and *sac* and all the privileges which that Church had enjoyed in the time of Henry I. It is attested by Arnulf, Bishop of Liseux, (Humphrey) de Bohun, Walcheline Maminot, William fitz Hamon, Warin fitz Gerold, Richard fitz Haldebrond, and Manasser Biset. It is dated at Argentan, in Normandy, and passed probably in 1151.<sup>3</sup>

The same Prince's Charter, after he ascended the throne, is a document of some historical interest. He confirms all things, viz. the site of the Abbey and the Church of St. Alkmund according to the former Charter of his "Lady the Empress" (a mode of designating his mother, which I have not elsewhere met with). The Deed is attested by R.<sup>4</sup> (Robert), Bishop of Lincoln, R. (Richard), Bishop of London; Thomas, the Chancellor; Manasser Biset, steward; Warin fitz Gerold, chamberlain; Robert de Dunstanvill, and Joceline de Baliol.<sup>5</sup> It is dated *Apud Alrewas in exercitu*, a circumstance which, with the witnesses' names, proves the Deed to have passed in the first year of Henry's reign, though the month is left uncertain.<sup>6</sup> A cotemporary precept of the same King gives the Canons of Lilleshall a new privilege, viz. an exemption from *toll and passage* throughout the King's dominions, under a penalty of £10, recoverable from any one who should charge them with such dues.<sup>7</sup>

I may now close my account of the *Foundation* of Lilleshall Abbey, with a summary of whatever is further known of its *Founder*.

RICHARD DE BELMEIS (II.), notwithstanding his ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 263, No. IV.

<sup>2</sup> Chartulary (ut supra), fo. 44.

<sup>3</sup> This date I assign on the following grounds. Henry became Duke of Normandy early in 1151, by cession of his father, Geoffrey. In the Autumn of that year he became also Earl of Aujou by his father's death; and in 1152 he acquired further titles by his marriage with Eleanor of Poitou. In the Deed before us, he simply styles himself "Duke of Nor-

mandy," but he is known to have used his other titles before his accession to the throne of England. The presumption is that he used them as they accrued.

<sup>4</sup> The name *Richard* stands here in the Chartulary. It must have been supplied by the Transcriber for an initial R., and is erroneous.

<sup>5</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, ut supra.

<sup>6</sup> Vide supra, Vol. I. p. 249, note 23.

<sup>7</sup> Chartulary, ut supra, fo. 44.

dignities, was not ordained a Priest till September 20, 1152, when his previous election to the See of London rendered that preliminary of his consecration imperative. His Consecration followed at Canterbury on Sunday, September 28, 1152, Archbishop Theobald officiating, and nearly every English Bishop attending. Henry of Winchester, the only notable absentee, sent a message to the Synod, excusing his attendance, but expressing in high terms his assent to Belmeis' promotion.—Elegance of person, polished manners, industrious activity, and scientific accomplishment, are all attributed to the new Bishop by his great Panegyrist, who predicted that "the tree, now to be planted in God's temple, would, with divine help, flourish and be fruitful." Such was the pious tone assumed by Henry of Blois, who, though not as yet sated with ambition and state-craft, gave after-evidence that he sometimes spoke both solemnly and sincerely.

Richard de Belmeis, Bishop of London, seems to have been a party to the negotiations which, in 1153, gave peace to the distracted nation, by settling the succession on Henry, Duke of Normandy. On December 19, 1154, he attended the coronation of that Prince at Westminster. I find him occasionally but not often at Court in 1155; and Prince Henry, who was born at London on February 28th of that year, was baptized by Bishop Belmeis. The next year the King was in Normandy; but a Court held at Colchester on May 24, 1157, was attended by Belmeis. Not again, at any later period, do I hear of him in public, or in attendance on the King. He died on the 4th of May 1162, having been many years a sufferer from some disorder, which, as one of the Chroniclers informs us,<sup>1</sup> deprived him of speech. His Uncle, the former Bishop of London, was, as we know, attacked by paralysis many years before his death, and the Nephew's malady was, I suspect, of a similar nature. His age at his death must have been considerably less than sixty.

No record remains of his having done anything for the fabric of the Church of St. Paul's, the Cathedral of his See. His whole cares of this kind were probably devoted to the completion of that Augustine Abbey of which we are speaking. It was associated with the neighbouring heritage of his kinsmen, and with the memories of his own early advancement; it was situated also in the County which had nursed the greater genius and fortunes of his illustrious Uncle.

<sup>1</sup> John Hagustald, p. 278.

Of the various Confirmations which mark the growing prosperity of Lilleshall Abbey, that of Pope Alexander III. (1159–1181) is the first to be noticed. It receives Abbot William and his brethren under the Papal protection according to the example of Pope Eugenius. It confirms the Church of St. Alkmund with its Prebends, which it enumerates. They were Lilleshull, Ettingham (Atcham), Ukington, Longedon, Edbricleg (Albright-lee), Hennecot, Preston (Preston Gubbalds), Lee (near Pimhill), Cherlton (near Shawbury), Dinthill, Wiluuredeschot, and nine acres in a second Cherlton.<sup>1</sup> Among other Benefactions to the Abbey it only notices those of Philip de Belmeis and of Walter de Dunstanvill of Idsall. It exempts the *Novalia* of the Canons from tithes, in the form already noticed under Haughmond and Wombridge.

Other Papal *Privilegia* (as they are termed in the Chartulary) were as follows.—Pope Urban II. (1185–1187) ratified the Charter of his Predecessor, Alexander. Innocent III. (1198–1216) exempted the Abbey from the observance of Interdicts. The Confirmation of Pope Honorius III. (1216–1227) enumerates various additions to the wealth of the Abbey by grants of private persons. It was also at this time in receipt of rents from Shrewsbury, Chester, Stafford, and Worcester. In this Bull the Pontiff gives to the Canons in the usual form, the right to elect their future Abbots. Three other rescripts of Honorius III. are preserved in the Lilleshall Chartulary. One guarantees the Papal protection; another does the same, speaking of the possessions secured to the Abbey by King John, *of illustrious memory*; a third forbids the Canons to confer on any person, or to convert to other than the existing uses, any Prebend of St. Alkmund's.

The Chartulary contains some other Papal Privileges; but I shall here notice only one, which I take to be by Pope Innocent III., though it is undated. It allows that a Canon of the House may undertake the cure of souls in any Parish Church of the Abbot's gift: and that two, three, or four of the Canons, living in any such

<sup>1</sup> This Cherlton was probably near Preston Gubbalds. An Inquest, of about 1200–20, preserved in the Lilleshall Chartulary (fo. 112), says as follows:—

PRESTON. *Juratores dicunt quod Abbas de Lilleshull tenet Preston cum membris, vidt Cherlton et Lee, de feodo Domini Regie, et est gildabilis, et pertinet ad Setum Alcmundum. Habet libertatem,*

*sed nesciunt quo varanto. Ibidem hida terra. Dictus Abbas habet in Cherlton 2 acras in dominico, et valent per annum 4 lib. (Qy 4 sol.) Item habet prata que valent 1 sol. Item habet brueram et moram ibidem que continet 4 acras et valet 3 sol. per annum.*

LEE. *Juratores dicunt, &c. &c.* (See hereafter, under Preston Gubbalds.)

Parish, may institute one of themselves, and present him to the Bishop or Archdeacon, from whom he may receive the cure of souls and license to exercise all sacerdotal and parochial functions in the said Parish.

Of Regal Confirmations to Lilleshall the most full and remarkable are, that of King John, dated August 31, 1199, that of Henry III., dated November 29, 1265, that of Edward I., dated June 7, 1285, that of Richard II., dated November 4, 1394, and that of Henry VIII., dated April 5, 1524. King John's Charter, I should observe, makes mention of Preston-Montford, and Wistanstow, as possessions of St. Alkmund's. It gives to the Canons these franchises, viz. soc, sac, tol, them, infengenthef, and utfengenthef; also it acquits them of Geld, Danegeld, suits of Counties and Hundreds, waste, forest-regard, army-aids, aids to Sheriffs or their Serjeants, of stretward, hidage, pleas and complaints pertaining to County, and of all secular services, saving such as might be reserved in the Charters of any of the Canons' Suzerains. They were also to be quit of toll, passage, tolls of bridges, ways, ferries, or sea-voyages, and of all tolls at fairs throughout the kingdom (except in the City of London); and in respect of such goods as could be proved to belong to themselves or to have been purchased for their uses.

We know from the cotemporary Pipe-Roll that this ample Charter cost the Abbot of Lilleshall 30 merks.

Among the Archiepiscopal Confirmations to Lilleshall Abbey, the Chartulary preserves an extraordinary series, viz. Charters of Archbishops Theobald, Thomas à Becket, Richard (1174-1184), Baldwin (1184-1190), Hubert Walter, and Stephen Langton. The continuous favour of the Bishops of Lichfield is testified by Charters or Confirmations of Walter Durdent, Richard Peche, Hugh de Novant, Alexander de Stavenby, and others. As to private benefactions, several Baronial Houses contributed to the prosperity of Lilleshall Abbey. I may name Fitz Alan, Le Strange, Dunstanvill, Pantulf, La Zouche, Trusbutt, and Erdington. The enumeration of less noted benefactors I leave to the specific localities concerned.

The Shropshire Pipe-Roll of 1199 shows the Canons of Lilleshall as fining 20s. for license to cultivate 5 acres of a certain moor near their *House*; also as promising a *Donum* of 5 merks, as a supplement to a *Tallage* of the King's Boroughs.

On the Roll of 1200 the Sheriff claims a deduction in the *Corpus Comitatus* of 20s. *in quietantiâ terrarum Abbatís de Lillishull hoc anno*. The entry is not referable to anything which could properly

be made an item of this portion of the Sheriff's account. The passage is *underlined* in the original Pipe-Roll, from which I infer that a coeval objection was taken to the validity of the deduction.

The Pipe-Roll of 1212 again exhibits the Canons of Lillishull as fining and paying 20s. for cultivation of 5 acres;—of forest land, I presume.

In 1242, the Pipe-Roll shows the Abbot of Lilleshull as receiving a Royal gratuity of 20 merks. In August 1245 King Henry III., passing from Brug to Chester, journeyed by Wenlock, Shrewsbury, Lilleshull, and Combermere. In the same year the Abbot of Lilleshull contributed 40s. towards the Aid on marriage of the Princess Royal. In 1249 the Abbot of Lilleshull contributed 10 merks (£6. 13s. 4d.) to an *auxilium*; the Abbot of Shrewsbury's quota being £13. 6s. 8d., the Abbot of Haghmon's £8, the Abbot of Wigmore's £5, the Prior of Chirbury's £2. 13s. 4d., and the Prior of Wombridge's £1.

In 1251 the Canons of Lilleshill were charged £1 for two years' rent of 23 acres of lands, assarted by them in the boscs of Lilleshill and Haweman.

Between the years 1241 and 1248 a question of Forest-law, curious rather than important, was decided in favour of Lilleshall Abbey. It was whether the dogs on the Abbot's several estates were liable to the well-known process of *expeditation*. John Biset, Justice of the Forest, is known to have visited Shropshire in 1240, and to have died about August 1241. In this interval he issued an order to Sir Hugh fitz Robert, Forester of Shropshire, to restrain certain Jurors to make Inquest on the above matter. The Inquest was held, probably in 1242, before Roger de Pyvelesdon, then Sheriff of Salop and Stafford, before the said Sir Hugh fitz Robert, and before two Verderers, viz. Sir Richard de Leighton and Roger de Appeley. The eleven Jurors {Hugh de Leeg, Robert de Wodecote, William de Etton, Robert de Kakinton (Caynton), Richard de Ireland, Robert Forester of Wellington, Ralph de Staunton, Roger de Halghton, John de Hales, Reginald de Hales, and Ranulph de Rodington} returned a verdict in favour of the Abbot's immunity, *because his lands had anciently been of the Royal demesne*. This verdict was actually recorded and ratified in Edward I.'s Confirmation of 1285.

By Patent of March 8, 1280, Edward I. allows the Abbot of Lylleshull to assart his bosc of .Lylleshull, situated within the Forest of Wombridge, and containing 30 acres.

An undated, but early, Rent-Roll of Lilleshall Abbey, would indicate an income of more than £100 *per annum*, exclusive of appropriated Rectories. From the Manor of Lilleshall itself the receipts in Michaelmas Term were £7. 8s. 2d., including 1s. 8d. which came from Horton. At Midlent the same Manor yielded £6. 17s. exclusive of 1s. 8d. from Horton.

The *Taxation* of 1291 gives a very inadequate idea of the Abbot of Lilleshall's income. He derived £10. 10s. *per annum* from the following estates in the Deaneries of Salop and Newport, viz. Cherleton, Tirne, Cold Hatton, Bonigale, and the Lizard Grange. But this computation excludes all the prebendal estates of St. Alkmund's, except Cherleton. In fact it extends chiefly to estates acquired from other sources.—

His estate at Greenlowe (Derbyshire) yielded an			
annual income of . . . . .	£5	7	0
That at Freseley (Warwickshire) yielded . . . . .	7	3	0
His Leicestershire estates (Ashby, &c.) yielded . . . . .	8	15	10
From Hkyndon (or Arkendon) in Yorkshire			
he had . . . . .	4	0	0 <sup>1</sup>

This is all that the *Taxation* says of the Temporalities of Lilleshall Abbey. It is probable that the Total of £35. 15s. 10d. does not represent a sixth of the Abbot's temporal income, to say nothing of the tithes which he received as Rector of several Churches.

In 1292 the Abbot of Lilleshall was impleaded by the King as to his warranty for holding Pleas-of-the-Crown, and exercising rights of Fair, Market, and Free-warren, in his Manors of Lilleshall, Bolyngull, Longedon, Atton Colde, Okynton, Attingeham, Hennecote, Atbrihtelegh, Preston Gobald, Preston Moneford, and Donthull. The Abbot appeared and stated that he held no Market in the said vill. A three days' Fair at Attingeham, held on the day of St. Giles and two following days (*i. e.* September 1, 2, and 3), he justified by Charter of Henry III. His Free Warren, in Colde Hatton, Okynton (Uckington), Hennecote, and Longedon, was exercised under Charters of Edward I. As to Bolyngull and Atton Colde, he said that "there *was* no such vill in the County." The Sheriff corroborated the statement and the Plea was admitted;—a strange circumstance, when accuracy of spelling was little studied, and punctuation almost unknown. As to holding Pleas of the Crown twice in a year in the other vills, the Abbot justified

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, pp. 261, 262, 257—b, 67, 309—b.

that, by usage from the time of King Richard, and by the general Charter of King John, and the confirmations of Henry III. and Edward I. The King's Attorney here attempted to show a discrepancy between the Abbot's two Pleas, "for if the privileges in question were conveyed by Charter of King John, then the previous usage was an usurpation;" but the Attorney denied "that King John's Charter was sufficient to divest the Crown of the privileges in question, inasmuch as it did not specifically name them."<sup>1</sup> The cause was adjourned, but we may venture to guess that the sophistical argument of the Lawyer did not eventually prevail.

In January 1321 Edward II. prosecuted the Abbot of Lilleshall for claiming immunities from toll, wharfage, and other dues, in the City of London. The Abbot failed to appear, and probably with good reason, for King John's Charter would not have served him here.

In 1535-6 Robert, Abbot of Lilleshall, returned the gross income of his Monastery, in temporalities and spiritualities, as £326. 0s. 10d. A few items of his account require special mention here.

The lands held in demesne at Lilleshall and  
cultivated for the Canons themselves were

worth yearly . . . . . £16 0 0

The assized rents of Lilleshall were . . . 52 13 4

The rents from the Lizard Grange were £2; from Newport 16s. From Sheriff Hales (Staffordshire), Howle, Bletchley (Shropshire), and Warmincham (Cheshire), came £7. From Horton (near Wellington) came 13s. 0d., and from Sugdon (near Rodington) 16d. Brampton (Northants) yielded £11; Ashby and Blackfordby (Leicestershire) yielded £8. 14s.; Arkenden (Yorkshire) £6; Freseley (Warwickshire) £5; Wich Malbank and Crabwell (Cheshire) £6; and Grenlowe (Derbyshire) £7. The Abbot was Impropriator of eight Churches. Of these Lilleshall Rectory yielded £5. 6s. 8d.; and St. Alkmund's, with its chapel of Great Berwick, yielded £6. Five of these Rectories were not in Shropshire, but I may name them. They were Farnborough (Warwickshire), Ashby de la Zouch (Leicestershire), Holm (Norfolk), Badminton (Gloucestershire), and North Molton (Devonshire).

Among the charges on the gross revenue, the following relate more immediately to the Home-estate of the Abbey.—

To Thomas Eyton, for land in Lylleshall, a quit-rent, as I sup-

<sup>1</sup> *Quo Warranto*, pp. 679, 453.

pose, of 12*d.*; to George, Earl of Shrewsbury, as Steward of the Abbey, £2. 13*s.* 4*d.*; to Thomas Bromley, its Auditor, £2; to Nicholas Cokkerell, its Receiver-General, £6. 13*s.* 4*d.*; to Roger Morton, Steward of Lilleshall Manor, 13*s.* 4*d.*; to Thomas Walson, Bailiff of Lilleshall, £2. It seems too that the Abbey still acknowledged Philip de Belmeis for its original Founder and remembered two of his bequests, viz. to distribute 40*s.* to the poor on Maundy Thursday (*Cæna Domini*), and £4 on September 8 (the Nativity of the Virgin).<sup>1</sup>

I do not know that the *Ministers' Accounts* of 1540–1, when the Monastery was already dissolved, invalidate the truth of Abbot Robert's return five years before. The particulars of the Homestead are however more full and are as follows.—

Lilleshall. Rents of lands and Tenements . . .	£1	13	4
Lilleshall and Hynnyngton (i. e. Honington).			
Diverse rents . . . . .	8	3	2
Lilleshall. Diverse Farms . . . . .	8	16	4
Hynnyngton. Farm of a Mill . . . . .	2	14	0
Lilleshall. Perquisites of Court . . . . .	2	3	0
Muxton. Assized rents and customary rents . . .	1	11	4
Muxton. Rents of Tenants at Will . . . . .	5	4	0
Muxton. Diverse Farms . . . . .	4	3	4
Donyngton (Donington Wood). Rents of			
Tenants at Will . . . . .	7	10	10
Donyngton. Diverse Farms . . . . .	11	7	2
Gildmore Pole (the pool so called) . . . . .	0	6	8
Chirshall Grange (Chesswell Grange) . . . . .	4	13	4
Wyldmore Grange . . . . .	12	0	0
Depmore pasture . . . . .	1	6	8
Total . . . . .	£71	13	2 <sup>2</sup>

The Surrender of Lilleshall Abbey bears date October 16, 1538. On November 28, 1538, King Henry VIII. granted the Site of the House, &c., in *fee-farm*, to William Cavendishe, Esq. In the following year it was granted to James Leveson, Esq.

#### ABBOTS OF LILLESBALL.

The election of any Abbot of Lilleshall required the double assent of the Crown and the Diocesan Bishop. Hence, from the Patent-Rolls, from the Lichfield Registers, and from the Abbey

<sup>1</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 197, 198. | <sup>2</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. p. 265.

Chartulary, we are able to form an almost perfect list of these Abbots.

WILLIAM, probably the first Abbot of Lilleshall, occurs about 1148. He was living after the consecration of Richard Peche to the See of Lichfield, *i. e.* after April 1161. Some lists state him to have been living about 1173-4. I think it very probable that that was the later limit of his career.

WALTER, Abbot of Lilleshall, is said to have been party to an agreement with Richard de Cherlton in 1177. He was certainly Abbot in 1180 and in October 1200. His infirm state in June 1200 has been already noticed.<sup>1</sup> A suit, which he commenced, could not be proceeded with in October 1203 owing to his death.<sup>2</sup> At this date—

RALPH was Abbot of Lilleshall.<sup>3</sup> He was still Abbot in July 1216.

N. is given as the initial letter of the Abbot's name in the confirmation of Pope Honorius III. (1216-1227).<sup>4</sup>

ALAN occurs as Abbot in 1220, in October 1221, and in November 1224. On his death, as I suppose, but certainly on May 4, 1226, the King, by Patent, assents to the election of—

WILLIAM DE DORLENG as Abbot of Lilleshall. He was deceased on July 27, 1235, which is the date of the King's license for the election of his successor. On August 9, 1235, the King ratifies the election of—

SIMON DE FODRING (probably Fotheringay), late Prior. On December 8, 1240, the Abbacy was vacant, and on December 14, the Royal assent was given to the election of—

RICHARD DE SALOP, a Canon of the House. He occurs as Abbot in 1242, 1249, and on June 25, 1252. On June 15, 1253, the King assents to the election of—

ROBERT DE ARKALAW as Abbot. He was still in office on July 8, 1261. He is said to have been "summoned to Parliament in 49 Henry III."<sup>5</sup> (1264-5), which means, I suppose, that the then Abbot of Lilleshall was one of those who were summoned "to consult with Simon de Montfort" by the Pseudo-Patent of De-

<sup>1</sup> Supra, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 197.

<sup>3</sup> Benjamin, who occurs as a Canon of Lilleshall in October 1201 (*vide supra*, p. 108), and again in October 1203, was Prior under Abbot Ralph in and about the year 1206.

<sup>4</sup> The letter N. is often used in old documents, as a symbol, and may here mean nothing more than *the Abbot then in office*. Thus the letters M. and N. are used in the Church Catechism, and A. and B. in common conversation.

<sup>5</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 261.

cember 14, 1264. The same authority speaks of Abbot Robert as being similarly summoned to Parliament in 56 Hen. III. (1271-2), but this is more than a mere error of description, for on November 20, 1270, custody of the Abbey, then vacant, was entrusted by Patent to the Convent, which fined 20 merks for the privilege. On November 30, 1270, the Royal assent was given to the election of—

WILLIAM DE HALES, late Prior, who had the temporalities restored to him by a third Patent of December 16, 1270. He occurs as Abbot in 1272, 1273, and 1275.

LUCAS occurs as Abbot in 1277, and in November 1282.

RALPH was Abbot in March 1284,<sup>1</sup> and in March 1289.

JOHN is said in one list to have been Abbot in 18 Edward I. (1289-90), but I doubt the accuracy of this.<sup>2</sup>

WILLIAM DE BRUGGE was Abbot in November 1291, and in June 1306. On February 28, 1308, he had resigned; and though the election of—

JOHN DE CHETWYND, a Canon, was found to be informal by the Bishop, he confirmed it, to prevent the Escheator's continued interference with the vacant Abbey. John occurs in office 1318, 1323, and 1328.

HENRY DE STOKES was Abbot on September 17, 1330, and in 1350. On August 6, 1350, the Bishop confirmed the election of—

ROBERT DE ASCHEBY, a Canon, and addressed a certificate thereof to the King, and a mandate to the Archdeacon's Official to install the new Abbot. The election of—

WILLIAM DE PIPPELOWE was similarly confirmed, and certified by Episcopal Writs of May 29, 1353. Abbot William was living in 1367, but the Abbey was vacant in July 1369.

ROGER NORREIS was Abbot in 1370 and 1371.

WILLIAM DE PREYNTONE, his successor, occurs in 1376 and in 16 Richard II. (1392-3).

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. II. p. 323, note.

<sup>2</sup> At the Assizes of October 1292, Abbot William de Brugge had a curious suit with one Master Richard Bernard, who had on March 6, 1289, been engaged by Abbot Ralph, *William's predecessor*, as a kind of Proctor to conduct any business of the Abbey throughout England, and for a salary of 4 merks per annum. Bernard now claimed 14 merks, or 3½ years' arrears of the said salary, and put his da-

mages at 20 merks. Abbot William appeared, and stated that Bernard's other employments were so numerous that he could not possibly fulfil his part of the contract, and that having been requested on November 22, 1291, by Abbot William himself, to undertake some business, Bernard had refused. The sentence was in harmony with the merits of the case.—*Ideo Abbas sine die, et Ricardus in misericordia pro falso clamore.*

WILLIAM LYE, previously a Canon of the House, was Abbot in 2 Henry IV. (1400-1) and 6 Henry VI. (1427-8).

JOHN DE WENLOCKE was Abbot in 10 Henry VI. (1431-2) and 8 Edward IV. (1463-4).

ROBERT FITZ JOHN had succeeded in 5 Edward IV. (1465-6), and was Abbot in 9 Henry VII. (1493-4).

JOHN (perhaps Robert) FITZ JOHN is said to have been Abbot in 12 Henry VII. (1496-7).

GEOFFREY BARTON, or BERTON, was Abbot in 14 Henry VII. (1498-9) and in 7 Henry VIII. (1515-6).

JAMES COCKERELL occurs in 10 and 11 Henry VIII. (1518-1520).

ROBERT WATSON, last Abbot of Lilleshall, was in office in 13 Henry VIII. (1521-2), and till July 16, 1538.

#### LILLESBALL PARISH-CHURCH.

I do not suppose that Lilleshall was one of the Saxon Parishes of this district, but in what Saxon Parish the Manor should be placed it is hard to determine. Idsall, which certainly included Sheriff-Hales in its Parish, perhaps involved Lilleshall, but no traces of such subjection in the latter instance are likely to exist.

That the Canons of Lilleshall found a Parish Church in existence when they entered on the Manor, I cannot doubt. That it was a Rectory is also apparent; for Bishop Richard Peche granted them an appropriation of the three Churches of St. Alcmund's, Attingham, and Lilleshall.<sup>1</sup>

H. (that is, Hugh de Novant) Bishop of Coventry, granted a similar license of appropriation in respect of the Parish Church of Lilleshall.<sup>2</sup>

In consequence of the perpetual strifes which arose between the Monastic Rectors and the Vicar of Lilleshall, Bishop Roger de Molend, on March 5, 1286, assigned a fixed portion for the Vicar. The Vicar was to have the manse, garden, a croft called *the Rudyng*, and a meadow adjoining, as William de Preston, late Vicar, had had. The tithes of gardens and crofts, under spade cultivation, the

<sup>1</sup> Harl. MSS. 3868, fo. 21. The Charter is attested by William Dean (of Lichfield); R. (probably Roger) Archdeacon; Richard Abbot of Roucester; R. Prior of Kenilworth; Master Teodoric; and Master Geoffrey de Lenton. It probably passed in 1161, the year of Bishop Peche's

consecration.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem. Witnesses, William de Duredent, Master Richard de Gnoweshall, Radulf Chaplain, Robert Marmion, Robert de Broch, Hugh Pantulf, John de Wylorvill, Geoffrey de Norton. The date must be between 1188 and 1194.

customary right of common and easements, as exercised by former Vicars, the *alterages*, the tithes of lambs, calves, colts, and other small tithes, the *mortuaries*, the hay-tithes of Donynton, Lylleshull, and Hynnyngton (Honington), and the tithes of pannage were also to be the Vicar's.

After Bishop Roger's death (Dec. 16, 1295), the then Abbot<sup>1</sup> accepted the above *Ordinance*. Both the *Ordinance* and the acceptance were copied on August 16, 1315, into the Register of Bishop Langton, then holding an Ordination in the Conventual Church of Lilleshall.<sup>2</sup>

The *Taxation* of 1291 values the Church of Lilleshall at £4. 13s. 4d.<sup>3</sup> In 1341 this *Taxation* is rightly quoted at 7 merks; but the Assessors of the *Ninth* rated the Parish at 6 merks. The reasons for the abatement were, because "one merk of the *Taxation* represented the glebe, oblations, and other income of the Church, not now to be reckoned; and because there had been a general murrain among the sheep."<sup>4</sup> The *Valor* of 1534-5 gives the income of William Jackson, Vicar of Lilleshall, as £7 *per annum*; out of which he paid 2s. 3d. for synodals.<sup>5</sup> The Rectory, appropriated to Lilleshall Abbey, was returned as worth £5. 6s. 8d. *per annum*; and was chargeable with 6s. 8d. for the Procurations of the Archdeacon of Salop.<sup>6</sup>

#### VICARS OF LILLESHALL.

R., Vicar of Lilleshall, occurs between 1232 and 1238.

The following were all presented by the Abbot and Convent of Lilleshall, except in one instance.—

WILLIAM DE PRESTON is spoken of as former Vicar in 1286.

SIR SIMON, Vicar of Lilleshall, resigned September 22, 1314; and on November 24 following—

JOHN LE KENT, Priest, was admitted. He occurs as Vicar on February 26, 1339.

SIR JOHN ADENEY, Chaplain, instituted December 26, 1364, died 1369.

ADAM KAY, Priest, was instituted July 24, 1369, the King presenting during a vacancy of the Abbey. On August 18, 1376, Kay exchanged with—


<sup>1</sup> The Abbot is described by the initial letter N. His name was however William or John (vide *supra*, p. 225, note 4).

<sup>2</sup> *Regist. Langton*, fo. 17, b.

<sup>3</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 248.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 185.

<sup>5, 6</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 186, 197, 198.



**FONT, LILLESHELL CHURCH.**



THOMAS DE PLEIDEWYK, late Vicar of Moneford. On May 27, 1383, Pleidewyk exchanged with—

JOHN DE ONNE, late Rector of Cleobury North.<sup>1</sup> John de On died in 1403, when on February 18—

JOHN REDESTUR, Chaplain, was instituted. He died in 1413.

#### LILLESHELL MANOR AND VILL.

The village of Lilleshall was sometimes called *Lilleston*, to distinguish it from the manor in general.

Some Lilla, a Saxon settler, had left his name with both village and hill; I say *hill*, for the older way of spelling the name, viz. *Lilleshull*, is undoubtedly more correct than *Lilleshall*.

The Forest-Roll of 1180 affords an early illustration of this matter of nomenclature. The Abbot of *Lilleshull* is assessed 12*s.* for imbladements of 7½ acres of corn and 7 acres of oats. His Tenants (*homines*) in *Lilleshull* are assessed 11*s.* for similar imbladements. Again, the *Villate* of *Lilleston* is assessed one merk for a *pourpresture*, viz. a Mill; and this entry is followed by a charge of 12*d.* against one Morinus for a *pourpresture* in *Dunniton* (i. e. Donnington Wood).

In a case of murder, presented by the Bradford Jurors at the Assizes of 1203, we have the name of this Manor spelt as *Lilleshill* or *Lilleshul*.—Elyas de Lilleshill, Alice Crithebrech, Eva de Lileskil, Aldet, Mable, Geoffrey, and Robert de Lilleshul, and Peter de Hopton, were accused of murdering a woman at *Lilleshill*. Elyas had taken sanctuary in the Church of *Lilleshill*, but had since acknowledged the murder and abjured the realm. Alice, immediately after the murder, had fled into Staffordshire with certain chattels of the murdered woman, had been there arrested, and brought back into Shropshire. Her defence before the *Curia Comitatus* of Salop was now recorded before the Justices-in-Eyre, as the King's Serjeant (*serviens*) and several knights remembered it. It was at least ingenious.—She had stated that, on hearing a noise at night in the murdered woman's house, she went and peeped through a chink in the door (*per medium hostii*), that she saw four men within, who presently coming out, seized, and threatened to murder, her, if she gave any alarm, but (on her keeping silence) gave her those stolen goods (*pelfam*) which had been found upon her when arrested. On

<sup>1</sup> The Hereford Registers give a different account of this exchange. (Vide supra, Vol. III. p. 31.) Robert Halton,

John *Dune's* successor at Cleobury, according to this authority, exchanged with Plaidwyk.

being brought before the Justices at the above Assizes, Alice Crithebrech no longer adhered to the above defence. She was judged to deserve death, but the penalty was commuted for one hardly less terrible.—*Sed per dispensacionem eruantur ei oculi*, was the sentence.<sup>1</sup>

At these same Assizes a question was mooted as to what rights the King had in the *bosc* and *pasture* of Lilleshull. The Abbot appeared with King John's own Charter of 1199 in his hands; which Charter conceded the site of the Abbey, and Lilleshull with its appurtenances, &c. *in bosco et plano, in pratis et pascuis*, &c. Judgment was deferred.<sup>2</sup>

In 1220, Robert de *Lilleston* was a Juror on the Inquest mentioned under Dodicote.<sup>3</sup>

A Patent of May 7, 1250, allows that the Abbot and Convent of Lilleshull may hold, for a rent of 10s., twenty-three acres of land which they had assarted, without license, in their boscs of Lilleshull and Haughmond, within the King's Forest.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says that the Abbot of Lilleshull holds the Manor of Lilleshull by gift of King Henry II., in *perpetual almoign*, and does suit neither to county nor Hundred.<sup>4</sup>

In April 1256, Sibil fitz Muriel has a Writ against Robert Abbot of Lilleshall for disseizin in Lilleshall. She has a similar Writ in August following.

I suppose it was the third Walter de Dunstanvill (1241–1270) between whom and the Abbot of Lilleshall a question of boundary was in dispute. As "Sir Walter de Dunstavyle Lord of Ydeshall" he *quitclaimed* to the Abbot all right to *common of pesson* in the boscs of Lylleshall beyond the road called Watlingestret, saving to both parties *common of herbage* on either side of Watlingestret. Moreover he allowed that the Abbot's men of Brerlatton (now Burlaughton) should have common of pasture in his (Walter's) wood of Lusgard (Lizard), paying one hen by way of rent for every three-year-old beast so depastured. In return, Walter was to feed 60 swine, properly marked, and counted (*talliatos*) by the Abbot's Bailiff, in the *forinsec bosc* of Lilleshall. The Abbot also *quitclaimed* all right in the boscs of Ydeshall, beyond Watlingstret, except the common pasture aforesaid.<sup>5</sup>

There is also a Charter whereby Galter de Dunstanvill son of Galter de Dunstanvill gives to the Abbey that bosc, beyond Wat-

<sup>1, 2</sup> *Assizes*, 5 John, m. 2 dorso, 4 dorso.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 57.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, page 16.

<sup>5</sup> *Lilleshall Chartulary*, fo. 78.

lingstret, towards Lilleshull, which had been in dispute between the Abbey and his Ancestors and himself, so that Watlingstret was to be for ever the boundary between the bosc of Hydeshal and the bosc of Lilleshull.<sup>1</sup>

Between the years 1271 and 1275 (as I think), William Abbot of Lilleshull and his Convent deliver to Henry de Meryton and his wife Felicia a parcel of land in *Wyldemore-juxta-Sydenhal*, to hold to the longest liver, at 12*d.* rent, and for a heriot of 2*s.* at the decease of either. Witnesses, Richard Brace, Richard Urse, John de Haliton, Roger le Harper, and Alan de Garmeston.<sup>2</sup>

The Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285), says that "the Abbot of Lilleshill holds the Manor of Lilleshill, with its members, viz. Donyngton and Mokeleston (Muxton): also the three Villis of Attecham, Unkynton (Uckington), and Adbright-lee, of the King, *in capite sine medio*, as members of the Church of St. Alchmund, Salop;—by gift of the King, and by Charter. The Abbot has his free court and holds pleas of bloodshed and *hue and cry*, and has gallows and Free warren."

Robert o' the Hull of Lilleshull occurs on a Sheriff-Hales Jury on April 28, 1294. It is curious that the Lilleshall Chartulary should record the death of this Tenant in the same year. There is a memorandum how Robert de Monte died in his house at Lylleshull in 22 Edward I., and how William, his son and heir, being a minor, was in ward to the Abbot for five years. Then William, Clerk of Newport, having married Agnes, the said Ward's mother, bought his wardship and marriage, for 10*s.*

DONNINGTON WOOD. On October 13, 1200, a Fine was levied at Westminster, between Geoffrey Chanterell, Plaintiff, and Walter Abbot of Lilleshill, Tenant (the Canon Benjamin being his Attorney), of one virgate in Duninton, whereof was suit of *mort d'ancestre*. The Abbot now allowed the Plaintiff's right to hold the premises in fee under the Abbot and his successors for a free rent of 4*s. per annum*. For this the Plaintiff paid 8½ merks.

At the Assizes of January 1256, Richard le Yongebonde and Alice his wife abandoned their suit *de ingressu*, against Richard le Bere and Geoffrey Chauntler concerning a half-virgate in Dunyton. Their Sureties were Griffin de Akilote and William Bordfaxe. It elsewhere appears that Geoffrey Chanteler had license to accord this suit for a fine of 6*s. 8d.* The Concord too is preserved. Thereby

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Charter at Trentham. The *Sydenhal*

alluded to is probably the place now called *Sydney*, in Kinneraley Parish.

Geoffrey Chaunterel, tenant, acknowledges the right of Alice wife of Richard le Yungebond to *one-third* of a virgate in Donyton. In return Richard and Alice concede the premises to Geoffrey, at a rent of 12*d.*, he also undertaking to discharge capital services.

MUXTON. One of the earliest Fines on Record relates to this member of Lilleshall. It was levied at Lichfield on August 13, 1186, before Robert Marmion, Hugh Pantulf, and their associate Justices, Barons and Knights.<sup>1</sup> It was between Reginald le Bere and Agnes fitz Sibil, concerning three virgates in Mukeleston, whereof was Plea of Grand Assize. They divide the land between them, one messuage remaining with Reginald, another with Agnes. And Agnes shall pay Reginald a rent of 2*s.* yearly, on the vigil of St. Mary Magdalene.<sup>2</sup>

Agnes de Mukeleston, daughter of Sibil, enfeoffed Elias de Ettingeham in 3 nokes in Mukeleston, for a rent of 18*d.*<sup>3</sup> This was about the year 1200, I think.

On October 6, 1203, Robert de Longedon, tenant of 6 acres in Duninton and Mukeleston, acknowledged by Fine that they were the Abbot of Lilleshall's. The Abbot conceded them to Robert, for life, at 4*s.* rent.<sup>4</sup>

The following narrative in the Lilleshall Chartulary is intended to show the Abbot's right of wardship over any heir of Bere of Muxton.—

"William son of Richard le Bere of Mokeleston was in ward to Abbot Richard (1240–53) till his age was completed. And Richard, William's son, was in ward to Abbot William de Halys (1270–1275) till he was of full age: and he was restored to his land without being obliged to take a wife (*sine maritagio*) at instance of Master John de Cherlton, whose daughter, by name Bulga, he espoused."

It is worth remarking that the name here written *Bere* was identical with *Bear*, and that the younger Richard le Bere was he who about 1273 has been seen attesting a Deed as *Richard Urse*.<sup>5</sup> Also

<sup>1</sup> Three others of the Associates are named on the Staffordshire Pipe-Roll of the same year (32 Hen. II). They were Ralph de Ardern, William fitz Stephen, and Thomas Noel. The Pipe-Roll of 33 Hen. II. shows them continuing their *Eyre* in Shropshire, Herefordshire, and other Counties. The extraordinary thing is that they were all Sheriffs; viz. Robert

Marmion of Worcestershire, Hugh Pantulf of Shropshire, Ralph de Ardern of Herefordshire, William fitz Stephen of Gloucestershire and Thomas Noel of Staffordshire. Pantulf did not sit, as a Judge in his own county; but Marmion, Ardern, Fitz Stephen, and Noel sat in theirs.

<sup>2</sup> 3. 4. Chartulary, fos. 84, 67, 84.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, p. 231.

we have had his father, as *William Urse of Mokeleston*,<sup>1</sup> attesting a Deed about 1250, and as *William de Mokeleston* attesting another Deed,<sup>2</sup> about 1260.

Richard le Bere, who occurs in 1256, seems to have been of Donnington. There was also a Richard le Bere attendant upon a Hinstock Inquest in 1306. Lastly, Adam le Bere, already mentioned under Sugden<sup>3</sup> as occurring in 1267, sat on two Bolas Inquests in 1292 and 1301.

LONGANEY. A place, thus named, fell to Lilleshull Abbey in the twelfth Century; but there is some doubt whether it was adjacent to Lilleshull or to Atcham. Fitz Alan's interest there is consistent with either supposition, and other evidences are by no means decisive on the point. Under this doubt I have nothing to do but quote, in chronological order, the documents which relate to Longaney.—

William fitz Alan (II.) expedited before the year 1199, a Charter to Lilleshull Abbey, of which the following is the substance.—

*"Willielmus filius Willielmi filii Alani dedi redditum v solidorum quem percipere solebam de Longeney, et totum jus quod habui in Longeney. Præterea concessi terram de Elbstaneshull,<sup>4</sup> scilicet xxx acras quæ sunt de dominio meo de Wroccestre."*<sup>5</sup>

King John's Charter to the Abbey, dated August 31, 1199, confirms, *Ex dono Willielmi filii Alani, quinque solidos de Longeneya et totum jus quod habuit in eadem terrâ, et totum jus et servicium quod habuit in villâ de Brerleton (Burlaughton) et triginta acras terræ in Hauestaneshull.*<sup>6</sup>

At the Assizes of November 1221, the two following Lawsuits seem to have some relation to each other.—

"Hugh le Strange and Leticia his wife, sued the Abbot of Lilleshul for a third of a half-virgate in Mucleston (Muxton) and in Langeney, as the dower of Leticia. The Abbot surrendered the said third."<sup>7</sup>

"The same Hugh and Leticia sued Thomas Mauveisin for a third of a half-virgate in Berwic (Berwick Maviston) which Leticia claimed as dower. After some delay Hugh le Strange came into Court and withdrew the suit, saying that Herbert his brother (the Defendant's brother was perhaps meant) had given him satisfaction."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1-2</sup> Supra, pp. 39, 49.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 384.

<sup>4</sup> Elbstaneshull, alias Hauestaneshull, will be noticed under Uckington.

<sup>5-6</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem, fo. 45.

<sup>7-8</sup> Assizes, 6 Hen. III., mm. 7 recto, 6 verso.

By a Fine levied at Worcester, on January 27, 1249, Henry de Berewyk and Muriell his wife (Impedients) allow themselves to have given to Richard Abbot of Lilleshill (represented by Adam, a Canon of the House) two acres of meadow in Longaneye, whereof was *suit of warranty*. For this the Abbot gave the Grantors participation in all good offices and prayers of his house for ever.

An early Rent-Roll of Lilleshall Abbey mentions *Longenei* between Uffington and Cherlton-St.-Elstrud, but the space which should contain some rent arising therefrom at Michaelmas, is left blank.

---

## Longdon upon Tern.

---

"THE same Church (St. Alkmund's) held (in Saxon times) and still holds Languedune. Here are 11 hides. In demesne is one ox-team; and there are 1111 Boors with one team; and there might be 111 teams here in addition. Here are vi \* \* \*<sup>1</sup> among the male and female Serfs; and a mill of 5*s.* annual value. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 21*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 9*s.* 4*d.*"<sup>2</sup>

It would be tedious to quote the various Confirmations to Lilleshall Abbey, which uniformly speak of Longdon as one of the prebendal estates of St. Alkmund's, and which recognize the consequent right of the Abbey to the Manor. The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255, with problematical accuracy, ascribes the Abbot's tenure of Longedon to a grant *in pure alms* of Henry II. Its freedom from suit of County or Hundred is also recorded on the same Roll.<sup>3</sup>

Public Records allude but seldom to Manors thus circumstanced. What we know of the history of Longdon consists chiefly of the Abbot of Lilleshall's negotiations with his neighbours. His endeavours to get the command of the River Tern, for the sake of a Mill, or Mills, prove the great value which was attached to that kind of property. The Map will show how the vill of Tern, Sug-

<sup>1</sup> A word is wanting here. I should  
supply *teams*, but that would only increase  
an appearance of inaccuracy in the whole

statement.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 253, a, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Hundred*. II. 57.

don, and Isombridge, occupied the bank of the stream opposite to Longdon. The Abbot had his negotiations with the Lords or Tenants of each of those villis.—

At the Assizes of 1203, Reginald de Tirne withdrew by license a suit of *disseizin* which he had against the Abbot of Lilleshull, who, by erection of a *stank* in Langedon, had injured Reginald's tenement in Tirne. About the year 1240, I find from a Rent-Roll of Lilleshull Abbey, that William de Tyrne (he was Grandson of the above Reginald) paid an annual acknowledgment of 6*d.* for using the Abbot's land (at Longdon) as a buttress for his Mill at Tern. At this time the Abbot's other receipts from Longdon were only 7*s.* 6*d.* rent half-yearly, and 8*s.* yearly from the Fishery there.

William de Suggedon, at some unascertainable period, gave to Lilleshall that meadow on the bank of the Tyrne which formed an abutment for the stank of Longedon Mill. The meadow lay between the *Lamilake* and the said stank.<sup>1</sup>

William de Suggedon gave to Lilleshall the meadow called *Mulnee*, near to Longdon Mill, and surrounded on all sides by the water of Tirne.<sup>2</sup>

Richard son of William de Suggedon confirmed this gift of his Father.<sup>3</sup>

Nicholas Urse of Sugdon also gave the meadow called *Mulnehec*. Reginald fitz John of Sugdon gave that ford in Tern water which was called *Straneford*, and also that bank of the Tern which was next his meadow, called *Frenesh*, that the Canons might use it as an abutment for their Fishery.<sup>4</sup>

Hugh fitz Robert (1200–1249) gave to the Refectory of the Abbey an abutment in his land of *Esnebrugg* (Isombridge). It was on the bank of the Tern, in a place called *Stromfort* and opposite to that meadow in Longdon which was called *Helfordisheye*. The object was to secure a permanent Fishery for the Canons.<sup>5</sup>

In 1251 the Abbot of Buildwas (who had a small estate at Tern) took out two writs against the Abbot of Lilleshall. One was concerning a stank in *Tyrne*, which had been unlawfully thrown down, the other was concerning a stank in Longedon which had been unlawfully erected. At the Assizes of 1256 Hamo le Strange sued the Abbot of Lilleshull for disseizing him of 2½ perches of land in Wrockwardine. The Abbot alleged the land to be in Longdon, and submitted that, even if it were in Wrockwardine, Wrockwardine was *ancient demesne of the Crown*. (He meant that a Writ of

<sup>1. 2. 3.</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fos. 68, 73.

<sup>4. 5.</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fos. 73, 65.

*novel disseizin* could not lie in respect of such a property.) To this Hamo replied, that his Father, John, was *Tenant-in-capite* of Wrockwardine and had enfeoffed him. The Court decided that there was no disseizin, inasmuch as the present Abbot of Lilleshull had held the land continuously since his predecessor's death.<sup>1</sup>

There is a composition in the Lilleshall Chartulary showing how Sir Hamo le Strange had sued Abbot Robert of Lilleshull for disseizing him of certain heath-land between Wrockwardine and Longdon, and how the Abbot had had a countersuit against Sir Hamo for disseizing him of a right of common, and how both matters were arranged.<sup>2</sup>

What claim Thomas de Withington (the husband, I presume, of Isabella Burnel)<sup>3</sup> can have acquired to the Manor of Longdon it is hard to say. By a Fine, levied November 3, 1282, Thomas de Wytinton (Plaintiff) releases to Lucas, Abbot of Lilleshull (Tenant), the Manor of *Longedon-super-Tirne*, about which there had been a suit of *Grand Assize*. For this *quitclaim* the Abbot is said to give 400 merks;—and the sum is not a fictitious one, for the Lilleshall Chartulary preserves a memorandum of 11 Edward I. (1282–3), in which the Abbot acknowledges a debt of 400 merks to Master Walter de Heselschawe, in respect of a *quitclaim*, made by the said Walter and Thomas de Whytinton, of the Manor of Longedon. As security for the debt the Abbot had given a power of distress on all his Manors in Shropshire to the Treasurer and Chamberlains of the King's Exchequer. However, on January 26, 1291, Master Walter de Heselschawe appeared in the Court of Exchequer at Westminster, and, before the Treasurer and Barons, acknowledged himself to have received the full payment of his debt.<sup>4</sup>

On January 5, 1283, the Abbot of Lilleshull obtained a Charter of Free-Warren in Longdon.<sup>5</sup>

In 1534–5 the Abbot of Lilleshall's receipts from Longdon, Cold-Hatton, and Tyrne, were returned as £16 *per annum*:<sup>6</sup> but in the *Ministers' Accounts*, six years later, Longdon alone seems to produce an income of £21. 9s. 8d., viz. The Grange, &c. £15. 3s. The Mill £6, and Perquisites of Court 6s. 8d.<sup>7</sup>

LONGDON CHAPEL. When, or in what Saxon Parish, or by whom, this Chapel was founded, I cannot say.

<sup>1</sup> *Assizes*, 40 Hen. III., m. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Chartulary, fo. 123.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 307.

<sup>4</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 131.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Chart.* 11 Edw. I., No. 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 197, 198.

<sup>7</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 265.

The ancient Parishes of High Ercall, Wellington, and Wrockwardine, met hereabouts, and may, any one of them, have included this district. The Chapel must have been *donative*, and the Abbot of Lilleshall responsible only to himself for its services. Hence I suppose in later times it was accounted a Peculiar. Such Chapelries are seldom named in Diocesan or other Records. However, in 1534-5 the Abbot of Lilleshall acknowledged that 2*s.* 6*d.* were payable yearly to the Archdeacon of Salop, for Procurations for the Chapel of Longdon.

---

## Uckington.

---

"THE same Church (St. Alkmund's) held (in Saxon times) and still holds Uchintune; and Godebold holds it of the Church. Here are IIII hides geldable. In demesne are III ox-teams, and (there are) II Radmans and III Boors with one team, and yet there might be III more teams. Here are VI neat-herds. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth 24*s.* (*per annum*). Now it is worth 30*s.*"<sup>1</sup>

This Manor had the ordinary destination of a St. Alkmund's estate; as we may see in those Confirmations which afterwards secured it to Lilleshall Abbey.

At Duncot, a member of Uckington, the Abbot had a Mill, which seems to have been partly dependent for a supply of water on some Fishery, belonging to that Robert Dardif, whom I have named under Wroxeter and Norton.<sup>2</sup> In the 12th century Robert Dardif and the Abbot had some disputes on this subject; but, before the year 1180, they came to the following agreement.—The watercourse (*fossa*) which the Abbot had cut (*duxit*) from Dardif's Fishery to his own Mill was to remain in the Abbot's possession. The Abbot's Miller was, as often as he pleased, but in open day, to dam up all other outlets of Dardif's Fishery, so as to train the water down to his Mill. And even by night he was to be at liberty to do the same, if so be that Dardif's Fisherman had not laid his baskets (*fiscellas*) for taking fish. In return the Abbot paid Dardif

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 253, a, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. pp. 312, 313, 319.

5s. down, and agreed to pay him a rent of 12d. yearly at Michaelmas, so long as Dardif could guarantee the watercourse to the Abbot. But if Dardif should carry out a proposed exchange of half his fishery with Roger fitz Henry (he was Lord of Withington), then the Abbot was to pay Dardif only 6d. yearly, and to return half the sum of 5s. now paid down.<sup>1</sup>

We have seen that this exchange did not take place, and that at a subsequent period Dardif gave the whole shilling rent which was coming from the Abbot of Lilleshall to the Abbey of Haughmond.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem that Robert Dardif's estate in this neighbourhood passed to one Philip de Nugent, who, for a term at least, so acted as if the shilling rent, payable by Lilleshall to Haghmon under Robert Dardif's grant, was due rather to himself.

Between the years 1174 and 1203, Philip de Nugent made an agreement with Walter, Abbot of Lilleshall. Philip gave his fishery of Ukynton in pure alms to the Abbey, so that the Abbey was to hold it at a *ferm* of 2s. 6d. payable to Philip for eight years, and then it was to remain (free of rent) to the Abbey. And as to the watercourse near the fishery (*fossa juxta piscariam*) the Abbey was to pay the shilling rent due thereon, to Philip for his life. Four years' *ferm* of the rent of 2s. 6d. is acknowledged to have been already received by Philip, and four years' *ferm* is stated to be yet coming to him.<sup>3</sup>

The term of eight years, stipulated for in this extraordinary document, is stated to commence *ab anno decemnovalis cicli V<sup>to</sup>, dominicali litteræ currente F*:—an inconsistent date,<sup>4</sup> which leaves room only for a conjecture that the transaction took place about 1200.

At the Assizes of 1203 Philip de Nugent essoigned his attendance at the *common summons* through Roger de Withenton. A century later, and we have seen that another Philip Nugent was stated to have a mesne interest in Withington;<sup>5</sup> but I find it impossible to indicate the exact tenure or tenures which Dardif and Nugent seem to have had in this neighbourhood. I return to our proper subject,—

William fitz Alan (II.) gave to Lilleshall Abbey the land of

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 80.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. pp. 319, 320.

<sup>3</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 82.

<sup>4</sup> During Abbot Walter's era the fifth year of the Cycle of 19 years fell in 1179

and 1198, but F was not the *Sunday-letter* in either of those years. It was the Sunday-letter in 1174, 1180 (till March), 1185, 1191, 1196 (after March), and 1202.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, p. 80.

*Elbstaneshull*, viz. 30 acres of land which were of his demesne of Wroxeter.<sup>1</sup> King John's Confirmation of 1199 mentions this grant as "30 acres in *Hauestaneshull*;" and the Confirmation of John fitz Alan (I.) calls the locality *Elfstaneshull*. We have seen the locality described as *Austaneshill*, and as "a field of Uckington lying near Beslow."<sup>2</sup>

In 1252 the Abbot of Lilleshall has a Writ against John fitz Alan for disseizing him of a tenement in Okinton.

This probably led to the *perambulation* between Wroxeter and Uckington, already noticed as having taken place in 1256.<sup>3</sup>

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 attributes the Abbot of Lilleshall's tenure of Uckington to the grant of Henry II. The immunities of the Manor in respect of suits to County or Hundred are duly marked.<sup>4</sup>

On May 12, 1285, the Abbot of Lilleshall obtained a Charter of Free Warren for his demesnes of Colde Atton, Okinton, and Hennecote.<sup>5</sup>

A Lilleshall Rent-Roll, of uncertain date, gives the ferm of Ukynton, less the Bailiff's Salary, as 33*s.* 9½*d.*, due at Michaelmas, and 31*s.* 0½*d.*, due at Midlent. In 1540-1 the rents and farms received by the late Abbey from Uckington and its Mill are put at £14. 6*s.* 6*d.* There is nothing in the *Valor* of 1534-5, which can be taken to represent such a receipt, and the omission is inexplicable.

---

## Atcham, formerly Attingham.

---

THE full meaning of the name Attingham or Ettingham is, *The home of the children of Eata*. What Saxon Eata may have first colonized this place I will not now conjecture. *Domesday* recognizes it as immemorially an estate of St. Alkmund's.—

"The same Church held (in Saxon times) and still holds Atingeham; and Godebold holds it of the Church. Here is one hide. In demesne there is one ox-team and a half; and (there are) 11 Vil-

<sup>1</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 51.

<sup>2, 3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. pp. 315, 310.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 57.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Chartarum*, 13 Edw. I., No. 108.

lains and 111 Boors with 111 teams. The former value (of the Manor) was 10s. (*per annum*). Now it pays a rent of 6s. 8d."<sup>1</sup>

We have seen that the history of St. Alkmund's Manors as held by Lilleshall Abbey must needs be circumstantial. Atcham is no exception to the rule, unless it were worth while to enumerate the various Confirmations which secured both Manor and Advowson to the Canons. I prefer to illustrate the subject with more interesting if less relevant details.

It was doubtless as a Parishioner of Atcham that Henry Mauveysin of Berwick became a Benefactor to Lilleshall Abbey. His grants, already described,<sup>2</sup> were afterwards increased by his son Herbert, whose brother William was probably a Canon of Lilleshall. The said Herbert, with William his brother, now one of the Religious (*qui se Religioni reddidit*), gives the arable land of *Lochesheye* to the Abbey. The said land is defined by "a road which goes up from a little meadow near the Severn and passes between *Lochesheye* and *Brucheshurlong* as far as a meadow; and thence alongside the said meadow, all the arable land, till you come to the road from Ettingham to Berwick."<sup>3</sup>

I must here say something of—

HELYAS DE ETTINGHAM, a person of some note in his day, and a native of Atcham. He has been often mentioned incidentally in these pages, but especially as being attendant in the Court of King Richard in 1190.<sup>4</sup> The fact is, that from Michaelmas 1184 till March 1199 he served Henry II. and Richard I. in the capacity of Custos of a House which those Kings maintained at Feckenham in Worcestershire. His salary for this duty was £6. 1s. 8d. *per annum*, and we find it paid more or less regularly on the Pipe-Rolls of Worcestershire, Staffordshire, or Shropshire. Sometimes the Custos makes a further charge for repairs, and on one occasion (in 1185) King Henry makes him a present of 2 merks. For the half-year ending Easter 1193 *Elyas de Etingehal* (as he is called) was Fermor of Feckenham. A Crown-debt of £10. 10s. thus incurred, was paid by him in Shropshire, in several instalments between the years 1197 and 1201. In the meantime others had been Fermors of Feckenham. In 1195 we have seen him purchasing the wardship and marriage of a Shropshire Coheiress, and bestowing her on his son Thomas.<sup>5</sup> About the same time he attests two Charters of William fitz Alan (II.) to Haughmond Abbey.<sup>6</sup> He has also been

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 253, a. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 390.

<sup>3</sup> *Chartulary*, fo. 65.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 12; Vol. VI. pp. 175-6.

<sup>6</sup> See *Monasticon*, VI. p. 108, No. II.

named as a Feoffee in Muxton, a member of Lilleshall, about the year 1200.<sup>1</sup> At the Assizes of October 1203, and again in April 1206, he appears as a Juror in causes tried by process of *Grand Assize*. This implies that he was a Knight. I will now show the concern he had in Atcham.—On October 6, 1203, a Fine was levied at Shrewsbury between Ralph Abbot of Lilleshall (Plaintiff) and Elyas de Ettingeham (Tenant) of half a virgate in Ettingeham, whereof was suit at law. Elyas acknowledged *the right of the Abbot and of St. Alkmund*. The Abbot allowed him to hold the said half-virgate together with another half-virgate, which he already held, at a rent of 3*s. per annum*. The tenure of both half-virgates was to be only for life of Elyas; and both were to revert to the Abbot or his Successors.<sup>2</sup>

We have seen that Helyas de Ettingham's son, Thomas, was deceased, without issue, in 1220.<sup>3</sup> We have also seen that there was a second Helyas de Ettingham, who having had a grant of Langley from Henry III., about the year 1249, was deceased in the year following.<sup>4</sup>

This, I take it; was that *Elyas de Ekyngham* for whom there was a Patent of Protection dated May 18, 1226, when he was about to accompany Richard Plantagenet, the King's brother, into Gascony.

Of this family or its connection with Atcham I can say no more, unless indeed Thomas de Ettingham, named by John fitz Alan as his Attorney in a Lawsuit of 1251, was of the same stock.

Another Fine was levied, I think in 1203, between Ralph Abbot of Lilleshall and Oliver de Ettingham, tenant, of a half-virgate in Ettingham. Oliver quitclaimed the same, but was allowed to hold it of the Abbot for life, paying one pound of frankincense, as a rent, on the day of the Nativity of St. Mary.

On October 28, 1221, the Abbots of Shrewsbury and Lilleshall met at Echingham and adjusted several matters of dispute. They agreed to divide the Moors of Kinnersley and Donnington (Donnington Wood); and of Sleap and Longdon by arbitration of 12 selected men.—

There had also been a breach made in the Severn bank at Echingham, under or below the bridge. This seems to have been on the Emstrey, or Shrewsbury, side of the River. Eight upright men, elected by both parties, were to settle this matter and provide for the due rights of the disputants in respect of the said breach.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Supra, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 81.

<sup>3-4</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. pp. 142, 150.

<sup>5</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 282.

At the Assizes of November 1221, the Burgesses of Shrewsbury made a curious presentment, which gives us the earliest history of *Atcham-Bridge*. They said that the Abbot of Lilleshull had instituted a certain new custom at the bridge of Attingeham, in that he charged one penny on every loaded cart which passed over. The Abbot appeared before the Justices and stated that "he had instituted no new custom, for that in fact, during the time of his Predecessor, there was no bridge at all there, but the Abbot kept two boats on the River for the sake of ferrying men across, and the said boats brought him in 2 merks per annum. Afterwards by common council of Lord William fitz Alan and other great men (*magnatum*) it was provided that the said Abbot should construct a bridge and should take one penny for every cart of Salop, if laden, and one halfpenny from every other cart. And now this bridge was completed except one arch. In this way the Abbot came to levy the aforesaid custom." A Jury was called upon to decide the question. Their verdict was that the present Abbot and his Predecessor had now levied the aforesaid custom for 20 years, and had introduced no change (*nullam emendacionem apposuerunt*).

Coupling the above extract with what we know of the history of the House of Fitz Alan and the succession of Lilleshall Abbots, we conclude that the first bridge at Atcham was commenced by Abbot Ralph between the years 1200 and 1210, and finished by Abbot Alan about the year 1222. It consequently was in progress, or in suspense, during the whole period of the Barons' wars.

Later in the 13th century, the Abbot of Shrewsbury concedes to the Abbot of Lilleshull that bank of the River Severn, towards Cronchull (Cronkhill), which belonged to the former. The object of the Lilleshull Canons was to get a buttress (*attachiamentum*) for a certain fishery or weir which they proposed to form at Cronkhill Ford, or somewhere between that Ford and Atcham Bridge, as they might determine. The Canons were to pay a rent of 8s. for this concession, and to suffer distraint in case of non-payment. The Abbot of Shrewsbury agreed not to permit any other Weir to be constructed on the Severn between the proposed Weir, and the Weir of Haghmon Abbey. Witnesses, Sir Odo de Hodenet, Sir Thomas de Costentin.<sup>1</sup>

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says that "The Abbot of

<sup>1</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 398. The Haghmon Weir alluded to was that at Preston-Boats. The Abbot of Shrews-

bury, as Lord of Emstrey, commanded the Western bank of the Severn from Cronkhill-Ford to Preston-Boats.

Lilishull holds Attenham in *pure almoign* as pertaining to the Church of St. Alkmund, Salop; that he held it "by gift of the elder King Henry" (meaning Henry II.), and did no suit to County or Hundred.<sup>1</sup>

At the Assizes of January 1256 Saer Mauveysin impleaded the Abbot of Lilleshall, Adam the Serjeant, Nicholas le Fevre, William Peket and Peter fitz Amice for disseizing him of common pasture in Etinham, pertaining to Saer's free tenement in Berwick. The Abbot appeared and pleaded that his own laud in Etinham and Saer's land in Berwick were of different Baronies, but that in time of Abbot Richard each party had shared in the common rights of the other, but that more recently this arrangement had proved unsatisfactory, and that, since Abbot Richard's death, he, the present Abbot, had not allowed Saer to participate in any common in Etinham. The Jury decided that the present Abbot had wrought no disseizin, but, if there had been any disseizin, it was the late Abbot's act.

On October 16, 1269, King Henry III. granted license to the Abbot of Lilleshall to hold an annual Fair at Attingham on the day of St. Egidius (September 1) and two following days.<sup>2</sup> On June 25, 1276, King Edward I. gave a similar license for a Fair to be held at Attingham on the day of St. Augustine in May (May 26) and two following days.<sup>3</sup>

In 1304 we have it recorded that Abbot William de Brugge assessed a *tallage* on his *Burgesses of Atyngham*. The levy amounted to £2. 3s. 7d.<sup>4</sup>

An undated Rent-roll of Lilleshall Abbey gives 16s. 5½d. as receivable from Ettingham at Michaelmas, and 14s. 1d. at Midlent. Besides this a Fulling-mill there produced £1. 3s. 4d. half-yearly.

An account of Roger Beist, as the Abbot's Bailiff at Atcham in 16 Henry VIII. (1524-5) is extant; but the summary given in the *Valor* of 1534-5 is enough for me to quote.—

The rents receivable from Atcham were £35 *per annum*; while the Rectorial tithes were fermed for £10. 6s. 8d.

The charges on this income were,—a chief-rent of 2s. to the Earl of Arundel for lands, said to be in Atcham (but which were originally perhaps in Berwick), a salary of 13s. 4d. to Francis Chorleton, as Seneschal, and another of 40s. to Thomas Sugdon, as Bailiff of

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 57.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Cartarum*, 53 Hen. III., m. 5.  
(The original in the possession of Mr.

George Morris of Shrewsbury.)

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Cartarum*, 4 Edw. I., No. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 153.

Atcham. The Abbot also paid the Archdeacon of Salop 6s. 8d. for the Procurations of Atcham Church.<sup>1</sup>

The *Ministers' Accounts* of 1540-1 give the following receipts from Attingham.—Assized rents 9s. 6d.; Rents of Tenants at will £1. 3s. 8d.; Diverse ferms £28. 9s. 4d.; Ferm of Mill £6. 13s. 4d.; Perquisites of Court 8s. 10d. Total £37. 4s. 8d.

#### ATCHAM CHURCH.

There is no case in which it is so clear as in this of Atcham, that the non-mention of a parochial Church, in *Domesday*, is no proof of the non-existence of such a Church.—

On Easter Sunday (April 5) 1075, that is, ten years before *Domesday* was compiled, Ordericus the Historian was “baptized at Ettingesham, in the Church of St. Eatta the Confessor, which is seated on the bank of the River Severn.” This fact we learn from the narrative of Ordericus himself, that simple, truthful, and earnest Monk, to whose labours we owe so much;—so much knowledge, not merely of the early annals of a county, but of a kingdom.


It is not my purpose to make Atcham Church a text for any biography of Ordericus. The touching story cannot be better told than in his own words; and, if a commentary be wanting, we have it in forms with which we may be well content. The spirit of submission and self-sacrifice, the spirit of love and of prayer, when embodied in the writings of a cloistered Monk, may fail to attract aught of homage from sectarian intolerance; but the zeal and faith of Ordericus have been more than once recognized by minds which could contemplate the subject with a larger catholicity and a more Christian sympathy.<sup>2</sup>

We have seen that Atcham Church was dedicated to St. Eatta the Confessor, whose day fell on October 26, while the Feast of St. Giles (September 1) was selected for the Epoch of an annual Fair. The theory therefore is non-universal, which supposes that there was any necessary association between the two things,—the Saint's-day of a Parish Church, and the Saint's-day of a Parish Fair.


As to St. Eatta, something is known of his life, but little of his end. Being Abbot of Melrose in 651, he became Abbot of Lindisfarne in 664, and in both positions distinguished himself as the early friend of, the afterwards great, St. Cuthbert. He was founder of Ripon Minster. In 677-8 he was consecrated Bishop of the

<sup>1</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 197, 198.

<sup>2</sup> See *Hist. of Shrewsbury*, Vol. I. pp. 66-70; and *Antiquities of Bridgnorth* (by the Rev. G. Bellett), pp. 94-97.



ATCHAM CHURCH.



Bernicians, that is, of Lindisfarne. In 684-5 St. Cuthbert, being appointed to the See of Hexham, exchanged with St. Eata. Some accounts say that Eata died in 685, others that he was driven from his See. It appears certain that Atcham Church was dedicated to him, and we have seen that the meaning of Ettingham is *the home of the children of Eata*. Further than this I can hardly go. It is perhaps possible that an Abbot and Bishop of the seventh century, being bound by no law of celibacy, may have left descendants, and that those descendants, removing into Mercia, may have colonized Atcham and dedicated its Church to their canonized progenitor.

I have related in a former Volume how, in the reign of Stephen, Atcham Church gained two-thirds of the tithes of Emstrey.<sup>1</sup> Archbishop Theobald's letter, enjoining the restoration of these tithes to Shrewsbury Abbey, speaks of the recent change in the patronage of the Church of Ettingham, viz. "that it was among the endowments of Lilleshall Abbey."

It was Archbishop Thomas à Becket (1162-1170) who first allowed the Canons of Lilleshall to appropriate Atcham Church.<sup>2</sup> His Successor, Richard, confirmed his Charter.<sup>3</sup> The *Taxation* of 1291 values the Church of Ettingham (in Salop Deanery) at £6. 18s. 4d. *per annum*.<sup>4</sup> In 1341, this *Taxation* being duly quoted as one of 10 merks, the Assessors charged the Parish only £5 for the *Ninth* of its wheat, wool, and lamb. The *Church-Taxation*, they said, involved a carucate of land which was the Abbot of Lilleshall's glebe as Rector. The said glebe and the small tithes could not be reckoned in estimating the *Ninth*, though, when a tenth was granted by the clergy on their gross receipts, these items were included in the Rector's assessment. Moreover, two virgates of land in the parish lay untitled, from the tenants' want of means.<sup>5</sup>

The *Valor* of 1534-5 values the preferment of Thomas Apulby, Vicar of Attyngnam, at £11. 10s. *per annum*, less 3s. 4d. for synodals and procurations.<sup>6</sup>

#### INCUMBENTS OF ATCHAM.

ORDRIC the Priest, who, in 1075, baptized and stood Sponsor for the Historian Ordericus, was probably Incumbent of Atcham. If so, he is perhaps the earliest Parish Priest that can be named for any locality in Shropshire.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. pp. 171, 172.

<sup>2</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fos. 46.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, fo. 49.

<sup>4</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 247.

<sup>5</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 184.

<sup>6</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 183.

Cocus or Tocus, Priest of Etingham, probably lived in Stephen's reign, for his son Alan occurs about 1157.<sup>1</sup>

HUGH occurs (says Mr. Blakeway) about 1167.

RICHARD DE LILLESHELL, Priest, was instituted to this Vicarage on August 20, 1305, at presentation of the Abbot and Convent of Lilleshull. He was perhaps a Canon of Lilleshull, for Bishop Langton swore him to reside.

HUGH DE WESTON, "a poor Priest," was collated to this Vicarage by Bishop Northburg, on January 27, 1338. This was under a *provision* of Pope Benedict XII., who had ordered the Bishop thus to bestow one of the Abbot of Lilleshall's Benefices. In 1346 Hugh de Weston exchanged livings with—

JOHN DE DERBYTON, late Vicar of Ditton Priors,<sup>2</sup> who on November 17, 1346, again exchanged with—

WILLIAM DE ERCALWE, late Rector of Abdon.<sup>3</sup>

WILLIAM GODITH, Vicar of Attingham, being deceased on March 13, 1374,—

JOHN DEL WOLD, was instituted, on the presentation of the Abbot and Convent of Lilleshall. In June 1401, this person, as *John Bolde* Vicar of Attyngnam, joins William Attyngnam, Chaplain, in granting to Bartholomew, Chaplain of Wombridge, a cottage at Uppington, which the Grantors had by feoffment of William, Vicar of Wroxeter. Witnesses, William Poynor, etc.<sup>4</sup>

SIR RICHARD WESTON, Chaplain, was instituted to this Vicarage on February 22, 1418. Same Patrons.

---

## Albright-Lee.

---

"THE same Church (St. Alkmund's) held (in Saxon times) and still holds Etbretelie. Here is one hide. In demesne is one ox-team, and (there are) 11 Villains and one Boor with a team. Here is one league of wood; but Earl Roger hath taken it from the Church. The value (of the Manor) was and is 12s. (*per annum*)."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 278.

<sup>2-3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 337; Vol. IV. p. 132.

<sup>4</sup> Wombridge Chartulary, *Tit. Upinton*, No. 131.

<sup>5</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 253, a, 1.

The ancient connection between this Manor and St. Alkmund's Church is illustrated by its parochial status. It is still a township in St. Alkmund's Parish.

The interests of Lilleshall Abbey, at Albright Lee, are marked by a very curious succession of documents. Thomas Burnel, of Acton Burnell, was the Abbot's Tenant here in 1195. The following agreement, which I must give in the original form, will be found to have passed on May 10, 1195, soon after Archbishop Hubert had reduced Carrechova Castle, and during the last illness of Thomas Burnel.—

*Hæc est convencio inter Abbatem de Lilleshull et Thomam Burnel in vigiliâ Ascensionis proximæ postquam Castellum de Karrechove redditum fuit a Walensibus Domino Regi per Dominum Cantuariensem;—scilicet quod Dominus Abbas, ad petitionem Thomæ et aliorum amicorum concessit Willielmo Burnel fratri suo, vel cui ipse Willielmus voluerit de fratribus suis, villam de Edbricteleg, tenendam de eo per firmam quam Thomas reddere solebat, tantum in villâ sud, si contigerit ipsum Thomam mori infirmitate quâ detinebatur die hujus convencionis;—ita quod nec aliquis heredum suorum jus in eadem villâ poterit reclamare post decessum ejus. Willielmus faciet in Curia Regis securitatem qualemcumque Abbas voluerit. Et Dominus Benjamin<sup>1</sup> ex parte Abbatis et per preceptum ejus affidavit hanc convencionem fideliter observandam.*

In less than a month after this agreement Thomas Burnel died, without issue, leaving his brother William his heir;<sup>2</sup>—and Archbishop Hubert, having doffed his armour, was in Eyre, with his associates, as Chief Justice of England. In fulfilment of the above agreement a Fine was levied on June 3, 1195, at Lichfield, of which this was the substance.—

*Hæc est finalis concordia facta in Curia Regis apud Lichesfeld anno regni Regis Ricardi VI<sup>to</sup>, die Sabbati proximâ post festum Beatorum Marcellini et Petri, coram venerabili patre H. Cantuar. Archiepiscopo, totius Angliæ Primate et Apostolicæ Sedis Legato, et Willielmo de Warenn. et Rad. de Ardern, et Willielmo Precentore Sti Pauli London. et Rann. Thesaurario Sarresburie et Hugone de Chaucumb et aliis fidelibus domini Regis, inter Willielmum Burnel petentem et Abbatem et Canonicos de Lilleshull tenentes, de villâ de Edbricteleg, unde placitum erat inter eos in eadem Curia. Willielmus Burnel tenebit villam de Abbate omnibus diebus vitæ suæ ad firmam, solvendo xv solidos annuatim, ita quod nec vendere nec in-*

<sup>1</sup> A Canon of Lilleshall (supra, p. 108).

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 122.

*vadiare nec in dote dare &c. poterit, quominus revertatur Abbati. Si Willielmus habitum religionis susceperit, vel in peregrinationem ierit, villa revertetur Abbati.—Si Willielmus villam vel partem villæ vendere voluerit, per taxationem<sup>1</sup> Abbatum de Bildewas et de Hagemon dimittet Abbati de Lilleshull: Interim Abbas de Lilleshull habebit pasturam et aisiamenta bosci sine vasto. Willielmus non faciet inde vastum. Preterea Willielmus concessit Abbati et Canonicis aisiamenta bosci sui de Langheleg ad usus eorum necessarios in Ettingeham. Willielmus quietum clamavit jus quod dicebat se habere hereditarie in villâ de Edbricteleg secundum cyrographum inter Abbatem et Canonicos et Thomam Burnel fratrem suum in Curia Regis factum, et cyrographum illud eis reddidit.<sup>2</sup> Ad instanciam insuper et petitionem utriusque partis apposuit Venerabilis Pater, H. Cantuar. et alii Magnati—<sup>3</sup>*

We may observe in the transactions of Lilleshall Abbey that it was the continual policy of the Canons to avoid giving feoffments-in-fee. They preferred the life-lease to any other form of demise; and it was thus that the value of their estates kept pace with the increasing value of land and the decreasing value of money. The trouble which, in the present instance, they took to change any real or supposed feoffment of the Burnels, into a lease, ultimately succeeded; but it is clear that the Burnels long held to some tradition that they were entitled to be hereditary tenants of Albrightlee.

On the death of William Burnel (II.), the above Grantee for life, that is about the year 1220, his son and heir William Burnel (III.) came in an evening to Albrightlee and took possession of the estate; but was ejected that very night by Abbot Alan. William hereupon sued the Abbey for disseizin. The cause was heard at the Assizes of August 1226. The question was whether Alan, Abbot of Lilleshull (he was dead, be it observed), had unjustly disseized William Burnell of his free tenement in Edbricteleg. The Abbot (it must have been Abbot William) appeared and exhibited the Lichfield Fine made with the Plaintiff's Father. The Plaintiff now acknowledged the Fine, and was not merely nonsuited, but committed to gaol, for having tried to controvert a Fine. He seems to have compounded for his freedom by a payment of 20s.<sup>4</sup>

Again at the Assizes of September 1272 this question was re-

<sup>1</sup> That is *valuation*.

<sup>2</sup> This earlier Cyrograph is not extant. Of course it was the interest of the Lilleshall Canons to suppress or destroy it.

<sup>3</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 80.—

Here the Record abruptly ends. I suppose something was to have been added about sealing;—but it was unusual for Justiciars to seal a Fine.

<sup>4</sup> *Assizes*, 10 Hen. III., m. 4.

opened by Richard Burnel (of Langley) as son and representative of William Burnel (III.). The issue which went to the Jury was "whether Alan, former Abbot of Lilleshall, had disseized William Burnel, Richard's father, of the Manor of Adbrihtleye?" The Jury found that a certain Abbot had given a life-grant to the present Plaintiff's grandfather, William; that on William's death, another William, Richard's father, entered, and was ejected as aforesaid by Abbot Alan, and that this happened 10 years before the King's first transference into Brittany (*i. e.* ten years before April 1230). In this case Richard Burnel *took nothing*. However his claim does not seem to have been altogether worthless, for on November 3, 1273, a Fine was levied at Westminster, whereby Richard Burnel, Plaintiff, *quitclaims* the Manor of Adbrihtleye to William, Abbot of Lilleshall, and receives 10 merks.

So much for the interest of the Burnels in this Manor. I now return to notice a dispute between the Abbots of Haughmond and Lilleshall, which probably took place early in the 13th century. The erection of a Mill at Pimley, by the Canons of Haughmond, has been already noticed.<sup>1</sup> It seems to have caused the stream called Pimbrook, to back-pound (*redundare*) upon Albrightlee. Hence the litigation, which was settled by the following agreement.<sup>2</sup>—The Lilleshall Canons allowed that the said *redundation* should continue, but its degree was to be determined by a stone, called *La Barra*, which being placed near the watercourse was always to remain dry. The Fishery in Pymbroc and in Sumergeld was to belong to Haughmond, from Pimley Mill-stank up to the said *Barra*, on both sides the stream; but from the *Barra*, upwards to Edbricteleg, and from the limit of the *redundation* in Sumergeld, the stream was to be common to both parties, as it had been of old. The Haughmond Canons, in return for all this, paid 12 merks down, undertook to make a bridge, and further transferred to Lilleshall an annual rent of one merk which was receivable from the Monks of Buildwas for Cuttesdon.<sup>3</sup>

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 does not mention Albright-

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. pp. 305, 308.

<sup>2</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 82.

<sup>3</sup> Cuttesdon, near Sheriff Hales, an estate granted to Haughmond by Fitz Alan and Pantulf, but since leased by Haughmond to the Buildwas Monks, who had an adjoining estate at Brookton.

The Lilleshall Chartulary (fo. 60) con-

tains another document whereby William Abbot of Hagmon (circa 1226-7) formally assigns the merk rent due from Buildwas, on Cuttesdon, to Lilleshall Abbey. The consideration is—*pro redundacione aquæ vivarii nostri de Pimbeley habendū supra terram suam (i. e. the Abbot of Lilleshall's land) de Edbricteley.*

lee; but the Tenure-Roll, thirty years later, does. It says that Albright-lee was held *in capite* by the Abbot of Lilleshull as a member of St. Alchmund's Church.

An Abbey Rent-Roll, of uncertain date, gives the income from Edbricteleg as 12*s.* 4*d.* at Michaelmas, and 11*s.* 6½*d.* at Midlent, over and above the Bailiff's Salary.

The *Valor* of 1535-6 probably includes the Abbot's receipts from Albrightlee in the £26, said to arise from the Town of Salop. The *Ministers' Accounts*, five years later, do not include any item which can be taken to represent the dissolved Abbey's receipts from Albrightlee.

The principal UNDERTENANT whom I can name under this Manor is Richard de Edbricteleg, who was amerced 6*s.* 8*d.* at the Assizes of 1221, *quia retraxit se*. At a Forest Assize, held in 1231, the whole Vill of Edbricteleg was amerced 20*s.* for default; while Roger Mainard of Adbrithteleg, Robert de Aldebrithteleg, and Robert fitz Ralph de Edbrithteleg, appear as liable to smaller fines.

---

## Charlton near Shawbury.

---

THIS place has no modern representative. The name is lost, but the land of course remains, and its situation may be half guessed by a hint which has already transpired.<sup>1</sup> There are however some difficulties in the investigation, and the first of these difficulties is that rare thing,—an error in *Domesday*. That Record places the Manor or a part of it in Culvestan Hundred. It was unquestionably either in Bascherch or Recordine. I have alluded to the question twice before,<sup>2</sup> and now prefer to treat Charlton as a Recordine Manor. I speak, for the present, only of St. Alkmund's share of the Manor;—if indeed it was a divided Manor, as there is reason to think that it was. *Domesday* describes this share as follows.—

“The same Church (St. Alkmund's) held (in Saxon times) and still holds Cerletone. Here is one hide. There was and is one

<sup>1</sup> Viz., that it lay between Shawbury and Morton Corbet, and near some tributary of the River Roden, then called

Cressewall-brook (supra, p. 144).

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. V. page 1; and Vol. VII. page 202.

Radman here. The Manor (or the Radman) used to pay 4s. rent. Now it (or he) pays 5s."<sup>1</sup>

Among the Prebendal estates of St. Alkmund's, mentioned in Pope Alexander's Bull, and confirmed therein to Lilleshall Abbey, we observe *Cherlton*, and *nine acres in another Cherlton*.<sup>2</sup> The last Cherlton I take to have been near Preston Gubbalds, the first to have been near Shawbury. King John's confirmation also enumerates Cherlton among the same Prebendal estates.

About the year 1177 (indeed that very year is given by an unvouched authority as the date of the transaction), the Abbot of Lilleshall and his Tenant at Charlton settled some misunderstanding as to the terms of tenancy.—Richard de Chorleton acknowledged to Abbot Walter that he had held the tenement called Chorleton by favour of Abbot William, and for Abbot William's life only, and that he had nothing of right therein. The Abbot and Convent in return allowed the said Richard to hold 3 virgates in Chorleton for life, paying a rent of one *petra* of wax<sup>3</sup> yearly at Michaelmas. A fourth virgate was retained by the Abbot in demesne. Richard bound himself not to permit any of his people to mortgage or alienate the premises from the Church of Lilleshull. If he should wish to get rid of the tenancy, he was to commit it to none but the Abbot. If he should wish to change his state of life, he was to assume the habit of Religion in the Abbey, and at his decease he was to leave his body, with the aforesaid land, thereto. Richard de Chorleton swore to observe this agreement in the County-Court of Salop, where it was read aloud, and confirmed by the Sheriff's seal. Afterwards he swore to observe it before the Convent of Lilleshull.<sup>4</sup>

In Hilary Term 1243 the Abbot of Lilleshull was suing Ralph de Cherlton for half a virgate in Cherlton, alleging that the said Ralph had obtained ingress only through the demise of Ralph, a former Abbot, who had acted against the will of his Chapter. Ralph de Cherlton on the other hand maintained that he inherited the premises from his mother Edith, who had died seized thereof.<sup>5</sup>

In Easter Term 1243, Ralph de Cherlton not appearing at Westminster, the half-virgate was seized *in manu Regis*.<sup>6</sup>

In Easter Term 1250 judgment in this cause was still unpronounced. I find Ralph de Cherlton attesting an Orleton Deed in

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 263, a. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, p. 219.

<sup>3</sup> The *Petra* was 12 lbs. or 14 lbs.

<sup>4</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fos. 61, 62, 81.

<sup>5</sup> <sup>6</sup> *Placita*, Hil. Tm., 27 Hen. III., m.

5; Pasch. Tm. 27 Hen. III., m. 14 *dorso*.

1248, and attending a Rodington Inquest in 1274 and a Shrewsbury Inquest in 1276.

Between the years 1275 and 1282 Henry de Erdinton, Lord of Shawbury, quitclaimed to L. (Lucas), Abbot of Lilleshall, and his Successors, all the right which he had in the common-pasture of the Abbot's whole Fee of Cherleton Grange. Witnesses, Sir Robert Corbet, Sir John fitz Aer, Sir John de Erkelowe, and Sir Roger Tyrel, Knights; Hugh de Bolinghale, and Roger de Preston.

On July 25, 1279, the same Henry de Erdinton gave to the Abbey of Lilleshall a certain meadow called Schanberieseye.<sup>1</sup> Both these grants were recited and confirmed in Edward I.'s Confirmation to Lilleshall in 1285.

An early Rent-Roll of Lilleshall Abbey describes this estate as *Cherleton juxta Stanton*. This gives a further hint as to its situation, viz. that it lay in the direction of Stanton Hyneheath. At the date of this Roll, nothing in the way of income appears to have been receivable by the Abbey from this Cherleton.

In the *Taxation* of 1291 the Abbot's receipts from Cherleton, in the Deanery of Salop, were—Assized Rents, 13s. 4d.; income from a meadow, £1.<sup>2</sup>

A Patent of March 10, 1336, allows Robert Corbet of Morton to give the Abbot of Lilleshall 3 acres of land in Morton Corbet, in exchange for 3 acres in Cherleton.

The *Valor* (1534-5) gives the Abbot of Lylleshull an income of £6 from Chorleton.<sup>3</sup> The *Ministers' Accounts*, six years later, make Chorlton's Grange to be worth £6. 13s. 4d. *per annum*.<sup>4</sup>

PABOCHIALLY, Charlton was a member of Shawbury. This brought the Abbot of Haughmond (as Rector of Shawbury) into collision with the Abbot of Lilleshall. However the Lilleshall Chartulary preserves a composition whereby the Abbot of Haghmon releases to the Abbot of Lilleshall the small tithes of all live-stock (*animalium*) in the vill of Chorleton, and the tithes of all assarts, vivaries, mills, and meadows, which the Abbot of Lilleshall had in the said vill and within the Parish of Sahebyr'.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chartulary, fo. 123.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 261.

<sup>3</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 197.

<sup>4</sup> *Monasticon*, VI. 265.

<sup>5</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 86.

## CERLITONE.

---

WITH respect to this Manor I must first quote the exact words of *Domesday*.—

“IN RECORDINE HUNDRED. Rogerius tenet de Comite Cerlitone. Uluric tenuit. Ibi i hida. Ibi ii servientes habent dimidiam carrucam; et una carruca et dimidia adhuc possent esse. Wastum fuit: modo reddit v solidos.”<sup>1</sup>

It is not quite certain whether the person here described as *Rogerus*, was Roger fitz Corbet, or Roger de Lacy. If the former, Cerlitone was his only Manor in Recordine Hundred. But at no subsequent period can any interest of Roger fitz Corbet, or Roger de Lacy, or their successors, be so traced in Recordine Hundred, as to establish the identity or situation of this Manor of Cerlitone. On the contrary, the doubt about the personal identity of the *Domesday Rogerius* does but increase a further doubt about the local identity of the *Domesday Cerlitone*.

This last question of identity must however be discussed, if only to show its difficulties. I know but of three theories worth stating.—

1. The first is, that Corbet's (or Lacy's) hide in Cerlitone was a part, that is a half, of Charlton near Shawbury, and that the other half (written in *Domesday* as *Cerletone*) was that Manor of St. Alkmund's, of which we were last treating.

In support of this theory, we find that there was another Manor (Preston Montford) which Roger fitz Corbet (or Roger de Lacy) shared with St. Alkmund's Church, and that in that Manor all subsequent interest of Corbet, or Lacy, vanished, and no interest but that of St. Alkmund remained.<sup>2</sup>

Again, the *Domesday* rent of the hide called *Cerletone* was tantamount to the rent of the hide called *Cerlitone*, viz. 5*s*. Lastly, Uluric, Saxon Lord of *Cerlitone*, had also a concern in Withington, Great Withiford, and Sleaf;—places with respect to which Charlton near Shawbury will be found central and more or less contiguous.

2. The second theory as to the identity of *Cerlitone* would make

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 255, b.

<sup>2</sup> Vide *supra*, Vol. VII. p. 194, where however I have not taken into considera-

tion that the *Rogerus* of *Domesday* might have been Roger de Lacy. I will speak more fully on that point under Montford.

it a part of the *Domesday Manor* of Cherrington, written *Cerlintone* in that Record.

In support of this theory we find that the hidage of *Cerlintone* (3 hides), when added to that of *Cerlitone* (1 hide), realizes the exact measurement (4 hides), of which Cherrington consisted in 1255.<sup>1</sup>

3. A third theory is that Corbet's, or Lacy's, estate of *Cerlitone* was near to Preston-Gobalds, and eventually became a possession of Lilleshall Abbey, and a reputed member of Preston-Gobalds.

When we see that Pope Alexander III.'s confirmation to Lilleshall speaks of *Cherlton*, and 9 acres in another *Cherlton*, as possessions of St. Alkmund's, we can hardly help concluding that two distinct places were alluded to. The same impression arises from the fact of Charlton near Shawbury having been called *Charlton juxta Stanton*, and so distinguished from *St. Elstrud's Charlton*, in the Lilleshall Rent-Roll already quoted.

An undated Inquest, in the Lilleshall Chartulary, speaks as follows.—“The Jurors say that the Abbot of Lilleshall holds Preston (Preston-Gobalds is meant), with its members, viz. Cherlton and Lee, of the Fee of the King, and it is geldable, and pertains to St. Alkmund's. Here is a hide of land, &c. &c. The said Abbot has in Cherlton 2 acres in demesne, and they are worth £4 (Query 4s.) yearly. Also he has meadow-land there, worth 10s. Also he has heath and moor there, containing 4 acres, and worth 3s. *per annum*.” Then follows a valuation of Lee. I will discuss this subject no further. The loss or cession of *Cerlitone*, whether by Lacy or Corbet, is consistent with its subsequent annexation to some other Manor, whether Charlton near Shawbury, or Cherrington, or Preston-Gobalds. In any case we have some later account of the territory thus involved, under the Manor which may be supposed to have involved it.

---

## Peplow.

---

RALPH de Mortimer had three Manors in Recordine Hundred, all held under Earl Roger. They were Peplow, Preston on the

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 198.

Wealdmoors, and Isombridge. Of Peplow *Domesday* speaks as follows.—

“Radulfus holds Papelau of Earl Roger. Orgrim and Uluric held it (in Saxon times) for two Manors. Here are *iii* hides, geldable. The (arable) land is sufficient to employ *vii* ox-teams. In demesne there is *i* team; and (there are) *ii* Serfs and *v* Villains with *iii* teams. In King Edward’s time the Manor was worth *46s.* (*per annum*); now it is worth *12s. 4d.* He (Radulf) found it waste.”<sup>1</sup>

That Ralph de Mortimer lost his three Recordine Manors soon after *Domesday*, and possibly by forfeiture for his rebellion in 1088, are subjects already alluded to in the analogous case of Cosford.<sup>2</sup> It is Peplow that furnishes an all but reliable proof that, between the years 1094 and 1098, the Manors which were lost to Mortimer were held by Earl Hugh de Montgomery in demesne. The spurious Charter wherein that Earl is said to have granted to Shrewsbury Abbey the tithes of his demesnes of *Hodneth* and of *Peopelaw*,<sup>3</sup> is confirmed by his less suspicious Charter,<sup>4</sup> and by the Abbot’s subsequent possession of those tithes. After the forfeiture of the Norman Earls, and probably by Henry I., Peplow was annexed to the *Fee of Hodnet*; that is, it became manorially, as it had been parochially, a member of Hodnet, and so was held *in capite* by the Lords of Hodnet, the hereditary Seneschals of Montgomery Castle.

It is probable, I think, that Little Bolas was originally a member of Peplow, and was, with Peplow, annexed to Hodnet. Thus I understand the *Feodary* of 1284, when it enumerates *Peppelowe* and *Bolewas* among the members of Hodnet. So too on the death of William de Ludlow in 1316, Boulwas and Peppelowe are noted as members of his Manor of Hodnet.

The succession of the Lords of Hodnet as already given under Westbury,<sup>5</sup> and hereafter to be recapitulated under Hodnet, gives us therefore the fullest account of the Mesne-Lords of Peplow and Little Bolas. I have little more to say distinctively of Peplow, except to notice that family of Swynnerton which held it under the Hodnets.—

At the Assizes of 1203, Adam Forester essoigned the attendance of Robert de Swinnerton, who was included in the *general summons*. A fine of November 25, 1231, gives Ralph fitz Odo as Tenant of 3

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, a, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>4</sup> *Salop Chartulary*, Nos. 5 and 8.

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 53 et seqq.

virgates of land and a Mill in Peppelawe. I think that this Ralph was identical with Ralph or Randulf de Hodnet, mentioned on former pages as occurring about this period.<sup>1</sup> By the Fine now under notice, he surrenders to Robert de Swinnerton, Plaintiff, the above land and mill in Peppelawe. In return Swinnerton guarantees him an annuity of 40s. receivable half-yearly at Swinnerton (Staffordshire), with power, in case of arrears, to distrain upon that Manor. He further pays him 10 merks down.<sup>2</sup>

By another Fine levied in Trinity Term 1281, John de Swynnerton (Impedient) recognizes the right of Richard son of Eudo de Hodenet (Plaintiff) to a Mill and 20s. rent in Peppelowe. In return Richard allows that John de Swinnerton and the heirs of his body shall hold the premises by payment of a penny rent to Richard and his heirs, and by performance of all capital services. In default of any heirs of John de Swinnerton's body, the premises were to revert to Richard and his heirs,—to hold of the Lords of the Fee.

It would seem that this remainder took effect. At the Assizes of 1292, the Bradford Jurors presented Richard de Hodnet as holding half the vill of Peppelowe, value 40s. *per annum*. The legality of the tenure was in question, it seems, as an alienation of part of the Serjeantry of Hodnet. The cause was adjourned in consequence of Richard de Hodnet's Fine, already noticed under Westbury.<sup>3</sup> The ultimate settlement of the matter transpires below.

On April 24, 1374, it was found by Inquest to be no injury to the Crown, if Sir John de Ludlow, Knight, should enfeof Thomas de Hodnet in 8 messuages and 3 carucates of land in Hodnet, Popelawe, and Heyford, so that Thomas should re-enfeof Sir John and his heirs, receiving in exchange the Manor of Henley near Ludlow, to hold to Thomas, and his wife Johanna, and the bodily heirs of Thomas. The messuages and carucates aforesaid were members of Hodnet, and held *in capite*, and one Richard de Hodnet had sometime charged himself with a chief-rent of 15s. payable to the Crown for the same. Henley Manor<sup>4</sup> was held of the Earl of March (as Lord of Ludlow, I presume).<sup>5</sup>

PEPLOW CHAPEL. The Chartulary of Shrewsbury Abbey is quoted<sup>6</sup> as an authority for including Peplow among the Chapelries

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. pp. 77, 94.

<sup>2</sup> Robert de Swynnerton fined one merk for license to make this concord. His Surety was Geoffrey de Swynesheved (*Rot. Pip.* 15 Hen. III.).

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 58.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, Vol. IV. pp. 375-6.

<sup>5</sup> *Inquisitions*, 48 Edw. III. (2nd Numbers), No. 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Dukes's Antiquities*, Appendix, p. x.

subject to Hodnet Church. My abstract of the said Chartulary does not enable me to verify the quotation.

## Preston on the Wealdmoors.

THIS Manor is noticed in *Domesday* as follows.—

“Radulf (de Mortemer) holds Prestune of Earl Roger. Burre held it (in Saxon times). Here is 1 hide, geldable. There is (arable) land (enough) for 1111 ox-teams. In demesne is one team; and (there are) 11 Neatherds and 111 Villains with one team. Here is half a league of wood. The old value of the Manor was 40s. (*per annum*), now it is worth 20s.”<sup>1</sup>

In its forfeiture by Ralph de Mortimer, and its subsequent annexation to the *Fee of Hodnet*, Preston is associated with Peplow, though we cannot trace it in its intermediate state as a Manor of the Earl Palatine’s demesne.

Among the outlawed companions of Fulk fitz Warin who were pardoned by Patent of November 1203, I notice the following, viz. Baldwin de Hodnet, Roger de Preston, John de Preston, and Richard de Preston. Of these it is certain that Roger de Preston was one of Baldwin de Hodnet’s brothers. It is probable that he had a feoffment at Preston on the Wealdmoors, from which he took his name. It is certain that he held something in the neighbouring vill of Horton under Baldwin de Hodnet; for Roger de Preston gave to Lilleshall Abbey half a virgate in Horton, held under him by *Sierius Rotarius*; and this grant was afterwards confirmed by Odo son of Baldwin de Hodnet, who calls Roger de Preston his Uncle.<sup>2</sup>

But before this, and in the time of Henry II. and of Richard I., there was one Pagan de Preston. Him, with his brothers Eustace and Roger, we have seen attesting two grants to Wombridge Priory.<sup>3</sup> Now this Pagan was not, I think, a Hodnet; but only Hodnet’s Tenant in the whole or the greater part of Preston. All that I

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, a, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 67.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 155; Vol. VII. p. 341.—  
One Roger de Preston also attests singly

about 1188 (*supra*, Vol. II. p. 279, note 51). It is difficult to say whether he was the brother of Baldwin de Hodnet or of Pagan de Preston.

know more of him is that he left four daughters and coheirs, viz. Agnes, Sabina, Margery, and Sibil. These Ladies concurred in a grant to Lilleshall Abbey, which will show the husbands of three of them at the time of its passing.—

William de Preston with consent of his wife Agnes, William de Horton with consent of his wife Sabina, Thomas Rabac with consent of his wife Margery, and Sibil de Preston, in her sole and liege power, concede, to the Abbey, power to make a stank for the Abbot's Vivary in Hollebroc, in the Moor of Horrebur', at Hundefordehull,<sup>1</sup> or higher up (the brook), if a higher site should be preferred, in any land, not arable, of the Grantors. Moreover they renounce all the right which they had in the Park called *Le Haye Gubald*. For this the Lilleshall Canons gave them 3½ merks in their *urgent necessity*.

The above Deed is entitled in the Chartulary as *Carta sororum de Preston de stagno vivarii de Lubsty ibi firmando et exaltando*;—a description which shows that it was the Abbot's wish to secure the command of the small stream which runs between Preston and Lubstree Park.

The date of the above grant may be partly determined by the confirmation of Baldwin de Hodnet (1204–1224), who “concedes the concession which the heirs of Pagan de Preston, his Vassals (*homines*) had made, in respect of the stank of the Canons' Vivary of Lubesty, and in respect of their Park there.”<sup>2</sup>

Subsequently to this, Agnes, daughter to Pagan de Preston, authorized two renewals of her former grant. In one case she appears as a widow; in the other, as wife of a second husband, Roger de Preston;<sup>3</sup>—possibly that very Roger whom we have seen to be Baldwin de Hodnet's brother.

So too Sabina de Preston renewed her former grant, as the widow of William de Horton.<sup>4</sup>

I find it impossible to trace the succession of each Coheiress of Preston; neither am I sure whether some of the persons now to

<sup>1</sup> These localities are probably to be identified at the present day. The Duke of Sutherland's farm, called Lubstree Park, is divided from the Preston-Hospital estate by a small but now nameless stream, doubtless the ancient *Hollebroc*. A meadow, in the above farm, abutting on the said stream, is called *Hamber* or *Homber meadow*. The latter, folks say,

is only a corruption of *hammer meadow*, and they attribute the name to the sometime existence of a forge near the spot. However, two fields in Lubstree Park are known as the *Near* and the *Far Hungerhill*, and they unquestionably represent the *Hundefordehull* of the text.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup> Lilleshall Chartulary, fo. 70.

<sup>4</sup> Ibidem, fo. 71.

be mentioned were themselves Coparceners, or only tenants of the several Coparceners. I have probably named some of the descendants of William and Sabina de Horton under Horton itself.

THOMAS RABACE, or RABAZ, occurs as a Surety, a Witness or a Juror in 1231, 1235, 1248, 1249, 1253, 1255, and 1258. In 1256, at the Assizes, one Henry Capel challenged Robert son of Thomas Rabaz for a violent assault, and Thomas the father for instigating it; but both charges were withdrawn. In 1258, Thomas Rabaz was party to a Fine of one virgate in Preston which has already been set forth.<sup>1</sup> The appearance is as if his heir, or at least the heir of his wife, was called Robert de la Forde.

SIBIL DE PRESTON, though a widow in or before 1224, was living in 1255. At that time she and Thomas Rabaz held two out of several shares in a hide of land at Pontesbury,<sup>2</sup> but I cannot make out that the other shareholders were descendants of Pagan de Preston.

WILLIAM DE PRESTON, the first husband of Agnes de Preston, may have been identical with William fitz Walter of Preston, who in 1209 was twice assessed for *imbladements* within regard of the Wrekin Forest.

ADAM DE PRESTON occurs as a Witness or Juror in 1249, 1256, 1258, 1260, 1262, 1264, 1279, 1280, and 1284.

In 1256 he was impleaded by John de Preston and Agnes his wife, for disseizing them of a tenement in Preston;—but they withdrew the suit, and were with their Sureties (William de Erleton and Adam Pride of Salop) *in misericordia*.

In 1262, he (Adam de Preston) was a Verderer of the Shropshire Forests, and in 1284 one of the Regarders of the same. Possibly there were two Adams in succession.

In 1262, the vill of *Preston in Wyldmore* was amerced 3 shillings by the Forest-Justices for neglecting to attend an Inquest, and Alan de Preston, resident in Wellington, was amerced 1s. for *vert*.

JOHN DE PRESTON, above mentioned as a litigant in 1256, occurs on a local Jury in 1264.

RALF DE PRESTON occurs similarly, about 1258, and in 1264.

RICHARD DE PRESTON attests a Wombridge Deed about 1264.

ROGER DE PRESTON occurs as an Attorney in 1269 and as a witness from about 1271 to 1290.

HUGH DE BETLE and WILLIAM FITZ RONDULF, both of Preston, were Jurors on a Wellington Inquest in 1278.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. II. p. 316.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 143.

The *Feodary* of 1284 merely names Preston as a member of Hodnet, but says nothing of its tenure. This omission is supplied by the Assize-Roll of 1292, when Pagan de Preston, William de Preston, Richard de Forde, and William de Horton, were questioned as to their tenure of this alleged member of the Serjeantry of Hodnet. They appeared, and stated that their ancestors had held Preston under the Lords of Hodnet from the time when Roger de Beleme, Earl of Salop, enfeoffed William de Hodnet's ancestors in the Serjeantry of Hodnet. A Jury was got to corroborate this statement, which, though it contained a falsehood as to name, and probably as to date, was doubtless correct in assigning a very high antiquity to the tenure of Preston.

PAYN DE PRESTON occurs as a Witness or Juror in 1296, 1302, 1308, and 1320. In one instance he is called Master Payn de Preston.

PHILIP DE PRESTON occurs on a Jury in 1304. So does—

WILLIAM DE PRESTON, and he probably was a Coparcener in the Manor.

In the years 1336 and 1340 the four Coparceners of Preston were Thomas de Styvynton, Hugh de Heth, Richard de Horton, and Richard son of William de Preston. An idea of their further descent may be gathered from the subjoined list of presentations to Preston Church.

#### THE CHURCH.

This Church is not named in the *Taxation* of 1291, nor was the Parish assessed as distinct in 1341. I am of opinion that the district originally belonged to the Saxon Parish of Wellington,<sup>1</sup> and that the Church, whenever founded, was founded by the Lords of the Manor. However, hardly a trace of any subjection to Wellington remains. It is remarkable that the Rural Deaneries of Wellington and Preston have always been distinct.—Preston was in the Deanery of Newport, Wellington in that of Salop.<sup>2</sup>

The *Valor* of 1534-5 calls this Church the *Free Chapel of Pres-*

<sup>1</sup> Between the years 1275 and 1285 a Charter (in possession of the Duke of Sutherland) is tested as follows, *Hic testibus;—Dominis Thomâ Lyart perpetuo Vicario Ecclesie de Welinton et Domino Rectore Capellæ de Preston, Petro de Eyton, &c.* (Supra, p. 40.)

It is possible that Lyart was both Vicar of Wellington and Rector of Preston; but

the clause is ambiguous.

<sup>2</sup> This is now the third instance, in the present Volume, where it appears that, on the division of the Diocese into Rural Deaneries, the connection between a Mother-Church and its Daughter was disregarded. The other cases were Eyton (page 35) severed from Wellington, and Waters Upton (page 58) severed from Ercall.

*ton super Wyldmore*, and states its clear value to be 60*s. per annum*.<sup>1</sup>

## EARLY INCUMBENTS.

ROGER, Rector of this Church, resigned September 6, 1336.

RICHARD DE BREWOD, Chaplain, was instituted to the *Church* of Preston super Wyldmore on September 7, 1336. Patrons, Thomas de Styvynton, Hugh de Heth, Richard de Horton, and Richard, son of William de Preston. This *Rector* resigned September 14, 1340, when—

WILLIAM DE LYNLEYE, Clerk, was admitted. Same Patrons.

JOHN DE MORTIMER, Rector of Preston, dying on June 21, 1345—

ROGER DE LAULEY, Clerk, was admitted on July 14th following. Patrons, Walter de Styvinton, Hugh del Heth, Richard de Horton, and Richard de Preston. Laueley removed to Dunchesworth (Sarum Dioc.) on March 19, 1350, and on May 22—

JOHN DE CHETWYND, Priest, was admitted. Patrons, Walter de Styvinton, Hugh del Heth, Richard de Horton, and Margaret, widow of Richard son of William de Preston. On November 9, 1363—

SIR JOHN PYKE, being *Rector* of this Free Chapel, but an absentee, the Bishop *commends* it, deprived as it was of divine services, to—

SIR JOHN DE PRESTON, who died in 1369, when on August 25—

STEPHEN DE PREES, Deacon, was instituted. Patrons, Sir John de Cherleton of Apley, Knight, Walter de Stevynton, Richard de Preston, and Richard de Horton. Prees resigned the same year, and on April 2, 1369 (read 1370)—

RICHARD DE PRESTON, Priest, was instituted. Same Patrons.

JOHN DE WIGINTON, Priest, was collated to this Living January 20, 1382. Patron, the Bishop;—to whom the right had lapsed. Wiginton resigning on February 13, following,—

JOHN DE OFFELEY, Priest, was instituted. Patrons, Thomas de Cherleton, Philip de Horton, Richard de Wrenbure, and William de Coton. On August 1, 1402—

THOMAS GOMON was instituted. Patrons, Sir Robert Fraunceys, Knight, Walter de Stevendon, William Coton, and Richard Horton, Esquires.

<sup>1</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 187.

## Isombridge.

---

*Domesday* describes this Manor as follows.—

“Radulf (de Mortemer) holds Asnebruge of Earl Roger. Ulf held it (in Saxon times). Here are 11 hides, geldable. The (arable) land is enough for 1111 ox-teams. In demesne is one team, and (there are) 11 Neat-herds, 1111 Villains, and 111 Boors with 11 teams. Here is a Mill paying (yearly) three measures of corn. A Knight here has half a hide of the said land. The value of the Manor was and is 20s. (*per annum*).”<sup>1</sup>

Isombridge, like Peplow and Preston, seems to have been lost to Mortimer immediately after *Domesday*, and to have been annexed to the Earl Palatine’s demesnes. Either Earl Roger or Earl Hugh conferred the Manor on the Chief Forester of Shropshire. No such person as a Chief Forester is named in the Shropshire *Domesday*, but the office must have been created immediately afterwards, for Ulger Venator, the first known Forester, attests a genuine Charter of Earl Hugh (between 1094–8); and there are reasons for thinking that Ulger was not the first Forester or the first Lord of Isombridge after Mortimer’s cession thereof. Contemporarily, as I think, with the creation of this office of Forestership, Isombridge ceased to be the Caput of a Manor. Great Bolas, previously a member of Isombridge, was made the Caput. Hence the hereditary Foresters of Shropshire are often called *Foresters of Bolas*.

I shall here treat of Isombridge as a mere member of Bolas, reserving much that I have to say of the successive Foresters till I speak of the capital Manor. The third known Forester was Robert fitz William, Ulger’s Grandson. A Roll, about the year 1200, says specifically that “Robert fitz William, the King’s Forester, holds in *Anebrig* one Mill which pays 10s. (*per annum*), and one carucate of land which is worth 10s. 6d. (*per annum*).”<sup>2</sup>

Hugh fitz Robert, the fourth Forester of Bolas, made a small grant in Isombridge to Lilleshall. This has been noticed under Longden. His Tenants here made, about the year 1230, another small grant to Haughmond, as the following Deeds will show.—

Richard Crurder, with consent of his wife, Alice de Rodington,

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 257, a, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 61.

and his heirs, gave, with his body, a half-virgate in Enesbrugge, held by William son of William Walsh, whose tenant-right is reserved, he henceforth paying his rent of 2*s.* to the Abbey. Witnesses, John fitz Alan, Vivian de Rossall, Thomas his son, Thomas de Costentin, William de Ercalue, Robert fitz Aer, William de Staunton, William Banastre.<sup>1</sup>

Alice de Roditon, daughter of William de Roditon, at the request of her husband, Richard Crurder, and with her body, gave the same half-virgate. Same witnesses.

The said Alice, now a widow, renewed the grant, *cum corpore*. Same witnesses.<sup>2</sup>

At the death of Hugh fitz Robert, in 1249, a carucate held by him in demesne at Esnebrugg was valued at 22*s.* (*per annum*). The other yearly items of receipt were—Assized rents 16*s.* 8*d.*; from meadow-land 18*s.*; Tallage 5*s.*; two Salmon at Christmas, value 2*d.*; one pound of pepper at Christmas and one pound of Cummin at Easter.

In Easter Term 1278, a Fine was levied, whereby Robert de Preston and Sibil his wife (*Impedients*) allow themselves to have given to Philip de Esnebrugg (Plaintiff) a messuage and half-virgate in Esnebrugg;—to hold to Philip and his heirs, at a rent of 1*d.* payable to the Grantors, and by performing all capital services for the Grantors and the heirs of Sibil. For this Philip gave 20 merks.

About the year 1325, two parcels of meadow-land in Isenbrigg, worth 2*s.* *per annum*, were in the King's hand, because, being part of a Serjeantry, they had been purchased, without Royal license, by Henry Wyldegous and William at Nasse.<sup>3</sup>

#### ISOMBRIDGE CHAPEL.

I know nothing of the origin of this foundation, but it was probably a private Chapel, built by some Lord of the Manor, and derogating nothing from the rights of the Mother Church at High Ercall. The Lords of Bolas were the Patrons.

In the *Valor* of 1534-5, the *Free Chapel* at Esomebrigge, in the Deanery of Salop, was valued at £1. 6*s.* 8*d.* *per annum*. William Palmer, Chaplain, was Incumbent.<sup>4</sup>

The site of this Chapel may be still identified.

<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 59.

Remem. Reginæ.

<sup>3</sup> Roll (inter Nomina Villarum) penes

<sup>4</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 185.

## EARLY INCUMBENTS.

RICHARD, *Chaplain of Isnebrug*, occurs in 1255. He had excommunicated one Robert de Peleshall, who (as a Bailiff probably) had distrained on the Chaplain's *lay-fee* for a crown debt;—an amercement apparently set on the Chaplain for some breach of the laws affecting money-changing.<sup>1</sup>

HAMUND DE LA MORE, Acolyte, was instituted to this *vacant Chapel* on June 4, 1310. Patron, the Bishop of Lichfield, *jure devoluto*. More resigned on March 17, 1346, when—

WILLIAM CONSTANTYN, Priest, was admitted. Patron, Sir John de Boulewas, Knight. Constantyn resigned February 16, 1347, and—

GEOFFREY DE BERKEFORD OF BERFORD was admitted. Same Patron. Berford, on September 22, 1349, exchanged livings with—

ADAM DE HETHEY, late Vicar of Wrockwardine. Same Patron. Hethey resigned this "Rectory," and on June 16, 1352—

WILLIAM DE LA MERE, Clerk, aged 18 years, was admitted to the "non-curative Chapel of Eesenbrugg." Patron, Sir John de Boulewas, Knight.

WILLIAM, SON OF WILLIAM DE BERTON, was admitted October 28, 1360. Same Patron.

WILLIAM DE WAVETON (perhaps the same person) resigned in 1369-70.

WALTER PRYDE was instituted March 11, 1370. Patron, Sir John de Eynesfeld, Knight. On Pryde's resignation, and on Aug. 5, 1371—

JOHN KNODE, Priest, was instituted at presentation of "Sir John de Eynesford, Lord of Boulewas."

---

## Bolas Magna.

---

ULGER VENATOR, the first known Lord of Bolas, and Forester of Shropshire, has been frequently mentioned in these pages. That he was related to Roger Venator, first Baron of Pulverbatch, and

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. p. 58

to Norman Venator, the ancestor of the Pichfords, I have already suggested.<sup>1</sup> He first occurs in the Court of Earl Hugh de Montgomery, between 1094 and 1098. He was associated with the treason of Earl Robert de Belesme in 1102, and was one of those who were entrusted by the Earl with the defence of Brug Castle.<sup>2</sup> His timely surrender of that fortress procured for him not only the pardon but the favour of King Henry I.

I conclude that the Forestership of Shropshire was founded by the Norman Earls, and greatly augmented by Henry I. Bolas, I think, was part of the endowment given to the Forestership by one of the Earls; for we are authentically told that Ulger's *Predecessors* had it. Now if Ulger himself had succeeded before the death of Earl Hugh, in 1098, his Predecessor or Predecessors must have held office and estate between 1085 (the date of *Domesday*) and 1098. Consequently they must have been enfeoffed either by Earl Roger or Earl Hugh.

Ulger Venator has been seen attesting a Charter of the Viceroy, Belmeis, about 1115.<sup>3</sup> A Precept of Henry I., earlier probably than this, is addressed to "Ulger, and to Geoffrey de Bortone, and to all the King's Foresters of Salopescire."<sup>4</sup> Again, Henry I.'s great Charter to Shrewsbury Abbey, passing in May 1121, has the personal attestation of Ulger Venator. *Ego Ulgerius Venator subscripsi*, are the words appended to the Deed.<sup>5</sup>

Ulger Venator apparently survived the accession of Stephen (1135), for I find record of a Charter of that Usurper, by which Ulger's descendants held the Manor of Bolas and its members. This Charter is apparently quoted verbatim, when the same Record states that "King Stephen restored (*reddidit*) the Manor of Bowlas to one Urger Venator, to be held by him as freely as his Predecessors held it."<sup>6</sup>

WILLIAM FITZ ULGER, son and heir of Ulger Venator, appears first on the Pipe-Roll of 2 Henry II. (1156). He there accounts for a Crown-debt of 10 merks, the half of which he had paid into the King's treasury, while the other half had been excused in the name of Nicholas de Castello, so that William fitz Ulger was *quit*. Again, on the Pipe-Roll of 1161 William fitz Ulger is entered as owing the King one merk; but I find no liquidation of the debt.

Before 1172 William fitz Ulger gave the Fishery of *Esnebrugg*

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. I. p. 355, note 488.

<sup>2-3</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 287; Vol. III. p. 234.

<sup>4-5</sup> Salop Chartulary, Nos. 49, 35.

<sup>6</sup> Bradford Tenure-Roll (pene mei).

to Haughmond Abbey, as we learn from the Bull of Pope Alexander III. confirming the gift.

In 1176 William fitz Ulger had been amerced 5 merks by Henry II. for some breach of Forest-Law. The entry is on the Pipe-Roll for Herefordshire, where it will be seen that the Shropshire Foresters had a valuable estate,—part of the endowment of their Serjeantry. In the next year (1177) the following entry occurs on the Shropshire Pipe-Roll.—*Willielmus filius Ulgerii debet 100 solidos pro habenda recognicione de maritagio matris sue, unde dissaisita fuit tempore werre, sine iudicio.* So then Ulger Venator's widow was living as late as the Civil War of 1173–4, and being suspected of disloyalty was deprived of some estate which was her marriage-portion.

William fitz Ulger's Fine of 1177 is repeated without liquidation on every Roll till the year 1182. Then it is certified that he was dead. Nevertheless the Fine is still repeated till the year 1186 inclusive.

ROBERT FITZ WILLIAM, son and heir of William fitz Ulger, has been noticed under Cotes, Dorrington, and Cantlop.<sup>1</sup> When, in the year 1200, Hugh de Nevill held Pleas of the Forest in Shropshire, Robert fitz William fined and paid 3*s.* 5*d.*, *pro trenched de Vilinton*, probably for leave to make some clearance in the King's Forest near Wellington.

About this date the Serjeantries of Shropshire were assessable to some aid or tallage, probably that which was sometimes called *caruage*.<sup>2</sup> "Robert fitz William, the King's Forester in Salopshire," seems to have made a return of all the estates held by him in Serjeantry, and to have proffered a sum of 3 merks as a composition for the whole. The particulars of Cotes, Dorrington, and Isombridge, have been given elsewhere. Caynton, Calvington, and Orleton, usually reputed to be members of Bolas, are separately described, though they were covered by the Fine. Bolas itself contained half a carucate of land held in demesne, and worth 6*s.* 8*d.* (*per annum*); one carucate and a half, held in villanage, and realizing 18*s.*; and a Mill, paying 10*s.*<sup>3</sup> All that I have further to say of Robert fitz William is, that he gave a rent of 4*s.* in Boulewas to the Abbot and Convent of Lilleshall. Robert fitz William died in 1203, owing an amercement of £100 to the Crown, which

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. IV. 36; Vol. VI. 21, 287.

<sup>2</sup> A Glossary in the Lilleshall Chartulary says of *Caruage*—"Hoc est si Domi-

nus Rex talliare totam terram per carrucas." It was distinct from Hidage.

<sup>3</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 61.

sum, as well as 20 merks for the Relief of his son and heir, is charged to the name of—

HUGH FITZ ROBERT, in the same year. In or about the year 1205, a tallage by the carucate was levied in Herefordshire, on all Serjeantries. The Assessors returned Hugh fitz Robert as holding Bromsted, *per forestariam*.<sup>1</sup> A Roll of the year 1211 is more explicit in stating that "Hugh fitz Robert held Bru'feld, by forest-serjeantry in Shropshire, and by gift of Henry I.,"<sup>2</sup>—to Ulger Venator, I presume. In a Roll of Shropshire Serjeantries returned in June 1211 it is said that "Hugh fitz Robert used to hold (*tenuit*) of the King, by service of being Chief-Forester of the County of Salop, but that his land was in the King's hand by precept of the Forest-Justices last *in eyre*."<sup>3</sup> The said *Eyre* was probably that of Hugh de Nevill and his Fellows in 1210. A Royal mandate of August 23, 1213, is addressed to Robert fitz William as Forester of Shropshire.<sup>4</sup> The substitution of the deceased father for the living son is evident. A Writ of January 28, 1214, is more correctly addressed to Hugh fitz Robert.<sup>5</sup> Of Fines recorded as having been made shortly previous to Michaelmas 1214, one of 100 merks is by Hugh fitz Robert, Forester. It was for having the bailiwick of the Forests of Shropshire as his father had had it. He had already paid 20 merks, he had been excused 30 merks by Writ-Royal, because, at request of the King, he had taken to wife the niece of John le Strange. He still owed 50 merks.<sup>6</sup>

Another Record supplies us with a curious hint about this nameless niece of John le Strange. On September 1, 1214, the King, then at Partenay, in Poitou, sends her to Peter de Maulay, and tells him to bestow her person, her horse, and its accoutrements, with his (De Maulay's) mother.<sup>7</sup> The damsel had apparently been waiting on the Queen (*quæ fuit cum domind Reginâ*). Why King John's cares should have further extended to providing her with a husband is hardly latent. Probably the Shropshire Forester's wife was a natural daughter or a discarded mistress of that licentious Monarch.

A Writ of February 16, 1215, shows Hugh fitz Robert in full exercise of his functions as Forester;<sup>8</sup> but he subsequently renounced his fealty to King John, and forfeited his estates. On September 11, 1217, a Writ of young King Henry certifies that he

<sup>1. 2. 3</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, pp. 73, 70, 55.

<sup>4. 5</sup> *Claus. I.* 148—b, 162—b.

<sup>6</sup> *Rot. Pipe*, 16 John, Salop.

<sup>7. 8</sup> *Rot. Claus. I.* pp. 171, 178.

had returned to his allegiance, and orders Engelard de Cigoyn (then Sheriff of Herefordshire) to restore his lands.<sup>1</sup>

On October 26, 1226, Henry III. enjoins the Sheriff of Shropshire to make proclamation that none, who have woods within the Forest Bailiwick of Hugh fitz Robert, shall make of their woods any sale, gift, waste, assart, or pourpresture, till the King do command otherwise.<sup>2</sup> In June 1237, I find Hugh fitz Robert and three other Shropshire knights commissioned as Justices to try a certain cause of *novel disseizin*. The King's Writ of *Diem clausit* on the death of Hugh fitz Robert bears date February 5, 1249.<sup>3</sup> A Herefordshire Inquest, held on the 22nd instant, reported the value of his estate at *Bromfeud*, and found that John, son and heir of the deceased, was 25 years of age. The Shropshire Inquest said that the deceased had held all his land of the King (which was untrue as regarded Sugden and Cantlop), by service of keeping the King's Forests in Shropshire, and that he and his Ancestors were Chief Foresters. Bolas, with its Mill, Fishery, rents, and one carucate of demesne-land, was calculated to be worth £8. 3s. 8½d. *per annum*. Erletun (now Orleton)<sup>4</sup> realized £3. 13s. 10½d. Mestun (now Meeson) realized £4. 6s. 3½d.; and Kaginton (now Caynton) brought 18s. 8d. of *assized rents*.

On March 11, 1249, the King received the homage of—

JOHN FITZ HUGH, as heir of his Father, his *Relief* being fixed at 15 merks.<sup>5</sup> The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 records how John fitz Hugh was holding the Manor of Bowlewas by serjeantry, viz. as Capital Forester of all the Forest of Salop.<sup>6</sup> In July 1269, John fitz Hugh was named as a Justice to deliver the Gaols of Shrewsbury and Stafford. At the Assizes of 1272, he appears as a Knight and a Juror in causes of *Grand Assize*. His Serjeantry was made matter of presentment, and his estates at Bolas, Isombridge, and Brumfeld, stated to constitute a knight's-fee. On July 18, 1284, the King's Writ announces the death of John fitz Hugh and orders the Escheator to seize his lands. On July 30, 1284, an Inquest, held at Lylleshull, valued his estates at Bolas and Bromfeld at £12. 5s. 8d. *per annum*. Hugh, his son and heir, was found to be of full age.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1-2</sup> *Claus.* I. 321; II. 156.

<sup>3</sup> *Inquisitions*, 33 Hen. III., No. 58.

<sup>4</sup> The place is called *Rodintun-Erletun* in the Inquest; a thing which I cannot explain, seeing that Orleton was near Wellington. Perhaps however, under

this head, the Inquest values whatever the deceased had at Sugden (in Bodington Manor) as well as what he had at Orleton.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Finium*, II. 49.

<sup>6</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* Vol. II. p. 57.

<sup>7</sup> *Inquisitions*, 12 Edw. I., No. 1.

On August 5, 1284, the King accepted the fealty of—  
 HUGH FITZ JOHN, sixth lineal Forester of Shropshire.—

The *Feodary* of that same year, usually known as *Kirby's Quest*, says merely that "Hugh fitz John holds the Manor of Bolewas, with its members, of the King *in capite*:" but the Tenure-Roll which belongs to nearly the same period is much fuller but less accurate. It enumerates Meiston (Meeson), Esumbridge (Isombridge), Caynton, Calvynton, Ellerton (Orleton), and half the vill of Sogdon (Sugden)<sup>1</sup> as members of Bowlas. It says that Hugh fitz John held the whole by Charter of King Stephen, and that he held his *free court* at Bowlas twice yearly, and adjudged cases of bloodshed and hue-and-cry, and had a gallows.

On March 5, 1292, King Edward's Writ of *Diem clausit* announced the death of Hugh fitz John. The Inquest, which followed on May 1, says that the deceased had held the vill of Esnebrugge, with his other lands, of the King by Serjeantry.<sup>2</sup> The items given under Esnebrugge are,—a Capital messuage;—a carucate of demesne-land worth 30*s. per annum*;—6 acres of meadow worth 9*s.*;—rents of 30*s. 1d.*, a pound of pepper, a pound of cummin, and a pair of iron spurs;—and 5*s.* for pleas and perquisites of Court.

Bolas itself does not appear to have been in the hands of the deceased, but he was in receipt of 42*s. per annum* "from the Lady of Boulewas;"—a matter which I will explain presently.

ROGER FITZ JOHN, brother and heir of the deceased, is stated on the Shropshire Inquest to be 26 years of age and upwards. The Herefordshire Inquest tells how the deceased had held Brumfeld by *Grand Serjeantry*, viz. as Chief Forester of Shropshire, but states the heir to be 30 years old and more.

SARA, LADY OF BOLAS, above alluded to, seems to me to have been widow of John fitz Hugh, and to have had Bolas in dower, except that it was charged with an annuity of £2. 2*s.* to Hugh fitz John, her son, or stepson. On John fitz Hugh's death (1284) Dame Sara became the second wife of the third Brian de Brompton, who had lost his first wife in that very year. Sir Brian dying about three years later (*i. e.* in 1287) left Dame Sara a second time a widow.<sup>3</sup> Hence at the Assizes of October 1292, the Jurors of Bradford Hundred made a presentment that "Sara, Lady of Bolwas, held seven *librates* of land in Bolwas, and had been married to Brian de Brompton, now deceased." The Lady appeared to the

<sup>1</sup> Half Sugden was held under Fitz Alan, and was not a member of Bolas.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquisitions*, 20 Edw. I., No. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Vol. IV. pp. 244, 251.

charge thus implied. She confessed that she had married Sir Brian without license; and compounded for this feudal irregularity by a Fine of 5 merks, naming Roger de Bitterley and Roger de Holycote as her Sureties. To return to—

ROGER FITZ JOHN; the Bradford Jurors presented him at these same Assizes for exercising *Free-Warren* in Boulewas. They also detailed the various alienations which had been made of this Serjeantry since the time when "Euger le Venor (Ulger Venator) had held the Manor of Boulewas as Custos of all the Forests." Besides other alienations, which I reserve to their proper place, one of Esnebrugg to John de Ludlow must be noticed here. John de Ludlow appeared and explained that he only held that Member of Bolas for a term of 10 years, and by demise of Hugh fitz John, deceased. Nor was the transaction illegal, for Hugh fitz John, when about to depart for the Holy Land, had obtained the King's leave to demise all his lands for the said term, and in such sort as that, in case of his death, no absolute loss of territory could result to the crown (*nil depereat in terris Domino Regi*). John de Ludlow was dismissed *sine die*.

In Hilary Term, 1293, *Roger fitz John of Bowelewas* had to answer in Staffordshire for holding Pleas of the Crown, and having warren, gallows, and *wayf*, at *Bowelewas*. He denied that he exercised any right but the first, which he justified by immemorial usage of his Ancestors. Hugh de Louther's counterstatement, that Richard I., as Lord of Bradford Hundred, had had the Crown-pleas of Bolas, was ignored by verdict of a Jury.<sup>1</sup>

On the great perambulation of the Shropshire Forests, taken in 1300. Roger fitz John is the first-named of the Foresters then in office.

On May 21, 1301, King Edward ordered it to be ascertained by Inquest whether it would injure the Crown to allow Roger fitz John to give the Manors of Boulwas, Brymfeld, and Isenbrigg, and the Serjeantry of the Shropshire Forests, to John le Strange, to be held by the latter and his heirs immediately of the Crown, and by the accustomed services. The Jurors replied in favour of the transfer, stating that Roger fitz John's only remaining tenure would be that at Rodington already described.<sup>2</sup> I do not think that this transfer was ever made, except perhaps in trust.

King Edward's Writ of *Diem clausit* on the death of Roger fitz John, bears date April 25, 1302. The Shropshire Inquest held on

<sup>1</sup> *Quo Waranto*, p. 708.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 386.

May 11 following, found the deceased to have died seized of Boulewas and Esnebrugg, as held *in capite per serjantiam*. Boulewas including Kaynton, &c. was valued at £5. 3s. 9d. *per annum*. Esnebrugg is treated as a member of Boulewas, worth £2. 14s. 2½d., from rents of Richard de Clotley, Gregory de Dodinton, and other tenants. The Herefordshire Inquest, recording the deceased Forester's tenure of Bromfeld, states that John his son and heir was 3 years of age on June 10, 1302. The Shropshire Inquest makes April 19, 1299, to have been the heir's birthday.<sup>1</sup>

JOHN FITZ ROGER, the infant in question, had a long minority, and occurs as a ward of the Crown in 1318. Meantime, that is in the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316, Isabel le Strange is set down as Lady of Bolas.<sup>2</sup> Of her I will say no more than that she also appears as Lady of the Norfolk Manor of Litcham. In May 1322 however, John fitz Roger presented to Bolas Church, as "Lord of Boulewas," and in 1324, as "Lord of Brymfeld," he was summoned by the Sheriff of Herefordshire to attend a great Council at Westminster.<sup>3</sup>

An Inquest, taken at Newport, January 8, 1349, found Boulwas to be worth 100s. *per annum*. It was the sole Shropshire estate of John de Boulwas. He now proposed to convey it to Trustees, who were to settle it on himself and his wife Petronilla and his heirs.<sup>4</sup> Sir John de Bolas was living in 1360.

My collections as to this family do not enable me to treat consecutively of its further succession. Some hints on the subject will be found among the presentations to Isombridge Chapel, already detailed, and to Bolas Church, as given below. For other particulars I refer elsewhere.<sup>5</sup>

## BOLAS CHURCH.

I take Edgmond to have been the Mother Church of this district, but think that Bolas, having been founded by the Lords of the Fee, soon attained independence. The *Taxation* of 1291, places Boulwas Church in the Deanery of Newport, and values it at £1. 13s. 4d. *per annum*.<sup>6</sup>

In 1341, the Assessors of the *Ninth* call Boulewas "a Chapel," and tax its Parish at 20s., intimating that the small-tithes, glebe, and oblations went to make up the higher *Taxation* of the Church, but were irrelevant to the current assessment.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Inquisitions*, 30 Edw. I., No. 57.

<sup>2-3</sup> *Parliamentary Writs*, IV. 397, 873.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquisitions*, 22 Edw. III., Second Numbers, Number 61.

<sup>5</sup> *Dukes's Antiquities of Shropshire*, pp. 43, 52, 176, 182.

<sup>6</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 245.

<sup>7</sup> *Inquis. Nonarum*, p. 192.

The *Valor* of 1534-5, gives William Moor, Rector of *Bollas*, as in receipt of £8 *per annum*, less 6s. 8d. for procurations and 4s. for Synodals.<sup>1</sup>

#### EARLY INCUMBENTS.

ALAN DE NEWTON having been presented to this Church by Edward I., as Guardian of Roger fitz John's heir,<sup>2</sup> the Bishop on November 10, 1306, gives the said Alan custody thereof, but revokes the step on January 17, 1307, making William de Thene Custos during the Episcopal pleasure. However, on February 7 following, Alan de Neweton was duly instituted. On November 1, 1315—

JOHN DE NORTON was in like manner presented by Edward II.;<sup>3</sup> but the Episcopal Register asserts the Church to have fallen vacant on August 31, 1318, by resignation of Alan de Neweton, and on October 18, 1318, the Bishop institutes—

EDMUND ATTE STONE of Neuton, Chaplain, on the presentation of King Edward II. On July 21, 1321, this Rector has license to put his Church at *farm* for a year, and pursue his studies.

JOHN FITZ HERBERT of Bascherch, Chaplain, had been presented to this Church on May 17, 1322, by letters of John fitz Roger, Lord of Boulewas, but Edmund, the existing Rector, appealed against his institution, which was delayed. The appeal was eventually successful, for it was Edmund who vacated the Church by death on July 24, 1349, and on August 7, following,—

THOMAS DE BOULEWAS, Chaplain, was admitted on the presentation of Sir John de Boulewas, knight.

THOMAS TABBE (probably the same person) died December 19, 1352, and on January 23, 1353—

BENEDICT DE FRODESLEYE, Chaplain, was admitted on a like presentation.

ROGER DIOS, Priest, instituted May 19, 1366, on the presentation of King Edward III., died October 24, following, and on November 8—

THOMAS DE NEUPORT, Clerk and Subdeacon, was instituted at the King's presentation. This Rector, in July 1367, has license for a year's non-residence *studendi gratia*, and in 1377 he resigned;<sup>4</sup> when, on July 16—

<sup>1</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 186.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Patent.* 84 Edw. I., m. 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Patent.* 9 Edw. II., p. 1, m. 16.

<sup>4</sup> He was afterwards Rector of Eyton and of Pulverbatch. Vide *supra*, p. 36; and Vol. VI. p. 204.

THOMAS DE CHETWYND, Priest, was instituted, at the presentation of Sir John de Eynford, knight.

HUGH HARPERE exchanged this Rectory on February 14, 1888, for the preferment of—

JOHN PIKERYNG, late Rector of Bishshopeston (Hereford Dioc.), Patron, Sir John de Eynford. There seems to have been something informal in the exchange, for—

JOHN, son of William DE BEVERTON, who was instituted to Bolas on June 6, 1888, is said to be so instituted on the resignation of Hugh Harperere. Patron, Sir John de Eynford. Sir John de Bawerton occurs as Rector in 1893-4.

SIR ROGER LOVET, Chaplain, instituted January 21, 1414, on the presentation of Richard de la Mare and Isabel his wife, resigned in 1454.<sup>1</sup>

OLD CAYNTON.

This member of Bolas was held under the Lords of Bolas, by a family which took its name from the place.

WILLIAM DE CAGINTON was amerced 20s. in 1180, for not producing one for whom he was Surety. About the same time we have seen him attesting a Deed of his Suzerain, Robert fitz William.<sup>2</sup> In the assessment of Robert fitz William, already quoted, and supposed to have been made about 1200, William de *Sagint's* tenure under the said Robert is said to be,—half a carucate of demesne, worth 6s. 8d.; one carucate held in villanage, worth 16s.; and a Mill, worth 10s. *per annum*.

ROBERT DE KAMYTON, as his name is written, attests a Deed about 1223,<sup>3</sup> and was Juror on a Lilleshall Inquest, about 1242,<sup>4</sup> where his name is written *Kakinton*.<sup>5</sup> He was soon afterwards succeeded by his son and heir—

WILLIAM DE KAGINTON (II.), who occurs on a local Jury in February 1249, and again in 1274 and 1275. His success in recovering an estate at Pixley in 1283, has been already noticed.<sup>6</sup> I find him attending three local Inquests in that same year, and one in the year following. The Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) gives him as holding Caynton, a member of Bolas. In 1292, how-

<sup>1</sup> Lovet had previously been Vicar of St. Alkmund, Salop.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 287.

<sup>3</sup> <sup>4</sup> Supra, pp. 65, 221.

<sup>5</sup> I cannot affirm that Robert de Kaynton who was deceased in 1246, and who

married Petronilla de Rodington (supra, Vol. VII. p. 380), was identical with the above Robert. If he was, it is probable that his son, William, was by some other wife.

<sup>6</sup> Supra, p. 94.

ever, it appears on the Assize-Roll that William de Kaynton held only two-thirds of Kaynton, and William son of William de Wylbryton held one-third. The latter was a Minor and in custody of Sara Lady of Bolas. William de Kaynton appeared in Court to account for his title to hold any part of Bolas. He stated that he was *Tenant-in-Socage* of Roger fitz John, to whom he paid 6s. 8d. rent, and that thus his ancestors has held from time immemorial, and that what they so held was no part of the Serjeantry. This the Crown Prosecutor denied, and stated that Kaynton, being part of a Serjeantry, had been alienated no further back than the reign of Henry III. The matter went to a Jury, which found that "before King Henry I. held anything in Shropshire (*i. e.* before the Escheat of the Norman Earls) the ancestors of William de Kaynton were seized of Kaynton, paying half a merk rent to the Lords of Bolas, and further that the vill was no part of the Serjeantry." William de Kaynton was hereupon dismissed *sine die*.

William de Kaynton's tenure by half a merk rent is duly specified in the Inquisition on Roger fitz John's death in 1302; and in March 1304, William de Kaynton occurs on two local Juries.

#### CALVINGTON.

This member of Bolas was held by Feoffees of the Foresters of Bolas from an early period.—

A Fine of September 25, 1199, shows William Porcel and Matilda his wife, quitclaiming for 30s. to Robert fitz William a half virgate and bovate in Kelvinton, which they had claimed under plea of *mort d'ancestre*.

HENRY DE LEGA, about the year 1200, is stated to hold half a carucate in Calventon, worth 6s. 8d. *per annum*, under Robert fitz William.<sup>1</sup> This Henry was, I think, a Cadet of the Lees of Hughley.

In 1209, Robert son of Henry de Leg' was amerced half a merk for a recent *pourpresture* on the King's Forest; but I doubt whether this Robert was son of the Lord of Calvington, for, at the same time, *Henry de Lega apud Kalvinton* (as he is called) was assessed 18d. for an *imbladement* of 3 acres of oats in Mount-Gilbert Forest.

Whether Henry de Lega, mentioned in a former page as occurring in 1221,<sup>2</sup> was of Calvington, I cannot say. There was also a Henry de Leg' who sat third Juror on a Wellington Inquest in May 1264.

<sup>1</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VI. p. 307.

About the latter period, Calvington, or a great part thereof, seems to have got into the hands of Hugh de Lee of Hughley. At all events the following Deed passed between 1256 and 1282, probably about 1270.—

Hugh de Lega and Elena his wife enfeoff their son Edmund, his heirs or assigns, in all the land which they had any time held in the vill of Calvinton;—to hold under them and their heirs by an annual rent of one pound of cummin, payable at Lega (Hughley). Witnesses, Sir Odo de Hodnet, Sir John fitz Hugh of Bolewas, Sir John de Erkalewe, Robert de Heselslawe (Helshaw), Roger Waldyn of Sambroc, Richard de Flosbroc, Thomas de Ethelerton (Ellerton), and Hugh de Kineleon.<sup>1</sup>

Between the years 1272 and 1283, Elena de Lega, widow of Sir Hugh de Lega, gives to her son Edmund, and to his heirs lawfully begotten, all the land which she had, whether as her portion in frank marriage, or by purchase, together with two messuages in the vill of Calvinton and all meadows, &c. pertaining thereto;—to hold at a rent of one pound of cummin, payable to the Grantress and her heirs. Witnesses, Sir Reginald de Lega, Sir John fitz Hugh, Sir Odo de Hodenet, John de Esthope, Richard Sprenschos.<sup>2</sup>

The Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) gives *Edmund Lyde* (evidently the above Feoffee) as holding the vill of Calvinton *immediately* under Hugh fitz John.

The Bradford Jurors, at the Assizes of 1292, presented Edmund de Legh as holding Calvynnton, a member of the Bolas Serjeantry. The said Edmund appeared in Court and acknowledged that he held Calvynnton without render of any service to the King. The estate was ordered to be confiscated, but Edmund fined one merk to retain it till next Parliament. His Surety was John de Esthope.

Calvynnton would seem afterwards to have been held with Orleton by the Orletons, and immediately of the Crown; that is, if we may rely upon a statement which I shall notice under Orleton.<sup>3</sup>

**MEESON.** This member of Bolas seems to have been held by a family taking name from the place. William de Meston has occurred to us about 1245 as a Feoffee in Tibberton.<sup>4</sup> On January 27, 1249, William, son of William de Meston (Plaintiff), quitclaims to Geoffrey Griffin (Deforciant) all right of common which he had claimed in Geoffrey's meadow called *Le Gorstes*<sup>5</sup> in Crugelton. For

<sup>1, 2</sup> Harl. MS. 2063, fo. 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Infra*, p. 277.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide supra*, p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> A meadow and *cultura*, described as *in Gorstes*, were afterwards given by Geoffrey Griffin to Wombidge Priory.

this Final Concord Geoffrey gave one merk. Further mention of this second William de Meston has been made under Tibberton.<sup>1</sup>

He or his father was perhaps identical with *William le Fraunceis* (who, together with William de Eton, was amerced half a merk in 1247 for some default in Suretiship), and with *William Fraunceys of Meston* (who occurs on a local Jury in 1249). In the time of Edward II. we have Thomas de Meston attesting an Ercall Deed.

#### ORLETON.

I should perhaps more properly treat of Orleton as originally a member of the Royal Manor of Wellington: but whereas it was annexed to Bolas, at least as early as the reign of Henry I., I proceed to speak of it here, in its most known relation, viz. as an out-lying member of Bolas.

RADULF DE ERLETON, the first of his name who occurs, was probably Tenant here of the Lords of Bolas. He was living between 1141 and 1155, as we have seen under Cherrington. After him comes—

ADAM DE HORLETON, already noticed as attesting two Charters between 1174 and 1180,<sup>2</sup> one Charter about 1175,<sup>3</sup> and a fourth Charter, of Robert fitz William (his Lord), about 1180.<sup>4</sup> Pope Alexander III.'s Confirmation to Haughmond Abbey, passing in 1172, records how *Adam de Werlethune* had given half a virgate in Greneleshul (Grinsill) and all the tithes of the same vill to that Abbey. We know that Adam de Horleton was succeeded by—

RALPH DE ORLITON (II.), his son and heir;—for the latter confirmed his father's grant to Haughmond. We have seen Ralph de Horliton, or Horleton, attesting two Wombridge Charters, one about 1186–7,<sup>5</sup> the other about 1195.<sup>6</sup> The interest which he acquired at Beckbury in 1196 has also been noticed.<sup>7</sup> About the year 1200 we have it recorded that Ralph de Horlet' held of Robert fitz William's Serjeantry, half a carucate of land and a Mill, worth one merk yearly, the current assessment on which tenure was covered by the Fine or composition of Robert fitz William.<sup>8</sup> In his attestation of a Leighton Deed (*circa* 1210–1215) Radulf de Erleton is followed by his brother William.<sup>9</sup> Ralph de Orleton occurs once more, and at a period perhaps ten years later. It is as enfeofing a Tenant in all his land at Grinsill, —a matter of which I shall speak elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> Supra, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, p. 47, and Vol. VII. p. 355.

<sup>3, 4</sup> Vol. VII. p. 321; Vol. VI. p. 287.

<sup>5, 6, 7</sup> Supra, Vol. II. pp. 112, 133, 68.

<sup>8</sup> *Testa de Nevill*, p. 61.

<sup>9</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 328.

After this there were a William and a Thomas de Orleton, contemporary. Both sat on a Withiford Jury in 1248, and Thomas is named first. However I believe Thomas to have been head of a younger branch of the family, and attribute his precedence to his acquired, or professional, importance, rather than to any right of birth. William I conceive to have been son and heir of Ralph, and Lord of Orleton. The earliest notice which I have of—

WILLIAM DE ERLETON, is his Fine with Richard de Leighton in 1240.<sup>1</sup> Besides the Withiford Jury of 1248 I find him on a Leegomery Jury of 1258 and a Sheriff-Hales Jury of 1260. In 1264 he was one of the Jurors who were sworn to ascertain the value of Bradford Hundred. After this, the same or another—

WILLIAM DE ERLETON occurs, viz. on two Juries in 1284. Him the Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) describes as William de *Ellerton*, and as holding *Ellerton*, a member of Bolas under Hugh fitz John. At the Assizes of 1292 he was a Juror in several cases of *Quo Warranto*, and was himself questioned for holding Erleton, a member of a Serjeantry, without license. He fined half a merk to retain the estate till next *Parliament*, Richard de Hodnet being his Surety. He occurs on two Jury-lists in 1293. On November 21, 1295, the King's Writ of *Diem clausit* announces his decease. It seems that he no longer held Erleton under the Lords of Bolas, but as a Tenant *in capite*, at a rent of 6s. 8d. This estate was valued at £2. 14s. 4d. *per annum*. He had also a tenement at Clotley held by a rent of 12d. payable to the "Church of St. Andrew" (Wroxeter, I presume). It only yielded 1s. 6d. to the owner.<sup>2</sup>

ADAM DE ERLETON, son and heir of William, is stated on the Inquest to have been 22 years of age at Easter 1295. I find it asserted<sup>3</sup> that in 27 Edw. I. (1298-9) he paid the King 16s. 8d. for his relief for Erleton and Calvynton, members of Bowlewas, but I cannot verify this from the Fine-Roll. Adam de Erleton was deceased March 14, 1305. Erleton with its Mill was now valued at £2. 9s. *per annum*, and was held *in capite* at 6s. 8d. rent. At Clotley, 2 cottages and 9½ acres of land, held at 12d. rent<sup>4</sup> under the Church of Wroxeter, were valued at 8s. *per annum*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. pp. 329, 330.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquisitions*, 24 Edw. I., No. 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Dukes's Antiquities*, p. 182, quoting Fines 27 Edw. I.

<sup>4</sup> We have seen (Vol. VII. p. 314) that

in 1347 the rent receivable by Wroxeter Church from Clotley was 2s.;—that is, I suppose, there was another rent besides De Erleton's.

<sup>5</sup> *Inquisitions*, 33 Edw. I., No. 32.

JOHN DE ERLETON, son and heir of Adam, was only 4 years of age on May 31, 1305. Of him, pending his long minority, I can say nothing. But an Inquest, taken at Newport on April 12, 1324, found that it would be no injury to the King to allow John, son of Adam de Erleton, to enfeoff John de Hynkeleye and Elizabeth his wife in one messuage, one Mill, two carucates of land, ten acres of meadow, and 26s. rent, in Erleton and Clotleye, to be held by the said John, Elizabeth, and the heirs of John, *in capite*. The premises were held by a rent of 6s. 8d., payable at the Exchequer, and were worth £4 *per annum*. No land would remain elsewhere to the Grantor.

A second Inquest, taken at Newport on November 12, 1324, found that it would not injure the King if he allowed the above John and Elizabeth (who had acquired the premises without license, and had suffered forfeiture thereof) to repossess them, and to hold them *in capite* by accustomed services.—

An indorsement on this Inquest suggests that the application failed. It notes how John de Erleton appeared personally in Chancery at Nottingham on December 16, and proved on examination to be deaf and dumb. "So," says the indorsement, "nothing of this Inquisition stands without good and deliberate Council."<sup>1</sup>—

I suppose that the question which suggested itself to the Officers of Chancery was really, whether the Crown was not entitled to the perpetual wardship of John de Erleton, as of one whose state was almost tantamount to idiocy.

I now return to speak of—

THOMAS DE ERLETON, who, attesting several Wombridge Deeds between 1225 and 1245, is in one instance styled *Sir Thomas, Clerk of Erleton*, in another is accompanied by Ivo de Erleton, and in another by Adam Clerk of Erleton. In 1241 he was one of four Visors of repairs at Shrewsbury Castle.

He occurs also on an Uppington Jury of 1243, a Withyford Jury of 1249, and a Bolas Jury of February 1249. Thomas de Erleton has already been noticed as purchasing half a virgate in Uppington of Alice de Burton.<sup>2</sup>

RALPH DE ERLETON, son and, I think, heir of Thomas, occurs as early as March 1248, that is in his father's lifetime. "William de Garmunstun demised and conceded to Ralph, son of Thomas de Erletun, that house, croft, and seilion, in the Vill of Erletun, which Godith, a widow, held; also half an acre in Bradeleg, and one acre

<sup>1</sup> *Inquis.* 17 Edw. II. No. 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, pp. 172, 173.

at Belingesleg and Heliotesleg, towards the *Bosc*; all for a term of 30 years commencing Lady Day 1248, and including the crop of the last year of the lease;—at a rent of  $\frac{1}{4}d$ . Witnesses, Robert de Clotleg, Thomas de Welintun, Radulf de Cherletun, John de Cherletun.”<sup>1</sup>

Ralph de Erleton occurs on a Leegomery Jury of 1251, about which time I take him to have succeeded to his father.

On March 26, 1257, Simon de Wauton is commissioned to try a cause between Hamo le Gros and others, of the one part, and Thomas Mauveysin and Radulf de Erleton, of the other part, viz. whether certain land in *Chateleye* pertained to the Church of Wroxeter, or was the lay-fee of Thomas and Radulf.<sup>2</sup>

On two Jury-lists of 1258 and 1260 Radulf precedes William de Erleton. Radulf was certainly a Tenant in Orleton; for, in October 1259, Roger de Napton and his wife implead him, under writ of *mort d'ancestre*, for a messuage and land in Erleton. About this time Ralph de Erleton attests a Wombridge Deed already quoted.

It would seem, from what has transpired above, that William de Erleton eventually succeeded to Radulf's interest in Clotley.

The only other member of this family, whom I shall name here, is Pagan de Erleton, who occurs as a witness in 1305.

AS TO MINOR TENURES in Orleton, Ralph Goki is incidentally named as a Tenant in the Lease of 1248. Singularly enough, at the Assizes of 1256, Ralph Goky and Petronilla his wife, tenants of a messuage and 8 acres in Erleton, were impleaded for the same by Juliana, as daughter and heir of Reginald de Erleton. The latter was found to have died seized of the premises; so Juliana recovered them.

## Eyton Abbots, or Eyton upon Severn.

ALL places called Eyton, Eaton, or Eton, probably obtained their names from the Saxon word *eá* (*a stream, or water*). It has been suggested that the Saxon word *eáh* (*an eye*) is the origin of

<sup>1</sup> Deed in possession of Robert Gardner, Esq. of Leighton. The Seal of this Deed is of white wax and much defaced.

The device has been already alluded to (*supra*, Vol. VII. p. 336, note 30).

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Patent.* 41 Hen. III., *dorso*.

such names; and it is indeed observable that many places, so called, are more or less isolated, and so have some metaphorical resemblance to the organ of vision. However the isolation or half-isolation of places called Eyton is not invariable, but their propinquity to water is. So I take *eá* to be the direct and real root of such names, and not *eáh*, which is only metaphorically and accidentally descriptive of their situation.

The important Manor of Eyton-upon-Severn is noticed in *Domesday* as one of those held by Shrewsbury Abbey as the gift of Earl Roger.<sup>1</sup>—"In the City of Sciropesberie Earl Roger is making an Abbey; and he hath given to the same the Monastery of St. Peter, where was a Parish of the City, and as much of his Burgesses and Mills as brings in £12 (yearly) to the Monks.<sup>2</sup> The same Church holds Aitone. Earl Leuric held it in the time of King Edward. Here are eight and a half hides. In demesne are 1111 ox-teams, and still two teams more might be (employed). Here are xvi Villains, and x1111 Boors, with xvi teams. Here are viii male, and 1111 female, Serfs, and 11 Fisheries. One (of the Fisheries) pays 16s. (yearly); the other goes towards victualling the Monks. In King Edward's time the Manor was worth £21 (*per annum*); and when the Earl gave it to the Church it was paying £14."

Any allusion of *Domesday* to a state of things existent in the days of Leofric, Earl of Mercia, is, as far as Shropshire is concerned, exceptional. The Shropshire *Domesday*, in short, usually refers to the status of Manors as held by Leofric's widow, Godiva, or his grandsons, Edwin and Morcar. This general rule has been already pointed out.<sup>3</sup> The *Domesday* notice of Eyton is abnormal.

Earl Roger's grant of Eyton to Shrewsbury Abbey is certified by his own general Charter, as well as by the Confirmations of William Rufus,<sup>4</sup> Henry I., Stephen, Henry II., and Henry III. Richard Peche, Bishop of Coventry, confirming to the Abbey the tithes of its various demesnes, includes "the whole tithes of Astone and Eyton,"<sup>5</sup> both of which places were, as we know, in the Parish of Wroxeter.

The Forest Assize-Roll of 1209 charges the Abbot of Shrewsbury for two *imbladements* in *Euton* or *Eton*, within regard of the Forest of Mount Gilbert. For 30 acres sown with oats he was charged 15s., and 6s. for 6 acres, otherwise cultivated.

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 252, b, 1.

<sup>2</sup> For some remarks on this passage, see *Hist. of Shrewsbury*, Vol. II. pp. 2, 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. III. p. 63, note 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide supra*, Vol. VI. p. 171.

<sup>5</sup> *Salop Chartulary*, No. 329.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 says that "the Abbot of Salop holds *Eiton* of the gift of *Earl Roger de Beleme*, in free alms, and it is a Manor of ix hides, and does no Suit to County or Hundred." Here I need not point out the misnomer by which Earl Roger is described. To account for the increase on the *Domesday* hidage I am unable, unless indeed Aston, once a member of Wellington, was now computed with Eyton. The same Hundred-Roll notices, under *Eiton*, certain persons whom I take to have been the Abbot's Tenants, but who were liable to certain dues to the Crown.—Walter le Longe held an acre of assart in the Forest of Mount Gilbert, paying 9*d.* rent to the King's Exchequer; Ayote, wife of Wyot, held another acre at the same rent; and Richard *Blawne-Coste* held 1½ acres and one perch at a rent of 15*d.*<sup>1</sup>

Henry III.'s Charter of *Free-Warren*, dated May 21, 1256, gives the Monks of Shrewsbury that privilege in their demesnelands at Eyton.

The Bradford Tenure-Roll (about 1285) enumerates the then members of *Eyton Abbots*. They were, Aston (near the Wrekin), Siwaldeton (a place now lost), Riston (now Rushton), Donynton, and Drayton. The Abbot held the whole of the King, *in capite sine medio*. He had at Eyton his *free court*, wherein he held *pleas of bloodshed* and *hue and cry*. He had gallows and free-warren, and exercised those privileges by Charter of *the said Earl* (read King) and by Royal confirmation.

The *Taxation* of 1291 gives a total of £21. 19*s.* 10½*d.* as the proceeds of the Abbot's estate at Eyton. The items are—Two carucates of land, yielding £1; Assized Rents £15. 1*s.* 6½*d.*; A Mill 13*s.* 4*d.*; Pleas and Perquisites of Court £1. 6*s.* 4*d.*; and Profits of Live-stock £3. 18*s.* 8*d.*<sup>2</sup>

An Abbey Rent-Roll, drawn up about two centuries later,<sup>3</sup> may be epitomized as follows:—

Eyton. Income on 22 items of revenue . .	£14	19	7
Drayton. Income on 7 items . . . . .	4	16	6
Haston (Aston). Income on 10 items . .	4	19	8
Roscheton (Rushton). Income on 8 items .	6	0	9
Donynton (Donnington). Income on 6 items .	8	17	10
Eyton. Other Income. . . . .	2	0	0
Total . . . . .	41	14	4

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 260.

<sup>3</sup> *History of Shrewsbury* (Owen and Blakeway), Vol. II. p. 508.

We may compare this estimate with the following receipts, extracted from the *Valor* of 1534-5.<sup>1</sup>—

<i>Eyton.</i> Assized rents. . . . .	£58	3	7½
<i>Aston subtus Wreken.</i> Assized rents. . . . .	2	9	4
<i>Aston subtus Wreken.</i> Ferm of the tithes of one message . . . . .	0	14	2
	<hr/>		
	£61	7	1½

In the *Ministers' Accounts* of the dissolved Monastery, drawn up in 1541-2, we have the rents and fermes of Eyton, Donyngton, Russheton, Aston-Drayton, and Aston subtus Wrekyn, stated to be altogether £63. 19s. 10½d.<sup>2</sup>

EYTON CHAPEL. Eyton, with all its members except Aston, was in the Saxon Parish of Wroxeter. Under Wroxeter Church I have shown how the tithes of Eyton, Rushton, Donnington, Drayton, and Sewallesdon, were divided between the Rectors and Vicars of Wroxeter. It does not appear that even the Abbot of Shrewsbury's demesnes at Eyton were exempt from payment of tithes to the Mother Church. We infer that, so far, Bishop Peche's confirmation to Shrewsbury Abbey, as quoted above, was *ultra vires* and inoperative. The only notice which I have of Eyton Chapel shows it distinctly as an affiliation of Wroxeter Church, and proves that the Vicar of Wroxeter was in 1347 bound to serve it, "as it had been served from ancient time."<sup>3</sup>

DRAYTON, now DRYTON. The Monks of Shrewsbury had a Tenant here, viz. William, son of Edward de Drayton. About the year 1230 this William and his Mother, Aveline, acknowledge in the Court of Sir H. (probably Henry), Abbot of Salop, that they had unjustly claimed to hold a noke in Dreyton, and 4 acres and 3 little meadows in Eyton, hereditarily;—for the premises were of the *Abbot's Villanage and Demesne*, as had been confessed in the Abbot's Court at Eyton and in the Hundred-Court of Salop. The Abbot now allowed them to hold the premises for their lives, for 20s. paid down, and at a rent of 18d. Witnesses, William, Priest of Wroxeter; Thomas de Eiton, Thomas his son.<sup>4</sup>

William, son of Edward de Drayton and Cecilia his wife, have been noticed as Feoffees of Alice Mussun at Uppington about 1225-6. The Deed of feoffment is attested by William Chaplain of Drayton, that is, by William de Drayton, Chaplain, who, as I

<sup>1</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Monasticon*, III. 529.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 315.

<sup>4</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 124, b.

have elsewhere stated,<sup>1</sup> was the same person with William, Priest of Wroxeter.

About 40 years later than this, viz. about the years 1260–70, we have three several Uppington Deeds attested by William Pilrin of Dreiton, and William the Parson his brother. It is hardly probable that these two were identical with William fitz Edward and William the Chaplain, above mentioned. Be this as it may, William the Chaplain appears before the year 1240 accompanied by his son Alan; and we have seen that William and Petronilla, son and daughter of one Alan de Drayton, succeeded to estates at Chatwall and Berrington, the former before 1255.<sup>2</sup> Chronology will not allow us to suppose that the said William and Petronilla were grandchildren of William the Chaplain; but that all these persons were members of one family I cannot doubt.

Again,—the wide interval at which William, the Chaplain or Canon, occurs (viz. from 1225 to 1276) suggests a doubt whether a single person is thus described.

Again, *William de Dreyton, Seneschall*, attests a Charter of the first John fitz Alan as early as 1218, and William de Dreyton, son of William, occurs in 1262,<sup>3</sup> and is perhaps the individual who, as *William de Drayton, Bailiff of Wroxeter*, is addressed by the second John fitz Alan in a letter dated September 21, 1265.

We have intermediate notices of one William de Drayton as a Feoffee in Uppington and a witness of Uppington Deeds. In 1262 such a person occurs too, as one of the Regarders of the Shropshire Forests.

In September 1272 *William de Dreyton-Pelerin* and *Richard de Dreyton* were Recognizors in the great trial noticed under Albrightlee.

Robert de Drayton, Juror on a Leegomery Inquest in 1258, may have been of this place. I think he was son of another Robert. In 1276 William son of Walter de Drayton, with assent of his wife Emma and his heirs, surrenders to his Lord, the Abbot of Salop, certain meadow-land, till five crops should have been taken therefrom. Witnesses, Master Robert de Stoke, John de Prestcote, Adam le Bole, Gilbert the Beadle.<sup>4</sup>

DONNINGTON. Robert Bras occurs on an Uppington Jury in 1243. Richard Bras of Doniton was Juror on a Wellington Inquest in 1278. He is probably the person noticed in a former

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 316.

<sup>2</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 294.

<sup>4</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 124, c.

Volume as occurring in 1281 and 1303.<sup>1</sup> When he is said to be "aged 40" in the latter year, it is probably meant that he was 40 at least.

SIWALDESTON. I can only guess the situation of this lost member of Eyton. In a Grant to Wombridge Priory,<sup>2</sup> a certain acre in the fields of Uppington is described as lying near the footpath called *Quenesty*, which footpath seems to have run between Aston and Siwaldeston. Siwaldeston probably lay between Aston and Rush-ton.

At the Assizes of 1221 Luna fitz Richard failed to appear in a suit of *novel disseizin* concerning a tenement in Siwaldesden, which she had instituted against William fitz Gregory, a Chaplain. The Defendant was dismissed *sine die*.

A Deed was among the Newport Evidences whereby "Alan son of Richard de Siwaldisdon gave to Richard son of William de Drayton" a house and some land (probably in Siwaldston or Uppington). A foss which extended towards the barn of *Dame Petronilla*;—the road which led to *Rustone*;—a place called *Stanechestre*;—and the road at *Hupiton*, are mentioned among the boundaries of the grant. The Deed was attested by Thomas de Constantine, Richard de Leighton, Robert de Cherleton, Walter de Drayton, Robert Bras, and Adam fitz Brice. I suppose this Deed to have passed about 1230–40, but am very doubtful as to its date.

In Michaelmas Term 1282, Walter de Dreyton was suing the Abbot of Shrewsbury for disseizing him of common-pasture in Siwaldesdon.

William and Robert de Siwaldsdon occur on a local Jury in 1298.

OF RUSHTON, another member of Eyton, I have no particulars to add to those already given.

O. ASTON and its early history I shall speak under Wellington, for originally it was a member of Wellington. It came to be reputed a member of Eyton because it was given to Shrewsbury Abbey.

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 394.

<sup>2</sup> Chartulary, Tit. Upinton, No. 24.

## Haughton.

I HAVE already treated of that part of Haughton, which, being a member of Upton Magna, has no distinct mention in *Domesday*.<sup>1</sup> The other part was a Manor in itself, and was held by Roger Venator. It is described in the Record as follows.—

“Roger Venator holds Haustone (of the Earl). Edwi held it (in Saxon times). Here is one hide, geldable. The (arable) land is (enough) for 11 ox-teams. Here is one Tenant (*homo*) rendering a ferm of 6s.”<sup>2</sup>

The Seignury of this Half-Manor continued, as we should expect, with Roger Venator's descendants, the Barons of Pulverbatch. The Tenants thereof were those Constantines whose history I have sketched under Oldbury and Eaton Constantine. The feudal, and perhaps blood, relationship which subsisted between the Barons of Pulverbatch and the Constantines has also been illustrated under Pulverbatch.<sup>3</sup>

The following Deeds will show how the Constantines dealt with their tenancy at Haughton.—

1. About the year 1200, as I think, Thomas de Costentin enfeoffs Stephen de Stanton<sup>4</sup> and his heirs, for their homage and service, in all his part of Meresbrok, at a rent of 12*d*. The Grantee may make a Vivary and mill, but must give an equivalent to the Grantor's tenants in Halghton for such land as the Vivary shall occupy. The Grantee may raise his stank so high as that the water of his Vivary shall ascend over three perches of land, (measuring) from the rivulet which falls into Meresbrok. Witnesses, Robert de Wodecote, Hugh de Wodeforde, Reyner de Acton; Helias and Ralph, the Grantor's brothers, and Robert de Espelee.<sup>5</sup>

2. Stephen de Staunton gave to Thomas de Costentin and his men of Halghton a right of common in his (Stephen's) land of Roden, in return for the donation, which he had had from the said Thomas, of the site of Meresbrok Mill. Same witnesses.

<sup>1</sup> Supra, Vol. VII. p. 280.

<sup>2</sup> *Domesday*, fo. 259, a, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, Vol. VI. p. 196.

<sup>4</sup> He was Lord of Roden, between

which and Haughton there is a Rivulet.

<sup>5</sup> Haughton Charters, Tit. Halghton juxta Haghmon :—which is also the authority for all the following Deeds.

3. About the year 1220 Thomas de Constantin grants all his land in Halghton to Robert son of Stephen de Stanton, for his service and for 14 merks paid down, and at a rent of 2*d.* Witnesses, William de Hetlee, Vivian de Roshall, Baldwin de Smethcote, Baldwin Wischart, Philip de Peninton, Robert fitz Aer.

4. It must be assumed that the rent of 12*d.* receivable from Meresbrok Mill merged with the last Deed, as becoming due to Robert de Stanton himself. He however seems to have renewed the charge in favour of a third party. About the year 1220 Robert de Stauntune gives to Haughmond Abbey, with his body, all the land (4 virgates) which he had bought from Thomas de Constantine, in the vill of Halghton, together with a rent of 12*d.* due from Halghton Mill. A rent of 2*d.* only is reserved to Thomas de Constantine. Witnesses, Duiet Cellarêr of Haghmon, Henry Cook, Roger Palmer, Roger his son, Richard Hirdman.

I imagine that Robert de Stanton died within the walls of Haughmond Abbey. At his death, then, the Canons became seized of the Manor of Haughton, holding it by payment of 2*d.* yearly to Thomas de Constantine, who held of the Lord of Pulverbatch.

5. Soon afterwards, Thomas de Constantine's mesne-right vanishes, for he confirms Robert de Stanton's Deed, and releases the rent of 2*d.* due to himself. Witnesses, Robert de Gyras, Vivian de Rosshale.

6. By another and equivalent Deed, Thomas de Costentin gives and confirms a moiety of Halghton to Haughmon Abbey, with assent of his son Thomas.

7. About the year 1230 William de Staunton acknowledges that he and his heirs are bound to pay the Canons of Haghmon 12*d.* rent for the "impounding of water by Roden Mill," which rent Robert, his brother, had bequeathed to the Canons with his body. Witnesses, Hugh English (Anglicus), Hamo Marescote, William Banastre, Wido de Hadenhale, and Thomas Cresset.

The Bradford Hundred-Roll of 1255 puts down the whole vill of Halihton as 1½ hides, paying 6*d.* for *motfee* and 6*d.* for *stretward*. The Abbot of Haymon is stated to be Lord of the Half-Manor (now under consideration), and to hold it of the *fee of Pulrebach*.<sup>1</sup>

The *Feodaries* of 1284-5 agree that the Abbot of Hawemon held half Haughton of the Fee of Philip Marmion of Pulverbatch.

The *Taxation* of 1291 gives the Abbot of Haughmond nothing but 3*s.* assized rents in *Halton subtus Haghmon*.<sup>2</sup> Some subse-

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Hundred.* II. 56.

<sup>2</sup> *Pope Nich. Taxation*, p. 260, a.

quent acquisitions in the other moiety of the Manor have been noticed already.<sup>1</sup> In the *Valor* of 1534-5 the Abbot's receipts from Halghton are massed with those from Astley, Edgebaldenham (Edgebold), Isombridge, Sugden, and Rodington. They were in all £2. 8s. 8d.<sup>2</sup>

OF UNDERTENANTS in Haughton the first to be noticed are the Cressets. About the year 1210, as I guess, Thomas de Costentin grants to Thomas Crasset, for a rent of one pound of cummin, a half and a third of a virgate in Halghton. Witnesses, Stephen de Staunton, Robert and William his sons; William de Hedleg; Robert fitz Aer; Hugh de Hupton; Philip de Peninton; Helias de Costentin; William, Ralph, and Richard his Brothers.

From his attestations of Deeds I conclude Thomas Crasset to have been living in the year 1235 and somewhat later. His successor seems to have been William Crasset, who attests two Charters between 1240 and 1250, and who, or one of his name, was living in June 1290. The latter, when under indictment for homicide and other crimes, was appointed Beadle or Lessee of Bradford Hundred by its Bailiff, Walter de Pedwardine. In 1292 the Bailiwick was seized by the Crown in consequence of this flagitious appointment; but Pedwardine re-obtained it by replevin. About 1270-80 I find mention of another Thomas Cresset of Haughton,<sup>3</sup> and in August 1331 I find Thomas Cresset attesting a Deed of the then Earl of Arundel. This I presume to be the same Thomas Cresset to whom, with Edith his wife, Isolda, daughter of William Willy of Halghton, gave two *seilions* in Halghton, one of which was bounded by land, late Richard de Leighton's.<sup>4</sup> By a subsequent Deed, Edith Cresset, widow, gave these two seilions to Philip her son; and on January 17, 1339, Philip Cresset quitclaimed them to Nicholas, Abbot of Haghmon. Witnesses, Thomas Cresset of Witherforde, Thomas Cresset of Halghton (probably Philip's elder brother), and Walter Cresset of Uffington.

Meantime, that is on March 17, 1335, we have an agreement be-

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. pp. 281, 282.

<sup>2</sup> *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, III. 192.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, Vol. VII. p. 281, note 14.

<sup>4</sup> This Deed is parallel with two in the *Newport Evidences*. By one—"Isolda, daughter of William de Halchton, gives to Thomas, son of Stephen de Elinhale, Carpenter, a messuage in Halchton. Witnesses, Thomas de Lee of Rodene, Alan fitz Thomas of Rodene, Richard fitz Ro-

bert of Estleg, Thomas Cresset of Halchton, and Thomas Gilbert of Halchton."

By the other—"Isolda, daughter of William Willy of Halchton repeats the same grant to Thomas, son of Stephen de Elynhal, Carpenter. Witnesses, Sir Robert Corbet, Knight; Thomas de Le, Lord of Roden; Philip, Lord of Pevynton; Thomas Cresset, William Cresset, Roger Gilbert, and his son, Thomas."

tween the Abbot of Haghmon, and Thomas Cresset of Halghton with his son Richard, concerning 12 acres held by Richard Hugyns in Halghton. Also on July 28, 1339, the same Abbot leases two parcels of waste in Halghton to Margery and Alice, daughters of Thomas Cresset of Halghton. On July 26, 1349, Richard son of Thomas Cresset of Halghton gives to Haghmon Abbey 5*s.* rent out of tenements in Halghton. Witnesses, William de Smethcote; Nicholas de Harley, Clerk; Philip, Lord of Penynton; William de Muriden; and Walter Cresset of Uffington.

Other Undertenants in Haughton occur as follows.—About 1253, Thomas de Haleton attests a grant to Haughmond Abbey. About 1245, Hugh son of Robert de Staunton gave to Haghmon Abbey, for 2½ merks, a rent of 3*s.* 6*d.* which he received from William de Almanian for one virgate and two-thirds of a noke in Halghton. Witnesses, Sir William de Ercalwe, Stephen de Penynton, John de Rodene, Reiner de Withiforde, William Crasset of Halghton, Roger fitz Gilbert (of Haughton), and Henry de Uffinton. Also Roger fitz Gilbert of Halghton gave to the Abbey, two acres in the field of Halghton, which Gilbert his father had bequeathed, with his body, to sustain the lights before the High Altar in the Church of Haghmon. Witnesses, Henry de Sibbeton, Alan Brito, Ralph de Preston, John de Horton, Thomas de Halghton, William his son, and William de Almagne.

About 1260, the last witness, as William Alemon of Halghton, gives, for the same purpose, 2 acres in Halghton, one of which is said to be in the field of *Veninton*. Witnesses, Sir John fitz Aer, John Lord of Arcalwe, Philip de Peninton, William Crasset of Halghton, and Roger fitz Gilbert of Halghton. Also William, son of Richard, son of Adam de Asteleg, with Avota his wife, gave for the same purpose, one acre in the fields of Halghton, which he bought from William Alemon, part of which is described as in the field towards *Ruleye*. Witnesses, Sir John de Ercalwe, Sir John fitz Aer, knights, Philip de Peninton, and Richard de Sogedon, Clerk.

The two last Deeds name Roger Gery as an adjoining Landholder, and the last Deed similarly names William fitz William. Now Hugh de Halghton and William fitz William of Halghton occur on a Wellington Jury in 1284.

On May 10, 1341, the Abbot of Haghmon and Robert Corbet of Morton (whose Lessee, Thomas de Upton, had made a *foss* in the Abbot's land at Halghton) came to an agreement, attested by Walter Cresset, Thomas de Halghton, and Henry del Clif.