

ADDITIONAL NOTES AS TO THE MANOR OF
ISELHAMPSTED AND THE BARONS LATIMER.

I AM obliged to the Rev. Thomas Williams for pointing out to me that the Latimers did not, at least in the first instance, obtain this manor by grant from the King, as stated in my paper, "The Barons Latimer," in the last issue of the RECORDS. I confess to not having gone beyond Lysons for my information, and am glad that Mr. Williams has referred me to the Rolls on which he (Lysons) based his statement. The Rolls (as printed, and in the British Museum) which concern the Manor are, in order of date, the following:—

1. "*Rotulorum Originalium Curia Scaccarii Abbre-
viatio*," Vol. I., p. 301, 20 *Edw. II.*, A.D. 1326.—The King commits to the custody of Matilda Botetourt the Manor of Iselhampsted, which had belonged to Hugh le Despenser, junior, the King's enemy, and which by forfeiture had come to the King's hands.

2. *Same Rolls*, Vol. II., p. 9, 1 *Edw. III.*, A.D. 1327.—William Trussel, escheator, is commanded to resume for the King the Manor of Iselhampsted, which had belonged to Hugh le Despenser, junior, formerly enemy, etc., etc.

3. *Same Rolls*, Vol. II., p. 21, 2 *Edw. III.*, A.D. 1328.—The Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk is ordered to seize the goods and chattels of Matilda Botetourt, who had died liable for sundry debts to the King, incurred during the time she had the custody of the Manor of Iselhampsted.

4. *Rolls of Parliament*, Vol. II., p. 37, 4 *Edw. III.*, A.D. 1330.—John Cyfrewast prays the King and his Council for recovery of land which Sir Simon de Bereford, escheator, had forcibly enclosed in his Park of Iselhampsted.

5. *Rolls of Parliament*, Vol. II., p. 41, 4 *Edw. III.*, A.D. 1330.—"To our Lord the King, his Bachelor, William Latimer, prays, that as Maud, who was the wife of John Botetourt, held the Manor of Iselhampsted of her heri-

tage, which Maud gave the said Manor to the said William, and Elizabeth his wife, the daughter of the said Maud, and to the heirs of their bodies issuing, by which grant they were in possession until wilfully deprived by Simon de Bereford, escheator south of Trent, under colour of his office: That he, of his good grace, will grant to the said William for his service, that which is his of right, to hold to the same William, and to the said Elizabeth, according to the form of gift before said.

Answer.—It pleaseth the King that the Manor of Iselhampsted and the appurtenances, of which this Petition makes mention, be granted to My Lord, William Latimer and his Consort, and to the heirs of their bodies begotten, if such there should be, etc., and that the said Manor shall revert to the King and to his heirs; and let this be for the good service which the said William has rendered to the King: and let this be his charter.” (*Translation of the old French.*)

Lysons has, “*King Edw. III., in the year 1324*” (by his reference, 2 *Edw. III.*, he evidently means 1328) “*granted the Manor of Iselhampsted, which had belonged to Hugh le Despenser to Sir Simon de Bereford, and two years afterwards to William Latimer.*” The Rolls I have quoted, 1 and 2, state that the Manor had belonged to Hugh le Despenser, junior, but no grant, either to Despenser or Bereford appears; and by 5 the grant to Latimer seems to have been no more than the restitution of that which had belonged to him and his wife as the gift of her mother, Maud Botetourt, in whose heritage it had been. How Despenser had possession of the Manor does not appear; it is very probable, however, as Mr. Williams suggests, that he had obtained it *more suo*, by force or fraud. But neither is it clear how Iselhampsted came to be in the heritage of Maud Botetourt, as Latimer stated in his Petition, and it is curious that she should have been appointed custodian (Roll quoted, 1) of that which may have been her rightful property. To that lady had descended a considerable portion of the estate of her maternal grandfather, William de Beauchamp, territorial lord of Bedford, and certain of his manors in Bedfordshire (to wit, Dylewyk, Kerdyngton, and Ronhale) are shown by the Rolls (*Placita de Quo Warranto Edw. III.*, p. 77) to have been granted by Maud to Latimer and his wife, her

daughter; but Iselhampsted is nowhere mentioned as a Beauchamp manor.

In view, however, of Latimer's claim, clearly expressed in his Petition, a claim, too, which seems to have been admitted, we may think, even in the absence of corroboration, that the manor had formed part of the heritage of Maud Botetourt; and this, as a fact, finds some support, I think, in Lipscomb's List of Ministers (quoted in the paper of Mr. Burgess), but for which, unfortunately, the Doctor does not give his authority. In the list, John Botehurst, kt., presents in 1304; and finding this name nowhere else, I am inclined to think it merely a scribal error for *Botetourt*, and that is meant Sir John Botetourt (Baron by writ 1305), husband of Maud, in whose right he presented; he died 1324.

From 1213, when Walter Foliot was lord of Iselhampsted, until 1330 or 1331, when Latimer had his grant, the possession of the manor will probably remain obscure; but crediting the claim advanced by Latimer in his petition for the grant, and for *Botehurst* reading *Botetourt* in the presentation to the church in 1304, we gather that in that year it belonged to Maud Botetourt, wife of Sir John. After his death, in 1324, it seems that, in some way, but not apparently by grant, Hugh Despenser obtained possession; and that on his downfall and forfeiture of his estates, in 1326, the widow, Maud Botetourt, had the custody of the manor, no reference being made to her right in it. Maud appears to have died the next year, 1327. Earlier in that year probably occurred the marriage of her daughter, Elizabeth, with Latimer (whose son and successor was born in 1328), and the grant to them of Iselhampsted may have been at the time of the marriage, or they may have had it by bequest. On Lady Botetourt's death, however, William Trussel, the escheator, had command to resume possession for the King (Roll quoted, 2); and the next year, 1328, her goods and chattels were seized by the King's order for debts to him incurred at the time she had the custody of Iselhampsted (Roll quoted, 3). Perhaps she had withheld the rents and profits of the manor, considering them to be of right her own.

Sir Simon de Bereford appears to have succeeded Trussel as escheator, and under colour of his office, as

stated by Latimer, to have taken possession of the manor ; his unlawful action being also the complaint of John Cyfrewast (Roll quoted, 4). No grant to Bereford appears, and Lyons, in stating that he had one, is probably incorrect.

Bereford being dead (executed for high treason), Latimer, in 1330 or 1331, makes his claim ; it is allowed, and the King, by grant, places him and his wife in possession, providing, that in case of failure of heirs the reversion should be to the Crown.

Mr. Williams also expresses doubt as to the wife of the fourth Baron Latimer having been a Fitz Alan. My authority for this is Burke. Having referred to Beltz's *Memorials of the Order of the Garter*, p. 150, I find he does not appear to credit the alliance, having found no authority for Vincent's showing in a pedigree that the wife of Lord Latimer was a daughter of Edmund Fitz Alan, Earl of Arundel. The pecuniary impediment which the College of Heralds places against the use of its records has prevented my reference to Vincent's pedigree. Dugdale merely mentions the wife as Elizabeth, not stating her family.

I have also found that the first wife of the 3rd Nevill Baron Latimer was Dorothy Vere, by whom his children. His second wife was Elizabeth Musgrave, whom he married June 20, 1528, not 1518 as Miss Strickland states.—(*Harleian Society's Publications*, vol. xvi., p. 225, note.)