

MISCELLANEA.

ADDITIONS AND EMENDATIONS TO VOL. VI.

ERRATA.

Page 89, note 2, 7 lines from bottom, for "Keytwell," read "Kentwell."

Page 302, line 2, for "VOL. IV." read "VOL. V."

NOTE TO NOTICE OF RICHARD WATTS. VOL. VI. PAGE 52.

A Correspondent assures us that there is a Will of an Alderman of Rochester in the Consistory Register there, dated 1572, which mentions "Richard Wätts of Bullihill nere the City of Rochester where he had then dwelled about 20 years—& before at Little Peckham where he was borne—a free man born—& then about lix y^{es} of age."

NOTES TO THE EXTRACT FROM THE HUNDRED ROLLS.

VOL. VI. PAGE 186.

The first name in the list of Jurors, printed Tomford, should, doubtless, be read Toniford. The family of Toniford, at the time referred to, occupied the manor of the same name in Thanington, near Canterbury. The mansion-house is now reduced to a farm, but extensive remains of fifteenth century buildings still exist.

The term *curtena*, which occurs in the same document (p. 187, and note 3), may be supposed to designate the vehicle which, within the last fifty years, was known universally, in the parts of the county towards Sussex, by the name of 'coort,' a strong, low-sided cart, primarily intended for carrying manure: the term is now rapidly falling out of use, and will probably soon be lost. The distinction between a dung-coort and any other kind of cart used to be as fully recognized as that between a cart and a wagon. The original word may have

been 'coorten,' or 'coortn,' and the final letter may have been dropped, as, in rustic pronunciation, 'kiln' has become 'kill,' or 'kell.' I am doubtful whether I have ever heard a final *n* sounded.

R. C. HUSSEY.

THE REV. LAMBERT BLACKWELL LARKING.

(In Memoriam.)

Few persons have closed their earthly career who have been more highly respected and more deeply lamented by a large number of friends than the subject of the present memoir. The Rev. Lambert Blackwell Larking was the eldest son of John Larking, of Clare House in East Malling, by Dorothy, daughter of Sir Charles Style, Bart., of Watlington Place, in Kent. He was born at Clare House on the 2nd of February, 1797. His ancestors on both sides had been for many ages resident in Kent, of which county his father was a Deputy-Lieutenant, and served the office of High Sheriff in 1808.

Having spent a few years in a school of some repute at Parson's Green, under the tuition of Mr. Pearson, young Lambert Larking was sent to Eton College as an oppidan, and remained there until the year 1816, when he became a member of Brazenose College, Oxford. He obtained a second-class degree in *literis humanioribus* at Easter, 1820. At Eton and at Oxford his unselfish and generous character procured him many friends, whose affection never deserted him. At the latter place he founded the University Lodge of Freemasons, now one of the most flourishing lodges in the kingdom. On leaving Oxford he made the grand tour with a Mr. Lowther, when travelling was not quite so easy as it is at present. His reminiscences of this period of his life were a constant source of amusement to his friends, for his memory was unailing, and his anecdotes were related with much raciness and enthusiasm. On his return to England he was ordained Deacon, and was licensed to the curacy of East Peckham, near Tunbridge, of which parish the Rev. George Moore was then Rector. It was here, probably, that he acquired the taste, which afterwards distinguished him, for searching into the memorials of the past.

Mr. Moore held the office of Registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and gave his curate permission to consult and copy the early wills under his custody. At East Peckham Mr. Larking devoted his leisure to the study of the history of his native county. Every nook and corner, every crumbling stone or stately monument, soon became familiarly known to him. In searching into the annals of the past, and in gathering up antiquarian and historical information, he was indefatigable, labouring only for the benefit of his friends and fellow-labourers in the same field.

On the 10th of December, 1823, he took his M.A. degree. On the 14th of April, 1830, he was admitted to the Vicarage of Ryarsh, in Kent, void by the death of the Rev. John Liptrott, to which he was presented by his friend and relative, Colonel the Honorable J. Wingfield Stratford. On the 28th of January, 1837, he succeeded to the Vicarage of Burham, in Kent, on the presentation of Charles Milner, Esq., of Preston Hall, in the same county. Soon after his institution to Ryarsh, Mr. Larking married Frances, eldest daughter of Sir William Jervis Twysden, Bart., of Roydon Hall, on the 20th of July, 1831. About this period the old Vicarage House at Ryarsh was taken down, and the present pretty residence, a model parsonage, was erected in its place, the cost of building which, however, tended very considerably to diminish Mr. Larking's income. After his removal to Ryarsh, the 'Surrenden Collection of Manuscripts' was placed in his hands by the liberality of Sir Edward Dering, the lineal descendant of the baronet by whom the Collection was formed in the middle of the seventeenth century. Such of the time as was not occupied by his parochial duties, Mr. Larking employed in the examination of these valuable papers, which had been collected from the Charter-chests of Christ Church and St. Augustine's, Canterbury, the muniment room of Cobham, the stores of Dover Castle, and the ancient title deeds of Sir Edward's own ancestral estates. Mr. Larking intended to publish a catalogue of the 'Surrenden Charters,' interspersed with copies and translations of the most ancient and valuable; but the great expenditure which such a publication would have entailed upon him alone prevented him from carrying his design into execution. Undismayed by work which many men would

have deemed laborious and irksome, Mr. Larking found time to copy and index all the early "*Pedes Finium*" relating to Kent now in the Public Record Office, as well as the early "*Inquisitiones post mortem*" in the same repository. All these documents were transcribed by himself in so neat and legible a hand that those who knew only his hastily scribbled letters would scarcely suppose that he could have so schooled himself as his transcripts prove he did. This most curious and valuable collection has passed, with all his other MSS. and books, into the hands of his brother, Mr. J. W. Larking. These pursuits naturally brought him into connection with the Rev. Thomas Streatfeild, of Westerham, who was engaged in writing a History of Kent. An intimate friendship sprang up between them. Mr. Larking's accumulated stores were freely communicated to Mr. Streatfeild, the value of whose collection was greatly enhanced by the contributions of his friend.

In the midst of these labours the Camden Society was formed, in the year 1838, for the purpose of publishing materials illustrating the civil, ecclesiastical, and literary history of this kingdom; and Mr. Larking, on his return from Malta, where he had been passing the winter of 1838-9, became an active supporter of the new Society. He was placed on the Council in 1852, and continued to be a member till the time of his death. His contributions to its publications consisted of (1) "the Report of Prior Philip de Thame to Elyan de Villanova, Grand Master of the Knights Hospitallers in England;" (2) "Proceedings, principally in the County of Kent, in connection with the Parliament called in 1640, and especially with the Committee of Religion appointed in that year, from the collections of Sir Edward Dering."

Having thus devoted his leisure hours to Archæological studies, he also became a contributor to the '*Collectanea Topographica*.' Several articles, from the year 1837, can be traced to his truthful pen. Among them the following may be mentioned:—"Deeds relating to the Manor of Stilton in Huntingdonshire, and the families of Bell and Sankey;" "Early charters relating to land in Babraham in Cambridgeshire;" "Charters relating to the Manor of Hemington in the parish of Stilton;" "Exemplification of records and charters relating to the Manor of Pynkeny and other Manors of the barony of

Pynkeny in the county of Northampton during the reigns of Edward II. and Edward III.;" "Charters relating to the family of De Alba Ripa and to the nunnery of Gokewell in Lincolnshire;" "Grant of Sprouton in Co. Suffolk by Robert de Blancheville to the Canons of Ipswich."

Though Mr. Larking was well known to a numerous circle of friends as a zealous collector of materials for the History of Kent, it was not until the year 1857 that he came conspicuously before the public as a promoter of the study of Kentish Archæology. At his instigation the Viscount and Viscountess Falmouth, to whom he was chaplain, invited a few friends to Mereworth Castle, for the purpose of laying the foundation of an Archæological Society for the county of Kent, on the formation of which the late Marquess Camden was unanimously chosen President, and Mr. Larking Honorary Secretary. On the 24th of November of the same year he had the gratification to announce that the Society so recently created already consisted of 367 members, of whom 24 were Life-compounders.

It is not intended, in a memoir necessarily so succinct as this is, to follow Mr. Larking through his exertions and labours in bringing the Kent Archæological Society to the high position it so deservedly occupies. The energy and perseverance manifested by him in furthering its fortunes are well known and acknowledged. Declining health compelled him to resign his office of Honorary Secretary, after he had filled it for five years to the honour of himself and the satisfaction of the Society.

The work, however, on which Mr. Larking's fame will eventually rest, and which I have no hesitation in saying will afford undeniable proof of his merit as an antiquary and a scholar, is yet unpublished. Dissatisfied with what had been done for illustrating our great national Doomsday, he determined to write a dissertation upon it, taking the county of Kent as the theme on which to hang his disquisitions. Long before the idea of photo-zincographing Doomsday was entertained, Mr. Larking employed Mr. Netherclift, the lithographer, to commence a fac-simile of it by tracing, while he himself was composing his contemplated Introduction.

Severe illness overtook him while engaged upon his work, and prevented him from making that progress which he so vehemently desired. In addition to this, the over-anxiety to

obtain an exactitude almost impossible, which had oppressed him from the very commencement of his literary life, now daily increased upon him. A desire to exhaust every source of information within his reach, a craving for perfection that can never be attained,—for certainty in things that must ever remain uncertain, retarded his labours. To have carried out his grand design would have demanded the devotion of his whole life, and a residence in the Metropolis. His shattered health, increasing age, and unlooked-for death intervened as insurmountable obstacles between him and the great object and aspiration of his literary life. This is to be deeply lamented, as the man can hardly be found, whatever his abilities and acquirements, who can give the finishing touches and completeness to a work which would have been achieved by the mind that originally conceived it.

In addition to the works already mentioned, Mr. Larking contributed many important papers to the ‘Archæologia Cantiana.’ Among them were, “The Inventory of Juliana de Leyborne, Countess of Huntingdon;” “On the Heart-shrine in Leyborne Church*;” A paper on the Surrenden charters; “*Probatio ætatis* of William de Septvans;” “Sir Roger Tywsden’s Journal;” Papers on the *Pedes Finium* for the County of Kent, with elaborate indexes; Paper on the Rev. Thomas Streatfeild; Paper on the *Inquisitiones post mortem* pertaining to Kent, with index thereto; Miscellanea; An elaborate paper on the Leyburne family; and a second, which follows this memoir. He was unwearied in his endeavours to bring before the world the literary labours of his friend Mr. Streatfeild, whose daughter-in-law, the present Mrs. Streatfeild, has generously bestowed on the county of Kent her late father-in-law’s collections.

It would not be just to Mr. Larking to close this brief memoir without some reference to those duties of a higher and more responsible kind, to the performance of which his life was devoted. Never was a parish priest more assiduous, or more unsparing of his energies, his time, and his means, in promoting

* Mr. Larking amused himself in the intervals of freedom from pain during his long illness by enlarging this work, and he had collected a large mass of interesting documents on the subject, amounting at least to threefold the original work.

the present and future welfare of his flock, than Mr. Larking. Early and late, at all times when required, he was at the bedside of the sick and the suffering,—counselling, warning, advising, comforting, as few but he could do. Never was any one more beloved in his parish. In him the poor have lost a benevolent and sympathizing pastor; their richer neighbours a steadfast, upright, and intelligent friend. For the children of his parish, always especial objects of his care, he built a school-house at Ryarsh, and provided a teacher at his own expense. The little vicarage of Burham enjoyed an equal share of his munificence,—the emoluments leaving him about £40 per annum, after he had erected a school-house there, and paid the teacher's salary.

Rich in the esteem of every one who knew him, Mr. Larking expired on the 2nd of August, 1868, and was buried in the churchyard of Ryarsh. Among all who knew him, he has left the memory of genial qualities rarely found. His sterling worth, his unimpeachable integrity, his nice sense of honour, his unfailing courtesy, his active benevolence, his unobtrusive kindness, will not be easily effaced from the memories of those who had the happiness of his friendship. It is scarcely possible that they will again find the same genial greeting, the same bright smile, the same hearty and affectionate manner, which were distinguishing characteristics of Mr. Larking, and diffused gladness around him like a ray of sunshine. If others have possessed more eminent gifts of genius, or talents better fitted to command the admiration of mankind, none have surpassed him in those winning and amiable qualities which attract at first sight, and often lead on to indissoluble friendships; and none knew better than he how to cement the friendship once gained by the exercise of every excellence befitting a man of high principle, unswerving probity, and unaffected piety.

T. D. H.

[I have prefixed the above Memoir, a tribute from one of Mr. Lambert Larking's oldest and most valued friends, to the last letter which he himself addressed to me on a subject which, as readers of these volumes well know, was of exceeding interest to him. It is melancholy to reflect that we have here the last work of his pen, and that our members will be delighted

with no more of those vivid and elaborate contributions which have adorned our first seven volumes. None of us will forget that his latest writing, and, as I know from our almost daily correspondence, some of his latest thoughts also, were for the Society which he founded and loved.—T. G. F.]

ON THE HEART-SHRINE IN LEYBOURNE CHURCH, AND
THE FAMILY OF DE LEYBOURNE.

(See Vol. V., p. 133.)

MY DEAR MR. FAUSSETT,—Since my last communication relative to the Heart-Shrine in Leybourne Church, and the biography of our great Kentish Baron, Sir ROGER DE LEYBOURNE, I have made further investigation at the Rolls, and other depositories of ancient Records, by which I have been enabled to confirm most of my conjectures, and to clear up such doubts as still remained in my former discussions. I hope, therefore, that you will be able to afford me sufficient space for a few *novissima verba*, such as, I believe, will leave no doubts or difficulties on these subjects unsolved.

I.—First, as to the Shrine itself.

It is evident from the three following documents that a Chantry formerly existed in LEYBOURNE CHURCH, and there can be little doubt that this structure was a shrine therein dedicated to the memory of its founders, viz. the great Sir Roger de Leybourne, and his son Sir William, and intended to contain their hearts, although one only has been actually deposited there. It is impossible to avouch with certainty, to which of these great men that one belonged. For myself, however, I have no hesitation in pronouncing it to be the heart of Sir Roger. Architectural indications point to this Tabernacle as the oldest of the two; and it stands on the dexter side of the Shrine, the place of precedence,—the other Tabernacle being probably prepared during the lifetime of his son SIR WILLIAM, on whose death, the heir being a mere infant, there was no one to be active in sending his heart to the depository prepared for it.

The first document which I shall notice, relative to this Chantry, is an entry on the “Coram Rege” Roll, 4 *Ed. J.*,

Trinity-Roll 2, being the pleadings in a suit between the heir of the former owner of the land out of which Sir ROGER DE LEYBOURNE had endowed the Chantry, and the then existing Rector of Leybourne and the Chaplain.

The following is a summary of this Record :—

1. ROGER RUFFYN complains that PETER, the Rector of LEYBURN, and JOHN the “Capellan” had seized his goods and chattels, to the value of 5 marks. That this Trespass was committed on 31st March, 4 Ed. I., A.D. 1276, and the Damages are laid at £5.

The Defence is, that RALPH RUFFYN, father of the Plaintiff, gave certain Tenements in LEYBURN to ROGER DE LEYBURN, who out of them gave an endowment to the Defendant and the Church of LEYBURN, for the maintenance of two “Capellans.” FRODINA, widow of the said RALPH, had her Dower in the said Tenements. When she died, the said Peter entered, as of right.

Therefore, they deny that they have illegally entered the dwelling of the Plaintiff, and seized his goods.

The Sheriff to summon a Jury.

The Jury come in Quindain of Easter, 5 Ed. I., A.D. 1277, and acquit the Defendants.

The Plaintiff is in “*misericordia*” for a false charge.

2. The next document which we have relating to the foundation of this Chantry, is a charter of Sir WILLIAM DE LEYBURNE, in which he confirms the endowment made by his father Sir ROGER, for the maintenance of this Chantry, and augments it by a charge of five marks per annum on his manor of RIDLEY, and by a grant of the entire tenement which RALPH RUFFYN had alienated to his father Sir ROGER.

This document is given in full by Thorpe, ‘*Registrum Roffense*,’ p. 474. It will be unnecessary, therefore, to reprint it here. It may, however, aid in the complete elucidation of the history of this Heart-Shrine, if I cite the following passage, rendered into English, from this Charter :—

“I have confirmed, in perpetual alms,—for the health of my Soul, and the Souls of my father and mother, my ancestors and successors, in honour of God, and the Blessed Mary, and of All Saints,—to PETER, Rector of the Church of the Apostles Peter and Paul of LEYBURNE, and his successors, for the maintenance of one ‘Capellan’ celebrating divine service there, for ever, all

the land which ROGER, my father, had of the gift of RALPH RUFFIN in LEYBURN and CAUMPES, with its appurtenances, the meadow called RUFFINESMEDE being reserved to me and my heirs.

“ I have also given and granted to the aforesaid Church, for the maintenance of the said Capellan, five marks of annual rent, to be received from the manor of RADLEHE, by the hands of BARTHOLOMEW DE WATTON, and his heirs or assigns, who may be holding the said manor, yearly.”

Thorpe furnishes us with no date to this document, but it must have been made after 1271, in which year Sir WILLIAM's father, Sir ROGER, died; and also, after 1276, as no allusion is made to it in RUFFYN's suit, cited above (No. 1). In the document No. 3, which I shall next cite, PETER, the Rector of LEYBURN, is stated to be dead; and, as that document is dated A.D. 1279, we can fix the date of Sir WILLIAM's augmentation as *inter* 1276 and 1279.

The land at CAUMPES (*modo COMP*), 100 acres, the subject of this augmentation, still forms part of the Rectorial Glebe of LEYBOURNE.

3. The next document which I shall adduce is one which I have transcribed from the Registers at LAMBETH. It is an ordinance of Archbishop PECKHAM, whereby THOMAS BACUN is allowed to hold the Church of LEYBOURNE in plurality with that of LANGLEY, on the petition of Sir WILLIAM DE LEYBURN, for the better maintenance of the Chantry founded by his father, Sir ROGER DE LEYBOURNE, in Leybourne Church.

There is no actual date given to this ordinance, but the nearest preceding date in the Register is “ii kalendis Februarii, A.D. 1279.” We may, therefore, ascribe it to the year 1279. Although it will be unnecessary to transcribe it in full, it may be well to give a certain portion of it as forming an essential evidence of the foundation of this Chantry.

“ Dudum vacante ecclesia de LANGELE, Cantuariensis dioceseos, post mortem PETRI ultimi Rectoris ejusdem, nobilis vir, WILLELMUS DE LEYBURN, verus ejusdem ecclesie Patronus, dilectum filium THOMAM BAOUN, subdiaconum, nobis, ad eandem ecclesiam presentavit, petens, cum instancia, ut idem THOMAS ipsam ecclesiam de LANGELE, una cum ecclesia de LEYBURN, que est de Patronatu ejusdem Domini WILLELMI, Roffensis dioceseos, tanquam eidem annexam, posset suo (*sic*) perpetuo

retinere;—Cumque; super hiis, ut moris est, facta esset Inquisicio diligens et solempnis, inventum est, quod olim bone memorie dominus ROGERUS DE LEYBURNE, pater Domini WILLELMI predicti, ordinavit Cantariam duorum Presbiterorum in ecclesia de LEYBURNE, qui celebrarent perpetuo, pro anima sua, et animabus antecessorum et sucessorum suorum, certis eidem terris et redditibus assignatis. Et cum, processu temporis, videret terras et redditus hujusmodi ad Cantariam predictam non sufficere, vacante ecclesia de LEYBURNE predicta, prefatus Dominus ROGERUS, a locorum Diocesanis optinuit, quod predictus PETRUS, tunc Rector ecclesie de LANGELE, ipsam ecclesiam de LEYBURNE, in augmentum porcionis Cantarie, quam ordinaverat, quasi annexam ecclesie de LANGELE retineret, et inde Cantariam predictam, una cum porcione assignata, suo (*sic*) perpetuo sustineret. Nos igitur, advertentes, etc. . . . petitionem dicti Domini WILLELMI, duximus annuendum, etc. etc. etc.” (See, among the Archiepiscopal Registers at Lambeth, Peckham, 48 a.)

The above three documents are conclusive as to the origin of our Heart-Shrines.

II.—Let us now pass on, therefore, to the next question, which we have hitherto left undecided, viz. Did Sir Roger de Leyburne actually start on the Crusade with his master and prince, EDWARD ?

At page 140 and page 162, note 12, ‘Archæologia Cantiana,’ Vol. V., it is evidenced that he was among those who obtained Letters of Protection as “crucesignati,” during their absence on the Crusade; but, as stated in the same volume (p. 141, l. 28, and p. 157, l. 8), whatever our conjectures may have been, we were then unable to produce decisive evidence that he actually accompanied the Crusade in obedience to his vows. Since those observations were printed, I have had the satisfaction of discovering an entry on the Patent Roll, proving beyond the power of contradiction that he most assuredly did accompany the Prince on the Crusade, and apparently as one of his personal suite. It is a mandate from the King, tested at Clarendon 17th November, 1270, actually putting in force the Letters of Protection which had been granted to Sir ROGER during his absence on the Crusade. It is directed to the King’s son, Prince EDMUND, setting forth that—

“Cum dilectus et fidelis noster ROGERUS de Leyburn, *tem-*

pore quo transfretavit cum Edwardo primogenito nostro, versus Terram Sanctam, in pacificam seisinam manerii de STANFORD extiterit, et nos ipsum, homines, terras, res, redditus, et omnes possessiones suas in protectionem et defensionem nostram suscepimus," etc.,—and that ROBERT DE FERRARIIS and others had intruded themselves into the said manor 'contra tenorem protectionis nostre predicte, et ad grave damnum predicti ROGERI, etc.' Therefore, the said Prince EDMUND is commanded to go in person to the said manor, and eject and attach the said intruders, to answer "coram nobis" for their said trespass. (Rot. Pat., 55 H. III., m. 25.)

Most assuredly, then, Sir ROGER did actually quit England with the Prince, on the expedition to the Holy Land, and had not returned in November, 1270.

He probably died while on the Crusade,—whether at Tunis, or after landing at Acre, we have, as yet, no knowledge. All we do know is, that he was dead before November, 1271, because that is the date of the homage of his son and heir, Sir WILLIAM. (See 'Archæologia Cantiana,' Vol. V. pp. 154 and 164, note 18.)

On the Charter Roll (Rot. Cart., 55 H. III., m. 1) there is an "Inspeximus" of a grant of the manors of ASHFORD and PAKMANSTON, made by ROGER DE ROLLING and MATILDA his wife, to Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN and ALIANORE his wife, dated 21st July, 1271. He was, therefore, still living in July of that year. He was also living in August, because the "Inspeximus" is dated 13th August, and cites the grant as "factam dilecto et fideli nostro ROGERO DE LEYBURN et ALYANORE DE VALLIBUS, Cometisse WINTONIE, uxori ejus." Had he been dead, the words "defuncto," or "jam defuncto," or "nuper defuncto," would have been added. Since the expedition landed at Acre during Easter, 1271 (Vol. V. pp. 141 and 164, note 17), and he was alive in August in the same year, I almost necessarily conclude that he died in the Holy Land itself, between August and the date of his son's homage in November. Of course I do not overlook the possibility, but great improbability, that he had deserted the Prince, and returned to England, after the capture of TUNIS. Knighton, after describing the Prince's indignation at the recreant allies, who then wished to return home, concludes with these words:—

"Quo audito, omnes Anglici (*The English, to a man*) qui

affuerunt cum eo velle proficisci promiserunt." (See Vol. V., note 16, p. 164.)

This almost precludes the possibility of Sir ROGER's desertion. The historian would, infallibly, have pointed him out by name, had he shewn such a recreant spirit.

III.—At pp. 156, 189, 190 'Archæologia Cantiana,' Vol. V., there is a statement that Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN, during the latter part of his life, resided at Leeds Castle, of which he became possessed by exchanging with ROBERT DE CREVECEUR his manors of TROSLEY and FLEET for that of LEEDS, A.D. 1268. This is not strictly correct, because he was in possession of Leeds in 1265 by a grant from the Crown on the forfeiture thereof by the rebel Robert de Creveceur. In all these transactions there is much that requires elucidation, which I will endeavour to give by enumerating all the charters relating to them.

1. Among the Chapter House Ancient Deeds is a charter of H. III., granting to ROGER DE LEYBURNE all the lands and tenements of ROBERT DE CREUQUOR "inimici et rebellis nostri," being an adherent of SIMON DE MONTFORT. It is dated at Westminster, 30 Nov^r, 50 H. III., *i.e.* 1265. (See 'Chapter House Ancient Deeds,' Box 171, Tray 2, No. 9.)

We know that LEEDS was among these lands, because in the Inquisition on the death of HAMO DE CREVECEUR, 47 H. III., 1263 (see Vol. III. p. 253), the "Manerium de LEDES" is returned by the Jury as one of his manors pertaining to his Barony of Chatham, and his grandson ROBERT is stated to be his heir therein.

2. Among the Charter Rolls there are grants made of market and fair and numerous franchises to Sir ROGER DE LEYBURNE in his Manor of LA MOTE, dated 9 Nov^r, 51 H. III., *i.e.* A.D. 1266. (See Rot. Cart., 51 H. III., m. 11.)

Hasted and other writers state that LA MOTE and LEEDS were the same manor under different names. I therefore insert this grant here, without vouching for the correctness of the assertion, although, as far as my own investigations have yet reached, I have seen but one solitary instance by which this supposition can be maintained.

In the roll of accounts rendered into the Exchequer by Sir ROGER DE LEYBURNE, for his expenses in the countless expeditions undertaken by him in the service of the Crown, we have

an entry in March 1266-7, stating that he went "a domo sua de LA MOTE" to Tenterden; and, on 9 June 1267, there is an entry that he was "apud La Mote;" and here, in the margin, is written "LEDES," seeming to identify the two, though not necessarily so; for the manor of the "MOTM" in Maidstone was close adjoining, and an error of the scribe might easily have arisen. According to these accounts, he had been at Rochester on the 8th June, and again there on 10th, 11th, and 12th June, going thence to the King, at Stratford, on the 13th, staying there two days, and returning thence "ad MOTAM" (no "Ledes" here in margin), where he stayed till 19th June, and then went to Winchelsea.

This entry of the word "LEDES" in the margin is the one solitary instance in which I have as yet seen any record identifying "Ledes" and "La Mote" as one and the same manor. In the above-cited Inquisition, on death of HAMO DE CREVECEUR, A.D. 1263, it is called "Manerium de LEDES." In the exchanges with ROBERT DE CREVECEUR it is "Manerium meum de LEDES;" and in every document that I have as yet inspected it is invariably (with the exception of the entry on the accounts above cited) "Manerium de LEDES," down to the alienation of it by Sir WILLIAM DE LEYBURN to the King, where it is then styled "de Castro et Manerio de LEDES."

Is it safe to conjecture that "La Mote" in Maidstone was his, as well as "Manerium de LEDES," and that he resided at the former while building a castle at "Ledes," on the completion of which he transferred his residence thither, and thenceforward it became "Castrum et Manerium de LEDES"?

Leaving open the question of identity, we next come to the exchange of the Manors of Trosley and Fleet for that of Leeds, in 1268, by which Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN is confirmed in his possession of the latter.

3. Apparently the grant of the Crown in 1265 had given him complete ownership, and we are, at first sight, surprised at the seeming contradiction of his being owner of LEEDS in 1265, and yet in 1268 giving his manors of TROSLEY and FLEET in exchange for it, as though his ownership only commenced in that year. I believe that the elucidation of this is to be found in the requirements of the "Dictum de Kenilworth."

I need hardly remind our readers that this "Dictum" con-

tains the terms of accommodation between the King and the Barons, and that they were drawn up by an assembly of the Clergy and Laity held at Coventry, while the King was besieging KENILWORTH at the latter part of the year 1266. It takes its place among the "Statutes of the Realm," and is thus tested:—"Given and proclaimed in the Castle of KENILWORTH, the day before the Kalends of November, in the year of our Lord MCCLXVI., the LI. year of the reign of the Lord Henry, the noble King of England." Many of the defenders of KENILWORTH refused the terms, and joined their party in the Isle of Ely. But a large number accepted them.

The 12th section of this "Dictum" declares that, with the disinherited Barons, the King has ordained that there shall not be actual disinheritance, but redemption,—*quod non fiat exheredacio, sed redemptio*,—viz.,

"Quod solvent quantum valet terra eorum per quinque annos; et, si isti solvent redemptionem, rehabebunt terras suas;—Ita quod, si terra vendi debeat, nullus eam emat, nisi ille qui eam tenet ex dono Domini Regis, si tantum velit dare quam quilibet communiter emens, et eisdem terminis;—Similiter, satisfaciens pro tota terra habeat totam,—pro medietate, medietatem habeat,—et pro tertia parte, statim tertiam partem habeat. Quod si, ultimo termino statuto, redimens non satisfecerit, medietas terre remanentis remaneat illis quibus terre collate sint per Dominum Regem;—liberum autem sit redimenti, infra illum terminum, vendere totum, vel partem terre, secundum formam vendicionis superius annotatum, et similiter ad firmam tradere." (See 'Statutes of the Realm,' vol. i. pp. 12 to 18.)

It appears, then, by this section, that the disinherited Baron ROBERT DE CREVECEUR was entitled to redeem the Manor of LEEDS from Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN, the grantee of the Crown, by the payment of the value of its issues for five years; and, if a sale were necessary, Sir ROGER could claim the right of pre-emption, provided he were willing to give as much as any ordinary purchaser would give, and on the same terms.

We have here, then, a key to our difficulties in finding Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN the grantee of the Crown in the Manor of LEEDS, and therefore rightful owner thereof in 1265, and yet apparently only acquiring it in 1268, by exchange of the Manors of TROSLEY and FLEET for it with ROBERT DE CREVE-

CŒUR; according to a charter of Sir ROGER, recorded in the Registry at Rochester, whereby he gives, grants, and confirms to ROBERT DE CREVECŒUR and ISOLDA his wife, his Manors of TROTTECLYVE and FLETE, in exchange for the said Robert's Manor of LEDES, with the mediety of all his fees. This charter is dated at London, 18th October, 52 H. III., *i. e.* A.D. 1268. (See '*Registrum Temporalium Ecclesie et Episcopatus Roffensis*,' in the Registry at Rochester, f. 31 a.) And on the Charter Rolls we have the King's Inspecimus and confirmation of it, tested at Westminster 22nd October, 1268. (See Rot. Cart., 52 H. III., No. 2.)

This exchange was evidently made in obedience to the above-cited requirements of the "Dictum de Kenilworth."

CREVECŒUR, it is clear, had claimed the privilege of redeeming his inheritance of Leeds, while Sir ROGER, on his part, asserted his right to the privilege of pre-emption; and he now satisfies CREVECŒUR's claim by giving him the manors of TROTTECLYVE and FLETE as equivalent to the money value of that claim, although, as we shall presently see, it afterwards turned out that they were not equivalent thereto, and that further payment became necessary on the part of Sir ROGER.

In many instances, when these requirements were carried into effect, the seeds of protracted litigation were abundantly sown, as seems to have been the case in the instance before us; for, in the Rochester Register above cited, at f. 31 a, we have a charter of ROBERT CREVECŒUR, dated 5th June, 1293, in which he states that disputes had formerly arisen between him and Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN concerning this exchange of manors (not, however, specifying the particulars of these disputes), that they had finally been settled by the arbitration of mutual friends, and that Sir ROGER had accordingly given him, in addition, a rent-charge of 100 marks on his Manor of Ridley. *Quia maneria predicta de TROTTECLYVE et de FLETE, non sufficiebant ad extentam manerii mei de LEDES.* Without this, the requirements of the *Dictum* would not have been fulfilled, and the whole transaction would have been utterly void and of none effect.

While speaking of "The Manor of TROTTECLYVE" in these transactions, it should be remembered that the estate in question, though bearing this title in the charters before us, was

not the "Chief Manor of TROTTESECLYVE," of which it could hardly have been predicated that *non sufficiebat ad extentam manerii de LEDES*. This Manor, as we learn from the Domesday Survey, was the property of the Bishop of Rochester, and has continued to be part of the possessions of that See, down to the present day. DE LEYBURN'S "MANOR OF TROTTESECLYVE" (which, before him, had belonged to the family of DE CRESSY) was only part of the Chief Manor, separated from it, doubtless, formerly by subinfeudation. It seems to have been that portion which is now called "Wrotham-Water," and it was again reunited to the Chief Manor in 1278, as appears by a Charter in which ROBERT DE CREVECEUR (2nd June, 1278) quitclaims it to JOHN, Bishop of ROCHESTER, for 50 marks and a Palfrey, *in gersumam*, reciting therein that WALTER, Bishop of ROCHESTER, predecessor to Bishop JOHN, had recovered the said Manor against him,—*per judicium Curie Regie, per quandam defaultam versus me recuperavit*. (See the 'Register of the Temporalities of the Bishoprick of Rochester,' in the Registry there, f. 30 b.)

Only two years before this transaction, notwithstanding the amicable settlement between Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN and DE CREVECEUR, as cited by the latter, it seems that litigation was still rife, for Thorpe cites a writ of EDWARD I., dated 21st July, 1276, addressed to WILLIAM, son of ROGER DE LEYBURN, in which the King enjoins, *quod sine dilacione rectum teneas Roberto de Creuter et Isolde uxori ejus, de uno mesuagio, centum et sexaginta et quatuor acris terre, etc. etc. etc. in Trottesclyve, Wroteham, et Adynghthone, et Ryershe, etc. etc.*, from which the Bishop of Rochester had deforced them, etc. etc. etc.

It is not impossible that these unceasing litigations had induced Sir WILLIAM DE LEYBURN, with little reluctance, to alienate LEDES to the King, as we shall presently see that he did, about this identical period (in No. IV., *infra*),—and the King, on his part, in his desire to possess an important fortress, may have not hesitated to use a little *gentle pressure*, in the form of writs, etc., supporting DE CREVECEUR'S pertinacity in advancing claims; but I cannot venture to advance this supposition on any ground stronger than that of mere conjecture.

IV.—We should leave our history of the connection of the

family of DE LEYBURN with Leeds Castle incomplete if we here omitted to state that Sir WILLIAM DE LEYBURN, son and successor of Sir ROGER, alienated it to Edward I. and his Queen Eleanor, *inter* 1271 and 1290, as appears by three notes in the ‘Ancient Kalendars and Inventories of the Exchequer,’ edited by Sir Francis Palgrave. They will be found in that part of the work which contains *the Kalendar compiled about the year 1323, under the direction of Walter Stapleton, Bishop of Exeter, who then filled the office of Treasurer.*

1. “Ss. Carta WILLELMI filii ROGERI de LEYBURN facta EDUARDO, Regi Anglie, et ALIANORE consorti sue, et heredibus suis, de Castro et Manerio de LEDES, cum parco de ASSHELEGH.” Sine data. (See p. 57, No. 174.)

2. “Ledes.—Carta Domini WILLELMI DE LEYBURN, militis, facta Domino EDUARDO, Regi Anglie, filio Regis HENRICI, et ALIANORE consorti sue, et heredibus suis. Castrum et Manerium de LEDES, cum pertinenciis, et cum advocacione, etc.” Sine data. (See p. 58, No. 182.)

3. “Ss. Quetaclamacio Castri de LEDES et Manerii de LEDES, facta per WILLELMUM DE LEYBORN, militem, etc., Domino EDUARDO, Regi Anglie, filio Regis HENRICI, et Domine ALIANORE consorti sue, et heredibus et assignatis.” Sine data. (See p. 59, No. 185.)

Although the above charters are recorded as being undated, yet, inasmuch as Sir WILLIAM DE LEYBURN did homage for his father’s estates in 1271, and Queen ELEANOR died in 1290, we can assign to them, as a proximate date, some year between 1271 and 1290. The originals are no longer to be found among the Exchequer records; I can, therefore, only give the notes of them as furnished by Bishop Stapleton’s ‘Kalendar.’

V.—But before quitting the subject of LEDES Castle, it is well to mention that among the records of the Exchequer there is still extant a charter by which EDWARD II. grants to Queen ISABELLA (the “she-wolf of France”), *consorti nostre karissime*, the reversion of the Castle and Manor of LEDES, with its advowsons, etc., which MARGARET, Queen of England, *mater nostra karissima*, holds for life by the grant of EDWARD, formerly King of England, *patris nostri*, and which, at the death of the said MARGARET reverts to us and our heirs—

To be held by the said Queen *Isabella* for life, and after her death to revert to us and our heirs.

Tested at Ramsey, 11th April, 7 Ed. II., *i.e.* A.D. 1314. (See 'Ancient Deeds, Exchequer, Kent,' $\frac{L}{I}$ —1.)

49

V.—And now let me offer a few closing words as to our great Baron being the son and heir of the first Sir Roger. The fact is, perhaps, sufficiently proved in Vol. V. p. 154, and Vol. VI. p. 303; but since those pages were printed I have found further evidence among the public records, which must set the question at rest for ever.

1. On the *Coram Rege* Roll, 34 H. III., *i.e.* A.D. 1250, there is this entry:—

“Kancia.—SIMON FILIUS ADE, per attornatum suum, optulit se, iij^{to} die, versus ROGERUM de LEYBURN, de placito quod esset ad hunc diem, ad capiendum Cyrographum suum de Fine facto in Curia Regis coram Justiciariis Itinerantibus apud Cantuariam, Inter ipsum SIMONEM, Querentem, et ROGERUM de LEYBURN, *patrem predicti Rogeri, cuius heres ipse est*, de hoc quod predictus ROGERUS, adquietaret ipsum de servicio quod JOHANNES de Curtenei ab eo exigit, de libero tenemento suo quod de predicto ROGERO tenet in CERTECUMBE, et quod Cyrographum remansit capiendum propter mortem predicti ROGERI, patris sui,” etc. etc. etc. (See *Coram Rege* Roll, 34 H. III., m. 9, Trinity. The office ticket is “Placita apud Westm. Trin., 34 H. III., A. 3, No. 6.”)

Here, then, is incontestable evidence that my statements as cited above in vols. v. and vi. are correct, and we have this further information, that Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN the father died before Trinity Term, A.D. 1250.

2. Again, on the same Roll (m. 8 and m. 26 *dorso*), we have two more entries confirming the fact that the first Sir ROGER was then recently dead. They record a suit of the Prior of St. Mary, Southwark, against Sir ROGER DE LEYBURN, that he shall acquit the Bishop of Rochester of a demand made on the said Prior for the service due from a freehold in Camberwell, held of Sir ROGER, who is mesne lord between the Bishop and the Prior.

3. And among the *Pedes Finium* of Kent, 35 H. III., *i.e.* A.D. 1251, 13th October, we have the final settlement of this suit, in which Sir ROGER agrees to pay the Bishop 25s. for damages in so long delaying the payment of his relief,—*occa-*

sione quod ipsum prius non acquietaverat de predictis Secta et Relevio versus predictum Episcopum.

“Relief” being due, it must have arisen from the death of the last tenant, viz. his father. This fact, combined with the entries on the Plea Rolls, as above, prove that the father died early in 34 H. III., *i. e.* A.D. 1250.

Yours very sincerely,

L. B. L.

Ryarsh Vicarage, 24th Jan., 1868.



IN THE course of the late extensive restorations at Canterbury Cathedral, a floor and ceiling were removed which from a very early date had divided the chapel of St. Andrew, (now nearly all that remains of the lofty Norman tower of that name,) into an upper and a lower chamber; the latter long used as a Vestry, the former as a repository for muniments. In the flooring were found several charters and other documents, which had obviously slipped through from the upper room,—the seal of one of which, a Charter of the Prioress of Minster, in Shepey, is engraved at p. 305;—and among them a mediæval pen of rather unusual shape, of which, by kind permission of the Dean and Chapter, I am enabled to give the accompanying woodcut. It is of bronze, and delicately formed, and of the size engraved. At about three-quarters of an inch from its point it swells to a greater thickness, from which it again tapers to the point, this part being indented with four grooves, to hold the ink and feed the point, very much as in some modern glass pens. It must have been well calculated for the laboriously minute and delicate writing of ancient charters and records, but would scarcely have accommodated itself to anything in the nature of a running hand.

T. G. F.

A LATE discovery enables us to add another to our list of known seals of the Cinque Ports,—such a matrix, in fine con-

dition, having been found, early in the winter of 1868, in the roadway which runs through the village of Goudhurst. It lay about three feet below the present surface, and at the level of what is described as clearly a former surface of the road. As will be seen in the engraving below, its legend, SIGILLUM · CUSTUM : DE · HETH · shows it to have been used in the business of the customs or dues of Hythe—we may assume of the Harbour; and it was therefore very probably the Portreeve's seal. It bears the demi-lion and demi-ship of the Cinque Ports, surmounted by a crown, and surrounded by little crosses, possibly intended for fleurs-de-lis. Its style and workmanship are probably of the latter part of the fourteenth century. The seal, with its handle, is of brass or bell-metal, roughly dressed with a file, and stands an inch and a half in height, tapering upwards to three rude rings, arranged in a cruciform shape at the top. The Society is indebted for most of these particulars, and for the impression from which the engraving has been taken, to the kindness of Mr. Hussey, of Scotney Castle.

The Cinque Ports of Kent have no other Seal of this kind extant; but in the first volume of the Sussex Archæological Society's Collections (p. 24) is figured a not dissimilar seal of Pevensey, apparently of the same century, the device of which consists of the two ostrich-feathers and ducal crown of Lancaster, surrounded by the legend s : THE · CUSTUM · SELLE · OF · THE · PORTE · OF · PEMSE.

T. G. F.

