



White Waltham and Shottesbrook in the Middle Ages.

WHEN Edward I returned to England in 1274, and was crowned at Westminster, nearly two years after the death of his father, Henry III, he made it his first duty, as King, to enquire into the state of the demesnes, rights and revenues of the crown, &c. ; and the answers made to the Commissioners appointed for the purpose were entered by the Court of Exchequer in documents known as Hundred Rolls ; and, as an outcome of these Rolls, the Quo Warranto Rolls followed on. These Quo Warranto Rolls consisted of inquiries which demanded by what Warrant does any man hold, or do, this or that. Many of the same jurors who held inquest for the Hundred Rolls also formed part of the inquest upon the proceedings entered in the Quo Warranto Rolls. The Hundred Rolls, the Quo Warranto Rolls, and the Assize Rolls were all of them entered in Latin.

One of these Hundred Rolls [c. 1274] tells us as follows, viz. :—
“They say that the present Abbot of Waltham [The Abbot of Waltham Abbey, in Essex] has erected gallows (*furcas*) in Heywode [Heywood Manor, in White Waltham, Berks] commencing with this year and has hanged there a certain woman contrary to the liberty of the lord King and without warrant.”

A portion of an Assize Roll (No. 48) relating to the Hundred of Beynhurst 12 Edw I. [1283-1284] is headed as follows :—“*Pleas de Juratis* (Jurors) *et assisis* taken before Saloman de Rochester Richard de Boillond Robert ffulke Geoffrey de Picheford Justices Itinerant [Justices in Eyre] of the lord King at Windsor in the County of Berks in the Octave of St Michael in the twelfth year of King Edward [the First],” and thus continues :—

“The Hundred of Beynhurst came by XII Jurors.

The jurors present that a certain Robert Waldyng was taken with an ox [which he had] stolen (*boue furato*) at the suit of John Wyood and in full hundred [court] of the seven hundreds was con-

victed at the suit of the aforesaid John and sentenced to be hanged and by William de la Ho then Bailiff of the seven hundreds was delivered to the Abbot of Wautham who caused judgment to be done on him in his manor of Heywode upon a certain oak (*super quemdam (sic) quercum*) they know not by what warrant And the Abbot [of Waltham Abbey, Essex] by his attorney comes and says that he claims to have Infangenethef in his lands because he says that the aforesaid Robert was taken within his manor and by his bailiff brought into full hundred and convicted as is aforesaid and afterwards he was delivered to him for judgment to be done on him by reason of his liberty of Infangenethef and afterwards they caused him to be hanged upon a certain oak because the Abbot and his predecessors lately had gallows in the same manor And upon this comes William de Gyselham who follows for the lord King and says that the lord King is in seisin [possession] and always has been of such liberties until the same Abbot and his bailiff unjustly seized such liberty from the lord King and he asks that inquiry may be made And the jurors being knights elected for this purpose [say] that the aforesaid Abbot and his predecessors have used the aforesaid liberties from the time that they first held the manor of heywode moreover that the lord King or his successors [never] had seizin thereof within the tenure of the said Abbot Therefore the aforesaid Abbot as far as this goes is without day [*sine die*, i.e. is discharged] saving the right of the lord King &c" *Infangenethef* signifies the right which attached to lords of certain manors to judge a thief caught *within* the manor.

In another entry of the same Assize Roll, we find: "Of liberties they say that the Abbot of Waltham claims to have gallows [and] correction of the assize of bread and ale [that is, of testing them as to price and freedom from adulteration] at Heywode while the Abbot of Chertsey claims to have the same liberties at Waltham they know not by what Warrant" etc., etc.

It will thus be seen that not only had Waltham Abbey in Essex a holding in White Waltham in Berkshire, but that Chertsey Abbey in Surrey had also a holding in White Waltham.

Earl Harold, who succeeded Edward the Confessor, as King, in 1066, and who was killed at the Battle of Hastings on October 14th of that same year, had been the founder of the grand Abbey of Waltham and had endowed it with land both in Essex and in Berkshire. Domesday Book [1086] expressly tells us, concerning this part of White Waltham, as follows, viz. :—"Ulwin a canon held it

of Earl Harold and it belonged to the Church of Waltham (*Uluuin canonicus tenuit de comite heraldo et ecclesia de Waltham pertenuit*).” After the Norman Conquest, however, King William made forfeit of all these lands which had belonged to Harold, both in Essex and in Berkshire, and handed them over to the Bishop of Durham; but it is interesting to notice that that portion of Waltham Abbots [White Waltham] which had belonged to Harold was afterwards restored to Waltham Abbey, because in *Testa de Nevill* (p. 124) we find that the Abbey held “Herwode Waltham” in demesne [i.e., Heywood Manor]: and it has been suggested that possibly ‘Herwode’ here is a corruption of ‘Harolds.’

As for the other portion of Waltham Abbots [White Waltham], it had belonged to Chertsey Abbey in the time of Edward the Confessor; and, after the Conquest, King William did not interfere with this arrangement, for Domesday Book tells us:—“The Abbey of Certesyg [Chertsey] holds Waltham as part of its demesne for the support of the monks (*Abbatia de Certesyge tenet Waltham de dominico victu monachorum*);” and further tells us that there was [in 1086] a chapel (*ecclesiola*) in that part of Waltham Abbots. The tower of White Waltham Church, as it stands in 1908, is of early Norman date.

In the *Testa de Nevill* (p. 124) we read that the Abbot of Chertsey holds ‘Wytewaltham’ in demesne as grant in almoyn by St. Edward—i.e., a portion of Waltham Abbots.

In another entry of the same Assize Roll, I notice that White Waltham is referred to thus, viz.: “*In villâ de blaunche Wautham*.” We have, here, an illustration of the blend of French with the Latin in such-like entries, in Edward the First’s reign. We find that:—“Thomas fitz Adam of the oak and Robert his brother were attached [to attach—means to seize a person or his goods] in the vill of White Waltham (*blaunche Wautham*) So that the aforesaid Robert struck the aforesaid Thomas with a certain stick (*quodam baculo*) on the head from which he died and forthwith fled and is suspected Therefore let him be demanded and outlawed (*ultralagetur*) His chattels [were worth] vs vi^d for which the vill of Shotesbrok must account The same held land whereof the year and waste [were worth] xis for which the same vill [Shotesbrok] must account and the mesne time [*medium temporis*, that is—“the mean—while”] of the same land [was worth] xv^s for which the same vill must account The first finder [of the corpse] comes and is not suspected No Englishry [is presented] It is

adjudged murder upon the hundred And the vills of Waltham and Shotesbroke have not made suit (*non fecerunt sectam*) and therefore they are amerced."

This little story of the middle ages gives us a peep into the sort of life which the local newspaper, if only there had been one, of that dark period in our history would have had to relate in our neighbourhood, from time to time. What happened may be paraphrased thus :—Robert, son of Adam of the oak—so-called, doubtless, because of a fine old oak tree close to his house—having, along with his brother Thomas, got attached, then quarrelled with Thomas ; and the dispute ended with Robert, who had a stick in his hand, hitting Thomas with it on the head and killing him. And then Robert, having got into all this trouble, bolted. A hue and cry was started ; and, later, Robert was caught and brought back again to the village where the crime had taken place. His chattels (*catalla*) were valued at five shillings and six pence, for which King Edward I. held the village of Shottesbrook responsible. In those days everybody in a township was specially interested in keeping down crime, within its own borders. Whenever a murder took place the vill was "at the mercy of the King;" in one word, it was "amerced;" and if the vill were too poor to pay, then the particular Hundred, or Division, in which the vill was situated had to bear the brunt of it. Both White Waltham and Shottesbrook, so far back as the date of the Domesday Survey [1086], were, as they still remain, in the Hundred of Beynhurst. In this case, Robert Fitzadam held land in Shottesbrook, whereof "the year and waste" were assessed as being worth eleven shillings (and the mesne time as being worth sixteen shillings). And the meaning of this is :—it was within the prerogative of the King to seize the profits of such land for "a year and a day" ; and he even had the right to "waste" the land [of the felon] to the extent of burning any houses upon it, ploughing up the meadows and pastures, rooting up the woods, &c., unless at least the Lord of the Fee came to terms with his Majesty and redeemed the "waste." After a year and a day from the date of the felony, the land of the felon was restored to the Lord of the Fee. Shottesbrook was responsible for everything, including the five shillings and sixpence for chattels. The man who found Thomas' body gave a full explanation, and was in no way suspected of killing him. "No Englishry" was presented, and so the Hundred of Beynhurst had to be responsible for the amercement money on account of this murder ; but, inasmuch as

Shottesbrook was well able to pay, the remainder of the Hundred escaped the charge.

The ancient plea of "Englishry" is quaint and interesting. The name of *murder* as a crime was formerly applied only to the secret killing of another, which the word *moërda* in the Teutonic language literally means. When King Canute had become King of England in 1016, some of those Danes who remained with him as a body-guard were from time to time secretly made away with by the English, and, so, the king made a law that if an *Englishman* secretly killed a Dane he should be tried for murder, and the vill in which the crime was committed made liable to pay heavily. The result of all this was that in such cases every effort was made by the English to prove that the man who had been killed was an Englishman, and not a Dane; in order to free the vill from amercement. The proof of Englishry was by calling the father and mother of the murdered man as witnesses. Great abuses, of course, were attendant on this extraordinary law, and it was repealed by statute in the reign of Edward III. [1327-1377]. In the case now before us, the "Englishry" law [*Englecheria*] was still in force, but inasmuch as "Englishry" was in no way pleaded as an extenuation in Shottesbrooke's favour, Shottesbrooke stood amerced for the murder.

Another entry in this Assize Roll runs thus:—"John de Waleys and Ivor his brother have slain Robert The Reaper (*Le Messer*) of Roesia de Shotesbroke, in the same vill and forthwith fled and are suspected Therefore let them be demanded and outlawed They had no chattels nor were they in the tything because they were strangers but they were of the manupast [household] of Henry de Shotesbroke Therefore he is amerced And the vill of Cressewelle does not come to the inquisition before the coroner Therefore it is amerced" The manor of Creswell, now Philiberts, is in Bray Parish. Mr. Kerry tells us, in his "Hundred of Bray [1861]," that "Roger de Cressewell was one of the principal inhabitants of Bray in 1333; the name occurs in 1338 and 1340, but he appears to have been the last of the family in Bray. . . . This manor [of Creswell] comprises the whole of Holyport, Stert-green, Foxley-green, Moneyrow-green, and Touchin."

Then, again, the following Assize Roll entry of the same date is interesting, concerning fishing rights in the Shottesbrook lake, viz. :—"Robert de la Ho Roger Le Tayllur and Stephen de la Lake fished in the fishery of Roesia de Shotesbroke on account of which the aforesaid Roesia commanded William le Bolt and Richard

le War reaper and Robert de la Bure and William le Rede carter and John fitz Terry to be sureties for them (*deuadiarent*) and contention arising between them the aforesaid William Richard and Robert de la Bure slew the aforesaid Robert de la Ho and forthwith were taken and imprisoned at Wyndesore and afterwards were delivered in Bail by writ of the lord King and William le Bolt has lately died And Richard the Reaper and Robert de la Bure have now withdrawn themselves and are suspected Therefore let them be demanded and outlawed They had no chattels nor were they in the tything but they were of the manupast of the aforesaid Roesia who is dead and John Terry now comes and defends the death and everything and for good or evil puts himself upon his Country And xii Jurors say upon their oath that he is in nowise guilty of the aforesaid death Therefore he is quit thereof And the aforesaid William le Rede carter never withdrew for the aforesaid deed nor is he suspected Therefore &c And the aforesaid (*sic*) William Terry of Shotesbrok William de Camera (*of the Chamber*) Robert fitz Peter Robert Thudret Ralph Godard William of the oak Walter Kere Robert Herding John Wolerich William de Cruchesfeld [Crossfield, the field with a cross in it] Ralph de Burnham mainprised [i.e., took into friendly custody, undertaking to produce them on a certain day] the aforesaid John Terry And Ralph de Camera Ralph Godard William de la le (*sic*) Adam Godard Robert Thudred William of the oak John de la Putte ? (*of the Well*) John de la Hulle (*Hill*) William Attewodehech [hech is the name of an engine to take fish in the river Ouse, 23 Hen. 8. c. 5] Adam de ffraxino (*of the ash-tree*) William de Cruceswell and Peter le Man mainprised the aforesaid Robert de Camera to have them on the first day and they have not done so Therefore they are amerced And it was agreed by the xii [Jurors] that Nicholas de Yatingdon [Yattendon, near Newbury] sometime constable of Wyndesore took mainprise of the aforesaid Richard le War and Bartholemew de y'tingdene brother and heir of the aforesaid Nicholas has not yet answered of the aforesaid mainprise Therefore it was commanded the sheriff that he cause the aforesaid Bartholemew to come and answer for the mainprise aforesaid Afterwards came the aforesaid Bartholemew and made a fine for the transgression because he did not answer xxs as appears within by the rolls aforesaid" When it is said here that Bartholemew 'made a fine' (*finem fecit*) it means that he 'ended the matter,' namely—by paying down the amount in which he was mulcted.

While all these events were happening in the village, the Church at Shottesbrook, as it now stands, did not exist. There was a church at Shottesbrook in 1086, because the Domesday Book says of Shottesbrook [*Sotesbroc in Benes hd.*]:—"Ibi Ecclesia." The present Church, an ideal specimen of the Decorated style at the zenith of its beauty, was built in 1337 by Sir William Trussell, of Cubleston, shortly after he had purchased Shottesbrook Manor. It is the gem of this neighbourhood, if not of the whole of England, with regard to its shape and style amongst Parish Churches. I believe that when the interior of Shottesbrook Church was restored in 1852, fragments of Norman mouldings and arches were laid bare.

The etymological derivation of 'Shottesbrook' is as follows. It corresponds to an Anglo-Saxon form *Scottes brōc*; here *Scottes* is the genitive case of *Scot*, a man's name; and *brōc* means "brook." So it means 'the place near Mr. Shot's brook.'

F. T. WETHERED.

Hurley Vicarage, Berks.

December, 1908.

The Stapleton Brass at Ipsden, Oxon.

By J. E. Field, M.A.,

Vicar of Benson.

ONE of the most interesting of the palimpsest brasses of Oxfordshire is that at Ipsden. A description of it with facsimiles was given by Mr. Percy Manning in a paper on the *Monumental Brasses of the Deanery of Henley-on-Thames* in the *Journal of the Oxford University Brass-Rubbing Society*, I. 253, 254 (October, 1898), and it is described also by Mr. Mill Stephenson in his *List of Palimpsest Brasses in Great Britain* (1903), p. 145. The obverse represents "Master Thamas Englysche and Isbell his wyffe" both of whom "discesyd wthin on yere," 1525. On the