

temporary, extending at most to the year's crop, and cannot have extended to the eviction of the inhabitants. Even, therefore, if the chief additions to the forest had come after some military 'wasting' in 1085, the eviction of the inhabitants from the villages taken entirely into the forest must still have been due, not to that military wasting, but, as the chroniclers say, to the villages being taken into the forest. F. H. BARING.

NOTE

As we are dealing with Domesday values it may be worth adding, with reference to Mr. G. J. Turner's paper in the April number,¹⁰ that Domesday entirely supports a crossing of the Thames by some part of the Conqueror's army, large or small, much nearer to London than Wallingford. We find signs of damage in 1066 on the south bank of the river at Mortlake, valued in 1065 at £32, then at £10, and then again at £38 in 1086, and at Combe, Malden, Molesey (3), Ditton (2), and Walton (2), together valued at £45, £26, £44. On the opposite bank we have Hampton valued at £39, £20, £40, Feltham and Bedfont (2) together £20, £8, £13, Stanwell and Harmondsworth £59, £26, £47, and Hayes £40, £12, £30. Domesday seems to point to a crossing at Hampton, where there was a good ford,¹¹ rather than at Brentford—there are 'aits' at both—but which has the better claim is not of much importance.

Henry Symeonis

It has often been quoted as an example of the persistence of university customs that down to 1827 every member of the university of Oxford was required, before admission to the degree of bachelor of arts, to swear that he would not lecture nor attend lectures at Stamford, *tanquam in universitate, studio, vel collegio generali*,¹ although the secession to that town of the northern party in Oxford ended in 1335. It is also well known that down to the same year in the nineteenth century all bachelors before inception made oath that they would never consent to the reconciliation of Henry Symeonis; but it has never been established who Henry Symeonis was. The terms of the statute are,

Singuli etiam bachilarii quum responderint in vesperis fidem prebeant quod nunquam consencient in reconciliacionem Henrici Symeonis nec statum bachilarii iterum assument.²

¹⁰ *Ante*, p. 216 f.

¹¹ *Ante*, xxii. 726; Drayton, *Polyolbion*, xvii. 26–31; Fea, *King Monmouth*, 314. This ford, connecting the damage at Molesey and Hampton, was not known to the writer in 1898. The rest of the army seems to have started by the old Roman road to Chichester and marched to Guildford through Cuddington near Ewell, Ashstead, Leatherhead, Gomshall, and Albury, together valued £51, £29, £55.

¹ Laudian Code, tit. ix, sect. vi, § 1. The oath is found in the Junior Proctor's Book (Arch. Univ. Oxon., Reg. C. fo. 2 b); it also appears as an insertion in the Senior Proctor's Book (Reg. B. fo. 37).

² Reg. C. fo. 20 [olim 14].

Brian Twyne, in his *Antiquitatis Academiae Oxoniensis Apologia*, § 342 (p. 376, Oxford, 1608), connected the two declarations mentioned in the passage quoted, and speaks of the iuramentis Magistrorum de non resumendis (non dico Henrici Simeonis gradibus quem in artibus Oxoniae Regentem imperante Ioanne, ut apud exteros in monasterium cooptaretur, baccalaureum se finxisse ferunt) lectionibus alibi in hoc regno, quàm hic Oxoniae et Cantabrigiae.

But the statute does not say that the reconciliation of Henry Simeon and the resumption by a master of a bachelor's degree have reference to the same class of offence. The last clause may be epexegetic, but it cannot be proved to be so unless we have evidence as to what Henry Simeon actually did. Twyne's interpretation is embodied in the Laudian Code of Statutes,³ in which the form of oath is prefaced by the words *de non resumendo Gradum Simeonis*; but this is no proof that it is correct. A few years later it was admitted that the meaning was a matter of conjecture. In a convocation held on 13 June 1651 it was proposed by the delegacy for the reform of the statutes that the oath 'de non resumendo gradum Simeonis' should cease:

Causa est quod cum ante secula aliquot ex causa nobis vel incognita vel incerta ortum habuerit, vtcunque pro eorum temporum ratione rationabili tanti tamen non videtur ut posterius omnes in eandem sub vinculo Iuramenti astringantur.⁴

But the recommendation does not appear to have been approved.⁵

There was in Oxford one Henry, son of Symeon, who is mentioned in the pipe roll of 1177⁶ and appears as a witness to a charter in the last decade of the twelfth century;⁷ he was perhaps one of the reeves of the town in the time of John,⁸ and was alive in 1226.⁹ He had a son, Henry son of Henry son of Simeon, who appears in 1225.¹⁰ In the next generation 'son of Simeon' or 'fitz Simeon' or perhaps 'Simmonds', seems to have become a surname. On 22 May 1242 Henry son of Henry son of Simeon and Robert Oweyn made fine with the king for £80 in despite of the outlawry which should have been proclaimed against them *pro morte scolarium Oxon*, so that they might stay at Northampton or further north, but not approach nearer Oxford until the king's return from Aquitaine.¹¹ The king was back in

³ Tit. vii, sect. i, § 6, cf. § 15.

⁴ Reg. T, p. 142, in the University Archives.

⁵ Anthony Wood, who records this decision, assigns it in error to 13 January, i. e. 1651/2: *Life*, i. 173, ed. A. Clark, 1891.

⁶ *Roll of 23 Henry II*, p. 16, 1905. For this and several other references I am indebted to the kindness of my friend the Rev. H. E. Salter.

⁷ *Eynsham Cartulary*, ed. Salter, 1907, i. 129, no. 172; Wood, *City of Oxford*, ed. Clark, ii. 534, 1890.

⁸ *Ibid.* iii. 4, 1899.

⁹ *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum*, ii. 151, 1844.

¹⁰ *Patent Roll*, 9 Henry III, m. 1 (p. 556, 1901).

¹¹ *Excerpta e Rotulis Finium*, i. (1835) 379.

England in the autumn, and in the following spring Henry Simeonis seems to have been again in Oxford.¹² In 1245 Henry III granted to the friars minor an island which he had bought from Henry son of Henry Simeon.¹³ Many years later many of the Oxford scholars seceded to Northampton: on 12 March 1264, the king suspended the university during the session of his council at Oxford,¹⁴ and on the 25th he issued letters patent reciting that, whereas he had ordered

that if it should appear . . . that the chancellor and university would be content that Henry son of Henry Simeonis, who withdrew for the death of a man, would return to Oxford and stay there, so that the university should not retire from the said town on account of his staying there; then they should permit him to return without impediment and have the king's peace; the king . . . has pardoned the said Henry the said death, on condition that he stand his trial if any will proceed against him, and has granted that he may return and dwell there so long as he be of good behaviour and that the university do not withdraw from the town on account of his return and the death of the said Henry.¹⁵

From this it appears that Henry son of Henry Simeonis was charged with homicide, and that his alleged crime was a cause of the secession of the university to Northampton. When it returned to Oxford, the king was a prisoner and the country was in the hands of his enemies.¹⁶ It was not to be expected that the scholars would pay attention to the order of 25 March requiring them to permit Henry the son of Henry Simeonis to come back peaceably to Oxford. Naturally they resumed their former attitude of hostility to him: they would never consent to his reconciliation. This, it seems to me, was the origin of the oath, which was maintained until 1827. REGINALD L. POOLE.

Copyhold Tenure at Felsted, Essex

THE manor of Felsted in Essex, that is, the chief manor of that parish, which had its manor-house, 'the Bury,' close by the church, belonged in 1576 to Robert, second Baron Rich of Leeze. In that year he caused an exhaustive survey to be made of it by Edward Worsely, gentleman, as well by walking the bounds of the manor as by the evidence, taken on oath, of a manorial jury of fifteen and of other tenants. The greater portion of this record is still extant, in an excellent eighteenth-century transcript, undoubtedly made, for professional purposes, under the direction of a steward of the manor. This manuscript is the property

¹² *Red Book of the Exchequer*, p. 1076, 1896.

¹³ 22 April a. 29, *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1232-47, p. 451, 1906.

¹⁴ *Cal. of Patent Rolls*, 1258-66, p. 307, 1910.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 309.

¹⁶ The order for the return is dated 30 May (*ibid.* p. 320).