

**PROJECT**

KENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

**KENT  
HUNDRED  
ROLLS**

2007/1

# KENT HUNDRED ROLLS PROJECT

Text  
Layout

© 2007 Bridgett Jones  
© 2007 Kent Archaeological Society

## THE KENT HUNDRED ROLLS – INTRODUCTION

The Kent Hundred Rolls of 1274-5, preserved in the National Archives, provide a mine of information for local historians. Many were printed by the Record Commission in the early nineteenth century, but the two bulky volumes are only to be found in major libraries and the rolls are printed in abbreviated Latin. This new website edition by the Kent Archaeological Society comprises the complete rolls for Kent, in the original Latin and in an English translation by Dr Bridgett Jones.

The Kent Rolls are remarkably complete, although there are a few omissions. The major liberties are only mentioned incidentally, namely the lowy of Tonbridge and the hundred of Wachlingstone, in the hands of Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester and Hertford; Wye, in the hands of the abbot of Battle abbey, Sussex; and the Cinque Ports which had their own privileges. In addition, there is no return for Sheppey or Ospringe.

Edward I returned from crusade in 1274 to a kingdom where the crown had been weakened by civil war during the baronial reform period of 1258-65, and where there was extensive local government corruption. According to the heading of the Kent Hundred Rolls, inquiry was to be made into the king's rights which had been usurped by lay and ecclesiastical lords, and into the excessive demands of sheriffs, escheators and coroners, and also of bailiffs and other officials, whether royal or seigniorial. Many of the encroachments on royal rights, often dating from c.1258-65, were the result of the expansion of royal government and justice in the thirteenth century. As new royal procedures developed, lay and ecclesiastical lords did their best to take them over for their own use, in order to strengthen their hold over their tenants. Henry III had ordered an inquiry into franchises in 1255, and Edward I throughout his reign was intent on building up the rights and powers of the Crown. He and his lawyers considered that all judicial rights belonged to the Crown, and any private liberty or franchise had to be backed up by royal warrant. He was, moreover, a reformer of law and justice, and realised that discontent among his subjects might lead to protest and rebellion. On the other hand, justice and good government would increase his prestige and his revenues.

The procedure for the Hundred Roll inquiry was similar to that of many other royal inquiries of the thirteenth century. Commissioners were appointed, two for each group of counties, who carried out their work between November 1274 and March 1275. The sheriff was ordered to empanel juries for each hundred who were to appear before the commissioners on a set day and place. The names of the Kent hundred jurors, together with those for Canterbury, Rochester, Brasted and Dartford, are recorded on the rolls (see pages 161-66). Judging by the returns for Blackheath and Axtane hundreds (see pp. 153-160), the jurors were unable to answer all the articles of the inquiry. The Blackheath jury, however, had plenty to say about franchises in private hands, recent encroachments on royal rights, the tax of one-twentieth on movable property, and the waste committed by the escheator when the vacant archbishopric of Canterbury was in his custody (1270-2). Their longest complaint concerned the so-called gifts taken by sheriffs, bailiffs and coroners under various pretexts.

Dr Jennifer Ward has written a Commentary on the Kentish Hundred Rolls which will appear in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, CXXVII (2007). The description above is drawn from the introduction to that paper.

The Kentish Hundred Rolls contain a very large number of place-names not readily identifiable – these are shown in italics in this edition. It has not been possible to undertake an exhaustive study of these unidentified names and is hoped that all with local knowledge, will be able to help in locating as many as possible.

Another issue is the identification of personal names.

Please inform the staff at the KAS Library of any such identifications and supporting evidence:

by email to:

[kentarchaeology@btconnect.com](mailto:kentarchaeology@btconnect.com)

header 'Hundred Rolls Project'

by mail to:

KAS Hundred Rolls Project,  
Maidstone Museum and Bentrif Art Gallery,  
St. Faith's Street, Maidstone, Kent ME15 1LH

THE KENTISH ROLLS - ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF HUNDREDS

Membrane	Page	Hundred	Lathe	Jury p.
M10	118	Aloesbridge	Shepway	161,63
M13, M14	147, 156	Axtane	Sutton at Hone	166
m5 dorso	59	Barkley	Scray	161
M3	28	Bewsborough	St Augustine's (Hedeling)	163
m4 dorso	46	Bircholt Barony	Scray	163
M9	113	Bircholt Franchise (half)	Shepway	162
m5 dorso	57	Blackborne	Scray	161
M12, M15	135, 153	Blackheath	Sutton at Hone	165
M1	1	Bleangate	St Augustine's	161
M4	41	Boughton	Scray	164
M12	135	Brasted	Sutton at Hone	164
m7 dorso	88	Brenchley	Aylesford	
m1 dorso	9	Bridge	St Augustine's	162
M12	144	Bromley	Sutton at Hone	165
M5	52	Calehill	Scray	163
M2	13	Canterbury	St Augustine's	161
M5	55	Chart	Scray	164
m7 dorso	91	Chatham and Gillingham	Aylesford	165
M12	142	Codsheath	Sutton at Hone	165
M3	26	Cornilo	St Augustine's (Hedeling)	162
m5 dorso	60	Cranbrook	Scray	164
M13	145	Dartford	Sutton at Hone	166
m2 dorso	20	Downhamford	St Augustine's	163
M3	31	Eastry	St Augustine's (Hedeling)	162
m7 dorso	95	Eyhorne	Aylesford	165
M4	36	Faversham	Scray	162
m4 dorso	42	Felborough	Scray	162
M9	108	Folkestone	Shepway	161
m2 dorso	24	[Great] Barnfield	Scray	162
M10	122	Ham	Shepway	163
M10	123	Heane	Shepway	161
m7 dorso	83	Hoo	Aylesford	166
m1 dorso	11	Kinghamford	St Augustine's	162
M7	78	Larkfield	Aylesford	164
M12	135	Lesnes	Sutton at Hone	165
M12	141	Little	Sutton at Hone	166
m6 dorso	70	[Little] Barnfield (half)	Scray	164
m2 dorso	23	Littlefield	Aylesford	166

M5	49	[Chart and] Longbridge	Scray	163
M9	110	Longport (half)	Shepway	163
m10 dorso	125	Loningborough	Shepway	161
M7	76	Maidstone	Aylesford	165
M7	82	Malling	Aylesford	164
M6	63	Marden	Scray	162
M6, M6 dorso	65	Milton	Scray	161
m10 dorso	128	Newchurch	Shepway	163
m6 dorso	70	Newenden	Scray	161
-----		Ospringe		
M9	107	Oxney	Shepway	162
m1 dorso	7	Petham	St Augustine's	162
M1	4	Preston	St Augustine's	163
M2	18	Ringslow	St Augustine's	162
M8	102	Rochester	Aylesford	165
m6 dorso	73	Rolvenden	Scray	161
m13 dorso	150	Ruxley	Sutton at Hone	166
M6	62	Selbritten	Scray	162
m7 dorso	92	Shamwell	Aylesford	164
-----		Sheppey		
M12	138	Somerden	Sutton at Hone	165
M10	121	St Martin	Shepway	162
M9	113	Stowting	Shepway	161
m10 dorso	131	Street	Shepway	162
m4 dorso	47	Tenham	Scray	164
m6 dorso	71	Tenterden	Scray	165
m7 dorso	86	Toltingtrough	Aylesford	164
-----		Tonbridge Lowy		
M8	100	Twyford	Aylesford	164
-----		Wachlingstone		
M12	138	Westerham	Sutton at Hone	165
m2 dorso	22	Westgate	St Augustine's	161
M1	6	Whitstable	St Augustine's	162
m3 dorso	33	Wingham	St Augustine's (Hedeling)	162
M9	115	Worth	Shepway	164
M7	79	Wrotham	Aylesford	165
-----		Wye		

<p>Inquisiciones facte per preceptum domini regis in comitatu Kancie de juribus et libertatibus domini regis subtractis et excessis vicecomitatum coronatorum escheatorum et aliorum ballivorum domini regis quorumcunque aliorum ballivorum alioquo modo dominum regem spectantibus anno regni regis Edwardi tercio.</p>	<p>Kent Hundred Rolls 1274-1275</p> <p>Inquisitions made by the lord king's command in the county of Kent about the lord king's rights and liberties which have been taken away and the excessive demands of the sheriffs, coroners, escheators and other of the lord king's bailiffs and of any other bailiffs whosoever appertaining/belonging to the lord king in any way, in the third year of King Edward's reign 1274-1275.</p>
<p><b>m.1 Hundredum de Blengate lastus Sancti Agustini de comitatu Kancie</b></p> <p>Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Blengate solebat tradi ad firmam cum lasto Sancti Augustini et Hedeling pro xxiiij libris a tempore Reginaldi de Cobham vicecomitis.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod hundredum de Blengate est in manus domini archiepiscopi Cant' sic una medietas et altera medietas in manu abbatis Sancti Augustini set a quo tempore aut quid valet nesciunt.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium placita de namio vetito wreccum maris et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set a quo tempore aut quo warento ignorant.</p> <p>Dicunt eciam quod archiepiscopus predictus habet liberam chaciam et warennam de antiquo et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' clamat habere warennam quo warento nesciunt.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Brewose impedivit execucionem mandatorum domini regis fieri in hoc quod tenuit januas parci de Trindele clausas ubi preceptus fuit per justiciarios domini regis eas tenere apertas ita quod transeuntes possunt ibidem transire.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod idem dominus Willelmus de Brewose inclusit communem stratam que ducit de Cant' versus Stodm' in parco suo de Trendele ut gentes ibidem non transirent. Ita cum gentes de Taneto emiserent de communi pecunia quomdam mariscum cum quodam milite nomine Ricardo de Bickel et fecissent murum ut rectius irent de Teneto ad Cant' et illud iter super predicto muro per xx annos usi fuissent et ultra alienas terras ubi non emerunt ita iter venit abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' et fecit fossatum magnum ad siccandum mariscum inter caput dicti muri et terras alienas ita quod gentes de Teneto non</p>	<p><b>m.1 Hundred of Bleangate, the lathe of St Augustine in the county of Kent</b></p> <p>The jury say that Bleangate hundred used to be demised at farm with the lathe of St Augustine and Hedeling for £24 from the time of Reginald of Cobham the sheriff.</p> <p>Then they say that the hundred of Bleangate is in the hand of the lord archbishop of Canterbury, thus one moiety and the other moiety is in the hand of the abbot of St Augustine's but they do not know from what time or what it is worth.</p> <p>Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck and other liberties which pertain to the crown and the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale but from what time or by what warrant they are ignorant.</p> <p>They say also that the aforesaid archbishop has free chace and warren from ancient times and the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury claims to have warren but they do not know by what warrant.</p> <p>Then they say that Sir William de Braose has hindered the execution of the lord king's mandates in that he has kept the gates of his park at Trindele [Trenley] closed when he was instructed by the lord king's justices to keep them open so that people could travel through there.</p> <p>Then they say that the same Sir William de Braose has enclosed a common way which leads from Canterbury towards Stodm[arsh] in his park of Trendele so that people cannot pass through there. Then since the people of Thanet with a certain knight named Sir Richard de Bickel bought a certain marsh with communal money and had made a [sea?] wall so that they could easily go from Thanet to Canterbury and they have been accustomed to make that journey by the side of the aforesaid wall for 20 years and the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury came over the other lands where they had not bought right of way and made a</p>

possunt ultra metas marisci sui transpire set solitum fuit quondam ibidem esse fossatum antequam iter et murus fierent ibidem

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Burn' quondam vicecomes cepit de Willelmo de Cruce de Chiselet v marcas pro felonia facta Johanni de Roffeburn et de Roberto de Heliere cepit xxs pro felonia facta Egidio de Or. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Sarsted cepit de Ada de Hersing pro ipso removendo de juratis vjd et de pluribus aliis pro simili ad estimacionem dimidam marcam. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus cepit iiijs de Augustino de Bradelond in ultimo Itinere justiciariorum apud Cant'. Item dicunt quod Walterus de Berksted cepit de hundredo de Blengat' xLs de catallis Andrei de Blengat' feloni et dictum hundredum versus dominum regem inde non acquietavit quare iterum pacavit.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime cepit cepit [sic] de hoc hundredo Ls pro pondere ultra certum numerum denariorum.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor dum fuit custos archiepiscopatus Cant' cepit de bosco de Reysele et Litlewud iiij libras et iiijs et de tenentibus ibidem de tallagio x libras. Item Hugo de Thornham clericus eius cepit de eisdem ne eos occasionaret 1 marcam, item de Andreo le plumer, Salomone Atteburn Ricardo le Cruder Roberto de Aula Radulfo de Strathend Jacobo de Halewolding Goldingo Palmario Hamone de Hawe Henrico de Herveford Jacobo de Colweinwod Roberto de Sowinton Thoma Dunstan et Thomas Dunstan extenditoribus instauri de Recluffre summam x equorum et iiij bovim de precio vj libras vjs et viijd dictum precium in denarios recepit et quare non solverunt ad voluntatem suam americiavit eos in iiij libris et cepit. Item cepit de eisdem ita quod se non intromitterent de venditione aliqua inpreterum v marcas et de tota curia cepit Cs pro eodem. Item escaetor archiepiscopi dimiserunt in manibus prepositi de Reculv' Ls ad emdendum quoddam molendinum quos denarios Hugo de Thornham clericus excatoris estorsit a manibus dicti prepositi.

Item Johannes Baudifer ballivus dicti excaitor cepit de Willelmo Milite ut posset dare relevium suum post fratrem suum dimidiam marcam. Item de Milone

great ditch to drain the marsh between the head of the said wall and the other lands so that the people of Thanet can not travel beyond the metes of their marsh, as they used to do formerly before the road and wall were made there.

Then they say that Sir Henry de Burn, formerly a sheriff, took 5 marks from William de Cruce of Chislet for a felony committed against John de Roffeburn and he took 20s from Robert de Heliere for a felony committed against Giles de Or. Then they say that Robert de Sarsted took 6d. from Adam de Hersing for removing him from juries and half a mark by estimation from many other men for a similar reason. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the bailiff, took 4s. from Augustine de Bradelond in the last eyre of the justices at Canterbury. Then they say that Walter de Berksted took 40s. from Bleangate hundred for the chattels of Andrew of Bleangate, a felon, and he has not acquitted the said hundred versus the lord king because it paid again.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took from this hundred 50s. by weight more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator while he was the custodian of the archbishopric of Canterbury took £4 4s. from the wood of *Reysele* and *Littlewood* and £10 from the tenants there as tallage. Then Hugh of Thornham his clerk took 1 mark from the same men so that he should not prosecute them, then he took from Andrew, the plumber, Solomon Atteburn, Richard le Cruder, Robert de Aula, Ralph de Strathend, James de Halewolding, Golding Palmarius, Hamo de Hawe, Henry de Herveford, James de Colweinwod, Robert de Sowinton, Thoma Dunstan and Thomas Dunstan, the valuers of the stock of Reculver a total of 10 horses and 4 oxen, price £6 6s. 8d., he received the said amount in money and because they did not pay this of their own accord he amerced them £4. Then he took 5 marks from the same men because they had not previously taken part in any sale and 100s. from the whole court for the same reason. Then the archbishop's escheator delivered 50s. into the hands of the reeve of Reculver to repair a certain mill, but this money Hugh of Thornham the escheator's clerk extorted from said reeve's hands.

Then John Baudifer, the said escheator's bailiff, took half a mark from William Knight that he might give his relief after his brother. Then 10s. from Miles the clerk



clerico ut posset ducere croppum suum seminata quo vellet Xs., item de Gervasio le Taillur inponendo sibi falso quod occidit uxorem suam Xs. Item de Petro de la Sole qui portavit securim in manu sua transeundo per mediam domum ubi sedebat dimidiam marcam, item de Johanne Lucas pro ingressu habendo in terra sua 1 marcam, item de Eote Bermund pro eodem dimidiam marcam, item de Luca capellano quod inposuit sibi quod detinuit iniuste servicium suum dimidiam marcam, item de Salomone de campis de Westhalimot quod discessit de Cant' sine licencia sua in ultimo Itinere justiciarorum viijs, de Heldrido de Gravene pro warda puerorum suorum habenda ij marcas, item de Waltero clerico Andreo le Plummer Ricardo le Cruder ut non inprisonavit falso diffamatos XXXs., item de Daniele mercatore inponendo sibi quod uxor sua occiderit puerum suum xLs., item de Simone Iuven' ut non distrineret eum pro debito Judaisorum dimidiam marcam, item de Milone clerico pro eodem 1 marcam, item de borgha de Serr inponendo sibi quod recepit quemdam garcionem contra defensionem suum dimidiam marcam, item de Ada de Aula ut dimitteret eum ne esset prepositus xxjs., item de Radulfo Algod pro eodem xs., de Johanne le Marun pro eodem ij marcas, de Gervasio de la Forde pro eodem xxiijs., de Hamone de Bromfeld pro simili ij marcas, de Jacobo Colewennewod pro simili ij marcas, de Sampson de Ett ut posset ducere bladum quo vellet xvjs., item de eodem ne inprisonaretur pro eisdem denariis non solutis ad mandatum suum dimidiam marcam, de Stephen Alcorn inponendo sibi falso quod debet fecisse dampnum in bosco de Rihslie xxs., item de Ricardo de Hawe pro conclamento injuste sibi inposito de wrecco maris ij marcas, item de Hamone de Henherst ut non inprisonaretur pro transgressionibus filii sui v marcas et dimidiam, item de Walerano King inponendo sibi injuste quod debuit fecisse dampnum in bosco de Rihsshelie vijs., item de Radulfo de Strethende ne inprisonaretur pro falso crimine sibi inposito iij marcas et dimidiam, item de borgha de Brokesgate quod manucepit Galfridum Holte et non habuit eum coram justiciariis iij marcas, item de eadem borgha de catallis eius xxvijs et nichilominus respondit eadem borgha de evasione et catallis eius coram justiciariis, item de Waltero preposito falso sibi inponendo de expensis suis factis in Knavingepoll quod noluit eidem allocare xxvijs et viijd, de Elia de Romenal pro ingressu habendo in terram suam in gavelikund xxs., de executoribus

that he might carry his sown crop where he might wish, then 10s. from Gervase the tailor accusing him falsely of killing his wife, then half a mark from Peter de la Sole who carried an axe in his hand when walking through the middle of the house where he was sitting, then 1 mark from John Lucas for having entry in his own land, then half a mark from Eota Bermund for the same reason, the half a mark from Luke the chaplain because he accused him falsely of unjustly withholding his service, then 8s. from Solomon of the fields of Westhalimote [Minster in Thanet par., lost] because he departed from Canterbury without his licence at the last eyre of the justices, 2 marks from Heldrid of Graveney for having the wardship of his sons, then 30s. from Walter the clerk, Andrew the plumber, Richard the Cruder that he should not imprison them on false accusation, then 40s. from Daniel the merchant accusing him that his wife killed their son, then half a mark from Simon Iuven' that he should not distrain him for a debt to the Jews, then 1 mark from Miles the clerk for the same reason, then half a mark from the tithing of Sarre making accusation that a certain youth had been received contrary to his prohibition, then 21s. from Adam Hall so that he would excuse him from being the reeve, then 10s. from Ralph Algod for the same reason, 2 marks from John de Marun for the same reason, 24s. from Gervase de la Forde for the same reason, 2 marks from Hamo of Broomfield for a similar reason, 2 marks from James Colewennewod for a similar reason, 16s. from Sampson de Ett that he can cart corn as he may wish, then half a mark from the same man that he should not be imprisoned as this was not paid at his order, 20s., from Stephen Alcorn accusing him falsely that he caused loss in *Rihslie* wood, 2 marks from Richard de Hawe, accusing him of unjustly concealing a wreck of sea, then 5½ marks from Hamo de Henherst that he might not be imprisoned for his son's trespasses, 7s. from Waleran King, unjustly accusing him of causing damage in *Rihsshelie* wood, then 3½ marks from Ralph de Strethende that he might not be imprisoned for a crime of which he was fasely accused, then 4 marks from the tithing of *Brookgate* because they bailed Geoffrey Holte and did not bring him before the justices, then 27s. from the same tithing for his chatells and nevertheless the same tithing made response before the justices about the escape and chatells, then 28s. 8d. from Walter the reeve falsely accusing him about his expenses incurred in *knavingepoll* which he was unwilling to allow him, 20s. from Elias of Romney for

<p>Alienore relicte Willelmi de Eneford ne inpediret eos in executione sua xxs., item idem habuit de Petro de Boytun ij boves nomine districcioni precii xvjs numquam eos restituit dicto Petro, item de borghis de Reculver et Brokesgate pro animalibus captis in pastura archiepiscopi tempore aperto ij marcas, item de Waltero Hughelot falso sibi inponendo quod extraxit animalia sua de pastura domini sine licencia dimidam marcam. Item Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris cepit de debito domini regis de Willelmo Roper dimidam marcam et eum non aquietavit, item de Elia Koc eodem modo Xs., item de Waltero clerico et Johanne Potin eodem modo dimidiam marcam, item de Sarra de Helesole eodem modo dimidiam marcam, item de Henrico de la Grave inponendo sibi quod furabat stipulas in campo domini quas emit Xs.</p>	<p>having entry into his own land in <i>gavelkind</i>, 20s. from the executors of Eleanor, widow of William of Eynsford that he would not hinder them in their work as executors, then the same man took 2 oxen, price 16s. from Peter Boytun as a distraint, he has never returned them to the said Peter, then 2 marks from the tithings of Reculver and Brookgate for their animals taken upon the archbishop's pasture at a time it was open, then half a mark from Walter Hughelot, falsely accusing him of driving his animals from the lord's pasture without licence. Then Hugh of Thornham, the escheator's clerk, took half a mark from William Roper for a debt to the lord king and he has not acquitted him, then 10s. from Elias Cook in the same way, then half a mark from Walter the clerk and John Potin in the same way, then half a mark from Sarra de Helesole in the same way, then 10s. from Henry de la Grave accusing him of stealing stubble, which he bought, in the lord's field.</p>
<p><b>Hundredum de Preston</b></p> <p>Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex habet in manu suo manerium de Middelton cum Merdenn. Item dicunt quod Menstre et Salmoneston solebant esse in manu regis antiquo et modo ea tenent abbas et conventus Sancti Augustini Cant' a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt, Item dicunt quod Monekenteton solebat aliquando esse in manu regum antiquorum et prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant' modo tenent a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod manerium de Ofspring fuit in manu domini regis Henrici et modo illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains dedit pro comitatu Kancie tenentibus Cs. ad dampnum patrie et tradidit lastum Sancti Augustini et Hedeling cum hundredo de Bregg' et dimidiam hundredi de Estri pro xxxij libris ad dampnum patrie et modo Thomas de Sutheneye ea tenet pro xxxvj libris et antiquitus solebant tradi pro X libris.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' et abbas de Bello clamant habere returnum brevium et alias libertates regis. Item prior ecclesie Christi Cant' et abbas Sancti Augustini clamant habere wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie quo waranto nec a quo tempore nesciunt. Dicunt eciam quod dominus</p>	<p><b>Hundred of Preston</b></p> <p>The jury say that the king holds the manor of Middleton with Marden in his own hand. Then they say that Minster and Salmoneston [Margate par.] used to be in in the king's hands in ancient time and now the abbot and convent of St Augustine Canterbury holds these, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that Monkton at some time used to be in the hand of the ancient kings and the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury now hold it, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the manor of Ospringe was in the lord King Henry's hand and now the lady queen, the present lord king's mother, holds it [Eleanor of Provence, married Henry III 1236 d. 1291, mother of Edward I], they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Henry Malemains gave 100s. to the tenants for the county of Kent with loss to the county and he handed over the lathe of St Augustine and Hedeling with Bridge hundred and half of Eastry hundred for £32 with loss to the country and now Thomas de Sutheneye holds those for £36 and in old times these used to be handed over for £10.</p> <p>Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the abbot of Battle claim to have return of writs and other liberties of the king. Then the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and the abbot of St Augustine's claim to have wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what</p>

Willelmus de Brewuse et Willelmus de Leyburn clamant habere furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' prior ecclesie Christi et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' habent et vendunt maritagia et wardas sokemannorum aliter qua deberent quare in Kancia non est warda

Item dicunt quod iidem archiepiscopus prior et abbas Willelmus de Brewuse et Willelmus de Leyburn habent chacias et warennas quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod idem dominus Willelmus de Brewuse opturat et deforciat quomdam viam communem hominibus pedibus per medium boscum suum.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes cepit xLs de Dionisia uxore Rogeri ate Nesse, Johannes Baldefar ballivus de Winge ham sub excaitore et Stephanus de Lynmming custos libertatis sub excaitore cepit de eadem Dionisia Ls que Dionisia fuit indictata et diffamata de morte Rogeri viri sui in hundredo de Wengeham.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall serviens lasti Sancti Augustini anno regni regis Henrici Lvj et Robertus de Garsted serviens eiusdem lasti post et Thomas de Suthen' proximo post ipsum ceperunt multociens pro summonitionis assisis redemptione de pluribus hominibus de dicto hundredi, sic dictus Hamo cepit de Paulino de Fonte ijs., de Thomas Belewe vjd., de Roberto de Fonte vjd., de Waltero Lyneth vjd. Item Thomas de Suthen cepit de Johanne de Sewinton xijd, de Godardo et Willelmo de Havekes xvjd.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall serviens dicti lasti occasionavit Ricardum Pertriche de hundredo de Preston inponendo ei concealamenti cepit de eo et quodam alio vjs. anno regis Henrici Lvj de Philippo Atteho et Waltero Budde eodem modo eciam xLd. Item Robertus de Sharsted serviens eiusdem lasti anno sequenti cepit de Radulfo de Pire ijs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de isto hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum xxvjs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stubbeldun et Willelmus de Kerston distrinxerunt homines de Preston quousque habuerunt xLs quare vj homines

warrant nor from what time. They say also that Sir William de Braose and William de Leyburn claim to have the gallows, and the assize of bread and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury, the prior of Christchurch and the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury have and sell marriages and wardships of sokemen other than where they ought, because there is no wardship in Kent.

Then they say that the same archbishop, prior and abbot, William de Braose and William de Leyburn have chace and warrens, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the same Sir William de Braose obstructs and damages a certain common way through the middle of his wood for men travelling on foot.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, the sheriff, took 40s. from Denise, Roger ate Nesse's wife, John Baldefar the bailiff of Wingham under the escheator, and Stephen of Lyminge, the keeper of the liberty under the escheator, took 50s. from the same Denise who had been indicted and accused in Wingham hundred of her husband Roger's death.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, a serjeant in the 56th year of King Henry's reign [October 1271-1272] of the lathe of St Augustine and Robert de Garsted, a serving man of the same lathe after him and Thomas de Suth' the next one after him, took from many men of the said hundred on many occasions for exempting them from summons to the assize; so the said Hamo took 2s. from Paulinus de Fonte, 6d. from Thomas Belewe, 6d. from Robert de Fonte, 6d. from Walter Lyneth. Then Thomas de Suthen' took 12d. from John de Sewinton, 16d. from Godard and William de Havekes.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, a serjeant of the said lathe, arrested Richard Pertriche of Preston hundred, accusing him of a concealment. He took 6s. from him and another man in King Henry's 56th year, and 40d. from Philip atte Hoo and Walter Budde in the same way. Then Robert de Sharsted, a serjeant of the same lathe, in the following year took 2s. from Ralph de Pire.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyferer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth from this hundred took 26s. more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that William de Stubbeldun and William de Kerston made distraint upon the men of Preston until they received 40s. because 6 men had been

summoniti fuerunt per constabularium Dover' ad castrum de Tunebrigg'

### **Hundredum de Wytstapel**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Witstapel pertinet ad baroniam de Eyelsham et tenetur in capite de domino rege et valet per annum £2

Item dicunt quod Alexander de Baillol dominus de Culham habet hundredum et warennam de antiquo tempore.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et socii sui collectores vicesime ceperunt ultra certum numerum denariorum de hoc hundredo xiijs et Hamo de la Forstall iniuste vicecomes cepit de quodam Johanne Symon qui fuit socius cuiusdam hominis versus ecclesiam qui interfecit quendam hominem in redeundo de ecclesia postquam idem Johannes aquietatus fuit per patriam 1 marcam. Item idem Hamo cepit de Ricardo le Nute vs inponedo sibi quod fuit in Judaiismo ubi numquam fuit. Idem Hamo cepit de Ricardo de Bulling eodem modo vs, de Joce de la Brok pro simili ijs.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus de Shamelford constabularius castri Cant' cepit injuste et sine causa de Willelmo de Wycheford et Willelmo le Blund Ls inponedo sibi quod insultaverunt Randulfum filium Thome de Estling maliciose et non fecerunt. Item idem Ricardus cepit de Ricardo Elfem xvjs. et de Johanne Bleford quare percussit quamdam mulierem unde pax facta fuit in curia domini cepit injuste iiijs et de Ricardo Elfem ijs. antequam potuit evadere de castello.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus de Lindested cepit iniuste quondam equum de Willelmo de la Brok et duxit eum ad castrum Cant' et antequam potuit equum habere dedit ei vjs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Sutheneye cepit iniuste de Thoma de Parco pro venditione propriorum bidencium inponedo ei furtum et de Matheo fratre suo dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Johanne de Galingeham iiijs inponedo sibi quod fuit fur et fuit fidelis.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Leming injuste maliciose occasionavit Johannem Belfire et cepit ab eo Xs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus Criel coronator cepit iiijs antequam voluit facere in hoc hundredo officium suum

summoned to Tonbridge Castle by the constable of Dover.

### **Hundred of Whitstable**

The jury say that the Whitstable manor pertains to the barony of Aylsham and is held of the lord king in chief and it is worth £2 each year.

Then they say that Alexander de Baillol, the lord of *Culham*, holds the hundred and warren from ancient times.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and his associates, collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 13s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred and Hamo de la Forstall, the sheriff, took 1 mark unjustly from a certain John Symon' who had accompanied a certain man towards the church and he killed that man on returning from church, afterwards the same John was acquitted by the jury. Then the same Hamo took 5s. from Richard le Nute accusing him of being in debt to the Jews and he had never been so. The same Hamo took 5s. from Richard de Bulling in the same way and 3s. from Joceus de la Brok for a similar reason.

Then they say that Richard de Shamelford, the constable of Canterbury castle, took 50s. unjustly and for no reason from William de Wycheford and William le Blund, accusing them of maliciously assaulting Randulph son of Thomas de Estling and they had not done this. Then the same Richard took 16s. from Richard Elfem and 4s. unjustly from John Bleford because he struck a certain woman, whence settlement had been made in the lord's court and 2s. from Richard Elfem before he could be released from the castle.

Then they say that Richard de Lindested unjustly took a certain horse from William de la Brok and rode it to Canterbury castle and before he was able to have his horse he gave Richard 6s.

Then they say that Thomas de Sutheneye took half a mark from Thomas de Parco and Matthew his brother, for the sale of their own sheep, accusing them of theft.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took 4s from John Galingeham accusing him of theft and he was innocent.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge maliciously arrested John Belfer unjustly and took 10s. from him.

Then they say that William Criel, the coroner, took 4s. before he was willing to perform the duties of his office

de quodam mortuo.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stopindon inposuit iij hominibus quod fuerunt ad insultum de Tunebrigg' ad mandatum domini regis et ideo cepit in villa de Witstapel xij marcas.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Toycestr' distringit injuste Thomas Legerum et cepit ab eo Xd et Morico filio Radulfi xijd et de Juliana relicta Alexandri xijd pro quadam secta quam Reynerus de Pastevil debebat et non ipsi.

#### m.1 dorse **Hundredum de Petham.**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Middeltun unacum hundredo de Mardenn tenetur in capite de domino rege per dominum Johannem de Burgo qui nunc tenet ex dimissione domini regis. Item dicunt quod manerium de Ofspring solebat esse in manu domini regis et nunc illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod tenentes de Heghardres et Robertus de Hardres subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi de Brugg' per Comitem Glovern' iam per xx annos de dampno nesciunt. Item dicunt quod idem Comes substraxit omnes tenentes de feodo suo in comitatu de sectis et tenet de eisdem visum francplegium et tenet placitum namio vetito et de sanguine et facit iudicium de vita et membris et capit emendas de pane et cervisia et aliis que ad coronam pertinent iam xvj annis elapsis que pertinent ad dominum regem.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cantuar' habet returnum omnium brevium a tempore regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc set nesciunt quo warrento et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet wreccum maris et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent et nesciunt quo waranto nisi per libertatem ccclesie Christi Cant'. Item dicunt quod habet liberam chaciam per totum hundredum et warennam excepto tenemento Barrasius de Valoyngnes militis et habuit de antiquo

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Thornham clericus Magistri Ricardus de Clifford excaitoris cepit ij marcas de Willelmo Constable et Johannes Parcenario suo heredibus cavel pro hereditate ipsos contingente et saysinam inde habenda.

Item dicunt quod cum plures de hundredo summoniti essent ad castrum de Tunebrigg' obsidendum statim post bellum de Evesham et pace proclamda Gilbertus nunc Comes Glovern' misit apud Cant' Willelmum de

in this hundred, concerning a certain dead person.

Then they say that William de Stopindon accused 4 men of being present at the siege of Tonbridge at the lord king's command and he took 12 marks from the vill of Whitstable.

Then they say that John of Towcester unjustly made distraint upon Thomas Legerum and took 10d. from him and 12d. from Maurice son of Ralph and 12d. from Juliana relict of Alexander for a certain suit which Reyner de Pastevil owed and which they did not.

#### m.1 dorso **Hundred of Petham**

The jury say that the manor of Middleton together with the hundred of Marden is held of the lord king in chief by Sir John de Burgh who now holds it by the lord king's demise. Then they say that the manor of Ospringe used to be in the lord king's hand and now the lady queen, mother of the present king holds that.

Then they say that the tenants of High [Upper] Hardres and Robert of Hardres have withdrawn themselves from suit of the hundred of Bridge through the earl of Gloucester, now for 20 years, with what loss they do not know. Then they say that the same earl has withdrawn all the tenants of his fee in the county from suits of court and he holds the view of frankpledge for the same tenants and he holds pleas of *withername* and bloodshed and he gives judgement on life and limb and he takes the fines of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown, for the past 16 years.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs from the time of King Henry, father of the present king, but they do not know by what warrant and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has wreck and other liberties which pertain to the crown and they do not know by what warrant unless through the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury, Then they say that he has free chace throughout the whole hundred and warren except in the tenement of Sir Barrasius de Valoyngnes, knight, and he has held this from ancient times.

Then they say that Hugh de Thornham, clerk of Master Richard de Clifford the escheator, took 3 marks from William Constable and John his co-tenant as heirs by lot [*gavelkind?*], concerning their hereditary right and then their having seisin.

Then they say that many men of the hundred were summoned to the siege of Tonbridge castle immediately after the battle of Evesham [1265] and peace having been proclaimed Gilbert, the present Earl

Gaston et Willelmum et Stupesden et minabantur plures de hundredo ita quod finem fecerunt cum predictis ita quod hundredum de Pecham pacavit ad opus Comitis X marcas. Item dicunt quod Ricardus ate Sole cepit equum Ivonis Fordred injuste et illum duxit ad domum Willelmi de Stupesden et ibidem detentus fuit per vj septimanas quousque finivit pro eo ijs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum xiijs pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod cum homines hundredi de Pecham summoniti essent apud Wingate precepto domini regis et cum dictus Willelmus de Stupesden serviens Comitis Glovern' hoc percepisset quod ad summonitionem regis adirent sine precepto suo cepit de Salomone de Stonstret qui ibidem tunc venit xxs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Toucestr' familiaris dicti Willelmi cepit averaria dicti Salomonis tempore domini regis nunc in tenemento de Herdres iniuste et ea detinuit contra vadum et plegium quousque pacavit dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod cum idem Johannes hospitatus esset ad domum dicti Salomonis crastina die idem Johannes et Hamo de la Forstall servientes domini regis maliciose occasionaverunt dictum Salomonem et extorserunt falso ab eo xvs.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' (*obiit*) vendit wardas et maritagia de hiis qui tenerent de eo in gavelikund contra judicium et statum communitatis licet modo usitatum sit.

Item dicunt quod Robertus de Hardres distrinxit Salomonem de Stonstret quod deberet esset eius prepositus et injuste quousque habuit ab eo Xs. Dicunt eciam quod ballivi archiepiscopi capit singulis annis pro puchre proclamanda iniuste xiijs. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris cepit de Rogero Wokkel xxs ad ejecendum Paulinam de libero tenemento suo. Item dicunt quod Magister Richard de Clifford excaitor qui saysit manerum de Pecham in manu domini regis sede archiepiscopi vacante cepit de tenentibus eiusdem hundredi xLs.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris fecit prosternere in Bocholte xxv lingna precii iiij libras xviijs et vj denarios et xj lingnaa precii

of Gloucester sent William de Gaston and William de Stupesdon to Canterbury and they threatened many men of the hundred so that they made a fine with the aforesaid men, of which the hundred of Petham paid 10 marks for the Earl's use. Then they say that Richard ate Sole unjustly took Ivo Fordred's horse and rode it to William de Stopesden's house and it was kept there for 6 weeks until he paid a fine of 2s. for it.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 14s. by weight from this hundred more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that as the men of Petham hundred had been summoned to *Wingate* at the lord king's command and when the said William de Stupesden, a serjeant of the earl of Gloucester learnt this that they had gone at the king's summons without his order he took 20s. from Solomon de Stonstret who then came there. Then they say that John of Towcester, a military follower of the said William, unjustly took the said Solomon's draught animals in Hardres tenement in the present lord king's time and kept those contrary to his surety and pledge until he paid half a mark. Then they say that when the same John had been a guest at the said Solomon's house, on the day after the same John and Hamo de la Forstall, the lord king's serjeant, maliciously arrested the said Solomon and falsely extorted 15s from him.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury (*he has died*) sells wardships and marriages for those who may hold from him in *gavelkind* contrary to justice and the custom of the community and the way it is lawfully observed.

Then they say that Robert of Hardres made distraint upon Solomon de Stonstret because he ought to have been reeve and he had 10s. from him unjustly. They say also that the archbishop's bailiffs every year take 14s. unjustly for emending faulty pleas. Then they say that Hugh de Thornham, the escheator's clerk, took from Roger Wokkel 20s. to eject Paulina from her free tenement. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, escheator, who took Petham manor in the lord king's hand when the see of the archbishopric was vacant [after the death of Archbishop Boniface of Savoy 1270 and before the election of Robert de Kilwardby 1272] took 40s. from the tenants of the same hundred.

Then they say that Hugh de Thornham, the escheator's clerk, has caused 25 trees, price £4 18s. 6d., to be felled in *Bocholte*, 11 trees price 32s. and underwood valued

xxxijs et de subbosco ad valentiam Cs set nesciunt quo tota pecunia devenit.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus excaitor seysivit totum prioratum in manu domini regis et multa bona inde percepit set per quantum tempus illum tenuit nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit archiepiscopatum Cant' in manu domini regis post mortem Bonefacii archiepiscopi et illum tenuit per ij annos et dimidiam

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit abbathiam Sancti Augustini Cant' post mortem Rogeri abbatis set per quantum tempus nec quid inde percipit nesciunt.

### **Hundredum de Bregg'**

Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Bregg' est in manu domini regis et reddunt domino rege per annum xxs et de turno vicecomitis ij marcas. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Leynburn tenet unum feodum de domino rege in capite in Burn.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glovern' appropriavit sibi borgham de Heghardres que est quarta pars hundredi per xx annos elapsos ad dampnum regis et communem per annum de iiijs et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod prior de Mertone clamat habere assisam panis et cervisie et habet in villa de Petrichesburn in hundredo de Bregg' et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Say habet warennam per omnia dominica sua et clamat habere et nesciunt quo warento.

Robertus de Hardres clamat habere warrenam per omnia dominica sua et habuit xv annis elapsis et omnes tenentes sui et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Burn vicecomes attachiavit Andream clericum pro quodam equo et equum retinuit et Andream sine plegium dimisit. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes attachiavit Willelmum de Thaldann injuste et ipsum inprisonavit quousque pacavit ei xxs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Braburn ballivus hundredi de Bregg' attachavit Gunnoram de Hardres iniuste et eam inprisonavit quousque pacavit ei ad valenciam xxxs. Item Hamo de la Forstall attachiavit Guidonem de

at 100s., but they do not know what is the total sum of money lost.

Then they say that the same Master Richard, the escheator, took the whole priory into the lord king's hand and took many goods there but they do not know for what length of time he held those.

Then they say that the same took the archbishopric of Canterbury into the king's hands after the death of archbishop Boniface and held it for 2½ years.

Then they say that the same Master Richard took the abbey of St Augustine's Canterbury after abbot Roger's death [Roger de Cicestre 1253-1273, succeeded by Nicholas de Spina 1273-1283] but they do not know for what length of time nor what he took from it.

### **Hundred of Bridge**

The jury say that the hundred of Bridge is in the lord king's hand and pays a rent of 20s. each year to the lord king and 2 marks for the sheriff's tourn. Then they say that William de Leynburn holds one fee in [Patrix?] Bourne of the lord king in chief.

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester has 20 years ago appropriated the tithing of High [Upper] Hardres for himself which is a fourth part of the hundred, with loss to the king and commonalty of 4s. each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the prior of Merton claims to have the assize of bread and ale and he has this in the town of Patrixbourne in Bridge hundred and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Say has warren throughout his whole demesne and claims to have this and they do not know by what warrant.

Robert de Hardres claims to have warren throughout his whole demesne and he and all his tenants have had this for 15 years and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Henry de Burn, the sheriff, arrested Andrew, the clerk, for a certain horse and he kept the horse and dismissed Andrew without a pledge. Then they say that Henry Malemains, the sheriff, unjustly arrested William de Thaldann and imprisoned him until he paid him 20s. Then they say that John de Braburn, the bailiff of Bridge hundred unjustly arrested Gunnora de Hardres and imprisoned her until she paid him the sum of 30s. Then Hamo de la Forstall unjustly arrested Guy de Brokkeshol regarding a certain lamb and held

Brokkeshol iniuste pro quodam angno [sic] et ipsum tenuit in priona quousque habuit ab eo xs. Item attachiavit quendam Carolum de Pette inponendo sibi falso crimen furti et inprisonavit eum quousque habuit ab eo xxs. Item idem attachiavit uxorem Johannis de Bosco inponendo sibi falso feloniam et ipsam tenuit in priona quousque habuit ab ea 1 vaccam et 1 porcum precii xs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Sutheneye nunc ballivus hundredi de Bregg' attachiavit Thomam le Brok pro felonia et ipsum sine plegium dimisit pro Xs. Item idem attachiavit Walterum de Marais Jordanum de Rede propter furtum et cepit ab eis dimidam marcam et dimisit ipsos quietos. Item Thomas de Leht' serviens dicti Thome de Suthen' attachiavit eosdem iterato pro felonia et cepit ab eis vjs et dimisit eos quietos. Item Thomas de Leht' attachiavit quamdam mulierem in villa de Bregg' inponendo sibi crimen furti et cepit ab ea xijd et eam dimisit.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Bradeburn ballivus hundredi de Bregg' cepit 1 marcam pro recognitione removendi de assisis et juratis.

Item Willelmus de la Dan' de Taneto ballivus dicti hundredi pro simili cepit de eodem hundredo dimidiam marcam. Item Philipus de Delham baillivus dicti hundredi cepit de eodem hundredo pro simili 1 marcam. Item Hamo de la Forstall ballivus dicti hundredi cepit pro simili de eodem hundredo xxs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupindon cepit de hundredo de Bregg' quare fuerunt ad insultum de Tunebrigg' per preceptum domini regis xLs.

Item dicunt quod Reginaldus de Cobeham tradidit Johanni de Bradeburn' hundredum de Bregg' ad firmam capiend 1 marcam plus solito. Item Willelmus de la Dane cepit dictum hundredum ad firmam de domino Johanne de Cobeham eadem firma. Item dominus Henricus de Burn tradidit dictum hundredum Hamoni de la Forstall augmentando firmam de xxs. Item dominus Stephanus de Pencestre tradidit idem hundredum Matheo de Kyngessuod' de crescendo firmam de dimidia marca. Item dominus Henricus Malemains tradidit dictum hundredum contra adventum justiciarorum Hamoni de la Forstall augmentando firmam de 1 marca. Item Hamo de la Forstall ballivus dicti hundredi per potestatem officii sui extorsit de Roberto de la Dane v perticatas terre cum croppo precii iiijs sine iudicio. Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores

him in prison until he received 10s. from him. Then he arrested a certain Charles de Pette falsely accusing him of a crime of theft and imprisoned him until he received 20s. from him. Then the same man arrested John de Bosco's wife falsely accusing her of a felony and he held her in prison until he received 1 cow and 1 pig, price 10s. from her.

Then they say that Thomas de Sutheneye now the bailiff of Bridge hundred arrested Thomas le Brok for a felony and released him for 10s. without a pledge. Then the same man arrested Walter de Marais, Jordan de Rede for theft and took half a mark from them and released them as acquitted. Then Thomas de Leht' the said Thomas de Suthen's serjeant, arrested the same men again for felony and took 6s. from them and released them as acquitted. Then Thomas de Leht' arrested a certain woman in Bridge vill accusing her of the crime of theft and he took 12d. from her and released her.

Then they say that John de Bradeburn, bailiff of Bridge hundred, took 1 mark for recognition of removal from assizes and juries.

Then William de la Dane of Thanet, bailiff of the said hundred, took half a mark from the same hundred for a similar reason. Then Philip de Delham, bailiff of the said hundred, took 1 mark from the same hundred for a similar reason. Then Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of the said hundred, took 20s. from the same hundred for the same reason. Then they say that William de Stupindon took 40s. from Bridge hundred because the men had been at the assault upon Tonbridge by the lord king's command.

Then they say that Reginald of Cobham demised Bridge hundred to John de Bradeburn' at farm by taking 1 mark more than customary. Then William de la Dane took the said hundred at farm from the lord John of Cobham, at the same farm. Then Sir Henry de Burn demised the said hundred to Hamo de la Forstall by increasing the farm by 20s. Then Sir Stephen of Pencestre demised the same hundred to Matthew of Kingswood by increasing the farm by half a mark. Then Sir Henry Malemains demised the said hundred to Hamo de la Forstall against the arrival of the justices, increasing the farm by 1 mark. Then Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of the said hundred, extorted from Robert de la Dane 5 perches of land with crops, price 4s. by the authority of his office without any judgment. Henry Malemains and Fulco Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the



vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum Xs.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall cepit pro summonitione scaccarii ut dixit set falso de Willelmo Aunsel dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes Kancie cepit xxs de villatis de Bregg' Blakemannesber' et Netherhardr' ut dictas villatas aquietavit de Cs. de summonitione scaccarii et non fecit

Item Hamo de la Forstall ballivus hundredi de Bregg' cepit xijd de Roberto de Woltun pro remittendo hundredo de debito domini regis et et Thomas de Leht' cepit xijd de eodem pro simili et de Roberto Flagellatore pro eodem cepit viijs.

Item dictus Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Roberto Barry xLd ut acquietet eum de debito regis et non fecit.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus filius Hamonis de Forstall summonuit apud Greenwich Willelmum de White, Johannem Gervais et alios contra formam brevis domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall baillivus hundredi de Bregg' noluit facere inquisitionem de quodam mortuo murdrato in borgha de Patrichesburn' in predicto hundredo antequam habuit de borgha Xs. Item idem Hamo attachiavit felonem dicti murdri et noluit tenere hundredum ad deliberandum dictum felonem antequam habuit de borgha de Lungesburn iijs.

### **Hundredum de Kynghamford**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Middeltun cum hundredum de Merdenn est in manu domini regis et valet per annum CC libras.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Kyngeston tenetur in capite de domino rege et dominus Alexander de Baillol per Isabellam uxorem suam illud tenet et valet per annum X libras.

Item manerium de Elham tenetur in capite de domino rege et fuit excaeta Normannorum et dominus Henricus rex dictum manerium dedit domino Edmundo filio suo et idem concessit illud domino Rogero de Leiburn et modo illud tenet Willelmus de Leiburn filius eius et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod quod arciepiscopus Cant' habet duas partes hundredi de Kynhamford per libertatem ecclesie

assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took half a mark from William Aunsel for summons of the Exchequer, as he said, but falsely.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains, sheriff of Kent, took 20s. from the townships of Bridge, Blackmansbury [Bridge par.] and Nether [Lower] Hardres so that he would acquit the said townships of 100s. for summons of the Exchequer, and he has not done so.

Then Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of Bridge hundred, took 12d. from Robert de Woltun for remitting the hundred of a debt to the lord king and Thomas de Leht' took 12d. from the same man for a similar purpose and 8s. from Robert Flagellator for the same purpose.

Then the said Hamo de la Forstall took 40d. from Robert Barry that he might acquit him of the king's debt and he has not done so.

Then they say that William, Hamo de la Forstall's son summoned William de White, John Gervais and other men at Greenwich, contrary to the form of the lord king's writ.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of Bridge hundred, was unwilling to hold an inquest upon a certain dead person, murdered in Patrichesburne tithing in the aforesaid hundred before he received 10s. from the tithing. Then the same Hamo arrested a felon for the said murder and was unwilling to compel the hundred to deliver the said felon before he had 3s. from the tithing of *Lungesburn*.

### **Hundred of Kinghamford**

The jury say that the manor of Middleton with the hundred of Marden is in the lord king's hand and it is worth £200 each year.

Then they say that the manor of Kingston is held of the lord king in chief and the lord Alexander de Baillol holds that through his wife Isabel and it is worth £10 each year.

Then the manor of Elham is held of the lord king in chief and it was an escheat of the Normans and the lord king Henry gave the said manor to his son Edmund [Edmund 'Crouchback' fourth child of Henry III, born 1245, d. 1296] and the same man granted that to Sir Roger de Leyburn and now his son William de Leiburn holds it and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has two parts of Kinghamford hundred through the liberty

Christi Cant' et Alexander de Baillol habet terciam partem et valet per annum iiijs et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod idem archiepiscopus habet et habere clamat omnes libertates regias per terras suas, Et dominus de Kyngeston habet assisam panis et cervisie et wreccum maris ab antiquo set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus regis cepit de Roberto de Yling ut amoveretur de assisis et juratis apud Grenewich viijd, de Simone le Mercer pro simili vjd., de Elia Wyberd pro simili vjd.

Item Thomas de Leht' serviens Thome de Suthen cepit de Willelmo Warderob' pro simili xvd, de Alano Gile pro simili xijd.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Gregorio filio Thome de Denne dimidiam marcam inponendo sibi falso homicidium et de Ada filio Roberti de Donne pro simili dimidiam marcam, de Roberto de Yling ijs inponendo sibi falso quod fuit socius cuiusdam homicide. Item idem Hamo et dominus Henricus Malemains cepit de Roberto de Stochman pro diffamacione homicidii xxs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit xvijjs et vjd pro pondere ultra verum numerum denariorum

Item dicunt quod Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris et Stephanus de Lymming cepit Xs. et viijd anno regis Lv antequam voluerunt tenere curiam ad judicandum quondam felonem de borgha de Chelwing' et Birt.'

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford qui cepit seysinam manerii de Bisshopesbur' cepit de tenentibus eiusdem manerii catallagium xLs et Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus eius pro simili xxiijs et iiijd. Item idem Hugo cepit de eisdem de summonitione scaccarii ut dixit set falso ut credunt v marcas et dimidiam. Item idem Magister Hugo et Stephanus de Lymming cepit de Johanne de Chelwing ut non esset prepositus xxs., de Eustachio de la Brome pro simili Xs., de Johanne le Mei pro simili dimidiam marcam de Willelmo Cleribaud pro simili iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor fecit prosternere et vendere in bosco manerii Lj quercus precii Lxvs. et amplius et denarios inde recepit.

of Christchurch Canterbury and Alexander de Baillol has the third part and it is worth 4s. each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop has and claims to have all royal liberties throughout his lands.

And the lord of Kingston has the assize of bread and ale and wreck from ancient times, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the kings' s bailiff, took 8d. from Robert de Yling so that he might be removed from the assizes and juries at Greenwich, 6d. from Simon the mercer for a similar reason, 6d. from Elias Wyberd for a similar reason.

Then Thomas de Leht' a serjeant of Thomas de Suthen' took 15d. from William Warderob for a similar reason, 12d. from Alan Gile for a similar reason.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took half a mark from Gregory son of Thomas de Denne, accusing him falsely of homicide and half a mark from Adam son of Robert de Donne for a similar offence, from Robert de Yling 2s. falsely accusing him that he had been an associate of a certain murderer. Then the same Hamo and Henry Malemains took 20s. from Robert de Stochman for an accusation of homicide.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 18s. 6d. by weight more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that Master Hugh de Thornham, the escheator's clerk, and Stephen of Lyminge took 10s. 8d. in the 55th year of the king's reign [October 1270-1271] before he was willing to hold a court to judge a certain felon in the tithings of *Chelwing* and *Birt*.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford who took seisin of the manor of Bishopsbourne took 40s. poll-tax from the tenants of the same manor and Master Hugh de Thornham, his clerk, 24s. 4d. for a similar purpose. Then the same Hugh took 5½ marks from the same tenants for summons of the Exchequer, as he said but falsely as they believe. Then the same Master Hugh and Stephen of Lyminge took 20s. from John de Chelwing that he had not been reeve, 10s. from Eustace de la Brome for a similar reason, half a mark from John le Mei for a similar reason, 4s. from William Cleribaud for a similar reason.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, had 61 oak trees, price 65s. and more cut down and sold in the wood of the manor, and he has received the money for it.

m. 2 <b>Civitas Cantuar'</b>	m.2 <b>The City of Canterbury</b>
<p>Jurati dicunt quod civitas Cant' tenetur ad firmam de domino rege per annum pro Lx libris ex dimissione domini regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc, Item dicunt quod habet manerium de Middeltun cum Merdenn et suis pertinenciis. Item habet quoddam castrum cum viij denariis annui redditus et uno parco quod valet per annum iiijd in Cantuar' que sunt in custodia vicecomitis Kancie</p> <p>Item dicunt quod gentes manentes extra Westgate fuerunt tempore domini Johnnis regis patris regis Henrici auxiliantes in omnibus pertinentibus ad dominum regem et communitatem civitatis Cant' sicut cives civitatis set post tempus domini archiepiscopi Huberti Walteri subtrahuntur unde dominus rex et civitas deteriorantur eo quod mercatores se trahunt ibidem sicut tannores et alii mercatores a civitate predicta et per dominum archiepiscopum manententur et defunduntur ad gravamen civitatis. Levaverunt eciam pillorium contra libertatem civitatis ubi nullum habuerunt ante Iter H. de Baton' justicarii. Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini tenent maneria de Menstre in Taneto Chistelet Sturreia et Langeport quod est in suburbio Cant' per quem et quo warento nesciunt.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod Comes Glovern' subtraxit tenentes suos de Heghardres de secta hundredo de Bregg' et tenentes de Blen' de hundredo de Wystapel et tenentes de Natindon et Crundal' ad visum franciplegii faciendum honori Glovern' a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod cives Cant' habent returnum omnium brevium placita namio vetiti furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et dominus archiepiscopus habet hec omnia et wreccum maris per cartas regum ut intelligent.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' capit wreccum maris et facit visum franciplegii infra libertatem Cant' in suburbio et habet assisam panis et cervisie et facit inde iudicium sine warento ut intelligent et prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant' levavit furcas in suburbio infra libertatem civitatis Cant' apud Horsfold tempore domini Henrici regis et</p>	<p>The jury say that the city of Canterbury is held at farm of the lord king for £60 each year by demise of the lord King Henry, the present king's father. Then they say that he holds the manor of Middleton with Marden and their appurtenances. Then he holds a certain castle with 8d. of annual rent and one park which is worth 4d. each year in Canterbury which are in the custody of the sheriff of Kent.</p> <p>Then they say that the people dwelling outside the Westgate were, in the time of King John [1199-1216] father of King Henry, subject in all things pertaining to the lord king and the community of the City of Canterbury, just as the citizens of the city, but after Archbishop Hubert Walter's time [abp. 1189-1205] they are withdrawn, whence the lord king and the citizens suffered loss, because merchants there, such as tanners and other merchants, withdrew themselves from the aftersaid city and they are supported and defended by the lord archbishop causing harm to the city. They have also built a pillory contrary to the liberty of the city where they had none before the eyre of the justice H. de Baton. Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's holds the manors of Minster in Thanet, Chislet, Sturry and Langport, which is in a suburb of Canterbury, through whom and by what warrant they do not know.</p> <p>Then they say that the earl of Gloucester has withdrawn his tenants of High [Upper]Hardres from suit of Bridge hundred and the tenants of Blean from Whitstable hundred and the tenants of Nackington and Crundale to make their view of frankpledge for the honor of Gloucester from the time of the lord King Henry, the present king's father, and they do not know by what warrant.</p> <p>Then they say that the citizens of Canterbury have the return of all writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and the lord archbishop has all these and wreck, through kings' charters, as they understand.</p> <p>Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury takes wreck and holds the view of frankpledge within the liberty of Canterbury, in the suburb and he has the assize of bread and ale and he administers justice without warrant, as they understand and the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury erected a gallows in the suburb at</p>

sine warento. Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet placita de namio vetito et prior Sancte Trinitatis similiter et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus abbas apopriavit sibi warennam et chaciam et suburbio Cant' infra libertatem eiusdem civitatis et prior Sancte Trinitatis in hundredo de Felebereg'h'. Item dicunt quod idem abbas levavit quoddam stillicidium in fossato civitatis Cant' apud Queinegate ubi putredines coquine sue ejiciuntur et nocens est omnibus transeuntibus ibidem. Item dicunt quod includit et appropriat sibi quoddam fossatum quod vocatum Burezdihc et levavit iij appodiamenta lapidis super terram domini regis, unde duo appodiamenta facta fuerunt tempore domini regis Henrici et alia duo tempore domini regis nunc. Item dicunt idem levavit quendam murum super terram domini regis de longitudine trium perticatrum ut credunt iuxta portam Sancti Augustini. Item idem abbas tenet tres insulas in ripa domini regis pertinentes ad civitatem Cant' que augmentate sunt super aquam apud Froxepol. Item idem in halimoto suo in suburbio Cant' apud Langport facit tenentes suos liberos homines civitatis et dare boreghesaldrespeni nec permittit eos esse in libero plegii civitatis et facit inquirere de assisa panis et cervisie et capit inde emendas contra libertatem civitatis Cant' et domini regis. In eodem hundredo facit boregheshaved et recipit presentacionem placitorum corone domini regis contra libertatem domini regis ad dampnum civitatis per annum Xs. a tempore domini Henrici regis proximi. Item dicunt quod idem abbas cepit in suburbio civitatis Cant' in hundredis de Borgat' et Redingat' homines et feminas et eos inprisonavit et detinuit in halimoto suo ad judicandum extra libertatem domini regis et civitatis Cant' et ad exheredacionem domini regis unde dominus rex Henricus pater domini regis nunc habuit seysinam. Item idem abbas levavit tam sublime molendinum suum et stangnum xv annis elapsis quod aque reversion inpedit molendinum domini regis ad dampnum per annum de xLs.

Item dicunt quod prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant' tenet curiam suam de la coltona de hominibus suis forinsecis et extraxit liberos homines civitatis

*Horsfold*,<sup>1</sup> within the liberty of Canterbury city during King Henry's time and without warrant. Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds wrongful pleas of distraint upon goods and similarly the prior of Holy Trinity and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the said abbot has appropriated for himself warren and chace and in the suburb of Canterbury within the liberty of the same city and the prior of Holy Trinity in Felborough hundred. Then they say that the same abbot has made a vent in the ditch of the city of Canterbury where putrid smells emerge from his kitchen and this is offensive to all people passing by. Then they say that he encloses and appropriates for himself a certain ditch called *Burez* ditch and has made 4 stone buttresses upon the lord king's land; two of these buttresses were made in the lord King Henry's time and the other two in the time of the present lord king. Then they say that the same man raised a certain wall upon the lord king's land next to St Augustine's gate, three perches long as they believe. Then the same abbot holds three islands in the lord king's water-front pertaining to Canterbury city, which have been extended above the water at *Froxepool*. Then the same man makes his tenants free men of Canterbury city in his hall-moot at Langport in a suburb of Canterbury and he does not permit them to give *boreghesaldrespeni*<sup>2</sup> nor to be in free pledge of the city and he makes enquiries about the assize of bread and ale and takes the fines contrary to the liberty of Canterbury city and of the lord king. He makes *boregheshaved*<sup>3</sup> in the same hundred and receives the presentation of pleas of the lord king's crown with loss of 10s. each year to the city from the lord King Henry's time. Then they say that the same abbot took men and women in a suburb of Canterbury city, in the hundreds of Bleangate and Ringslow and imprisoned them and detained them for judgement in his hall-moot, outside the liberty of the lord king and of Canterbury city and to the lord king's disinheritance, whence the lord King Henry, the present king's father, held seisin. Then 15 years ago the same abbot raised his mill and pond so high that the back-flow of water obstructs the lord king's mill with loss of 40s. each year. Then they say that the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury holds his court extra-ordinary for his foreigners and has withdrawn the free men of

Cant' extra Norhtgat' et per distrucionem ipsos facit sequi curiam suam ubi nullam sectam debuerunt. Item dicunt quod idem prior et conventus tenent quoddam pratum quod dominus rex tenet in dominicio et est pertinens ad civitatem et scitum apud Holistun extra muros civitatis Cant'. Dicunt eciam quod idem prior et conventus incluserunt quamdam viam que solebat extendere de Norhtgate fere usque ad Queinegate et habent inde warentum ut dicunt. Item dicunt quod levaverunt quamdam porchiam in vico de Newingate ad nocumentum regie strate et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod levaverunt quamdam schaloriam apud Horsfold ubi prius nulla fuit.

Item dicunt quod Fratres Predicatorum augmentaverunt quamdam insulam et fecerunt ibi purpresturam in ripa regali ad nocumentum domini regis et impedimentum molendini sui. Item idem Fratres obstruxerunt et mutaverunt quamdam viam communem per quam gentes solebant ire ad aquam. Item incluserunt quamdam terram super ripa regali que continet in longitudine X perticas et in latitudine fere vj pedes.

Item dicunt quod Fratres Minores fecerunt purpresturam in via regia videlicet longitudine X perchitas et latitudine xj pedes per loca diversa ad grave dampnum civitatis et patrie. Item dicunt quod Magister hospitalis pauperum sacerdotum augmentavit quamdam insulam in ripa regia unde cursus aque artatur ad nocumentum molendini domini regis et omnium vicinorum et habet in longitudine 20 percitas et latitudine dimidiam percitam per loca diversa. Item idem edificavit super ripa domini regis et fecit ibidem purpresturam longitudine vj percitas et latitudine v pedum. Item idem construxit quamdam grangiam et fecit purpresturam longitudine vj percitas et latitudine vj pedes. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Hardres nuper defunctus fecit purpresturam super ripa regali longitudine xx percitas et latitudine 1 percitam.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancte Radegundis tenet quoddam mansum cum petinenciis in fossato domini regis continens in longitudine xvj percitas et in latitudine Lx pedes. Item idem fecit

Canterbury city outside Northgate and by distraint makes them do suit at his court where they owed no suit. Then they say that the same prior and convent hold a certain meadow which the lord king holds in demesne and it is pertaining to the city and situated at *Holistun*<sup>4</sup> outside the walls of Canterbury city. They say also that the same prior and convent have enclosed a certain way which used to extend from the Northgate almost as far as *Queensgate* and they have warren there, as they say. Then they say that the same men have built a certain piggery in the lane of Newgate to the detriment of the king's highway and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that they have put up a certain stile at Horsfold where there used not to be one.

Then they say that the Dominican Friars have extended a certain island and have made an encroachment there upon the royal water-front to the lord king's detriment and the obstruction of his mill. Then the same Friars have obstructed and altered a certain way across which people went to the water. Then they have enclosed a certain piece of land upon the royal water-front which is 10 perches in length and almost 6 feet wide.

Then they say that the Franciscan Friars have made an encroachment on the highway 10 perches long and 11 feet wide in diverse places, with severe loss to the city and country.

Then they say that the Master of the hospital for poor priests has extended a certain island on the royal water-front, from which a flow of water issues causing damage to the lord king's mill and to all the neighbourhood and it is 20 perches long and half a perch wide in divers places. Then the same man has built upon the lord king's water-front and made an encroachment there 6 perches long and 5 feet wide. Then the same man has built a certain barn and made an encroachment 6 feet long and 6 feet wide. Then they say that Robert de Hardres, lately deceased, made an encroachment 20 perches long and 1 foot wide upon the royal water-front.

Then they say that the abbot of St Radegund's [Alkham par.] holds a certain measure of land with appurtenances in the lord king's ditch, containing 16 perches in length and 40 feet in width. Then

purpresutram super ripa regali longitudine X perticas et latitudine quatuor pedes.

Item dicunt quod omnes vicecomites qui fuerunt in Kancia xx annis elapsis tradiderunt ballivis extortativis hundreda et huiusmodi ad firmam et talibus de quibus magis percipere potuerunt, sic Thome ballivo de Eyleford, Johanni le Brode, Osberto de Ledes, Thome Andr' Philipo de Delham et Ivoni de Merdenn.

Item cum dominus rex qui nunc est teneretur Anselmo le Formgir Cant' in xxvijs et traditi fuerunt Willelmo de Janua avenator archiepiscopi ut redderet idem Willelmus solvit dicto Anselmo unam summam pisorum, precii Vs. et residuum retinuit. Item idem Willelmus solvit Gudoni Pollard pistori Cant' unam summam pisorum precii Vs de xjs quod dominus rex eidem debuit quos denarios dictus Willelmus receperat.

Item dicunt quod tempore domini regis Henrici Robertus de Beche et Henricus de Ledes nomine vicecomitis distrinxerunt Thomam de Bremble de Faversham et alios de villa pro summonitione scaccarii pro civitate de Faversham et vendiderunt averia sua ad valenciam XX librarum et non aquietaverunt eos ut credunt.

Item tempore domini regis nunc venerunt Willelmus de Hever vicecomes Kancie et ministri sui et distrinxerunt civitatem Cant' pro vicesima et pro ruta habenda ballivi dederunt sibi xLs et nicholominus retinuit ij equos cuiusdem vidue precii Ls. sic Margarete Thalebot nec equos sibi restituit nec allocaciam sibi fecit neque communitate. Item idem Willelmus et Henricus de Ledes venerunt ad domum Laurencii de Fonte in suburbio Cant' distringens eum pro X marcis de amerciamentis Magistri Rogeri de Seton et ceperunt 1 equum precii viij marcas et dimidiam et duas summas frumenti precii xijs et 1 carectam ferro ligatam precii Xs. et ij saccos precii xijd et unum avelacium de ebore precii iij et omnia ista retinent et nichil eidem Laurencio allocatur.

Item Willelmus de Evere et Thomas de Sutheneye

they say the same man has made an encroachment upon the royal water-front 10 perches long and four feet wide.

Then they say that all the sheriffs who have been in Kent for the last twenty years have delivered the hundreds at farm in this manner to extortionate bailiffs, to such men from whom they can receive more things, thus to Thomas the bailiff of Aylsford, John le Brode, Osbert of Leeds, Thomas Andrew, Philip de Delham and Ivo of Marden.

Then since the present king [Edward I 1272-1307] is indebted to Anselm le Formgir' of Canterbury for 28s. and this money was delivered to William de Janua, the archbishop's avener so that he might refund it; the same William paid one load of peas, price 5s. to the said Anselm and he kept the remainder. Then the same William paid Guy Pollard, a baker of Canterbury one load of peas, price 5s. of the 11s. which the lord king owed him, which money the said William had received.

Then they say that during the lord King Henry's time Robert de Beche and Henry of Leeds in the sheriff's name made distraint upon Thomas de Bremble of Faversham and other men for a summons of the Exchequer for the city of Faversham and they sold their draught animals valued at £20 and have not acquitted them, as they believe.

Then in the present king's time William of Hever, the sheriff of Kent, and his ministers came and made distraint upon Canterbury city for the tax of one-twentieth and the bailiffs gave him 40s. for holding a legal enquiry and nevertheless he kept 2 horses, price 50s. belonging to a certain widow, Margaret Thalebot, and he has neither restored the horses to her nor paid any compensation neither to her nor to the community. Then they say that the same William and Henry of Leeds came to the house of Lawrence de Fonte in the suburb of Canterbury, distraining him for 10 marks of amercements for Master Roger de Seton and they took 1 horse, price 8½ marks and two loads of wheat, price 12s. and 1 cart bound with iron, price 10s. and 3 sacks, price 12d. and one *avelacium de ebore* harness of tawed leather, price 3s. and they keep all these things and nothing is allowed to the same Lawrence.

Then William of Hever and Thomas de Sutheneye,

Willelmus Peverel Jacobus de Dene Radulfo de Paris Walterus de Hudon Emericus de Sancto Leodogar' et Nicholas le Porter die Veneris ante festum apostolorum Petri et Pauli anno regni regis Edwardi secundo venerunt ad domum Ricardi de Shamelefford in Cant' et distrikerunt dictum Ricardum et fregerunt hostium camere sue et ceperunt ibidem unam culcitram precii vj marcas xij mappas precii xLs unam penulam de minuto veram precii xLs viij manteria precii viijs unum cyphum argenti precii xviijs et xj cochlearia argenti precii xjs pro vicesima quam civitas Cant' prius solverat ad scaccarium domini regis et hec omnia penes se retinent sine aliqua restitutione facta dicto Ricardo.

Item dicunt quod Arnoldus de Esling quondam ballivus et custos castri Cant' et Radulfus de Esling tunc marescallus comitatus fecerunt quemdam probatorem appellare Johnnem Dodeker et Willelmum Smelt de Cant' homines fideles causa lucri.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus Spicer nuper defunctus erat ballivus Cant' et cepit xxs de Nicholao Pokel et Godelena de Schalaria pro eisdem dimittendis de prisona qui boni et fideles fuerunt.

Item dicunt quod coronatores et eorum clerici noluerunt exsequi nec facere officia sua sine mangnis [sic] muneribus neque ballivi viceomitum unde populus multum gravatur.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor et sui baillivi tempore quo fuit custos archiepiscopatus Cant' maximam et innumerum fecit distructionem in boscis parcis vivariis warennis homagiis et in edificiis eodem modo fecit de abbathia Sancti Augustini Cant' tempore vacationis.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Vaus fecit ducere ad portum de Sandwico xLj saccos et ibidem transivit Willelmus de Lumbre per eundem portum X saccos, Jacobus Holte xx saccos per eundem portum. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochull, Johannes de Sarcino, Robertus frater eius Dover' Thomas de Basing de eadem, Alexander de Crawthorn, Robertus Peni, Johannes Peni, Thomas Peni, Batin Hautun, Robertus le Ferun, Adam Wyberd, Robertus de Stapel, Robertus Vincent, Henricus Weres, Bateman Terye,

William Peverel, James de la Dene, Ralph de Paris, Walter de Hudon, Emeric of St Leger and Nicholas the porter came to Richard de Shamleford's house in Canterbury on the Friday before the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul in the second year of king Edward's reign [22<sup>nd</sup> June 1274] and made distraint upon the said Richard and they broke his chamber door and took there one knife price 6 marks, 12 table cloths price 40s., one small fur hood price 40s., 8 towels price 8s., one silver cup price 18s. and 11 silver spoons price 11s., for the tax of one-twentieth which the city of Canterbury had first paid to the lord king's Exchequer and they kept all these things themselves without making any restitution to the said Richard.

Then they say that Arnold de Esling, formerly the bailiff and custodian of Canterbury castle and Ralph de Esling, then the marshall of the county appointed a certain approver to accuse John Dodeker and William Smelt of Canterbury, both law abiding men, for a reward.

Then they say that Richard Spicer, lately deceased, had been bailiff of Canterbury and he took 20s. from Nicholas Pokel and Godelena de Schalaria for releasing them from prison and they were worthy and law-abiding people.

Then they say that the coroners and their clerks have been unwilling to do or perform the duties of their office without great gifts [bribes], likewise the bailiffs of the sheriffs, whence the people are much burdened.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and his clerks while he was the custodian of the archbishopric of Canterbury caused the greatest and immeasurable destruction in the woods, parks, fish-ponds, warrens, homages [?] and he acted in the same way in the buildings of St Augustine's abbey while it was vacant.

Then they say that William de Vaus had conveyed 41 sacks [? of wool] to the port of Sandwich and there exported them., William de Lumbre 10 sacks from the same port, James Holte 20 sacks from the same port. Then they say that William de Brochull, John de Sarcino, Robert his brother of Dover, Thomas de Basing of the same town, Alexander of Crawthorn, Robert Peni, John Peni, Thomas Peni, Batin Hautun, Robert le Ferun, Adam Wyberd, Robert de Stapel, Robert Vincent, Henry Weres, Bateman Terye, Hertin Peni, John Peni junior of

Hertinus Peni, Johannes Peni junior de Sandwico omnes ille transfretaverunt lanas per plures particulas set numerum nec quo warento fecerunt nesciunt.

### **Hundredum de Ringeslo**

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus rex pater regis nunc tenet in dominico manerium de Ofspring et modo illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod ballivus domini regis qui pro tempore fuerit tenet lastum Sancti Augustini et lastum de Edeling et hundredum de Ringeslo pro xxxiiij libris per annum et sunt ibidem iiij marcas de turno vicecomitis quas Johannes de Watton vicecomes tempore suo primo levare fecit. Item dicunt quod villati de Munkeneton et Westhalimot solebant sequi ad turnum vicecomitis bis per annum per X homines et subtracti sunt per xx annos et amplius tempore Bonifacii archiepiscopi et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium placita namio vetiti wreccum maris assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warento.

Item abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' clamat habere eadem quo warrento nesciunt. Item prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant' habet ab archiepiscopo returnum brevium et habet placita namio vetiti wreccum maris et assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod ballivi domini regis solebant tenere hundredum de Ringeslo et ballivi abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant' non permittebant eos facere officium suum X annis elapsis ad dampnum domini regis set nesciunt de quanto.

Item dicunt quod Cristina de Remmesgate et Johannes filius Martini et fratres eius de eadem opturant et inpediunt quamdam viam communem apud Remisgat' ad dampnum patrie per annum de ijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes tradidit lastum Sancti Augustini Cant' et lastum de Hedeling pro xxxij libris Hamoni de la Forstall ballivio extorsori ad mangnum [sic]

Sandwich, have all exported wool in many parcels but they do not know what number nor by what warrant.

### **Hundred of Ringslow**

Then they say that the Lord Henry, the present king's father, holds the manor of Ospringe in demesne and now the lady queen, the present king's mother holds that but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say the lord king's then bailiff holds the lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling and Ringslow hundred for £24 each year and there are 4 marks each year from the sheriff's tourn there, which John de Watton first had levied at the time he was sheriff.

Then they say that the townships of Monkton and Westhalimot used to do suit at the sheriff's tourn by 10 men twice a year and they have been withdrawn for 20 years and more since archbishop Boniface's time and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the assize of bread and ale and they do not know by what warrant.

Then the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury claims to have the same things, by what warrant they do not know. Then the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury has the return of writs from the archbishop and he has pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck and the assize of bread and ale and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord king's bailiffs used to hold Ringslow hundred and the bailiffs of the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury have not allowed them to perform the duties of their office for 10 years, with loss to the king, but they do not know how much.

Then they say that Christine of Ramsgate and John son of Martin and his brothers of the same place, obstruct and block a certain common way at Ramsgate with loss of 2s. each year to the country.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains the sheriff, demised the lathe of St Augustine Canterbury and the lathe of Hedeling for £32 to the bailiff Hamo de la Forstall an extortionist causing



gravamen patrie que ante solebant tradi pro xvij libris. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de villatis de Menstre Moneketon et Westhalimot ultra certum numerum vicesime vij libras et iiijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' et prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant' per potestatem suam vendunt wardas de gavelikund contra consuetudinem regni et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit de Elia le Prude et sociis suis de summonitione scaccarii X marcas per manus Hugonis de Thornham promittens quod ad scaccarium eos aquietavit et non fecit nec unquam inde habuerunt allocanciam ad grave dampnum eorum.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen ballivus lesti Sancti Augustini Cant' cepit de borgha de Menstre pro hundredo tenendo dimidiam marcam de Henrico le Bedel pro simili ix. Hamo de la Forstall ballivus regis cepit de eadem borgha pro summonitione facta coram coronatore iiijs. Thomas de Sutheneie ballivus cepit de Norhtburna pro simili dimidiam marcam.

Item dominus Willelmus de Criel coronator cepit pro ij vices per manus Stephani clerici sui pro inquisicione facta de borgha de Bircheton vjs et de Norhtburna Sancti Petri pro simili cepit iiijs et de borgha de Wod' pro simili iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hever vicecomes cepit de Norhtburna Sancti Petri 1 marcam ut non occasionaretur de placitis corone et Henricus de Ledes ballivus cepit de eadem pro simili dimidiam mrcam.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor tempore vacacionis archiepiscopatus Cant' cepit de villatis de Reculre et Westhalimot de recognicione ad opus domini regis X libras. Item Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus eius cepit de eisdem pro gratia habenda 1 marcam. Item idem Magister Ricardus cepit de villata de Menstre ad opus domini regis post obitum Rogeri abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant' de recognicione xvij libras. Item Johannes Baudefer ballivus dicti excaitoris cepit de Daniele mercatore ut ipsum non inprisonaret xLs. Item de Gervasio le Taillur pro

severe hardship to the country whereas before these lathes used to be demised for £18. Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyferer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took £7 4s. more than the assessed amount from the townships of Monkton and Westhalimot.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury by their authority sell wardships of *gavelkind* contrary to the custom of the realm and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford the escheator took 10 marks from Elias le Prude and his associates for a summons of the Exchequer by the hand of Hugh de Thornham, claiming that he had exonerated them at the Exchequer and he had not done so and they never received any allowance for this, causing them a severe loss.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, bailiff of the lathe of St Augustine Canterbury, took half a mark from the tithing of Minster for holding a hundred court, 9s. from Henry the beadle for a similar reason. Hamo de la Forstall, the king's bailiff took 4s. from the same tithing for a summons made before the coroner. Thomas de Sutheneie the bailiff took half a mark from Northbourne for a similar reason.

Then Sir William de Criel the coroner on 2 occasions took 6s. through Stephen his clerk from the tithing of Birchington for making an inquest and he took 4s. from Northbourne St Peter for a similar reason and 4s. from the tithing of *Wood* for a similar reason.

Then they say that William of Hever, the sheriff, took 1 mark from Northbourne St Peter that it should not be harassed for pleas of the crown and Henry of Leeds took half a mark from the same tithing for a similar reason.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £10 from the townships of Reculver and Westhalimot as a recognizance for the lord king at the time of the vacancy of the archbishop of Canterbury. Then Master Hugh de Thornham his clerk took 1 mark from the same places for having his goodwill. Then the same Master Richard took £18 from the township of Minster as a recognizance for the lord king after the death of Roger the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury. Then John Baudefer, the said escheator's bailiff, took 40s. from Daniel the

simili Xs. Item de Petro de la Sole qui venit coram eo habens securim in manu sua dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod dominus Magister Ricardus excator tenuit archiepiscopatum in manu domini regis una cum manerium de Westhalimot pertinente ad hoc per duos annos et dimidiam. Item idem tenuit manerium de Menstre post obitum Rogeri abbatis Sancti Augustini in manus domini regis per iij septimannas.

#### m 2 dorso **Hundredum de Dunhamford**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Elham solebat esse in manu domini regis et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn illud modo tenet et esciunt quo warento et valet per annum Lx libras.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Say et canonici de Bello Loco tenent de domini rege in capite feodum 1 militis apud Patrishesburn et valet per annum xL libras.

Item dicunt quod prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant' vendunt wardas sokemannorum heredis Johannis de la Berton pro xLs. et heredum Hugonis Attewud pro iiijs. dum fuit plene etatis contra legem patrie

Item dicunt quod lestus Sancti Augustini Cant' in quo est hundredum de Dunhamford pertinet ad dominum regem set quod valet hundredum per annum nesciunt et dicunt quod lestus valet per annum xxvj marcas.

Item dicunt quod medieatas hundredi de Dunhamford est de libertate ecclesie Christi Cant' et altera medieatas de baronia et solebat totum teneri per ballivos domini regis unde abbas Sabcti Augustini Cant' clamat tenere per senescallos suos dictum hudredum simul cum ballivo domino regis per vj annos elapsos ad dampnum regis per annum ijs et amplius et habet in illo hundredo assisam panis et cervisie et alia regalia et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod villa de Litleburn debet sectam ad comitatum per iij homines de quibus 1 de tenemento de Lukedale tempore Reginaldi de Cornhull xx annis elapsis subtrahitur ad dampnum regis per annum dimidiam marcam et illud tenementum modo tenet Willelmus de Brewuse et sectam illam subtrahitur.

merchant so that he might not imprison him. Then 10s. from Gervais the tailor for a similar reason, then half a mark from Peter de la Sole who came before him carrying an axe in his hand.

Then they say that Master Richard, the escheator, held the archbishopric in the lord king's hand together with Westhalimot manor pertaining to this for 2½ years. Then the same man held the manor of Minster in the king's hands for three weeks after the death of Roger, abbot of St Augustine's.

#### m.2 dorso **Hundred of Downhamford**

The jury say that the manor of Elham used to be in the lord king's hand and Sir William de Leyburn now holds that and they do not know by what warrant and it is worth £60 each year.

Then they say that William de Say and the canons of Beaulieu [Normandy?] hold 1 knight's fee of the king in chief at Patrichbourne and it is worth £40 each year.

Then they say that the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury sells wardships of sokemen contrary to the law of the country, that of John de la Berton's heir for 40s. and that of Hugh Atwood's heirs for 4s. and he was of full age.

Then they say that the lathe of St Augustine Canterbury in which the hundred of Downhamford is situated, belongs to the lord king, but they do not know what the hundred is worth each year and they say the lathe is worth 26 marks each year.

Then they say that a moiety of Downhamford hundred is of the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury and the other moiety of the barony and the whole used to be held by the lord king's bailiffs, whence for the last 6 years the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury claims to hold the said hundred through his stewards simultaneously with the lord king's bailiff with a loss to the king of 2s. and more each year and in that hundred he holds the assize of bread and ale and other royal perquisites and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the vill of Littlebourne owes suit to the county through 4 men, of these the man from Lukedale's tenement has been withdrawn for the last 20 years, in Reginald of Cornhill's time with a loss of half a mark each year to the king and William de Braose now holds that tenement and he has withdrawn that suit.

Item dicunt quod ecclesia Christi Cant' habet returnum brevium wreccum maris placita namio vetito assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regias.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Brewuse opturat quamdam viam regiam per medium parcum suum de Trindle per V annos elapsos. Item dicunt quod Johannes Sperewe ballivus libertatis ecclesie Christi Cant' cepit de Guidone de la More iijd ut removeret eum de assisis et juratis, de Waltero de Cherefeld cepit pro simili vjd, de Nicholao de Bocland pro simili xijd., de Thoma le Creat pro simili iijjd., de Johanne Bledding vjd. Item Thomas le Leht' serviens eiusdem hundredi cepit de Thoma le Tannur pro simili iijjd., de Willelmo Mercatore viijjd., de Johanne de Breveshamme pro simili Xd. et 1 busshellum ordei, de Nicholao de Swanton pro simili vjd., de Willelmo Hartin pro simili vjd., de Johanne de Berne pro simili vjd., de Radulfo de Froginhal vjd., de Waltero de Suhtburton vjd., de Stephano Attehale Vd., de Rogero le Blake iijjd., de Willelmo Asketin vjd., de Henrico Attebrigg' xijd., de Thoma le Prude vjd., de Waltero Koc vjd., de Thoma Cissore iijjd., de Ricardo de la Dune iijjd., de Elia de Brevesham vjd. Item Willelmus de Hardres ballivus eiusdem hundredi cepit de Thoma le Tannur pro simili iijjd., de Willelmo Mercatore iijjd., de Willelmo de Wyham pro amerciamento iijjs cepit ij equos precii xiijs et numquam eos sibi restituit.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Haute clericus domini Willelmus de Brewos amisit xiijs quos Robertus de Mersward invenit et occasionavit eum super hoc et cepit ab eo 1 acram terre idem ballivus et dominus Willelmus de Brewus illam tenent et valet xLs

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemans et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt in hoc hundredo ultra certam vicesimam xLs.

Item dicunt quod quidam Stephanus de Ecclesia inprisonatus fuit in priona ecclesie Christi Cant' set qualiter deliberatus fuit nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod quidam Johannes filius Ivonis de Moningham fuit inprisonatus pro burgaria per unum mensem et non potuit deliberi antequam

Then they say that Christchurch Canterbury has the return of writs, wreck, pleas of *withername*, the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties. Then they say that for 5 years the lord William de Braose obstructs a certain royal way through the middle of his park of Trenley. Then they say that John Sparrow, bailiff of the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury, took 4d. from Guy de la More to remove him from the assizes and the juries, he took 6d. from Walter de Cherefield for a similar reason, 12d. from Nicholas of Buckland for a similar reason, 4d. from Thomas le Creat for a similar reason, 6d. from John Bledding. Then Thomas le Leht', a serjeant of the same hundred took 4d. from Thomas the tanner for a similar reason, 8d. from William the merchant, 10d. from John de Breveshamme for a similar reason and 1 bushel of oats, 7d. from Nicholas de Swanton for a similar reason, 6d. from William Hartin for a similar reason, 6d. from John de Berne for a similar reason, 6d. from Ralph de Froginahl, 6d. from Walter of Southburton, 5d. from Stephen Attehall, 4d. from Roger le Blake, 6d. from William Asketin, 12d. from Henry Attebridge, 6d. from Thomas le Prude, 6d. from Walter Cook, 4d. from Thomas Cissor, 4d. from Richard de la Dune, 6d. from Elias de Brevesham. Then William de Hardres, bailiff of the same hundred, took 4d. from Thomas the tanner for a similar reason, 3d. from William the merchant, from William de Wyham for an amercement of 4s. he took 2 horses price 14s and he has never given them back to him.

Then they say that William de Haute, a clerk of Sir William de Braose, lost 14s. which Robert de Marshward found and he arrested him for this and took 1 acre of land from him and the same bailiff and the lord William de Braose hold that land and it is worth 40s.

Then they say that Henry Malemans and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, have taken 40s more than the assessed amount in this hundred.

Then they say that a certain Stephen de Ecclesia was inprisoned in the prison of Christchurch Canterbury but they do not know how he was released.

Then they say that a certain John son of Ivo de Moningham was inprisoned for one month for burglary and he could not be released until John de

Johannes de Haliburegh' habuit de borgha de Stapel dimidam marcam.

Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant' cepit de borgha de Aldesham pro evasione cuiusdam latronis iiij libras et nicholominus amerciata fuit coram justicariis in Cs.

Item dicunt quod Matheus de Kyngeslond ballivus regis noluit tenere hundredum ad deliberandum quemdam prisonem nisi haberet dimidam marcam et sic evasit a prisona per quem evasionem prior ecclesie Christi Cant' cepit de borgha de La Leye Cs. et pertinet huiusmodi ad dominum regem. Item Robertus de Sarsted ballivus eiusdem borghe cepit pro eodem ijs.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus hundredi antequam voluit tenere ad deliberandum Henricum Wyrun inprisonatum pro latrocinio cepit de hundredo dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupesdun et Willelmus de la Gerston ballivi Comitis Glovernie ceperunt de eodem hundredo Cs. quod fuerunt in guerra ad Tunebrigg' per preceptum domini regis.

### **Hundredum de Westgate**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent et hundredum de Westgate est in manu sua et valet per annum Lxs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor sede Cant' vacante cepit de hundredo de Westgate xLs ita quod eos sustineret eo modo quo ballivi eos tenuerunt et occasione illius finis fecit injuste levare de eodem hundredo iiij marcas.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus et ballivi sui vendiderunt boscum archiepiscopi ad estimacionem xxxijs. et postmodum xxs. Item quidam Robertus ballivus excaitoris dictus forestarius vendidit boscum dicti archiepiscopi ad valenciam xxs, set contra voluntatem excaitoris. Item idem excaitor amerciavit priorem Sancti Gregorii ad iiij marcas quare emit boscum de dicto Roberto et Philippum de Westgate ad xLs. pro huiusmodi emptione et Simonem le Wehtaker pro simili ad iiij. et Robertum de Campo pro simili ad Vs. et Johannem Bercar' pro simili ad Vs. et

Haliburegh received half a mark from *Stapel* [Staple Farm] tithing.

Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury took £4 from *Aldesham* tithing because a certain robber had escaped and nevertheless the tithing was amerced 100s. before the justices.

Then they say that Matthew of Kingsland, the king's bailiff was unwilling to compel the hundred to deliver a certain prisoner unless he received half a mark and thus the prisoner escaped and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury took 100s. from the tithing *de la Ley* because of this escape and cases of this nature pertain to the lord king. Then Robert de Sarsted, the bailiff of the same tithing took 2s. for the same.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the bailiff of the hundred took half a mark from the hundred before he was willing to compel it to deliver Henry Wyrun, imprisoned for larceny.

Then they say that William de Stupesdun and William de la Gerston, the earl of Gloucester's bailiffs, took 100s. from the same hundred because the men had been at the siege of Tonbridge as the lord king's command.

### **Hundred of Westgate**

The jury says that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs and other liberties which pertain to the crown and the hundred of Westgate is in his hand and it is worth 60s. each year.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 40s. from Westgate hundred while the see of Canterbury was vacant so that he might sustain them in that manner which the bailiffs held them and by the reason of that fine he levied unjustly he took 4 marks from that hundred.

Then they say that the same Master Richard and his bailiffs have sold the archbishop's wood estimated at 32s. and afterwards at 20s. Then a certain Robert, the escheator's bailiff, the said forester sold the said archbishop's wood valued at 20s. but against the escheator's will. Then the same escheator amerced the prior of St Gregory's 4 marks because he bought wood from the said Robert and amerced Philip of Westgate at 40s. for the same purchase and Simon the whitesmith 4s. for a similar reason and Robert de Campo 5s. for a similar reason and John the shepherd 5s. for a

Galfridum Atteweilece pro simili ad Vs. et Petrum de eodem et Robertum Langewelbe pro simili ad Vs. Item dicunt quod dictus Magister Ricardus per potestatem officii sui occasionavit quemdam Willelmum filium Johannis de Wenchep ut faceret eum prepositus de bethona de Westgate et quod non esset dedit ei xijs., item de Roberto de Dustinton cepit pro simili iiijs., item de Johanne Balfir' pro simili Xs.

Item dicunt quod idem cepit injuste de Isaac de Disburn occasionando eum de blado non bene sarclato ut dixit xLs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hundredo de Westgate ultra rectam vicesimam xxjs et Vd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Criel coronator cepit per manus clerici sui de borgha' de Westgate dimidiam marcam antequam voluit videre quemdam mortuum anno regis Edwardi secundo.

### **Hundredum de Littlefeld**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Westpecham antiquitus tempore esse solebat in manibus regum predecessorum regis et datum fuit primo post conquestum Alveredo de Bendevill per serjantiam custodiendi domino regi unum esturcum et partem illius manerii tenet nunc dominus Johannes de Pecham et partem tenet Comes Glovernie per debitum Judaisorum et tenuit per iij annos et dimidam et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod totum hundredum de Littlefeld esse solebat antiquitus in manibus regum et nunc illud tenet ad firmam Comes Glovernie de domino regis pro xxs. annuatim solvendis et illud ita tenuit a tempore regis Johnnis qui illud dimisit Ricardo comiti avo Gilbertis Comitis nunc per Willelmum Smalwriter tunc ballivum domini regis et eodem modo tenet nunc Gilbertus Comes Glovernie hundredum de Wethelestan et ab eodem tempore set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum omnium brevium et prior ecclesie Christi Cant' habet returnum ab archiepiscopo et tenet placita de namio vetito et habent furcas et assisam

similar reason and Geoffrey Atteweilece 5s. for a similar reason and Peter for the same and Robert Langewelbe 5s. for a similar reason. Then they say that the same Master Richard, by the authority of his office threatened a certain William son of John de Wenchep that he would make him the reeve of Westgate barton and because he had not done this he gave him 12s. Then he took 4s. from Robert de Dustinton for a similar reason, then 10s. from John Balfir for a similar reason.

Then they say that the same man unjustly took 40s. from Isaac de Disburn prosecuting him for not hoeing the corn properly, as he said.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 21s. 5d. more than the assessed amount from Westgate hundred.

Then they say that in the second year of King Edward's reign [November 1273-1274] Sir William de Criel the coroner took half a mark from Westgate tithing through the hands of his clerk before he was willing to view a certain dead man.

### **Hundred of Littlefield**

The jury say that the manor of West Peckham from ancient times used to be in the hands of kings, the predecessors of the king and it was first given after the Conquest to Alvered de Bendevill by serjeanty service of keeping one hawk for the lord king and Sir John of Petham now holds part of that manor and the earl of Gloucester holds part because of a debt to the Jews and he has held it for 3½ years and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the whole hundred of Littlefield used to be in ancient times in the hands of kings and now the earl of Gloucester holds that at farm of the lord king for 20s. to be paid annually and thus he has held that from King John's time, who demised that to the Earl Richard, grandfather of Gilbert the present Earl through William Smalwriter then the lord king's bailiff and in the same way Gilbert the present Earl holds the Wachlingstone hundred and from the same time, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has return from the archbishop and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint

panis et cervisie et Comes Glovernie similiter habet hec omnia et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod John Sperewe ballivus ecclesie Christi Cant' cepit de Henrico de Strethend quod non venit ad quemdam assisam ubi non fuit summonitus dimidiam marcam. Dicunt eciam quod Elias le Paumer distrinxsit villatam de Westpecham exigendo debitum domini regis ubi in nullo tenebatur et extorsit hac de causa de eadem villata xLs. Item dicunt quod Nigellus de Pecham cepit iniuste Rogero de Quercu viijs et iiijd et de Willelmo Fromund xvs pro debito Walteri Martel et de Gabrielo Attelond cepit 1 bovem et 1 vaccam pro eodem iniuste precii xxijs et de Rogero le Taillur iniuste iijs vjd.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Halburegh senescallus ecclesie Christi Cant' falso inposuit Nicholao Duraunt felonie et pro eo cepit iiijjs. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyferer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo ultra certum vicesimam iiijjs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Merley coronator cepit dimidiam marcam de borgha de Uppepecham pro inquisitione facta de Johanne Turk qui fugit ad executionem pro feloniam. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor post electionem Ade prioris ecclesie Christ Cant' ad archiepiscopatum seysit hundredum de Uppecham in manu domini regis et cepit ab eodem de tallagio 1 marcam.

### **Hundredum de Bernefeld**

Jurati dicunt quod Willelmus de Kassingeham tenet vij hundreda de Waldis reddendo ad comitatum per annum Cs. et postmodum dominus Reginaldus de Cobeham vicecomes tradidit ead ad firmam per annum pro X libris. et postmodum dominus Henricus rex pater domini regis nunc concessit eadem hundreda domino Rogero de Leyburn pro Cs per annum reddendis ad scaccarium per manum vicecomitis et post mortem domini regis tenet ea dominus Stephanus de Penecestr' ad warnesturam castri Dover' set quid inde reddendo per annum aut quo warento ea tenuit

upon goods and they have a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and the earl of Gloucester has similarly all these things and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John Sparrow, the bailiff of Christchurch Canterbury, took half a mark from Henry de Strethend because he did not come to a certain assize where he had not been summoned. They say also that Elias le Paumer made distraint upon West Peckham township demanding a due for the lord king where they have no responsibility and for this reason he extorted 40s from the same township. Then they say that Nigel de Pecham took 8s. 4d. unjustly from Roger de Quercu and 15s. from William Fromund for Walter Martel's debt and from Gabriel Attelond he unjustly took 1 ox and 1 cow, price 22s. for the same and 3s. 6d. unjustly from Roger the tailor.

Then they say that John de Halburegh, a steward of Christchurch Canterbury falsely accused Nicholas Duraunt of felony and for this he took 4s.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 4s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that John de Merley the coroner took half a mark from the tithing of Up (East) Peckham for holding an inquest on John Turk who took flight at blinding? for felony.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator after the election of Adam the prior of Christchurch Canterbury to the archbishopric [Adam de Chillenden, prior 1264-1274] seized Petham hundred into the king's hand and took 1 mark from the same as tallage.

### **Hundred of Barnfield**

The jury say that William de Kassingeham holds the 7 hundreds of the Weald paying rent of 100s. each year to the county and afterwards the lord Reginald of Cobham the sheriff demised them at farm for £10 and afterwards the lord King Henry, the present king's father, granted the same hundreds to the lord Roger de Leyburn for 100s. each year, to be paid to his Exchequer by the sheriff's hand and after the lord king's death the Sir Stephen of Penecestr' holds these by garrison service at Dover castle but what he renders for this each year or by what warrant he holds those they

<p>nesciunt.  Item dicunt quod abbas de Bello subtraxit omnes tenentes suos de vij hundredis de sectis hundredi ad laghed' et de secta leita et hundredi et comitatum et de turno vicecomitis pro xvj annos elapsos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd et nesciunt quo warento.  Item dicunt quod abbas de Bello clamat habere returnum et extractum brevium et omnes alias libertates regias per dominum Henricum regem et nesciunt quo warento.  Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hac dimidia hundredo ultra certam vicesimam ijs.    Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor multa mala fecit in archiepiscopatu Cant' dum habuit custodiam per dominum regem. in dorso: Lasti Sancti Agusutini de comitatu Kancie pro rege.</p>	<p>do not know.  Then they say that for 16 years the abbot of Battle has withdrawn all his tenants from suits to the hundred at lawdays and from leet suit and suit of the hundred and counties and from the sheriff's tourn, with loss to the king of 6d. each year and they do not know by what warrant.  Then they say that abbot of Battle claims to have return and extract of writs and all other royal liberties from the lord King Henry and they do not know by what warrant.  Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 2s. more than the assessed amount from this half hundred.  Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, did many outrageous things in the archbishopric of Canterbury while he had custody of it through the lord king.  [on dorse: <i>The lathe of St Augustine in the county of Kent on the king's behalf.</i>]</p>
--	---

- 1 *Horsfold*: according to W. Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, p. 198, the prior of Christ Church kept his gallows at Horsfold, beyond the vineyards, east of the Sturry road.
- 2 *boreghesaldrespeni* – chevage, the payment made by the tithing for each of its members.
- 3 *boregheshaved* – *borgha*/tithing and *haved*/head, meaning unclear here.
- 4 *Holistun*: Urry, *op. cit.* (see note 1), p. 200, describes Holy Stone as a landmark, at or on the townwall, near the river bank, opposite St Mildred's Church.

**m. 3 Lastus de Hedelinge ashuc de comitatu  
Kancie: Hundredum de Quernulo.**

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Quernulo est abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant' exceptis duabus borghis videlicet Monigham et Dale que sunt prioris Christ Cant' et prioris Doverie, ita quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant' percipit emendum panis et servisie de borgha de Monigham et prior de Doverie de borgha de Dale et est pertinens manerium de Nortburne quod est eiusdem abbatis a quo tempore ignorant.

Dicunt eciam quod Alexander de Balliolo miles tenet unam borgham videlicet Ridlingwalde et Gregorius de Rokeste borgham de Walesmere et inde percipiunt emendas panis et servisie sed nesciunt quo warento et eas eo modo tenuerunt et fructus inde perceperunt iam quinque annis elapsis et amplius et sont [sic] dicte borghe pertinentes ad eundem hundredum.

Dicunt eciam quod manerium de Middelton tenetur de rege in capite et Johannes de Burg' illud tenet per concessionem domini regis qui nunc est.

Dicunt eciam quod hundredum de Quernul valet ad opus dicti abbatis per annum xxs.

Dicunt quod Gregorius de Rokest' tenet unum feodum militis in Walemere de rege in capite et hoc tribus annis elapsis rescitur quo warento.

Dicunt quod lastum Sancti Augustini traditur ad firmam pro X libris excepto turnum vicecomitis.

Dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium et tenet placita namio vetiti et habet wreccum maris et capit emendas panis et servisie et habet furcas et simili modo prior ecclesie Christi Cant' et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' et habent alias libertates regias ut supradictum est et habuerunt longo tempore sed nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt quod Henricus Malemains quondam vicecomes iniuste inprisonavit quemdam Robertum de Napesherst et Radulfum Ruben quousque finem fecerunt de vj marcis et quod idem Henricus cepit injuste de hundredo de Quernulo iiij marcas qui ante solute fuerunt eidem pro amerciamento eiusdem hundred injusto.

Dicunt eciam quod Hamo de la Forstall tunc serviens domini regis maliciose inposuit Reginaldo filio

**The lathe of Hedeling still of the county of Kent:  
Hundred of Cornilo**

The jury say that the hundred of Cornilo is of the abbey of St Augustine's Canterbury, except for two tithings, that is of Great Mongeham and Deal which are of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and of the prior of Dover; in addition the prior of Christchurch Canterbury takes fines for the assize of bread and ale of the tithing of Great Mongeham and the prior of Dover that of the tithing of Deal and it is pertaining to Northbourne manor which the same abbot holds, from what time they are ignorant.

They say also that Sir Alexander de Balliol, knight, holds one tithing that is Ringwould and Gregory de Rokeste the tithing of Walmer and there they take the fines for the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant and they have held these in this way and have taken the fines for five years and more and the said tithings belong to the same hundred.

They say also that the manor of Middleton is held of the king in chief and John de Burg now holds it by grant of the present lord king.

They say also that the hundred of Cornilo is worth 20s. a year for the said abbot's use.

They say that Gregory de Rokest' holds one knight's fee in Walmer of the king in chief and has held this for three years; it is not known by what warrant.

They say that the lathe of St Augustine's is demised at farm for £10 except the sheriff's tourn.

They say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has wreck and he takes the fines for the assize of bread and ale and he holds the gallows and in a similar way the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury and they have other royal liberties as is above said and have held these for a long time, but they do not know by what warrant.

They say that Henry Malemains, formerly the sheriff, unjustly imprisoned a certain Robert de Napesherst and Ralph Ruben until they made a fine of 6 marks and that the same Henry unjustly took 4 marks from Cornilo hundred which they had paid previously to the same man for an unjust amercement of the same hundred.

They say also that Hamo de la Forstall, then the lord king's serjeant, maliciously accused Reginald son of



Jordani latrocinium quousque redimeretur de vjs. Item idem Hamo cepit injuste de Willelmo Welwat eadem occasione Vs. Item idem Hamo inposuit iniuste Thoma de Nortburne et Roberto filio suo homicidium et cepit ab eisdem ij marcas.

Dicunt eciam quod Thomas de Sutheney iniuste cepit Waltherum Jopedale et ipsum duxit ad curiam Willelmi de Kyriol et ibidem ipsum inprisonavit donec finem fecit per dimidiam marcam et quod idem Thomas injuste cepit Thomam Ive et minabatur eum de concelemento latrocinii donec finem fecit per Xs. et tunc finet garcione suo iijs.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstalle cepit equos Willelmi Mareschall de Monigham injuste et illas detinuit contra vadum et plegium donec dedit eum ijs.

Dicunt eciam quod Robertus de Becche quondam clericus viceomitis maliciose occasionavit Thomam filium Edmundi de Dale et abstulit ei unam acram terre injuste. Item idem Robertus nomine summonitionis scaccarii cepit injuste de Roberto Havebrond dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstalle cepit de Henrico Porterewe dimidam marcam de summonitione scaccarii et ipsum non aquietavit quare eandem dimidiam marcam iterum solvit Roberto de Beche. Dicunt eciam quod borgha de Riple solvit dimidam marcam de summonitione scaccarii Henrico de Borne quondam viceomiti et ipsos non aquietavit quare iterum soluerunt Henrico Malemains viceomiti sequenti. Dicunt eciam quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemins collectores vicesime ceperont [sic] de hundredo de Quernulo xLs pro pondere ultra numerum denariorum. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Sutheney cepit de Willelmo Clis pro respectu habendo respectu de dimidia marca que venit in summonitione scaccarii ijs. Item dicunt quod cum totum hundredum summonitum esset ad mandatum egis apud Tonebreg' ad castrum obsidendum venit Willelmus de Stoppisdon serviens Comitis Glovernie et minabatur hominibus dicti hundredi ita quod per timorem dederunt ei ad opus Comitis x marcas.

Dicunt eciam Magister Ricardus de Clifford eschetor seysivit abbathiam Sancti Augustini Cant' post mortem abbatis Rogeri et tenuit in manu regis per quod tempus nesciunt et cepit de tallagio de manerio de Northburn X libras.

Jordan of robbery until he was released for 6s. Then the same Hamo unjustly took 5s. from William Welwat making the same accusation. Then the same Hamo unjustly accused Thomas of Northbourne and his son Robert of homicide and took 2 marks from them.

They also say that Thomas de Sutheneye unjustly seized Walter Jopedale and brought him to the court of William de Kyriol and there imprisoned him until he made a fine of half a mark and that the same Thomas unjustly seized Thomas Ive and threatened him of hiding a thief, until he paid a fine of 10s. and then he fined his boy 4s.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall unjustly took the horses of William Marshal of Great Mongeham and kept them until he gave him 2s. contrary to surety and pledge.

They say also that Robert de Becche, formerly the sheriff's clerk, maliciously arrested Thomas son of Edmund de Dale and unjustly took one acre of land from him. Then the same Robert unjustly took half a mark from Robert Havebrond for summons of the Exchequer. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took half a mark from Henry Porterewe for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted him since he paid the same half mark again to Robert de Becche. They say also that the tithing of Ripple paid half a mark for summons of the Exchequer to Henry of Bourne, formerly the sheriff and he has not acquitted them since they paid it again to Henry Malemains, the next sheriff. They say also that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemains, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 40s. by weight more than the assessed number of pence from Cornilo hundred. Then they say that Thomas de Sutheney took 3s. from William Clis for having postponement for half a mark which came from a summons of the Exchequer. Then they say that when the whole hundred had been summoned by the king's command to the siege of Tonbridge castle, William de Stoppisdon, a serjeant of the earl of Gloucester came and threatened the men of the said hundred so that because of this intimidation they gave him 10 marks for the earl's use.

They say also that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took possession of the abbey of St Augustine's Canterbury after abbot Roger's death and held it in the king's hand, from what time they not know and he took £10 from Northbourne manor as tallage

### **Hundredum de Bewesberwe, in eodem lasto**

Dicunt quod manerium de Westclive tenetur de rege in capite et modo illud tenet Gilbertus pro uno feodo militis sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Johannes rex dedit abbati et conventui Sancte Radegundis centum acras de Riparia cum advocacionis ecclesie eiusdem et unum molendinum et dictus abbas modo tenet sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dictus Johannes rex dedit Salamoni quondam prepositus Doverie centum acras Rip'ia apud Arbertone et Cupland et Salemon de Camp' modo tenet per tale servicium quod tenebit capellanus domini regis dum transffretabit mare nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus rex dedit residuum riparie Magistro et Fratribus domus Dei Doverie et fuit eschaeta sua sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancte Radegundis tenet unum feodum militis apud Poltone de domino rege in capite per servicium quod facit sectam ad curiam regis de Revelet. Item dicunt quod dictus abbas habet duas partes unius feodi in Pissingge de dono Bertramini de Kyriol et de Deamande de Pissingge que tenentur de Roberto de Campane et idem Robertus defendit eas duas partes versus dominum de Sancto Johanne et idem dominus de Sancto Johanne versus dominum regem. Item idem abbas tenet medietatem unius feodi in Pissingge de Johanne de Bikenore et idem Johannes tenet illam medietatem de domino Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de Sancto Johanne de domino regis sed nesciunt quo servicio. Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Doverie tenet terciam partem unius feodi in Pisingge que tenetur de domino Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes tenet de rege in capite sed nesciunt quo servicio. Item dicunt quod heredes Henrici de Crammanil tenent unam quartam partem unius feodi apud Soltone de domino rege in capite. Item dicunt quod dictum manerium de Westcliffe tenetur de rege in capite et valet per annum xL libras.

Item dicunt quod lesta Sancti Augustini et Hedelinge posita sunt ad firmam pro xj libris per annum sine turno vicecomitis ad grave dampnum patrie.

Dicunt eciam quod medietas hundredi de Bewesberwe est in manu domini regis et quod firma hundredi numquam separata fuit a firma predictorum lastorum Sancti Augustini et Hedeling sed omnia placita et perquisita predicti hundredi possunt valere per annum

### **Hundred of Bewsborough, in the same lathe**

They say that the manor of West Cliffe is held of the king in chief and now Gilbert holds it for one knight's fee, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that King John gave the abbot and convent of St Radegund's a hundred acres in River with the advowson of the church of the same place and one mill and the said abbot now holds it, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the said King John gave Solomon, formerly a reeve of Dover a hundred acres at River, at *Arbeton* and *Cupland* and Solomon Field now holds it, by such service as a chaplain of the lord king shall hold while he shall be overseas, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord King Henry gave the rest of the water-front to the Master and Brethren of God's House at Dover and it was his escheat, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that abbot of St Radegund's holds one knight's fee at Poulton of the lord king in chief by service of doing suit at the king's court at *Revelet*. Then they say that the said abbot has two thirds of one fee in Pising [Whitfield or Guston pars] by grant of Bertram de Kyriol and of Deamanda de Pising which are held of Robert de Campane and the same Robert defends his claim to the two parts against the lord of St John and the same lord of St John similarly against the lord king. Then the same abbot holds a moiety of one fee in Pising of John of Bicknor and the same John holds that moiety of the lord John of St John and the same John of St John of the lord king but they do not know by what service. Then they say that the Master of God's house at Dover holds a third part of one fee in Pising which is held of the lord John of St John and the same John holds of the king in chief, but they do not know by what service. Then they say that the heirs of Henry Crammanil hold one fourth part of one fee at Shoulden of the lord king in chief. Then they say that the said manor of West Cliffe is held of the lord king in chief and is worth £40 each year.

Then they say that the lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling have been demised at farm for £11 each year without the sheriff's tourn, with serious loss to the country.

They also say that a moiety of Bewsborough hundred is in the lord king's hand and that the farm of the hundred has never been separated from the farm of the aforesaid lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling but that all pleas and perquisites of the aforesaid hundred can be valued

xiijs iiijd ad firmam predictarum X librarum.

Item dicunt quod Borstall subtraxit se per Templarios de sectis hundredi predicti per quadraginta annos ad dampnum domini regis xijd per annum quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Colrede subtraxit se per Magistrum et Fratres Domus Dei Doveri de predicta secta per xL annos ad dampnum regis per annum xviijd nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Wittefeud subtraxit se de secta predicti hundredi per predictum Magistrum per xL annos ad dampnum regis xijd sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Kokelecumbe subtraxit se per Fratres hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerusalemis de secta predicta et tenentes eiusdem apud le Denne subtraxerunt se de secta facienda cum burgo de Popeshal ad predictum hundredum per predictos Fratres hospitalis Sancti Johannis per sex annos ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd et amplius et tenetur de baronia de Say.

Item dicunt quod sex mesuagia apud Pynham subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi per Magistrum Domus Dei Doverie per xxxta annos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd. sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Kokelescumbe et tenentes de Ledene cum borgha de Popeshale subtraxerunt se de turno vicecomitis per sex annos per predictos Hospitelarios ad dampnum regis per annum xijd et amplius sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Doverie detinuit turnum vicecomitis de predicta tercia parte unius feodi in Pisinges per xxxta annos scilicet per annum viij denariorum sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod quinque mesuagia apud Cherlertone subtraxerunt se de secta predicti hundredi per libertatem portus Doverie per quindecim annos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd per annum nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Vingham subtraxit se de lasto de Hedlinge per xx annos per archiepiscopum sed nesciunt dampnum.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et wreccum maris furcas et assisam panis et servisie sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod prior Novi Operis Doverie habet wreccum maris

at 13s. 4d. to the farm of the aforesaid £10 [sic- £11 above].

Then they say that Borstal [Rochester?], by the Templars, has withdrawn itself from suits of the hundred for 40 years causing a loss of 12d. each year to the king, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Coldred has withdrawn itself through the Master and Brethren of God's House at Dover, from the aforesaid suit for 40 years with loss of 18s. a year to the king, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Whitfield has withdrawn itself for 40 years through the aforesaid Master, with a loss of 12d. each year to the king, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Kokelecumbe [Lydden par., lost], by the Knights Hospitallers, has withdrawn itself from the aforesaid suit and the tenants of the same at le Denne [Woodnesborough par.] have withdrawn themselves from making suit with the tithing of *Popeshal* at the aforesaid hundred by the aforesaid Knights Hospitallers for six years, with a loss of 12d. and more each year to the lord king and it is held of the barony of Say.

Then they say that six messuages at Pineham [Whitfield par.] have withdrawn themselves from suit of the hundred, through the Master of God's House at Dover, for 30 years with a loss of 6d. each year to the king, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Kokelescumbe and the tenants of Lydden with the tithing of *Popeshale* have withdrawn themselves from the sheriff's tourn for six years, by the aforesaid Knights Hospitallers with a loss of 12d. and more each year to the king, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Master of God's house at Dover has not attended the sheriff's tourn from the aforesaid third part of one fee in Pising for 30 years, that is of 8d. each year, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that five messuages in Cheriton have withdrawn themselves from suit of the aforesaid hundred, through the liberty of the port of Dover for fifteen years, with a loss of 6d. each year to the king, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Wingham has withdrawn itself from the lathe of Hedeling for 20 years, through the archbishop, but they do not know what is the loss.

They say also that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return (of writs) and wreck, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the prior of the New Work

et assisam panis et servisie in borgha Sancte Margarete nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Gilbertus Pecche habet wreccum maris et assisam panis et servisie apud Westclive sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item Templarii habent assisam panis et servicie apud Ewell sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Doverie habet assisam panis et servicie apud Riparia Colrede et Wittefeud sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus Thome de Sutheneye cepit de Gileberto de Maxtone xvij. d., de Salamone de Westclive vj. d., de Simone Gurgeis ix. d., de Stephano de Wittefeud vj. d., de Johanne de Witham xij. d., de Willelmo filio Jacobi vj. d., de Willelmo Putemite iij. d., de Gileberto de Maxtone x denarios.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Horton cepit de Roberto de Bugham xvj. d. Dicunt quod predictus Robertus malectravavit homines patrie et cepit de eis plures denarios quorum modo nesciunt numerum pro assisis et juratis removendis.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hevere vicecomes tradidit Roberto de Sharstede lesta Sancti Augustini et Hedeling custodiendo et idem Robertus cepit iniuste Ricardum filium Nicholai de Lymberg et inposuit ei fecisse furtum ubi nullum fecit et voluit duxisse ipsum ad prisonam donec pacificavit cum ipso dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod cepit Johannem filium Nicholai de Lymberg iniuste et ipsum inprionavit in castrum Cant' quousque dedisset unam marcam et unum equum precii xvj. d. perdidit.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus Thome de Sutheney cepit L multones in regia strata de Henrico Herlewine et Jacobo Lodsterre injuste et eas detinuit quousque dederunt ei xix. d.

Item dicunt quod Philippus de Ho Hamo de la Forstall Robertus de Scharstede et Thomas de Sutheneye ballivi vicesimam sumpserunt xxi. iij. d. pro xij. et sumpserunt xL vel L pro xxi. iij. d. et sumpserunt pauperes ubi deberent sumpsisse divites et sic ceperunt plures denarios sed nesciunt numerum ad grave dampnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod Fulco Peynfor et Henricus Malemeins collectores vicesime ceperunt de eodem hundredo xLs pro pondere ultra certum numerum denariorum eiusdem vicesime.

Item dicunt quod monachi Novi Operis Doverie vendiderunt custodes et maritagia heredum Dionisii de Guffeston de terra de gavelykinde pro iij. marcis et

at Dover has wreck and the assize of bread and ale in the tithing of St Margaret's at Cliffe, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Gilbert Pecche has wreck and the assize of bread and ale at West Cliffe, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then the Templars have the assize of bread and ale at [Temple] Ewell but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the Master of God's house at Dover has the assize of bread and ale at River, Coldred and Whitfield but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Richard, Thomas de Sutheney's clerk, took 18d. from Gilbert de Maxtone, 6d. from Solomon of West Cliffe, 9d. from Simon Gurgeis, 6d. from Stephen of Whitfield, 12d. from John de Witham, 6d. from William son of James, 4d. from William Putemite, 10d. from Gilbert de Maxtone. Then they say that William of Horton took 16d. from Robert de Bugham. They say that the aforesaid Robert ill-treated men of the country and took much money from them, they do not know the amount, for removing them from assizes and juries.

Then they say that William of Hever the sheriff demised the lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling to Robert de Sharstede to his custody and the same Robert unjustly seized Richard son of Nicholas de Lymberg and accused him of committing a robbery where he had not done so and he wished to imprison him until he had made peace with him with half a mark. Then they say that he unjustly seized John son of Nicholas de Lymberg and imprisoned him in Canterbury castle until he had given him one mark and he lost one horse, price 16d.

Then they say that Richard, Thomas de Sutheney's clerk, unjustly took 50 sheep from Henry Herlwin and James Lodsterre on the king's highway and kept them until they gave him 19d.

Then they say that Philip of Hoo, Hamo de la Forstall, Robert de Sharstede and Thomas de Sutheneye, bailiffs, have taken as the twentieth 24 for 12 and have taken 50 or 40 for 24 and have taken poor men where they ought to have taken rich men and thus they take much money, but they do not know the amount, with a serious loss to the country.

Then they say that Fulk Poyforer and Henry Malemeins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 40s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that the monks of the New Work at Dover have sold wardships and marriages of Dennis of Guffeston's heirs from land in *gavelkind* for 3½ marks

dimidia et custodes et maritagia heredum Baldewini de Hugham de terra de gavilikin de pro xLs et hoc iniuste contra consuetudinem patrie et regalis dignitatem.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brothell et Thomas de Basinge mercatores emerunt lanas in eodem hundredo et eas duxerunt ad portus Doverie et Hethe et postea duxerunt eas ad partes transmarinas sed nesciunt quot saccos nec quo warento.

### **Hundredum de Estri, adhuc in eodem lasto**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex habet quamdam placiam que valet per annum iij marcas unde prior Christi Cant' capit expleta

Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Erde tenet dimidiam feodi in Denetone de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de domino rege in capite et debet ad wardam castrum Doverie per annum Xs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Soles tenet unum feodum in Soles de Johanne de Rokeste et idem Johannes de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite et debet per annum ad castrum Doverie xxs.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus Indley et Johannes de Woghoppe tenent dimidiam feodi de Bertramo Tanerey in Berfreston et idem Bertramus de Roberto de Sancto Johanne et idem Robertus de rege in capite et debent ad castrum Doverie xxs. Item Willelmus de Herthangr' tenet 1 feodum in eadem de Simone filio Ade et idem Simon de rege in capite et debet ad castrum Doverie xxs

Item Radulfus Kalekin tenet dimidiam feodi in Freydevile de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de rege in capite ad quod servicium nesciunt. Item Radulfus Pirot tenet 1 feodum et dimidiam in Knolton de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de rege in capite per servicium ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt quantum. Item Henricus Pyrot tenet 1 feodum de Radulfo Pirot in Ringelt' et idem Radulfus de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de rege in capite. Item Johannes de Sandwico tenet dimidiam feodi in la Denne de Rogero de Milmannest' et idem Rogerus de Radulfo Pirot et idem Radulfus de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. Item Simon de Ercheslo tenet 1 quartam in Ercheslo de Radulfo Pyrot et idem Radulfus de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. Item Bertramus Tanerey tenet unum feodum in Betlesangr' de Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de rege in capite per xxs. per annum ad

and the wardships and marriages of Baldwin de Hugham's heirs from land in *gavelkind* for 40s. and this was done unjustly contrary to the custom of the country and the royal honour.

Then they say that William de Brothell and Thomas de Basinge, merchants, have purchased wool in the same hundred and have brought it to the ports of Dover and Hythe and afterwards sent it to places overseas, but they do not know how many sacks nor by what warrant.

### **Hundred of Eastry, still in the same lathe**

The jury say that the lord king has a certain plot which is worth 3 marks a year, from which the prior of Christchurch, Canterbury takes the profits.

They also say that John de Erde holds half of a fee in Denton of William de Say and the same William of the lord king in chief and he owes guard at Dover castle of 10s. each year. Then they say that John de Soles holds one fee in Soles [Nonington par.] of John de Rokeste and the same John of Robert de Crevequer and the same Robert of the king in chief and he owes 20s. each year at Dover Castle.

Then they say that Richard Indley and John de Woghoppe hold a half fee in Barfreston of Bertram Tanerey and the same Bertram of Robert of St John and the same Robert of the king in chief and they owe 20s. at Dover castle. Then William de Herthangr' holds 1 fee in the same place of Simon son of Adam and the same Simon of the king in chief and he owes 20s at Dover castle.

Then Ralph Kalekin holds half a fee in Fredville [Nonington par.] of William de Say and the same William of the king in chief, by what service they do not know. Then Ralph Pirot holds 1½ fees in Knowlton of William de Leyburn and the same William of the king in chief by service at Dover castle, but they do not know how much. Then Henry Pyrot holds 1 fee of Ralph Pirot in Ringelton [Woodnesborough par.] and the same Ralph of William de Leyburn and the same William of the king in chief. Then John of Sandwich holds half a fee in la Denne of Roger de Milmannest' and the same Roger of Ralph Pirot and the same Ralph of the archbishop and the same of the king in chief. Then Simon de Ercheslo holds a quarter (of a fee) in *Ercheslo* of Ralph Pyrot and the same Ralph of the archbishop and the same of the king in chief. Then Bertram Tannerey holds 1 fee in Betteshanger of John of St John and the same John of the king in chief by

castrum Doverie. Item Radulfus de Saandwiz et Johannes filius Bernardi tenent dimidam feodi de Johanane de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de domino rege et debent Xs ad castrum Doverie. Item Johannes Malemains tenet unum feodum et dimidiam in Walwarecchare de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de domino rege in capite per wardam ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt per quantum. Item idem Johannes Malemains tenet dimidiam feodi in Wodenesberg de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite per wardam ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt per quantum. Item Robertus de Sancto Leodeger tenet vj partem unius feodi in Denne de Johanne Malemains et idem de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite per wardam ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt per quantum. Item Stephanus de [ ] tenet 1 feodum in Hamwold de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de rege in capite per Xs ad castrum Roffens'. Item Rogerus de Whinkling tenet 1 feodum in eadem de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite sed quod servicium nesciunt. Item Ivo de Schillingeheld tent vj partem 1 feodi in Elminton de Johanne Malemains et idem Johannes de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de rege in capite.

Item idem Ivo tenet quartam partem 1 feodi in Elmington de Gocelino de Badelesmere et idem Goselinus de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite. Item Willelmus de Titm[ ] tenet dimidiam feodum in Tilmannestun de Roberto de Roberto (sic) de Crevequer et idem de archiepiscopo et idem de rege. [ ]anneston tenet dimidam feodi in eadem de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de Roberto de Crevequer [? et idem de archiepiscopo] et idem de rege in capite. [ Dicunt quod ] hundred de Estre est in manu domini regis et valet per annum xxs.

[Dicunt eciam quod lesta Hedeling et] Sancti Augustini positi [sic] sunt ad firmam pro xxviiij libris sine turnis [ ] baroniam relinquerunt domos et terras et reversi sunt super archiepiscopatu.

[Dicunt eciam quod ] est in manu prioris Christi Cant' et tenet omnia placita que ad coronam pertinent [? ad dampnum domini regis per annum ].

[ Dicunt quod ] et Henricus de Wengham appropriaverunt sibi tenentes de Heygethorne qui sequi solebant [ ] dictum domini hundredum sunt subtrahuntur per xx annos ad grave dampnum rege nesciunt quo waranto.

20s each year at Dover castle. Then Ralph of Sandwich and John son of Bernard hold half a fee of John of St John and the same John of the lord king and they owe 10s at Dover castle. Then John Malemains holds one and a half fees in Walmer of William de Say and the same William of the lord king in chief by guard at Dover castle but they do not know how much. Then the same John Malemains holds half a fee in Woodnesborough of Robert de Crevequer and the same Robert of the king in chief by guard at Dover castle, but they do not know how much. Then Robert of St Leger holds a sixth part of one fee in Denne of John Malemains and the same of Robert de Crevequer and the same Robert [holds] of the king in chief by guard at Dover Castle, but they do not know how much. Then Stephen de [ ] holds 1 fee in *Hamwold* of William de Say and the same William of the king in chief by 10s. at Rochester castle. Then Roger de Whinkling holds 1 fee in the same place of William de Leyburn and the same William of Roger de Crevequer and the same Robert holds of the king in chief, but they do not know what is the service. Then Ivo of Schillingeheld holds a sixth part of 1 fee in Elmton [Eythorne par.] of John Malemains and the same John of William de Say and the same William of the king in chief.

Then the same Ivo holds a fourth part of 1 fee in Elmton of Jocelyn of Badlesmere and the same Jocelin of Robert de Crevequer and the same Robert of the king in chief. Then William de Titm[ ] holds half a fee in Tilmanstone of Robert de Crevequer and the same man holds of the archbishop and he holds of the king. [ ]anneston holds half a fee in the same place of William de Leyburn and the same William of Robert de Crevequer [? and the same man of the archbishop ] and the same of the king in chief. [They say] that the hundred of Eastry is in the king's hand and it is worth 20s. each year.

[They say also that the lathes of Hedeling and] St Augustine's were placed at farm for £28 without the tourns [of the sheriff] they left houses and lands and they reverted to the archbishopric.

[They say also that ] is in the hand of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and he holds all pleas which pertain to the crown [? to the king's loss each year ] [They say that ] and Henry of Wingham have taken over the tenants of *Hegethorne* who used to do suit [at] the said hundred, they have been withdrawn for 20 years with severe loss to the king, they do not know by what warrant.

[Dicunt eciam quod] abbas Sancti Augustini appropriavit tenentes de Pette et Tykenherst qui sequi solebant dictum hundredum per xxvj annos manu domini regis nesciunt quo waranto. Item Magister de Ofspring appropriavit tenentes de Somerfeud qui sequi solebant sequi dictum hundredum per xxviiij annos ad grave dampnum regis nesciunt quo warento.

Item hundred de Wingham subtractavit se de turno vicecomitis nesciunt quo warento et solebat [sequi]

Item dicunt quod libertates Quinque Portuum inpedit communem justiciam quod distringeront [sic] [ ]

m.3 dorso **Hundredum Wingham adhuc eodem lasto**

Dicunt jurati quod Middeltun et Merdenn sunt dominca regis sed ea tenet Johannes de Burgo quo warento nesciunt et manerium de Ofsrpinge est de dominica domini regis et illud tenet mater domini regis qui nunc et quo warento nesciunt. Dicunt eciam quod Ellam solebat esse in manu regis Henrici et modo tenet Wilelmus de Leyburne quo warento vel quomodo fuerit alienata nesciunt [sic]. Dicunt eciam quod quarta pars de Fleet solebat esse in manu domini regis Henrici patris Edwardi regis et modo tenet Robertus de Crevequer quo warento vel quo modo fuerit alienate nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Bregg est in manu regis et valet per annum xLs., hundredum de Preston est in manu domini Willelmi de Leyburn et valet per annum xxs. Dicunt quod medietatem hundredi de Estre est in manu domini regis et altera est in manu prioris Christi Cant' quo warento vel a quo tempore nesciunt et valet hundredum per annum xxs. Dicunt quod hundredum de Donhamford una pars est in manu prioris Christi Cant' secunda pars in manu abbatis Sancti Augustini et tertia pars in manu Willelmi de Breuhose a quo tempore vel quo warento nesciunt et valet per annum Cs.

Item dicunt quod borgha de Eghethorne subtrahitur de secta hundredi de Estre per xxxta annos et modo sequitur hundredum de Wingham quo warento nesciunt et valet secta per annum ijs. Dicunt eciam quod archiepiscopus Cant' et abbas de Bello habent returnum et extractas breviom [sic] et omnia

[They say also that ] for 26 years the abbot of St Augustine's has taken over the tenants of *Pett* and *Tykenhurst* who used to do suit at the said hundred by the hand of the lord king, they do not know by what warrant. Then for 28 years the Master of Ospringe has taken over the tenants of *Somerfeud* who used to follow the said hundred with severe loss to the king, they do not know by what warrant.

Then the hundred of Wingham has withdrawn itself from the sheriff's tourn, they do not know by what warrant and it was accustomed [to do suit].

Then they say that the liberties of the Cinque Ports hinder common justice because they make distraint [ ].

m. 3 dorso **Hundred of Wingham, still in the same lathe**

The jury say that Middleton and Marden are of the king's demesne but that John de Burgh now holds them, by what warrant they do not know and that Ospringe manor is of the lord king's demesne and the present lord king's mother now holds that and by what warrant they do not know. They also say that Elham used to be in King Henry's hand and now William de Leyburn holds it, by what warrant or how it was alienated they do not know. They also say that a fourth part of Fleet [Richborough?] used to be in the hand of the lord King Henry, King Edward's father and now Robert de Crevequer holds it, by what warrant or how it was alienated they do not know.

Then they say that Bridge hundred is in the king's hand and it is worth 40s. each year, Preston hundred is in William de Leyburn's hand and it is worth 20s. each year. They say that a moiety of Eastry hundred is in the lord king's hand and the other is in the hand of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, they do not know by what warrant nor from what time. They say that Downhamford hundred, one part is in the hand of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, the second part in the hand of the abbot of St Augustine's and the third part in William de Braose's hand, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant and it is worth 100s. each year.

Then they say that the tithing of Eythorne [?] is withdrawn from suit of Eastry hundred for 30 years and now Wingham hundred does suit, they do not know by what warrant and the suit is worth 2s. each year. They also say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the abbot of Battle have return and extract of writs and all

huiusmodi placita corone quo tempore vel quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini et Willelmus de Brewose et Willelmus de Leyburn habent furcas et assisam panis et servisie quo tempore vel quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet wardas de kavelykinde (sic) et per hoc abutitur libertate. Dicunt eciam quod Walterus de Wengham Willelmus de Leyburn, Willelmus de Breuhose archiepiscopus Cant' abbas Sancti Augustini et prior Christi Cant' habent warenum a quo tempore vel quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod quedam assisa de Esse per preceptum domini regis coram Magistro Ricardo de Stanes arainiata duobus annis elapsis et quinquies apud Grenewic vexata adhuc capi non potuit et una jurata xxiiiijor de Wicham arainaita coram eundem [sic] tribus annis elapsis et decies apud Grenewic et alibi vexata adhuc capi non potuit quo racione nesciunt unde patria destructa est ad grave dampnum regis et patria.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains cepit Xs sub Magistro Ricardo de Clifford custode [ *words missing* ] archiepiscopatus de Dionisia quondam uxore Rogeri de Fraxino defamata de morte dicti Rogeri viri sui et sic evasit quieta. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Kyriol coronator in lasto de Hedelinge cepit ijs pro quodam infortunio in eodem hundredo de borgha de Denne pro officio suo faciendo et de Ada de Witfeld in borgha de Wingham cepit ijs pro eodem et Stephanus clericus suus iiij vjd pro eodem de Hugone de Brentingham occiso.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes Robertus de Beche Hamo de la Forstall Thomas de Sutheneye ballivi et eorum ministri ceperont [sic] munera pro recognitionibus de assisis et juratis removendis sed nesciunt [sic] quam nec a quibus quod fuerunt de baronia.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes tradidit hundredum de Estria ad firmam Hamoni de Forstall qui cepit et extorsit 1 marcam de Rogero Ledberd quo fine ballivus domini regis arestavit quamdam mulierem rectatam de denariis furatis dicto Rogero postea inde occasionata posuit se et bono et malo super eundem hundredo quod hundredum dictum mulierem de dicto latronio esse inculpabilem.

pleas of the crown of this nature, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

They they say that the abbot of St Augustine's and William de Braose and William de Leyburn have a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop has wardship of *gavelkind* and through this misuses the liberty. They also say that Walter of Wingham, William de Leyburn, the archbishop of Canterbury, the abbot of St Augustine's and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury have warren, from what time or by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that a certain assize of Ash, by the lord king's command had been arraigned in the presence of Master Richard de Stanes two years ago and had been disturbed five times and could not yet be taken and one jury of 24 from Wickham was then arraigned in the same man's presence three years ago and it was disturbed ten times at Greenwich and elsewhere and could not yet be taken, for what reason they do not know and the country was discredited with serious harm to the king and country.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, a former sheriff of Kent, took 40s. and Stephen of Lyminge 40s. and John Baudifer, then the bailiff of Wingham, all by the authority of Master Richard of Clifford the custodian of the archbishopric, took 10s. from Denise formerly Roger de Fraxino's wife, as she was accused of the death of the said Roger her husband and thus she was released as innocent. Then they say that William de Kyriol the coroner, in Hedelinge lathe took 2s. for performing the duty of of his office for an unfortunate person from the tithing of Denne in the same hundred and he took 2s. for Adam de Whitfield in Wingham tithing for the same and Stephen his clerk took 4s. 6d. for the same concerning Hugh de Brantingham's killing.

Then they say that Henry of Leeds, Robert de Beche, Hamo de de la Forstall, Thomas de Sutheneye bailiffs and their ministers have taken gifts for allowing men to be removed from the assizes and juries and they know not how or by whom because they are of the barony.

Then they say that Henry Malemains the sheriff handed over Eastry hundred at farm to Hamo de Forstall who took and extorted 1 mark from Roger Ledberd, for which fine the lord king's bailiff rightly arrested a certain woman for stealing money from the said Roger.

Afterwards, having been accused she placed herself for better or worse upon the same hundred and the hundred decreed that the said woman was not guilty of the said



Item dicunt quod Ricardus de Clifford escheator cepit de tenentibus hundredi xx libras in primo adventu suo et clericus suus xxs. et postea extorsit ab eis viij marcas pro inquisitione habenda utrum avermanni deberent servicium suum vel servicii redempciones et inquisitum fuit per liberos tenentes quod debebant servicium et nichilominus distrinxit eos pro utroque et pro respectu habendo cepit dominus Milo capellanus eiusdem escheatoris xxs a dictis tenentibus pro ea capta eorum distrinctione et retenta donec extorserat ab eisdem X marcas et Hugo de Thornham dimidiam marcam et postea fecit dictos avermannos ducere finem de Vingham ad manerium suum de Munte nec potuerunt pacem habere de predicto Ricardo donec ab eis extorsit v marcas et clericus suus 1 marcam preterea recepit ab eisdem tenentibus xLs et Magister Hugo de Thornham dimidiam marcam falso occasione.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de la Forde et Magister Hugo de Thornham receptores sub Magistro Ricardo de Clifford escheatore cepit de Henrico filio Hugonis dimidiam marcam, de Martino Herdman xxd, de Felicia de Horsete dimidiam marcam et alia placita debita de summonitione sacaccii et eos non acquietaverunt.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Limmigg' tempore vacationis archiepiscopatus cepit 1 marcam de Thoma Ordrich Thoma Cotfich et Stephano Arnold pro eis per plevinam dimittendam qui sine causa incarcerati fuerunt.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeins et Fulco Peyfor' Nicholaus le Bret et Arnoldus de Esseling ceperunt de vicessima de eodem hundredo pro pondere ultra certum numerum vj libras.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escheator et Radulfus Derby Hugo de Thornham Willelmus de Forde ballivi escheatoris fecerunt vastum in boscum manerii de Wingham ad valorem xij librarum.

theft.

Then they say that Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £20 from the tenants of the hundred at his first arrival and his clerk 20s. and afterwards he extorted 8 marks from them for holding an inquisition to decide whether men owed carrying service to him or whether there had been a remittance of service and an enquiry was made among the free tenants as to what service they owed and nevertheless he made distraint upon them for both and for having a postponement Miles, the same escheator's clerk, took 20s. from the said tenants for taking their distraint and kept it until he had extorted 10 marks from them and Hugh de Thornham half a mark and afterwards he made the said men owing carrying service cart dung from Wingham to his manor of *Munte* and they could not have peace from the aforesaid Richard until he extorted 5 marks from them and his clerk 1 mark, moreover he received 40s. from the same tenants and Master Hugh de Thornham half a mark by a false exaction.

Then they say that William de la Forde and Master Hugh de Thornham, the receivers under Master Richard de Clifford the escheator, took half a mark from Henry son of Hugh, 20d. from Martin Herdman, half a mark from Felicity de Horsete and other pleas owing by summons of the Exchequer and they have not not acquitted them.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge took 1 mark from Thomas Ordrich, Thomas Cotfich and Stephen Arnold at the time of the vacancy of the archbishopric for those whose pledges had been ignored and who had been imprisoned without cause.

Then they say that Henry Malemeins and Fulk Perfor', Nicholas le Bret and Arnold de Esseling took for the tax of one-twentieth from the same hundred £6 by weight more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford the escheator, and Ralph Derby, Hugh of Thornham, William de Forde, the escheator's bailiffs, have made waste in the wood of Wingham valued at £13.

<p>m. 4 <b>Hundredum de Faversham adhuc in comitatu Kancie in lesto de Strawtyngheope</b></p>	<p>m.4 <b>Hundred of Faversham, still in the county of Kent in the lathe of Scray</b></p>
<p>Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Middeltun cum toto hundredo est dominicum domini regis sed nunc est in manu domini Johannis de Burgo et valet per annum CC libras. Item manerium de Ospring est dominicum regis tamquam escheatum de honore de Peverel et est in manu domine regine et valet per annum Lv libras et ad dictum manerium pertinent xv feoda militum et dimidiam ut patet infra unde dominus Hamo de Gattun tenet v feoda videlicet Gattun, Boctun Malherbe, Thrulee, Wodneshelle, Samelesford, Borstall et tenentur de domino rege in capite et faciunt sectam curia de Ospring. Item Henricus de Crommeville tenet tria feoda militum videlicet apud Graveshende unum feodum et dimidiam et Saltus' dimidiam feodum, Denham et Deneseye unum feodum et dimidiam et tenentur de rege in capite et subtraxerunt se de secta curie per xxxta annos elapsos ad dampnum domini regis X marcas quo waranto nesciunt. Item Johannes de Mares tenet tria feoda militum sic Wathelingh', Shelve, Hockemere, Senthuke et tenentur in capite de rege et subtraxerunt sectam per xxj annos elapsos ad dampnum regis xLs. Item dominus Willelmus de Leyburn' tenet unum feodum apud Heriattesham et subtraxit sectam per xv annos ad dampnum regis xxs. Item Hugo de Gerunde tenet tria feoda militum sic Wrenstede, Esshert, Dodintun in comitatu Bokingeham Foxcote et facit sectam plenam. Item dominus Luca de Vianum tenet quartam partem unius feodi militis apud Potewudode et Thornherst et facit sectam. Item Radulfus de Essing et heres Philippus Coci et Domus Dei de Ospring per Robertum de London' tenent quartam partem unius feodi et omnes faciunt sectam preter Domus Dei et ipsa Domus Dei tenet Elverlonde ex dono et venditione Nicholai Servorde qui tenet per medium.</p>	<p>The jury say that the manor of Middleton with the whole hundred is the lord king's demesne but now is in the lord John de Burgh's hand and it is worth £200 each year. Item the manor of Ospringe is the king's demesne, as an escheat of Peverel honour and it is in the lady queen's hand and is worth £55 each year and 15½ knights' fees pertain to the said manor as is shown below; whereof Sir Hamo of Gatton holds 5 fees, that is <i>Gatton</i>, Boughton Malherbe, Throwley, <i>Wodneshelle</i>, Shalmsford Street [Chartham par.] and <i>Borstall</i> and they are held of they king in chief and they perform suit in the court of Ospringe. Then Henry de Crommeville holds three kinghts' fees, that is 1½ fees at Gravesend and half a fee at Saltwood, 1½ fees at <i>Denham</i> and Densole [Swingfield par.] and they are held of the king in chief and they have withdrawn themselves from suit of court for 30 years, by what warrant they do not know, with loss of 10 marks to the lord king. Then John de Mares holds three knights' fees in <i>Wathelingeham</i>, <i>Shelve</i>, <i>Hockemere</i>, <i>Senthuke</i> and they are held of the king in chief and they have withdrawn suit for 21 years with loss of 40s. to the king. Then Sir William de Leyburn holds one fee at Harrietsham and he has withdrawn suit for 15 years with loss of 20s. to the king. Then Hugh de Gerunde holds three knights' fees at Frinsted, Ashurst, Dodington in the the county of Buckingham, Foscott [Bucks] and he performs full suit. Then Sir Luke de Vianum holds a fourth part of one knight's fee at Petts Wood [Orpington par.?] and Thornhurst [Headcorn par.] and he performs suit. Then Ralph de Essing and Philip Cook's heir and God's House at Ospringe, through Robert of London, hold a fourth part of one fee and they all perform suit except God's House and that God's House holds Elverland [Ospringe par.] by grant and sale from Nicholas Servorde who holds as a mesne tenant.</p>
<p>Iterum dicunt quod manerium de Faveresham cum toto hundredo haberent religiosi de Faveresham ex dono regis Stephani salvis homagio et servicio hominum de villa de Faveresham que pertinent ad dominum regem. Item dicunt quod xvij tething' et dimidiam sunt in manibus religiosorum cum dicto hundredo sed de valore nesciunt. Item dicunt quod tenentes Henrici Malemayns in borgha de Elegrave et Foltwoldefelde subtraxerunt se de turno</p>	<p>Again they say that the monks at Faversham hold Faversham manor with the whole hundred by grant of King Stephen [1135-1154] saving the homage and service of the men of Faversham which pertain to the lord king. Then they say that the 17½ tithings with the said hundred are held by the monks, but they do not know what is the value. Then they say that the tenants of Henry Malemayns in the tithing of <i>Elegrave</i> and <i>Foltwoldefield</i> have withdrawn themselves from the</p>

vicecomitis per xvij annos ad dampnum domini regis xvijis in toto.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium wreccum maris placita namio vetito furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regales que ad coronam pertinent de antiquo tempore.

Item quod manerium de Stallesfeld quod tenetur de Hospitariis Jerusalem' habent asisam panis et cervisie sed nesciunt quo waranto. Item dominus abbas de Faveresham habet furcas assisam panis et cervisie de antiquo. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus vendit wardas familekind extra manus priorum possessorum et proprinquorum parentum sicut de manu patris et matris et advunculi huius heredis et hoc facit contra communem justiciam et contra morem et consuetudinem tocius Kancie. Item dicunt quod Johannes Dyve habet warennam ex concessione domini regis Henrici.

Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes ballivus lesti de Strawynghope cepit de Petro de Leste xijd pro removendo ipsum de assisa. Item idem cepit de Johanne de Sobesole pro eodem vjd. Item Thomas Andr' quondam ballivus de Strawinghope tempore suo cepit de borgha de Ewelle pro habendo relaxacionem cuiusdam districcionis facte per summonicionem apud Grenewych coram quibusdam justicariis iiijs. Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes clericus vicecomitis cepit de Roberto filio Johannis de Thrullesleg' xijd pro eodem. Item Johannes de Hamberghe minister Osberti de Ledes tunc ballivi cepit de Stephano de la Gare de borgha de Rode xvjd pro eodem. Idem Johannes cepit de Alexandro de Rode viijd pro eodem et de Thoma de Rode pro eodem vjd et de Thoma Baldewyne vjd pro eodem et de Johanne Pope pro eodem ijs.

Iterum dicunt quod Johannes de Wattun quondam vicecomes Kancie tempore suo tradidit lestum de Strawinghope ballivis suis ad incrementum firme sue pro xx libris ubi ante tempus suum non solverunt nisi X libras et omnes vicecomites post ea usque hec tantum ceperunt quorum nomina sunt hec: Ricardus de Wockeseye, Thomas Atebir, Nicholaus de Handlo, Johannes de Cobbeham, Reginaldus de Cobbeham, Fulco Payfor', Robertus Waleram, Johannes filius Johannis de Cobbeham, Reginaldus de Leyburn, Henricus de Burn' pro eo Stephanus de Pensherst, Henricus Malemeyns, Willelmus de Hever. Item dicunt quod vicecomes capit ad duos turnos per annum de dicto hundredo vij marcas tempore

sheriff's tourn for 18 years with a loss of 18s. in all to the king.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, wreck, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties which pertain to the crown from ancient times.

Then that the manor of Stalisfield Green is held of the Knights Hospitallers; they have the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant. Then the lord abbot of Faversham has a gallows, the assize of bread and ale from ancient times. Then they say that the archbishop sells wardship of heirs away from the rightful guardians and the nearest relatives, that is away from the father and mother and uncle of this heir and he does this against the common justice and contrary to the form and custom of the whole of Kent. Then they say that John Dyve has warren by a grant of King Henry.

Then they say that Osbert of Leeds, bailiff of Scray lathe took 12d. from Peter de Leste for removing him from the assize. Then the same man took 6d. from John de Sobesole for the same reason. Then Thomas Andrew, formerly bailiff of Scray, in his time took 4s. from the tithing of [Temple?] Ewell for the remittance of a certain distraint made by a summons to Greenwich before certain justices. Then they say that Henry of Leeds, the sheriff's clerk took 12d. from Robert son of John of Throwley for the same reason. Then John de Hamberghe, a servant of Osbert of Leeds, then the bailiff, took 12d. from Stephen de la Gare of Rode tithing for the same reason. Then John took 8d. from Alexander de Rode for the same reason and 6d. from Thomas de Rode and 6d. from Thomas Baldwin for the same reason and 2s. from John Pope for the same reason.

Again they say that John de Wattun, a former sheriff of Kent, during his time handed over the lathe of Scray to his bailiffs for £20, to increase his farm whereas before his time only £10 had been paid and all the sheriffs from then until this time have taken such an amount.

The names of these sherriffs are: Richard de Wockeseye, Thomas Atebir, Nicholas of Hadlow, John of Cobham, Reginald of Cobham, Fulk Peyfor', Robert Waleram, John son of John of Cobham, Reginald de Leyburn, Henry of Bourne on behalf of Stephen of Penshurst, Henry Malemeyns, William of Hever. Then they say that the sheriff takes 7 marks each year from this hundred at the two tourns since John de Wattun's time and he unjustly first levied that tourn.

Johannis de Wattun qui primo levavit turnum istum iniuste.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeis et Arnulphus de Erling et Nicholaus de Bret collectores vicesime receperunt ultra certum numerum denariorum x marcas et quod dominus Gilbertus comes de Clare cepit de hundredo de Faveresham xv libras pro insultacione castri de Tunnebrigge quam fecerunt per districionem domini Johannis de la Hay et dum comunarius fuit cum domino rege et sciendum quod dictam pecuniam cepit per consensus et auxilium ballivorum domini regis qui eandem pecuniam levaverunt et pro eadem pecunia levanda distrinxerunt quousque ea haberunt.

Iterum dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemeyns quando fuit vicecomes occasionavit Simonem le Taillar sibi inponendo usurie et ea racione cepit ab eo dimidiam marcam. Item quod Johannes de Hambergh' occasionavit Alexandrum de Strete per quod distrinxit ipsum per unum bovettum quem vendidit pro xvij s et habuit.

Et quod Osbertus de Kede serviens domini regis inprisonavit et inposuit Margerie de Rameshelde maletraxiise contra pacem Galfridi le Mirie et sic injuste cepit ab ea ijs.

Item idem Osbertus et Johnnes de Hamberegh eius serviens occasionaverunt Galfridum le Mirie quod vendidit unum bovettum apud Cant' qui remeavit ad domun suam et ipsum concealavit et habuit ut dixerunt et sic ceperunt ab eo injuste iij s quod voluerint eum de hiis aquietare et ipsi voluerunt aquietatem recipere.

Item Yvo de Merdenne ballivus schire tempore Henrici Malemains vicecomitis inposuit Waltero atte Dane quod emit unum equum de quodam latrone et quod potuit eum retinuisse et noluit et sic iniuste cepit ab eo dimidiam marcam.

Item Osbertus de Ledes inponens eidem Waltero eandem occasionem per quod cepit ab ipso ijs.

Item Yvo de Merdenn inposuit Johanni Prest quo malo modo impercavit quondam porcum vicini sui et dictum porcum concealavit et noluit suam purgationem accipere sed cepit ab eo dicta occasione iij s.

Item Osbertus de Ledes et Johannes de Hambergh' inposuit Johanni Prest' quod combussit domum Willelmu Humfrey et dictus Johannes voluit se aquietare per proportum et noluerunt sed ceperunt ab

Then they say that Henry Malemeis and Arnulph de Erling and Nicholas de Bret, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, have received 10 marks more than the assessed amount and that the lord Gilbert Earl of Clare took £15 from Faversham hundred for the assault upon Tonbridge castle which they made at the distraint of Sir John de la Hay and while he was an ally of the lord king and it is known that he took the said money by agreement and assistance of the lord king's bailiffs, who levied that money and to obtain that money they made distraint until they received it.

Again they say that when Sir Henry Malemeyns was sheriff he prosecuted Simon the tailor, accusing him of usury and for that reason he took half a mark from him. Then (they say) that John de Hambergh prosecuted Alexander de Strete and for this he made distraint upon him of one bullock which he sold for 18s. and he kept this.

And that Osbert de Kede, the lord king's serjeant, imprisoned and accused Margery de Rameshelde of breach of the peace against Geoffrey le Mirie and for this he unjustly took 2s. from her.

Then they same Osbert and John de Hambergh his serjeant, prosecuted Geoffrey le Mirie because he sold one bullock at Canterbury which he removed to his house and concealed and kept it, as they say, and thus they have taken 4s. from him unjustly because they wished to clear him of these things and they desired to secure his acquittal.

Then Ivo of Marden, the bailiff of the shire when Henry Malemains was sheriff, accused Walter atte Dane that he bought one horse from a certain thief and that he could have kept it and he was unwilling and thus he unjustly took half a mark from him.

Then Osbert of Leeds accusing the same Walter of the same offence took 2s. from him because of it.

Then Ivo of Marden accused John Prest that he impounded a certain pig of his neighbour by bad means and he concealed the said pig and he was unwilling to accept John's compurgation, but took 4s. from him for this said charge.

Then Osbert of Leeds and John de Hambergh accused John Prest that he set fire to William Humfrey's house and the said John wished to clear himself by an assize verdict, but they were unwilling and took half a mark

eo dimidiam marcam et Johannes de Hambergh iterum vjd.

Item Yvo de Merdenne in ultimo Itinere justiciariorum inposuit Henrico de la Woylete quod occidit quamdam feminam et quod eam projecit in quodam puteo et ipsum Henricum attachiavit et detinuerit quousque finivit xxs et de Johannis puero ijs.

Item dominus Henricus Malemains cepit de dicto Henrico 1 marcam pro eodem et recessis justicariis et dicto Henrico aquietato coram dictis justicariis venit dictus Yvo de Merdenn et cepit a dicto Henrico ij marcas.

Item the said Yvo de Merdenn inposuit Willelmo Post quod cum fuit serviens Bartholomei de Eversle per xx annos depredavit dominum suum cum aliis malefactoribus ad valenciam Cs. dictus Willelmus optulit aquietacionem noluit audire sed cepit ab eo vjs. et Gwydo clericus de Thrule xijd. Item Osbertus de Ledes cepit de Osberto de la Forstalle et Willelmo Renewold quod percusserunt unum garcionem extra quamdam tavernam pro contencione quam fecit in domo sine malo portatus fuit.

Item Osbertus de Ledes cepit ijs de Alexandro de Rode inponens ei quod furatus fuit ij boves et ipsum distrinxit quousque solvit.

Item Thomas Andr' inposuit Sandri de Rode quod debuit Willelmo Marescall de Middeltun quondam summam pecunie quam non debuit quare inde tallagium habuit de aquietatione et noluit allocare et cepit ab eo xLd.

Item idem Thomas Andr' inposuit Alicie uxori Roberti Asketin injuste quod interefecit unum hominem et cepit ab ea viijs et Johannes de Hambergh' iijs.

Item dominus Henricus Malemains inposuit Cecilie de Langedon quod fuit cum fratribus suis in quadam domo combusta et cepit ab ea xLs et Osbertus de Ledes cepit ab ea pro eodem 1 marcam.

Et Yvo de Merdenn cepit ab ea pro eodem 1 marcam. Item Osbertus de Ledes inposuit dicte Cecilie quod abduxit plures porcos de bosco quoniam induxit et idem cepit ab ea iiijs. Item Johannes de Hambergh' cepit ab ea pro eodem vjd.

Item quod Thomas Andr' cepit de Salamone de Folemanneston iiijs et unam copam vestoriam precii Xd quare noluit esse plegium dicti Thome et quod Thomas Andr' inposuit Hugoni Franceis quod usus

from him and again John de Hambergh took 6d.

Then Ivo of Marden at the justices' last eyre accused Henry de la Woylete of killing a certain woman and of throwing her in a certain well and he arrested Henry and detained him until he paid a fine of 20s. and 2s. from John's boy.

Then Sir Henry Malemains took 1 mark from the said Henry for the same charge and after the justices had retired and the said Henry had been acquitted before the justices, Ivo of Marden came and he took 2 marks from the said Henry.

Then the said Ivo of Marden accused William Post that when he had been a servant of Bartholomew de Eversle, he, with other evil associates, robbed his lord of 100s. He was unwilling to hear the acquittance which the said William received but took 6s. from him and Guy a clerk of Throwley took 12d. Then Osbert of Leeds took from Osbert de la Forstall and William Renewold because they struck one youth outside a certain tavern because of a disturbance which he made in the house, he was carried away unharmed.

Then Osbert of Leeds took 2s. from Alexander de Rode accusing him of the theft of 2 oxen and he distrained him until he paid.

Then Thomas Andrew accused Alexander de Rode that he owed William Marshal of Middleton a certain sum of money which he did not owe, since he received tallage from there for this acquittance and he made no allowance for this but took 40d. from him.

Then the same Thomas Andrew accused Alice the wife of Robert Asketin of killing one man and he took 8s. from her and John Hambergh took 3s.

Then Sir Henry Malemains accused Cicely of Langdon that she had been with her brothers in a certain house which was set alight and he took 40s. from her and Osbert of Leeds took 1 mark from her for the same reason.

And Ivo of Marden took 1 mark from her for the same reason. Then Osbert of Leeds accused the said Cicely of driving away many pigs from the wood whenever she came there and the same man took 4s. from her. Then John de Hambergh took 6d. from her for the same reason.

Then that Thomas Andrews took 4s. from Solomon de Folemanneston and one vestment cope price 10d. because he did not wish to act as the said Thomas's pledge and that Thomas Andrew accused Hugh

fuit pasturam suam dum tenementum suum fuit in manu domini regis et cepit ab eo viijs viijd. Item Thomas Andr' cepit unam culcitram pinnatam in villa de Faveresham de Willelmo Daniel precii xxxd et per potestatem officii sui hoc fecit et nondum soluit.

Item Ricardus de Gastheld equitavit equum Hamonis de Wyltega' contra voluntatem suam et dictus equus moriebatur et hoc fecit per potestatem sui officii et dictus Hamo habuit dampnum xijs. Item dictus Ricardus summonuit dictum Hamonem apud Wyvelesbergh' sine warrento et fecit eum dare xijd quod cepit et habuit et Apsalon socius ipsius cepit a dicto Hamone pro eodem xijd  
Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall constabularius castri Cant' anno regni regis Edwardi ij attachiavit Ricardum de Gastfeld [Estvelde given as alternative] et ipsum minavit inprisonare quare inposuit ei quod fecit conclamentum de quadam muliere qua idem Ricardum inprisonavit et ipse per proportium se aquietavit et dictus Hamo nichilominus cepit ab eodem Ricardo ix d.

Item dicunt quod Yvo de Meredenn tempore domini regis Henrici anno Lvj occasionavit ipsum Ricardum esse absentem in Itinere justiciarorum et sic cepit ab eodem Ricardo 1 marcam.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes occasionavit Johannem de Meister eo quod indictavit dictum Ricardum de Estveld quod fecit conclamentum de latrocinio falso et maliciose et cepit ab ipso Johanne xxxtas.

Item idem Henricus de Ledes cepit de Ediva Bene xxd pro falso clamnio sibi inposita unde dicta Ediva se aquietavit.

Item cepit de Willelmo Man et Willelmo filio eius xLd quare fecit falsum clamnium super dictam Edivam quod debuit conclasse unum quarterium lane furatum.

Item Thomas Andr' ballivus de schira anno regis Henrici Lvj voluit mutuare equum Johannis de Hundestvell et idem noluit et occasione illa cepit duos equos eiusdem Johannis et eosdem inparcavit et detinuit quousque solvit iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Robertus Beche et Henricus de Ledes distrinxerunt homines de villa de Faveresham per pannum et corea at valorem xxxs. et vj libras et illam districionem fecerunt ad nundinam de Wy anno

Franceis that he had used his pasture while his tenement was in the lord king's hand and he took 8s. 8d. from him. Then Thomas Andrew took one bed coverlet price 30d. from William Daniel in the town of Faversham and he did this by the authority of his office and he has not yet paid.

Then Richard de Gastheld rode Henry de Wyltega's horse without his permission and the said horse died and he did this by the authority of his office and the said Hamo suffered a loss of 12s. Then the said Richard summoned the said Hamo to *Wyvelesbergh'* without a warrant and made him give him 12d. which he took and held and Absolom his associate took 12d. from the said Hamo for the same reason.  
Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall the constable of Canterbury castle, in the 2nd year of King Edward's reign [November 1273-1274] arrested Richard de Gastfield and threatened to imprison him because he accused him of concealing a certain woman, for which the same Hamo imprisoned Richard and he acquitted himself of the charge and nevertheless the said Hamo took 9d. from the said Richard.

Then they say that Ivo of Marden in the 56th year of King Henry [October 1271-1272] charged that Richard of being absent from the justices' eyre and so he took 1 mark from the same Richard.

Then they say that Henry of Leeds charged John de Meister that he falsely and maliciously indicted the said Richard de Estveld of concealing a robber and he took 30s. from the same John.

Then Henry of Leeds took 20d. from Edith Bene for a false claim attributed to her, of which the said Edith cleared herself.

Then he took 40d. from William Man and William his son because they falsely claimed that the said Edith must have concealed one hundred weight [quarter of?] of stolen wool.

Then Thomas Andrew, bailiff of the shire, wished to borrow John de Hundestvell's horse, in King Henry's 56th year and the same man was unwilling and by that charge he took two of the same John's horses and impounded them and kept them until he paid 4s.

Then Robert Beche and Henry of Leeds made distraint upon the men of Faversham for cloth and leather valued at 30s. and £6 and they made this distraint at Wye fair in the 54th year of King Henry's reign

regni regis Henrici Liiij et adhuc dictam districcionem in manu sua retinent. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Hambergh' serviens domini regis fecit Johannem de Showesale et Thomam Frethemund manucaptors domini Guncelde de Badesmere per brevem domini regis ipsis nescientibus unde amerciati fuerunt ad 1 marcam ad scaccarium domini regis anno regni regis Henrici Lv. Item Johannes de Hambergh distinxit dominum Robertum de Scoteho pro unum equum per summonitionem scaccarii et liberavit dictum equum Henrico de Ledes precii equi ixs et non recuperavit. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hevr et Henricus de Ledes vicecomites ceperunt de Johanne de Hert dimidiam marcam per summonitionem scaccarii fraudulenter pro villa de Faveresham ubi non est levans neque cuilibet anno regni regis Edwardi primo unde nec ipsum nec villam de Faveresham aquietavit et Henricus de Ledes iniuste cepit de relicta prepositi de Westwode per summonitionem scaccarii xiiij ubi numquam venit in summonitione. Item Thomas Andr' serviens domini regis cepit de Ricardo preposito de Westwode per eandem summonitionem dimidiam marcam ubi nunquam venit in summonitione et quod Johannes de Hambergh' serviens domini regis cepit equum relicte dicti prepositi de Westwode et imparcavit eundem occasione predicta et detinuit quousque fuit mortuus. Item Nicholaus de Hambergh' et Elia frater eius ceperunt de Simone de Tong et Alexandro de la Strete xxs. per summonitionem scaccarii ubi nulla fuit.

### **Hundredum de Bocton Archiepiscopi.**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex tenet in dominico hundredum de Middeltun cum membro videlicet Merdenn. Item dicunt quod aliquando predecessores domini regis habuerunt Moneketun Westhalimot et Menstre in insula Tanet et modo abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet manerium de Menstre et prior ecclesie Sancte Trinitatis et conventus tenent manerium de Moneketun et dominus archiepiscopus Cant' tenet Westhalimot in Tanet quo warrento nesciunt et Henricus rex tenuit in dominicis suis manerium de Elham et modo dominus Willelmus de Leyburn illud tenet quo waranto nesciunt et quod idem Henricus rex tenuit manerium de Ospring et modo domina regina illud tenuit quo waranto nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Bocton est in manu

[October 1269-1270] and they still retain the goods distrained in their hand. Then that John de Hambergh, the lord king's servant in the 55th year of King Henry's reign [October 1270-1271] made John de Showesale and Thomas Frethemund mainpernors of Sir Jocelin de Badlesmere by the king's writ without their knowledge, whence they were amerced at 1 mark at the lord king's Exchequer. Then John de Hambergh made distraint upon Sir Robert de Scoteho for one horse, for summons of the Exchequer and he delivered the said horse, price 9s., to Henry of Leeds and he has not recovered it. Then they say that William of Hever and Henry of Leeds the sheriffs, in the first year of King Edward's reign [November 1272-1273] took half a mark from John de Hert for summons of the Exchequer, in fraudulent manner for the town of Faversham where it is not levied; he has acquitted neither John de Hert nor the town of Faversham of this and Henry of Leeds unjustly took 14s. from the widow of the reeve of Westwood [Preston par.] for summons of the Exchequer where he has never been present in summons. Then Thomas Andrew, the lord king's serving man, took half a mark from Richard the reeve of Westwood for the same summons and he has never been present in summons and that John de Hambergh, the lord king's serjeant took a horse from said reeve of Westwood's widow and impounded the same for this aforesaid charge and he kept it until it had died. Then Nicholas de Hambergh' and Elias his brother took 20s. from Simon de Tong and Alexander de la Strete for summons of the Exchequer where there was none.

### **Hundred of Boughton**

The jury say that the lord king holds the hundred of Middleton with its member, that is to say Marden, in demesne. Then they say that some time ago the lord king's predecessors held Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster in the Isle of Thanet and now the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds the manor of Minster and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity hold the manor of Monkton and the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds Westhalimot in Thanet, by what warrant they do not know and King Henry holds Elham manor in his demesnes and now Sir William de Leyburn holds that, by what warrant they do not know and that the same King Henry held the manor of Ospringe and now the lady queen holds that, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that Boughton hundred is in the lord

domini archiepiscopi sed de valore nesciunt et est ibi de certo quolibet anno de turno vicecomitis 1 marca de borgha de Malling quam Johannes de Bocton vicecomes Kancie primo fecit levare. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum et extractum brevium et tenet placitas de namio vetito et habet wreccam maris et assisam panis et cervisie quo waranto nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis per ministros et baillivos suos cepit Lvijis vjd de X magnis lignis venditis in bosco de Herst et quod idem Magister Ricardus fecit fieri carbonem in bosco qui vocatur Byssupedenn faciendo destruccionem in quercubus ad valorem xLs. Item dicunt quod idem escaetor cepit de hundredo de Bocton pro eo quod ipse non tenuit dictum hundredum sic lageday xLs injuste. Item Magister Hugo de Thornham cepit de eodem hundredo pro eodem 1 marcam injuste et idem cepit de tenentibus de Boctun iniuste pro averagiis residuum seminis ubi averare non tenebantur et ubi nichil fuit ad averandum xxvs. Item cepit de eisdem tenentibus pro averiis suis inparcamentum de stipulis ubi deberent de jure communem habere et quod dictus Magister Hugo cepit de Philippo de Deregat xLs quod emerat boscum in Byssupedenn de forestariis suis et quod idem cepit de Willelmo filio Philippo de Fraxino ijjs ut possit intrare terram cuiusdam heredis qui fuit de etate xxxta annorum et amplius. Item idem cepit pro recognitione et tallagio in primo adventu suo Cs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupesdun et Willelmus de Gerstun ceperunt de hundredo de Bocton xx marcas pro insultu de Tonebrigg qui se advocaverunt ballivos domini Comitis Glovernie et quod dominus Johannes de la Haye tunc temporis constabularius Dovor' per districtionem suam fecit quosdam de dicto hundredo ire cum eo ad insultum predicti castri de Tonebrigg'

m. 4 dorso **Hundredum de Felebereghe.** .

Dicunt jurati quod Alexander de Balliolo et Isabella uxor eius tenent manerium de Chillehm cum certa parte hundredi de Felebereghe, Kyngeston Wytstaple Rydlingwalle membra ad baroniam de Chyleh'm tenentur de domino rege in capite per servicium. Dicunt etiam quod prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant' tenent maneria de Chartham et Godmeresham

archbishop's hand but they do not know of what value it is and there is every year whatsoever 1 mark from Malling tithing for the sheriff's tourn which John of Boughton when the sheriff of Kent was the first to levy. Then they say that the archbishop has return and extract of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has wreck and the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, through his ministers and bailiffs took 67s. 6d. for 10 great trees sold in *Herst* wood and the same Master Richard caused charcoal to be made in the wood called *Bishopdenn* causing destruction of oak trees valued at 40s. Then they say that the same escheator took 40s unjustly from Boughton hundred because he has not held the hundred, thus at lawday. Then Master Hugh of Thornham took 1 mark unjustly from the same hundred for the same reason and the same man unjustly took the remainder of the seed from the tenants of Boughton for carrying services, when they were not bound to perform carrying services and 25s. when there was nothing to carry. Then he took inclosed land from the same tenants with its stubble for his own draught animals where the tenants ought by right to have common and that the said Master Hugh took 40s. from Philip of Deregat because he had bought wood in Bishopdenn from his foresters and that the same man took 3s. from William, son of Philip de Fraxino, so that he could have entry to the land of a certain heir, who was 30 years of age and more. Then the same man took 100s. at his first coming for acknowledgement of his authority and for tallage. Then they say that William de Stupesdun and William de Gerstun took 20 marks from Boughton hundred for the assault upon Tonbridge as they themselves supported the lord earl of Gloucester's bailiffs and that the lord John de la Haye, who was constable of Dover at that time compelled certain men of the said hundred by distraint to go with him to the assault upon the aforesaid castle of Tonbridge.

m. 4 dorso **Felborough Hundred**

The jury say that Alexander de Baillol and his wife Isabel hold the manor of Chilham with a certain part of Felborough hundred. Kingston, Whitstable, *Ringlestone*, members of the barony of Chilham are held of the king in chief through service. They say also that the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury hold Chartham and Godmersham manors from ancient



de antiquo sed quo waranto nesciunt. Item dicunt quod certa pars dicti hundredi pertinet ad manerium de Chilham ut supra et duas partes predicat hundredi habent prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant' pertinentes ad maneria sua de Chertham et Godmeresham nesciunt quo waranto. Item dicunt quod tenentes archiepiscopatus Cant' racione libertatis predicte ecclesie subtraxerunt se veniendi ad lestum et ad turnum vicecomitis reddendum et hoc per xx annos elapsos et amplius nesciunt quo waranto. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium racione libertatis ecclesie sue nesciunt quo waranto et quod idem archiepiscopus et prior ecclesie Christi tenent placita de namio vetito et habent furcas assisas panis et cervisie et omnes alias libertates regales racione libertatis ecclesie sed nesciunt quo waranto et quod dominus Alexander de Balliolo habet furcas in dicto hundredo assisam panis et cervisie racione manerii sui de Chyleham ab antiquo tempore nesciunt quo waranto. Item dicunt quod quidam homo archiepiscopatus Cant' de manerio de Tenham captus fuit et appellatus in dicto hundredo de latrocinio et morti iudicatus et homines hundredi de Tenham calumpniaverunt ad facere executionem justicie dicti felonis eo quod hoc pertinebat ad libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant' et cum ipsum felonem dictis hominibus de Tenham dimisisset duxerunt ipsum usque Tenham nolentes de eo facere executionem nisi alias in eodem hundredo de Tenham de eodem facto esset appellatus et hoc injuste et contra communem justiciam et hoc factum fuit per Willelmum de Hanyngefeld ballivum archiepiscopi et per hundredum de Tenham. Item dicunt quod quidam de hundredo de Pecham captus fuit in dicto hundredo de Feleberegh pro diffamacione latrocinii qui per predictum hundredum plene aquietatus fuit et cum vertisset ad hundredum de Pecham Michaelis de Meynill ballivus archiepiscopi cum aliis tenentibus eiusdem hundredi dictum diffamatum ceperunt et inprisonaverunt eadem occasione contra justiciam. Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi appropriavit sibi warenum in aqua et terra per tota maneria de Chartham et Godmeresham sed nesciunt quo waranto.

Item dicunt quod fratres Domus Dei de Ospringe tenent quoddam tenementum de Hamone de Gattun et

times but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that a certain part of the said hundred pertains to Chilham manor as above and the prior and convent of Christchurch have two thirds of the aforesaid hundred pertaining to their manors of Chartham and Godmersham, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the tenants of the archbishopric of Canterbury because of the liberty of the aforesaid church have withdrawn themselves from coming to the lathe and paying at the sheriff's tourn and this for 20 years and more, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return of writs because of the liberty of his church, they do not know by what warrant and that the same archbishop and prior of Christchurch have pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and they have the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and all other royal liberties because of the liberty of the church, but they do not know by what warrant and that Sir Alexander de Baillol from ancient times has the gallows in the said hundred, the assize of bread and ale by reason of his manor of Chilham, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that a certain man of the archbishopric of Canterbury from Teynham manor was captured and accused in the said hundred of robbery and condemned to death and the men of Teynham hundred made objection to committing justice upon the said felon because this pertained to the liberty of Christchurch and when he delivered the felon to the said men of Teynham they brought him as far as Teynham, as they did not wish his execution to be done except in another place in the same hundred of Teynham, where he had been appealed of the same deed and thus unjustly and contrary to common justice. This was done by William de Hanyngefeld, the archbishop's bailiff and by Teynham hundred. Then they say that a certain man of Petham hundred was arrested in the said hundred of Felborough and charged with theft and he was fully acquitted through the aforesaid hundred and when he had returned to Petham hundred, Michael de Meynill, the archbishop's bailiff, with other tenants of the same hundred seized the accused man and contrary to justice, imprisoned him upon the same charge. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch has taken warren for himself by water and by land throughout the whole of Chartham and Godmersham manors, but they do not know by what warrant.

They say that the Brethren of God's House at Ospringe hold a certain tenement of Hamo de Gattun and Hamo

ipse Hamo de rege in capite et subtraxerunt se de scotto et lotto que facere consueverunt ad borgham de Sahameleford ad dampnum patrie per annum xijd et quod abbas Sancti Augustini subtraxit se eodem modo de predicta borgha ad dampnum per annum xijd per x annos elapsos et quod tenentes Templariorum subtraxerunt se eodem modo de scotto et lotto ad borgham de Esture que facere consueverunt ad grave dampnum ipsius borghe per xxx annos nesciunt quo waranto.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Sparewe cepit bedellariam prioris cepit iijjd de Willelmo Pynere pro assisa relaxanda et dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes tradidit lestum de Scrawingthope Yvoni de Meredenn qui posuit Nicholaum le Brett et Robertum att Estynghele pleggia de prisona super breve domini regis qui numquam pleggia fuerunt pro qua causa amerciati fuerunt in dimidia marca. Item idem Henricus vicecomes tradidit predictum lestum Thome de Faveresham et idem Thomas habuit secum quendam servientem nomine Johannem de Rameshelde qui cepit carectam Stephani de Hemstede iniuste in via regia et eum retinuit quousque dedit ei iijjd et eodem modo fecit de multis aliis. Item dicunt quod Ricardus de la Berne constabularius castri Cant' cepit equum Baldewini de la Denne et ipsum detinuit quousque dederat ei iijjd. Item Jacobus de la Denne constabularius eiusdem castri inprisonavit Nicholaum Mannyng donec habuit ab eo xijd et quod Johnnes de Wattun quondam vicecomes primo levavit turnum vicecomitis in comitatu Kancie unde villati de Chileham dat per annum ad eundem turnum 1 marcam et quod Henricus Malemeyns vicecomes injuste occasionavit totum hundredum de Chileham eo quod non responeret ad diversos articulos quod facere non debuerunt neque consueverunt unde amerciavit eos ad xxs et solverunt. Item idem Henricus vicecomes cepit de predictis tenentibus de Chileham pro inspectione rotulorum suorum hundredi tempore Itineris Magistri Rogeri de Seytun 1 marcam de convencionem et statim post Iter predictum finitum cepit ab eisdem pro eodem alteram marcam. Item idem Henricus vicecomes cepit de predictis tenentibus pro respectu habendo de summonitione scaccarii in quo amerciati fuerunt usque redderet compotum suum ij marcas et cum eas recepisse statim levavit ab eisdem summonitionem domini regis contra convencionem et iniuste. Item Willelmus de Eure vicecomes et [Willelmus- sic]

himself of the king in chief and they have withdrawn themselves from scot and lot which they used to make to the tithing of Shalmsford Street [Chartham par.] with a loss of 12d. each year to the country and that the abbot of St Augustine's has withdrawn himself in the same way from the aforesaid tithing for 10 years with loss of 12d. each year and that the Templars' tenants have withdrawn themselves in the same way for 30 years from the scot and lot which they were accustomed to make to the tithing of Eastry with severe loss to that tithing, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John Sparrow took the office as the prior's beadle. He took 4d. from William Pynere for remittance of the assize and they say that Henry Malemains the sheriff, handed the lathe of Scray to Ivo of Mardon who placed Nicholas le Brett and Robert att Estynghele as sureties of the prison upon the lord king's writ whereas there had never been sureties and for this reason they were amerced at half a mark. Then the same Henry the sheriff handed over the aforesaid lathe to Thomas of Faversham and the same Thomas had a certain serjeant called John of Rameshelde with him who unjustly took Stephen de Hemstede's cart on the highway and kept it until he gave him 4d. and he acted in the same way towards many others. Then they say that Richard de la Berne, the constable of Canterbury castle, took Baldwin de la Denne's horse and kept it until he had given him 4d. Then James de la Denne, constable of the same castle, imprisoned Nicholas Mannyng until he had 12d. from him and that John de Wattun, formerly the sheriff first levied the sheriff's tourn in Kent county, for which the townfolk of Chilham give 1 mark each year at the same tourn and that Henry Malemayns, the sheriff, unjustly prosecuted the whole hundred of Chilham because they did not respond to various articles, because they were not obliged nor accustomed to do so, thence he amerced them at 20s. and they paid. Then the same Henry the sheriff took 1 mark as a fine from the aforesaid tenants of Chilham for making an inspection of the rolls of their hundred, at the time of Master Roger de Seytun's eyre and immediately after the aforesaid eyre was finished he took another mark from them for the same purpose. Then the same Henry the sheriff took 2 marks from the aforesaid tenants for having respite from summons of the Exchequer in which they had been amerced until they paid his account and when he had received these he immediately levied a summons of the lord king upon

Henricus de Ledes subvicecomes occasionaverunt injuste villatos de Chileham ad turnum suum tempore regis nunc et ceperunt ab eis Ls. Item idem Willelmus falsa suggestione Petri le Vache attachiavit Robertum Elselm et Radulfum fratrem eius pro quadam contentacione que rexit inter eos et ipsos inprisonavit in castro Cant' quousque fecerunt finem xLs pro redemptione et idem Willelmus vicecomes adhuc cepit de predicto Roberto pro eodem xxs et alia dampna habuit et sustinuerunt predicta occasione ad valorem xxs.

Item idem Willelmus vicecomes inprisonavit Robertum le Ber pro quadam contencione que rexit inter ipsum et Petrum le Wasch et eundem Robertum in priona detinuit quousque habuit ab eo xxs. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes cepit de borgha de Burlonde eo quod non habuerunt Robertum Elselm et Radulfum fratrem eius cum insufficientia ad hoc per predictum vicomitem essent premunita Xs. injuste. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes occasionavit Robertum de Stalar et inposuit ei quod interfuit cuidam Ludovinus Anseris et ipsum distrinxit et ipsum distrinxit quousque fecerat finem de pare iiij duodeniis precii iijs quos solvit et de Ricardo Johanne et Rogero de Businge eadem occasione cepit ix auceres precii iijs et de Gileberto Attebrok' cepit iij auceres precii ixd et de Willelmo Bot iij aucas pro eadem occasione precii ixd et de Ada Pistore Hugone Pistore et Johanne fratre suo ix auceres precii vjd. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes injuste occasionavit Robertum Heseday et inposuit ei quod asportavit quamdam civeram de domo Petri le Wosche injuste qui hoc non fecit qua occasione cepit ab eo Xs. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes inprisonavit Johannem Messeaday inponendo ei quod fregit grangiam Galfridi le Bedel qua occasione cepit ab eo Vs. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes distrinxit Guidonem de Solinghelde inponendo ei quod recettavit Ricardum de la Dane utlagatum quod nesciebatur quousque idem Guido dederat ei xLs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de la Garstun et Willelmus de Stupesdon ballivi comitis Glovernie inposuerunt hominibus hundredi de Feleberegh' quod debuerunt obsidese castrum de Tunebrygg qua occasione ceperunt de hundredo predicto xxxta marcas injuste quare hoc fecerunt precepto Johannis de la Haye constabularii tunc Dovorie per dominum regis.

them, contrary to the agreement and unjustly. Then William de Eure the sheriff and Henry (*William* – sic) of Leeds, under-sheriff unjustly prosecuted the townfolk of Chilham at their turn, in the present king's time and took 50s. from them. Then the same William by false information of Peter le Vache, arrested Robert Elselm and Ralph his brother because there had been a certain dispute between them and he imprisoned them in Canterbury castle until they paid 40s. fine for their release and the same William, the sheriff, in addition took 20s. from the aforesaid Robert for the same reason and he had other losses and by this prosecution they benefited to the value of 20s. Then the same William the sheriff, imprisoned Robert le Ber because there had been a certain dispute between him and Peter le Wasch and he detained the same Robert in prison until he had 20s. from him. Then the same William the sheriff, took 10s. unjustly from Buckland tithing because they did not hold Robert Elselm and Ralph his brother and insufficient warnings about them were given to the sheriff. Then the same William the sheriff prosecuted Robert de Stalar and accused him that Ludovinus should compensate a certain person for his goose and he made distraint upon him until he had paid a fine equal to 4 dozen geese, price 4s. which he paid and he took 9 geese price 4s. from Richard, John and Roger de Businge on the same charge and he took 3 geese, price 9d. from Gilbert Atbrook and 3 geese, price 9d. and 3 geese, price 9d. from William Bot for the same charge and 9 geese, price 6d. from Adam the baker, Hugh (sic – *Hubert*) the baker and John his brother. Then the same William the sheriff, unjustly prosecuted Robert Heseday and accused him of unjustly taking away a certain wheelbarrow from the house of Peter le Wosche, which he had not done and he took 10s. from him for this charge. Then the same William the sheriff, imprisoned John Messeaday accusing him of damaging Geoffrey the beadle's barn, for which charge he took 5s. from him. Then the same William the sheriff, made distraint upon Guy de Solinghelde accusing him of sheltering Richard de la Dane, an outlaw he did not know, until the same Guy had given him 40s. Then they say that William de la Garstun and William de Stupesdon, the earl of Gloucester's bailiffs, accused the men of Felborough hundred that they ought to have besieged Tonbridge castle, for which charge they took 30 marks from the aforesaid hundred, unjustly because they acted thus at the command of John de la Haye then constable of Dover castle,

Item dicunt quod Hugo Peyferer et Henricus Malemeins collectores vicesime ceperunt de predicto hundredo per pondus ultra certum numerum Lxs. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' [obiit] vendit wardas et maritagia de hiis qui tenent de eo in gavylkende injuste. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Crioll coronator cepit pro officio suo exercendo ad opus clerici sui ijs. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford esceator domini regis seisivit archiepiscopatum Kanc' post mortem Bonifacii archiepiscopi a festo Sancte Margarete Virginis anno regni regis Henrici Liiij et illum tenuit in manu domini regis usque ad festum Sancte Lucie Virginis anno regni regis Edwardi primo sed nesciunt cui inde respondit neque valorem.

Item dicunt quod domina Isabella de Chileham que tenet de domino rege in capite maritavit cum domino Alexandro de Balliolo sine licencia domini regis.

#### **Hundredum de Bircholte de Baronia**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex habet in manu sua hundredum de Middeltun cum Merdenn et quod maneria de Moneketun Westhalimot et Minstre in antiquo fuerunt regum Anglie et nunc abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet manerium de Menstre et dominus archiepiscopus Cant' tenet Westhalimot et prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis Cant' tenent manerium de Moneketun sed quo warento nesciunt et quod rex Henricus habuit maneria de Elham et Ospring et modo domina regina mater domini regis nunc tenet manerium de Ospring et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet manerium de Elham quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod rex Johannes habuit manerium de Braburn per escaetam et modo dominus Willelmus de Valence tenet illud manerium quo warento nesciunt et valet per annum Lx libras et aliorum predictorum maneriorum valorem nesciunt. Item manerium de Wy fuit in antiquo cuiusdam regis Anglie et modo abbas de Bello tenet illud manerium quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Valence tenet hundredum de Braburn quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' [obiit] et abbas de Bello habent returnum et extractum brevium et habent placita de namio vetito wreccum maris et alias

through the lord king.

Then they say that Fulk Peyferer and Henry Malemeins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 60s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury (*he is dead*) unjustly sells wardships and marriages from these tenants who hold from him in *gavelkind*. Then they say that William de Crioll the coroner took 2s. for the use of his clerk to perform the duties of his office. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, took possession of the archbishopric of Canterbury after Archbishop Boniface's death and held it in the lord king's hand from the feast of St Margaret the Virgin in the 54th year of King Henry's reign until the feast of St Lucy the Virgin in the first year of King Edward's reign [20<sup>h</sup> July 1270 - 13 December 1272] but they do not know to whom it then answered nor what is its value. Then they say that the Lady Isabel of Chilham who holds of the king in chief has married the lord Alexander de Baillol without the lord king's licence.

#### **Hundred of Bircholt with the Barony**

The jury say that the lord king holds in his hand the hundred of Middleton with Marden and that in ancient times the manors of Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster were of the kings of England and now the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds the manor of Minster and the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds Westhalimot and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Canterbury hold Monkton manor but by what warrant they do not know and that King Henry has the manors of Elham and Ospringe and now the lady queen, the present king's mother holds Ospringe manor and Sir William de Leyburn holds Elham manor, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that King John held Brabourne manor through escheat and now the lord William de Valence holds that manor by what warrant they do not know and it is worth £60 each year and they do not know the value of the other aforesaid manors. Then Wye manor was of a certain king of England in ancient times and now the abbot of Battle holds that manor, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the lord William de Valence holds Brabourne [Bircholt Barony] hundred, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury (*he is dead*) and the abbot of Battle have the return and extract of writs and they have pleas of wrongful

libertates ut furcas et assisam panis et cervisie quo warento nesciunt et dominus Willelmus de Valence habet in Braburn placita namio vetito et furcas et assisam panis et cervisie quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor cepit in manu domini regis archiepiscopatus Cant' post mortem Bonifacii archiepiscopi et tenuit in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidiam.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochell duxit lanas ad partes transmarinas apud Hethe sed quod saccos nec per quem nec per cuius advocacionem omnino ignorant.

### **Hundredum de Tenham**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Ospring est de dominico domini regis et nunc est in manu domine regine et hundredum de Mideltun est de dominico regis et nunc est in manu domini Johannis de Burg' qui illud tenet ad terminum vite sue.

Item dicunt quod tenentes cuiusdam terre que vocatur Gerundislande in parochia de Lodenham solebant sequi hundredum domini regis apud Eyhorn et modo preocupati sunt ad hundredum abbatis de Faveresham apud Faveresham fere per xxx annos ad dampnum regis nesciunt quantum nec quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum extractum brevium et placita namio vetito wreccum maris assisam panis et cervisie et furcas de antiquo et quod idem archiepiscopus Cant' iniuste capit wardas de terris gavelkind contra communem justiciam.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Wynestun quondam bedellus de Tenham cepit vjd de Henrico Fabro tempore vacacionis archiepiscopatus pro assisa removenda.

Et quod Robertus de Serring quondam bedellus curie Cant' cepit vjd de Symone de Dodington pro eodem et de Henrico de Edmelistun ut removeretur de assisa vjd. et de Philippo de Boclone pro eodem vjd..

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeyns et Fulco Peyuferer collectores vicesime ceperunt xxxviij libras de vicesima et pro pondere xxijs ultra certum numerum et quod Henricus Lowelle senescallus Bonifacii archiepiscopi cepit de Willelmo de la Dane dimidiam marcam per summonitionem scaccarii et illum non aquietavit quare idem Willelmus iterum solvit.

distrain upon goods, wreck and other liberties as the gallows and the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they do not know and in Brabourne Sir William de Valence has pleas of distrain upon goods and the gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took the archbishopric of Canterbury into the lord king's hands after archbishop Boniface's death and held it in the lord king's hand for 2½ years.

Then they say that William de Brochell sent wool from Hythe to places overseas but they are completely ignorant how many sacks nor through whom nor through whose arrangement.

### **Tenham Hundred**

The jury say that Ospringe manor is of the lord king's demesne and now is in the lady queen's hands and the hundred of Middleton is of the king's demesne and now is in John de Burg's hand who holds it for his life time.

Then they say that the tenants of a certain land called *Gerundisland* in Luddenham parish used to do suit at the lord king's hundred at Eyhorne and now they have been taken into the abbot of Faversham's hundred at Faversham for almost 30 years, they do not know what is the loss to the king nor by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs and pleas of wrongful distrain upon goods, wreck, the assize of bread and ale and the gallows from ancient times and that the same archbishop of Canterbury unjustly takes wardships from lands in *gavelkind* contrary to common justice.

Then they say that John de Wyneston, formerly beadle of Teynham, took 6d. from Henry the smith at the time of the vacancy of the archbishopric, for removing him from the assize.

And that Robert de Serring formerly beadle of Canterbury court, took 6d. from Simon of Dodington for the same reason and 6d. from Henry de Edmelistun that he might be removed from the assize and 6d. from Philip of Buckland for the same.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulk Peyfurer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took £38 for the twentieth and 22s. by weight more than the assessed amount and that Henry Lowelle, archbishop Boniface's steward, took half a mark from William de la Dane for Exchequer summons and has not acquitted him because the same William has paid

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis tempore vacacionis archiepiscopatus Cant' fecit levare X marcas de bosco archiepiscopi apud Hockinfald et ibidem cepit cc ligna precii xiijs et ducere fecit apud London et quod idem Ricardus cepit X libras de tenentibus hundredi de Tenham injuste nomine tallagii in primo adventu suo. Item quod idem Ricardus cepit vj marcas ab eisdem pro cariagio bosci et hoc iniuste quod nullo tempore cariare solebant. Item idem Ricardus cepit de eisdem tenentibus Cs. pro concealamento cuiusdam terre de heryeto injuste. Idem Ricardus cepit X marcas de Johanne de Hockinfald quod levavit postquam Cs de bosco sine precepto suo.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Wynston emit bedellariam habendam de Tenham de predicto escaetore pro 1 marca. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stopisdon cepit de tenentibus de Tenham ad opus Comitis Glovernie Cs quod venerunt apud Tonbrygge per preceptum Johannis de la Haye tunc constabularii Dovorie.

again.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator at the time of the vacancy of the archbishopric caused 10 marks to be levied from the archbishop's wood at *Hockinfald* and there took 200 trees, price 13s. and had them taken to London and that the same Richard took £10 from the tenants of Teynham hundred, unjustly in the name of tallage at his first coming. Then that the same Richard took 6 marks from the same men for carriage of wood and this was unjust because at no time had they been accustomed to carrying service. Then the same Richard took 100s. unjustly from the same tenants for concealing a certain land liable for heriot. Then Richard took 10 marks from John de Hockinfald because he afterwards levied 100s. from the wood without his instruction. Then they say that John de Wynston bought the right of holding the office of beadle of Teynham for 1 mark from the aforesaid escheator. Then they say that William de Stopisdon took 100s. for the earl of Gloucester's use from the tenants of Teynham, because they came to Tunbridge at the command of John de la Haye, then constable of Dover.

**m.5 Hundredum de Langebrigge adhuc in comitatu Kancie in lasto de Strawinghope**

Dicunt jurati quod hundreda de Middeltun et Meredenn sunt dominica domini regis et nunc ea tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo per dominum regem et quod maneria de Moneketon Westhalimot et Menstre in antiquo fuerunt regum Anglie et nunc dominus archiepiscopus Cant' tenet Westhalimot et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet manerium de Menstre et prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis Cant' tenent Moneketun nesciunt quo warento et quod rex Henricus habuit maneria Elham et Ospring et nunc regina mater regis tenet Ospring et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet Elham quo warento nesciunt et quod manerium de Wye in antiquo fuit regum Anglie et nunc abbas de Bello illud tenet quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Essedeford tenetur de rege in capite pro duobus feodis militis et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn nunc tenet quo warento nesciunt et debet ad castrum Doverie de warda xxs per annum et dicunt quod hundredum de Langebrygg' cum lesto ponitur ad firmam et valet per annum xLs. Item dicunt quod predictum hundredum de Langebrygg est in manu domini regis preter libertatem abbatis de Bello et prioris Sancte Trinitatis Cant' quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod abbas de Bello tenentes suos in borgha de Kyngeswod de secta hundredi substraxit et sibi appropriavit ad dampnum domini regis per annum dimidiam marcam et hoc a tempore anno regni regis Henrici Lvj quo warento nesciunt et quod tenentes prioris Sancte Trinitatis Cant' de Merseham sectam faciunt ad hundredum sed non presentant causa libertatis quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis Cant' habent returnum extractum brevium et placitant de namio vetito et habent alias libertates regis ut assisam panis et cervisie quo warento nesciunt et quod abbas de Bello habet assisam panis et cervisie et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn habet assisam panis et cervisie apud Essedesford et mercatandiam et nundinaria quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis

**m.5 Chart and Longbridge Hundred still in the county of Kent in the lathe of Scray**

The jury say that the hundreds of Middleton and Marden are of the lord king's demesne and now Sir John de Tithing holds them of the lord king and that Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster manors in ancient times were of the kings of England and now the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds Westhalimot and the abbot of St Augustine's holds Minster manor and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Canterbury hold Monkton, they do not know by what warrant and that King Henry held Elham and Ospringe manors and now the queen, the present king's mother holds Ospringe and Sir William de Leyburn holds Elham, by what warrant they do not know and that Wye manor in ancient times was of the kings of England and now the abbot of Battle holds that, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the manor of Essedesford [Ashford] is held of the king in chief for two knights' fees and Sir William de Leyburn now holds it, by what warrant they do not know and he owes 20s. each year for castleguard at Dover castle and they say that Longbridge hundred with the lathe is placed at farm and is worth 40s. each year. Then they say that the aforesaid hundred of Longbridge is in the lord king's hands apart from the liberty of the abbot of Battle and of the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the abbot of Battle has withdrawn his tenants in Kingswood [Wye par.] tithing from suit to the hundred and appropriated it for himself with loss of half a mark each year to the king and this from the 56th year of King Henry's reign, by what warrant they do not know and that the tenants of the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury in Mersham perform suit at the hundred but because of the liberty they have not presented themselves, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Canterbury have return (and) extract of writs and they have pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and they have other liberties of the king as the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they do not know and that the abbot of Battle has the assize of bread and ale and Sir William de Leyburn has the assize of bread and ale at Ashford and market and fair tolls, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the prior and convent of Holy

Cant' sibi appropriaverunt liberas chacias et warennas apud Merseham et Comitissa Winton' que habuit manerium de Essedesford eodem modo appropriavit liberas chacias et warennas et quod racione warrenne aquarum servientes predictae Comitisse ceperunt Walterum le Heare et Willelmum ate Ware et ipsos inprisonaverunt quousque finirent dimidiam marcam et Matheum Brun et Johannem Puppere eodem modo quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Magister Hamo Doge sibi appropriavit warennam in Kenintun sine warento et quod abbas de Bello habet warennam et transit ultra metas et fines warrenne sue apud Kenintun aliter quam deberet quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod rector ecclesie de Kenintun fecit purpresturam super dominicum regem intrando quamdam partem terre de communa in Kenintun anno regis nunc secundo ad nocumentum patrie et ad dampnum domini regis 1d per annum. Item dicunt quod Thomas dictus bedellus hundredi de Longebrigg' cepit de Ricardo Puttak pro removendo de assisa xijd et de Henrico de Frome pro consuetudine vjd.

Item dicunt quod Yvo de Meredenne quondam ballivus de Longebrigg occasionavit Elyam le Taillur de Essedesford quod debuit mersisse quendam garcionem in puteo suo et non fuit culpabilis et sic cepit de ipso 1 marcam. Idem Yvo occasionavit Rogerum Strudard de Essedesford quod recepit rechattum de latrocinio et cepit ab ipso iniuste iij s. iiij d. Idem Yvo occasionavit Willelmum Brichin de Kenintun quod recettavit filium suum hutlagatum et cepit ab eo iniuste 1 marcam. Item idem Yvo cepit de eodem Willelmo vi s. iniuste inponendo ei quod fuit pleggium Gerardi de Helbing de fidelitate. Idem Yvo occasionavit dictum Gerardum de Helbing inponendo ei latrocinium et cepit ab eo xiiij s. iniuste. Idem Yvo occasionavit Ricardum de Hengselle, Radulfum Wolf et Johannem de Rosingbrok et inposuit eis raptum et cepit ab eis iniuste xxx s. Idem Yvo occasionavit Edilde de Rosingbrok et Willelmum Capernet pro inquisitione habenda de hundredo de fidelitate et cepit ab eis iniuste xx s. Idem Yvo cepit iniuste de Henrico Attenesse iij s. inponendo ei quod inprisonavit quendam hominem. Idem Yvo occasionavit Willelmum filium Henrici de Atelesworthe inponendo ei quod fecit murdrum et cepit ab eo ix s. iniuste. Idem Yvo occasionavit Radulfum Atte hale inponendo ei quod cepit rechattum de latrocinio et cepit ab eo

Trinity Canterbury have appropriated for themselves the free chaces and warrens at Mersham and the Countess of Hampshire who holds Ashford manor has appropriated free chaces and warrens in the same way and because of the warren of waters, the aforesaid Countess's serving men have seized Walter le Heare and William ate Ware and imprisoned them until they paid half a mark as fine and they used Matthew Brun and John Puppere in the same way, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Master Hamo Doge has appropriated warren in Kennington for himself without warrant and that the abbot of Battle has warren and has gone beyond the metes and bounds of his warren at Kennington other than he ought, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that in the second year of the present king [Edward I, November 1273-1274] the rector of Kennington church made an encroachment upon the king's demesne by entering a certain part of the common land in Kennington, with loss of 1d. each year to the lord king. Then they say that Thomas, the said beadle of Longbridge hundred, took 12d. from Richard Puttak to remove him from the assize and 6d. from Henry de Frome for a customary payment.

Then they say that Ivo of Marden, formerly the bailiff of Longbridge charged Elias the tailor of Essedesford that he had immersed a certain youth in his well and he was not guilty and thus he took 1 mark from him. The same Ivo charged Roger Strudard de Essedesford that he received stolen goods and he took 3s. 4d. from him unjustly. The same Ivo charged William Brichin of Kennington that he had sheltered his son, an outlaw and Ivo took 1 mark from him unjustly. Then the same Ivo took 7s. from the same William accusing him that he had been the surety of Gerard de Helbing for good behaviour. Then the same Ivo charged the said Gerard de Helbing accusing him of robbery and unjustly took 14s. from him. The same Ivo charged Richard de Hengselle, Ralph Wolf and John de Rosingbrok and accused them of rape and took 30s. from them unjustly. The same Ivo charged Edilda de Rosingbrok and William Capernet of holding an inquest of the hundred about their good characters and took 20s. from them unjustly. The same Ivo took 3s. from Henry Attenesse unjustly accusing him of imprisoning a certain man. The same Ivo charged William son of Henry de Atelesworthe, accusing him that he had committed murder and he took 9s. from him. The same Ivo charged Ralph Atte hale accusing him of receiving stolen goods and he took 20s. from him unjustly.



injuste xxs. Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes ballivus de Longebrygg occasionavit Thomam de Letherst inponendo ei quod invenit denarios in tecturam domus sue et cepit ab eo xxs injuste. Idem Osbertus occasionavit Ricardum Fabrum et Ringeldum inponendo eis quod furtum fecerunt et cepit ab eis xs injuste. Idem Osbertus occasionavit Ricardum de Hengselle inponendo ei quod verbavit Thomam Sutorem contra pacem et cepit ab eo injuste 1 marcam. Idem Osbertus occasionavit Johannem filium Rogeri de Wesile inponendo ei quod fecit furtum de gallinis et cepit ab eo injuste vs. Idem Osbertus occasionavit Alanum de Bosco inponendo ei quod potuit attachiare quendam felonem et noluit et cepit ab eo injuste ijs. Idem Osbertus occasionavit Johannem le Hore inponendo ei quod recettavit quendam hutlagarium et cepit ab eo injuste ijs. Idem Osbertus occasionavit Mabillam de Bromlygh' inponendo ei quod recettavit quendam felonem et cepit ab ea iiijs injuste. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Bech cepit iniuste de Roberto de Kyngeswod 1 marcam inponendo ei quod fuit in debito Iudaismo et non fuit. Item Robertus cepit eodem modo iniuste de Willelmo Poynot 1 marcam. Item dicunt quod Stephano de Tenet et Thomas de Bere ceperunt super pasturam Roberti de Kyngeswod octo boves et iiiij jumenta et unum pullanum que averia fuerunt domini Ricardi de Hores in dampnum eiusdem Ricardi viij libras vjs viijd quod non recuperavit dicta averia. Item dicunt quod collectores vicesime domini regis in hoc hundredo (ceperunt) ultra certum numerum denariorum xxs et quod Wydo de Nortun quondam ballivus de Longebrygg cepit de Stephano Pund dimidiam marcam quem non aquietavit ad scaccariam. Idem Wydo cepit de Daniele Sprot dimidiam marcam eodem modo. Item dicunt quod Benedictus de Cilworton quondam ballivus eiusdem hundredri cepit de Galfrido et Johanne Pynot eodem modo xs et hoc tempore regis Henrici quos non aquietavit. Item dicunt quod Yvo de Merdenne ballivus hundredri de Longebrigg inprisonavit quendam Alanum le Pak iniuste sed quo modo nec qualiter ipsum delibaret nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit omnia maneria episcopatus [sic] Cant' post mortem Bonefacii archiepiscopi et ea tenuit in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidiam. Item dicunt quod M. de Essedeford que tenuit de rege in capite maritavit se Rogerum de Rolling sine licentia domini

Then they say that Osbert of Leeds, the bailiff of Longbridge, prosecuted Thomas de Letherst accusing him of finding money in the roof of his house and he took 20s. from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged Richard the smith and the under-bailiff accusing them of committing theft and he took 10s. from them unjustly. The same Osbert charged Richard de Hengselle accusing him that he insulted Thomas the tailor in a way to disturb the peace and he took 1 mark from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged John the son of Roger de Wesile accusing him of stealing hens and he took 5s. from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged Alan de Bosco accusing him that he had been unwilling to arrest a certain felon when he was able to do so and he unjustly took 2s. from him. The same Osbert charged John le Hore accusing him of sheltering a certain outlaw and he took 2s. from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged Mabel of Bromley accusing her of sheltering a certain felon and he took 4s. from her unjustly. Then Robert de Bech took 1 mark from Robert of Kingswood unjustly, accusing him of being in debt to the Jews and he was not. Then Robert in the same way unjustly took 1 mark from William Poynot. Then they say that Stephen of Thanet and Thomas de Bere took eight oxen and 4 mares and 1 colt which were on Robert de Kingswood's pasture and which were the draught animals of the lord Richard de Hores, with a loss of £8 6s. 8d. to the said Richard because he has not recovered the draught animals. Then they say that the collectors of the lord king's tax of one-twentieth [took] 20s. more than the assessed amount of money in this hundred and that Guy of Norton, formerly a bailiff of Longbridge took half a mark from Stephen Pund whom he has not acquitted at the Exchequer. Then the same Guy took half a mark from Daniel Sprot in the same way. Then they say that Benedict of Cilworton, formerly a bailiff of the same hundred, took 10s. from Geoffrey and John Pynot whom he has not acquitted and this was during King Henry's time. Then they say that Ivo of Marden, bailiff of Longbridge hundred, unjustly imprisoned a certain Alan le Pak, but they do not know in what way nor how he delivered him.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took possession of all the manors of the archbishopric of Canterbury after Archbishop Boniface's death and held them in the lord king's hands for 2½ years. Then they say that M. de Essedeford who held of the king in chief married Roger de Rolling without the lord king's

regis. Item dicunt quod quidem Johannes de Bovintun de parochia de Godwynestun seysivit manerium de Meresham post mortem Bonifacii archiepiscopi Cant' et illud tenuit pro octo dies et cepit de tenentibus de Meresham pro recognitione iiiijs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochulle duxit lanam ad partes transmarinas sed quot saccos nec quo nec per quos portus nesciunt.

### **Hundredun de Kaleshulle**

Dicunt jurati quod Middeltun et hundredum de Merdenn sunt de dominico domini regis et nunc ea habent dominus Johannes de Burg' ad terminum vite sue per dominum regem et quod manerium de Ospring solebat esse in manu regum predecessorum regis quod quidam manerium est nunc in manu domine regine matris regis nunc quo warento neciunt. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Kalehull est pertinens ad ecclesiam Christi Cant sed est ibi quedam borgha infra dictum hundredum que est de baronia unde quedam pars tenetur de abbate Sancti Augustini et quedam de domino de Chileham quedam de domini Eudone de Sillingheld et quedam de abbate de Bello et ministri archiepiscopi non permittunt ballivos domini regis ministrare in baronia domini regis et archiepiscopus appropriavit sibi quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus capit summonitionem scaccarii et catalla felonum ubi ballivi domini regis capere deberent sic Westkyngeswod, Gorsparruk, Mardenn in Smardenn, Roting, Wysparrok, Estkyngeswod, Snoddenn, Everyngekere in hundredo de Kalehulle nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alia huius que ad coronam pertinent nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod ballivi archiepiscopi Cant' et prioris ecclesie Christi Cant nec servant nec sustinent assisam panis et cervisie sed capiunt denarios pro assisis factis et iudicium non faciunt ad dampnum patrie xLs per annum et hoc xxti annis elapsis. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet liberas chacias et warennam quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Hevre tunc temporis vicecomes et Henricus de Ledes subvicecomes inprisonaverunt Radulfum de Pynynton pro diffamacione mortis Thome de Rotyng unde dictus Radulfus perquisivit

licence. Then they say that a certain John de Bovintun of Goodnestone parish took possession of Mersham manor after the death of Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury and held that for eight days and he took 4s. from the tenants of Mersham for acknowledgment of lordship. Then they say that William de Brochulle sent wool to places overseas but they do not know how many sacks, nor to whom, nor through which ports.

### **Calehill Hundred**

The jury say that Middleton and the hundred of Marden are of the lord king's demesne and now Sir John de Burgh holds them for the term of his life of the lord king and that Ospringe manor used to be in the hand of kings, the predecessors of the king, which manor is now in the hand of the lady queen the present king's mother, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Calehill hundred pertains to Christchurch Canterbury but there is a certain tithing within the said hundred which is of the barony, thence a part is held of the abbot of St Augustine's and a part of the lord of Chilham, a part of Sir Eudo de Sillingheld and a part of the abbot of Battle and the archbishop's ministers do not permit the lord king's bailiffs to officiate in the lord king's barony and the archbishop has appropriated this for himself, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop takes the summons of the Exchequer and the chatalls of felons where the lord king's bailiffs ought to take these, thus in *West Kingswood*, *Gorsparruk*, *Marden* in Smarden, *Rooting* [Pluckley par.], *Wysparrok*, *East Kingswood*, *Snodden*, *Evering Acre* [Pluckley par.] in Calehill hundred, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has the gallows and the assize of bread and ale and other pleas of this nature which pertain to the crown, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury's bailiffs and those of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury neither observe nor hold the assize of bread and ale but keep the money for taking the assizes and justice is not done, with loss of 40s. each year to the country and this since 20 years have passed. Then they say that the archbishop has free chaces and warren, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Sir William of Hever, when he was sheriff, and Henry de Leeds, the sub-sheriff,

habere breve domini regis de odio et atria et per inquisitionem captam et ad curiam domini regis returnatam idem Radulfus habuit aliud breve ut eum deliberaret usque ad proximum adventum justiciariorum Itinerancium sed noluerunt eum deliberare per preceptum domini regis quousque dedisset eisdem vicecomitibus ij marcas et dimidiam in prisona ante deliberacionem et preter hoc dictus Henricus vicecomes cepit carucam dicti Radulfi invitam dum fuit in prisona et tunc ea arare fecit per xv dies unde averia predicta deteriorabantur ad dampnum xxxtas. et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Henricus filius Burge Attewater aresttatus fuit de fractione domus Wydonis Herebad et quod filiam eiusdem Wydonis depredasse debuit in eadem domo unde dominus Willelmus de Hevre tunc vicecomes noluit pati ut aliquis ipsam attachiatus infra libertatem nec extra sed ipsam duxit a patria quo placuit. Item Willelmus Hogheman et Johannes Moys interfecerunt duos homines et Henricus Malemeyns dum vicecomes sustinuit ipsos Willelmum et Johannem et ubi sunt nunc nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Robertus le Hunte sumonitor archiepiscopi Cant' cepit de Elya Atter Wyldered pro removenda assisa viijd. et de Thoma de Hylgardenn pro eodem xijd et de Waltero Attebure vjd pro eodem et de Roberto de Stonford vjd pro eodem et de Ada Nyweman vjd pro eodem et de Wulford ate Heghelond iijjd pro eodem. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupesdon Hamo de la Forstall et Johannes Heringod ceperunt de Waltero de Eversle per Comitem Glovernie ut dicebatur xvj marcas in denariis et mobilibus quod idem Walterus fuit apud Tunebrigg per Johannem de la Haye. Item dicunt quod Robertus le Hunte recepit in hoc anno libertatem archiepiscopatus Cant' quam habet in vij hundredis ad firmam pro xLs ubi numquam ad firmam tradi solebat ad dampnum patrie per predictos xLs et amplius. Item dicunt quod Johannes Baldefert ballivus de Cerryng per escaetorem vacante sede archiepiscopatus Cant' cepit de Waltero Chastelun iijs per quandam purpresuram emendam quam idem Walterus fecerat. Item dicunt quod idem Johannes Baldefert distrinxit Johannem de Eversle ut esset borgesaldre sine electione borghe sue et sic cepit ab eodem Johanne 1 marcam. Idem Johannes Baldefert eligere fecit plures de tenentibus de Cerryng ut essent prepositi et huius occasione cepit de Willelmo Attedunt xvs. et de Johanne de Wyneston xxijs pro

imprisoned Ralf de Pynynton accusing him of Thomas de Rotyng's death, thence the said Ralph sought to obtain the lord king's writ *de odio et atria* and by an inquisition taken and returned to the lord king's court the same Ralph had another writ which delivered him at the next coming of the eyre justices, but they were unwilling to deliver him at the king's order until he had given the same sheriffs 2½ marks while in prison, before he was released and in addition to this the said Henry the sheriff took the said Ralph's plough without permission while he was in prison and then used it to plough for 15 days, thence the condition of the aforesaid draught animals deteriorated causing a loss of 30s. and more.

Then they say that Henry, son of Burge Atwater, was arrested for breaking Guy Herebad's house and that the same Guy's daughter ought to have been seized in the same house, thence Sir William of Hever, then the sheriff, was unwilling to allow anyone to arrest her within the liberty or without, but took her before a jury which let her go. Then William Hogheman and John Moys killed two men and Henry Malemeyns while he was sheriff supported William and John and they do not know where these men are now. Then they say that Robert le Hunte, the archbishop of Canterbury's summoner, took 8d. from Elias Atter Wyldered for removing him from the assise, 12d. from Thomas de Hylgardenn for the same reason, 6d. from Walter Attebure for the same reason, 6d. from Robert de Stonford for the same reason, 6d. from Adam Newman for the same reason and 4d. from Wulford ate Heghelond for the same reason. Then they say that William de Stupesdon, Hamo de la Forstall and John Heringod took 16 marks in money and goods from Walter de Eversle through the earl of Gloucester, as he said, because the same Walter had been at Tonbridge by John de la Haye's order. Then they say that in this year Robert le Hunte received the liberty of the archbishop of Canterbury, which he has in the 7 hundreds at farm for 40s. whereas this liberty never used to be demised at farm, with loss to the country of the aforesaid 40s. and more. Then they say that when the see of Canterbury archbishopric was vacant, John Baldefert, the bailiff of Charing, took 4s. from Walter Chastelun through the escheator as a fine for a certain encroachment which the same Walter had made. Then they say that the same John Baldefert made distraint upon John de Eversle as he had been a headborough without election of his tithing and thus he took 1 mark from the same John. The same John Baldefert made an

eodem et de Henrico de Derheye unam vaccam precii vjs pro eodem. Idem Johannes Baldefert inposuit Gileberto de Stapelyg' qui fidei est quod furtum fecit de v garbas avene in campo domini Willelmi de Jusne et propter hoc ipsum attachiavit quousque finivit Xs. Idem Johannes summonivit xij homines ad quondam extentam faciendam et quod omnes non venerunt cepit de quolibet eorum xijd tam de presentibus quam de absentibus.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemeins et dominus Fulco Peyferer collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundredo xLs ultra certum numerum pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod quidam de servientibus Magistri Ricardi de Clifford escaetoris domini regis vacante sede archiepiscopatus Cant' venerunt ad manerium prioris et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant' apud Westwell et manibus injecerunt in dominum Johannem monachum de Bello custodem eiusdem manerii et ipsum monachum et plures de servientibus dicti prioris verbaverunt et vulneraverunt quod voluerunt eis deliberari introitum parci et postea fregerunt portas eiusdem parci et ceperunt et asportaverunt xvj feras contra voluntatem dicti prioris et conventus. Idem Ricardus de Clifford cepit de bosco manerii de Cerring de vasto X libras. Idem Ricardus cepit de Willelmo de Edesle preposito de Cerryng Cs quos in compoto suo allocare noluit. Idem Ricardus cepit de tenentibus de Cerryng in primo adventu suo X marcas et Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus cuiusdam Magistri Ricardi 1 marcam contra voluntatem ipsorum tenencium et idem Magister Hugo inprisonavit Willelmum de Edesle prepositum de Cerryng per unam tybiam in coppis quousque finivit Cs et dedit unam vaccam et unam juvencellam precii 1 marcam et idem Magister Hugo fecit ipsum Willelmum assidare quod nullum narraret infra duos annos proximo sequentes. Item predictus Magister Ricardus cepit a tenentibus de Cerryng Cs eo quod noluerunt recipere terram eiusdem manerii extentatam ad voluntatem suam et predicti tenentes non poterant pro eo eandem terram integere sicut extentata fuit. Item dicunt quod dictus Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit manerium de Cerryng et illud tenuit per ij annos et xiij septimanas et valet manerium per annum Lx libras et amplius.

election of many of the tenants of Charing in order that they might be reeves and on this occasion he took 15s. from William Attedunt, 22s. from John de Wyneston for the same reason and one cow price 6s. from Henry de Derheye for the same reason. The same John Baldefert accused Gilbert de Stapelyg who was a law-abiding man that he had stolen 5 sheaves of oats in Sir William de Jusne's field and because of this he arrested him until he paid 10s. fine. The same John summoned 12 men to make a certain extent and because all of them did not come, he took 12d. from each of them, both from those present as well as from those absent.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemeins and the lord Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 40s. by weight more than the assessed amount from the said hundred.

Then they say that while the archbishopric of Canterbury was vacant, certain of the officials of Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, came to the manor of the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury at Westwell and they struck Sir John of Battle, a monk and the custodian of the same manor, and they insulted and injured the same monk and many of the said prior's officials, because they wished the entry of the park to be delivered to them and aforewards they broke the same park gates and captured and carried away 16 deer contrary to the wishes of the said prior and convent. The same Richard de Clifford took wood from Charing manor causing waste of £10. The same Richard took 100s. which he was unwilling to allow for in his account, from William de Edesle, the reeve of Charing. The same Richard took 10 marks from the tenants of Charing at his first coming and Master Hugh de Thornham, Richard's clerk, 1 mark against the tenants' will and the same Master Hugh imprisoned the reeve of Charing, William de Edesle, in the stocks by one leg until he had paid 100s. fine. And he gave him one cow and one heifer price 1 mark and the same Master Hugh made William undertake that he would relate nothing of this for the next two years following. Then the aforesaid Master Richard took 100s. from the tenants of Charing because they did not wish to receive the land of the same manor which had been surveyed at his wish and the aforesaid tenants are not able to integrate the same land in the way in which it had been surveyed. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took possession of the manor of Charing and held that for two years and 13 weeks and the manor is

### **Hundred de Cherst**

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum hoc valet ixs Xd. ab antiquo et turnum vicecomitis est vjs de novo levatum in tempore Johannis de Wattun et quod archiepiscopus Cant' recipit medietatem hundredi et abbas de Bello decimam partem subtrahit post ultimum Iter justiciarorum. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum et placita de namio vetito a quo tempore ignorant sed dicunt quod idem archiepiscopus et abbas de Bello habent libertates predecessorum domini regis et quod dominus de Essedesford habet warennam nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod quedam felona fuit in prisiona prioris ecclesie Christ Cant apud Cherst et evasit per Willelmum le Meystere postea tenentes dicte curie fuerint distrincti per Johannem de Aliburge donec soluerunt Cs. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopatu vacante venit quidam minister coronatoris et voluit habere promissum de tenentibus prioris et prior prerexit ad curiam domini regis et perquisivit breve quod tenentes essent in pace et interim collegerunt xLs et prior jussit redidi tenentibus. Item dominus Johannes de Bello monachus ecclesie Christi Cant' cepit dictos xLs vi et retinuit. Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes cepit vjd de Thoma de Northbrok ut removeretur a quadam assisa et quod Thomas de Laveye vicecomes Kancie cepit de dimidia parte hundredi vjs marcas de quodam amerciamento coram justiciariis ubi debuit cepisse xLs. et de alio Itinere cepit ij marcas ubi debuit cepisse 1 marcam. Idem cepit iiijs de baronia hundredi et inposuit eis quod fuerunt summoniti ad turnum et non fuerunt. Item dicunt quod Thomas Scissor de Cherst fuit attachiatus in hundredo de Wy pro uno equo et aquietatus fuit per dictum hundredum et cum esset eundo versus domum venit Willelmus de Burne clericus prioris Cant' et cepit ipsum Thomam et misit ad prisonam prioris Christi Cant' et Willelmus de Haute et Willelmus le Cam' [ ] prerexerunt propter ipsum et sine judicio deliberatus fuit et dedit dicto Willelmo de Haute xLs et unam acram prati precii xxs.

Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeyns collectores vicesime ceperunt xjs iiijd pro

worth £60 and more each year.

### **Hundred of Chart**

The jury say that the hundred is worth 9s. 10d. from ancient times and the sheriff's tourn is 6s., newly levied in John de Wattun's time and that the archbishop of Canterbury receives a moiety of the hundred and the abbot of Battle has withdrawn a tenth part after the last eyre of the justices. Then they say that the archbishop has return (of writs) and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, from what time they do not know and the abbot of Battle has the liberties of the lord king's predecessors and that the lord of Ashford has warren, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that a certain felon who was in the prison of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury at Chart escaped with William le Meystere's assistance; the tenants of the said court were afterwards distrained by John de Aliburge until they paid 100s. Then they say that while the archbishopric was vacant, a certain minister of the coroner came and wanted to have an aid from the prior's tenants and the prior made presentation at the lord king's court and procured a writ that the tenants might be left in peace and meanwhile they collected 40s. and the prior ordered this to be returned to the tenants. Then Sir John of Battle, monk of Christchurch Canterbury, forcibly took the said 40s. and kept it. Then they say that Osbert of Leeds took 6d. from Thomas of Northbrook that he might be withdrawn from a certain assize and that Thomas de Laveye, sheriff of Kent, took 6 marks from a half part of the hundred for a certain amercement made before the justices, whereas he ought to have taken 40s. and at another eyre he took 2 marks when he ought to have taken 1 mark. Then he took 4s. from the barony of the hundred and accused the men that they had been summoned to a tourn and they had not been. Then they say that Thomas Scissor of Chart was arrested in Wye hundred for [the theft of] one horse and he was acquitted by the said hundred. When he was returning home William de Burne, one of the prior of Canterbury's clerks, came and seized Thomas and sent him to the prison of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and William de Haute and William le Cam [ ] came and pleaded on his behalf and he was released without a trial and he gave William de Haute 40s. and one acre of meadow, price 20s. Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeyns the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth,

pondere ultra certum numerum.

Item dicunt quod quidam felo captus fuit et ductus ad castrum Cant' et habuit iudicium suum et postea Philippus de Delham ballivus vicecomitis cepit de X hominibus predicti hundredi xxxiij s iiijd et de Thoma de Northbrok xijd inponendo eis iniuste quod perexerunt domum sine licencia et de borgha dicti feloni inponendo eis quod scierunt latrocinium suum quod fuit falsum. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Laveye cepit iij libras pro quodam amerciamiento coram justiciariis et non debuit cepisse plus quam xLs et Gwido de Nortun eius minister cepit de Johanne de Rapetun et Fulcone Bulard qui fuerunt pleggia Roberti Yrlonde qui plene aquietavit eos xijs et de Moyse de Hellewode xLs inponendo ei quod mutavit semitam unde totum hundredum ipsum aquietavit. Idem cepit de Thoma de Pote dimidiam marcam quod noluit hospitare dictum Gwydonem cum quatuor equis et leporariis suis et pro durata sua xx homines vel plures vendiderunt omnia que habuerunt et abierunt. Item dicunt quod Benedictus de Ospring fuit minister sub Henrico de Burne et cepit de tota deceysenteia xLs injuste postquam fuit acquietatus per propriam et Thomas Man de Cant' cepit ab ipso xxs et inposuit quod sciunt furtum cuiusdam feloni unde aquietatus fuit per propriam. Item Thomas Bedellus minister eiusdem Henrici cepit xLs de Thomas Pistore inponens ei quod fuit pleggium Yvonis Bedelli unde idem Yvo solvit plenum. Idem Thomas venit ad domum Fulconis Bulard et quod non dederit ei potum cepit ab eo ijs vjd. Idem Thomas cepit de Moyse de Hellewode Xs injuste pro quadam via et de Willelmo de Herst et Johanne de Rapetun xvjd quare noluerunt dare ei pro voluntate sua [ ] Roberto le Neyd cepit ijs pro eodem. Item quidam occisus fuit in domo Galfrido de la Brok et dictus Thomas qui non fuit coronator summonivit ij hundreda ad inquisitionem [faciendam et] cepit xLs et amplius sic de hoc hundredo et Langebrigg'. Item dicunt quod Humfridus de Luvedun, Johannes filius eius Robertus le Nerd solverunt [ ] antecessors eorum fuerunt amerciati coram justiciariis Lx annis alapsis et nesciunt quid faciunt de dictis denariis nec quo warento recepti fuerunt [ ? et dicunt quod ] de Swyneford quod male fecerunt unam foveam unde voluerunt eos aquietasse et cepit ab eis iniuste ijs

took 11s. 4d. by weight more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that a certain felon was captured and taken to Canterbury castle and had his trial and afterwards Philip de Delham, the sheriff's bailiff, took 33s. 4d. from 10 men of the aforesaid hundred and 12d. unjustly from Thomas of Northbrook accusing them of sending him home without licence and he accused the said felon's tithing that they knew of his theft, but this was false. Then they say that Thomas de Laveye took £4 for a certain amercement before the justices and he ought not to have taken more than 40s. and Guy of Norton his minister took 12s. from John de Rapetun and Fulk Bulard who were the sureties of Robert Yrlonde, who had fully acquitted them and 40s. from Moses de Hellewode accusing him of changing a footway; the whole hundred acquitted him of this. The same man took half a mark from Thomas de Pote because he did not wish to entertain the same Guy with his four horses and his greyhounds and as a result of his hardship 20 men and more sold all that they possessed and went away. Then they say that Benedict of Ospringe who was a minister under Henry of Bourne, took 40s. unjustly from the whole tithing after it had been acquitted by a jury and Thomas Man of Canterbury took 20s. from the same tithing and accused the men of knowing about a theft made by a certain felon; the tithing had been acquitted of this before a jury. Then Thomas the beadle, the same Henry's minister, took 40s. from Thomas the baker accusing him of being Ivo the beadle's surety, thence the same Ivo paid in full. The same Thomas came to Fulk Bulard's house and he took 2s. 6d. from him because he, Thomas, was unwilling to give him a drink. The same Thomas took 10s. unjustly from Moses de Hellewode for a certain road and 16d. from William de Herst and John de Rapetun because they were unwilling to give him at his wish [ and ] he took 2s. from Robert le Neyd for the same reason. Then a certain man was killed in Geoffrey de la Brok's house and the said Thomas, who was not the coroner, summoned the two hundreds to hold an inquest and he took 40s. and more thus from this hundred and from Longbridge. Then they say that Humphrey de Luvedun, John his son, Robert le Nerd have paid [ ] their ancestors had been amerced before the justices 60 years ago and they do not know what they do about the said pence nor by what warrant these were received. [?and they say that and ] de Swyneford because they made one embankment badly, thence they wished to

[Item dicunt quod Ricardus] de Clifford eschaetor cepit de Thoma de Parherste xLs ad removendum eum de prisona sine iudicio.

m.5 dorso **Hundredum de Blakeburn**

Dicunt jurati quod quidam Thomas filii Radulphi de Northmanvyle tenet quoddam manerium suum apud Kenardinton cum Cokryde de domino rege in capite pro uno feodo militis et debet ad wardam castris Dovor' per annum Xs. et sectam curiam de Radlevet et valet per annum xx libras et quod quidam Thomas filius Ricardi de Tunlonde tenet de domino rege in capite la Tunlonde pro dimidia feodi militis et debet per annum ad wardam dicti castris Vs. et sectam curie de Radlevet et valet per annum xxxijs. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Blakeburn debet per annum ad firmam vicecomitis xvjd et valet per annum cum assisa panis et cervisie et aliis perquisites xLs. aliquando magis aliquando minus quod quidam hundredum est in manu regis unacum aliis vj hundredis et dimidia que quondam Willelmus de Kasingham habuit ad feodum firmam pro Cs et post decessum dicti Willelmi Reginaldus de Cobbeham tunc vicecomes illa tradidit ad firmam pro X libris. Item post bellum de Evesham Rogerus de Leyburn habuit per dominum regem Henricus dicta hundreda pro Cs. et post mortem ipsius Rogeri Stephanus de Penesherst habuit per dictum dominum regem predicta vj hundreda et dimidiam et ad hoc habet et illa tradidit ad firmam pro X libris sic responsis ad castrum Dovor' que solebant pertinere ad vicecomitem.

Item dicunt quod tenentes domini archiepiscopi Cant' et prioris Christi Cant' subtraxerunt se de eadem secta et de eodem turno sic iijd per annum per iiij annos elapsos et de secta hundredi domini R. de Blakeburn quo warento nesciunt ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd et amplius. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus et abbas de Bello habent returnum et alias libertates quo warento nesciunt et quod archiepiscopus et sui ballivi vendunt wardas gavelikendorum de tenentibus suis injuste a quo tempore ignorant.

Item dicunt quod quidam Johannes de Herst cepit in eodem hundredo de Blakeburne pro recognicione removendi de pluribus iiijis anno regni regis Henrici

acquit them of this charge and he took 3s. from them unjustly.

[Then they say that Richard] de Clifford, the escheator, took 40s. from Thomas de Parherste for releasing him from prison without trial.

m. 5 dorso **Hundred of Blackborne**

The jury say that a certain Thomas son of Ralph de Northmanvyle holds his manor at Kenardington with *Cokryde* of the lord king in chief for one knight's fee and he owes guard at Dover castle at 10s. each year and suit of court at *Radlevet* which is worth £20 each year and that a certain Thomas son of Richard de Tunlonde holds Townland [Woodchurch par.], of the lord king in chief for half a knight's fee and he owes guard at the said castle at 5s. each year and suit of court at *Radlevet* and it is worth 32s. each year. Then they say that Blackborne hundred owes 16d. each year for the sheriff's farm and it is worth 40s. each year with the assize of bread and ale and other perquisites, sometimes more, sometimes less. This particular hundred is in the lord king's hand together with the other 6½ half hundreds which formerly William de Kasingham held at fee farm for 100s. and after the said William's decease, Reginald of Cobham, then the sheriff, demised those at farm for £10. Then after the battle of Evesham [1265] Roger de Leyburn held the said hundreds from the lord King Henry for 100s. and after that Roger's death Stephen of Peneshurst held the the aforesaid 6½ hundreds from the said lord king and still holds these and he has demised those at farm for £10, thus paying them at Dover castle which used to pertain to the sheriff.

Then they say that the tenants of the lord archbishop of Canterbury and of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury have withdrawn themselves from the same suit and from the same tourn, thus 3d. each year for the last 4 years and from suit of the hundred of the lord R. of Blackborne, by what warrant they do not know, with loss of 12d. and more each year to the lord king. Then they say that the archbishop and the abbot of Battle have return (of writs) and other liberties, by what warrant they do not know and that the archbishop and his bailiffs unjustly sell wardships of *gavelkind* from his tenants, from what time they are ignorant. Then they say that a certain John de Herst in the 56th year of King Henry's reign [October 1271-1272] took 4s. for recognition of the removal of the same hundred

Lvj. Item dicunt quod lesti in comitatu tradidi sunt ad majorem firmam quam quondam solebant ad magnum dampnum tocius baronie. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Wy ballivus vij hundredorum ligare fecit quemdam Godefridum filium Cristine de Belerygge et Jordanum filium dicte Cristine donec dicti Godefridus et Cristina fecerunt eo finem C solidorum et solverunt xLs. Item idem Hugo et Laurencius de Savetuntewell venerunt in hundredum de Blakburn vi et iniuste et plures graviter distrinxerunt ad ducendam quandam domum de Chelmintun apud Bedlesmere cum karris et carectis contra voluntatem eorum. Idem Hugo distringere fecit per servientem suum quendam Johannem de Berburdun per dimidiam marcam de summonitione scaccarii ut dixit et de ipso cepit ijs ad relaxandam. Item dicunt quod in Itinere Nicholai de Turri hundredum de Blakeburn' amerciatum fuit in Xs unde Thomas de la Weye tunc vicecomes distrinxit baroniam eiusdem hundredi et cepit Vs. Item venit Thomas Sporun clericus et per summonitionem scaccarii fecit distringere et cepit de baronia pro eodem Vs. Item venit Willelmus de Evere vicecomes et levare fecit de eadem baronia pro eodem Vs. Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeyns collectores vicesime domini regis ceperunt ultra certum numerum denariorum in eodem hundredo pro pondere ij marcas.

Item dicunt quod tempore domini regis Henrici Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor et ministri sui ceperunt de curia de Aldintun pro inquisitione habenda inter Augustinum de Moresden et alios tenentes archiepiscopi iniuste xx marcas. Idem Ricardus ceperunt de tenentibus dicte curie ut dimitteret eos in pace de extenta manerii injuste X libras. Idem Ricardus cepit a dicta curia in primo adventu suo injuste xxvij libras.

Item dicunt quod Alfredus de Dene tunc escaetor cepit manerium de Kenardiston in manu domini regis xv annis elapsis unde dominus rex Henricus vendidit wardam et maritagium Galiene de Northmanvill incontinenti pro ccc marcas quas solvit. Item Laurencius de Sokenesse seisivit dimidiam feodi de Tunlonde in manu domini regis X annis elapsis unde dominus rex incontinenti dedit wardam et maritagium Magistro Henrico de Lacy coco suo.

**Hundredum de Badekele**

of Blackborne from many things. Then they say that the lathes in the county have been demised at a higher farm than they used to be, with great loss to the whole barony. Then they say that Hugh of Wye, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds, had a certain Godfrey son of Christine de Belerygge and Jordan the said Christine's son tied up until the said Godfrey and Christine had made a fine of 100s. to him and they paid 40s. Then the same Hugh and Laurence de Savetuntewell came into Blackborne hundred by force and unjustly made severe distraint upon many people, thus coming to certain house of *Chelmintun* at Badlesmere with hand-barrows and carts against the inhabitants' will. The same Hugh made distraint through a certain John de Berburdun, his serjeant, for half a mark for Exchequer summons, as he said, and he took 2s. from him to remit this. Then they say that in the eyre of Nicholas de Turri Blackborne hundred was amerced at 10s., thence Thomas de la Weye, then the sheriff, made distraint upon the barony of the same hundred and took 5s. Then Thomas de Sporun, a clerk, came and made distraint for Exchequer summons and took 5s. from the barony for the same reason. Then William of Hever, the sheriff came and made a levy of 5s. from the same barony for the same purpose. Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeyns, the collectors of the lord king's tax of one-twentieth, took 2 marks by weight more than the assessed amount of pence in the same hundred.

Then they say that in the lord King Henry's time Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and his ministers unjustly took 20 marks from Aldington court for holding an inquisition between Augustine de Moresden and other of the archbishop's tenants. The same Richard unjustly took £10 from the tenants of the said court so that he would not harass them about the extent of the manor. The same Richard unjustly took £28 from the said court at the time of his first coming.

Then they say that Alfred de Dene, then the escheator, took Kenardington manor into the lord king's hands 15 years ago, whence the lord King Henry immediately sold the wardship and marriage to Galiene de Northmanvill for 300 marks which she paid. Then Lawrence de Sokenesse took half the fee of Townland into the lord king's hands 10 years ago, whence the lord king immediately gave the wardship and marriage to Master Henry de Lacy his cook.

**Hundred of Barkley**



Dicunt jurati quod Willelmus de Casinghame habuit vij hundreda tempore suo reddendo vicecomiti Kancie Cs per annum et postea venit Reginaldus de Cobbeham et tradidit predictum hundredum ad firmam Wydonis de Nortun reddendo X llibras per annum et nunc est appropriatum castro Dovor nesciunt quo warento per dominum Stephanum de Penecestr'.

Item dicunt quod tenentes abbatis de Bello subtraxerunt se precepto domini sui predicti de sectis consuetudinibus et serviciis comitatus et hundredi per iiij annos ad dampnum domini regis quolibet anno Vs. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita namio vetito et alia et eciam prior Christi Cant' hoc idem habet per archiepiscopum et idem archiepiscopus subtraxit sectam leet et turnum vicecomitis sic xLd per annum ad dampnum regis et hoc per xvj annos nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod libertates abbatis de Bello inpedit communem justiciam ex quo nullam faciunt sectam ad regem nec ad hundredum que semper solebant facere exceptis iiij annis elapsis. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Herst cepit de Jacobo Becketelye xviiij d injuste pro summonitione scaccarii et de Willelmo Bydenden xijd et de Waltero de Byssupesden vjd et de Simone de Watwalden vjd pro summonitione predicta. Item dicunt quod dominus Stephanus de Penescet' tradidit predicta hundreda Hugone de Wy ad firmam qui gravavit iniuste Robertum de Hurchinden per procuramentum suum ad faciendam appellacionem super Robertum de Hurchinden fidelem de uno porco quem appellacionem fecit Petrus de Kelche in predicto hundredo et comitatu unde dictus Robertus per sacramentum xxxij virorum aquietatus fuit de porco et aliis in comitatu unde idem Robertus deterioratus est occasione predicta ad valorem X marcas. Item dicunt quod Walterus de Chilmentum cepit iniuste de Alicia de Bresinden xvjs cause quod predictus Walterus inposuit eidem Alicie quod ipsa fecit destruccionem in bosco pueri sui qui fuit in custodia sua et quod idem Walterus cepit injuste et sine iudicio de Radulfo Waltero et Johanne de Roklinden xxs quod deberet dixisse quod predicti Radulfi Waltero et Johanne sibi retinuerunt per xv annos redditum j obolum ubi nichil debent.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford

The jury say that William de Casinghame held the 7 hundreds during his time by payment of 100s. to the sheriff of Kent each year and afterwards Reginald of Cobham came and he demised the aforesaid hundred at farm to Guy of Norton, for a payment of £10 each year and now the hundred is appropriated to Dover castle, through the lord Stephen of Penecestr', they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the abbot of Battle's tenants by their aforesaid lord's order, have withdrawn themselves from suits, customary payments and services of the county and hundred for 4 years with loss of 5s. each year to the lord king. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs and pleas of distraint upon goods and other liberties and also the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has these same through the archbishop and the same archbishop has withdrawn suit, court leet and the sheriff's tourn, thus with 40d. loss each year to the king and this for 16 years, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the abbot of Battle's liberties hinder the common justice and because of this they make no suit to the king, nor to the hundred which they always used to make, except for the last 4 years. Then they say that John de Herst unjustly took 18d. from James Becketelye for summons of the Exchequer, 12d. from William Byden, 6d. from Walter of Bishopsden and 6d. from Simon de Watwalden for the aforesaid summons. Then they say that the lord Stephen of Penecestr' demised the aforesaid hundreds at farm to Hugh of Wye, who unjustly oppressed Robert de Hurchinden at his instigation when an appeal was made about Robert as a law-abiding man, in matters concerning one pig, which appeal Peter de Kelche made in the aforesaid hundred and county, whence the said Robert was acquitted through the testimony of 32 men and others in the county about the pig, whence the same Robert lost 10 marks because of this charge. Then they say that Walter de Chilmentum unjustly took 16s. from Alice de Bresinden because the aforesaid Walter accused her of causing damage in the wood belonging to his boy who was in his custody and the same Walter unjustly and without judgement took 20s. from Ralph, Walter and John de Roklinden because he maintained that the aforesaid Ralph, Walter and John had kept for themselves 15 years rent of half a penny when they owed nothing.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, King

escaetor domini regis Henrici vendidit quandam wardam Johannis de Fyle Thome de gavilekende de tenure de Serryng vendita fuit Waltero de Fyleche pro xxx marcis per eundem Ricardum iniuste quod parentes propinquos debebunt habere de jure.

### **Hundredum de Cranebrok**

Dicunt jurati quod vij hundreda teneri solebant de domino rege in capite tempore Willelmi de Canyngham pro Cs. ad vicecomitem domini regis soluendis unde hundredum de Cranbrebrok solebat reddere de porcione sua xxvs per annum et ubi prius dicta hundreda solebant teneri ad vicecomitem ut predictum est modo tenentur de castro Dovor' pro X libris per annum unde dictum hundredum reddit per annum pro porcione sua Ls. et subtraxit se de soluccionem vicecomite facta per iij annos per dominum Stephanum de Penecestr' et tempore Rogeri de Renynden tunc ballivi. Item dicunt quod abbas de Begebemme tenet tenementum de Rodelindenn quod solebat sequi in omnibus lottis et scottis cum hundredo et subtraxit eandem sectam a tempore Nicholai de Halyng' tunc ballivi sic per xij annos ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd et nesciunt quod warento. Item abbas de Bello tenet tenementa Johannis Joymey, Simonis de Anglangle, Agnetis de Anglangle qui de eisdem tenementis solebant sequi cum hundredo in lottis et scottis et in omnibus aliis quam sectam idem abbas subtraxit per viij annos ad dampnum regis per annum xvd. Item abbas de Boxle tenet tenementum quinque tenencium de Cetthamesle qui solebant sequi in lottis et scottis et in aliis cum hundredo et idem abbas subtraxit eandem sectam per xvj anos ad dampnum regis per annum ijs sed nesciunt quo warento. Item prior de Cumbwelle subtraxit sectam de tribus tenentibus suis qui tenentes solebant sequi in lottis et scottis per tres annos ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd nesciunt quo warento.

Item abbas de Faveresham tenet tenementum quod fuit Stephani de Hokeregg quod tenementum solebat sequi omnibus cum hundredo et idem abbas subtraxit eandem sectam et lottos et scottos per xij annos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd. Item prior ecclesie Christi Cant' subtraxit sectam de tenentibus suis qui solebant quondam sequi in lottis et scottis cum hundredo et subtraxit per xL annos et amplius ad dampnum regis per annum ijs nesciunt quo

Henry's escheator, sold a certain wardship of John de Fyle Thomas of *gavelkind* of the tenure of *Serryng*; it was sold unjustly by the said Richard to Walter de Fyleche for 30 marks because the nearest kinsmen ought by right to have this wardship.

### **Hundred of Cranbrook**

The jury say that the 7 hundreds used to be held of the lord king in chief in William de Canyngham's time for 100s. payable to the lord king's sheriff, thence Cranbrook hundred used to pay 25s. each year as its portion and where at first the said hundreds used to be held under the sheriff, as is said above, they are now held of Dover castle for £10 each year, whence the said hundred returns 50s. each year as its portion and has withdrawn itself from payment made to the sheriff for 3 years, by Sir Stephen of Penecestr' and from the time of Roger de Renynden then the bailiff. They they say that the abbot of Bayham holds the tenement of *Rodelindenn* which used to do suit at hundred in all lot and scot and it has withdrawn the same suit from the time of Nicholas de Halyng then the bailiff, thus for 12 years with loss to the lord king of 12d. each year and they do not know by what warrant. Then the abbot of Battle holds the tenements of John Joymey, Simon de Anglangle and Agnes de Anglangle who, for the same tenements used to do suit at the hundred in lot and scot and in all other things; the same abbot has withdrawn this suit for 8 years with loss of 15d. each year to the king. Then the abbot of Boxley holds a tenement of five tenants of *Cetthamesle* who used to do suit at the hundred in lot and scot and other things and the same abbot has withdrawn the same suit for 16 years with loss of 2s. each year to the king, they do not know by what warrant. Then the prior of Combwell has withdrawn suit for three years from his three tenants who used to do suit and pay lot and scot, with loss of 12d. each year to the lord king, they do not know by what warrant.

Then the abbot of Faversham holds Stephen of Hucking's tenement, which used to follow in all things with the hundred and the same abbot has withdrawn the same suit and lot and scot for 12 years with loss of 6d. each year to the king.

Then the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has withdrawn the suit of his tenants who formerly were accustomed to do suit at the hundred with lot and scot and has withdrawn it for 40 years and more with loss

warento. Idem prior subtraxit sectam de iiij tenentibus suis apud le Euelle qui solebant sequi cum hundredo et subtraxit per xL annos et amplius ad dampnum regis per anum xijd. Item tenentes archiepiscopi Cant' qui sunt in eodem hundredo subtraxerunt xiiij denarios per xx annos quos denarios solebant reddere per annum ad turnum vicecomitis et prior ecclesie Christi Cant' subtraxit de tenentibus suis xiiij per annum per eundem terminum de eodem turno.

Item abbas de Boxle subtraxit per annum de tenentibus suis 1d per eundem terminum de eodem turno.

Et dominus Willelmus de Valence subtraxit de tenentibus suis per annum xjd per eundem terminum de eodem turno a tempore Willelmi de Wasingeham tunc ballivi.

Idem dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' (*obiit*) habet returnum brevium et quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant' habet extractum brevium per aarchiepiscopum. Idem prior habet assisam panis et cervisie de tenentibus suis in eodem hundredo ad dampnum regis per annum dimidiam marcam jam xL annis elapsis. Abbas de Bello habet eandem assisam de tenentibus suis ad dampnum regis per annum xvij et prior de Cumbwelle habet eandem assisam de tenentibus suis ad dampnum regis per annum vjd. Dominus Willelmus de Valence habet eandem assisam de tenentibus suis ad dampnum regis per annum ijs xxti annis elapsis nesciunt quo warrento. Predicti prior ecclesie Christi Cant' abbas de Bello prior de Cumbwell et dominus Willelmus de Valence habent eandem assisam.

Item dicunt quod prior de Cumbwelle fecit purpresturam super dennam de Creggesen per quam patria impeditur de itinere suo in yeme xij annis elapsis ad dampnum per annum vjd et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeyns et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicecesime ceperunt de eodem hundredo xxs ultra certum numerium pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Hezham ballivus vij hundredorum et constabularius castri Rofecens' inposuit Willelmo de Stonlode qui fedelis est debuit furtum fecisse de uno bovetto et ob hoc ipsum attachiavit quousque finem fecerat de xLs injuste.

Item Yvo de Merdena attachiavit dictum Willelmum quousque finierat ad opus domini Henrici Malemeyns xLs. Item dicunt quod predictus Thomas de Hezham

of 2s. each year to the king, they do not know by what warrant. The same prior has withdrawn the suit of 4 of his tenants at [Temple?] Ewell who used to do suit at the hundred and he has withdrawn this for 40 years and more with loss to the king of 12d. each year. Then the tenants of the archbishop of Canterbury who are in the same hundred have withdrawn 14d. for 20 years, which pence they used to render each year at the sheriff's tourn and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has withdrawn 14d. each year from his tenants at the end of the same turn.

Then the abbot of Boxley has withdrawn 1d. each year from his tenants at the end of the same tourn.

And Sir William de Valence has withdrawn 11d. each year from his tenants at the end of the same tourn, from the time of William de Wasingeham who was then bailiff.

The same jury say that the archbishop of Canterbury (*he has died*) has return of writs and that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has the extract of writs through the archbishop. The same prior has the assize of bread and ale for his tenants in the same hundred with loss to the king of half a mark each year for the last 40 years. The abbot of Battle has the same assize for his tenants with loss to the king of 18d. each year and the prior of Combwell has the same assize for his tenants with loss to the king of 6d. each year. Sir William de Valence has the same assize for his tenants with loss to the king of 2s. each year for the last 20 year, they do not know by what warrant. The aforesaid prior of Christchurch, the abbot of Battle, the prior of Combwell and the lord William de Valence have the same assize.

Then they say that the prior of Combwell has made an encroachment upon the den of *Creggesen* which for the last 12 years has caused a nuisance for the people of the country when travelling in winter with a loss of 6d. each year and more.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 20s by weight from the same hundred more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Thomas Hezham, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds and constable of Rochester castle, accused William de Stonlode who was a law-abiding man, that he had stolen one bullock and because of this he unjustly arrested him until he had paid a fine of 40s. Then Ivo of Marden arrested the said William until he paid a fine of 40s. for the use of Sir Henry de Malemeyns. Then they say that the

occasionavit Walterum de Hungereberte et inposuit ei concealamenti quod arestavit mulierem que male debuit recepisse dimidam busselum frumenti de filio suo et propter hoc attachiavit eundem Walterum quousque finem fecit versus dictum Thomam de V marcis et totum injuste. Item Hugo de Wy ballivus vij hundredorum inposuit Waltero le Ros qui recettavit quendam felonem et ob hoc eundem Walterum attachiavit quousque finivit 1 marcam injuste.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de la Weye quondam vicecomes cepit de hominibus hundredi de Cranebrok xxs. de summonitione scaccarii et eos non aquietavit qui quidem xx solidi ab eisdem hominibus dicti hundredi ad hoc exiguntur et tempore quo eosdem denarios dictus Thomas recepit usque nunc sic octo annis elapsis et injuste.

#### **m.6 Hundredum de Selebryhtind in lesto de Scrawynghope**

Dicunt jurati quod quarta pars unius feodi tenetur de domino rege apud Lossenham per medium sic per Radulfum de Seyntlegero. Item dicunt quod firmam vij hundredorum solvi solebat per manus vicecomitis ad scaccarium sic X libras per annum et dominu Stephanus de Penecestr' subtraxit eas ad castrum Dovor' tempore quo dominus rex Edwardus fuit ultra mare. Item quod villa de Nywindenn quondam fuit una borgha ad hundredum de Selebryhtinden et subtracta est per libertatem archiepiscopi et nunc est in manu domini Ricardi le Walays sed nesciunt quomodo.

Item dicunt quod iiij marce que solvi solent de vij hundredis de turno vicecomitis dominus Bonifacius archiepiscopus Cant' ab Itinere Gileberti de Prestune inde subtraxit ij marcas racione libertatis sue et quod abbas de Bello recepit per manus Ricardi Meridal tunc ballivi sui de Johanne de Sepesdenn qui tenuit de rege. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum placita de namio vetito wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento nec quo tempore. Item dicunt quod dominus Ricardus le Walays capit tholneum de batellariis vjd ubi capere consuevit 1d et hoc per xv annos elapsos. Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant clamat habere warennam apud Apeldr' et apud Ebbene et nesciunt a quo tempore nec per quem.

aforesaid Thomas de Hezham charged Walter de Hungereberte and accused him of making concealment because he arrested a certain woman who wrongly claimed to have received half a bushel of wheat from her son and because of this he arrested the same Walter, totally unjustly until he paid a fine to the said Thomas of 5 marks. Then Hugh of Wye, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds, accused Walter de Ros who sheltered a certain felon and because of this he arrested the same Walter unjustly until he paid a fine of 1 mark. Then they say that Thomas de la Weye, formerly the sheriff, took 20s. from the men of Cranbrook hundred for summons of the Exchequer and he did not acquit them, which particular 20s. were demanded from the men of the said hundred for this purpose and eight years have passed from the time when the said Thomas unjustly received the same money until now.

#### **m. 6 Hundred of Selbrittenden in the lathe of Scray**

The jury say that a fourth part of one fee is held of the lord king at Lossenham as mesne tenure, thus by Ralph de St Leger. Then they say that the farm of the 7 hundreds used to be paid at the Exchequer through the sheriff's hands, thus £10 each year and the lord Stephen of Penecestr' has diverted this money to Dover castle from the time when the lord King Edward was overseas. Then the vill of Newenden was formerly one tithing with Selbrittenden hundred and it was withdrawn by the archbishop's liberty and is now in Sir Richard le Walays's hand but they do not know by what means.

Then they say that the lord Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury, from the time of Gilbert de Preston's eyre, has withdrawn by reason of his liberty, 2 of the 4 marks which by custom are paid from the 7 hundreds for the sheriff's tourn and which the abbot of Battle received through the hands of his then bailiff, Richard Meridal, from John de Sepesdenn who held of the king. Then they say that the archbishop has return (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant nor from what time. Then they say that Sir Richard de Walays takes 6d. in toll for boat-hire whereas he used to take 1d. and this for the last 15 years. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have warren at Appledore and Ebony and they do not know from what

Item dicunt quod abbas Pontis Roberti tenet quarterium unius feodi tam in dominico quam in reddendo de feodo de Hepindenn et est de feodo comitis Hereford qui tenet de rege in capite. Item dicunt quod Willelmus Gnet de Newinden fecit quamdam viam extra libertatem super feodum tenementium de domino rege apud Lessenham per potestatem officii sui ad dampnum nesciunt quantum et quod dominus Henricus Malemeyns tunc vicecomes cepit injuste de Johanne de la More 1 marcam et eum inprisonavit racione cuiusdam alteris habentis nomen ipsius. Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Poyforer et dominus Henricus Malemeyns collectores vicesime receperunt de dicto hundredo iiijs pro officio suo exercendo et quod Yvo de Merdenn abjecit Chetheloce de Feryngherste a domo sua quousque finiret xLd.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford fecit magnam destruccionem tam in gravando tenentes quam in destruccione bosci in episcopatus Cant' sed quantitatem dampni ignorant. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Heyham ballivus vij hundredorum seisivit mansionem Johannis de la More injuste et ejecit eum donec finiret ijs.

### **Hundredum de Meredenn**

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Meredenn tenetur de domino rege in capite pertinens ad hundredum de Middeltun et valet redditus eiusdem hundredi per annum xiiij libras xiijs viijd obolum et respondet tam de redditibus quam de perquisites xx libras ad hundredum de Middleletun et nunc tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo de domino rege ad vitam suam. Item dicunt quod tenentes de dennis sic Folkesherte, Waudesherse, Chilindenn, Pykindenn, Hecham, Wyghetheherst qui sunt tenentes prioris ecclesie Christi Cant' solebant serv ad hundredum de Merdenn ad ij laghedays per annum et querelare et respondere de sanguine et plaga et de namio vetitio et illi qui venerunt ad etatem suam legitimam fecerunt ibi fidelitatem domino regi et se subtraxerunt de omnibus predictis serviciis per xxviiij annos a tempore Ricardi de Puns tunc ballivi quo warento nesciunt et est dampnum regis Xs per annum.

Item tenentes abbatis de Boxle sic Petthehurst, Dokeshurst, Sendenn, Suthland, Starndenn, Smoghele

time nor through whom.

Then they say that the abbot of Robertsbridge [Sussex] holds a quarter of one fee, both in demesne and paying rent from the fee of *Hepindenn* and it is of the fee of the earl of Hereford, who holds of the king in chief. Then they say that William Gnet of Newenden, by the authority of his office has made a certain road outside the liberty over the fee of the lord king's tenants at *Lessenham*, they do not know how much loss there is, and that Sir Henry Malemeyns, then the sheriff, unjustly took 1 mark from John de la More and imprisoned him because he was using another person's name. Then they say that Fulk Poyforer and Sir Henry Malemeyns, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, received 4s. more from the said hundred by exercising their office and that Ivo of Marden evicted Chetheloce de Feryngherste from her house until she paid 40d. fine.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford caused great damage both in oppressing the tenants and in destroying wood in the archbishopric of Canterbury, but they are ignorant of the amount lost. Then they say that Thomas de Heyham, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds, unjustly seized John de la More's dwelling house and evicted him until he paid a fine of 2s.

### **Hundred of Marden**

The jury say that Marden hundred is held of the lord king in chief, pertaining to Middleton hundred and the rent of the same hundred is worth £14 13s. 8½d. each year and it contributes £20 both from the rents and from the perquisites to Middleton hundred and now the lord John de Burgh holds it of the lord king in chief for his life time.

Then they say that the tenants of the dens, namely *Folkesherte*, *Waudesherse*, *Chillenden*, *Pykindenn*, *Hecham* and *Wyghetheherst* who are tenants of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury used to perform service at Marden hundred each year at 2 lawdays and to plead and to answer in pleas involving wounding and bloodshed and of wrongful distraint upon goods and the tenants who reached their full age did their fealty to the lord king and they have withdrawn themselves from all the aforesaid services for 28 years, from the time of Richard de Puns, then the bailiff, by what warrant they do not know and there is 10s. loss each year to the king

Then the abbot of Boxley's tenants at *Pettehurst*, *Dokeshurst*, *Sendenn*, *Suthland*, *Standen* and *Smugley*

se subtraxerunt de eisdem serviciis et preterea solebant habere boregessaldr' de eisdem tenentibus dicti abbatis ad respondendum et faciendum in dicto hundredo quod pertinuit et se subtraxerunt per xx annos tempore Petri Dodeman tunc ballivi quo warento nesciunt et est dampnum domini regis per annum dimidiam marcam.

Item tenentes domini Willelmi de Valence de Sutton sic Mothingby, Fokingbery, Hethehurst, Wygethenerst solebant facere feoditatem domino rege in dicto hundredo de quo subtraxerunt se per xxx annos quo warento nesciunt et est dampnum regis per annum iijs. Item dominus Willelmus de Dethling subtraxit se de secta facienda in dicto hundred bis in anno per vij annos quamquidam sectam dominus Willelmus pater eius solebant facere pro terra que fuit Ade de Petherst et est dampnum domini regis per annum ijs et similiter tenentes eiusdem Willelmi de Hundeherst subtraxerunt se de lottis et scottis hundredi predicti per iiij annos et assisam panis et cervisie ad dampnum regis per annum ijs et reddunt per annum vjs ad redditum hundredi supradicti. Item prior ecclesie Christ Cant' et abbas de Boxle placitant de namio vetito quod quidem placita dominus rex solebat habere et debet in hundredo suo de Merdenn et predicti prior et abbas appropriaverunt sibi assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento et est dampnum domini regis per annum ex parte prioris dimidiam marcam et ex parte abbatis dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Adam de Ryddenn fecit ardere xxij fageta de bosco domini regis per Amfridum de la Rogheye qui illas arbores exarsit ad cineres ad dampnum domini regis xxs. Item Petrus Dodeman fecit destruccionem in eodem bosco domini regis et presentatum fuit coram domino H. Bygod unde idem Petrus americiatus fuit coram eodem domino H ad X libras. Item dicunt quod dominus Reginaldus de Cobbeham tradidit Petro Dodeman dictum hundredum ad firmam pro xxiiij libris ubi dictum hundredum non solebat tradi nisi pro xx libris ad nocumentum patrie. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Waudeshes attachiatus fuit per Adam de Ryddenn ballivum de Merdenn qui inposuit ei feloniam et idem Johannes aquietatus fuit coram justiciariis et finem fecit cum dicto Ada xxs et

(Goudhurst par.] have withdrawn themselves from the same services and moreover they used to have headboroughs from the said abbot's same tenants and to make contribution and do the things in the said hundred which pertained and they have withdrawn themselves for 20 years, from the time when Peter Dodeman was then bailiff, they do not know by what warrant and the loss to the king is half a mark each year.

Then the tenants of William de Valence in Sutton, thus in *Mothingby, Fokingbery, Hethehurst* and *Wygthenerst* were accustomed to do fealty to the lord king in the said hundred, from whence they have withdrawn themselves for 30 years, by what warrant they do not know and there is a loss of 3s. each year to the king. Then for 7 years Sir William de Dethling has withdrawn himself from making suit twice a year in the said hundred, which suit Sir William his father used to make for the land which was of Adam de Petherst and there is a loss of 2s. each year to the king and similarly for 4 years the same William's tenants of *Hundeherst* have withdrawn themselves from lot and scot of the aforesaid hundred and from the assize of bread and ale, with a loss of 2s. each year to the king and they render 6s. each year to the rent of the abovesaid hundred. Then the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and the abbot of Boxley hear pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, which pleas the lord king used to have and ought to have in his hundred of Marden and the aforesaid prior and abbot have appropriated the assize of bread and ale for themselves, they do not know by what warrant and there is a loss of half a mark to the lord king because of the prior's appropriation and of half a mark because of the abbot's appropriation.

Then they say that Adam de Ryddenn caused 22 of the lord king's beech trees to be burnt by Amfridus de la Rogheye who reduced those trees to ashes causing a loss of 20s. to the lord king. Then Peter Dodeman caused damage in the lord king's same wood and this offence was presented before Sir H. Bygod, whence the same Peter was amerced before the same lord H. £10. Then they say that Sir Reginald of Cobham demised the said hundred at farm to Peter Dodeman for £24 causing harm to the country, because the said hundred used to be demised at only £20.

Then they say that John de Waudeshes was arrested by Adam de Ryddenn, the bailiff of Marden, who accused him of felony and the same John was acquitted before the justices and made a fine with the said Adam at

solvit.

Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeymis collectores vicesime ceperunt ultra certum numerum denariorum Lxs de hoc hundredo pro pondere.

### **Hundredum de Middiltun**

Dicunt quod manerium de Middiltun est domini regis et quod dominus Edwardus rex qui nunc est tradidit illud domino Johanni de Burgo ad vitam ipsius Johannis. Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Northwude tenet quamdam terram in Northwode de dono Ricardi regis, Stephanus pater dicti Rogeri reddit inde annuatim leprosis hospitalis Langeporte xLs per annum de dono domini regis. Item dicunt quod monachi ecclesie Christi Cant' tenent xxxta libratis in Bakeshore Leysdun et Osmundesheye de dono regis Henrici avi regis Henrici pro martirio Sancti Thome martiris. Item dicunt quod moniales de Scapeia tenent quendam boscum in Kyngesdun de dono regis Ricardi ut credunt nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet quamdam escaetam in Renham apud Chelesherste de dono Henrici regis patris regis nunc que valet per annum Cs. Idem tenet Mere et la Gare que solebant reddere per annum domino regi xxxs et amplius et nunc tenet illa pro fedo [sic] unius militis nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus filius Willelmi de Codestede tenet quamdam terram apud Codestede per serjantiam unius spervarii reddendo per annum ad scaccarium domini regis que solebat reddere per annum ad manerium de Middeltun xxs. qui condonantur per Johannem regem. Item dicunt quod Thomas Abelyn tenet unum feodum in capite de domino rege in Moriston, Elmele et Milstede. Item dicunt quod dominus Bartholomeus de Munston tenet unum feodum apud Munston de domino Roberto filio Johanne et quod dominus Stephenus de Pencestr' tenet unum feodum apud Tonstall de eodem rege et quod dominus Radulfus filius Bernardi tenet unum feodum in Tang' et eodem domino Roberto et idem dominus Robertus aquietat illos versus castrum Dovor per wardam qualiter vel per quos vel a quo tempore fuerunt alienati ignorant.

Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Poyforer et Henricus

20s., which he paid.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeyns, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 60s. by weight more than the assessed amount of pence from this hundred.

### **Hundred of Middleton or Milton**

They say that Middleton manor is of the lord king and that the Lord Edward the present king has demised that to the John de Burgo for his life time. Then they say that the lord Roger of Northwood holds a certain land in Norwood [Milton par.] by grant of King Richard [1189-1199]. Stephen, the said Roger's father makes an annual payment of 40s. to the lepers of Longport hospital [St Barts without Rochester] each year as a gift of the lord king. Then they say that the monks of Christchurch Canterbury hold £30 worth of rent in *Bakeshore*, *Leysdown* and *Osmundesheye* as a gift of King Henry II [1154-1189], King Henry III's grandfather, as atonement for the murder of St Thomas the martyr. Then they say that the nuns of Sheppey hold a certain wood in Kingsdown by grant of King Richard, as they believe, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn holds a certain escheat in *Renham* at Chislehurst by grant of King Henry, the present king's father, which is worth 100s. each year. The same man holds Mere [Murston par.] and Gore [Tunstall par.] which used to pay 30s. and more each year to the lord king and now he holds those for one knight's fee, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that William son of William de Codestede holds a certain land at *Codestede* by serjeanty service, of one sparrow hawk to be rendered each year at the lord king's Exchequer, for which he used to pay 20s. each year at Middleton manor which payment was pardoned by King John. Then they say that Thomas Abelyn holds one fee of the lord king in chief in *Moriston*, *Elmley* and *Milsted*. Then they say that Sir Bartholomew de Munston holds one fee at Murston of the Lord Robert, son of Joan and that Sir Stephen of Pencestr' holds one fee at Tunstall of the same king and that Sir Ralph, son of Bernard, holds one fee in *Tang'* of the same Lord Robert and the same Lord Robert acquits them of castleguard at Dover castle, through whom or from what time they have been alienated they are ignorant.

Then they say that Fulk Poyforer and Henry Malemeis,

Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt in dicto hundredo per pondere ultra certum numerum xv libras.

Item dicunt quod quedam terre fuerunt quondam alienate per quosdam ballivos tempore quo non constat memoria unde dominus rex habet redditum ad valorem Lxs iijd obolum et dictus redditus solvitur cum dicto redditu de Middeltun et dominus rex nichil est perdens. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Middeltun traditur per dominum regem domino Johanni de Burgo ad vitam eius et quod est hundredum de Merden est membrum dicti hundredi de Middilton et est cum eodem manerio in manu dicti Johannis de Burgo qualiter dictus Johannes illa teneat ignorant.

Item dicunt quod Juliana filia Ade Asty dedit tenementum suum quod tenebat de domino rege in capite monialibus de Scapeye unde dominus rex non habet servicium in dampnum ipsius domini regis per annum xijd. Item dicunt quod dicte moniales tenent unum tenementum quondam vocatum Selveslonde unde dominus rex non habet servicium et dampnum xijd et amplius per annum et quod Sabina de Cumba tenet quoddam tenementum de domino rege in capite et dedit illud dictis monialibus unde rex perdit servicium et relevium ad dampnum xijd per annum et amplius et quod Henricus de Fonte capellanus tenet quoddam tenementum de domino rege in capite et illud dedit dictis monialibus unde dominus rex perdit servicium et relevium ad dampnum vjd. Item dicunt quod priorissa de Scapeia levare fecit unum juwisum quod vocatur Sean in predicto hundredo in prejudicium regis et quod dicta priorissa appropriavit sibi tenentes suos qui solebant lottiare et scottiare ad villatam de Middeltun et non facerunt ad dampnum patrie per annum vjd et quod Henricus filii Martini Wulphez tenuit quoddam tenementum de domino rege in capite in villa de Bauden et illud dedit priori et conventui de Ledes unde dominus rex perdit servicium et relevium ad dampnum ijs per annum et quod Johannes Hemmyng tenet quoddam tenementum in eadem villa de domino rege et prior et conventus de Ledes habent illud unde dominus rex habet dampnum per annum ijs et quod heredes Johannis de Clive tenent quoddam (tenementum) in villa de Bredegare et illud vendiderunt fratribus et sororibus Sancti Jacobi Cant' unde dominus rex habet dampnum xijd et amplius et quod Gilebertus filius Salamonis tenet quoddam tenementum in eadem villa et illud vendidit dictis fratribus et sororibus unde dominus rex habet

the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took £15 by weight more than the assessed amount in the said hundred.

Then they say that certain lands were formerly alienated by certain bailiffs at a time before the memory of man, whence the king has rent worth 60s. 3½d. and the said rent is paid from Middleton and the lord king loses nothing. Then they say that Middleton hundred was demised by the lord king to John de Burgh for the term of his life and that Marden hundred is a member of the said hundred of Middleton and it is in the hand of the said John de Burgh together with the same manor; they do not know how the said John de Burgh holds those.

Then they say that Juliana, daughter of Adam Asty, gave her tenement, which she held of the lord king in chief, to the nuns of Sheppey, for which the king does not have service with loss to the king himself of 12d. each year. Then they say that the said nuns hold one tenement formerly called *Selvelsonde*, for which the king does not have service and the loss is 12d. and more each year and that Sabina of Coombe holds a certain tenement of the lord king in chief and she has given that to the said nuns, whence the king loses the service and relief with loss of 12d. and more each year and that Henry de Fonte the chaplain holds a certain tenement of the lord king in chief and he has given this to the said nuns, whence the lord king loses the service and relief with loss of 6d. Then they say that the prioress of Sheppey has erected a certain pillory called a *sean* in the aforesaid hundred to the king's prejudice and that the said prioress has appropriated for herself his tenants who used to pay lot and scot at the township of Middleton and they do not, thus causing a loss of 6d. each year to the county and that Henry son of Martin Wulphez held a certain tenement of the lord king in chief in the vill of Bauden [Borden?] and he gave that to the prior and convent of Leeds, thence the king loses the service and relief with loss of 2s. each year and that John Hemmyng holds a certain tenement of the lord king in the same vill and the prior and convent of Leeds have that, thence the lord king has a loss of 2s. each year and that John of Cliffe's heirs hold a certain (tenement) in the town of Bredgar and they have sold that to the Brethren and Sisters of St James [hospital] Canterbury, whence the lord king has a loss of 12d. and more and that Gilbert son of Solomon holds a certain tenement in the same vill and has sold that to the said Brethren and Sisters, whence



dampnum per annum vjd et amplius et quod Johannes de Fughelestun vendidit vj acras terre monialibus de Clerkenewell London' quas tenuit de domino rege in villa de Syningeburn et defenduntur versus dominum per heredes dicti Johannis per medium et quod dominus Thomas Abelyn appropriavit sibi tenentes suos qui solebant lottiare et scotiare ad villatam de Burne et non faciunt nesciunt quo warento ad dampnum vj per annum et quod Johannes Cnepehalste vendidit hospitulariis v acras et dimidiam terre in villa de Radesham quas tenuit de domino rege in capite ad dampnum regis xijd per annum sine redditibus et releviis. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn appropriavit sibi tenentes de domino rege in villa de Mekelande et Elmestede quod tenent sorores hospitalis Sancte Katerine London, unde dominus rex perdit in releviis eschaetis et aliis per mortem cuiusdam heredis dimidiam marcam utrum sit de libero feodo vel non ignorant. Item dicunt quod nullus habet returnum (brevium) placita navii vetiti in dicto hundredo nisi camerarius de Middiltun.

Item dicunt quod dominus Stephenus de Pencestr' clamat habere furcas tumberellum et assisam panis et cervisie in Tonstall nesciunt quo warento et quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' habet tumbrellum et assisam panis et cervisie in villa de Nywentum nesciunt quo warento et quod priorissa de Scapeye habet tumbrellum et assisam panis et cervisie in villa Scapeye apud Menstre nesciunt quo warento et quod priorissa clamat habere wreccum maris nesciunt quo warento et quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant' clamat habere wreccum maris et assisam panis et cervisie apud Leysdun nesciunt quo warento et quod dominus Rogerus de Sylonde habet assisam panis et cervisie et dat per annum domino regi pro eodem xxxs. usus est libertate sua nesciunt quo warento et quod inpediunt regis potestatem et communem justicam ut credunt.

Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant' et dominus Willelmus de Leyburne appropriant sibi warrenam de novo et metas et fines transcendent nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Marescall de Synele tenet unam parvam purpresturam in villa de Sydingeburn et solvit domino regi per annum 1d et dominus rex nichil perdit et quod Petrus de London tenet unam parvam purpresturam in villa de

the king has a loss of 6d. each year and more and that John de Fughelestun sold 6 acres of land to the nuns of Clerkenwell, London, which he held of the lord king in the vill of Sittingbourne and they are defended againt the lord by the said John's heirs through mesne tenure and that Sir Thomas Abelyn has appropriated for himself his tenants who used to pay lot and scot to the township of [Sitting?] Bourne and they do not do this, by what warrant they do not know and that John Cnepehalste sold 5½ acres of land in the vill of *Radesham* which he held of the king in chief, to the Knights Hospitallers with loss of 12d. each year to the king without the rents and reliefs. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn has appropriated for himself the lord king's tenants in the vills of *Mekelande* and *Elmsted* which the Sisters of St Katharine's hospital, London hold, thence the king loses half a mark in reliefs, escheats and other things through the death of a certain heir, whether from a free fee or not they are ignorant. Then they say that no-one has return (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods in the said hundred unless it is the chamberlain of Middleton.

Then they say that Sir Stephen of Penecestr' claims to have a gallows, tumbrel and the assize of bread and ale in Tunstall, they do not know by what warrant and that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury has tumbrel and the assize of bread and ale in Newington, they do not know by what warrant and that the prioress of Sheppey has tumbrel and assize of bread and ale in the vill of Sheppey at Minster, they do not know by what warrant and that the prioress claims to have wreck, they do not know by what warrant and the the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have wreck and the assize of bread and ale at Leysdown, they do not know by what warrant and that Sir Roger de Sylonde has the assize of bread and ale and gives the lord king 30s. each year for it, as part of his liberty, by what warrant they do not know and that these restrict the king's power and common justice as they believe. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and Sir William de Leyburn are appropriating a warren for themselves and are exceeding its metes and boundaries, the jury do not know by what warrant.

Then they say John Marshall de Synele holds one small encroachment in the vill of Sittingbourne and he pays the lord king 1d. each year and the lord king loses nothing and that Peter of London holds one small encroachment in the vill of Sittingbourne and he pays

Sydingeburn et solvit inde per annum domino regi 1d et rex nichil perdit.

Item Philippus de Trypeleweye tenet unam parvam purpresturam in villa de Nywentun et solvit inde regi 1d et nichil est perdens.

Item dicunt quod Simon Wiberd ballivus de Middeltun attachiavit Sexburgam de Halesto et ipsam incarceravit pro diffamacione mortis Johannis fratris sui et ipsa Sexburga acquietata fuit per propriam et adhoc illam deliberare noluit priusquam haberet de illa ij marcas quas injuste solvit eidem Simoni quatuor marcas. Idem Simon attachiavit Nichlaum le Toghe pro diffamacione mortis uxoris sue et fecit finem cum eodem Simone ne inprisonaretur de iiij marcis et solvit et aquietatus fuit per propriam ante et quod idem Simon incarceravit Adam filium Godfridi tixtoris pro iiij ovibus quas furatus fuit et cepit a dicto Ada xxs et ipsum deliberavit a carcere sine judicio hundredi et quod dictus Simon incarceravit Thomam le Bedel et deliberari non potuit per propriam priusquam dedisset eidem Simoni viijs. Dicunt quod Henricus Malemeis vicecomes Kancie promisit Hamonem le Especer ad intrare debitum suum per xLs quod dictus Hamo sibi promisit sed nichil ei fecit et postea dictum Hamonem incarceravit in castro Cant' donec dictus Hamo dictos xLs sibi solvisset.

Item dicunt quod Dunstanus de Berstede ballivus de Middeltun incarceravit Dionisiam de la Stone et Isabellam filiam suam pro quadam diffamacione et deliberari non potuerunt per propriam antequam dedissent ei xLs et solverunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Willelmus de Sydingeburn ballivus de Middiltun incarcavit Philippum Galde de quadam diffamacione [ ] qui aquietatus fuit coram justicariis et postquam fuit deliberatus dictus Magister Willelmus cepit ab eo maliciose et injuste xLs. Item dicunt quod Simon Wyberd incarceravit Hamonem le Especer voluntarie ita quod non potuit deliberari antequam haberet ab eo iiij. Item dicunt quod Philippus Swydlet diffamatus fuit et ponebatur per pleggia et preterea dedit dicto Magistro Willelmo Xs ne incarceraretur. Idem Magister Willelmus cepit de Gileberto pistore de Nywentun eodem modo dimidiam marcam

*Prospice in tergo*

m.6 dorso Item dicunt jurati infra scripti quod Magister Laurencius de Sokenesse ballivus de Middiltun cepit multociens pro assisis removendis et

1d. each year to the lord king and the king loses nothing.

Then Philip de Trypeleweye holds a small encroachment in the vill of Newington and he pays the king 1d. for this and nothing is lost.

Then they say that Simon Wiberd, the bailiff of Middleton, arrested Sexburga de Halesto and imprisoned her, accusing her of causing her brother John's death and Sexburga was acquitted by a jury and still he was unwilling to release her until he first received 2 marks for that release, then she paid four marks unjustly to the same Simon. The same Simon arrested Nicholas le Toghe who was accused of causing his wife's death and he made a fine with the same Simon of 4 marks not to be imprisoned and he paid this and he was previously acquitted by a jury and that the same Simon imprisoned Adam son of Godfrey the weaver because he had stolen 4 sheep and he took 20s. from the said Adam and released him from prison without trial of the hundred and that the said Simon imprisoned Thomas the beadle and he could not be released by a jury before he had given the same Simon 8s. They say that Henry Malemeis the sheriff of Kent promised Hamo the grocer to cancel his debt for 40s. which the same Hamo promised him, but he did nothing for him and afterwards imprisoned the said Hamo in Canterbury castle until the said Hamo had paid him the said 40s.

Then they say that Dunstan of Bearsted, a bailiff of Middleton, imprisoned Denise de la Stone and her daughter Isabel because of a certain accusation and they could not be released by a jury before they had given him 40s. and they paid it.

Then they say that Master William of Sittingbourne, a bailiff of Middleton, imprisoned Philip Galde for a certain accusation [ ] who was acquitted before the justices and after he was released the said Master William took 40s. from him, maliciously and unjustly. Then they say that Simon Wyberd of his own volition, imprisoned Hamo the grocer, thence he could not be released before Simon received 4s. from him. Then they say that Philip Swydlet was charged and placed on bail and moreover he gave the said Master William 10s. not to imprison him. The same Master William took half a mark from Gilbert the baker of Newington in the same way.

*See on the back m. 6 dorso* Then the jury as written above say that Master Lawrence de Sokenesse, a bailiff of Middleton, many times took 20s. from many people for removing them from the assizes.

aliquando de pluribus xxs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeis cepit de Hugone de Tonstalle quod non venit ad inquisitionem injuste 1 marcam.

Item dicunt quod Tabernarius de Sidingeburn cepit injuste iijs de Roberto Chevere et quod Elyas filius Emme ballivus prioris Cant distrinxit maliciose Thomam le Becke ad dampnum ipsius Thome Cs et quod dictus Elyas abstulit Willelmo Yvo domum et terram suam maliciose ad dampnum suum iijs et quod dictus Elyas maliciose distrinxit Robertum de Rygge ad dampnum suum de xLs. et quod Reginaldus de Sorune ballivus de Middiltun cepit de Hamone le Especer unum bovum precii xxs et illum bovem vi detinuit. Item cepit de eodem Hamoni Lx lagenas cervisie precii Vs et nichil solvit et quod Thomas de Hegham amerciatus fuit de Xs tempore Magistri Willelmi et solvit eidem Willelmo pro se et plegiis suis et preterea idem Willelmus amerciavit pleggios suos in xxiijs et illos cepit sine iudicio hundredi et quod Thomas de Burne ballivus de Middiltun cepit de Waltero Tannatore injuste dimidiam marcam et quod Reginaldus de Sorune cepit de Johanne de Wydegare injuste ijs. Item dicunt quod Arnoldus clericus de Esling cepit injuste de Johanne Landlord Adam Baite et Rogero Cordawanar iijs vjd.

Item dicunt quod Jordanus Kayn ballivus cepit de Roberto Chevere xLd de summonitione scaccarii et ipsum non acquietavit et quod Henricus Malemeis cepit de eodem Roberto vjd eodem modo et quod Henricus de Burne vicecomes cepit de heredibus Stephani Rysindun xLd pro eodem modo et eos non acquietavit et quod Henricus Malemeis vicecomes cepit de heredibus dicti [Thome –erased] Stephani pro eodem xLs et ipsos non acquietavit et idem Henricus cepit de Henrico filio Egidii dimidiam marcam et non fuit amerciatus.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Babbe vendidit Flammangis dimidiam pise lane et Willelmus Poser vendidit lanas et cepit denarios quantum ignorant. Item Stephanus Pove vendidit unam pisam. Item Robertus de Hyldestone vendidit quartam partem unius pise et Robertus de Pumlonde vendidit dimidiam pisam et Elyas filius Emme vendidit dimidiam pisam Flammangis contra defensionem.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Rynston forestarius tempore Henricus Malemeis fecit vastum et destructionem in bosco domini regis apud Chistens'

Then they say that Henry Malemeis unjustly took 1 mark from Hugh of Tunstall because he did not come to an inquest.

Then they say that a tavern-haunter of Sittingbourne took 3s. unjustly from Robert Chevere and that Elias son of Emma, the prior of Canterbury's bailiff, maliciously made distraint upon Thomas le Becke with loss of 100s. to Thomas and that the said Elias maliciously took away William Yvo's house and land causing him a loss of 3s. and that the said Elias maliciously made distraint upon Robert de Rygge causing him a loss of 40s. and that Reginald de Sorune, a bailiff of Middleton took one ox price 20s. from Hamo the grocer and forcibly detained that ox. Then he took 60 gallons of ale price 5s. from the same Hamo and paid nothing and that Thomas de Hegham was amerced 10s. in Master William's time and he paid the same William for himself and his sureties and meanwhile the same William amerced his sureties at 24s. and took the money without the judgment of the hundred and that Thomas of Bourne, a bailiff of Middleton, took half a mark unjustly from Walter the tanner and that Reginald de Sorune took 2s. unjustly from John de Wydegare. Then they say that Arnold, a clerk of Esling [Eastling?] unjustly took 3s. 6d. from John Landlord, Adam Baite and Roger the cordwainer. Then they say that Jordan Kayn, a bailiff, took 40d. from Robert Chevere for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted him and that Henry Malemeis took 6d. from the same Robert in the same way and that Henry of Bourne the sheriff took 40d. from Stephen Rynsindun's heirs in the same way and he has not acquitted them and that Henry Malemeis, the sheriff, took 40s. from the said Stephen's heirs for the same reason and he has not acquitted them and the same Henry took half a mark from Henry son of Giles and he was not amerced.

Then they say that John Babbe has sold half a wey of wool to the Flemings and William Poser has sold wool and has received money, how much they do not know. Then Stephen Pove has sold one wey. Then Robert de Hyldestone has sold a quarter of one wey, Robert de Pumlonde has sold half a wey and Elias son of Emma has sold half a wey to the Flemings contrary to the regulation.

Then they say that John Rynston, a forester at the time of Henry Malemeis, damaged and caused destruction estimated at 100s. in the lord king's wood at *Chislet*[?]

ad valorem Cs et quod Walterus de Hodun forestarius fecit destructionem et vastum in eodem bosco ad valorem dimidie marce.

### **Dimidia Hundredum de Bernefeld**

Dicunt jurati quod Rogerus Vinitar' de Malling tenebat lestum de Elesford ad firmam de Johanne de Wattun tunc vicecomite pro X libris per annum et Thomas de Ho qui nunc est ballivus tenuit dictum lestum de Willelmo de Hevere vicecomite in anno preterito pro xxvij libras per annum ad dampnum patrie per annum de tanto augmento ultra primam firmam et dicunt quod dimidia hundredi de Bernefeld est in manu domini regis et valet per annum iij solidos.

Item dicunt quod borgha de Chingele sequi solebat cum dicto dimidio hundredo ad duos *laghedays* per annum et bis ad turnum et subtraxit se xx annis elapsis per abbatem de Boxle ad dampnum regis nesciunt quantum. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle habet assisam panis et cervisie sed nesciunt quo warento et prior de Cumbwelle habet assisam panis et cervisie et furcas nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod hundreda de Wetchelstan et de Littlefeld solebant esse in manu domini regis antiquo tempore et modo Comes Glovernie tenet ea in manu sua et solvit inde annuatim xLs sed nesciunt quo modo alienata sunt tempore Gileberti comitis Glovernie avi comitis qui nunc est.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Seint Cler cepit de dimidio hundredo de Bernefeld xvij ad faciendam inquisitionem de infortunio et retinuit.

Item dicunt Fulco Poyforer et Henricus Malemeis ceperunt de vicesima sic in Lijs. ijs ijd ultra certum numerum pro pondere.

### **Hundredum de Nywindenn**

Dicunt jurati quod vij hundreda ad dominum regem pertinentia dimissa sunt ad firmam Willelmo Barer nesciunt per quem nec quomodo. Item dicunt quod villa de Newynden fuit quedam borgha ad hundredum de Selebrychtindenn quondam nesciunt qui eam subtraxit nec a quo tempore sed nunc est in manu Ricardi le Walays et substractum est per Josephum et (*Johannem* – erased) Thomam Lugge de eadem villa.

and that Walter de Hodun, a forester has damaged and caused waste estimated at half a mark in the same wood.

### **Half of the Hundred of Barnfield [Little Barnfield]**

The jury say that Roger Vinitar of Malling used to hold the lathe of Aylesford at farm of John de Wattun, who was then the sheriff, for £10 each year and Thomas of Hoo, who is now the bailiff, held the said lathe in the past year of William of Hever, the sheriff, for £28 a year with loss to the country each year because of such an increase more than the first farm and they say that half of Barnefield hundred is in the lord king's hand and it is worth 4s. each year.

Then they say that the tithing of Chingele [Chingley in Goudhurst par.] used to do suit at the said half hundred at two lawdays each year and twice at the tourn and through the abbot of Boxley it has withdrawn itself for 20 years, with loss to the king, they do not know how much. Then they say that the abbot of Boxley has the assize of bread and ale, but they do not know by what warrant and the prior of Combwell has an assize of bread and ale and a gallows, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the hundreds of Wachlingstone and Littlefield used to be in the lord king's hand in ancient times and now the earl of Gloucester holds them in his hand and pays 40s. annually for them, but they do not know how they were alienated in the time of Gilbert Earl of Gloucester, the present earl's grandfather.

Then they say that John de St Clare took 18d. from Barnefield half hundred to hold an inquest upon an unfortunate person and he kept the money.

Then they say that Fulk Poyforer and Henry Malemeis took for the tax of one-twentieth, thus on 52s., by weight 2s. 2d. more than the assessed amount.

### **Hundred of Newenden**

The jury say that the 7 hundreds pertaining to the lord king have been demised at farm to William Barer, they do not know through whom nor how. Then they say that the vill of Newenden was formerly a tithing of Selbritten hundred, they do not know who withdrew it neither at what time, but now it is in Richard le Walays's hand and has been withdrawn by Joseph and (*John*-erased) Thomas Lugge from the same vill.

Et quod Ricardus le Walays capit tholneum de scutis et de parvis naviculis videlicet vjd pro 1 denario in resolvendo et hoc injuste per xv annos. Item dicunt quod idem dominus Ricardus de Nywindenn clamat habere furcas assisam panis et cervisie et hoc per libertatem archiepiscopi ut intelligent et habet per tempus ipsius et antecessorum suorum. Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant' clamat habere warennam apud Ebbene nesciunt a quo tempore nec quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Northye dimisit terram suam abbati Pontis Roberti apud Mederesham in comitatu Suthsex sed quantum cepit nec quomodo ad dampnum regis ignorant.

Item dicunt quod quidam Robertus de Cheryng (*obit*) anno regni regis Edwardi primo cepit de Simone Brech xijd ut ipsum removeret de assisa et de Johanne de Sponden vjd pro eodem. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor fecit magnam destructionem et vastum in custodia domini regis ut in homagiis et boscis sed quantitatem nesciunt et quod dominus Fulco Peyforer et dominus Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt in dicto hundredo viijs ultra certum numerum pro pondere.

### **Hundredum de Tenderden**

Dicunt jurati quod hoc hundredum cum aliis vij hundredis est in manu domini regis et solvunt per annum ad castrum Dovor X libras que Willelmus de Cassingeham tenuit per Cs per annum tempore regis Henrici per xL annos et dominus Simon de Penecestr' appropriavit ad castrum Dovor' dictas X libras per tres annos et amplius. Item dicunt quod tenentes archiepiscopi et tenentes prioris Cant' se subtraxerunt de sectis lesti per dominum Bonefacii archiepiscopi in vij hundredis et de ij marcis de turno vicecomitis annuatim a tempore Gileberto de Prestun tunc justicario Ininerante ad dampnum regis xxxvj marcas nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Wy cepit de Josia de Smaldene xijd pro removendo eum de assisa tempore regis nunc et quod idem Hugo de Wy inparcavit jumentum Gunnilde de Merkesham per potestatem officii sui et noluit deliberare donec habuit dimidam marcam ubi nichil ei debet tempore domini Edwardi regis nunc. Idem Hugo cepit per potestatem officii sui

And that Richard le Walays takes toll from barges and from small boats, that is 6d. for 1 penny to be paid on the occasion and this unjustly for 15 years. Then they say that the same lord Richard of Newenden claims to have a gallows, the assize of bread and ale and this through the liberty of the archbishop as they understand and he holds this throughout his time and the time of his ancestors. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have warren at Ebony, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that Sir William de Northye demised his land at *Mersham* in the county of Sussex to the abbot of Robertsbridge, but they do not know how much he takes nor what is the king's loss. Then they say that a certain Robert of Charing (*he is dead*) in the first year of King Edward's reign [November 1272-1273] took 12d. from Somon Brech to remove him from the assise and 6d. from John de Sponden for the same reason. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, caused great destruction and waste to be made in things where he acted as custodian for the king, as in his tenantry and woods, but they do not know the amount and that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Sir Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 8s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

### **Hundred of Tenterden**

The jury say that this hundred with the other 7 hundreds is now in the lord king's hand and they pay £10 each year to Dover castle. William de Cassingeham held them by payment of 100s. each year for 40 years, in King Henry's time and Sir Simon of Penecestr' has appropriated the said £10 at Dover castle for three years and more. Then they say that the archbishop's tenants and those of the prior of Christchurch have withdrawn themselves through the lord Archbishop Boniface from suits of the lathe in the 7 hundreds and from the 2 marks each year at the sheriff's tourn from the time of Gilbert of Preston then an eyre justice, with loss of 36 marks to the king, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Hugh of Wye took 12d. from Josia de Smaldenn for removing him from an assize in the present king's time and that the same Hugh of Wye in the time of the Lord Edward the present king, by the authority of his office impounded Gunilda of Mersham's mare and would not return it until he received half a mark from her, when she owed him

de Henrico Molendinario Xs pro quodam prisonario qui attachatus fuit in hundredo de Tenderdene inponens eidem quod evasit per ipsum et falso. Item Hugo misit Josephum Asketinum de Essinden et Willelmum filium suum et filiam suam quod venirent ad domum Willelmi de la Feld in predicto hundredo et venerunt et quod ligati fuerunt a latronibus in domibus suis in hundredo de Rulwinden et nesciebant dicere a quibus ligati fuerint cepit ab eis dimidiam marcam. Idem Hugo cepit unam marcam injuste de Henrico Fabro de Tenderdene quod idem Henricus jactavit de clausura suo propriam robam suam lineam et manutergum que vicina ejus ibi pendebat se nesciente et falsa occasione. Idem Hugo inposuit predicto Henrico Fabro dum jacuit infirmus in lecto suo quod fuit usuratus ita quod predictus Henricus promisit eidem Hugoni xxs et solvit et ad opus domini Willelmi de Hevere tunc vicecomitis et solvit ut possit habere inquisitionem de vij hundredis si esset talis aut non que quidem inquisicio ipsum bene aquietavit et quod idem Hugo per potestatem officii sui cepit quendam Nicholaum le Masun de parochia de Lammhurst per querelam quam Beatrix soror eius super ipsum fecit sic quod tradiderat eidem Nicholao denarios sic xx libras quos noluit ei solvere ita quod predictus Hugo retinuit corpus ipsius Nicholai in hundredo de Tenderden donec recepisset predictos denarios iniuste et adhuc eos retinet in manu sua unde dicta Beatrix nichil inde habuit nec habere potest omnia ista facta fuerunt per dictum Hugonem tempore regis nunc adhuc dicunt quod dictus Hugo de Wy cepit viijs pro duobus cursibus teneri hundredi ubi prisonati fuerunt ad deliberandum tempore domini Edwardi regis.

Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt in dicto hundredo xxs ultra certum numerum denariorum pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Wy cepit injuste in manu domini regis Edwardi domos et terras Henrici filii Henrici Fabri et omnia bona sua Roberti le Waldeys ibidem et Beatricis uxoris eiusdem et predictum puerum ad domum suam apud Wy duxit et retinuit donec abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' perquisivit de dono Stephano constabulario Dovor' ita quod ad dampnum dicti Roberti et Beatricis Lxs et ad dampnum Willelmi de la Felde 1 marcam a quo

nothing. The same Hugh by the authority of his office took 10s. from Henry the miller on behalf of a certain prisoner who had been arrested in Tenterden hundred, accusing Henry of allowing the prisoner to escape and this was false. Then Hugh sent instruction to Joseph Asketun de Essinden and William his son and his daughter to come to William Field's house in the said hundred. They came and they were tied up by robbers in their houses in Rolvenden hundred and as they could not say who had tied them up he thus took half a mark from them. The same Hugh took one mark unjustly from Henry the smith of Tenterden because the same Henry threw his linen gown and towel out of his enclosure not knowing this was in the area where Hugh hung things and it was a false charge. Then Hugh accused the aforesaid Henry the smith while he was lying sick in his bed, of being an usurer, this because the aforesaid Henry promised the same Hugh 20s. and he paid this and to the use of William of Hever then the sheriff and he paid in order that he could hold an inquest of the 7 hundreds to determine whether or not he was an usurer. He was entirely acquitted at this inquest and that the same Hugh by the authority of his office seized a certain Nicholas the mason of Lamberhurst parish because of a claim which Beatrix his sister made upon him, that she had given money, £20, to the same Nicholas which he was unwilling to pay her. Thus the aforesaid Hugh kept Nicholas in Tenterden hundred unjustly until he had received the money and he still keeps it in his own hand, whence the said Beatrix has had nothing nor can have anything of it. All these things were done by the said Hugh in the present king's time, yet still they say that the said Hugh of Wye took 8s. for two writs to be issued for the hundred to release those men who had been imprisoned during the time of the lord King Edward's time.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 20s. by weight in the said hundred more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that Hugh of Wye unjustly took into the lord King Edward's hand, the houses and lands of Henry, son of Henry the smith, and all the goods of Robert le Waldeys and Beatrice his wife there and Hugh took the aforesaid youth to his house at Wye and kept him there until the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury aquired him by a gift from Stephen the constable of Dover, thus there was a loss of 60s. for the said Robert and Beatrix and a loss of 1 mark for

dictum tenementum tenebatur et ad dampnum et gravamen Thome Mercatoris 1 marcam.

### **Hundredum de Rulynden**

Dicunt jurati quod vij hundreda tempore Willelmi de Cassingeham pro Cs tenebantur per annum et post decessum dicti Willelmi per dominum Reginaldi de Cobeham vicecomitem pro X libris ad firmam tradebantur et adhuc dicta firma redditur domino Stephano de Penestr' constabulario Dovorr' per ballivos suos per annum et dicto castro appropriantur per dictum Stephanum in subtractionem vicecomitis Kancie per iiij annos elapsos tempore regis Henrici et Edwardi regis nunc.

Item dicunt quo ab Itinere Gilberti de Prestun archiepiscopus Bonifacius subtraxit omnes tenentes suos vij hundredorum de sectis wappentacium et de ij marcis turni vicecomitis quo warento nesciunt pro xvj annis ad dampnum regis xxxij marcas et dicti tenentes subtraxerunt se per totum tempus predictum ad dampnum regis Cs. Item dicunt quod abbas Pontis Roberti tenet de feodo de Hechinden ij quarteria dicti feodi per feofamentum Radulfi de Heckinden xL annis elapsis et amplius nesciunt quo warento ad exheredacionem domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Amisius Echermer (*obiit*) indicatus fuit de Asketino de Eselindene quod ipsum Asketinum noctanter ligavit et bona sua asportavit pro quo indictamento Hugo de Wy ballivus vij hundredorum cepit a dicto Amisio dimidiam marcam ut ipsum in pace dimitteret et idem Hugo cepit de dicto Asketino dimidiam marcam ne ipsum duceret ad castrum Dovor.' Item dicunt quod quidam Ricardus de Essinden (*obiit*) qui fuerat ballivus ante dictum Hugonem capit de hundredo pro officio suo exequendo ad suspendendum ij latrones vs vjd.

Item dicunt quod dictus Hugo de Wy per ij annos elapsos de diversis hominibus cepit ad valorem ij marcas ut aliquos removeret ab assisis et alios poneret loco eorum videlicet de Simone de Meham xijd., de Willelmo le Sumetir xvijjd, de Ricardo de Cranewell xijd, de Rogero de la Helle et Wulnodo fratre suo xijd, de Herewardo de Stonlonde xijd, de Andrea de Cumdene xijd, de Gilberto de Metblingeham xijd, de Radulfo de Stonlond xijd, de Stephano de Mapplisden xijd, de Roberto le Wayte xijd, de Henrico Echmere

William de la Felde from whom the said tenement was held and loss and damage of 1 mark to Thomas the merchant.

### **Hundred of Rolvenden**

The jury say that the 7 hundreds were held in William de Cassingham's time for 100s. each year and after the said William's decease they were demised at farm by Sir Reginald of Cobham, the sheriff, for £10 and still the said farm is rendered each year to Sir Stephen de Penestr', the constable of Dover, by his bailiffs and the money is appropriated to the said castle by the said Stephen and withdrawn from the sheriff of Kent for 4 years during the time of King Henry and of Edward the present king.

Then they say from the time of Gilbert of Preston's eyre Archbishop Boniface withdrew all his tenants of the 7 hundreds from suits of the hundred and from paying the 2 marks at the sheriff's tourn for 16 years, they do not know by what warrant with a loss of 33 marks to the king and the said tenants withdrew themselves throughout the aforesaid time with loss of 100s. to the king. They they say that the abbot of Robertsbridge holds 3 quarters of the fee of *Hechinden* by feoffment of Ralph de Hechinden 40 years ago and more, they do not know by what warrant, thus endangering the lord king's inheritance.

Then they say that Amisius Echermer (*he is dead*) was indicted for Askelin de Eselindene that he harmfully tied up Askelin and carried off his goods for which indictment Hugh of Wye, bailiff of the 7 hundreds, took half a mark from the said Amisius on condition that he kept the peace and the same Hugh took half a mark from the said Askelin so that he should not be taken to Dover castle. Then they say that a certain Richard de Essinden (*he is dead*) who was bailiff before the said Hugh, takes 5s. 6d. from the hundred to perform the duties of his office to hang two robbers.

Then they say that the said Hugh of Wye took money amounting to 2 marks from divers men in the last two years that he should remove some men from the assizes and place others in their place, that is to say: 12d. from Simon de Meham, 18d. from William le Sumetir, 12d. from Richard de Cranewell, 12d. from Roger de la Helle and Wulnod his brother, 12d. from Hereward de Stonlonde, 12d. from Andrew de Cumdene, 12d. from Gilbert de Metblingeham, 12d. from Ralph de Stonlond, 12d. from Stephen de

vjd, de Rogero de Bynerden ijs, de Stephano Hechynden vjd, de Huberto de eodem vjd, de Ricardo de Holwise vjd, de Ordmero de Sysseke vjd, de Willelmo de Hacwelden vjd., de Thoma de Pytlesden vjd, de Nicholao de Bleccescote vjd., de Luca de eodem vjd, de Martino de Francesco vjd, de Willelmo le Maystre vjd, de Willelmo de Mappesden xijd, de Stephano de Halle ijs, de Willelmo le Hewette xijd, de Thoma Holwstall vjd, de Thoma le Franceis vjd, de Reginaldo Comener xijd, de [ ] de Thorndenn vjd, de Ricardo Wyse vjd, de Asketino de Essinden vjd. Item dicunt quod Henricus de Wodintun qui fuit clericus vij hundredorum ante dictum Hugonem pro summonicione scaccarii cepit de Hawisa de Meyham dimidiam marcam et ipsam non acquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Herward serviens dicti Hugonis de Wy injuste distrinxit Gunnore de Ethinden et cepit ab ea ijs pro summonitione scaccarii ut dixit, [ idem Her]wardus injuste cepit de Ricardo de Ethindenn et de relictis Willelmi de Fugesbrok pro eodem modo ijs et de Andrea de [ ] et quod predictus Hugo de Wy cepit de eodem Andrea pro eodem iiijs et quod predictus Herwardus cepit de Matilda et Matilla [ ] et quod quidam Robertus de Thring serviens archiepiscopi injuste cepit de Ricardo Daly et Johanne Fabro pro bracino et non brachiavit [ ] et quod Hugo de Wy iniuste cepit de Herewardo de Stonland xvijjd pro hundredo tenendo ad ipsum deliberandum.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Godington cepit tempore Henrici regis de Hawisa de Meham pro summonitione scaccarii et ipsam inde non acquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Blite constabularius de Rofa tempore regis Henrici fecit attachiare per quendam probatorem nomine Wulbaldi iniuste sex legales homines de hundredo de [ ]dene et Willelmum Franceys, Alured de Medessele, Alured de Thornden, Ricardum Blund, Willelmum fratrem suum et Haro(Idu)s de Chell [ ] ad dampnum ipsorum xx marcas et quod Fulco Peyforer vicecomes Kancie cepit de eisdem appellatis xLs ut eos deliberaret post breve domini regis et quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeins ceperunt de dicto hundredo pro vicesima recepta iiijs et de incremento ultra certum numerum viijs ixjd et quod Magister

Mapplisden, 12d. from Robert le Wayte, 6d. from Henry Echmere, 2s. from Roger de Bynerden, 6d. from Stephen Hechynden, 6d. from Hubert of the same place, 6d. from Richard de Holwise, 6d. from Ordmerus de Sysseke, 6d. from William de Hacweldon, 6d. from Thomas de Pytlesden, 6d. from Nicholas de Bleccescote, 6d. from Luke of the same place, 6d. from Martin de Francesco, 6d. from William le Maystre, 12d. from William de Mappesden, 2s. from Stephen de Halle, 12d. from William le Hewette, 6d. from Thomas Holwstall, 6d. from Thomas le Franceis, 12d. from Reginald Comener, 6d. from [ ] de Thorndenn, 6d. from Richard Wyse, 6d. from Asketin de Essinden. Then they say that Henry de Wodintun, who was a clerk of the 7 hundreds before the said Hugh, took half a mark from Hawisa de Meyham for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted her.

Then they say that, Hereward the said Hugh of Wye's serjeant unjustly made distraint upon Gunnora de Ethinden and took 2s. from her for summons of the Exchequer, as he said. ? Then they say that the same [Here]ward unjustly took 2s. from Richard de Ethindenn and from William de Fugesbrok's widow for the same reason and from Andrew de [ ] and that the aforesaid Hugh of Wye took 4s. from the same Andrew for the same reason and that the aforesaid Hereward took from Matilida and Matilla [ ] and that Robert de Thring, a serjeant of the archbishop, unjustly took from Richard Daly and John the smith [ ] for a brewhouse and he has not brewed [ ] and that Hugh of Wye unjustly took 18d. from Hereward de Stonland for summoning the hundred for his release.

Then they say that during King Henry's time, Henry de Godington took from Hawisa de Meham for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted her of this.

Then they say that in King Henry's time, Hugh de Blite, constable of Rochester, through a certain approver called Wulbald unjustly arrested six law-abiding men of [Rolven]den hundred and William Franceys, Alured de Medessele, Alured de Thornden, Richard Blund, William his brother and Har[old] de Chell [ ] with loss to them of 20 marks and that Fulk Peyforer, the sheriff of Kent, took 40s. from the same accused men, so that he might release them after the lord king's writ and that Fulk Peyferer and Henry Malemeins took from the said hundred 4s. for the tax of one-twentieth received and 8s. 9d. as an increase above the assessed amount and that Master [Richard]



[Ricardus ] de Clifford fecit vastum et destruccionem in vij hundredis de Rulwinden in quercubus fagetis et aliis arboribus precii xLs et amplius et quod [ ] de tenentibus archiepiscopi in Waldis X marcas de fine iniuste. Item dicunt quod ballivi archiepiscopi iniuste capit finem pro warda [ ] in gavelkund per totum Waldum iniuste et contra consuetudinem tocius regni.

de Clifford caused waste and destruction in the 7 hundreds of Rolvenden upon the oaks and beeches and other trees, price 40s. and more and that [has taken] 10 marks from the archbishop's tenants in the Weald unjustly for a fine. Then they say that the archbishop's bailiff unjustly takes a fine for wardship [from lands in] *gavelkind* throught the whole Weald unjustly and contrary to the custom of the whole kingdom.

**m. 7 Hundredum de Maydenstan adhuc in comitatu Kancie in lesto de Heylysford**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus Osbertus de Lungchamp miles tenet quamdam teram que vocatur Ovenhelle per servicium quod debet exsequi dominum regem in exercitu suo usque in Walliam xL diebus propriis sumptibus cum uno equo precii vs et cum 1 sacco precii vjd et cum brochia ad eundem factum et de illa terra alienantur xvj acre terre quas dominus Stephanus de Cosintun tenet per iiij3 annos eidem [*Roberto-erased*] Osberto reddendum set a quo tempore nec per quem sunt alienate neque in manu quorum regum nesciunt.

Item heredes Johannes le Walays tenent unam acram terre que vocatur Weveringe per serjantiam eodem servicio sed insuper reddunt Roberto de Boctun per annum xLs., Robertus vero de Boctun antecessor Roberti nunc feoffavit Hugonem le Waleys de eadem terra C annis elapsis et amplius et idem Robertus fuit feoffatus a domino rege sed a quo tempore ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle non permittit heredes de Wovering qui tenent illam serjantiam communicare in pastura de Pynendenn unde serjantia minuitur quolibet anno ad valorem vs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Borveling tenet unum feodum de domino rege in capite.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Mayden' est in manu domini archiepiscopi Cant' sed tamen quando dictum hundredum debet ameriari coram justiciariis Itinerantibus seu inquisitoribus domini regis dominus rex habet quartam partem sed a quo tempore et quo waranto archiepiscopus habeat hundredum et quod hundredum valet per annum ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle subtraxit omnes tenentes suos ab hundredo domini regis apud Merdenn qui solebant facere sectam ibidem et quod idem abbas subtraxit tenentes suos de hundredo domini regis de Cranebrok per xvj annos elapsos et amplius. Item dicunt quod prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant' subtraxerunt tenentes suos de Bademinden qui solebant sequi hundredum de Brenchesle xx annis elapsis et subtraxerunt tenentes suos de la Knocke et Chilintun qui solebant sequi hundredum de Merdenne xvj annis elapsis et tenentes suos de Stokebery qui solebant sequi hundredum de Twyforde ad laghedays.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum (et) extractum (brevium) placita namio vetito

**m.7 Maidstone Hundred still in the county of Kent in the lathe of Aylesford**

The jury say that Sir Osbert de Longchamp holds a certain land which is called *Ovenhelle* by the service that he must follow the lord king in his army as far as Wales for 40 days at his own costs with one horse price 5s. and with 1 bag price 6d. and with a fastening made for the same and 16 acres have been alienated from that land which Sir Stephen de Cosintun holds for 4 years to the same Osbert by payment of rent but they do not know from what time nor by whom they have been alientated neither in the hand of which kings these were.

Then John le Walays's heirs hold one acre of land which is called Weaving [Boxley par.] through serjeanty for the same service but in addition they pay rent of 40s each year to Robert of Boughton. Robert of Boughton indeed, the present Robert's ancestor, enfeoffed Hugh le Waleys with that same land 100 years ago and more and the same Robert was enfeoffed by the lord king, but from what time they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbot of Boxley does not permit the heirs of Wo[e?]vering who hold that serjeanty to have common in the pasture of *Pynendenn*, thence the serjeanty has diminished, each year to value of 5s. Then they say that William de Borveling holds one fee of the lord king in chief.

Then they say that Maidstone hundred is in the hand of the lord archbishop of Canterbury, but when the said hundred ought to be amerced before the justices in eyre or the lord king's inquisitors, the lord king has a fourth part, but from what time or by what warrant the archbishop has the hundred and what the hundred is worth each year they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbot of Boxley has withdrawn all his tenants from the lord king's hundred at Marden who used to perform suit there and that the same abbot has withdrawn his tenants from the lord king's hundred of Cranbrook for 16 years and more. Then they say that the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury have withdrawn their tenants of Badmondenn [Horsmondenn par.] who used to do suit at Brenchley hundred 20 years ago and they have withdrawn their tenants of *la Knocke* and Chillinden [Marden hun.] who used to do suit at Marden hundred since 16 years have passed and their tenants of Stockbury [?] who used to do suit at Twyford hundred on lawdays.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint

wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent per dominum archiepiscopum a quo tempore ignorant et quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant habet omnes predictas libertates per dominum archiepiscopum a quo tempore ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle excessit metas et fines warenni a tempore xx annorum et amplius quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbas de Begeham recipit annuatim de feodo farma de Detling' xxs ad dampnum domini regis quod si archiepiscopatus esset in manu domini regis per custodem et heredes domini de Becking essent infra etatem per custodiam dominus rex haberet custodiam eorum. Ita quod nisi dicti xxs annui redditus essent in retro dominus illos haberet.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Daniel bedellus de Maiden' in Itinere Magistri Rogeri de Seytun cepit de Hugone de Holstrete ne esset in assisis dimidam bushellum frumenti. Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus domini Johannis de Merlay coronatoris cepit de Ricardo Muntemore quod non venit ad inquisitionem vjd. Item dicunt quod Johannes Danyel de Mayden cepit de Johanne et Willelmo Haghmund et de Radulfo le Man dimidam marcam ad solvendam ad scaccarium et non fecit et quod idem Johannes recepit eodem modo de Nicholao Sparewe et sociis suis de Eastmalling xxs et pro labore suo ijs. et nichil solvit nec homines predictos ad scaccarium nec alibi aquietavit. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford cepit de Stephano serviente Gileberti Elye quem inprisonavit pro eo dimittendo Vs et de Thoma Heverico et Anselmo de Foringdun pro eis dimittendis quos inprisonavit injuste xLs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Merlay assignavit Gilebertum tinctorem ut solveret Bartholomeo Sellario pro eo 1 marcam quam dictus Gilbertus finivit de hoc quod coronator ei inposuit quod quidam Reginaldus qui occidit uxorem Thome Coci fuit serviens eius et non fuit nisi per dietatum locatus. Item Daniel de Burham cepit de Gilberto pro eodem dimidiam marcam. Item dominus Fulco Peyforer et dominus Henricus Malemeins collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundred xxij s vjd ultra certum numerum pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit manerium de Maydenestan et tenuit per iij annos et cepit ad introitum xv libras iniuste et cito

upon goods, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other liberties which pertain to the crown through the lord archbishop, from what time they are ignorant and that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has all the aforesaid liberties through the lord archbishop, from what time they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbot of Boxley has exceeded the metes and boundaries of the warren for a period of 20 years and more, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbot of Bayham each year receives 20s. from the fee farm of Detling with loss to the lord king, but if the archbishopric should be in the lord king's hand in custody the lord king has wardship and thus if the lord of Becking's heirs should be under age the lord king should be their guardian because of his wardship. Then unless the said 20s. annual rent should be in arrears the lord may have those.

Then they say that John Daniel, the beadle of Maidstone at the time of Master Roger de Seytun's eyre, took half a bushel of wheat from Hugh of Hole Street that he should not be in the assizes. Then they say that Richard, the clerk of Sir John de Merlay the coroner, took 6d. from Richard Muntemore because he did not come to an inquest. Then they say that John Daniel of Maidstone took half a mark from John and William Haghmund and Ralph le Man to pay at the Exchequer and he did not and that the same John received in the same way 20s. from Nicholas Sparewe and his companions of East Malling and 2s. for his labour and he paid nothing neither did he acquit the aforesaid men at the Exchequer or elsewhere. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took 5s. from Stephen, Gilbert Elye's servant whom he imprisoned, for his release and 40s. from Thomas, Hervey and Anselm de Foringdun whom he imprisoned unjustly, for their release.

Then they say that Sir John de Merlay appointed Gilbert the dyer to pay Bartholomew the saddler 1 mark on his behalf and which fine the said Gilbert paid as the coroner made accusation that a certain Reginald who killed Thomas Cook's wife, had been his servant and he had not been, except upon a daily basis. Then Daniel de Burham took half a mark from Gilbert for the same reason. Then Sir Fulk Peyforer and Sir Henry Malemeins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took from the said hundred 22s. 6d. by weight more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took possession of Maidstone manor and held it for 3 years and took £15 unjustly at his entry and immediately afterwards £17 3s. 6d.

post xvij libras iijs vjd iniuste. Idem Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit maneria de Ferlygh et Lese in manu domini regis sine precepto domini regis et cepit ad introitum iij marcas et tenuit dicta maneria per iij septimanas et tunc deliberavit dicta maneria precepto domini regis. Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit quoddam manerium prioris ecclesie Christi Cant' quod capi non deberet et tenuit per iij septimanas et cepit in introitum iij marcas.

### **Hundredum de Laverkefeld**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Heryllisford solet esse in manu domini regis et datum fuit Ricardo de Grey per regem Henricum patrem regis qui nunc est pro uno feodo militis xxx annis elapsis et nunc tenet illud manerium domina Lucia de Grey in dotem et valet per annum xxxij libras. Item dicunt Magister Galfridus de Hosal' tenet Nesindenn de rege in capite pro dimidio feodo quo warento nesciunt et quod Reginaldus de Mumby tenet manerium de Reyrerse de rege in capite et est baronia et valet per annum xiiij libras et quod Willelmus de Say tenet Berling et Tithingam de rege in capite et est baronia et valet per annum L libras.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Laverkefeld est in manu domini regis et valet per annum Cs et quod hundreda de Littlefeld et Wacheleston solebant esse in manibus dominorum regum predecessorum regis qui nunc est et valent Lx (libras) per annum et nunc sunt in manu Comitis Glovernie pro xLs soluendis domino regi per annum qualiter et quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Adinton et Otles que Lora de Scercio nunc tenet in dotem subtraxerunt sectas hundredi predicti per potestatem Willelmi de Montecanis a tempore belli de Evesham ad dampnum regis iij per annum et quod Ricton et Siffletun tenentes Comitis Glovernie per potestatem eiusdem Comitis subtraxerunt se de secta de lagheday per X annos elapsos ad dampnum regis ijs per annum et amplius quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium et episcopus Roff' ab archiepiscopo habet returnum a tempore X annorum pro viij libris solvendis archiepiscopo per annum et quod domina Lucia de Grey in curia de Eyleford placitat de namio vetito nesciunt quo warento et comes Glovernie in curia de Tunebrygg quo warento nesciunt

unjustly. The same Master Richard de Clifford took East Farleigh and Loose manors into the lord king's hands without the lord king's command and took 4 marks at his entry, held the said manors for 3 weeks and then delivered the said manors at the lord king's command. Then they say that the same Master Richard de Clifford took possession of a certain manor of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury which ought not to be seized; he held it for 3 weeks and at his entry he took 4 marks.

### **Larkfield Hundred**

The jury say that Aylesford manor used to be in the lord king's hand and 30 years ago it was given to Richard de Grey by King Henry, the present king's father, for one knight's fee and now the Lady Lucia de Grey holds that manor in dower and it is worth £32 each year. Then they say that Master Geoffrey de Hosal holds *Nesindenn* of the king in chief for a half fee, they do not know by what warrant and that Reginald de Mumby holds Ryarsh manor of the king in chief and it is the barony and it is worth £14 each year and that William de Say holds Birling and Burham of the king in chief and it is the barony and it is worth £50 each year.

Then they say that Larkfield hundred is in the lord king's hand and it is worth 100s. each year and that Littlefield and Washlingstone hundreds used to be in the hands of the lord kings, the present king's predecessors and the hundreds are worth £60 each year and are now in the earl of Gloucester's hand by payment of 40s. each year to the lord king, how and by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Addington and Eccles, which Lorna de Scercio now holds in dower, have withdrawn suits from the aforesaid hundred through the authority of William de Montecanis from the time of the battle of Evesham [1265] with loss of 4s. each year to the king and that Ricton and Siffletun, the earl of Gloucester's tenants, through the same earl's authority have withdrawn themselves from suit of lawday for 10 years with loss of 2s. and more each year to the king, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and the bishop of Rochester has return (of writs) from the archbishop for 10 years, by paying £8 to the archbishop each year and that the Lady Lucia de Grey has pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods in Aylesford court, by what

Item dicunt quod Rogerus de Leyburn obstupavit quamdam semitam ducentem de Malling versus Berling ad nocumentum patrie et quod Willelmus de Offeham obstupavit quamdam regalem viam in Offenham et quod Walterus de la Broke et Radulfus Champun obstrupaverunt quamdam semitam ducentem de ecclesie de Addington versus domum Lucie Speche et quod Thomas Eryng obstrupavit quamdam viam ducentem de Halebech versus parcum de Halling. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Marlay cepit iijs de Willelmo de Clifford pro officio suo faciendo de abjuracione cuiusdam feloni fugantis in ecclesiam de Elisford et quod idem Johannes de Marlay cepit ijs de Willelmo de Reyersse pro officio suo excercendo de presbitero mortuo in eadem villa invento et quod idem Johannes cepit iiijs de villa de Berling pro officio suo exercendo de quodam puero mactato in eadem villa.

Item dicunt quod Robertus filius Lamberti de Cheketelle cepit de Willelmo Blakeman recognitione removendi de assisa vjd et quod Willelmus Mamwrech cepit de Willelmo le Mone recognitione removendi vjd.

Item dicunt quod Reginaldus de Cokkeshale cepit unam marcam pro deliberacione Edwardi Molendinarii de Adyngtun qui inprisonatus fuit pro evasione Agnetis de Wilton inprisonata pro latrocinio suo apud Adington.

Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt xxvijs de hundredo predicto pro pondere ultra certum numerum de xx libris.

Item dicunt quod domina Margareta de Say maritata est unde maritagium pertinet ad regem sed nesciunt utrum per licenciam regis aut non.

### **Hundredum de Wrotham**

Dicunt jurati quod domina Isabella tenet medietatem manerii de Wrotham ad firmam de domino rege et reddit inde xx libras per annum usque ad estatem heredis domini Nicholai Cryoll et cepit illam firmam cito post festum Sancti Nicholai anno regni regis Edwardi primo et dominus Willelmus de Rokesle tenuit eandem medietatem ante dictam dominam per

warrant they do not know and the earl of Gloucester likewise in Tonbridge court, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that Roger de Leyburn has obstructed a certain path leading from Malling towards Birling causing harm to the country and that William of Offham has obstructed a certain highway in Offham and that Walter de la Broke and Ralph Champun have obstructed a certain path leading from Addington church towards Lucy Speche's house and that Thomas Eying has obstructed a certain way leading from *Halebech* towards Halling park. Then they say that John de Marlay took 4s. from William of Clifford for performing duties of his office concerning the abjuracion of a certain felon seeking sanctuary in Aylesford church, that the same John de Marlay took 2s. from William de Reyersse for performing duties of his office upon a priest found dead in the same vill and that the same John took 4s. from Birling vill for performing duties of his office for a certain youth slaughtered in the same vill.

Then they say that Robert, son of Lambert de Cheketelle, took 6d. from William Blakeman in recognition of his removal from an assize and that William Mamwrech took 6d. from William le Mone for recognizing his removal.

Then they say that Reginald de Cokkeshale took one mark to release Edward the miller of Addington who had been imprisoned because Agnes of Wilton, who had been imprisoned for her robbery at Addington had escaped.

Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 27s. by weight from the aforesaid hundred more than the assessed amount of £20.

Then they say that the Lady Margaret de Say has married, thence the giving in marriage pertains to the king, but they do not know whether by the king's licence or not.

### **Wrotham Hundred**

The jury say that the lady Isabel holds a moiety of Wrotham manor at farm of the lord king and she pays £20 each year in rent for this until Sir Nicholas Cryoll's heir comes of age and she took that farm immediately after the feast of St Nicholas in the first year of king Edward's reign [6 December 1272] and Sir William de Ruxley held the same moiety before

unum annum per eandem firmam.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus habet returnum (brevium) sed a quo tempore nesciunt. Item dicunt quod villata de Shiburn que fuit de libertate hundredi de Wrotham per Comitem Glovernie et per Rogerum Horn ballivum suum subtrahitur de secta hundredi predicti ad libertatem de Tunbrygg a tempore belli de Lewes ad grave dampnum regis et domini archiepiscopi que solebat sequi dictum hundredum in omnibus tangentibus coronam et modo illam subtrahunt sed quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod per predictum Comitem et predictum Rogerum Horn includuntur fossatis et palaciis ad forestam de Tunbrygg de tenemento dominorum de Wrotham et de feodo domini regis modo per custodem heredis domini Nicholai de Crioll et Willelmi Heryngaud C acre bosci et pasture a tempore anno regni regis Henrici patris regis Edwardi Lv.

Item dicunt quod dominus Walterus de Berste tunc vicecomes cepit unam carucatam terre de Simone de Wytham in Estkant rettato de feloniam et salvavit eum et cibuit eum victum et vestimentum in vita sua. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Towcestr' per potestatem Comitis Glovernie attachiat equum Nicholaum de Eythetham in foro de Malling quod inveniret pleggium ad satisfaciendum Gileberto Renekyn pro Roberto nepote suo unde Robertus de Shirburn manucepit quod idem Robertus nepos satisfeceret dicto Gileberto ad certum diem per aspectum iiij virorum ex utraque parte electorum in loco certo in hundredo de Wrotham et cum venissent ad dictum diem dictus Gilebertus adduxit ibi dominum Bartholemeum de Woteringbir' militem et plures alios armis bene munitos minantes quod dictus Robertus nepos Nicholai et Robertus filius Godefridi et Robertus filius Roberti ducerentur ad castrum de Tunebrigg nisi satisfacerent dicto Gilberto ad voluntatem suam et nisi Galfridus Brodhok satisfaceret Robertum Sagon ad voluntatem unde predicti quatuor homines pavore coacti finierunt cum eis Lxs et preterea Robertus de Fonte de Tunebrigg' cepit carucam Roberti de Shyburn et oves eiusdem et equum Deuwyni Sheys in hundredo de Wrotham et duxit eos usque Dalkehurst ad manerium domini Comitis et tenebantur ibi in parco quousque dictus Robertus solvisset pro supradictis iiij hominibus de Wrotham Ls quos Johannes le Boxne porterevus recepit.

said lady for one year, at the same farm.

Then they say that the lord archbishop has return (of writs) but they do not know from what time. Then they say that the township of Shipbourne which was of the liberty of Wrotham hundred, has through the earl of Gloucester and Roger Horn his bailiff withdrawn from suit of the aforesaid hundred to the liberty of Tonbridge from the time of the battle of Lewes [1264] with serious loss to the king and the lord archbishop as Shipbourne used to do suit at the said hundred in all things concerning the crown and now they withdraw that suit, but by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that in the 55th year of King Henry's reign, father of King Edward [October 1270-1271] 100 acres of wood and pasture were inclosed with ditches and pales at Tonbridge forest, through the aforesaid earl and the aforesaid Roger Horn, from the tenement of the lords of Wrotham and the fee now of the lord king, because of the wardship of Nicholas de Crioll's heir. Then they say that Sir Walter de Berste, then the sheriff, took one carucate of land from Simon of Witham in east Kent who was indicted of felony and he saved him and fed and clothed him during his lifetime. Then they say that John of Towcester by the authority of the earl of Gloucester seized Nicholas of Eythorne's horse in Malling market place which he found as a pledge for making amends to Gilbert Renekyn on behalf of his nephew Robert; thence Robert de Shipbourne acted as surety that the same Robert the nephew should made amends to the said Gilbert on a certain day before 4 men elected from both sides, in a certain place in Wrotham hundred and when they arrived on the said day, the said Gilbert brought Sir Bartholomew de Woteringbir knight and many others well armed, threatening that the said Robert, nephew of Nicholas and Robert son of Godfrey and Robert son of Robert should be taken to Tonbridge castle unless they made satisfaction to the said Gilbert on his terms and unless Geoffrey Brodhok made satisfaction to Robert Sagon on his terms. Thence the four men driven by fear paid them a fine of 60s. and in addition Robert de Fonte of Tonbridge took Robert of Shipbourne's plough and his sheep and a horse of Deuwyni Sheys in Wrotham hundred and took them to the lord earl's manor at Dachurst [Hildenborough] and they were held in the park there until the said Robert paid 50s. for the above named men of Wrotham, which John le Boxne, the port-reeve, received.

Item dicunt quod Johannes le Boxne attaciavit in Tunebrygg Alanum Maken' tenentem tunc domini regis Edwardi ad respondendum Roberto de Sagon in portemoto de Tunebrygg unde idem Paganus (sic) ibi iniuste occasionatus dedit dicto Roberto Sagon dimidiam marcam et dicto comiti viijs viijd.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor et (*Martinus*) Warinus de Chawcumbe ballivus eius iniuste inprisonavit Johannem filium Thome, Willelmum de Fychele, Galfridum Godynogh, Henricum le Brok, Willelmum le Chun et Thomam fabrum in Wrotham pro bosco quem emerunt de ballivo domini Nicholai de Cryoll ipso vivente et tenerunt eos in priona quousque finierunt xxs et solverunt dicto Warino et nicholominus totum predictum boscum amiserunt. Item dictus Magister Ricardus et Johannes de Estwode ballivus eius ceperunt de Waltero Carbonario mahemium in Wrotham quod idem Walterus emit de domino Nicholai de Cryoll et de Willelmo Herigod ad valorem X marcas. Item idem Magister Richardus escaetor Johannes de Estwode et Warinus de Chaucumbe ballivi dicti escaetoris iniuste ceperunt de tenentibus qui fuerunt dicti domini Nicholai et Willelmi Herygod in Wrotham viij marcas nomine recognitionis ubi numquam ante tale donum dederunt nec archiepiscopo nec aliis. Item dicunt quod Walterus le Howere tunc ballivus de Wrotham cepit dimidiam marcam de Juliane de Shyburn pro marca amerciata coram Nicholao de Turri justiciario et preterea Thomas le Pendere tunc prepositus de Atteford cepit de eadem pro dicta marca ij boves et vendidit eos pro dimidia marca et nichilominus venit in summonitione scaccarii dimidia marca predicta.

Item dicunt quod Adam Pens de Wrotham inprisonatus apud Otteford pro ij ovibus unde homines de hundredo de Wrotham quesierunt ipsum ibi petentes eum per plevinam et habere non poterunt quousque dictus Adam finivit cum Johanne de Estwode tunc ballivo 1 marcam quam statim solvit eidem. Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de eodem hundredo xijs vjd ultra certum numerum pro pondere. Item dicunt quod post mortem Willelmi Heryngod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis cepit seisinam medietatis manerii de Wrotham occasione sedis Cant' vacante videlicet anno regni regis Henrici Lv et tunc Johannes de Estwode ballivus dicti escaetoris nomine ipsius

Then they say that John le Boxne arrested Alan Maken in Tonbridge, a tenant of the then Lord Edward now King, to make response to Roberto de Sagon in Tonbridge portmoot, the same Pagan (*sic*- recte Alan) unjustly accused there gave Robert de Sagon half a mark and 8s. 8d. to the said earl.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and Warin de Chawcumbe, his bailiff, unjustly imprisoned John son of Thomas, William de Fychele, Geoffrey Godynogh, Henry le Brok, William le Chun and Thomas the smith in Wrotham because they bought wood from Sir Nicholas de Cryoll's bailiff while he was alive and they held the men in prison until they paid 20s. fine. They paid the said Warin and nevertheless they have lost the aforesaid wood. Then the said Master Richard and John of Eastwood his bailiff, took timber from Walter the charcoal burner in Wrotham which the same Walter bought from Sir Nicholas de Cryoll and William Herigod, valued at 10 marks. Then the same Master Richard, the escheator, John of Eastwood and Warin de Chaucumbe the said escheator's bailiffs, unjustly took 8 marks from those who had been tenants of the said Sir Nicholas and William Herygod in Wrotham in the name of recognition whereas they had never given such a gift to the archbishop nor to any others. Then they say that Walter le Howere, then bailiff of Wrotham took half a mark from Juliana of Shipbourne for the mark amerced before Nicholas de Turri the justice and afterwards Thomas le Pendere, then the reeve of *Atteford*, took 2 oxen from the same Juliana for the same amercement and sold them for half a mark and nevertheless the aforesaid half mark came in summons of the Exchequer.

Then they say that Adam Pens of Wrotham was imprisoned at Otford for 2 sheep, thence the men of Wrotham hundred claimed him, seeking him there through a pledge and they could not have this until the said Adam had been fined 1 mark by John of Eastwood, then the bailiff, which he paid immediately to the same man. Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 12s. 6d. by weight more than the assessed amount from the same hundred. Then they say that after William Heryngod's death Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, took seisin of a moiety of Wrotham manor, because the see of Canterbury was vacant, that is in the 55th year of King Henry's reign and then John of Eastwood, the

destruxit boscos de Wrotham qui fuerunt dicti Willelmi Heryngod ad valorem xx marcarum. Item post mortem domini Nicholai de Crioll Warinus de Craucumbe et eius (? clerici) injuste destruxerunt boscos qui fuerunt dicti Nicholai in Wrotham ad valorem X marcarum. Item dicunt quod dictus escaetor cepit medietatem manerii de Wrotham die Mercurie proximo post festum Sancti Nicholai anno Lv et tenuit eam usque circumscisionem Domini proximo sequente et quod idem escaetor cepit seisinam alterius medietatis dicti manerii de Wrotham predicti post seisinam escaetoris venit Warinus de Chaucumbe ex parte domini Roberti Burnel et cepit seisinam eiusdem et tenuit ad opus domini Edwardi cui rex dedit [ ] illius medietatis per annum et dimidiam. Item dicunt per inquisitionem aliorum hundredorum quod Comes Glovernie et Rogerus de Horne fecerunt purpresturam super dominum regem [ ] hundredi de Ho occupantes ad liberam leucatam de Tunebrygge tria mesuagia et unum molendinum ad bladum et unum molendinum fullonum et C acras terre et bosci [ ] tempore regis Henrici Lij et quod tempore regis Johannis quidam Willelmus Smalewryrte custodivit hundredum de Wachelestan et hundredum de Littlefeld ad opus domini regis et dimisit illa Comiti Glovernie sic Comiti Ricardo patri Gileberti avi istius Comitis qui nunc est per redditum xxs de uno hundredo et xxs de altero sic valent dicta hundreda Lxs quo warento Comes ea teneat nesciunt.

### **Hundredum de Malling sive Villata**

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Middiltun est de dominico domini regis et valet per annum ccc marcas et dominus Johannes de Burgo nunc tenet illud hundredum quo warento ignorant et quod manerium de Ospring est de dominico domini regis et valet per annum C marcas et domina regina mater domini regis nunc ea [sic]) tenet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod manerium de Eyllsford fuit de dominico domini regis Henrici patris regis qui nunc est aliquo tempore et valet per annum xL libras et nunc tenent heredes Johannis de Grey quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod hundreda de Wecheliston et Lytlefeld sunt de dominico domini regis tunc tenuit Comes Glovernie reddidit per anum domino regi xLs tempore regis Henrici et fuerunt alienata per ballivos domini

said escheator's bailiff, in his name destroyed the woods of Wrotham which were of the said William Heryngod, to the value of 20 marks. The after the lord Nicholas de Crioll's death, Warin de Craucumbe and his [?clerks] unjustly destroyed woods which had belonged to the said Nicholas in Wrotham to value of 10 marks. Then they say that the said escheator took a moiety of Wrotham manor on the Wednesday next after the feast of St Nicholas in the 55th year and held it until the Lord's circumscision next following [12 December 1270-1 January 1271] and that the same escheator took seisin of another moiety of the said manor of Wrotham aforesaid. After the escheator's seisin Warin de Chaucumbe came on behalf of the lord Robert Burnel and took seisin of the same and held it for the use of the Lord Edward, to whom the king gave [ ] of that moiety for a year and a half. Then they say through an inquisition of the other hundreds that the earl of Gloucester and Roger de Horn have made an encroachment upon the lord king, [ ] of Hoo hundred, occupying in the lowy of Tonbridge 3 messuages, one corn mill, one fulling mill and 100 acres of land and wood [ ] at the 53rd year of King Henry [October 1268-1269] and in King John's time a certain William Smalewryte had the custody of Wachlingstone and Littlefield hundreds for the king's use and he demised those to the earl of Gloucester, thus to Earl Richard the father of Gilbert, grandfather of that present earl, by a rent of 20s. from one hundred and 20s. from the other, thus the said hundreds are worth 60s. each year [*sic-recte 40s.*] they do not know by what warrant the earl holds these.

### **Malling Hundred or township**

The jury say that Middleton hundred is of the lord king's demesne and is worth 300 marks each year and Sir John de Burgh now holds that hundred, by what warrant they are ignorant and that Ospringe manor is of the lord king's demesne and is worth 100 marks each year and the lady queen, the present king's mother holds it, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that Aylesford manor was of the demesne of the lord King Henry, the present king's father, at another time and is worth £40 each year and now John de Grey's heirs hold it, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that Wachlingstone and Littlefield hundreds are of the lord king's demesne, then the earl of Gloucester held them and paid the lord king 40s. each year at King Henry's time and they



regis tempore Comitis Glovernie avi Comitis qui nunc est.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita namio vetiti wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbatissa de Malling habet assisam panis et cervisie furcas de antiquo tempore quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn habent warentum et liberam chascias in Leyburn quo warento ignorant.

Item dicunt quod Rogerus de Leyburn pater predicti Willelmi fecit purpresturam super semitam domini regis in Leyburn et Willelmus filius eius adhuc tenet quo warento ignorant.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus Hunwyn cepit injuste per potestatem officii sui V marcas de Henrico Smoys tempore regis Henrici Lij. Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundredo ultra certum numerum pro pondere duas marcas ultra certum numerum

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escator domini regis cepit maheremium de Waltero Calyer post decessum archiepiscopi Bonifacii ad valorem X marcas in villa de Wrotham injuste et sine causa et quod idem escaetor fecit vastum per omnes terras archiepiscopi sed quantitatem ignorant.

m. 7 dorso **Hundredum de Ho in lesto adhuc de Heylisford**

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Ho est in porcione particione cum Hugone Poynz et abbate de Reding et Henricus de Grey qui est infra etatem in custode domine regine matris regis et sunt in dicto hundredo tres borghe unde predictus dominus Hugo habet unam borgham et inde percipit emendum panis et cervisie et alias emendas transgressionum que accidunt in eadem borgha et abbas eodem modo et regina eodem modo racione warde Henrici de Grey predicti et tenetur de domino rege in capite et sic tenebatur de antiquo sed nesciunt per quod servicium nec quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Agulon tenet dimidium feodum militis in dicto hundredo in parochia de Stok racione warde Johannis filii Thome Malemeis quod tenetur de domino regis in capite per xx annos set nesciunt quo warento et valet dictum dimidium feodum per annum X libras. Item dicunt quod manerium de Middiltune tenetur de domino rege

were alienated by the lord king's bailiffs in the earl of Gloucester's time, the present earl's grandfather.

Then they say that the archbishop has return and extract of writs and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbess of Malling has the assize of bread and ale, the gallows from ancient times, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn has warren and free chaces in Leybourne, by what warrant they are ignorant.

Then they say that Roger de Leyburn, the aforesaid William's father, made an encroachment upon the lord king's pathway in Leybourne and William his son still holds it, they are ignorant by what warrant. Then they say that Richard Hunwyn by the authority of his office, unjustly took 5 marks from Henry Smoys in King Henry's 52nd year [October 1267-1268]. Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took two marks by weight more than the assessed amount from the said hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, unjustly and unreasonably took timber, valued at 10 marks from Walter Calyer after the death of Archbishop Boniface and that the same escheator caused damage throughout all the archbishop's lands but they do not know how much.

m. 7 dorso **Hoo Hundred still in Aylesford lathe**

The jury say that Hoo hundred is in parts divided between Hugh Poynz, the abbot of Reading and Henry de Grey who is under age and is a ward of the lady queen, the present king's mother, and there are three tithings in the said hundred, whereof Sir Hugh has one tithing and there he takes the fines of the assize of bread and ale and other fines for wrong-doings which occur in the same tithing, likewise the abbot and the queen also because of the wardship of the aforesaid Henry de Grey and Hoo hundred is held of the lord king in chief and thus it was held from ancient times but they do not know through what service nor by what warrant. Then they say that Sir Robert de Agulon holds half a knight's fee in the said hundred because he holds the wardship of John, son of Thomas Malemeis, and this is held of the lord king in chief for 20 years but they do not know by what warrant and the said half fee is worth £10 each year. Then they say that

in capite per Johannem de Burgo qui illud modo tenet ex concessione domini regis nunc et quod manerium de Ospring fuit quondam domini regis et illud modo tenet regina mater regis sed nesciunt a quo tempore vel quo warento. Item dicunt quod vicecomes percipit per annum ad turnum suum ad opus regis ij marcas de consuetudine et quod hundredum predictum valet ad opus dominorum xLs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas Malemeis tempore vite sue solebat venire ad communitatem hundredi de Ho ad audiendum precepta domini regis et auxiliandum iudicibus dare de sanguine vita et membra una cum hundredo predicto et inde subtraxit se ante decessum suum per vij annos et eodem modo subtrahit se Robertus de Agulum racione warde quam de filio dicti Thome et nesciunt quo warento et hoc per ix annos elapsos ad grave dampnum hundredi.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium wreccum maris et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervise et alia que ad coronam pertinet et habuit de antiquo nesciunt quo warento simili modo habent assisam panis et cervisie predicti Hugo et regina racione warde predictae et furcas similiter et fieri faciunt iudicium de sanguine vita et membra. Item dicunt quod abbas de Reding levavit in eodem hundredo furcas per viij annos elapsos et fieri facit iudicium de vita et membra nesciunt quo warento sed habet iuste et libere assisam panis et cervisie cum aliis pertinenciis suis predictis. Item dicunt quod idem abbas injuste extraxit unum hominem appellatum et prosecutum de hundredo usque in curia et in eadem curia de eodem fieri fecit iudicium ubi debuit adjudicari in hundredo nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Turgisius de Heredefeld levavit quamdam purpresturam super regalem viam in hundredo predicto et artatur via regalis ex illo fossato decem pedibus in latitudine et in longitudine xL perticatas et hoc per annum ad dampnum regis et patrie per annum iij d. et amplius.

Item dicunt quod ballivi domini regis solebant ministrare cum servientibus episcopi Roff' in omnibus excecucionibus mandatorum regis et quod idem episcopus non habuit eo tempore returnum brevium sed idem episcopus habet modo returnum brevium de

Middleton manor is held of the lord king in chief by John de Burgh who now holds that by the present lord king's grant and that Ospringe manor was formerly of the lord king and now the queen, the king's mother holds that, but they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the sheriff takes 2 marks at his tourn each year for the king's use and that the aforesaid hundred is worth 40s. for the lords' use.

Then they say that Thomas Malemeis during his lifetime used to come to the community of the hundred of Hoo to hear the lord king's commands and to support the justices in pronouncing sentences for cases of blood-shed, life and limb together with the aforesaid hundred and then he withdrew himself 7 years before his death and in the same way Robert de Augulum withdraws himself because of his wardship of the said Thomas's son and they do not know by what warrant and this for 9 years with serious loss to the hundred.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown and he has held these from ancient times, by what warrant they do not know. Similarly the aforesaid Hugh and the queen because of the aforesaid wardship have the assize of bread and ale and similarly a gallows and they give judgement in cases of blood-shed, life and limb. Then they say that 8 years ago the abbot of Reading erected a gallows in the same hundred and passes judgement of life and limb, they do not know by what warrant, but he has the assize of bread and ale with his other aforesaid appurtenances justly and rightly. Then they say that the same abbot unjustly took one man accused and prosecuted in the hundred to the court and he heard the case in the same court whereas the man ought to have been judged in the hundred, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Turgisius de Heredefeld has made a certain encroachment upon the royal highway in the aforesaid hundred and the highway is diverted ten feet from that ditch in length and 40 perches in width and this causes loss to the king and country of 3d. and more each year.

Then they say that the lord king's bailiffs used to officiate with the bishop of Rochester's serjeants in carrying out all the lord king's mandates and that the same bishop did not have return of writs at this time, but the same bishop now has return of writs from the

archiepiscopo Cant' et ballivi sui exequantur modo mandata regia et hoc habuit ab ultimo Itinere Gilberti de Prestun in comitatu Kanc' sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Robertus Heryng cepit de Rogero Kempelof ij agnos, precii xijd ut removeretur a quadam assisa capta apud Grenewychum Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Garston ballivus Comitis Glovernie per falsas suggestiones inposuit Willelmo fabro de Stok quod erat inimicus regis et domini sui Comitis et quod insidiabatur regi in dampnum secundum posse suum et huius malicia cepit ab eo xLs injuste et hoc fuit post bellum de Evesham. Item Ricardus Atteburne habuit de eodem modo et racione eadem de eodem Willelmo ij marcas et quod dictus Willelmus de Garstun cepit de Galfrido ate Rypelonerie eadem racione 1 marcam et iterum de eodem Willelmo et Hugone carpentario eadem racione 1 marcam et idem Willelmus de Garstun cepit de Henrico de Bradfeud de villa Omnium Sanctorum pro eodem 1 marcam et de Thoma le Paumer de villa de Sancte Marie de Ho pro eodem dimidiam marcam et de Willelmo Cok de villa Omnium Sanctorum pro eodem dimidiam marcam et de Jordano de la Grange de eadem villa pro eodem dimidiam marcam ijs et de Willelmo Horwode pro eodem xijd et de Willelmo Lucas iijs et dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime domini regis ceperunt in dicto hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum pro pondere Lxs.

Item dicunt quod quidcunque hundredi de Ho in Itinere justiciariorum fuerit americiatus coram eisdem justiciariis abbas de Reding stabit in tercia parte cum hundredo scottando et lottando sicut tercius dominus eiusdem hundredi et in Itinere Magistri Rogeri de Seytun dictum hundredum americiatum fuit ad xLs et due partes eiusdem hundredi solverunt porcionem suam et dictus abbas subtraxit se et tenentes suos ad presens de scotto predicto et nichilo venit dictum hundredum in summonitione de dictis xLs ad grave dampnum patrie set nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Scotto subeschaetor domini regis seisivit terras Henrici de Grey post mortem Johannis de Grey et tenuit eas in manu domini regis per 1 septimanam et levavit de tenentibus ibidem V marcas pro tallagio. Idem Robertus seisivit terras Hugonis Poynz post mortem Nicholai Ponnz in Ho et tenuit eas in manu domini regis per 1 diem et levavit de tallagio ibidem V marcas.

archbishop of Canterbury, and his bailiffs now execute the royal mandates and he has had this from the time of Gilbert of Preston's last eyre in the county of Kent, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Robert Heryng took 2 lambs, price 12d. from Roger Kempelof for removing him from a certain assize held at Greenwich. Then they say that William de Garston, the earl of Gloucester's bailiff, accused William the smith of Stoke, through false accusations that he had been an enemy of the king and of the said earl his lord and he had plotted to undermine the king's prestige and for this malicious rumour he took 40s. from him unjustly and this was after the battle of Evesham [1265]. Then Richard Atteburne had 2 marks from the same William in the same way and for the same reason, that the said William de Garstun took 1 mark from Geoffrey ate Rypelonerie for the same reason, again 1 mark from the same William and Hugh the carpenter for the same reason, the same William de Garstun took 1 mark from Henry de Bradfeud of the vill of All Saints [Allhallows?] for the same and half a mark from Thomas le Paumer of the vill of St Mary Hoo for the same, half a mark from William Cook of the vill of All Saints for the same, half a mark 2s. from Jordan de la Grange of the same town for the same, 12d. from William Horwood for the same and 4s. from William Lucas and they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 60s. by weight more than the assessed amount in the said hundred.

Then they say that whenever anyone of Hoo hundred is amerced before the justices in eyre, the abbot of Reading shall stand for the third part with the hundred for scot and lot levy, as the third lord of the same hundred and in Master Roger de Seytun's eyre the said hundred was amerced 40s. and two-thirds of the same hundred paid their portion and the said abbot withdrew himself and his tenants up to the present from the aforesaid scot and the same hundred never came in summons for the said 40s. with severe loss to the country, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Sir Robert de Scottus, the lord king's sub-escheator, took possession of Henry de Grey's lands after John de Grey's death and held these in the lord king's hand for 1 week and he exacted 5 marks from the tenants there for tallage. The same Robert took possession of Hugh Poynz's lands after Nicholas Poynz's death in Hoo and held these in the lord king's hand for 1 day and exacted 5 marks there for tallage.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glovernie intravit et cepit super dominum regem in Ho iniuste ad libertatem suam in Tunebrygge quam vocant la Lawe tria mesuagia duo molendina et centum acras terre et bosci et hoc per V annos ad grave dampnum regis et patrie sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Simon Mortlak quondam constabularius castris de Tunbrygg occasionavit maliciose Radulfum de Fraxino per falsas suggestiones et cepit ab eo xxs et de Henrico de Bradefeud xij capons precii ijs eodem modo et de Roberto le Keyere pro eodem xjs et de Johanne Salomone pro eodem 1 marcam, de Willelmo fabro de Stok pro eodem 1 pondus casei dimidiam marcam et quod dictus Simon omnes denarios predictos recepit sed nesciunt cui inde respondit. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Sancto Claro coronator in lesto de Heylisford cepit de borgha Henrici Prude iijs pro officio suo exequendo et idem Johannes cepit de borgha Roberti de Hok iijs pro eodem et de villa de Stok pro eodem ijs et de borgha de Stok pro eodem ijs. Item dicunt quod Johanne de Meryle qui modo est coronator cepit de borgha de Sancta Werburga pro officio suo ijs.

Item dicunt quod post bellum de Evesham rex cepit seisinam de hundredo de Ho et fecit ballivos suos Ricardum Page et Herevicum le Prude qui colligerunt tempore suo redditus ad dampnum regis ad valenciam iiij librarum xvs. postea dominus Rogerus de Leyburn habuit illud hundredum ex concessione domini regis et fecit ibidem alios ballivos et exigebat a predictis Ricardo et Herewico predictos denarios et ipsi responderent quod illos denarios solverunt ad scaccarium domini regis et nunc iterum veniunt in summonitione ad grave dampnum patrie.

### **Hundredum de Toltyntre**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Mepeham quondam fuit domini regis et modo est in manu prioris Sancte Trinitatis Cant' et valet per annum xxx libras sed a quo warento nesciunt nec a quo tempore. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Montecanis tenet baroniam de Talebot ad Swaneschamp de domino rege in capite et inde reddit annuatim custodi castris Roff' xvij libras set nesciunt quo warento et quod Henricus de Crammavile tenet manerium de Gravesende in capite de domino rege per servicium unius militis et quod Nicholaus filius Willelmi Reyner tenet manerium de Mistede de Galfrido de Pey per

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester arrived and unjustly, and took from above the kingthree messuages, two mills and one hundred acres of land and wood in Hoo for his liberty in Tonbridge, which they call the Lawe [Lowy] and this was 5 years ago with severe loss to the king and country and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Simon Mortlake, formerly constable of Tonbridge castle, maliciously charged Ralph de Fraxino through false accusations and took 20s. from him, 12 capons price 3s. from Henry de Bradefeud in the same way, 11s. from Robert de Keyere for the same and 1 mark from John Solomon for the same, from William the smith of Stoke 1 wey of cheese price half a mark for the same and that the same Simon received the aforesaid money but they do not know to whom he gave account of it. Then they say that John de St Clare, the coroner in Aylesford lathe, took 4s. from Henry Prude's tithing to perform duties of his office and the same John took 4s. from Robert de Hok's tithing for the same, 2s. from the vill of Stoke for the same and 2s. from Stoke tithing for the same. Then they say that John de Marley who is now the coroner took 2s. from the tithing of [Hoo] St Werburga for his office.

Then they say that after the battle of Evesham the king took seisin of Hoo hundred and he appointed Richard Page and Hervey le Prude as his bailiffs, who collected the rents during their time of office to the king's loss of £4 15s. Afterwards Sir Roger de Leyburn held that hundred by the lord king's grant and he appointed other bailiffs there and demanded the aforesaid money from the aforesaid Richard and Hervey and they replied that they paid that money to the lord king's Exchequer and now they come again with summons with severe loss to the country.

### **Toltingtrough hundred**

The jury say that Meopham manor was formerly of the lord king and now is in the hand of the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury and is worth £30 each year, but they do not know by what warrant nor from what time. Then they say that the lord William de Montecanis holds Talbot barony at Swanscombe of the lord king in chief and he pays rent of £18 each year for this to the keeper of Rochester castle, but they do not know by what warrant and that Henry de Crammavile holds Gravesend manor of the lord king in chief by the service of one knight and that Nicholas son of William Reyner holds *Minstead* [Nursted?] manor of Geoffrey

servicium dimidii feodi. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' tenet hundredrum de Toltr' et valet per annum xLs sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus archiepiscopus habet returnum brevium wreccum marcis furcas assisam panis et cervisie et placita namio vetitio nesciunt quo warento et quod episcopus Roff' habet returnum brevium ab archiepiscopo et reddit sibi inde per annum viij libras nesciunt quo warento et dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Montecanis habet furcas apud Swaneschamp in sua baronia et idem suspensi fuerunt tres latrones et per fratres hospitalis ducti fuerunt ad monasterium et in monasterio invenerunt de illis unum vivum et in ecclesia illa quamdiu voluit moram fecit et postea ad voluntatem eius exivit et adhuc vivit. Item dicunt quod ix anni sunt elapsi quod Adam Toxkemale in dicto loco fuit suspensus super unam quercum qui iudicatus fuit in curia de Hertleye et per sectam tocus curie ductus fuit ibidem et invenerunt furcas caducas et relevare noluerunt nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Adam Elnold fecit quamdam purpresturam in villa de Northflete super regiam viam ad dampnum patrie vjd. per annum. Item dicunt quod Robertus Carlebi subballivus cepit de Johanne le Reg' iiij pro eo removendo ab assisa et de Johanne Nyweman vjd pro eodem et de Willelmo de Hetche ijd pro eodem et de Johanne Atteborstalle ijd pro eodem

Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de eodem hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum pro pondere dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod dominus de Craye et Simon Morlak quondam constabularius Roff' tenuerunt quendam peram pontis Roff' ad valorem xL marcarum ad magnum dampnum tocus patrie omnium [ ] pere de Northflet sed quadam causa nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis cepit seisinam apud Northflet post mortem archiepiscopi Bonifacii Cant et in custodia et seisina temporis sui manerium deterioratum fuit sicut in dicto molendino et omnibus aliis rebus dicti manerii ad valorem C solidorum et amplius. Item Magister Ricardus de Clifford fecit removeri in dicto manerio usque manerium suum de Moleseye duos equos carectarios precii xLs et viij stottos precii iiij librarum et viij boves precii iij librarum et cepit injuste de villa de Northflet X

de Pey by service of a half fee. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury holds Toltrough hundred and is worth 40s each year, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the said archbishop has return of writs, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, by what warrant they do not know and that the bishop of Rochester has return of writs from the archbishop and he pays him £8 each year for this, they do not know by what warrant and they say that the lord William de Montecanis has a gallows at Swanscombe[Axtane hun.] in his barony and there three robbers were hanged and they were brought to the monastery by the Brethren of the hospital and in the monastery they discovered that one of them was alive and he stayed in the church as long as he wished and afterwards departed when he wished and he is still living. Then they say that 9 years ago that Adam Toxkemale was hanged in the said place upon a certain oak; he had been sentenced in the court of Hartley [Axtane hun.] and by suit of the whole court had been conveyed there when they found the gallows were broken and they did not wish to repair them, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Adam Elnold made a certain encroachment in Northfleet vill on the highway with loss of 6d. each year to the country. Then they say that Robert Carlebi, a sub-bailiff, took 4s. from John le Reg' to remove him from an assise, 6d. from John Newman for the same, 2d. from William de Heche for the same and 2d. from John Atteborstalle for the same. Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took half a mark by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that the lord of Cray and Simon Morlak, formerly constable of Rochester, held a certain pier of Rochester bridge, value 40 marks, causing great loss to the whole country [ ] the pier of Northfleet, but they do not know for what reason. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, took seisin at Northfleet after the death of Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury and during the time of his custody and seisin the manor deteriorated, in the said mill and all other assets of the said manor, to the value of 100s. and more. Then Master Richard de Clifford had 2 cart-horses price 40s., 8 steers price £4 and 8 oxen price £3 removed from the said manor to his manor of East Molesey [Surrey] and he unjustly took 10 marks from Northfleet vill, that Master Hugh de

marcas et quod Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus eius unam marcam et quod Robertus Deveneye serviens dicti Ricardi cepit ut dixit dicti Ricardi ut dixit de Johanne Strange injuste xLs et idem Johannes se conquerens cepit ab eo l marcam et quod idem Johannes finxit se solvere venit dictus nocturno tempore ad domum dicti Johannis et eum assaltavit donec levavit hutesium super eum et quod idem Robertus cepit injuste de Johanne de Fraxino clerico suo unum bovem precii unius marce. Item dictus Magister Ricardus de Clifford venit ad curiam de Mepeham et cepit ibidem seysinam per dominum regem priore adhuc vivente occasione eleccionis archiepiscopi Cant' et in dicto manerio cepit injuste ix libras vjs et de tenentibus dicti manerii cepit iniuste V marcas et Adam de Meleburn eius serviens cepit ad expensas suas ibidem unuam sumam et dimidam frumenti et idem cepit et iniuste asportavit xxxs de collectione pontagii Roff' tocuis hundredi predicti et communie et idem Adam cepit iniuste de Johanne de Fraxino aliam dimidiam marcam.

Item dictus Magister Ricardus de Clifford cepit iniuste de Johanne de la Hegge Cs pro evasione duorum prisonum et iterum cepit de eodem Johanne xLs et quod Robertus Deveney's serviens dicti Ricardi cepit de Thoma de Rundal iniuste dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod dictus Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit manerium de Northflete et moram fecit in eodem manerio in seisina sic per ij annos et xx septimanas videlicet in principio Augusti intravit anno regni regis Henrici Liiij et manerium valet per annum C libras. Idem Ricardus cepit manerium de Mepeham in manu domini regis et tenuit per V septimanas donec redderentur per preceptum domini regis et per breve.

### **Hundredum de Brenchchesle**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Bokingsfelde tenetur de rege in capite per dominum Ricardum de Crevequer et valet per annum xv libras. Item dicunt quod Rogerus Vinitarius de Malling tenet lestum de Eylesford ad firmam de vicecomitibus qui tunc fuerunt pro X libris et modo Thome de Ho tenet dictum lestum ad firmam de vicecomite qui nunc est pro xxvj libris racione debet [ ] ad dampnum patrie de tanto amerciamento. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Brenchchesle est in manu domini regis et valet per annum l marcam quod non est in dicto hundredo nec

Thornham, his clerk, (took) one mark and that Robert Deveneye, the said Richard's serjeant took, as he said of the said Richard unjustly as he said, from John Strange 40s. and as the same John complained he took 1 mark from him and when the same John declined to pay him, the said [man] came to the said John's house during the night and assaulted him until he raised a hue and cry upon him and that the same Robert unjustly took one ox, price one mark from John de Fraxino his clerk. Then the said Master Richard de Clifford came to the court of Meopham and took seisin there on the lord king's behalf on the occasion of the election of the archbishop of Canterbury, although the prior was still living and he took £9 6s. unjustly in the said manor. He took 5 marks unjustly from the tenants of the said manor, Adam of Melbourne his serjeant took one and a half loads of wheat as his expenses there and the same man took and unjustly carried off 30s. from the collection of Rochester pontage of the whole hundred and community and the same Adam unjustly took another half mark from John de Fraxino.

Then the said Master Richard de Clifford took 100s. unjustly from John de la Hedge for the escape of two prisoners and again he took 40s. from the same John, and that Robert Deveney's, the said Richard's serjeant unjustly took half a mark from Thomas de Rundal. Then they say that the said Master Richard de Clifford took possession of Northfleet manor and stayed in the same manor in his seisin thus for 2 years and 20 weeks, that is from the beginning of August in King Henry's 54th year [1270] and the manor is worth £100 each year. The same Richard took Meopham manor into the lord king's hand and held it for 5 weeks until they had been repossessed by the lord king's command and writ.

### **Brenchley Hundred**

The jury say that Buckingfield manor is held of the lord king in chief by Sir Richard de Crevequer and it is worth £15 each year. Then they say that Roger the vintner of Malling holds Aylsford lathe at farm of the sheriffs who then hold office for £10 and now Thomas of Hoo holds the said lathe at farm of the present sheriff for £26 because he owes [ ] with loss to the country because of such amercement. Then they say that Brenchley hundred is in the lord king's hand and is worth 1 mark each year because it is not in the hundred nor 1d. of the rent. Then they say *Stamendon*

1d de redditu.

Item dicunt quod Stamendon et Lehal fuerunt due secte et sequi solebant cum hundredo et sunt subtracte per Ricardum de Grey xv annis elapsis ad dampnum patrie per annum xix d [ ] dampnum regis.

Item Tong et Suthlong est una secta et subtraxerunt se xv annis elapsis per Walterum de Aldewyk seneschallum Comitis Glovernie ad dampnum patrie per annum xd [? dampnum ] domini regis quantum nesciunt quidam una secta pro valore per annum et dimidia secta de Hedenn subtraxit se per eundem Walterum ad dampnum patrie per annum Vd ad grave [dampnum domini regis] ac una secta de Bokingfolde subtraxit [se] per eundem Walterum ad dampnum patrie per annum Xd et grave dampnum dicti regis per xv annos. Item dimidia secta de Upstok shelle subtraxit se per xv annos per Henricum Lovel [ ] ad dampnum patrie Vd et ad gravamen domini regis et una secta de Epergha subtraxit se per xxiiij annos per locatos de Tunebrig quare contencio mota fuit [inter] Comitem Glovernie et Bonifacium archiepiscopum Cant' et monstratum fuit regi Henrico ita quod per preceptum eiusdem regis apposerunt se in xxiiij de vicinis ad [? curiam] de Eperegh infra locatum et postea demonstrabatur in locato ad dampnum patrie per annum Xd et ad grave dampnum regis. Item tenentes abbatisse de [ ] solebant sequi ad omnia cum hundredo et subtraxerunt se per xxv annos per Willelmum Peverel ballivum eiusdem abbatisse ad dampnum patrie per anum ijs et ad [grave] dampnum domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glovernie clamat habere returnum (brevium) et tenet placita namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento et abbas de [ ] clamat habere assisam panis et cervisie in tithinga de Lamberherst nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Wetcheleston fuit antiquo tempore in manu domini regis et hundredum de Littlefeld eodem modo et comes Glovernie tenet predicta hundreda [? et percipit] pro quolibet xxs per annum sed nesciunt quo modo alienata fuerunt nec quo warento sed est magnum dampnum domini regis quolibet anno. Item dicunt quod Isabella de Charlton [fecit quandam] purpresturam super viam regis de dimidia acra in Brenchale ad dampnum patrie et

and *Lehal* used to be two suits and used to do suit at the hundred and 15 years ago they were withdrawn by Richard de Grey with loss of 19d. each year to the country [ ] loss to the king.

Then Tong and South Tong [Brenchley par.] are one suit and they have been withdrawn by Walter de Aldewyk, steward of the earl of Gloucester, for 15 years with loss to the country of 10d. each year and they do not know what loss to the lord king. One suit of value each year and the half suit of *Hedenn* has been withdrawn by the same Walter with loss of 5d. each year to the county and serious [loss to the lord king] and for 15 years one suit of Bockingfold [Yalding par.] has withdrawn itself through the same Walter with loss of 10d. each year to the country and severe loss to the said king. Then for 15 years a half suit of *Upstoke Hill* has withdrawn itself through Henry Lovel [ ] with loss of 5d. to the country and harm to the lord king and for 24 years one suit of *Epergham* has withdrawn itself through the local people of Tonbridge, because a dispute had arisen between the earl of Gloucester and Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury and it was revealed to King Henry so that through the same king's precept they put themselves before [a jury] of 24 men of the locality at *Epergham* court within the lowy and afterwards it was shown in the lowy that there had been a loss of 10d. each year to the country and a severe loss for the king. Then the tenants of the abbess of [? Malling, who] used to do suit at the hundred in all things and have been withdrawn for 25 years by William Peverel, the bailiff of the same abbess, with a loss of 2s. each year to the country and [severe] loss to the lord king.

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester claims to have return (of writs) and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant and the abbot of [ ] claims to have the assize of bread and ale in Lamberhurst tithing, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Wachlingstone hundred was in the lord king's hand in ancient times and Littlefield hundred in the same way and the earl of Gloucester holds the aforesaid hundreds [and receives] for each one 20s. each year, but they do not know by what warrant, but there is great loss to the lord king each year. Then they say that Isabel of Charlton [has made a certain] encroachment of half an acre over the king's highway in Brenchley with loss to the country and to

domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Leinham et Nicholaus de Denet vendiderunt abbati Ponis Roberti dimidium feodum in Lamberherst xvij annis elapsis [ et clamat] habere custodiam et maritagium sic haberet in manu sua baroniam de Crevequer et valet per annum dicta terra xx libras et sic alienata est in prejudicium domini regis xx librarum sed quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Borminge quando fuit coronator cepit dimidiam marcam de hundredo ad sepeliendum Adam But et quod Bartholomeus de [ ] ingebe coronator cepit de catallis Elvithe de Sesella unum jumentum precii viijs ad sepeliendum. Item quando Ricardus Horsman interfectus fuit Johannes de Seint Claro [coronator] cepit iiijs de hundredo ad sepeliendum et ad inquirendum. Item idem Johannes cepit de hundredo dimidiam marcam pro Johanne de Mettefeld pro eodem. Item Nicholaus de Tettesdon cepit de Willelmo de Merber pro eodem ijs. Item quando Johannes Bonyng vacatus fuit in Hoksmundenn Johannes de Marley fecit officium coronatoris quod fuit coronator et tamen [ho]mines hundredi dederunt ei spontanea voluntate ijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus Crevequer inprisonavit Dionisium filium Brun' nesciunt qua causa et permisit eum abire. Thomas Beke Ricardus Aylward Willelmus et Robertus filii Roberti de Rodmerege rettati sunt de fractione cuiusdem domus et Thomas de Ho ballivus cepit de quolibet illorum iiijs ne attachiaret eos et postea Henricus de Hid subvicecomes fecit illos attachiari donec finirent cum eo xxs ut traderentur per plevinum et solverunt. Item predictus Henricus inposuit Godefrido Sleb' quod debuit emisse porcos furatos et finivit Xs et solvit injuste. Idem Henricus inposuit Willelmo Waryn quod deliquit contra ipsum et tenuit ipsum contra voluntatem suam donec finiret xvs et solvit. Item Thomas Molendinarius rettatus fuit de latrocinio ovium et attachiatus fuit per Robertum de Ho ballivus donec solvit Thomaas Xs.

Item dicunt quod dictus Thomas de Ho ballivus et omnes alii ballivi capiunt denarios de pistoribus et braciaticibus pro [? assisis panis et cervisie capiendis ] et non facientibus de eis et ideo assisa non est servata neque emendata. Item Daniel de Burtham tenuit hundredum [ ] in octo solidis et solverunt. Item Thomas de Ho

the lord king.

Then they say that 18 years ago Nicholas of Lenham and Nicholas de Denet sold a half a fee in Lamberhurst to the abbot of Robertsbridge [ and claims] to have wardship and giving in marriage just as he held the barony of Crevequer in his hand and the said land is worth £20 and thus it was alienated with a loss to the lord king of £20, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that when Robert de Borminge was the coroner he took half a mark from the hundred for Adam But's burial and that Bartholomew de [ ] ingebe the coroner took one mare price 8s. from Elvitha de Sesella's chatells for her burial. Then when Richard Horsman was killed John of St Clare [the coroner] took 4s. from the hundred for his burial and for holding an inquest. Then the same John took half a mark from the hundred for performing the same on behalf of John de Mettefield. Then Nicholas de Tettesdon took 3s. from William de Merber for the same reason. Then when John Bonyng was away in *Hoksmundenn* [Horsmonden?] John de Marley did the office of coroner, because he was the coroner and however the men of the hundred gave him 2s. of their own accord.

Then they say that Sir Robert Crevequer imprisoned Dennis son of Brun, for what reason they do not know and allowed him to go free. Thomas Beke, Richard Aylward, William and Robert, sons of Robert de Rodmere were charged with wrecking a certain house and Thomas of Hoo, the bailiff took 4s. from each of them so that he should not arrest them and afterwards Henry of Hythe, the sub sheriff, caused them to be arrested until they paid him 20s. fine so that they could be supported through a pledge and they paid. Then the aforesaid Henry accused Godfrey Sleb' that he had been buying stolen pigs and fined him 10s. which he paid unjustly. The same Henry accused William Waryn that he had acted wrongly against him and held him against his will until he was fined 15s. which he paid. Then Thomas the miller was charged with theft of sheep and was arrested by Robert of Hoo the bailiff until Thomas paid 10s.

Then they say that the said Thomas of Hoo the bailiff and all the other bailiffs take money from bakers and brewers for [taking the assizes of bread and ale] and these are not held by them and thus the assize is neither heard nor administered. Then Daniel de Burtham held the hundred [ ] for 8s. and they paid. Then Thomas of Hoo the bailiff employing three



ballivus sustinens tres ministros sub [eo ] Petrus de Berkindenne cepit equum Rogeri Carpentarii injuste [? donec solvit] dimidiam marcam.

Item domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt [de hoc hundredo ]

#### **m. 8 Hundredum de Chetham adhuc in lesto de Heylisford**

Dicunt jurati quod Middiltun et Merdenn sunt dominica regis et ea tenet nunc Johannes de Burgo et Ospring est manerium domini regis et illud tenet domina regina mater regis Edwardi nunc. Item dicunt quod manerium de Eylisford solebat esse in manibus regum predecessorum regis nunc et illud tenet heres Johannis de Grey quo tempore quo modo nec quo warento fuerit alienatum ignorant. Dicunt eciam quod manerium de Elham solebat esse domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc et illud tenet dominus Willelmus de Leyburn quo warento nec quo modo fuerit alienatum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Crevequer tenet baroniam de Chetham de rege nunc in capite que baronia continet xiiij feoda dimidiam et 1 quarterium, unde dictus Robertus tenet de predicta baronia unum feodum in hundredo de Chetham et heres Fulconis de Marsted tenet dimidium feodum et unum quarterium per medium de dicta baronia in Chetham. Item Radulfus Savage tenet unum quarterium unius feodi per medium de eadem in Chetham. Johannes de Northwode tenet unum quarterium unius feodi per medium de eadem in Chetham. Willelmus Bokerel tenet unum quarterium unius feodi per medium de eadem in Chetham; de ceteris feodis de eadem baronia que et per quos tenentur et a quo tempore alienata fuerunt nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium placita namio vetito wreccum maris assisam panis et cervisie per totam libertatem suam nesciunt quo warento et Robertus de Crevequer habet assisam panis et cervisie de antiquo.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis summonuit Adam de Gilling ut fieret miles pro respectu hundredo dedit ei dictus Adam xLs tempore quo archiepiscopus Cant' fuit in manu domini regis. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Seint Claro qui fuit coronator tempore Henrici regis

ministers under him [ ] Peter de Berkindenne took Roger the carpenter's horse unjustly [until he paid ] half a mark.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took [from this hundred .... ].

#### **m. 8 Chatham Hundred, still in Aylsford lathe**

The jury say that Middleton and Marden are of the king's demesne and John de Burgh now holds them and Ospringe is the lord king's manor and the lady queen, King Edward's mother, now holds that. Then they say that Aylesford manor used to be in kings' hands, the predecessors of the present king, and John de Grey's heir holds it, they do not know from what time, in what way or by what warrant it was alienated. They say also that Elham manor used to be of the lord King Henry, the present king's father, and Sir William de Leyburn holds that, they do not know by what warrant nor in what way it was alienated.

Then they say that Sir Robert de Crevequer holds Chatham barony of the present king in chief, which barony contains 14<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> fees, whence the said Robert holds one fee of the aforesaid barony in Chatham hundred, and Fulk of Marsted's heir holds a half fee and one quarter through mesne tenure of the said barony in Chatham. Then Ralph Savage holds one quarter of one fee through mesne tenure of the same in Chatham. John of Northwood holds one quarter of one fee through mesne tenure of the same in Chatham. William Bokerel holds one quarter of one fee through mesne tenure of the same in Chatham; they do not know about the rest of the fees of the same barony, who and through whom they are held and from what time they were alienated.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the assize of bread and ale throughout the entire liberty, they do not know by what warrant and Robert de Crevequer has the assize of bread and ale from ancient times.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, summoned Adam de Giling in order that he should become a knight, the said Adam [being reluctant] for respite gave him 40s. when the archbishopric of Canterbury was in the lord king's hand. Then they say that John de St Clare who was the

cepit iiijs de hominibus de Gren priusquam vellet deliberare ecclesiam de Gren de duobus felonibus qui fugerunt post mortem Ade de Stretende et Johannes de Aldinge clericus Johannis de Merlay coronator lesti de Eylisford cepit ijs de Middelburga de villa de Gillingham in hundredo de Chetham.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis tempore quo archiepiscopatus Cant' fuit in manu domini regis defuncti cepit de villata de Gillingeham in hundredo de Chetham X libras ad terram semindam in dicta villa que fuit in manu domini regis et illas X libras asportavit et terras non seminavit. Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus predicto tempore tenuit in predicta villa de Gilling' super custum domini regis ad destructuendum warenum iij homines unam mutam canum quatuor leporarios et unum furettum per vj septimanas. Item dicunt quod quidam mercatores sic Walterus et Willelmus de Vaus qui conversati fuerunt in hundredo de Chetham in villa de Gilling' duxerunt et duci fecerunt duas naviculas lane extra portum de Medewey ultra partes transmarinas quot saccos vel quo precio aut quo loco vel quo precepto advocacione vel conveniente et quid inde receptum fuit nesciunt. Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime domini regis receperunt de dicto hundredo xxs ultra certum munerum denariorum pro pondere.

### **Hundredum de Shamele**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus Edwardus rex qui nunc est habet in manu sua vij marcas quatuor denarios et quadratam annui redditus de Cobbeham provenientes de quadam terra que vocatur Hagneslaunde et de tenemento Henrici de Cant' in villa de Cobbeham sic de Hangingland xxiijs et de terra Henrici de Cant' V marcas iiijs que et predictae vij marce iiijd que accidebant predicto domino Edwardo regi pro morte comitisse de Albamarle que fuit uxor domini Edmundi fratris regis Edwardi et obiit predicti regis anno secundo et est escaeta.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus rex pater regis Johannis dedit Templariis manerium de Strode cum hundredo de Shamele et valent per annum xx libras et tenentur de rege in capite et quod dictus Henricus rex pater Johannis regis dedit manerium de Shorne Judlano

coroner at King Henry's time took 4s. from the men of Grain before he was willing to deliver Grain church from two felons who had fled after Adam de Stretende's death, and John de Aldinge clerk of John de Marley the coroner of Aylesford lathe took 2s. from *Middelburga* of Gillingham township in Chatham hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator, when the archbishopric of Canterbury was in the late king's hand, took £10 from Gillingham township within Chatham hundred to sow land in the said township, which was in the lord king's hands and he carried off those £10 and the lands have not been sown. Then they say that the same Master Richard, at the aforesaid time employed in the aforesaid township of Gillingham 3 men, one pack of dogs, four greyhounds and one ferret for 6 weeks, to destroy the warren at the lord king's cost..

Then they say that certain merchants, that is Walter and William de Vaus who were known in Chatham hundred in Gillingham township brought and caused to be brought two small boat-loads of wool from the port of Medway to places overseas, they do not know how many sacks, nor for what price nor to what place nor by whose order, arrangement or contract nor what was received for them.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the lord king's tax of one-twentieth have received from the said hundred 20s. by weight more than the assessed amount of money.

### **Shamwell Hundred**

The jury say that the present lord King Edward holds in his hand 7 marks, four pence and a farthing of annual rent issuing from a certain land which is called *Hagneslaunde* and from Henry of Canterbury's tenement in Cobham vill, thus 23s. from Hangingland and 5 marks 4s. from Henry of Canterbury's land, these and the aforesaid 7 marks 4d. came to the aforesaid lord King Edward by the countess of Aumale's death who was the wife of the Lord Edmund the king's brother [Avelina married to Edmund 1269, died 10 November 1274] and she died in the second year of the aforesaid king and this is an escheat. Then they say that the lord King Henry, King John's father, gave Strood manor with Shamwell hundred to the Templars which are worth £20 each year and they are held of the king in chief and that the said King Henry, King John's father, gave Shorne to Judlanus de

de Neyvile et dominus Rogerus de Northwude habet illud de dono Johannis de Nevyle et tenet de domino rege in capite et valet xx libras per annum. Item dicunt quod dominus Ricardus rex dedit manerium de Westchalke Hugoni de Neyvile et Johannes filius eius dedit illum Johanni de Cobbeham veteri et Johannes filius eius modo tenet de Johanne de Neyvile et idem Johannes de rege in capite et valet per annum Cs. et quod dominus Henricus pater regis Johannis dedit manerium de Hegham monialibus de Hegham que modo illud tenent de rege in capite et valet per annum Lx libras et dominus rex Henricus pater regis Edwardi dedit Rogero de Leyburn ij marcas iiijd in villa de Shorne que fuerunt escaeta post mortem Rogeri Tanel et Willelmi de Leyburn nunc eas tenet per cartam domini regis.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Estchalke tenetur de domino rege in capite et prior de Beremundesye habet illud de dono domini Johannis de Burgo iam per iiij annos elapsos et sic tenetur per medium et valet per annum xxx libras. Item Willelmus de Sancto Claro tenet dimidium feodum in Marston de Willelmo de Montecanis per medium et idem Willelmus de domino rege in capite et valet per annum X libras et quod domina Johanna de Cobbeham Johannes de Hakinton et Petronilla de Tokintun tenent dimidium feodum in villa de Hegham de comitissa de Insula per medium et Comitissa de domino rege in capite et valet per annum Cs. et quod Willelmus de Sancto Claro tenet dimidium feodum in villa de Hegham de Willelmo de Montecanis per medium et idem Willelmus tenet de domino rege in capite et valet per annum Cs et quod Johannes de Cobbeham tenet unum feodum in Coulyng de Comitissa de Insula per medium et ipsa Comitissa de domino rege in capite et valet per annum xxx libras et quod Laura de Godinton tenet dimidium feodum in Strode de Galfrido de Scolande et idem Galfridus de Comite Leycestr' et idem Comes de domino rege in capite et valet per annum xLs et quod Saerus de Strodes Adam Frankelayn et Petrus Myles tenent dimidium feodum in Strode de Simone de Chelesfeud et idem Simon de Comite Leycestr' et idem Comes de domino rege in capite et valet per annum xLs.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Shamele est in manu domini Johannis de Cobbeham et reddit per annum Templariis xxs. Item dicunt quod Petrus Gardun subtraxit se de secta hundredi predicti per iiij annos ad dampnum per annum vjd et turnum vicecomitis per iiij

Nevyle and Sir Roger de Northwood has this by grant of John de Nevyil and he holds of the lord king in chief and it is worth £20 each year. Then they say that the lord King Richard gave West Chalk manor to Hugh de Neyvile and his son John gave that to John of Cobham senior and John his son now holds it of John de Neyvile and the same John of the king in chief and it is worth 100s. each year and that the Lord Henry, King John's father, gave Higham manor to the nuns of Higham who now hold that of the lord king in chief and it is worth £60 each year and the lord King Henry, King Edward's father, gave Roger de Leyburn 2 marks 4d. in the town of Shorne, which were an escheat after Roger Tanel's death and William de Leyburn now holds these by the lord king's charter.

Then they say that East Chalk manor is held of the lord king in chief and the prior of Bermonsey holds that by grant of the lord John de Burgh, now for the last 4 years and thus it is held by mesne tenure and is worth £30 each year. Then William of St Clare holds half a fee in Merston [Shorne par.] of William de Montecanis by mesne tenure and the same William of the lord king in chief and it is worth £10 each year and that the lady Joan of Cobham, John of Hackington and Petronilla de Tokintun hold half a fee in Higham vill of the Countess de l'Isle<sup>1</sup> by mesne tenure and the Countess holds of the lord king in chief and it is worth 100s. each year and that William of St Clare holds half a fee in Higham vill of William de Montecanis by mesne tenure and the same William holds of the lord king in chief and it is worth 100s. each year and that John of Cobham holds one fee in Cooling of the Countess de l'Isle by mesne tenure and the Countess herself of the lord king in chief and it is worth £30 each year and that Laura de Godinton holds half a fee in Strood of Geoffrey de Scolande and the same Geoffrey of the earl of Leicester and the same earl of the lord king in chief and it is worth 40s. each year and that Saerus of Strood, Adam Franklayn and Peter Myles hold half a fee in Strood of Simon de Chelesfeud and the same Simon of the earl of Leicester and the same earl of the lord king in chief and it is worth 40s. each year.

Then they say that Shamwell hundred is in the Sir John of Cobham's hand and he pays 20s. rent each year to the Templars. Then they say that Peter Gardun without warrant, has withdrawn himself from suit of the aforesaid hundred for 3 years with loss of 6d. each

annos ad dampnum per annum iijd sine warento. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' (*obiit*) habet returnum brevis placita namio vetito wreccum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento et quod dominus Rogerus de Northwode habet furcas assisam panis et cervise in Shornes nesciunt quo warento et quod episcopus Roff' habet returnum (brevium) placita namio vetito furcas assisam panis et cervisie apud Halling nesciunt quo warento et prior ecclesie Christi Cant' [written above: *Sancte Trinitatis*] habet furcas assisam panis et cervisie apud Clive nesciunt quo warento et quod Petrus Gardin cepit emendam braciatoribus apud Westonling iam per iij annos fine warento. Item dicunt quod Willelmus Franceys cepit de Johanne filio Philippi vjd pro ipso removendo de assisis et Radulfus Kenewarde de Gileberto de Ponte vjd pro eodem. Item Willelmus Franceys cepit de Stephano filio Edmundi vjd pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod Petrus Gardun qui fuit serviens castri Rofens' cepit de Willelmo Parleben in proximo ante bellum de Lewes tres boves de precio xLs iiij vaccas de precio ij marcas tres juvencas precii xvs C et xv oves precii Cs.

Item Simon Marlek qui fuit constabularius eiusdem castri cepit de dicto Willelmo injuste Cs et idem Simon cepit de eodem Willelmo xvj baconos precii xxs et iiij carcosia multonum precii xLd et 1 carcosium bovis precii vjs et 1 vaccam precii dimidiam marcam et X sectis precii xLs et alia multa bona ad valenciam xx marcarum. Item cepit de eodem Willelmo bladum de xxxvij acris unde vij fuerunt de frumento novem de siligine vj de ordeo et V de avena et valuit predictum bladum xv marcas et amplius.

Item dictus Simon Morlak cepit de Willelmo Synoch dimidiam peysam casei precii dimidie marce et dimidiam sumam avene precii xLd. Idem Simon cepit equum Willelmi Sinoch et eum detinuit quousque dedisse ei dimidiam marcam pro borgha de Ostrelaund. Item dictus Simon cepit de Roberto de Scalaro de Cobbeham 1 marcam injuste et de Waltero de Vela dimidiam marcam injuste.

Item dicunt quod domini Fulco et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundredo xxs ultra certum numerum denariorum pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford

year and the sheriff's tourn for 3 years with loss of 3d. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury (*he is dead*) has return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant and that the lord Roger of Northwood has a gallows, the assize of bread and ale in Shorne, they do not know by what warrant and the bishop of Rochester has return (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, a gallows, the assize of bread and ale at Halling, they do not know by what warrant and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury [written above: *Holy Trinity*] has a gallows, the assize of bread and ale at Cliffe, they do not know by what warrant, and that Peter Gardin now for 3 years has taken the fines for the brewers' offences at Wichling without a warrant. Then they say that William Franceys took 6d. from John son of Philip for removing him from the assizes and Ralph Kenward 6d. from Gilbert de Ponte for the same reason. Then William Franceys took 6d. from Stephen son of Edmund for the same reason.

Then they say that Peter Gardun, who was a serjeant of Rochester castle, just before the battle of Lewes took three oxen price 40s., 4 cows price 2 marks, three heifers price 15s., 115 sheep price 100s. from William Parleben.

Then Simon Marlek, who was constable of the same castle, unjustly took 100s. from the said William and the same Simon took 16 sides of bacon price 20s. and 4 sheeps' carcasses price 40s. and 1 carcase of an ox price 6s. and 1 cow price half a mark and 10 of young animals price 40s. and many other goods valued at 20 marks. Then he took the grain of 37 acres from the same William, of these 7 were sown with wheat, nine with rye, 6 with barley and 6 with oats and the aforesaid grain is worth 15 marks and more. Then the said Simon Morlak took half a wey of cheese, price half a mark and half a load of oats, price 40d. from William Synoch. The same Simon took William Sinoch's horse and kept it until he had given him half a mark for the tithing of *Ostrelaund* [?Oysterland, Stoke par., detached]. Then the said Simon unjustly took 1 mark from Robert de Scalaro of Cobham and half a mark unjustly from Walter de Vela.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took from the said hundred 20s. by weight more than the assessed amount of money.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord

escaetor domini regis capere fecit per Robertum Deveneys ballivum suum de Johanne Strange injuste xLs et de Johanne de Mydenesse injuste xLs. Idem Magister Ricardus magnam fecit destructionem in archiepiscopatu Cant' sed nesciunt quot et que. Item dicunt quod Alexander de Cranewetern Symon Kydenot et Aufrey Blakedeys mercatores emerunt lanas in hundredo de Shamele et duxerunt eas per mare usque portum de Sandwico sed nesciunt quot saccos nec quo warento.

### **Hundredum de Eyhorne**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Herezetesham fuit dominicum domini regis Henrici qui illud dedit Hugoni de Cressy veteri quod manerium nunc tenet per annum Rogerus Leuveday de dimissione domini Willelmi de Leyburn et in eodem manerio tenet Johannes de Northwode X libratas redditus et consuetudinum de dono domini Guncelini de Badelemere et tenetur illud manerium de domino rege in capite pro 1 feodo militis et idem Johannes tenet dictum redditum per 1 annum. Item dicunt quod manerium de Sutton fuit dominicum domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc qui dedit illud manerium domino Willelmo Comiti Marescallo in maritaggio cum domina Elianora sorore sua et mortuo dicto Marescallo dominus Simon de Montefort duxit dominam predictam in uxorem et habuit cum ea illud manerium et mortuo ipso domino Simone post bellum de Evesham intravit in illud manerium dominus Willelmus de Valence qui illud manerium clamat hereditatem uxoris sue et idem Willelmus tenet manerium predictum de domino rege in capite nesciunt per quot feoda militum que pertinent ad marescallam. Item dicunt quod denna de Hedycron cum advocacione ecclesie eiusdem fuit dominicum domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc qui dedit illa hospitali suo de Ospring in perpetuam elemosinam.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Girunde tenet dimidium feodum militis in Wrenstede de domino rege in capite et dominus Willelmus Peyforer tenet dimidium feodum militis de rege in capite in Wycheling et dominus Hamo de Gattun tenet unum feodum militis in Bocton et Wornesell faciendo omnes isti wardam castro Dovor' et tenent domino rege in capite. Item dominus Robertus de Septevannis et domina

king's escheator, unjustly took through Robert Deveneys, his bailiff 40s. from John Strange and 40s. unjustly from John de Mydenesse. The same Master Richard caused great damage in the archbishopric of Canterbury but they do not know how much and what sort. Then they say that Alexander de Cranewetern, Symon Kydenot and Aufrey Blakedeys, merchants bought wool in Shamwell hundred and took it by sea to the port of Sandwich, but they do not know how many sacks not by what warrant.

### **Eyhorne Hundred**

The jury say that the Harrietsham manor was the lord King Henry's demesne who granted that to Hugh de Cressy the elder. This manor Roger Loveday has now held for a year by demise of Sir William de Leyburn and in the same manor John of Northwood holds 10 pounds-worth of rents and customary payments by grant of Jocelin of Badlesmere and that manor is held of the lord king in chief for 1 knight's fee and the said John has held the said rent for 1 year. Then they say that Sutton manor was of the demesne of the lord King Henry, the present king's father and he gave that manor to William the Earl Marshal upon his marriage with Lady Eleanor<sup>2</sup> his sister and after the said Marshal died the Lord Simon de Montfort married the aforesaid lady and held that manor with her. After the Lord Simon died, William de Valence after the battle of Evesham entered that manor and claimed it by hereditary right of his wife and the same William holds the aforesaid manor of the lord king in chief, they do not know for how many knights' fees which pertained to the Marshal's wife. Then they say that Headcorn dens with the advowson of the church of the same place, was the demesne of the lord King Henry, the present king's father, who gave it to his hospital of Ospringe in perpetual alms.

Then they say that Hugh de Girunde holds half a knight's fee in Wrinsted [Frinsted par.] of the lord king in chief and Sir William Peyforer holds half a knight's fee of the king in chief in Wichling and Sir Hamo de Gattun holds one knight's fee in Boughton and Wormshill, all those men by making castle guard at Dover and they hold of the lord king in chief. Then the lord Robert de Septevannis and the lady Margaret de Valoynes hold 2 fees and one quarter of the king in chief in Aldington [?Thurnham par.] doing castle guard at Rochester for these and the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds Lenham manor of the

Margareta de Valoynes tenent de rege in capite ij feoda et unum quarterium in Aldyntun faciendo inde wardam castro Roff' et abbas Saancti Augustini Cant' tenet manerium de Lenham de domino rege in capite ab antiquo tempore et Nicholaus de Cryoll qui est in wardam domini regis nunc tenet in Stokebir' unum feodum et sextam partem unius feodi faciendo inde wardam castro Roff' quod Gregorius de Rokele tenet nunc ex tradicionem regis nunc et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet in Ledes 1 feodum militis per medium sic dominum Robertum de Crevequer quod idem Robertus solebat tenere in capite de rege et dominus Rogerus de Leyburn adquisivit illud manerium de dicto domino Roberto de tenuit per vij annos.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Eyhorne est in manu domini regis nunc videlicet per annum in redditu assise xLvjs et est in eodem hundred levata quedam extorsio vocata turnum vicecomitis per Johannem de Wattun xx annis elapsis sic xLvs. iiijd et valet posterea perquisitus eiusdem hundredi per annum xxvs, salva omni justicia. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Lyttlefeld et hundredum de Wacheleston solebant esse in manu regis Johannis et comitis Glovernie nunc tenet illa solvendo inde annuatim xLs redditum domino regi a tempore quo tenuerit et valent per annum Cs et amplius et trahuntur in leucam de Tunebrigg et non sequitur ut solent ad dampnum regi et patrie per annum xLs et borge de Ledes et Homfeld subtrahuntur a secta hundredi de Eyhorn per Rogerum de Leyburn per vij annos ad dampnum regi per annum xijd et ad dampnum secte hundredi eiusdem dimidiam marcum per annum. Item dimidia borge de Westbocton sic tenentes Willelmi de Montecanis subtrahuntur a secta hundredi post bellum de Lewes ad dampnum regi per annum xxd obolum de redditu assise et ad dampnum secte hundredi vjd per annum. Item dimidia quarterii unius borge in Hedyton subtrahitur ab eadem secta per xvj annos ad dampnum regi per annum vjd per Fratres de Ospreng. Item vj mesuagia in Wycherindenn subtrahuntur a dicta secta per Hospitalarios de Scalefeld per xx v annos ad dampnum regi per annum vjd. Item Clopham Stonkere Bedemanton et Cenegefold subtrahuntur a dicta secta per xxx annos per abbatem Sancti Augustini Cant' ad dampnum patrie per annum vjd et de omnibus istis subtractionibus dicunt quod nesciunt quo warento et similiter villa de Sutton tenentes domini Willelmi de Valence subtrahuntur per multa tempora a dicta secta ad dampnum regi et patrie per

lord king in chief from ancient times and Nicholas de Cryoll who is the lord king's ward now holds one fee and a sixth part of one fee in *Stokebir'* by doing castle guard at Rochester, and this Gregory of Ruxley now holds by demise of the present king and Sir William de Leyburn holds 1 knight's fee in Leeds by mesne tenure of Sir Robert de Crevequer, which the same Robert used to hold of the king in chief and Sir Roger de Leyburn has acquired that manor from the said Sir Robert and has held it for 7 years.

Then they say that Eyhorne hundred is in the present lord king's hand, that is in rent of assize 46s. each year and 20 years ago a levy of 45s. 4d. was exacted in the same hundred through John de Wattun called the sheriff's tourn and afterwards the assets of the same hundred were worth 25s., saving all justice. Then they say that Littlefield hundred and Wachlingstone hundred used to be in King John's hand and the earl of Gloucester now holds those, paying a yearly rent of 40s. for them to the lord king from the time he held them and they are worth 100s. and more each year and they are handed over to the lowy of Tonbridge and do not do suit of court, as they are accustomed to do, causing loss to the king and country of 40s. each year, and the tithings of Leeds and Hothfield are withdrawn by Roger de Leyburn for 7 years from suit of Eyhorne hundred with loss of 12d. each year to the king and loss of half a mark to the suit of that hundred each year. Then half of West Boughton [Monchelsea?] tithing, the tenants of William de Montecanis, after the battle of Lewes are withdrawn from suit of the hundred, with loss of 20½d. assize rent each year to the king from and loss of 6d. to suit of the hundred. Then a half of one quarter of one tithing in *Hedyton* is withdrawn for 16 years by the Brethren of Ospringe from the same suit with loss of 6d. each year to the king. Then for 25 years 6 messuages in Wissenden [Bethersden par.] are withdrawn from the said suit by the Hospitallers of Stalisfield with loss to the king of 6d each year. Then for 30 years Clap Hill [Aldington par.?), *Stonkere*, Bedmanton [Wormshill par.] and *Cenegefold* are withdrawn from the said suit by the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury with loss of 6d. each year to the country and they say that they so not know by what warrant all these suits were withdrawn and similarly the tenants of the lord William de Valence in the town of Sutton are withdrawn a long time ago from the said suit, with loss to the king and country of 5s. each year and the town of

annum Vs. et villa de Holingeburne sic tenentes prioris (ecclesie) Christi Cant' et tenentes domini Radulfi de Sancto Leodegar' in Vlcombe de archiepiscopatu Cant' non sequuntur dictum hundredum per antiqua tempora nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' et prior ecclesie Christi Cant' per archiepiscopatum clamant habere per totum returnum brevium wreccum maris placita namio vetito furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et dominus Willelmus de Valence apud Suttun placita namii vetiti furcas et assisam panis et cervisie. Item abbas Sancti Augustini in Lenham et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn in Ledes clamant ex antiquo habere furcas assisam panis et cervisie et dominus Rogerus Loveday et Johannes de Northwode apud Herietesham et dominus Rogerus de Northwood apud Thornham clamant habere assisam panis et cervisie nescitur quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' prior ecclesie Christi Cant' per omnes terras suas dominus Willelmus de Valence apud Suttun dominus Willelmus de Leyburn in Ledes abbas Sancti Augustini in Lenham Nicholaus de Cryell in Stokeber' dominus Rogerus de Norwode in Thornham clamant habere warenum nesciunt quo warento. Item abbas de Boxele in Boxele et dominus Radulfus de Sancto Leodegar' in Vlcombe clamant habere warenum ex dimissione domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod Elyas de Frethenested serviens domini regis haberet breve domini regis ad attachiandum dominos Galfridum Gascelyn Rogerum Hunting' et alios contentos in brevi nisi Radulfum de Pyntunn. Item dominus Galfridus per Willelmum servientem suum non permisit servientem domini regis facere suum officium secundum tenorem brevis regis sic apud Eastsuttun nec idem Rogerus Hunting' permittere voluit.

Item dominus Willelmus de Valence in Suttun clamat quod serviens domini regis non deberet habere suum officium quodcumque nisi per ballivos ipsius Willelmi nec illos servientes regis officium facere permittit nescitur quo warento.

Hollingbourne, that is the tenants of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and of Sir Ralph of St Leger in Ulcombe in the archbishopric of Canterbury, from ancient times do not follow the hundred, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claim to have return of writs, wreck, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale throughout the whole archbishopric, and Sir William de Valence to have pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale at Sutton. Then the abbot of St Augustine claims to have the gallows, the assize of bread and ale in Lenham from ancient times and similarly Sir William de Leyburn in Leeds and the lord Roger Loveday claims to have the assize of bread and ale at Harrietsham and similarly Sir Roger of Northwood at Thurnham [?], it is not known by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch claim to have warren throughout all their lands, similarly Sir William de Valence at Sutton, Sir William de Leyburn in Leeds, the abbot of St Augustine's in Lenham, Nicholas de Cryell in Stockbury, Sir Roger of Northwood in Thurnham, they do not know by what warrant. Then the abbot of Boxley claims to have warren in Boxley and Sir Ralph of St Leger in Ulcombe by demise of the lord King Henry, the present king's father.

Then they say that Elias de Frethenested, the lord king's serjeant had a writ of the lord king to arrest the Lords Geoffrey Gascelyn, Roger Hunting' and others named in the writ, except Ralph de Pyntunn. Then Lord Geoffrey, through his serving man William, did not permit the lord king's serjeant to carry out the duty of his office at East Sutton, according to the tenor of the king's writ nor was the same Roger Hunting' willing to permit it.

Then Sir William de Valence claimed that in Sutton a serjeant of the lord king ought not to exercise any of his authority whatsoever, unless through the bailiffs of William himself and he does not permit those serjeants of the lord king to perform their duties, by what warrant it is not known.

Then they say that the prior of Leeds has appropriated for himself 100 acres and more of land in Leeds, thence if the lord king should have a ward in Leeds he

Item dicunt quod prior de Ledes appropriavit sibi in Ledes C acras terre et plus unde si dominus rex haberet casu warde de Ledes haberet dampnum per annum Xs et fratres de Ledes de Modindenn appropriaverunt sibi xL acras et plus ad dampnum regi per annum Vs et haberet wardam de Ledes.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Parker de Harrietsam cepit de Rogero de Erdesles vjd pro removendo assisa, de Thoma Burton vjd, de Petro de Byckenor vjd, de Simon Virg' vjd, de Olivero Attehale vjd, de Willelmo Piper iijjd, de Henrico Wybarn et Florencio de Wyteling vjd. Item Thomas de Merle cepit pro eodem de Waltero de Otham iijjd de Ada de Clopham xijjd, de Gileberto Quether iijjd, de Johanne de Capella iijjd, de Rogero Pistore de Suttun vjd, de Johanne Taillur vjd, de Moyse Scot vjd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemeis injuste inposuit Roberto de Lenham quod fecerat feloniam et ipsum inprisonavit quousque habuit de eo xLs et eodem modo de Radulfo de Rugele cepit V marcas et de Johanne Onrett eodem xxs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Chilecroft cepit pro summonitione scaccarii de Benedicto de Sandputte dimidiam marcam et eum non aquietavit et de Thoma de La eodem modo dimidiam marcam, de Ricardo Howe eodem modo dimidiam marcam, de villa de Aldintun eodem modo dimidiam marcam, de Gilberto le Gaunt xLd et ipsos non aquietavit. Item dominus Henricus Malemeis eodem modo cepit de Bartholomeo Attewode dimidiam marcam et eum non aquietavit. Item Johannes de Braburn eodem modo cepit de Johanna Constantin 1 marcam et non aquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Bonburg et Robertus Grayn in Ledes attachiaverunt Thomam filium Petri Tabard utrum juste vel injuste sed promiserunt eum abire pro xxs quos receperunt. Item cum Thomas Wineton esset occisus apud Ledes quidam subscripti fuerunt rettati de morte eius de quibus dominus Willelmus de Ledes cepit bona pro attachiamento dimittendo et gratias eisdem faciendo sic de Orabilia uxore Ricardi Pistoris xLs, de Johanne Tannere et fratribus suis ij marcas, de Johanne Chirel et sociis suis V marcas.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Seint Cler' coronator cepit de borgha de Stokebir pro officio execendo iijs pro sepelliendo Willelmum filium Johanne de

will have a loss of 10s. each year and the Brethren of Leeds of *Modindenn* have appropriated for themselves 40 acres and more with a loss of 5s. each year to the king and he had a ward of Leedes.

Then they say that John de Parker of Harrietsam took 6d. from Roger de Erdesles' for removing him from the assize, 6d. from Thomas Burton, 6d. from Peter of Bicknor, 6d. from Simon Virg', 6d. from Oliver Attehale, 4d. from William Piper, 6d. from Henry Wybarn and Florian de Wyteling. Then Thomas le Merle took 4d. from Walter of Offham for the same reason, 12d. from Adam of Clop Hill, 3d. from Gilbert Quether, 4d. from John of the Chapel, 6d. from Roger the baker of Sutton, 6d. from John the tailor, 6d. from Moses Scot.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemeis unjustly accused Robert of Lenham of committing a felony and imprisoned him until he received 40s. from him and in the same way he took 5 marks from Ralph de Rugele and 20s. from John Onrett for the same. Then they say that William de Chilecroft took half a mark from Benedict de Sandputte for summons of the Exchequer and has not acquitted him and in the same way half a mark from Thomas de La [ ], half a mark from Richard Howe in the same way, half a mark from the vill of Aldington in the same way, 40s. from Gilbert Gaunt and he has not acquitted them. Then the lord Henry Malemeis took half a mark from Bartholomew Attewode in the same way and he has not acquitted him. Then John of Brabourne took 1 mark from Joan Constantin in the same way and he has not acquitted her.

Then they say that John Bonburg and Robert Grayn in Leeds arrested Thomas son of Peter Tabard, justly or unjustly but they promised to release him for 20s. which they received. Then after Thomas Wineton had been killed at Leeds certain people as written below were charged with his death, from whom the lord William of Leeds took goods for releasing them from arrest and for collecting largesse for the same men, thus from Orabila wife of Richard the baker 40s., from John Tannere and his brothers 2 marks, from John Chirel and his associates 5 marks.

Then they say that John of St Clare the coroner took 3s. from the tithing of Stokebir for performing the duties of his office for burying William, son of John of Bicknor, who had been killed and 5s. for a certain stranger killed in Fretthenestede [Fristed par.] and he took 4s. in the same way for the death of Roger de Erdeslonde in Hollingbourne and John Kembelef his



<p>Bykenore occisus et pro quodam extraneo occiso in Fretthenestede Vs. et de morte Rogeri de Erdelonde in Holingeburn iijs eodem modo et Johannes Kembelef clericus eius pro eodem ijs et de morte Stephani filii Pollard in Selve [ ] dominus Johannes de Marleye coronator cepit eodem modo de morte Margerie de Fareburn in Heryetesham iijs et 1 thalun precii xvij d et in [ de ] morte ij puerorum cepit Vs eodem modo et de morte filii Willelmi de Boycote in Walecumbe ijs.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod dominus [ intravit] manerium de Heryetesham post mortem domini Stephani de Cressy et cepit ibi de bonis Galfridi de Chewyk qui [ fecit vastum et destructionem in ] boscis et bladis xx marcas et plus per Ricardum de Chistelden servientem suum. [ intravit ma]nerium prioris ecclesie Christi Cant' sic Holingeborne post obitum Bonefacii archiepiscopi et cepit de tenentibus [ ] Xs eodem modo post obitum Rogeri de Leyburn. [Item domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis cepit de] eodem hundredo ultra certum numerum pro pondere [ ]. [ ] habuit furcas apud Swaneschamp et eis usus est.</p>	<p>clerk took 2s. for the same and for the death of Stephen son of Pollard in Selv' [ ]. Sir John of Marley the coroner took 4s. in the same way for the death of Margery of Fairbourne in Harrietsham and 1 <i>thalun</i> price 18d. and in [ ] for the death of 2 youths he took 5s. in the same way and 2s. for the death of William de Boycote's son in Walcombe. Then they say that the lord [ ] entered Harrietsham manor after Sir Stephen de Cressy's death and there took from Geoffrey de Chewyk's goods as [he had caused waste and damage] in the woods and crops worth 20 marks and more, through Richard of Chisleden his serjeant. [ ] entered the Hollingbourne manor of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, after the death of Archbishop Boniface and took from the tenants [ ] 10s. in the same way after Roger de Leyburn's death. [Then Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis took from] the same hundred over the assessed amount by weight [from this hundred]. [ ] has the gallows at Swanscombe and he has used them.</p>
---	---

- 1 Countess de l'Isle: Isabella de Forz, dowager Countess of Aumale, Countess of Devon and Lady of the Isle of Wight.
- 2 Eleanor was 5th child of King John and Isabella, born 1215, married William Marshal, 2nd Earl of Pembroke 23 April 1224, d. 1231, married Simon de Montfort 19 February 1238, killed at Evesham 1265. Eleanor died April 1275.

<b>Hundredum de Twyford</b>	<b>Twyford Hundred</b>
<p>m. 8v Dicunt jurati quod Comes Glovernie tenet manerium de Elding de rege in capite et est membrum de Clare et valet per annum xxx libras et dominus Robertus de Crevequer tenet manerium de Terston et de Farlee de rege in capite et sunt membra baronie de Chetham et valent per annum xxx libras. Item dicunt quod Rogerus Vinitar' tenuit lestum de Heilisford de Johanne de Wattun tunc vicecomite ad firmam pro X libris et modo traditur ad firmam pro xxviiij libris [<i>sic-de- erased</i>] ad dampnum patrie de quantitate tanti augmenti ultra primam firmam. Item dicunt quod hundredum predictum est in manu domini regis et valet per annum Vs de redditu assisa et fortuna que inde possunt accidere preterea dicunt quod Johannes de Wattun quando fuit vicecomes levavit dimidiam marcam ad turnum vicecomitis prece sua super Farlee et Terstone et Wot'engebur' et Walterus de Berstede tempore quo fuit vicecomes augebat predictum turnum de xLd et post bellum de Lewes borgha de Fall' solvit predictum turnum per se quod Woting'ebur' subtraxit se post bellum de Lewes per potestatem Willelmi de Muchenesy ad dampnum de Farl' per annum Vs et ad grave dampnum domini regis.</p> <p>Item dicunt quod tenentes Bartholomei de Woteringsbir sequi solebant cum hundredo de Twyford ad duos laghedayes per annum et subtraxerunt se post bellum de Lewes per Willelmum de Montecanis, Nettlestede sequi solebat eodem modo ad duos laghedayes per annum et subtraxerunt se xx annis elapsis per Rodlandum de Malling ballivum Ricardi Comitis Glovernie qui tunc fuit. Item dimidiam borgha de Weststede subtraxit se per iij annos per Rogerum de Horn ballivum Comitis Glovernie et sequi solebant ad omnia cum hundredo de Twyford modo tamen redierunt et fecerunt pacem pro subtractione cum Thoma de Ho ballivo hundredi per iiijs</p> <p>Item dicunt quod Comes Glovernie clamat habet returnum (brevium) apud Netlestede per honorem Glovernie et tenet placita namio vetito et clamat habere furcas et assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento. Item dominus Willelmus de Munchenes' levavit (furcas) infra istos tres annos apud Woteringebur et dicunt quod numquam viderunt ibi furcas et habet assisam panis et cervisie et ballivus hundredi de Twyford quicunque fuisset solebat habere</p>	<p>m. 8v The jury say that the earl of Gloucester holds Yalding manor of the king in chief and it is a member of the honour of Clare and is worth £30 each year and Sir Robert de Crevequer holds Teston manor and East Farleigh from the king in chief and they are members of Chatham barony and are worth £30 each year. Then they say that Roger Vinitarius held Aylesford lathe at farm of John de Wattun the then sheriff for £10 and now it is demised at farm for £28 causing a loss to the country by the amount of this increase over the first farm. Then they say that the aforesaid hundred is in the lord king's hand and is worth 5s. each year from rent of assize rent and the things they are able to acquire by good fortune, moreover they say that when John de Wattun was sheriff he made a levy of half a mark at the sheriff's tourn by his will upon East Farleigh, Teston and Wateringbury and when Walter of Bearsted was sheriff he increased the aforesaid tourn by 40d. and after the battle of Lewes the tithing of East Farleigh paid the aforesaid tourn for him, that Wateringbury by the authority of William de Muchenesy withdrew itself with loss to East Farleigh of 5s. each year and a severe loss to the lord king.</p> <p>Then they say that Bartholomew of Wateringbury's tenants used to do suit at Twyford hundred at two lawdays each year and withdrew themselves after the battle of Lewes, through William de Montecanis, Nettlestead used to do suit in the same way at two lawdays each year and the tenants withdrew themselves 20 years ago through Roland of Malling, bailiff of Richard then Earl of Gloucester. Then half the tithing of Whetsted [Capel/Tudeley pars] withdrew itself 3 years ago through Roger de Horn, the earl of Gloucester's bailiff, and it used to follow Twyford hundred in all things. Now however they have come back and have made peace with Thomas of Hoo, bailiff of the hundred by payment of 4s. for the withdrawal.</p> <p>They say that the earl of Gloucester claims to have return (of writs) at Nettlestead through the honour of Gloucester and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he claims to have a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant. Then three years ago the Lord William de Munchenes' raised (a gallows) at Wateringbury and they say that they have never seen a gallows there and he holds the assize of bread and ale and the bailiff of</p>

assisam panis et cervisie de Wotingebur sed nesciunt quo warento predictus Willelmus habet.

Item dicunt quod Rodland de Okstede avus Rodlandi qui nunc est fecit purpresturam super regiam viam in borgha de Netlestede ad quantitatem L perticatarum in longitudine et in latitudine 1 perticam ad nocumentum patrie et ad gravamen domini regis. Item Johannes Pykenot fecit purpresturam super regiam viam de duabus deywerrkis terre in tithinga de Stokingber' in Pecham xxv annis elapsis ad nocumentum patrie et ad dampnum domini regis. Item Paganus de la Hale fecit purprestuam super communam ville de Pecham ad quantitatem partis unius acre terre ad nocumentum patrie. Item xxx annis elapsis Hugo de Beremundeseye avus Hugonis qui nunc est fecit purpresturam super regiam viam apud Ledeford ad quantitatem dimidie acre terre ad nocumentum patrie et dampnum regis. Item Auvicinus clericus fecit quoddam fossatum in regia via ad nocumentum patrie et Alanus de Meyllaner fecit purpresturam super regiam viam de quarta parte unius acre terre ad nocumentum patrie et gravamen domini regis.

Item dicunt quod domini reges habuernt antiquo tempore hundredum de Littlefeld et hundredum de Wethelestan in manu sua modo Comes Glovernie tenet hundreda predicta reddendo per annum domini regi pro quolibet xxs, sed nesciunt qualiter alienata sunt nec a quo tempore.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Sparue cepit de hominibus de borgha de Stokingberi ad removendum de assisa ad quantitatem Xs. Item Hugo Mot cepit de Ricardo Palmere ijs ne duceret eum ad Cantuar'. Idem Hugo inposuit Ade de Cruce quod commendit cum fratre suo qui fuit hutlagatus et cepit ab eo vj denarios ut dimitteret eum in pace. Item dicunt quod Willelmus Champeneys et Rosa mater eius capti fuerunt per latrocinio et liberati Henricus de Ledes subvicecomes et permisit eos abire sine iudicio unde patrie est in dubio.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Sancto Claro coronator noluit exequi officium suum priusquam permetteretur certa pecunia unde habuit tempore suo de hundredo predicto ad quantitatem xxs.

Item cum Willelmus de Lodeneford venisset ad

Twyford hundred, whosoever he might be, used to have the assize of bread and ale at Watingbury, but they do not know by what warrant the aforesaid William has this.

Then they say that Roland de Oksted, grandfather of the present Roland, made an encroachment upon the royal highway in Nettlestead tithing to the extent of 50 perches in length and 1 perch wide causing impediment to the country and harm to the lord king. Then 25 years ago John Pykenot made an encroachment on the royal highway of two dayworks of land in Stokingbury tithing in [East] Peckham causing obstruction to the country and loss to the lord king. Then Pagan de la Hale has made an encroachment upon Peckham vill's common in size part of an acre of land causing obstruction to the country. Then 30 years ago Hugh of Bermondsey, the present Hugh's grandfather, made an encroachment upon the highway at Lunsford [East Malling par.] in size half an acre of land causing obstruction to the country and loss to the king. Then Auvicinus the clerk made a certain ditch upon the royal highway to the damage of the country and Alan de Meyllaner made an encroachment upon the royal highway the size of a fourth of one acre of land causing obstruction to the country and damage to the lord king.

Then they say that from ancient times the lord kings have held Littlefield hundred and Wachlingstone hundred in their hands. Now the earl of Gloucester holds the aforesaid hundreds by paying 20s. rent each year to the lord king for each one, but they do not know how these were alienated nor at what time.

Then they say that John Sparrow took the amount of 10s. from the men of Stokingbury tithing to remove them from the assize. Then Hugh Mot took 2s. from Richard Palmer so that he should not take him to Canterbury. The same Hugh accused Adam de Cruce that he had associated with his brother who was an outlaw and he took 6d. from him so that he would leave him in peace. Then they say that William Champeneys and Rose his mother were captured by a robber and when they were released Henry of Leeds, the sub sheriff allowed them to depart without trial, thence the jury is in doubt.

Then they say that John of St Clare, the coroner, is unwilling to perform the duties of his office before he has received certain sums of money, thence during his time he has received the amount of 20s. from the aforesaid hundred

Then when William of Lunsford had come to the

comitatum cum hundredo eum quodam presentamento et Henricus Malemeis tunc vicecomes occasionavit eum quod quedam calumpnia facta fuit in domo sua et detinuit ipsum quousque finivit Xs et solvit invenisset pleggios et postea cepit equum Ricardi de Henhurst precii unius marce pro illis Xs et detinuit et vicecomes qui nunc est destringit modo predictum Willelmum de Lodeneford pro illis Xs. Item post bellum de Evesham quando dominus Bartholomeus de Woteringebur' fuit inprisonatus apud Dovor' Petrus de Barkindenn tunc ballivus domini regis cepit xvij s de herbagio et duos boves precii xxs de bonis dicti Bartholomei et retinuit. Item Nigellus de Chetham fecit triturari de blado dicti Bartholomei xx summas ordeii precii summe iij s et xv summas frumenti precium summe Vs quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis quando seisivit manorium de Pecham in manu domini regis post obitum Bonifacii archiepiscopi cepit de borgha de Stokinbery xxs injuste. Item dicunt quod Hugo Mot subballivus cepit de borgha de Wotingby ad quantitatem iij s per injustam distrucionem.

### **Civitas Roffensis**

Dicunt jurati quod civitas Roff' tenetur de domino rege in capite pro xij libris per annum ad scaccarium et dono et concessione domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc et quod prior Roff' habet quartum deveriorum dicte civitatis et habuit de antiquo. Item dicunt quod quoddam tenementum quod situm est juxta portam civitatis versus Medeweie quod fuit Johannis de la Chambre subtrahitur de dicta civitate per heredes dicti Johannis per xvj annos elapsos ad dampnum regis per annum iij s. Item dicunt quod xLs cum pertinenciis ad hundredum de Roff' (sunt) et continentur in dictis xij libris de firma et quod dictum hundredum est regis.

Item dicunt quod heredes Hugonis de Gillingham subtraxerunt se de secta de hundredo de Roff per xvj annos ad dampnum regis per annum i s nesciunt quo warento et dominus Johannes de Burgo subtraxit se de eadem per vij annos ad dampnum regis per annum iij s nesciunt quo warento et dominus Johannes de Cobbeham per xij annos ad dampnum regis xijd et dominus episcopus Roff' per xvj annos et amplius ad

county with the hundred for a certain presentment and Henry Malemeis who was then the sheriff arrested him because there had been a certain dispute in his house and he detained him until he had been fined 10s. and he paid this, he had found pledges and afterwards he, Henry took Richard de Henhurst's horse, price one mark for those 10s. and kept them and now the present sheriff makes distraint upon the said William of Lunsford for those 10s. Then after the battle of Evesham when Sir Bartholomew of Wateringbury was imprisoned at Dover, Peter de Barkindenn, who was then the lord king's bailiff, took 18s. from the crop of hay and two oxen price 20s. from the said Bartholomew's goods. Then Nigel of Chatham caused 20 loads of barley price 3s. per load and 15 loads of wheat price 5s. per load from the said Bartholomew's grain, to be threshed, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that when the lord king's escheator, Master Richard de Clifford, took Peckham manor into the lord king's hand after Archbishop Boniface's death, he took 20s unjustly from Stokinbury tithing. Then they say that Hugh Mot the sub-bailiff took the amount of 4s. from Wateringbury tithing through unlawful destruction.

### **Rochester City**

The jury say that Rochester city is held of the lord king in chief for £12 each year at the Exchequer and by grant and concession of the lord King Henry, the present king's father, and that the prior of Rochester has a fourth of the services of the said city and has had these from ancient times. Then they say that a certain tenement which is situated next to the bridge of the city, towards the Medway which was of John de la Chambre, is withdrawn for 16 years from the said city through the said John's heirs, with a loss of 4s. each year to the king. Then they say that 40s. with appurtenances belong to Rochester hundred and are included in the said £12 of farm and that the said hundred is of the king.

Then they say that for 16 years Hugh of Gillingham's heirs have withdrawn themselves from suit to Rochester hundred with loss to the king of 2s. each year, they do not know by what warrant, the lord John de Burgh has withdrawn himself from the same for 7 years with loss of 3s. each year to the king, they do not know by what warrant, Sir John of Cobham for 12 years with loss of 12d. to the king, the lord bishop of

dampnum xijd per annum et Rogerus Pugeys per vj annos et amplius ad dampnum regis xijd per annum et dominus de Parva Delce per vj annos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd et quod triginta et duo homines de Strodes de feodo Templariorum solebant facere sectam ad dictum hundredum que secta subtrahitur per Templarios per V annos elapsos et per assensus Ricardi de Grain et Hugonis de Celeby sine assensu tocius comunitatis ad dampnum regis per annum xvjs. Item dicunt quod homines eiusdem hundredi habent returnum brevium placita namio vetito habent furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alia que ad coronam pertinent per cartam confirmatam a domino rege ab antiquo tempore.

Item dicunt quod Benedictus Potyn dum fuit ballivus prior Roffensis non sustinuit execuccionem mandatorum domini regis de uno brevi de recto quod Willelmi Bateman tulit in curiam dicti prioris anno regis Henrici Lvjto. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Blythe habet iiij domos fundatos super murum regis laterando in longitudine se extendit super dictum murum per xL pedes et amplius et dictus murus se extendit in latitudine ad iij pedes et amplius et facta est ista purprestura elapsos xvj annos et amplius et quod quedam domus facta est ultra la Watergate de Medewye per Simonem Potyn et quod quedam purprestura facta est super fenellam Sancti Clementis in latitudine per ij pedes et amplius et in longitudine xxxta pedes et amplius per Henricum le Carpentarium et hoc per iiij annos elapsos et quod heredes Ricardi de Gren habent quamdam domum in Brodegheslane que sita est in regia via in purprestura domini regis in longitudine vj pedes et latitudine viij pedes et amplius et quod Hugo de Blythe habet quondam furnum situm in eadem venella in purprestura domini regis in latitudinine iiij pedes et amplius et in longitudine iiiij. Idem Hugo levavit quamdam portam cum serura que oppressit quamdam viam per quam ire solebant per medium Chethmes haghe usque ad fletam regis. Item Johannes Potyn et Adam Sterlyng oppresserunt quamdam viam per quam ire solebant ad parcum domini regis ubi latrones solebant pugnare. Item Gylemyn cocus domini Simonis de Grey cepit ij ligna per que porta de Cheldegate pendere solebat et ea duxit in castrum precium ij lignorum xijd. Item Johannes Dillyng levavit quondam murum in Estgate super viam regis in latitudine ij pedes et amplius et in longitudine xx pedes et amplius uno anno elapso. Item Johannes Potyn levavit quamdam portam sub baillio

Rochester for 16 years and more with loss of 12d. each year, Roger Pugeys for 6 years and more with loss of 12d. each year to the king and the lord of Little Delce for 6 years with loss of 6d. each year to the king and that thirty two men of Strood from the Templars' fee used to do suit to the said hundred and this suit was withdrawn for 5 years by the Templars and with the assent of Richard of Grain and Hugh de Celeby, without the whole community's assent with loss to the king of 16s. each year. Then they say that the men of the same hundred have return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, they have a gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown, through a charter from ancient times, confirmed by the lord king.

Then they say that while Benedict Potyn was the bailiff of the prior of Rochester he did not execute the lord king's mandates, namely of one writ of right which William Bateman brought into the said prior's court in the 56th year of king Henry's reign [October 1271-1272]. Then they say that Hugh de Blythe has 4 houses which were built along the king's [town] wall in length extending 40 ft and more along the said wall and the said wall extends in width 3ft and more and that the encroachment was made 16 years ago and more and that a certain house has been made beyond the Watergate of the Medway by Simon Potyn and that 4 years ago a certain encroachment was made by Henry the carpenter, along St Clement's lane, 2ft and more in length and 30ft and more in width and that Richard of Grain's heirs have a certain house in Brodeghes lane which is situated in highway and is an encroachment upon the lord king's land of 6ft long and 8ft wide and more and that Hugh de Blythe has a certain oven/furnace situated in the same lane making encroachment upon the lord king's land of 4ft and more in length and 4 in width. Then Hugh erected a certain gate with a lock which obstructs the particular way along which men used to pass through the middle of Chatham's *haghe* to the king's water-channel. Then John Potyn and Adam Sterlyng have obstructed a certain road along which people used to travel to the lord king's park where robbers are accustomed to fight. Then Gylemyn, Simon de Grey's cook, took 2 pieces of timber upon which *Cheldegate* used to be supported and he took those into the castle; the price of the two pieces of timber was 12d. Then one year ago John Dillyng erected a certain wall in Eastgate 2ft and more wide and 20ft. and more in length along the royal highway. Then John Potyn erected a certain gate below

castri versus occidentem per quam oppressa est quedam via per quam homines ville solebant ire ad terras suas et circa eandem villa.

Item dicunt quod cum Alanus de Kyrkeby constabularius Roff' tenebatur civitati Cant' Cs. et Hugoni de Celeby clerico in viij libris iij solidis post mortem eius domini Alani sic anno regni regis Edwardi primo venit uxor dicti Alani in eadem civitate cum vij equis et aliis catallis ad valorem xL marcarum et amplius que catalla arestita fuerunt per querelam dicti Hugonis et ibi venerunt Johannes Potyn et Johannes de Mares tunc ballivi eiusdem civitatis et ceperunt de dicta muliere xLs maliciose et eam cum dictis catallis abire permiserunt noctanter. Item dicunt quod Johannes Potyn per potestatem officii sui eodem tempore cepit de predicto Hugone lanam quantitatem nesciunt et eandem lanam detinuit donec finisset dimidiam marcam eo quod erat coram baronis de Scaccario ad conquerendum de eo cum tota communitate et quod idem Johannes Potyn emit debita xLvjs quos Stephanus le Teynterer debuit Reginaldo le Baud de London pro 1 marca et statim eundem Stephanum distrinxit quousque solvisset eidem Johannis ante terminos suos unde idem Stephanus cecidit in iudaismo. Idem Johannes Potyn et Johannes de Mares ceperunt Robertum Stourok et inprisonaverunt in castro per viij dies donec soror eiusdem Roberti finiret xjs et predicti Johannes et Johannes ceperunt et adhuc detinent et habent de Hugone de Celeby clerico catalla ad valorem xxxs et amplius per que ipsum distrinxerunt pro ixjs quos ei inposuit quod debuit Sampsoni le Espyc' et eos non recognovit. Idem Johannes Potyn cepit de Alano filio Marthe nomine districtionis unam zonam argenteam precio dimidiam marcam et adhuc habet. Idem Johannes per potestatem officii sui cepit de dicto Alano duos cados plenos cervisie precio xjs et eos duxit ad castrum et nichil inde solvit. Idem Johannes fecit dictum Alanum filium Marthe finire cum quodam burgense de Sandwyco xxxs pro xvs in quibus dictus Alanus ei tenebatur et tum non haberet unde reddivit et inprisonavit in domum suam prefatum Alanum quousque invadiavit ij domos precii xLs ut ipsum inde aquietaret ad terminum vj annorum. Idem Johannes cepit de dicto Alano xxx boscos precii xvs postquam quietus erat antequam ipsum vellet deliberare et Johannes de Mares cepit pro eodem de dicto Alano dimidiam marcam et dictus Johannes Potyn cepit a dicto Alano 1 gladio precii ijs.

the bailey of the castle towards the west; because of this a certain road along which men of the town used to go to their lands and around the town, is obstructed.

Then they say that because Alan of Kirkby, constable of Rochester, was indebted to Canterbury city for 100s. and to Hugh de Celeby for £8 4s., that after the lord Alan's death, thus in the first year of King Edward's reign, the said Alan's wife came into the same city with 7 horses and other chattells valued at 40 marks and more, which chattells were taken for the said Hugh's claim and John Potyn and John de Mares, then bailiffs of the same city, came there and maliciously took 40s. from the same woman and allowed her to depart at night with the said chattells. Then they say that at the same time John Potyn by the authority of his office took wool, they do not know how much, from the aforesaid Hugh and kept the same wool until he had paid a fine of half a mark, this because he was in the presence of the barons of the Exchequer to complain about him with the whole community and that the same John Potyn purchased the debts of 46s. which Stephen the dyer owed to Reginald le Baud of London for 1 mark and immediately he made distraint upon the same Stephen until he had paid the same John before his terms, thence the same Stephen became indebted to the Jews. Then the same John Potyn and John de Mares seized Robert Stourok and imprisoned him in the castle for 8 days until the same Robert's sister paid 11s. fine and the aforesaid John and John took and still keep and hold chattells valued at 30s. and more from Hugh de Celeby the clerk, for which they made distraint upon him for 9s. which they accused him of owing to Sampson the grocer and he did not accept this. The same John Potyn took one silver belt price half a mark from Alan, son of Martha, as a distraint and he still holds this. The same John by the authority of his office took two kegs full of ale, price 11s. from the said Alan and he never paid for them. The same John caused the said Alan son of Martha to make a fine with a certain burgess of Sandwich of 30s. for 15s. in which the said Alan stood bond and then he did not have this, whence he returned and imprisoned the aforesaid Alan in his own house until he gave the pledge of 2 houses, price 40s. that he might be acquitted at a term of 6 years. The same John took 30 pieces of timber price 15s. from the said Alan after he had been acquitted, before he was willing to release him and John de Mares took half a mark from the said Alan for the same reason and the said John Potyn took

Item dicunt quod quidam Simon filius Philippi de Delham habuit CCCC marcas et amplius in prioratu Roff' sub custodia cuiusdam monachi eiusdem domus nomine Ade fratris ipsius Simonis qui Simon arettatus fuit de morte cuiusdam hominis unde dominus Simon de Grey constabularius tunc habuit preceptum domini regis ut dictos denarios in manu regis caperet et dictum Simonem si inventus esset attachiaret unde predictus Johannes Potyn ipsum Simonem munivit et pro hoc cepit X marcas et de dicto monacho C marcas ut dicitur per quod dominus rex amisit totam pecuniam predictam sed qualiter conveniret post inter dictum Simonem et Johannem Potyn et predictum Simonem de Delham ignorant. Idem Johannes Potyn per potestatem officii sui intervenit in domum Godwini qui manet in ballivio domini regis et ostium thalami sui fregit et unum furettum ad cuniculorum capiendum precii dimidiam marcam cepit contra voluntatem ipsius Godwini asportavit. Item cum Johannes Havekyn faceret unam navem juxta castrum ubi alie naves fieri solebant et dominus Simon de Graye noluit pati ut dictus Johannes eam abducere donec finivit Lxs quos cepit injuste cepit. Item Rogerus de Leyburn cepit de hominibus de Strode iiij xx libras post bellum de Evesham tempore pacis quod Simon de Morteforti morabatur in Strode in insultu Roff' et hoc fuit contra voluntatem eorum. Item dicunt quod quoddam mesuagium quod fuit Elye Bateman tenebatur civibus Roff' in dimidia marca annui redditus quod tenementum Simon Morlak emit de dicto Elya viij annos elapsos a quo tempore dictus redditus retinetur usque hoc. Item Johannes Barun per potestatem officii sui cepit de Ricardo Lomberdo xxs dum fuit serviens in castro Roff' contra voluntatem suam post pacem proclamandam. Item eodem tempore idem Simon Morlak cepit Stephanum Blodreth et ipsum in castro predicto inprisonavit quousque finivit xxs. Idem Simon per potestatem etc. cepit de quodam Johanne de la Rye unam navem plenam bladi precii xx marcas et amplius et dicta blada cum aliis bonis ducere fecit in castrum predictum. Idem Simon cepit de quodam homine de Wybcheles' unam navem plenam allectorum precii iiij libras et amplius et ducere fecit in eodem castro et quod dominus Simon de Graye dum fuit constabularius per potestatem officii sui cepit de bonis plurimorum in trave piscibus bladis et vinis et boscis et aliis rebus ad valorem Lx marcarum et amplius

1 sword price 2s. from the said Alan.

Then they say that a certain Simon, son of Philip of Delham, kept 400 marks and more in Rochester priory in the care of a certain monk of the same house, his brother called Adam. When Simon was arraigned for the death of a certain man, Sir Simon de Grey the constable then received a mandate from the lord king that he should take the said money into the king's hand and if the said Simon was found he should arrest him. Whence the aforesaid John Potyn protected the same Simon and for this took 10 marks and 100 marks from the said monk, as it is said, because of this the lord king lost all the aforesaid money, but they do not know what happened afterwards between the said Simon and John Potyn and the aforesaid Simon of Delham. Then John Potyn by the authority of his office entered the house of Godwin who lives in the lord king's bailiwick/jurisdiction and broke the door of his chamber and took one ferret for catching rabbits price half a mark and carried it away against Godwin's will. Then when John Havekyn moored one ship next to the castle where other ships were moored habitually Sir Simon de Grey was unwilling to permit John to take her away until he paid a fine of 60s. which he took unjustly. Then Roger de Leyburn took £80 from the men of Strood at the time of peace after the battle of Evesham because Simon de Montfort stayed in Strood during the assault upon Rochester and this fine was contrary to the mens' will. Then they say that a certain messuage which was of Elias Bateman is in pledge to the citizens of Rochester at half a mark of annual rent, which tenement Simon Morlak bought from the said Elias 8 years ago, from this time until now the said rent has been retained. Then John Barun while he was a serjeant in Rochester castle took, by the authority of his office, 20s. from Richard Lomberdus against his will, after peace had been proclaimed. Then at the same time the same Simon Morlak took Stephen Blodreth and imprisoned him in the aforesaid castle until he paid a fine of 20s. The same Simon by the authority, etc., took one ship loaded with corn, price 20 marks and more from John de la Rye and had the said corn with other goods brought to the aforesaid castle. The same Simon took from a certain man of Winchelsea one ship filled with herrings, price £4 and more and had them brought to the same castle and that Sir Simon de Greye while he was constable, by the authority of his office took from the goods of many people, timber, fish, corn and wine and wood and other

unde nichili solvit [? nec] in predicta civitate et Strode et alibi in patria. Item dicunt quod Ricardus filius Jodlani et Benedictus Potyn asportaverunt duos flaellos de porta domini regis que est versus pontem.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Heure vicecomes Kancie cepit de hominibus Roff' pro respectu quem dedit eis de vicesime Cs et amplius et unam loricam nomine districtionis de Gileberto Elys predicto [ ] quam adhuc habet et dominus Henricus Malemeis tempore suo Lxs pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod cum Hugo de Blythe et Simon Potyn operari fecissent in turri castri Roff' [ ] caverunt Cs et amplius plusquam apposuerunt tempore domini Reginaldi de Cobbeham tunc vicecomes Kancie et constabularius Roff. Item dicunt quod cum Comes Warenn' et dominus Rogerus de Leyburn fuerunt in castro Roff' tempore gwerre et combusserunt aulam domini regis que fuit in eodem castro et postea cum Simon Morlak fuisset constabularius et Johannes Potyn constabularius [fuit ] idem Johannes discooperuit (aulam - sic) cameram domini regis et ibi cepit tria millia tegulorum ad valorem xxs et amplius et idem Johannes habuit plumbum in eodem castro quod valuit [ ] et amplius. Item Johannes habuit maheremium de quodam oriello quod valuit xxs et amplius. Item idem Johannes cepit ij ostia in castro que valuerunt dimidam marcam et amplius. Item dicunt quod [? cum idem Johannes ] fecisset operari in castro predicto per zxx annos elapsos cepit et abduxit petram que fuit in eodem castro fieri fecit in villa Roff' quondam celariam de eadem [ ] et per operarios domini regis ad dampnum regis X marcas et amplius et quod Allanus de Kyrkeby Simon Morlak et dominus Simon de Graye dum fuerunt constabularii dicti castri [com]buserunt maheremium in dicto castro de domibus ad valorem xLs et amplius et quod Thomas Atteston de Maydestan [ ] et filii sui de eodem Alanus [de Kyrkeby] et alii de secta sua venerunt apud Roff' et ibi depredaverunt in eadem villa de plumbo domini regis ad valorem Lxs et amplius quodquidam plumbum abduxerunt.

Item dicunt quod Johannes le Engleys et Ricardus frater eius duxerunt lanas ad partes transmarinas ter ad valorem 1 marcam et amplius et quod Rogerus Pykston et Walterus Long [? socius] eius duxerunt quatuor saccos [? Lane] precii xx marcas et amplius et

things valued at 60 marks and more and he paid nothing neither in the aforesaid city nor Strood nor elsewhere in the country. Then they say that Richard son of Jodland and Benedict Potyn have carried off two pieces of iron from the lord king's gate which is towards the bridge.

Then they say that William of Hever, the sheriff of Kent, took 100s. from the men of Rochester for the respite from the tax of one-twentieth which he gave them and one *hauberk* [coat of mail] as a distraint from the aforesaid Gilbert Elys [ ] which he still keeps and Sir Henry Malemeis (took) 60s. in his time for the same purpose.

Then they say that when Hugh de Blythe and Simon Potyn had work done on the tower of Rochester castle and they concealed 100s. more than they spent while Reginald of Cobham was sheriff of Kent and constable of Rochester. Then they say that the earl Warene and Sir Roger de Leyburn were in Rochester castle during the time of war and they burnt the lord king's hall which was within the same castle and afterwards when Simon Morlak was constable and when John Potyn was constable, the same John took the roof off the lord king's chamber and took three thousand tiles, value 20s. and more from it and the same John took the lead in the same castle which was worth [ ] and more. Then John had the timber from a certain oriel which was worth 20s. and more. Then the same John took 2 doors in the castle which were worth half a mark and more. Then they say that [? when the same John] caused work to be done in the aforesaid castle, 20 years ago, he took and carried away stone which was in the same castle and used it to make a cellar in Rochester town by the lord king's workmen with loss of 10 marks and more to the king and that Alan of Kirkby, Simon Morlak and Sir Simon de Grey, while they were constables of the said castle, burnt the timber of the houses in Rochester castle, value 40s. and more and that Thomas Atteston of Maidstone, [ ] and his sons of the same town, Alan [? of Kirkby] and others of their suit came to Rochester and there plundered the same city of the lord king's lead valued at 60s. and more and have carried away that lead.

Then they say that John le Engleys and Richard his brother have three times taken wool to places overseas, of 1 mark and more in value and that Roger Pykston and Walter Long [? his associate] have taken 4 sacks [? of wool] price 20 marks and more and that Walter



quod Walterus de Vaus et Willelmus socius eius duxerunt lanas ad valorem C marcas et amplius et quod [? Johannes Potyn] et Johannes de Mares ballivi tunc temporis permiserunt Johannem le Engleys et Ricardum fratrem eius transpire pro muneribus capiendis sed nesciunt quantum ceperunt. Item Johannes [Potyn et Johannes de Mares] ceperunt de Rogero Pykston et Waltero Longo munera ut transirent sed nesciunt quantum et quod predictus Johannes Potyn cepit de Philippo et aliis quarterium avene et cortices de quercu et maheremium, que dictus Johannes Philippus duxerunt in partes transmarinas et quod homines Comitisse Flandr' venerunt et fuerunt in partibus istis et collegerunt [ ] cortices de quercu et maheremium et duxerunt ad partes transmarinas et ex hoc Johannes Potyn et Johannes de Mares tunc ballivos ceperunt de eisdem Cs et eos transire permiserunt.

m.9 Inquisiciones facte in lasto de Shuppwye in comitatu Kancie

### **Hundredum de Oxeneye**

Jurati dicunt quod xijs pro anguillis debentur domino regi annuatim et iijs solvendis ad firmam prima die lune in xL de baronia de Oxen

Dicunt eciam quod quarta pars hundredi de Oxen est in manu domini regis set valorem eius per annum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' clamat habere et habet returnum brevium furcas et assisam panis et cervisie.

Item dicunt quod idem archiepiscopus et prior ecclesie Christi Cant' clamant habere warennam set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod abbas de Ponte Roberto et Matheus de Knoll opturaverunt quamdam viam ducentem a villa de Oxen usque ad villa de Newinde in comitatu Sussex ad mangnum dampnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Northie quamdam terram dimisit abbati Pontis Roberti que valet per annum X marcas et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Whokenesrishe coronator cepit de juratis istius hundredi pro officio suo excercendo quatuor summas avene et aliis cepit pro simili 1 marcam et certo pro simili de eisdem xxs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemeis dum fuit vicecomes Kancie tradidit lestum de Shuppweye

de Vaus and William his associate have taken wool valued at 100 marks and more and that [John Potyn ] and John de Mares the bailiffs at that time took bribes to permit John le Engleys and his brother Richard to export goods, and they do not know how much they took. Then John [Potyn and John de Mares] took bribes from Roger Pykston and Walter Long to allow them to export goods but they do not know what quantity and that the aforesaid John Potyn took from Philip and others a quarter of oats, bark of oak trees and timber which the said John Philip took to places overseas and that the countess of Flanders's men came and were in these parts and they collected [ ] bark from oak trees and timber and took these to places overseas and for this John Potyn and John de Mares, then bailiffs, took 100s. from the same men and permitted them to go overseas.

m. 9 Inquisitions taken in **Shepway** lathe in the county of Kent.

### **Oxney Hundred**

The jury say that 12s. is owed yearly to the lord king for eels and 3s. to be paid at farm on the first Monday in Lent from Oxney barony.

They say also that a fourth part of Oxney hundred is in the lord king's hand but they do not know its value each year.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury claims to have and has the return of writs, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale.

Then they say that the same archbishop and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claim to have warren, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the abbot of Robertsbridge [Sussex] and Matthew of Knowle have obstructed a certain road leading from Oxney vill as far as the town of Newick in the county of Sussex with severe loss to the country.

Then they say that Sir William de Northie demised a certain land to the abbot of Robertsbridge which is worth 10 marks and more each year.

Then they say that Lawrence de Whokenesrishe, the coroner, took four loads of oats from the jury of this hundred for performing the duties of his office and from others he took 1 mark for a similar reason and 20s. from the same people for a similar reason.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemeis, while he was sheriff of Kent, demised Shepway lathe at farm to

Laurentio de Shokenerth ad firmam unde idem Laurencius cepit de baronia de Oxen injuste et quod injuste non occasionaretur xLvs et de Godardo filio Petri inponendo sibi falso quod fuit usurarius pro pace habenda habuit xxs et de Godelena de Pessina inponendo sibi quod fecit purpresturam ubi nullam fecit 1 marcam.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen ballivus ibidem post dictum Laurencium per predictum vicecomitem cepit de Thoma de Rmdhamm inponendo sibi feloniam et fuit fidelis pro pace habenda Xs. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus ibidem post dictum Thomam per dominum Willelmum de Hevere vicecomitem cepit de Waltero de Abbodestond injuste iiijs et de Willelmo Passur inponendo sibi quod fuit usuarius et non fuit Xs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit de villata de Oxen' domini archiepiscopi injuste iiiij marcas et dimidiam et de bosco eiusdem ibidem ij marcas. Item dicunt quod ballivi domini archiepiscopi vendunt custodias de gavelkund contra communem justiciam.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et dominus Fulco Payforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo xiiijs ultra rectam vicesimam.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht' serviens Rogeri clerici ballivi de Shuppweye venit ad domum Godelene de Pessinden et namiavit eam de 1 equo precii 1 marce et abduxit et eum adhuc detinet.

### **Hundredum de Falkestane**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex habet in comitatu Kancie manerium de Middeltun cum membris quod nunc tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo ad terminum vite et manerium de Offspring quod nunc tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc et Magister domus Dei de Ofspring tenet partem eiusdem ville set quantum aut quo warento ingornorant [sic] et dominus rex habet in manu sua curiam de Rudlevet que valet per annum xLs.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Wye quod abbas de Bello tenet et manerium de Elham quod Willelmus de Leyburn tenet sunt de dominico domini regis set quid valent per annum aut quo warento ea tenent nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Sandwico et dominus Bertammus de Crioll tenent baroniam de

Lawrence of Shokenerth, thence the same Lawrence unjustly took 45s. from Oxney barony so that he should not make arrests unjustly and he took 20s. from Godard son of Peter to make peace because he falsely accused him that of practising usury and he took 1 mark from Godelena de Pessina accusing her of making an encroachment when she had not made one. Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, the bailiff there, after the said Lawrence took, through the aforesaid sheriff, 10s. from Thomas of Rainham for making peace after accusing him of felony when he was a law-abiding man. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the bailiff there after the said Thomas, took, through William of Hever the sheriff, 4s. unjustly from Walter de Abbodestond and 10s. from William Passur accusing him of being a usurer and he was not. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 4½ marks from the lord archbishop's township of Oxney and 2 marks there from the wood of the same place. Then they say that the lord archbishop's bailiffs sell wardship of minors of *gavelkind* contrary to common justice.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Sir Fulk Payforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth tax have taken 14s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Thomas le Leht', serjeant of Roger the clerk, bailiff of Shepway, came to Godelena de Pessinden's house and made distraint upon her of 1 horse, price 1 mark and he took it away and he still keeps it.

### **Folkestone Hundred**

The jury say that the lord king holds Middleton manor with its members in the county of Kent, which now the lord John de Burgh holds for the term of his life and Ospringe manor which the lady queen, the present king's mother, now holds and the Master of God's House in Ospringe holds part of the same vill, but they do not know how much nor by what warrant and the lord king holds in his own hand *Rudlevet* court which is worth 40s each year.

Then they say that Wye manor, which the abbot of Battle holds, and Elham manor, which William de Leyburn holds, are of the lord king's demesne but what they are worth each year or by what warrant they are held the jury do not know.

Then they say that Sir John of Sandwich and Sir Bertram de Crioll hold the barony of Folkestone of the

Fulkestan de domino rege in capite unde dictus Johannes tenet vij feoda et dictus dominus Bertrammus viij feoda et communiter tenent hundredum de Fulkestan pro xxs per annum solvendis domino regi per manus vicecomitis. Item dicunt quod Colentena de Columbario tenet in dote duo feoda in Postling de rege in capite pro xxs solvendis per annum ad castrum Dovor'. Item dicunt quod civitas Cant' et Roff' tenentur de domino rege set quo modo ignorant. Item dicunt quod medietas hundredi de Nywecherich est in manu domini regis et altera medietas est in manu domini archiepiscopi Cant' et prioris ecclesie Christi ibidem de quo hundredo tenentes de Rokyng subtrahunt se de secta ad dampnum domini regis per annum de iiijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium placita de namio vetito furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set a quo tempore nesciunt aut quo warento nisi per ecclesiam Christi Cant' ignorant.

Item dicunt quod Magister de Swunesfeld Hospitelarius vendicat libertatem per quam assisam domini regis panis et cervisie inpeditur in dicto hundredo a quo tempore aut quo warento ignorant.

Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Leyburn diebus suis mutavit quoddam iter in parochia de Elham ad nocumentum domini regis et dampnum patrie per annum dimidiam marcam et amplius et quod Johannes de Evereslye obstupavit quoddam iter apud Winesfeld ad nocumentum domini regis et dampnum patrie per annum de ijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains tunc vicecomes inprisonavit quemdam Willelmum de Caltethe inponendo ei falso et maliciose crimen furti et pro deliberacione eiusdem cepit de eo xLs injuste quod hundredum suum eundem Willelmum de omnimoda feloniam et furto aquietavit. Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus de Elham cepit de Jordano Atteburegh vijd pro eodem removendo de assisa et Nigellis Pundherst et Johannes Finet cepit de Alano clerico de Shottemer et Johanne Cucku pro simili xijd et Daniellus serviens Magistri Laurencii de Sticeche ballivi regis cepit de Willelmo Pavmir' pro simili vjd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains dum fuit vicecomes Kancie tradidit balliviam de Shuppewye Thome de Suthen' baillivo extorsoribus pro xvij libris et amplius qui ultra modum gravabat

lord king in chief, of this the said John holds 7 fees and the said lord Bertram 7 fees and they hold Folkestone hundred in common for 20s. each year paid to the lord king through the sheriff's hands. Then they say that Colentena de Columbario holds two fees in Postling in dower, of the king in chief for 20s paid each year at Dover castle. Then they say that the cities of Canterbury and Rochester are held of the lord king, but they do not know in what way. Then they say that a moiety of Newchurch hundred is in the lord king's hand and the other moiety is in the hand of the lord archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch there. The tenants of Ruckinge of this hundred withdraw themselves from suit with loss of 4s. each year to the lord king.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, but from what time they do not know nor by what warrant unless through Christchurch Canterbury.

Then they say that the Master of the Hospitallers of Swingfield claims the liberty through which the lord king's assize of bread and ale in the said hundred is disturbed, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Roger de Leyburn in his time changed a certain way in Elham parish causing nuisance to the lord king and loss of half a mark and more each year to the country and that John of Eversley has made an obstruction on a certain way at *Winsfield* causing nuisance to the lord king and loss of 2s. each year to the country.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains, then the sheriff, imprisoned a certain William de Caltethe, falsely and maliciously accusing him of the crime of theft and for his release he took 40s. from him, unjustly because his hundred acquitted the same William from every manner of felony and theft. Then they say that Richard, the clerk of Elham, took 7d. from Jordan Atteburegh to remove him from the assize and Nigel Pundherst and John Finet took 12d. from Alan the clerk of Shotmer and John Cucku for a similar reason and Daniel the servant of Master Lawrence de Sticeche, the king's bailiff, took 6d. from William Pavmir for a similar reason.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains, while he was sheriff of Kent, demised the bailiwick of Shepway to Thomas de Suthen, a bailiff, [ ] for £18 and more who oppressed the people immeasurably. The same man

populum. Idem cepit de Willelmo Parmentario inponendo sibi falso quod fregit grangiam Henrici Boles de Hethe 1 marcam et dictus Henricus vicecomes de eodem per eadem causa 1 marcam. Item dicunt quod Johannes Finet et Nicholaus de Pundherst cepit xjs de Johanne de Caseburn, Simone Redwin, Rogero Bone et Thoma de Caseburn pro summonitione Scaccarii de amerciamento coram Magistro Rogero de Seton justicario Itinerante et illos non aquietaverunt. Item iidem ceperunt de Rogero Tylor, Willelmo de Aula et Thoma Waltero eodem modo Vs et iijd et de priore de Folkestan ijs et vjd et eos non aquietaverunt. Item dicunt quod Adam filius Walteri de Stonden captus et inprisonatus fuit in domo domini Henrici Malemains injuste et antquam potuit evadere dedit Nicholao de Stratford servientem predicti Henrici Malemains et Ricardo de Chelinden xxs et nicholominus eidem Henrico Malemains 1 marcam et ita transivit sine iudicio. Item dicunt quod Daniel serviens Magistri Laurencii de Stivech' cepit injuste iiijs de Johanne Holman quem voluntarie inprisonavit.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit de tenentibus domini archiepiscopi Cant' apud Saltwod contra voluntatem ipsorum ij marcas ita quod tractarentur ut consueverant tempore archiepiscopi et de tenentibus archiepiscopi at Caseburn cepit pro simili Lxxs. Item dicunt quod idem excaitor cepit de dictis tenentibus de Saltwod quod nolebant capere terram tam caro precio sicut voluit ij marce et Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris cepit de eisdem per ij vicesimas xxs pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochull fecit ducere lanas et caseum ad partes transmarinas set quantum aut quo warento nesciunt.

### **Dimidium Hundredum de Langport**

Jurati dicunt quod Kotride et Kenewardinton tenentur de domino rege pro 1 feodo in capite quod Thome de Normanville heres qui est infra etatem tenet pro redempcione matris sue et valet per annum xx libras et Johannes Literihc tenet quartam partem unius feodi de domino Bertrammo de Criol et vocatur Shingledehall et dominus Bertammus tenet illud de domino rege in honore de Harle et valet per annum Cs

took 1 mark from William the cloth-comber falsely accusing him of damaging the barn of Henry Boles of Hythe and the said Henry, the sheriff, took 1 mark from the same man for the same reason.

Then they say that John Finet and Nicholas de Pundherst took 11s. from John de Caseburn, Simon Redwin, Roger Bone and Thomas de Caseburn for summons of the Exchequer because of an amercement made before Master Roger de Seton an justice in eyre and they have not acquitted the men. Then the same men took 5s. 4d. from Roger Tyler, William de Aula and Thomas Walter in the same way and 2s. 6d. from the prior of Folkestone and they have not acquitted them. Then they say that Adam son of Walter de Stonden was unjustly captured and imprisoned in the house of Sir Henry de Malemains and before he was able to escape he gave Nicholas of Stratford, the aforesaid Henry Malemains's serjeant and Richard of Chillenden 20s. and nevertheless 1 mark to the same Henry Malemains and thus he left without trial. Then they say that Daniel, a servant of Master Lawrence de Stivech took 4s. unjustly from John Holman whom he imprisoned arbitrarily.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 2 marks from the archbishop of Canterbury's tenants at Saltwood against their will, that they might be treated in the way to which they had become accustomed during the archbishop's time and he took 70s. from the archbishop's tenants at *Caseburn* for a similar reason. Then they say that the same escheator took 2 marks from the said tenants of Saltwood because they were unwilling to take their land at such a price as he wished and Master Hugh of Thornham the escheator's clerk took 20s. from them for 2 taxes of one-twentieth.

Then they say that William de Brochull has arranged the export of wool and cheese to places overseas, but they do not know how much nor by what warrant.

### **The Half Hundred of Longport [St Martin Longport]**

The jury say that Cockreed [Hope All Saints par.] and Kenardington are held of the lord king in chief for one fee which the heir of Thomas de Normanville who is under age holds by fine of his mother and it is worth £20 each year and John Literihc holds a fourth part of one fee of Sir Bertram de Criol and it is called Shingledehall [Eastwell par.] and Sir Bertram holds that of the lord king in the honour of *Harle*

et heredes Rogeri de Romenal tenent quamdam partem terre cum tenentibus de serjancia que vocatur Offeton de domino Johanne filio Bernardi et idem Johannes illam tenet de domino rege in capite pro 1 falcone custodiendo et valet per annum xvij s.

Item dicunt quod quarta pars borghe de dimidio hundredo de Langport que vocatur Bletching est in manu domini regis et unum quarterium eiusdem borghe subtrahitur de secta istius hundredi per relictam Huberti de Burgo Cometissam Kancie per spacium xx annorum ad dampnum domini regis quolibet anno de xijd et modo tenet dominus Nicholaus Sistlewast et nesciunt quo warento. Dicunt eciam quod dimidia borga de Esewarestun est in manu domini regis et quod borga de Northen similiter est in manu domini regis et non sunt in ea nisi tres domus facientes sectam ad hundredum et alii tenentes vendunt terras suas hominibus de Romenhal et Magistro Domus Dei Dovor' vendunt duo tenementa de quibus dominus rex solebat habere sectam ad hundredum suum que subtrahitur per spacium vj annorum ad dampnum domini regis per anum de vjd et amplius et dimidia borga de Dengemarais subtrahitur per abbatem de Bello de omnibus sectis pertinentibus ad coronam domini regis per spatium iij annorum ad dampnum regis per annum de ijs et amplius et nesciunt quo warento et dimidia borga de Langport dimidia borga de Esewarestun et dimidia borga de Lide sunt de libertate archiepiscopi Cant' et secta eadem sutrahitur de hundredo domini regis per 1 annum per dictum archiepiscopum et ballivos suos et faciunt sectam ad hundredum suum ad dampnum regis per annum de ijs et amplius et dicunt quod illa pars istius hundredi que est in manu domini regis cum firma et turno vicecomitis valet per annum xvjs et ix d et dicunt quod quoddam tenementum in borga de Northeneth quod vocatur Stapelteche subtrahitur de firma turni vicecomitis per Thomam de Normanvil per x annos ad dampnum patrie per annum de iijd et amplius.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita de namio vetito tenet et habet wreccum maris et furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regis per libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant.

Et dicunt quod abbas de Bello habet wreccum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warento.

[Haughley?]and it is worth 100s. each year and Roger of Romney's heirs with tenants, hold a certain part of land which is called *Offeton* by serjeanty service of Sir John, son of Bernard, and the same John holds that of the lord king in chief by keeping 1 falcon and it is worth 17s. each year.

Then they say that a fourth part of Langport half hundred which is called *Bletching* [Lydd par.?] is in the lord king's hand and one quarter of the same tithing is withdrawn from suit of that hundred by the countess of Kent, Hubert de Burgh's widow for 20 years with loss of 12d. each year to the lord king and now Sir Nicholas Sistlewast holds it and they do not know by what warrant. They say also that a half of *Esewarestun* tithing is in the lord king's hand and that Northiam tithing [Sussex] similarly is in the lord king's hand and in this tithing there are only three houses making suit to the hundred and the other tenants sell their lands to the men of Romney and they sell two tenements from which the king used to receive suit at his hundred, which is withdrawn for 6 years, to the Master of God's House at Dover with the loss of 6d. and more each year to the lord king; and half the tithing of Dungeness is withdrawn by the abbot of Battle from all suits pertaining to the lord king's crown for 3 years with loss of 2s. and more each year to the lord king and they do not know by what warrant; and half of Langport tithing, half of Esewarestun tithing and half of Lydd tithing are of the archbishop of Canterbury's liberty and the same suit is withdrawn from the lord king's hundred for 1 year by the said archbishop and his bailiffs and they do suit at his hundred with loss of 2s. and more each year to the king; and they say that that part of that hundred which is in the lord king's hand with the farm and sheriff's tourn is worth 16s. 9d. each year and they say that a certain tenement in Northiam tithing which is called Stapelteche is withdrawn from the sheriff's tourn by Thomas de Normanvile for 10 years with loss of 3d and more each year to the country.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has wreck and the gallows and the assize of bread and ale and other liberties of the king through the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury.

And they say that the abbot of Battle has wreck, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale and they do not know by what warrant.

Item dicunt quod Jacobus Hunfray cepit vadia injuste in via regali apud Hilines ad dampnum patrie de dimidia marca.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes Kancie tradidit lestum de Shipweye cuidam Thome de Suthen ad firmam tempore suo qui Thomas et Thomas de Leht subballivus eius ceperunt de quadam Cecilia Swein iijs inponendo sibi falso quod furabatur bladum Johannis Adam de Romenhale et idem Thomas de Suthen cepit injuste de relicta Randulfi Parin per gravem distrinccionem iijis et dictus Thomas de Leht per eadem distrinccionem xvd et Hugo Sacrista per eandem distrinccionem xijd. Item dicunt quod idem Thomas de Sutheneye attachiavit Walterum Picston et ipsum retinuit quousque habuit ab eo iijis. Item idem Thomas attachiavit quendam Willelmum Rob' pro suspicione furti et antequam voluit tenere hundredum ad eundem deliberare cepit de hundredo iijs. Item idem cepit injuste pro quodam latrone evaso de ecclesia pro sui defectu et pro officio suo faciendo de alio felone de hoc hundredo iijis et Johannes le Brode cepit de eodem dimidio hundredo de summonitione scaccarii vs vd et dictum hundredum inde non aquietavit set alias solvebantur vicecomites. Item dictus Thomas de Suthen cepit injuste de borgha de Osewabeton vjs antequam possent presentare coram eo in hundredo et Johannes de Brode serviens eius cepit injuste de Johanne de Hamon ijs et de Henrico Corebye et Willelmo Nigro ijs et Johannes de Stuting cepit injuste de Martino Betewete pro relacione unius assise ijs et de Thoma Fulsalt pro simili xvijid.

Item de Hamone Fulsalt pro simili xijd, de Rogero de Hope pro simili vjd. Item dicunt quod dictus Johannes le Brode cepit de Thoma Eylwin pro simili xijd. Item dictus Johannes de Stuting relaxavit Willelmum ate Ructune et Willelmum Godefrai de assisa pro xijd. Item predictus Thomas le Leht distrinxit Ricardum Coting per ij jumenta et ea retinuit quousque alterum ei concessit. Idem Thomas distrinxit Robertum Galiot et Thomam Eylwin per ij jumenta injuste et ea detinuit quousque jumentum dicti Roberti moriebatur et nichilominus cepit ab eisdem pro alio jumento ijs injuste. Item predictus Johannes de Stuting cepit de Martino filio Leticie et Galfridi le Sumer pro relaxacione unius assise ijs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford

Then they say that James Hunfray took payments unjustly on the king's highway at *Hilines* with loss of half a mark to the country.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, sheriff of Kent during his time of office, demised Shepway lathe at farm to a certain Thomas de Suthen and that Thomas and Thomas de Leht his sub-bailiff took 3s. from Cecily Swein accusing her falsely that the corn of John Adam of Romney was stolen and the same Thomas de Suthen took 4s. unjustly from Randulf Parin's widow as a serious distraint and the said Thomas de Leht 15d. for the same distraint and Hugh the sacristan took 12d. for the same distraint. Then they say that the same Thomas de Sutheneye arrested Walter Picston and detained him until he received 4s. from him. Then the same Thomas arrested a certain William Rob' on suspicion of theft and before he was willing to allow the hundred to deliver him, he took 3s. from the hundred. Then the same man took 4s. unjustly from this hundred because a certain robber had escaped from the church because of the hundred's negligence and for performing the duty of his office in regard to another felon and John de Brode took 5s. 5d. from the same half hundred for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted the said hundred of this but the sheriffs have been paid other sums. Then the said Thomas de Suthen took 6s. unjustly from *Osewabeton* tithing before they could make presentation before him in the hundred and John de Brode his serjeant took 2s. unjustly from John de Hamon and 2s. from Henry Corby and William Niger and John of Stowing unjustly took 2s. from Martin Betewete for remittance of one assize and 18d. from Thomas Fulsalt for a similar reason.

Then 12d. from Hamo Fulsalt for a similar reason, 6d. from Roger de Hope for a similar reason. Then they say that the said John le Brode took 12d. from Thomas Eylwin for a similar reason. Then the said John of Stowing excused William ate Ructune and William Godfrey from an assize for 12d. Then the aforesaid Thomas de Leht took 2 mares from Richard Coting as distraint and kept them until he had given him one of them. The same Thomas took 2 mares unjustly from Robert Galiot and Thomas Eylwin as distraint and kept them until the said Robert's mare died and nevertheless he took 2s. from them unjustly for another mare. Then the aforesaid John of Stowing took 2s. from Martin son of Letitia and Geoffrey the Sumner for excusing them from one assize.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the

excaitor cepit de dimidio hundredo de Langport injuste et sine causa xxxvijs.  
Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra vicesimam xxxvj.

### **Dimidium Hundred de Biriholt de Libertate archiepiscopi.**

Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Middeltun cum Merden est de dominicum domini regis et dominus Johannes de Burgo nunc tenet per dominum regem.  
Item dicunt quod maneria de Muneketun Westhalimot et Menstr' quondam fuerunt in manibus regum et nunc abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet manerium de Menstre dominus archiepiscopus manerium de Westhalimot et prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis manerium de Munketun set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Henricus rex nunc proximus habuit in manu sua maneria de Elham et de Ofspring et modo domina Eliena regina mater domini regis nunc tenet manerium de Ofspring et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet manerium de Elham et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod manerium de Wy fuit quondam in manibus regum et abbas de Bello nunc illud tenet set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium furcas assisam panis et cervisie wreccum maris et alias libertates regales set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo plusquam vicesimam Xs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor vendidit boscum in parco archiepiscopi apud Aldinton tempore vacationis sedis Cant' ad valorem Lxvj et cepit in eodem parco xx feras et amplius et idem cepit de tenentibus de Aldinton de recognitione xLij libras.

Item idem excaitor cepit de eisdem tenentibus xx marcas inponendo eis quod non extendebant sufficienter terras pertinentes ad dictum manerium.

### **Hundredum de Stuting**

Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Stuting tenetur de domino rege in capite pro xxs per annum ad turnum vicecomitis et pro xxs ad Scaccarium domini regis per

escheator, took 38s. unjustly and for no reason from Langport half hundred.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulc Poyforer the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 36s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

### **The Half Hundred of Bircholt of the Liberty of the archbishop [Bircholt Franchise]**

The jury say that the hundred of Middleton with Marden is of the lord king's demesne and Sir John de Burgh now holds through the lord king.

Then they say that the manors of Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster were formerly in the hands of kings and now the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds Minster manor, the lord archbishop Westhalimot manor and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Monkton manor but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that King Henry, the previous king, held Elham and Ospringe manors in his own hand and now the lady Eleanor, the present king's mother, holds Ospringe manor and Sir William de Leyburn Elham manor and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Wye manor was formerly in the hands of the kings and the abbot of Battle now holds it, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, wreck and other royal liberties but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulc Poyforer the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, sold wood in the archbishop's park at Aldington valued at 66s. and he took 20 deer and more in the same park and he took £42 from the tenants of Aldington for acknowledgment of his lordship.

Then the same escheator took 20 marks from the same tenants making accusation that they had not made sufficient valuation of the lands pertaining to the said manor.

### **Stowting Hundred**

The jury say that Stowting hundred is held of the lord king in chief for 20s. each year at the sheriff's tourn and 20s. at the lord king's Exchequer each year by the

annum per manum vicecomitis et illud nunc tenentes Johannis de Berkel' racione custodie heredum Willelmi Heringod sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Tirkebi tenet hundredum de Stuting racione warde Emme filie Willelmi Heringod.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Elleham tenetur de domino rege in capite et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn illud nunc tenet sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Johanes de Burgo tenet hundredum de Middeltun de domino rege in capite ex concessione domini regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Ofspring tenetur de domino rege in capite et domina regina nunc illud tenet mater domini regis nunc sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus et tenentes de Stelling subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi vicecomitis post bellum de Lewes per Comitem Glovernie ad dampnum regis per annum de ijs et dicunt quod tenentes de Elmstede Wadenhale et Heroldeshyrok subtraxerunt se de lottis et sectis ad turnum vicecomitis iam per ij annos per Robertum archiepiscopum Cant' ad dampnum per annum de vjs sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod idem archiepiscopus habet returnum omnium brevium wreccum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et tenet placita namio vetito et habet alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent ab antiquo set nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus de Stuting habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod idem habet liberas chacias in dominicis suis per concessionem domini regis Johannis per cartam quam Stephanus Heringod adquisivit. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Watton quondam vicecomes primo levavit turnum vicecomitis in comitatu unde hundredum de Stuting gravatum est de xxs per annum.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus Heringod dominus de Stuting fecit onerare injuste totum hundredum de Stuting ad solvendum ad Scaccarium xxs per annum de firma quam ipse idem reddere debuit et per propriam districcionem.

Item dicunt quod Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitor cepit equum Matilde Atteheth precii xvjs in parco de Aldinton et illud ad opus suum proprium retinuit injuste et contra voluntatem dicte

sheriff's hand and now John de Berkley's tenants because of the wardship of William Heringod's heirs, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John de Tirkebi holds Stowting hundred because of the wardship of Emma, William Heringod's daughter.

Then they say that Elham manor is held of the lord king in chief and Sir William de Leyburn now holds that but by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the lord John de Burgh holds Middleton hundred of the lord king in chief by grant of the present lord king.

Then they say that Ospringe manor is held of the lord king in chief and the lady queen, the present king's mother, now holds that but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord and tenants of Stelling Minnis withdrew themselves from from suit of the hundred (and) of the sheriff after the battle of Lewes through the earl of Gloucester with loss of 2s. each year to the king and they say that the tenants of Elmsted, Waltham and *Heroldeshyrok* have withdrawn themselves from lots and suits at the sheriff's tourn now for 2 years through Robert archbishop of Canterbury [Robert Kilwardby 1272-1278] with loss of 6s. each year but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the same archbishop has return of all writs, wreck, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has other liberties from ancient times which pertain to the crown but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord of Stowting has the gallows and the assize of bread and ale but from what time or by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the same man has free chace in his demesnes by grant of King John through a charter which Stephen Heringod acquired. Then they say that John de Watton formerly the sheriff first exacted the sheriff's tourn in the county, for this Stowting hundred is burdened with 20s. each year.

Then they say that Stephen Heringod the lord of Stowting has caused the whole hundred to Stowting to be burdened unjustly with a payment of 20s. each year at the Exchequer for the farm, which the same man himself ought to pay as his own distraint.

Then they say that Master Hugh de Thornham, the escheator's clerk, took Matilda Atteheth's horse, price 16s. in Aldington park and unjustly kept that for his own use and against the said Matilda's will, giving her



Matilde nil sibi dando pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod cum hundredum de Stuting adisset per preceptum domini regis ad obsidendum castrum de Tunebrigg et Willelmus de Stupesdon ballivus Comitis Glovernie pro eo quod filius Willelmi de la Grave fuit ibidem cepit de eodem Willelmo xxs et de Johanne Rauf pro filio suo qui fuit ibidem cepit dimidiam marcam et de Alexandro de Cumbe pro simili iiij s et de Willelmo Wudeman pro simili xijd et de Henrico de Sondreye pro simili ijs et de Willelmo Heringod pro simili xx porcos precii xxxs et 1 bovem precii xxxijs et iiijd.

Item dicunt quod cum Willelmus Heringod dedisset Petro de Benhale manerium de Staunford in ultimo vite sue venit Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor et cepit a predicto Petro injuste pro pacifica seysina habenda.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit archiepiscopatum Cant' tempore domini regis Henrici et illud tenet in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidiam.

### **Hundredum de Worth**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Eastbrigg' fuit aliquando in manu regis Johannis et Magister Domus (Dei) Doverie illud nunc tenet et alientatum fuit per Hubertum de Burez ut credunt et valet per annum xvij libras.

Item dicunt quod Henricus rex pater domini regis tunc habuit in manu sua quoddam feodum quod vocatum Grainston et Magister Domus Dei de Ofspring illud nunc tenet et valet per annum Cs.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Worth reddit domino regi per annum de firma Vs. Item dicunt quod medietas eiusdem hundredi est in manu domini regis quarta pars in manu archiepiscopi Cant' sexta pars in manu Magistri Domus Dei Dover' duodecima pars in manu Magistri Domus Dei de Ofspring set quid valeat per annum nesciunt et de parte domini regis predicti hundredi subtracta est secta viij mesuagiorum ad hundredum de Strete per potestatem dicti Nicholai de Haullo ad dampnum regis per annum de Xd.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' subtraxit sectam viij mesuagiorum de predicto hundredo exceptis duobus laghedais et Magister Domus Dei Dover subtrahit sectam sexe partis

nothing for the same horse.

Then they say that when by the lord king's command (the men) of Stowting hundred had gone to take part in the siege of Tonbridge castle and William de Stupesdon, the earl of Gloucester's bailiff took 20s. from William de la Grave because his son had been there, he took half a mark from John Rauf because his son had been there, 4s. from Alexander of Combe for a similar reason, 12s. from William Woodman for a similar reason, 2s. from Henry de Sondreye for a similar reason and for a similar reason he took 20 pigs price 30s. and 1 ox price 33s. 4d. from William Heringod.

Then they say that when William Heringod had given Peter de Benhale Stanford manor at the close of his life, Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, came and unjustly took (money) from the aforesaid Peter to allowing him peaceful seisin.

Then they say that the same Master Richard took seisin of the archbishopric of Canterbury during the lord King Henry's time and held it for 2½ years in the lord king's hand.

### **Worth Hundred**

The jury say that Eastbridge manor was sometime in King John's hand and now the Master of God's house at Dover holds it and it was alienated by Hubert de Burez as they believe and it is worth £17 each year.

Then they say that King Henry, the present king's father, then held a certain fee called *Grainston* in his hand and now the Master of God's house at Ospringe holds that and it is worth 100s. each year.

Then they say that Worth hundred pays 5s. each year in rent to the lord king for the farm. Then they say that a moiety of the same hundred is in the lord king's hands, a fourth part in the hand of the archbishop of Canterbury, a sixth part in the hand of the Master of God's house at Dover and a twelfth part in the hand of the Master of God's house at Ospringe but they do not know what it is worth each year and the suit of 8 messuages has been taken away from the lord king's part of the aforesaid hundred to Street hundred by the authority of Nicholas de Haullo, with loss to the lord king of 10d. each year.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury has withdrawn the suit of 8 messuages lawdays and the Master of God's house at Dover withdraws the suit of a sixth part of Worth hundred

hundredi de Worth et firmam sibi appropriat que valet per annum ijs et vjd et Magister Domus Dei de Ofspring subtrahit sectam duodecime partis eiusdem hundredi et firmam similiter que valet per annum xiiijd.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regias et tenet placita de namio vetito et Magister domorum Dei Doverie et Ofspring habent assisam panis et cervisie.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' levavit furcas in predicto hundredo anno regni regis Henrici Lvj set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod libertas baronum V Portuum inpedit communem justiciam et regiam potestatem subvertit in hoc quod distringunt aliquos alios pro aliquo debito quam principales debitores vel pleggios eorum et insuper distringunt forinsecos extra libertates suas ut infra libertates eorum respondeant.

Item dicunt quod in ultimo anno regni domini regis Henrici quidam puer submersus fuit in hoc hundredo et Willelmus Kyriel coronator venire recusavit ad videndum mortuum. Ita quod miserunt post Thomam de Leht ballivum domini regis ad videndum illud infortunium qui venire noluit ad officium suum faciendum antequam habuit de hundredo dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod occasione quod hoc hundredum traditum fuit ad firmam Hamoni de la Forstall Johanni le Brode Johanni filio sacerdotis et Thome de Sutheneye ballivis vicissim gravantibus populum supra modum tota baronia fere destruitur per eosdem et pars domini regis multum deterioratur.

Item dicunt quod Elias clericus cepit [? no sum given] de Willelmo Gunnild pro jumento suo currente in via regia quod equus suus dictum jumentum sequebatur.

Item idem Elias ballivus per potestatem officii sui (cepit) medietatem domus Roberti filii Magistri Parcii dimidiam marce et alias reos plures.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus regis cepit injuste iiijs de Johanne Mercatore.

Item idem Hamo cepit iiijs de Roberto filii Magistri Parci pro respectu hundredo de debito de summonitione Scaccarii quod debitum ante solverat et per talia et alia facta huismodi ballivi populum gravant ultra modum et hoc tempore domini regis

and appropriates the farm for himself which is worth 2s. 6d. each year and the Master of God's house at Ospringe withdraws the suit of a twelfth part of the same hundred and similarly the farm which is worth 14d. each year.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and the Masters of the houses of God at Dover and Ospringe have the assize of bread and ale.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury erected a gallows in the aforesaid hundred in the 56th year of king Henry's reign [October 1271-1272] but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the liberties of the barons of the Cinque Ports obstruct common justice and subvert the royal power in that they make distraint upon any others for any debt both of principal debtors or their pledges and moreover they distraint foreigners outside their liberties in the same way as they act within their liberties.

Then they say that in the last year of the lord King Henry's reign a boy was drowned in this hundred and William Kyriel the coroner refused to come to see the dead boy. Then they after sent Thomas de Leht the lord king's bailiff to see that unfortunate boy, and he was unwilling to come and perform the duties of his office before he had received half a mark from the hundred.

Then they say that on the occasion that this hundred was demised at farm to Hamo de la Forstall, John le Brode, John the priest's son and Thomas de Sutheneye, the bailiffs, who greatly oppressed in turn the people in every way so that the whole barony was almost destroyed by them and the lord king's part greatly deteriorated

Then they say that Elias the clerk took (?) from William Gunnild because his mare was running upon the royal highway and because his horse followed the said mare.

Then the same Elias the bailiff by the authority of his office took a moiety of the house of Robert, son of the Master of the park, half a mark and many other things. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the king's bailiff, unjustly took 4s. from John the merchant.

Then the same Hamo took 4s. from Robert son of the Master of the park for postponing a debt of summons at the Exchequer due from the hundred which debt it had paid before and by such acts and others of this

Henrici et domini regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor post obitum Bonifacii archiepiscopi Cant' posuit tallagium injuste super tenentes de Worth de xLs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Wyngesham quondam excaitor domini Henrici regis seysivit in manu domini regis xvj acras terre de serjancia de Hurst que vocatas Dommershe et extenduntur per annum ad scaccarium ad xvjs

Item dicunt quod terra et domus Ade Daniel seysiate fuerunt in manu domini regis Henrici quod fugitivus fuit et nunc tenet dictam terram et domum Magister domus Dei Dover' et apreciata fuit domus predicta eo tempore ad xxs et dicta terra ad xiiijjs

Item dicunt quod domini Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt xxviijs de hundredo de Worth plusquam vicesimam.

nature, the bailiffs greatly oppressed the people beyond measure and this was during King Henry's time and the time of the present king.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, unjustly imposed a tallage of 40s. upon the tenants of Worth after Archbishop Boniface's death.

Then they say that Henry of Wingham, formerly the lord King Henry's escheator, took 16 acres of land held by serjeantry at Hurst called *Dommarsh* into the lord King Henry's hand and these were assessed at the Exchequer each year at 16s.

They they say that Adam Daniel's land and house have been taken into the lord King Henry's hand because he was a fugitive and now the Master of God's house at Dover holds the house and land and the aforesaid house is appraised at 20s. at this time and the said land at 14s.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 28s. more than the assessed amount from Worth hundred.

**m.10 Hundred de Alolvesbrigg adhuc in lesto de Shepweye**

Jurati dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet unum feodum in Snavo de domino rege set nesciunt per quod servicium. Item quod totus lesto iste traditur ad firmam per vicecomitem ad grave dampnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod medietas hundredi de Alolvesbrigg in manu domini regis et reddit per annum domino regi ixs et vijd sine turno vicecomitis et si poneretur ad firmam nesciunt quid posset valere per annum.

Item dicunt quod tenentes abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant' subtrahunt se per eundem abbatem de sectis hundredi domini regis et capit de illis emendas assisas panis et cervisie et furcas levavit de novo sed nesciunt quo warento et facta est ista predicta subtractio per predictum abbatem per iij annos ad dampnum regis per annum dimidam marce et amplius.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet assisam panis et cervisie furcas wreccum maris et tenet placita de namio vetito set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de la Belhuse subtrahit tenentes suos de secta hundredi domini regis per iij annos ad dampnum regis per annum de Vs.

Item dicunt quod barones de Cinque Portibus distringunt forinfecos infra libertates suas pro debito ubi non sunt debitores nec pleggios ad grave dampnum patrie eo quod ministri domini regis non possunt intrare propter libertatem suam.

Item dicunt quod minute purpresture facte sunt in dicto hundredo et baillivi regis capit inde expleta.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus Criel coronator comtempnit pluries exsequi officium suum ad mangnum [sic] gravamen hundredo.

Item dicunt quod ballivi domini regis cum sumonere deberent xij liberos homines ad assisas vel inquisitiones sumonerunt xxiiij vel plures et tunc aliquos de sumonitis permittunt in pace pro vjd et hoc fecit Thomas de Leht ballivus regis tempore Magistri Laurencii et tempore Thomas de Sutheneye quos sub-ballivus fuit et Symon David fecit eodem modo tempore suo ad grave dampnum patrie.

**m.10 Aloesbridge Hundred still in Shepway lathe**

The jury say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds one fee in Snavo of the lord king but they do not know by what service. Then that that whole lathe is demised at farm by the sheriff with serious loss to the country.

Then they say that a moiety of Aloesbridge hundred is in the lord king's hand and renders 9s. 7d. to the lord king each year without the sheriff's tourn and if it should be placed at farm they do not know what it may be worth each year.

Then they say that the tenants of the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury withdraw themselves through the same abbot from suits of the lord king's hundred and he takes the fines for the assizes of bread and ale from them and has erected a gallows recently but they do not know by what warrant and that the aforesaid withdrawal was done by the aforesaid abbot three years ago with loss of half a mark and more each year to the king.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the assize of bread and ale, the gallows, wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Thomas de la Belhuse has withdrawn his tenants from suit of the lord king's hundred for 2 years with loss to the king of 5s. each year.

Then they say that the barons of the Cinque Ports make distraint upon outsiders within their liberties for debt, when they are neither debtors nor acting as pledges with serious loss to the country, because the lord king's minsters cannot enter because of their liberty.

Then they say that small encroachments have been made in the said hundred and the king's bailiffs take a levy for this.

Then they say that William Criel the coroner has on many occasions refused to perform the duties of his office causing serious hardship to the hundred.

Then they say that the lord king's bailiffs when they ought to have summoned 12 free men to assizes or inquisitions, have summoned 24 men or more and then for payment of 6d. have granted some men remission from summons and Thomas de Leht who was bailiff during Master Lawrence's time and sub-bailiff during Thomas de Sutheneye's time, did this and Simon David acted in the same way during his time of office

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hevere vicecomes americiavit tempore suo Adam de Grenehull in ijs quod non venit ad inquisitiones suas et Robertum de North'm in ijs pro simili et denarios levavit et inquisitione non remansit capta pro defectu personarum.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes tempore suo tradidit ad firmam Thome de Suthen totum lestum hunc pro xx libris per annum ubi priusquam tradi solebat pro xvij libris ad mangnum [sic] gravamen patrie unde plures relinquunt baroniam pro tali gravamine et conversantur super archiepiscopatum.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen ballivus inposuit Willelmo Frei quod fecit purpresturam super regiam (viam) et nullam fecit et ideo cepit ab eo ijs

Item dicunt quod Simon David subballivus Magistri Laurencii de Shokenesshe inposuit Eglentine relicte Ade le Blund quod retinuit redditum domini regis et nullum debuit quare noluit dare ei garbas in autumpno et cepit ab ea eadem occasione viijs et de Jacobo Rufo pro simili iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht predictus subballivus inprisonavit Jacobum Stroggel et Thomam Hunicod inponendo eisdem falso quod furabant 1 angnum [sic] unde non fuerunt culpabiles et post modicum permisit eos abire pro una marca.

Item idem Thomas distrinxit pluries homines istius hundredi per equos et boves et tunc junxit eos ad carucam suam et aravit terram suam et vendit arura ad mangnum dampnum hundredi.

Item idem Thomas inposuit Thome Ham' de Ivecherich quod debuit custodisse quemdam latronem in ecclesia de Snaves et ideo cepit de eo injuste ijs.

Item dicunt quod idem Thomas de Leht levavit per Thomam de Suthen ballivum regis de summonitione Scaccarii de parochia de Snaves xLs et dederunt dicto Thome de Suthen ut eos inde aquietaret Vs et non aquietavit eos set totum retinuit ad grave dampnum eorum.

Item dictus Thomas le Leht levavit vijs de hoc hundredo de redditu domini regis et hundredum inde non aquietavit

Item idem Thomas levavit xLd de summonitione

causing serious loss to the country.

Then they say that when William of Hever was sheriff he amerced Adam of Greenhill 2s. because he did not come to his inquisitions and Robert of Northiam 2s. for a similar reason and he raised a levy and the inquisition taken was not valid because of the lack of people.

Then they say that when Henry Malemains was the sheriff he demised this whole lathe at farm to Thomas de Suthen for £20 each year whereas it previously had been demised at £18, thus causing great suffering for the country, whence many people left the barony because of this oppression and have changed their residence to that of the archbishopric.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen the bailiff accused William Frei that he made an encroachment upon the king's highway and he had not done so and he took 2s. from him.

Then they say that Simon David, the sub-bailiff of Master Lawrence de Shokenesshe, accused Eglantine, Adam le Blund's widow, that she has kept back the lord king's rent and she owed nothing since she refused to give him some sheaves at harvest time and he took 8s. from her on this account and 4s. from James Rufus for a similar reason.

Then they say that the aforesaid Thomas le Leht the sub-bailiff imprisoned James Stroggel and Thomas Hunicod, falsely accusing them of the theft of 1 lamb and they were not guilty of this and after a short time he permitted them to go for payment of one mark.

Then the same Thomas made distraint upon many men of that hundred for horses and oxen and then he yoked them to his own plough and ploughed his own land and sold the ploughing services, causing great loss to the hundred.

Then the same Thomas accused Thomas Ham of Ivychurch that he should have guarded a certain robber who was in Snaves church and he took 3s. from him unjustly.

Then they say that the same Thomas de Leht made a levy of 40s. upon Snaves parish through Thomas de Suthen the king's bailiff for summons of the Exchequer and they gave 5s. to the said Thomas so that he should acquit them and he has not acquitted them but has kept the whole amount causing them severe loss.

Then the said Thomas le Leht made a levy of 7s. upon this hundred for the lord king's rent and he has not acquitted this hundred of this sum.

Then the same Thomas made a levy of 40d. for

Scaccarii de Benedicto filio Simonis et eum inde non aquietavit.

Item idem cepit de relictis Godefridi Bacun xijd pro uno quadrante quem debuit de firma ut dixit et nullum debuit.

Item dicunt quod dictus Thomas de Suthen levare fecit per predictum Thomam de Leht subballivum suum vijd de Maynardo de Capella quos levasse debuit de domino Willelmo de Orlewestun pro dampnis adjudicatis dicto Mainardo pro dissasina quam dictus dominus Willelmus sibi fecerat. Item dictus Thomas le Leht distringit Hamonem le Bard per xxiiij vaccas lactatas et eas detinuit per iiij dies ad dampnum eiusdem de iiijs et nichilominus cepit pro warda iiijs  
Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo plus quam vicesima V marcas.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen baillivus regis noluit tenere hundredum Radulfum le Todeler attachiatum antequam haberet de hoc hundredo ij marcas.

Item dicunt quod idem Thomas ballivus cepit de dicto hundredo 1 marcam pro deliberacione Alani clerici post ultimum Iter justiciarum.

Item Magister Laurencius de Suthenisse ballivus regis noluit tenere hundredum ad deliberandum quemdam felonem Godefridum Burdun antequam habuit xxxs.

Item dictus Thomas de Suthen' baillivus cepit de hundredo dimidiam marcam ad deliberandum Thomam Lampeshin felonem.

Item dicunt quod subballivus Hamomis de la Forstall ballivi regis attachiavit quemdam hominem extraneum in hundredo de Hamme et injuste eum duxerunt infra istud hundredum quem noluit dictus Hamo deliberare subballivo eius antequam habuerunt de hoc hundredo Xs

Item dictus Thomas le Leht calumpniavit borgham de Betlingehop de iiijd de redditu domini regis ubi nullum debuit et ea occasione cepit de borgha iiijs et iiijd.

Item Thomas de Suthen predictus ballivus regis inposuit Stephano Bate et Henrico fratri suo quod debebant debitum in Judaismo ubi nullum debuit ac tamen ea occasione cepit ab eis iiijs

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Lyming levavit nomine Magistri Ricardi de Clifford excaitoris de

summons of the Exchequer upon Benedict son of Simon and he has not acquitted him of this sum. Then the same man took 12d. from Godfrey Bacun's widow for one farthing which she owed for the farm, as he said, and she owed nothing.

Then they say that the said Thomas de Suthen made a levy of 7d. through his sub-bailiff, the aforesaid Thomas de Leht, upon Maynard Chapel whereas he ought to have made the levy upon Sir William de Orlewestun for damages awarded to the said Maynard for the dispossession which Sir William had caused him. Then the said Thomas le Leht made distraint upon Hamo le Bard for 24 milch cows and he kept them for 4 days causing loss of 4s. to the same man and nevertheless he took 4s. for their care.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 5 marks more than assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, the king's bailiff was unwilling to hold the hundred court for Ralph le Todeler who had been arrested, before he received 2 marks from this hundred.

Then they say that the same Thomas the bailiff took 1 mark from this hundred to deliver Alan the clerk after the last eyre of the justices.

Then Master Lawrence de Suthenisse the king's bailiff was not willing to hold the hundred court to deliver a certain felon, Godfrey Burdun, before he received 30s. Then the said Thomas de Suthen the bailiff, took half a mark from the hundred to deliver Thomas Lampeshin who was a felon.

Then they say that the sub-bailiff of Hamo de la Forstall, the king's bailiff, arrested a certain strange man in Ham hundred and they unjustly took him within that hundred whom the said Hamo was unwilling to deliver to his sub-bailiff before they received 10s. from this hundred.

Then the said Thomas le Leht charged the tithing of *Betlingehop* 4d. for the lord king's rent whereas they owed nothing and on this occasion he took 4s. 4d. from the tithing.

Then the aforesaid Thomas de Suthen, the king's bailiff accused Stephen Bate and his brother Henry that they were in debt to the Jews whereas they owed no debt and however on this occasion he took 4s. from them.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge raised a levy of £6 within this hundred in the name of Master

archiepisopatu et prioratu in hoc hundredo vj libras set nesciunt qua racione et de tenentibus abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant' in eodem hundredo xLvjs viijd set nesciunt qua racione.

Item quod dictus Stephanus ballivus predicti excaitoris seysivit manerium de Snaves in manu domini regis anno regni regis Edwardi primo post obitum Rogeri abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant' et tenet illud in manu domini regis per iij septimanas et cepit de tenentibus eiusdem manerii xLvjs viijd.

### **Hundredum de Sancto Martino in predicto lesto**

Jurati dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet wreccum maris et alias libertates regis et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod homines de Romenale qui sunt de V Portibus dstringunt homines forinfecos pro diversis debitis ubi non sunt debitores neque pleggios ita quod vicecomes nec aliquis ballivus regis possunt hoc emendare et ita regiam potestatem subvertunt ad grave dampnum tocius patrie contra consuetudinem et nesciunt quo warento. Dicunt eciam quod Thomas le Leht ballivus de Shupweye accasionavit Robertum Brice pro quodam infante mortuo et ipsum distrinxit quousque habuit ijs et dicunt quod Nicholaus Biroc per potestatem libertatis de Romenal cepit injuste averia Petri de Hawene ita quod non potuit ea deliberare per regiam potestatem quousque dedit eidem Nicholao 1 marcam et averia deteriorata fuerunt de dimidia marca. Dicunt eciam quod Robertus le Pore habuit quemdam servientem nomine Andream de Wylhop qui furabatur vaccam eiusdem Roberti et ut ipsum permitteret inde in pace cepit ab eo xLs.

Dicunt eciam quod Petrus le Warde distrinxit Ricardum le Leygh per vj oves et iiij angnos [sic] precii viijs pro dimidia marca quam debuit Alano Godefray quam dimidiam marcam dictus Ricardus pacavit predicto Petro et nicholominus dictas oves cum angnis penes se retinuit.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht occasionavit Matheum le Kopier pro quodam infante mortuo pro miseria et ipsum distinxit quousque habuit dimidiam marcam et de Roberto Blakeman cepit eadem

Richard of Clifford, the escheator of the archbishopric and the priory but for what reason they do not know and 46s. 8d. from the tenants of the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury and for what reason they do not know.

Then that the said Stephen, the bailiff of the aforesaid escheator, took possession of the manor of Snav into the lord king's hand in the first year of King Edward's reign, after the death of Roger, the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury and he held that for 3 weeks in the lord king's hand and took 46s. 8d. from the tenants of the same manor.

### **St Martin Hundred in the aforesaid lathe**

The jury say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has wreck and other liberties of the king but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the men of Romney who are of the Cinque Ports make distraint upon outsiders for various debts when they are neither debtors nor pledges, as a result of this neither the sheriff nor any other bailiff of the king is able to correct this situation and therefore the men of Romney undermine the royal authority with serious harm to the whole country and contrary to custom and the jury do not know by what warrant. They say also that Thomas le Leht, the bailiff of Shepway, charged Robert Brice with the death of a certain child and made distraint upon him until he received 2s. and they say that Nicholas Biroc by the authority of the liberty of Romney unjustly took Peter de Hawene's draught animals and that he was not able to reclaim them by royal authority until he gave the same Nicholas 1 mark and the condition of the draught animals has deteriorated to value of half a mark. They say also that Robert le Pore had a certain serving man called Andrew de Wylhop who stole the same Robert's cow and he took 40s. from him to permit him to be discharged.

They also say that Peter le Warde distrained Richard le Leygh for 6 sheep and 4 lambs price 8s. because of a half mark which he owed Alan Godfrey and this half mark he paid to the aforesaid Peter and nevertheless he, Peter has kept the said sheep with the lambs for himself.

Then they say that upon complaint Thomas le Leht charged Matthew the cooper with the death of a certain child and he made distraint upon him until he received half a mark and he took 5s. from Robert Blakeman on

occasione Vs et de Ricardo Brice eadem occasione et de Lovekyn Stukepen ijs et de Roberto Adam Vs.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Liming tunc ballivus excaitoris cepit injuste de Matheo Copier occasione predicta ij marcas et de Roberto Brice xxs. et de Willelmo Legat 1 vaccam precii Xs et adhuc eam detinet et de Roberto Willelmo de Dobur' eadem occasione 1 vaccam precii Xs et eam detinet et de Willelmo Erl 1 marcam eadem occasione. Item idem Stephanus cepit injuste de Galfrido le Suniere pro quadam muliere mortua per miseriam in febris unde dictus Galfridus non fuit culpabilis xLs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit de tenentibus archiepiscopi in hoc hundredo pro auxilio ad opus regis X libras et Stephanus de Lyming baillivus eiusdem cepit de Willelmo Norhtman ut non esset prepositus de Aldintun 1 marcam et de Thoma Pute pro eodem 1 marcam et de Hamone Kyvet pro eodem xxs et de Roberto Wastehr pro eodem 1 marcam et de Henrico Ham' pro eodem xxs et hec omnia cepit injuste quod non fuit necesse habere ibidem prepositum nisi causa lucri.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicecesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo plusquam rectam vicesimam xLiiijs.

### **Hundredum de Hamme**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Orlanestun tenet de domino rege duo feoda militis in eadem villa quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod medietas hundredi de Hamme est in manu domini regis et debet per annum ad firmam redditus et wardas xxxvd et ad turnum vicecomitis viijs et altera pars est in manu archiepiscopi Cant per antiquam libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant' et valet cum assisis et perquisitis per annum dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' subtraxit quosdam tenentes suos de hundredo de Hamme et appropriavit sibi de Itinere Magistri Rogeri de Seyton justiciarii ad [grave dampnum domini] regis per annum de xvijjd.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' clamat [habere ret]urnum et extractum brevium placita de namio

the same occasion, [blank] from Richard Brice on the same occasion, 2s. from Lovekyn Stukepen and 5s. from Robert Adam.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge, then the excheator's bailiff, unjustly took 2 marks from Matthew the cooper on the aforesaid occasion, 20s. from Robert Brice and 1 cow price 10s. from William Legat which he still keeps and 1 cow price 10s. from Robert William of Dover on the same occasion which he keeps and 1 mark from William Erl on the same occasion. Then the same Stephen unjustly took 40s. from Geoffrey le Suniere after complaint of a certain woman's death through affliction of fever, and the said Geoffrey was not guilty of this.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £10 from the archbishop's tenants in this hundred for an aid for the king's use and Stephen of Lyminge, the same man's bailiff, took 1 mark from William Norhtman so that he should not be reeve of Aldington and 1 mark from Thomas Pute for the same reason, 20s. from Hamo Kyvet for the same reason, 1 mark from Robert Wastehr' for the same reason and 20s. from Henry Ham for the same reason and he took all this money unjustly because it was not necessary to have a reeve there unless for profit..

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 44s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

### **Ham Hundred**

The jury say that Sir William de Orlanestun holds two knights' fees in the same vill of the lord king in chief, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that a moiety of Ham hundred is in the lord king's hand and owes at farm for rents and wards 35d. each year and 8s. at the sheriff's tourn and the other part is in the archbishop of Canterbury's hand by an ancient liberty of Christchurch Canterbury and it is worth half a mark each year with the assizes and perquisites.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury has withdrawn certain tenants of his in Ham hundred and appropriated those for himself, from the time of the eyre of justice Master Roger de Seyton with [severe loss to the lord] king of 18d. each year.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury claims [to have the ret]urn and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the gallows



vetito wreccum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regias que ad coronam pertinent per antiquam libertatem.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus le Horpede de Vetere Romenhal fecit purpresturam in via regali in borgha de Esteham ad magnum gravamen patrie.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht serviens hundredi cepit xLjd de Henrico Spakeman et Willelmo Bishop et de aliis de hundredo de Hamme per particulas cepit xxs ex Itinere Nicholai de Turri justiciarii.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Burn vicecomes tradidit lestum de Shipweye cuidam Magistro Laurencio qui cepit in hundredo de Hamme de Thome filio Benedicti pro inquisicone habenda de quadam fama Xs et de Koc de Fraxino 1 marcam et de Johanne Palmar qui fuit attachiato ut posset transire per patriam cepit xxs et xiiij oves precii Xs de Johanne de Capella 1 taurum precii [ ] de Martino Sired 1 vaccam precii viijs ut ipsum de tanto aquitaret in Judayismo et non fecit et de hundredo de Hamme per X annos quolibet anno xviijs ut ipsos non occasionaret ad duos laghedais et nihilominus eos inquerelavit et quolibet anno cepit de eodem hundredo de injustis amerciamentis et sic ipsos de hundredo excoriavit ita quod destructi sunt et plures evacuaverunt baroniam. Postea venit Henricus Malemains vicecomes et cepit de Hamme 1 marcam quare quidam homo vulneratus fuit in domo sua.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen fuit ballivus per ij annos sub Henrico Malemains vicecomite et cepit lestum de Shipweye pro xxxij libris qui solebant capi pro xiiij libris et malectravavit et excoriavit hundredum ita quod vix sunt in baronia xL mansiones pauperes et solebant esse C ad minus.

Item dicunt quod ballivi archiepiscopi capiunt et vendunt wardas de gavelikund iniuste contra regiam potestatem.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo xiijs et vd plus quam rectam vicesimam.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit in bosco de Subturneswod xLs et de tenentibus eiusdem ville xxxvjjs.

**Hundredum de Hean in predicto lesto**

and the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties which pertain to the crown, through an ancient liberty.

Then they say that Stephen le Horpede of Old Romney has made an encroachment upon the highway in East Ham [Ruckinge par.?] tithing causing great harm to the country.

Then they say that Thomas le Leht, a swrjeant of the hundred took 41d. from Henry Spakeman and William Bishop and from others of Ham hundred he took 20s. as itemised, from the eyre of the justice Nicholas de Turri.

Then they say that Sir Henry of Bourne, the sheriff, demised Shepway lathe to a certain Master Lawrence who took 10s. as it is rumoured, in Ham hundred from Thomas son of Benedict for holding an inquest and 1 mark from Koc de Fraxino, 20s. and 14 sheep price 10s. from John Palmer who was under arrest, so that he might be released by the jury, 1 bull price [ ] from John Chapel, 1 cow price 8s. from Martin Sired so that Master Lawrence might acquit him of a debt to the Jews and he has not done so and for 10 years he took 18s. each year from Ham hundred so that he should not prosecute the men at the two lawdays and nevertheless he has sued them and each year he has taken from the same hundred in unjust amerciaments and in this way he has so despoiled men of the hundred that they are ruined and many have departed from the barony. Afterwards Henry Malemains, the sheriff, arrived and took 1 mark from Ham because a certain man was wounded in his own house.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen was bailiff for 2 years under Henry Malemains, the sheriff, and he took Shepway lathe at £32 which used to be taken at £14 and he maltreated and despoiled the hundred so that there are scarcely more than 40 poor houses within the barony and there used to be at least 100.

Then they say the archbishop's bailiffs unjustly take and sell wards of *gavelkind* contrary to royal authority.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 14s. 5d. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 40s. in the wood of *Subturneswod* and 36s. from the tenants of the same vill.

**Heane Hundred in the aforesaid lathe**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex habet in comitatu Kancie manerium de Middeltun cum membris quod tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo ad terminum vite sue et Ofspring quod tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc et Magister Domus Dei de Ofspring et curia de Bed[ ] sed nesciunt quo w]arento.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Wy quod tenet abbas de Bello [et manerium de ] quod tenet dominus Willelmus de Leyburn solebant esse aliquando in manu domini regis.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Sandwico [ et Bert]ramus de Crioll tenent baroniam de Folkestan de domino rege in capite de qua dictus Johannes tenet vij feoda et dictus [ ] et tenent hundredum de Folkstan in communi pro xxs solvendis per annum domino rege et quod domina Eglentina [ ] tenet Postling cum membris sic [ ] in dote pro xxs solvendis warde Dover' per annum et tenetur de domino rege in capite.

Item [? archiepiscopatus] Cantuar et Roffe tenentur de domino rege set nesciunt quo modo et quod medietas hundredi de Nywecheriche (est) in manu domini regis et altera medietas in manu archiepiscopi et prioris ecclesie Christi Cant' unde tenentes de Roking subtrahunt se de sectis ad dampnum domini regis iijs per annum a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractas brevium placita de namio vetito de (quo) tempore aut quo warento ignorant [sic].

Item dicunt quod Magister de Swinesfeld hospitale vendicat libertatem per quam assisam domini regis in pane cervisia et mensura inpeditur a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Leyburn tempore suo mutavit quoddam iter in parochia de Elham ad nocumentum domini regis et p[atrie] et et quod Johannes de Everslye obstrupavit quoddam iter apud Swinefeld ad nocumentum domini regis et patrie.

Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Pundherst cepit pro recognicione removendi (? de assisis) de Waltero Horum vjd, de Gileberto de la [ ], de Philippo de Hamwud vjd et de Elia le Blund vjd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et

The jury say that in the county of Kent the lord king holds the manor of Middleton with its members, which the Lord John de Burgh now holds for his lifetime and Ospringe which the lady queen, mother of the present king holds and the Master of God's house at Ospringe and the court of Bed[ ] but they do not know by what w]arrant.

Then they say that Wye manor which the abbot of Battle holds [ and the manor of ] which the lord William de Leyburn holds used to be in the lord king's hand at some time.

Then they say that Sir John of Sandwich [and Bert]ram de Crioll hold the barony of Folkestone of the lord king in chief in which the said John holds 7 fees and the said [ ] and they hold Folkstone hundred in common paying 20s. each year to the lord king and that the lady Eglantine [ ] holds Postling with its members, that is [ ] in dower for 20s. paid each year as castle guard at Dover and it is held of the lord king in chief.

Then [the archbishopric] of Canterbury and Rochester are held of the lord king but they do not know in what way and that a moiety of Newchurch hundred (is) in the lord king's hand and the other moiety is in the archbishop of Canterbury's hand and that of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, from whence the tenants of Ruckinge withdraw themselves from suits, with loss of 4s. each year to the lord king, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, from what time or by what warrant they are ignorant.

Then they say that the Master of Swingfield Minnis hospital claims a liberty whereby the lord king's assize of bread, ale and measure is hindered, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Roger de Leyburn in his time altered a certain way in Elham parish causing nuisance to the lord king and to the country and John de Everslye obstructed a certain way at Swingfield Minnis causing nuisance to the lord king and the country.

Then they say that Nicholas de Pundherst took for recognition of their removal (? from assizes) 6d. from Walter Horum, from Gilbert de la [ ], 6d. from Philip de Hamwud and 6d. from Elias le Blund.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulke

Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo ultra rectam [vicesimam] pro pondere xijs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes [ Thome] de Suthen exitus.

Item dicunt quod Daniel serviens [ ] de Hugone de Langacra vjd.

Et quod Magister Laurencius de Smethe maliciose et injuste cepit de hoc hundredo viijs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaetor cepit de tenentibus archiepiscopi apud S[ ] ut possent tractari eo modo quo fuerunt tempore archiepiscopi et Magister Hugo de Thornham [ cepit de] eisdem tenentibus xxs pro ij vicesimis injuste et predictus Magister Ricardus cepit de eisdem xxs quare [ noluerunt ] preco sicut voluit et fecit vastum in bosco archiepiscopi in hoc hundredo apud Saltwudum [ ].

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochell fecit ducere lanas et caseum ultra mare set quantum aut quo aut [quo warento nesciunt].

m. 10 dorso **Hundredum de Lonesburegh in lesto de Shupweye**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Elham quod fuit Alicie cometisse de Aungo solebat esse in manu domini regis et dominus Henricus rex patris domini regis nunc cepit illud manerium in manu sua racione excaite Normannie et dedit illud domino Edwardo filio suo et idem dominus Edwardus dedit illud domino Rogero de Leyburn per cartam suam salva advocacione ecclesie et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn nunc tenet illud.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra certum numerum vicesime xxxiij iiijd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet medietatem hundredi de Lonebergh solvendo ad turnum vicecomitis Vs racione manerii de Elham et dominus archiepiscopus habet aliam medietatem racione manerii de Lemmyng et dicunt quod hundredum de Lemyng valet ij marcas per annum.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum omnium brevium et wreccum maris et tenet placita de namio vetito. Item idem et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn habent in eodem hundredo

Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 12s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Henry Malemains the sheriff [ ] and profit of Thomas de Suthen'.

Then they say that Daniel, a serjeant [took] 6d. from Hugh of Langacra.

And that Master Lawrence de Smethe maliciously and unjustly took 8s. from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took from the archbishop's tenants at S[ ] so that they might be treated in the manner which they enjoyed during the archbishop's time and Master Hugh de Thornham unjustly [took] 20s. for 2 taxes of one-twentieth [from] the same tenants and the aforesaid Master Richard took 20s. from the same tenants because [they were unwilling ] by the appraiser just as he wished and he made waste in the archbishop's wood in this hundred at Saltwood while [? the archbishopric was vacant].

Then they say that William de Brochell sent wool and cheese overseas but they do not know how much nor by [what warrant]

m.10 dorso **Loningborough Hundred in Shepway lathe**

The jury say that Elham manor which was of Alice Countess of Aumale, used to be in the lord king's hand and the lord King Henry, the present king's father, took that manor into his own hand because it was an escheat of Normandy and he gave that to his son the Lord Edward and the same Lord Edward gave that to Sir Roger de Leyburn by his charter, saving the advowson of the church and Sir Roger de Leyburn now holds that.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 33s. 4d. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn holds a moiety of Loningborough hundred by paying 5s. each year at the sheriff's tourn because of Elham manor and the lord archbishop has the other moiety because of Lyminge manor and they say that Lyminge hundred is worth 2 marks each year.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs and wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods. Then the same man and Sir William de Leyburn have a gallows in the

furcas et assisam panis et cervisie ab antiquo tempore et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus Willelmus de Leyburn habet nundinas apud Elham et valent per annum iijs et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus apud Lymming et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn apud Elham habent chacias et warrenam ab antiquo et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupindon ballivus comitis Glovernie cepit dominum Willelum de Crioll ad domum suam et duxit eum apud Tunebrigg et eum inprisonavit eo quod fuit ad insultum castri de Tunebrigg per preceptum domini regis et predictus Willelmus ballivus cepit de bonis predicti Willeli de Crioll ad valenciam xx librarum tempore pacis post bellum de Evesham.

Item Ernaldus de Eling ballivus lesti de Shupweye cepit iijis de hundredo de Lunebereghe ad videndum Matildem Forwar mortuam apud Halirode.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Crioll coronator cepit iijis ad videndum Matildem filiam Willelmi de Lymming clerici apud Lymming.

Item idem Willelmus cepit iijis de domino Radulfo filio Bernardi ad officium suum faciendum pro Ricardo Begelet occiso at Lymming.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen baillivus lesti de Shipweye fecit summonitionem Henrico Brunman pro quadam recognitione apud London' et cepit de eo ijs ut possit remanere domi et Willelmus filius Hamonis de la Forstall ballivi eiusdem lesti summonuit Osebertum le Rugg' ibidem et ut possit remanere domi cepit ab eo xijd et de Johanne Duraunt pro simili vjd et de Roberto Noite vjd et dictus Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Bertramo filio Willelmi de Crioll pro simili ijs.

Item dicunt quod Daniel subballivus Laurencii de Shokeness cepit de Johanne Purs' xijd pro quadam defalta in una assisa ad quam fuit paraliter apud Coritun. Item idem Daniel venit apud Halirod et secum duxit quondam qui se dixit esse servientem Comitis et petit de tenentis ibidem aurum regine quod prius solverant domino Henrico Perot attunc cepit ab eisdem xvjd ut bestie eorum possent morari ad domum suam et Henricus de Ledes cepit ab eisdem pro simili ijs et ixjd.

same hundred and the assize of bread and ale from ancient times and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the said William de Leyburn has the fairs at Elham and they are worth 3s. each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop has chace and warren at Lyminge and Sir William de Leyburn likewise at Elham from ancient times and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that William de Stupindon, the earl of Gloucester's bailiff, took Sir William de Crioll to his own house and then conducted him to Tonbridge and imprisoned him because he had been at the assault upon Tonbridge castle, by the lord king's command and the aforesaid William the bailiff took goods to the value of £20 from the aforesaid William de Crioll, in the time of peace after the battle of Evesham.

Then Ernald de Eling, bailiff of Shepway lathe, took 4s. from Loningborough hundred for holding an inquest for Matilda Forwar deceased at *Halirode* [Stelling par.?).

Then they say that William de Crioll the coroner took 4s. for holding an inquest upon Matilda, daughter of William of Lyminge the clerk, at Lyminge.

Then the same William took 4s. from Sir Ralph son of Bernard for performing the duties of his office, for Richard Begelet who was slain at Lyminge.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, bailiff of Shepway lathe, issued a summons to Henry Brunman for a certain acknowledgment of debt at London and he took 2s. from him so that he might remain at home and William the son of Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of the same lathe, summoned Osbert le Rugg there and he took 12d. from him so that he might remain at home, 6d. from John Duraunt for a similar reason and 6d. from Robert Noite and the said Hamo de la Forstall took 2s. from Bertram son of William de Crioll for a similar reason.

Then they say that Daniel, the sub-bailiff of Lawrence de Shokeness, took 12d. from John Purs for a certain default in one assize at which he had acted in a similar way as he had at *Coryton*. Then the same Daniel came to *Halirod* and brought with him a certain man who said that he had been a serving man of the earl and he sought the queen's gold from the tenants there, which they had previously paid to Sir Henry Perot and then he took 16d. from the same tenants so that their animals might remain at his own house and Henry of Leeds took 2s. 9d. from the same tenants for a similar reason.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus le Bret cepit de Nicholao de Bokenolt xiiij de catallis Thome de Grimeshaker fugitivi et eum versus dominum regem inde non acquietavit et postmodum Henricus Malemains vicecomes tunc et dictus Nicholaus predictum Willelmum retinuerunt in castro Cant' donec habuerunt de eo xiiij et vjd.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor fecit capere oves Willelmi filii Willelmi de Monte super terram suam et eas posuit cum ovibus suis et faldam suam fecit ponere super terram suam. Ita quod dictus Willelmus non potuit aliquod commodum habere de terra sua antequam terram illam vendidisset ad dampnum suum xLs. Item idem Magister Ricardus fecit distringere Willelmum et Robertum Hered et Thomam Burgeis super quadam terra vocata *Cokkeresfeld* ita quod nullum commodum inde potuerunt habere donec eidem Magistro Ricardo terram illam vendidisset ad dampnum ipsorum de iiij marcis.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Lovel cepit de Willelmo de Prato de Lymmig xxs ut eum acquietaret de xLvs de debito Judeorum et nichil sibi fecit quare heredes dicti Willelmi predictos xLvs postmodum solverunt.

Dicunt etiam quod dominus Robertus de Scoito subexcaitor Magistri Ricardi de Clifford post obitum Rogeri de Leyburn cepit de tenentibus de Ellham nomine tallagii ij marcas. Item Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor post obitum Bonifacii archiepiscopi in primo adventu suo cepit de tenentibus de Lymming de recognitione X marcas. Item anno secundo petebat idem Magister Ricardus ab eisdem quemdam redditum xLs quem redditum non debebant et pro inquisitione super hoc facta cepit ab eis Cs et tunc noluit inquisitionem illam facere. Idem idem Magister Ricardus fecit vendere in forinseco bosco de Limming Lx quercus precii Cs et de subboscis precii ix et cariare fecit ad domum suam propriam xvj quercus ad portam suam faciendam. Item idem cepit de tenentibus de Lymming Cs quare noluerunt capere partem manerii secundum extentam tocus manerii quare voluit retinere boscos prata et molendina ad opus suum proprium et residuum eis tradere tam caro parco sicut totum manerium fuit extentum.

Item idem Magister Ricardus fecit capere xxiiij feras in parco de Lymming. Item idem cepit de Willelmo de

Then they say that William le Bret took 14s. from Nicholas de Bokenolt from the chattels of Thomas de Grimeshaker, a fugitive and he did not acquit him versus the lord king of this and after a short time Henry Malemains, who was then the sheriff, and the said Nicholas held the said William in Canterbury castle until they received 14s. 6d. from him.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took the sheep of William son of William de Monte which were upon his own land and he put them with his own sheep and had his sheep-fold placed upon his land. Consequently the said William was not able to have any benefit from his own land until he had sold that land with a loss to himself of 40s. Then the same Master Richard made distraint upon William and Robert Hered and Thomas Burgeis for a certain land called *Cokkeresfeld*, consequently they could not have any benefit from it until they had sold that land to Master Richard de Clifford with a loss of 4 marks to themselves.

Then they say that Henry Lovel took 20s. from William de Prato of Lyminge that he might acquit him of 45s. from a debt to the Jews and he did nothing for him because the said William's heirs afterwards paid the aforesaid 45s.

They also say that Sir Robert de Scoito, the sub-escheator of Master Richard de Clifford, after Roger de Leyburn's death took 2 marks from the tenants of Elham in the name of tallage. Then Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, after the death of Archbishop Boniface, took 10 marks from the tenants of Lyminge at the time of his first coming, for acknowledgment of his lordship. Then in the second year the same Master Richard requested a certain rent from them, which rent they did not owe and he took 100s. from them to hold an inquisition upon this matter and then he was unwilling to hold that inquisition. Then the same Master Richard caused 60 oak trees, price 100s. to be sold in the wood of Lyminge [located outside L ?] and underwood price 9s. and he had 16 oak trees carried to his own house for making his gateway. Then the same man took 100s. from the tenants of Lyminge because they were unwilling to take part of the manor according to the valuation of the whole manor, because he wished to keep the woods, meadows and mills for his own use and to hand over the remainder to them, that is so much poor land at the same rate at which the whole manor had been valued.

Then the same Master Richard had 23 deer caught in Lyminge park. Then the same man took [blank] from

Grang' tunc preposito quod non venit London die quo eum preceperat ad computum suum reddendum. Item idem Magister Ricardus cepit de eodem Willelmo Cs ut eum aquietaret de eisdem denariis versus executores Bonefacii archiepiscopi et non fecit set idem Willelmus quicquid debuit executoribus eisdem solvit.

### **Hundredum de Nywecherche in lesto de Syppwey**

Jurati dicunt quod rex habet in manu sua quondam escaetam post obitum Willelmi de Sylevebr' et valet per annum vijs et Willelmus de Redlente tenet in manu sua ad opus domini regis in hundredo de Nywecherche.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Monsel habuit terciam partem curie inferioris de Bilsintune et post obitum dicti Johannis dominus rex accepit illam in manu sua et dedit domino Petro de Pynibus per cartam suam et idem Petrus vendidit illam Johanni Andr' de Wyncheles' et idem Johannes escambiavit cum domino Johanne de Sandwico milite qui nunc tenet et valet per annum Cs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Ordlageston tenet dimidium feodum militis quod erat Nicholai Folet de domino rege in capite et dicunt quod Willelmus de Sylenebr' tenuit de domino rege in capite dimidium feodum et vendidit pluribus et nunc tenent illud abbas de Boxel priorissa Sancti Sepulchri Johannes de Gredle Hugo de Kyrfingeham Hamo le Bret Willelmus de Capella Johannes de Berledindenn.

Item dicunt quod dominus rex habet in manu sua quoddam manerium quod vocatur Middeltun.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Nywch'che debet per annum de firma et redditu Xs xjd et iiijd qui substracti sunt per Ricardum Oyn et debet de turno xvjs.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Nywech'che medietas est baronia et est in manu domini Regis et altera pars est in manu archiepiscopi et prioratus ecclesie Christ Cant' et se subtrahunt sequi nisi bis in anno qui vocati est lagheday et ad precepta domini Regis audienda et ita subtraxerunt per xx annos elapsos et nesciunt quowarento. Item dicunt quod Hubertus de Burgo habuit cartam domini regis de libertate et Johannes de Burgo filius eius dictam cartam usus est et tenuit hundredum suum de tenentibus suis et post obitum domini regis Henrici capta est libertas in manu domini regis qui nunc est et adhuc est in manu domini regis et

William de Grang' who was then the reeve because he did not come to London on the day upon which he had been ordered to render his account. Then the same Master Richard took 100s. from the same William that he might acquit him of the same money before Archbishop Boniface's executors and he did not do this but the same William paid whatever was owing to the same executors.

### **Newchurch Hundred in Shepway lathe**

The jury say that the king holds a certain escheat in his own hand after the death of William de Sylevebr' and it is worth 7s. each year and William de Redlente holds in his own hand for the lord king's use in Newchurch hundred.

Then they say that John Monsel held a third part of the lesser court of Bilsington and after the said John's death the lord king received it in his own hand and gave it to the lord Peter de Pynibus by his charter and the same Peter sold it to John Andrew of Winchelsea and the same John exchanged it with Sir John of Sandwich knight who now holds it and it is worth 100s. each year.

Then they say that Sir William de Ordlageston holds a half knight's fee which was of Nicholas Folet, of the lord king in chief and they say that William de Sylenebr' held a half fee of the lord king in chief and sold it to many people and now the abbot of Boxley, the prioress of St Sepulchre's [Canterbury], John de Gredle, Hugo de Kyrfingeham, Hamo le Bret, William Chapel (and) John de Berledindenn hold that.

Then they say that the lord king has in his own hand a certain manor which is called Middleton.

Then they say that Newchurch hundred owes each year 10s. 11d. and 4d. for the farm and for rent and these have been taken away by Richard Oyn and it owes 16s. for the tourn.

Then they say that Newchurch hundred, a moiety is of the barony and is in the lord king's hand and the other part is in the hand of the archbishop and of the priory of Christchurch Canterbury and they withdraw themselves from doing suit except twice a year upon the occasions called lawday and for hearing the lord king's commands and for 20 years they have thus withdrawn themselves and the jury do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Hubert de Burgh had a charter of the lord king concerning the liberty and his son John de Burgh observes the said charter and he held his hundred of his tenants and after the lord King

sequuntur ad omnia presentamenta cum dicto hundredo.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus et abbas de Bello clamant returnum brevium et tenent placita de namio vetito et wreccum maris nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Burgo levavit furcas in hundredo de Aloesbregge et abbas Sancti Augustini in eodem hundredo et prior ecclesie Christi Cant in hundredo de Newecherche sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod tenentes abbatis de Bello solebant sequi cum dimidio hundredi de Langeport et tempore justiciarum itinerantium ultimo in Kancia subtraxerunt aliterquam solebant et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Dovor habet quoddam manerium vocatum Castbregg in hundredo de Wurthe et jacet pro sexta parte dicti hundredi et tenet hundredum de tenentibus suis in curia sua per quod dominus rex est in dampno dimidiam marcam per annum et amplius et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Ordlingestun habet warennam et forum de novo in Ordlingestun set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Sandwico habet warennam in parcis et vivariis in hundredo de Nywecherche sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus Oyn de Romenale distrinxit Oyn de Hamigeherst pro delicto facta extra villam et cepit ab eo xxs. Item Nicholaus Sott distrinxit Hamonem filium Ricardi quare presentavit in hundredo hoc quod accidit et cepit ab eo unam summam avene.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Sancta Cruce rector ecclesie de Bilsintun fecit quamdam purpresturam in regalem vico et arentatus est coram justicariis Itinerantibus 1 obolum.

Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxel et priorissa Sancti Stephani tenent quartam partem dimidii feodi militis apud Sylembr' ubi dominus rex amisit relevium et wardam nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Borne cepit de hundredo de Alevesberg 1 marcam pro quadam evasione et nicholominus amerciatum fuerit coram

Henry's death the liberty was taken into the hand of the present lord king and still is in the lord king's hand and they do suit with the said hundred at all presentments.

Then they say that the lord archbishop and the abbot of Battle claim return of writs and they hold pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and wreck, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John de Burgh has raised a gallow in Aloesbridge hundred and also the abbot of St Augustine's in the same hundred and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury in Newchurch hundred, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the abbot of Battle's tenants used to do suit with the half hundred of Langport and from the last visitation of the eyre justices in Kent they have withdrawn in different ways from the procedure to which they were accustomed and the jury do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Master of God's House at Dover has a certain manor called *Castbridge* [Eastbridge?] in Worth hundred and it includes a sixth part of the said hundred and he holds a hundred of his own tenants in his own court, as a result of which the king suffers a loss of half a mark and more each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Ordlingestun has warren and market recently in Orlestone but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir John of Sandwich has warren in the parks and fish-ponds in Newchurch hundred but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Richard Oyn of Romney made distraint upon Oyn de Hamigesherst for a transgression committed outside the vill and he took 20s. from him.

Then Nicholas Sott made distraint upon Hamo son of Richard because he made presentment of the event in this hundred and he took one load of oats from him.

Then they say that John of St Cross, the rector of Bilsington church, has made a certain encroachment on the royal highway and he was arraigned before the eyre justices at half a penny.

Then they say that the abbot of Boxley and the prioress of St Stephen's hold a fourth part of half a knight's fee at Silwell [Newchurch par.] whereupon the king has lost the relief and wardship, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Henry of Bourne took 1 mark from Aloesbridge hundred because of a certain escape and nevertheless the hundred was amerced before the

justicariis.

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokeness fuit ballivus de Sypwey et distrinxit Stephanum de Cupere iniuste et detinuit averia sua donec dedit eidem ij quarteria avene precii dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenesse accepit de Ada Quikeman pro assisa removenda ijs.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Wattune vicecomes Kancie tradidit Johanni de Kemesing lestum de Sepway pro xvj libris qui multa gravamina fecit per quod hundredum domini Regis deteriorantur eodem tempore et quod Henricus Malemeins tradidit dictum lestum pro xxx libris. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Hevere tradidit dictum lestum Laurencio de Sokenesse pro xvj libris et quod idem Laurencius et sui ministri fecerunt multas destricciones in populo ita quod levaverunt eodem anno de dicto lesto xxxij libras et amplius ita quod homines solebant manere super baroniam remoti sunt in libertatem archiepiscopi et aliorum dominorum. Dicunt eciam quod Nicholas Sarebere qui fuit cum domino Willelmo de Ordlegestun distrinxit Johannem Gileberd noctanter per unum pullanum precii dimidiam marcam quem amisit pro eadem districcione.

Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Poyforer attachiavit Johannem filium Hugonis pro thesaurio invento et cepit ab eo 1 marcam et presentatum est coram justiciariis Itinerantibus quod idem Johannes invenit 1 cercellum auri precii dimidiam marcam per sacramentum hundredorum de Nywcherche Wurthe et hundredi et Sancto Martino.

Dicunt eciam quod Stephanus de Lyming subescaetor domini regis fecit multa mala in archiepiscopatu et cepit de Willelmo de la More 1 marcam ut non esset collector ad colligendum redditum.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeyns et Fulco Poiforer collegerunt vicesimam domini regis et ceperunt in dicto hundredo pro pondere ultra numerum Xs.

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenesse levavit de Roberto de Tanihud de summonitione Scaccarii xLijs et ipsum non acquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Rogerus de Sokenesse dedit Henrico de Borne vicecomiti qui ipsum summonuit ut fieret miles xLs ne esset miles.

Item dicunt quod Ambrosius clericus aliquo tempore inprisonavit quondam Gerardum filium Thome et cepit

justices.

Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse was bailiff of Shepway and he unjustly made distraint upon Stephen de Cupere and took away his draught animals until he had given him 2 quarters of oats, price half a mark.

Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse received 2s. from Adam Quikeman for removing him from the assize.

Then they say that John de Wattune, sheriff of Kent, handed over the lathe of Shepway to John of Kemsing for £16 and because he committed many ill-deeds, the condition of lord king's hundred deteriorated at the same time and that Sir Henry Malemains handed over the said lathe for £30. Then they say that Sir William of Hever handed over the said lathe to Lawrence de Sokenesse for £16 and that the same Lawrence and his ministers caused much distress to the people because they levied £32 and more upon the said lathe in the same year, so that the men who used to live within the barony were removed into the liberty of the archbishop and of other lords. They also say that Nicholas Sarebere who was with Sir William de Ordlegestun made distraint upon John Gilberd at night of one colt, half a mark in price, which he lost because of the same distraint.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Poyforer arrested John son of Hugh for a treasure trove and he took 1 mark from him and it was presented before the eyre justices that that same John found 1 small gold ring, price half a mark by oath of the hundred of Newchurch and Worth and of the hundred of Martin.

They also say that Stephen of Lyminge, the lord king's subescheator, did many harmful things in the archbishopric and he took 1 mark from William de la More so that he should not be the collector for collecting rent.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulk Poyforer collected the lord king's tax of one-twentieth and they took in 10s. by weight in the said hundred more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse made a levy of 42s. for summons of the Exchequer from Robert de Tanihud and he has not acquitted him.

Then they say that Roger de Sokenesse gave 40s. to Henry of Bourne the sheriff, who summoned him for knighthood, so that he might not be a knight.

Then they say that at another time Ambrose the clerk imprisoned a certain Gerard son of Thomas and took



ab eo quare noluit fideles appellare xLs [erased: *ut fideles vocare*]. Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenesse cepit de Simone de Tunilonde dimidiam marcam et permisit eum abire a priona.

Item dicunt quod Egidius clericus cepit de burga de Humchild pro priona deliberanda et quod Laurencius de Sokenesse cepit de burga de Fraxino iiijs pro deliberacione Gerardi filii Thome inprisonati. Item Thomas de Sutheneye cepit de burga de Hamyngeherste ij pro deliberacione Roberti filii Thurstani.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Criol coronator non vult venire in hundreda de Nywecherche Hamme Wurthe Alolvesbrigge et in dimidium hundredum de Langport ita occisi et alii mortui fecerent antequam possint sepeliri et tunc ballivi capiunt munera pro sepeliendo videndo Laurencius de Sokenesse cepit pro ij infortuniis 1 marcam de burga de Humchild.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford fecit destruccionem et vastum in parcis et vivariis de Aldinton ad X libras et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Lyming cepit de heredibus Hamonis Kyvet dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford cepit de curia de Aldintun ad opus domini regis ut dixit xxvij libras et iterum cepit Cs.

Item dicunt quod dictus Magister Ricardus et sui ballivi ceperunt de dicta curia xx marcas quare extenderunt dictam curiam ultra voluntatem eorum

Item dicunt quod Matildem de Essedesford maritata est cum Rogero de Rolling sine licentia domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor et sui ministri tenuerunt archiepiscopatum Cant' in seisina domini regis per duos annos et xx septimanas ut intelligunt.

m.10 dorso **Hundredum de Strete in lesto de Sepwey**

Dicunt jurati quod rex Henricus dedit Selling domino Willelmo Pucot ad totam vitam suam et post obitum ipsius Willelmi dominus rex dedit illud feodum Hugoni de Vinum in feodum et valet per annum X libras et facit wardam ad castrum de Dover sic Xs per annum et regina mater regis tenet illam terram racione custodis.

Item dicunt quod rex habet Vs de hundredo de Strete et quod Johannes de Hadlo tenet unum feodum apud Strete in capite de domino rege per servicium Xs singulis annis ad castrum Dovor solvendum et

40s. from him because he was unwilling to accuse sureties. Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse took half a mark from Simon de Tunilonde and allowed him to depart from prison.

Then they say that Giles, the clerk, took from *Humchild* tithing for gaol delivery and that Lawrence de Sokenesse took 4s. from *Fraxin* tithing for releasing Gerard son of Thomas who had been imprisoned. Then Thomas de Sutheney took 2s. from the tithing of *Hamyngeherste* for releasing Robert son of Thurstan.

Then they say that Sir William de Criol, the coroner, was not willing to come to Newchurch, Ham, Worth, Aloesbridge hundreds and Langport half hundred and so there were people slain and others dead who could not be buried and then the bailiffs took rewards to oversee burials, Lawrence de Sokenesse took 1 mark from *Humchild* tithing for 2 unfortunate cases.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford caused destruction and waste in the parks and fishponds of Aldington at £10 and more.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge took half a mark from Hamo Kyvet's heirs.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took £27 from Aldington court, as they say for the lord king's use and he took 100s. again.

Then they say that the said Master Richard and his bailiffs took 20 marks from the said court because they had made an extent of the said court against their will.

Then they say that Matilda de Essedesford married Roger de Rolling without the lord king's licence.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and his ministers held the archbishopric of Canterbury in seisin of the lord king for two years and 20 weeks as they understand.

m.10 dorso **Street Hundred in Shepway lathe**

The jury say that King Henry granted Selling [Sellindge?] to Sir William Pucot for his entire lifetime and after William's death the lord king gave that fee to Hugh de Vinum in fee and it is worth £10 each year and he does castle guard at Dover, thus 10s. each year and the queen, the king's mother holds that land by reason of wardship.

Then they say that the king has 5s. from Street hundred and that John of Hadlow holds one fee at Street of the lord king in chief by service of 10s. to be paid each year at Dover castle and James of Wilmington holds

Jacobus de Wylmington unum feodum tenet de predicto Johanne per servicium Xs ad castrum et valet per annum X libras. Item Thomas de Marais habet unum feodum apud Oterpole de rege per servicium Xs ad dictum castrum singulis annis solvendorum et valet per annum X libras. Item prior hospitalis et parcenarii tenent unum feodum apud Bonnyngton de rege et solvent ad castrum Dovor Xs et valet per annum Cs. Item dicunt quod Godefridus Faukener tenet manerium de Hurst de domino rege in capite per serjanciam per servicium ij falconum custodiendorum et valet per annum viij libras et nesciunt de tempore.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus tenet dimidium hundredum apud Strete per libertatem suam quam habet de domino rege et valet per annum Vs. Item dicunt quod Bonington subtraxerunt se de communi secta hundredi de Strete ubi bis per annum nec bis per annum pro xx annis et amplius nesciunt quo warento ad dampnum domini regis per annum ijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus habet returnum per totum.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Hadlo tenet ij nundinas per annum de Sancto Martino et capit tholoneum aliter quam facere debet nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod ballivi domini regis et ballivi libertatis destruunt patriam eo quo capiunt ameriamenta de assisis fractis et non faciunt justiciam alio modo de pistoribus et braciatoribus et hoc ad magnum dampnum patrie et dicunt quod Egidius ballivus domini regis cepit de Johanne de la Chirke per ij annos iiijs pro bracina. Item dicunt quod Alexander clericus de Bonnyngton pro eodem et per idem tempore de fabis ijs et de Johanna relicta Horald ijs. Item dicunt quod Laurencius ballivus domini regis cepit de predicta Johanna Alexandro et Johanne Harold per spacium iiij annorum quolibet anno ijs et quod Hamo de la Forstalle baillivus domini regis cepit de fine de borga Sellinges pro bracerino iiijs et totum injuste et sine judicio. Item dicunt quod ballivi domini archiepiscopi vendunt wardas gavelkundorum contra consuetudinem regis et hoc diu fecerunt.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Curiol coronator domini regis noluit venire ad officium suum facere ad sepeliendum mortuos occisos in dicto hundredo per defectum ipsius coronatoris dictum hundredum dedit

one fee of the aforesaid John by service of 10s. at the castle and it is worth £10 each year. Then Thomas de Marais has one fee at Otterpool of the king by service of 10s to be paid each year at the said castle and it is worth £10 each year. Then the prior of the hospital and his *parceners* hold one fee of the king at Bonnington and they pay 10s. at Dover castle and it is worth 100s. each year. Then they say that Godfrey Faukener holds the manor of Hurst of the lord king in chief through service of serjeanty, by keeping two falcons and it is worth £8 each year and they do not know from what time.

Then they say that the lord archbishop holds a half hundred at Street through his liberty which he holds of the lord king and it is worth 5s. each year.

Then they say that Bonnington has withdrawn itself for 20 years and more from common suit of Street hundred, where it used to be twice a year it is not once a year, by what warrant they do not know, with loss of 2s. a year to the lord king.

Then they say that the lord archbishop has return (of writs) throughout the whole.

Then they say that John of Hadlow holds 2 fairs each year at St Martin's tide [11 November] and he takes more toll than he ought to do, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord king's bailiffs and the bailiffs of the liberty damage the country because they take ameracements for breach of assizes and they do not administer justice in any way for the bakers and brewers and this causes great harm to the country and they say that Giles, the lord king's bailiff, for 2 years took 4s. from John de la Chirke for a brew-house.

Then they say that Alexander the clerk of Bonnington for the same and at the time the same man (took) 2s. for beans and 2s. from Joan widow of Harold. Then they say that Lawrence, the lord king's bailiff, took from the aforesaid Joan, Alexander and John Harold 2s. each year over a period of 4 years and that Hamo de la Forstalle, the lord king's bailiff took 4s. as a fine from Selling [Sellindge?] tithing for a brewhouse and all was unjust and done without justice. Then they say that the lord archbishop's bailiffs sell wardships of *gavelkind* contrary to the king's custom and they have done this for a long time.

Then they say that William de Curiol, the lord king's coroner, was unwilling to come to perform the duties of his office, to bury dead people slain in the said hundred. Because of the coroner's default the said

ballivo domini regis sic Egidio clerico ijs ad sepeliendum Robertum filium Willelmi de Forestock. Item dederunt Magistro Lawrencius dimidam marcā ad sepeliendum Matheum de Venghelde et Petronillam uxorem eius qui occisi fuerunt noctanter in domo sua. Item dederunt dicto Laurencio Vs ad sepeliendum Johannem filium Alexandri de Shortun pro infortunio in aqua.

Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Hadle perquisivit forum apud Strete et fuit per mediam semitam curie sue et dictum iter parum amovit a curia sua per quod gentes de marisco debent ire et redire et equitare in quo loco Johannes filius predicti Nicholai fecit unum scalarium ad dampnum et impedimentum patrie.

Item dicunt quod turnum est vocatum furreveturn injuste levatum per Johannem de Wattun tempore quo fuit vicecomes Kancie ad magnum dampnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod Daniel Spitewinch cepit de Philippo Bribisun xijd ut ipsum amoveret de assisis et de Johanne Gul vjd pro eodem. Item dicunt quod Laurencius baillivus domini regis cepit de predicto Johanne pro eodem vjd. Item dictus Laurencius cepit de Amisio de Herring et Oseberto fratre suo 1 summam avene precii iijs pro eodem. Item idem Laurencius cepit ab eisdem pro eodem xvij. Item idem Laurencius cepit de Rogero de Herring pro eodem ijs. Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Pundhurst serviens domini regis cepit de Amisio de Herring dimidiam summam frumenti precii xLd et quod idem Nicholaus injuste summonuit Stephanum de Stalar ut veniret ad castrum Dovor et quare non venit cepit ab eo ijs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus filius Hamonis de Forstalle serviens domini regis attachiavit quondam hominem et uxorem suam pro suspicione cuiusdam panni de blueto de vij ulnis qui quomdam pannum est ad domum Philippi carpentarii in eodem hundredo et dictus Willelmus dictos attachiamentos duxit ad domum Amisii de Herring borewesalde et illi tradidit ut ipsos servaret per 1 noctem et in crastino venit dictus Willelmus et dictos attachiatos secum duxit et promisit illos abire set quo modo et postea venit idem Willelmus et imposuit dicto Amisio quod dictos attachiatos permisit abire et ideo ipsum Amisium injuste distrinxit et distrinxionem detinuit quousque finivit Hamoni de Forstalle ballivo domini regis

hundred gave the lord king's bailiff, that is Giles the clerk, 2s. for the burial of Robert son of William de Forestock. Then they gave Master Lawrence half a mark for the burial of Matthew de Venghelde and his wife Petronilla who were killed at night in their own house. Then they gave the said Lawrence 5s. for the burial of John the son of Alexander de Shortun after his death by drowning in water.

Then they say that Nicholas of Hadlow acquired the market at Street and it went through the middle way of his court and little by little he removed the said right of way along which the people of the marsh have to come and go and ride horseback from his court and John, the aforesaid Nicholas's son has made one stile in this place, causing loss and inconvenience to the country. Then they say that the tourn which is called the *furreveturn* was unjustly levied by John de Wattun at the time when he was sheriff causing great loss to the country.

Then they say that Daniel Spitewinch took 12d. from Philip Bribisun so that he would withdraw him from the assizes and 6d. from John Gul for the same reason. Then they say that Lawrence, the lord king's bailiff, took 6d. from the aforesaid John for the same reason. Then the said Lawrence took 1 load of oats price 4s. from Amisius de Herring and Osbert his brother for the same reason. Then the same Lawrence took 18d. from the same men for the same reason. Then the same Lawrence took 2s. from Roger de Herring for the same reason. Then they say that Nicholas de Pundhurst, the lord king's serjeant, took half a load of wheat, price 40d. from Amisius de Herring and that the same Nicholas unjustly summoned Stephen de Stalar to come to Dover castle and because he did not come he took 2s. from him.

Then they say that William son of Hamo de Forstalle, a serjeant of the lord king, arrested a certain man and his wife on suspicion of the (theft) of a certain blue cloth of 7 ells [7 x 44in.], which certain cloth is at Philip the carpenter's house in the same hundred and the said William took the arrested man and wife to the house of Amisius de Herring, the headborough and handed them over to him so that he might detain them for 1 night and the next day the said William came and took the said arrested man and wife with him and promised to let them go but in some way and afterwards the same William came and accused the said Amisius of allowing the arrested man and wife to depart and thereupon he unjustly made distraint upon

dimidiam marcam et solvit. Item dicunt quod dictus Hamo de Forstalle cepit de Rogero de Herring iiijs pro eodem et de Ricardo Peitcurt ijs pro eodem et de Johanne Hemund xvjd pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeyns et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime domini regis ceperunt de dicto hundredo pro pondere ultra numerum vj marcas.

Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Hadlo vicecomes Kancie cepit de Willelmo Peitevin Cs pro purprestura reddeseisa.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hewre cepit de Jacobo de Wylminngton ne esset miles xxs et quod Johannes de Hadlo distrinctus fuit pro eodem sed quid dedisset nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clyfford escaetor domini regis in partibus Kancie cepit de archiepiscopatu de uno manerio quod vocatur Aldingtun xxvij libras et Stephanus de Langerigg ballivus dicti escaetoris collegit dictam pecuniam et ultra Cs. Item idem Ricardus et Stephanus predictus injuste ceperunt de omnibus tenentibus xxxv marcas et adhuc ceperunt de eisdem Cs de communi fine quare injuste voluerunt eos facere prepositos. Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Langebregge incarceravit Parisium de Strete et illum abire non permisit donec redemptus fuit de Cs. Item predicti Ricardus (et) Stephanus ceperunt in eodem manerio de boscis bestiis et vivariis ad valorem xx librarum. Item dictus Stephanus cepit de Ricardo Meryhal dimidiam marcam injuste pro presentacione fideliter facta coram Magistro R. de Leyburn justicario. Item dicunt quod libertas dimidii hundredi de Strete americiata fuit coram Willelmo de Englefeld justicario in dimidia marca et soluta fuit domino Rogero de Northwude senescallo domini archiepiscopi per talliam et postea dictus Stephanus distrinxit dictos tenentes pro xxs et solverunt.

Amisius himself and kept the distrained goods until he paid a fine of half a mark to Hamo de Forstall, the lord king's bailiff, and he paid this. Then they say that the said Hamo de Forstall took 4s. from Roger de Herring for the same reason, 2s. from Richard Peitcurt for the same reason and 16d. from John Hemund for the same reason.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the lord king's tax of one-twentieth, took 6 marks by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Nicholas of Hadlow, sheriff of Kent took 100s. from William Peitvin for re-possessing of an encroachment.

Then they say that William of Hever took 20s. from James of Wilmington so that he should not be a knight and that John of Hadlow was distrained for the same reason and they do not know how much he had paid.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king's escheator in the districts of Kent, took £27 from one manor which is called Aldington and Stephen of Longbridge, the said escheator's bailiff, collects the said money and another 100s. Then the same Richard and the aforesaid Stephen unjustly took 35 marks from all the tenants and in addition have taken 100s. as a common fine because they wished unjustly to make the tenants reeves. Then they say that Stephen of Longbridge imprisoned Paris of Street and did not permit him to be released until 100s. had been paid as ransom. Then the aforesaid Richard (and) Stephen despoiled the woods, cattle and fish-ponds of the same manor of items valued at £20. Then the said Stephen unjustly took half a mark from Richard Meryhal for making a presentment of his good character before the justice, Master R. de Leyburn. Then they say that the liberty of Street half hundred was amerced before the justice William de Englefield at half a mark and this was paid to Sir Roger de Northwood the lord archbishop's steward by tally and afterwards the said Stephen made distraint upon the said tenants for 20s and this they paid.

**m.12 Lastus de Sutton in Comitatu Kancie****m.12 Sutton at Hone lathe in the county of Kent.****Villata de Bradestede**

Jurati dicunt quod Comes Glovernie tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set per quem aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Scaccio dum fuit senescallus de Tunebregg augmentavit finem ville de Bradested a la laghedai de xLd bis in anno et adhuc recipiuntur per ballivos Comitit.

**Villata de Leysnes**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Leysnes esse solebat aliquando in manu regis et nunc illud tenet dominus Gilebertus Peche nomine Johanne uxoris sue racione dotis quod habuit per Ricardum Doveria quondam virum suum.

Item dicunt quod dominus Gilebertus Peche habet in manerium de Leysnes wreccum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alia que ad coronam pertinent set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod tenentes de Leysnes solebant habere omni tempore duos certos laghedais assignatos et dominus Gilebertus Peche dominus ibidem mutavit unum lagheday tenendum ad voluntatem suam ad quem diem tenentes facientes defaltam amerciantur ad volunatem domini sine taxacionie parium eorum et hec facta sunt per ij annos elapsos ad dampnum predictorum tenencium de xLs et amplius.

Item dicunt quod districciones factas in burgo de Leysnes numquam solebant ballivi ducere nec fugare extra burgum set dominus Gilbertus Peche et ballivi sui eas abducunt contra justiciam et hoc per V annos elapsos et contra antiquam consuetudinem ad dampnum dictorum tenencium per annum unius marce et amplius.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt Xs de villata de Leysnes ultra certum vicesimam.

**Hundredum de Blakeheth**

Jurati dicunt quod Avichia de Rofa dicta de Aula tenuit Modingeham et Wolewyche xv annis elapsis de dominico domini regis que solebant annuatim reddere domino regi X libras quo warento tenet nesciunt.

**Brasted Township**

The jury say that the earl of Gloucester holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by whom nor by what warrant.

Then they say that while the lord Roger of the Exchequer was steward of Tonbridge he increased the fine of the vill of Brasted at the lawday from 40d. twice in the year and this money is still received through the earl's bailiffs.

**Lesnes Township**

The jury say the Lesnes manor used to be in the king's hand at one time and Sir Gilbert Peche now holds that in the name of Joan his wife by her dower which she had from Richard Dover, her former husband.

Then they say that Sir Gilbert Peche has wreck and the assize of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown in Lesnes manor, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the tenants of Lesnes used to have at all times two certain *laghdays* appointed and Sir Gilbert Peche, the lord there has changed to one *laghday* to be held when he wished, upon which day the defaulting tenants are amerced at the lord's will without assessment of their peers and this has been the practice for two years with loss of 40s. and more to the aforesaid tenants.

Then they say that the bailiffs never used to take or drive away chattels upon which distraint has been made in the vill of Lesnes, but Sir Gilbert Peche and his bailiffs take these away against justice and this has been their procedure for 5 years, causing loss to the said tenants of one mark and more each year.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken from Lesnes township 10s. more than the assessed amount.

**Blackheath Hundred**

The jury say that Avicia de Rochester called 'of the Hall' has held Mottingham and Woolwich for 15 years of the lord king's demesne which were accustomed to pay the lord king £10 each year in rent, they do not

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Blakeheth reddit per annum domino regi ijs et vjd.

Item dicunt quod villa de Elteham debet sectam ad hundredo de Blakeheth bis in anno et subtracta est secta illa xxx annis elapsis per dominum Ricardum Comitem Glovernie et per dominium Gilebertum filium suum postmodum set quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod Charles qui tenet quoddam tenementum apud Chintebrok in villa de Le retinuit per unum annum elapsum iiijd et obolum annui reddituus domino regi pertinenti et adhuc detinet.

Item dicunt quod prior de Levesham habet assisam panis et cervisie in villa de Grenewich et villa de Levesham set quo warrento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod prior de Beremundes' habet assisam panis et cervisie et furcas et forum in villa de Cherleton a tempore domini regis Henrici pater domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod Avicia de Aula de Rofa habet assisam panis et cervisie et furcas in villatis de Wolewiche et Modingeham a tempore predicti domini regis Henrici quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium set a quo tempore aut quo warento ignorant.

Dicunt eciam quod episcopus de Rofa habet returnum brevium a predicto archiepiscopo pro xij marcis annuatim sibi solvendis.

Item dicunt quod prior de Levesham habet liberas chacias et warennam in villa de Levesham et villa de Grenewich a quo tempore aut quo warrento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus Gilbertus comes Glovernie habet simili modo eadem in villa de Elteham a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warrento.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus Willelmus de Say habet simili modo eadem in Westgrenewich set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Nicholaus de Leukenor clausit quamdam viam qua itur de Modingeham versus Elteham que fuit via communis et clausit eandem xvj annis elapsis et heredes domini Ernaldi de Maundevill tenent eam clausam et est purpresturam.

know by what warrant she holds them.

Then they say that Blackheath hundred pays 2s. 6d. rent each year to the lord king.

Then they say that Eltham vill owes suit to Blackheath hundred twice in a year and that suit has been withheld for 30 years through the lord Richard Earl of Gloucester and afterwards through the Lord Gilbert his son but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Charles who holds a certain tenement at Kidbrook in the vill of Lee has withheld for one year an annual rent of 4½d. which pertains to the lord king and he still witholds it.

Then they say that the prior of Lewisham has the assize of bread and ale in the vill of Greenwich and the vill of Lewisham but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the prior of Bermondsey has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and the market in the vill of Charlton from the time of the lord King Henry, the present king's father and they do not know by what warrant.

They say also that Avicia of the Hall de Rochester has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows in the townships of Woolwich and Mottingham from the aforesaid lord King Henry's time, by what warrant they do not know.

They say also that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs but they are ignorant from what time or by what warrant.

They say also that the bishop of Rochester has return of writs from the aforesaid archbishop for 12 marks to be paid to him each year.

Then they say that the prior of Lewisham has free chace and warren in the vill of Lewisham and the vill of Greenwich, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

They say also that the lord Gilbert Earl of Gloucester has in a similar manner the same things in the vill of Eltham from the time of the lord King Henry, the present king's father, and they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that Sir William de Say has the same things in West Greenwich in the same way, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Lord Nicholas de Leukenor stopped up a certain way which led from Mottingham towards Eltham which was a common way and has closed the same for 16 years and Sir Ernald de Mandeville's heirs keep it closed and it is an encroachment.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes Kancie tempore domini regis Henrici predicti cepit 1 marcam de Roberto Koc felone de Eltham ut tempore suo permetteret eum in pace et fuit ante hutlegatus et dominus Willelmus de Hever vicecomes Kancie precepit ab eodem felone xxs ut dimitteret eum per vj pleggios usque adventum judiciorum.

Item dicunt quod Adam le Walais de Shorham serviens Philippi de Delham ballivi de Sutton cepit de hominibus de Grenewich injuste pro falsa summonitione xxs tempore Rogeri de Seton justicarii Itinerantis anno regni regis Henrici Lv. Dicunt eciam quod idem Adam cepit de hominibus de Modingeham pro falsa summonitione Scaccarii ijs. Dicunt eciam quod Elias de Lenham ballivus hundredi de la Blakeheth cepit de eisdem pro simili anno regni regis Edwardi primo iijs.

Dicunt eciam quod Hugo de Kokerhurst ballivus eiusdem hundredi cepit de Thoma filio Galfridi de Modingeham pro simili ijs. Dicunt eciam quod Thomas Sorang coronator fecit inquisitionem de quodam mortuo apud Levesham et cepit de hominibus eiusdem ville pro officio faciendo ijs et Johannes Levold clericus suus xijd.

Item dicunt quod prior de Levesham cepit Elias Swetman et Eliam filium suum et illos tenet in priona sua quousque fuerint deliberati per ballivos domini regis et nesciunt quo modo.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt Xs ultra certum vicesimam de hoc hundredo.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor habuit in manu sua archiepiscopatum Cant' per ij annos et maximam fecit interim destruccionem in dicto archiepiscopatu in boscis parcis vivariis warennis et homagiis set quantum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Philippus de Delham ballivus de Sutton cepit injuste 1 marcam de hominibus de Modingeham pro falso attachiamento tempore dicti regis Henrici.

### **Hundredum de Westerham**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Caunvile tenet de domino rege 1 feodum et dimidium in Westerham et dedit domino Johanni de Camvile

Then they say that when Sir Henry Malemains was sheriff of Kent during the aforesaid lord King Henry's time, he took 1 mark from a felon Robert Cook of Eltham so that at this time he would allow him to go in peace and before he was declared an outlaw and Sir William of Hever, sheriff of Kent, took 20s. from the same felon so that he would deliver him by 6 men acting as sureties until the justices arrived .

Then Adam le Walais of Shoreham, a serjeant of Philip of Delham the bailiff of Sutton, unjustly took 20s. from the men of Greenwich for a false summons, in the 55th year of King Henry's reign [October 1270-1271] at the time of Roger de Seton eyre justice. They also say that the same Adam took 2s. from the men of Mottingham for a false summons of the Exchequer. They also say that Elias of Lenham, the bailiff of Blackheath hundred, took 3s. from the same men for a similar reason in the first year of King Edward's reign.

They also say that Hugh de Kokerhurst, bailiff of the same hundred, took 2s. from Thomas son of Geoffrey of Mottingham. They also say that Thomas Sorang the coroner held an inquest upon a certain dead person at Lewisham and he took 2s. from the men of the same vill for performing the duties of his office and John Levold his clerk took 12d.

Then they say that the prior of Lewisham took Elias de Swetman and Elias his son and held them in his prison until they were released by the lord king's bailiffs and they do not know in what way.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, held the archbishopric of Canterbury in his hand for two years and meanwhile caused the greatest destruction in the said archbishopric, in the woods, parks, fishponds, warrens and homages, but they do not know what the amount was.

Then they say that Philip of Delham, the bailiff of Sutton, unjustly took 1 mark from the men of Mottingham for a false arrest made during King Henry's time.

### **Westerham Hundred**

The jury say that Sir Robert de Caunvile holds 1½ fees of the lord king in Westerham and he, Robert, gave the half fee to Sir John de Caunvile for the term of his life

dimidium feodum ad terminum vite sue et idem Johannes vendidit illud domino Gileberto Comiti Glovernie que nunc est et dictus Robertus tenet feodum integrum in Westerham.

Item dicunt quod lestum de Setton solebat tradi ad firmam per vicecomitem Kancie pro xij libris et postmodum per dominum Reginaldum de Cobeham traditum fuit pro xvij libris.

Dicunt etiam quod hundredum de Westerham debet per annum domino regi de turno vicecomitis xxs de quibus de Upland de Bradested subtraxit se de tercia parte predictorum xxs per Comitem Glovernie et suos ballivos per xvij annos elapsos et villata de Westerham totum solvit.

Item dicunt quod Lindherst et Werclindenn subtraxerunt se eodem modo et per idem tempus per Johannem de Stangegrove tunc senescallum Comitis Glovernie et per Comitem nunc et suos ballivos ad grave dampnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Westerham est in manu domini Roberti de Camvil et existit ab antiquo et habet assisam panis et cervisie ab antiquo.

Item dicunt quod quidam Willelmus le Scut cepit de regia strata tres perticatas in borgo de Westerham ad nocumentum patrie.

Item dicunt quod Johannes le Prude senescallus domini Roberti de Caunvil cepit Johannem et Stephanum Atterlake et eos sine culpa inprisonaviit apud Westerham et ipsos abire permisit sine warento et iudicio.

### **Hundredum de Sumerdenn**

Jurati dicunt quod maneria de Middeltun et Merdenn sunt de dominico domini regis et dictus Johannes de Burgo ea tenet et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt etiam quod manerium de Ofspring est de dominico domini regis et domina regina mater domini regis nunc modo tenet et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt quod villa de Derteford fuit de dominico domini regis et data fuit Comitis de Albermarle et iterum revertit.

Item dicunt quod due partes hundredi de Sumerdenn sunt de libertate domini archiepiscopi et una borga tamen pertinet ad dominum regem reddendo per annum iijs et vjd et vocatur Grensted

Item rex habet per manum archiepiscopi de episcopo

and the same John sold that to the Lord Gilbert who is now the earl of Gloucester and the said Robert holds a whole fee in Westerham.

Then they say that Sutton lathe used to be demised at farm by the sheriff of Kent for £12 and afterwards it was demised though Sir Reginald de Cobham for £18.

They also say that Westerham hundred owes 20s. each year to the lord king for the sheriff's tourn, of this money the payment of a third part of the aforesaid 20s. from the Upland of Brasted has been withdrawn for 17 years by the earl of Gloucester and his bailiffs and the township of Westerham pays the full amount.

Then they say that Lyndhurst [Edenbridge par.] and *Werclindenn* have withdrawn themselves in the same manner and for the same length of time by John de Stanegrove, who was then the earl of Gloucester's steward and through the present earl and his bailiffs with serious loss to the country.

Then they say that Westerham hundred is in Sir Robert de Camvile's hand and has been from ancient times and he holds the assize of bread and ale from ancient times.

Then they say that a certain William le Scut took three perches out of the royal highway in Westerham tithing causing harm to the country.

Then they say that John le Prude, the Lord Robert de Caunvil's steward, took John and Stephen Atterlake and imprisoned them at Westerham for no reason and he allowed them to be released without warrant or justice.

### **Somerden Hundred**

The jury say that Middleton and Marden manors are of the lord king's demesne and the said John de Burgh holds these and they do not know by what warrant.

They say also that Ospringe manor is of the lord king's demesne and the lady queen, the present king's mother, now holds it and they do not know by what warrant.

They say that Dartford vill is of the the lord king's demesne and it was given to the earl of Aumale and it again reverts.

Then they say that two thirds of Somerden hundred are of the lord archbishop's liberty; however, one tithing belongs to the lord king by the payment of 3s. 6d. rent each year and it is called *Grinstead*.

Then the king has 26s. 8d. from the bishop of



de Rofa de tenentibus suis de Trottesclive xxvjs et viijd. Item idem archiepiscopus Cant' habet de episcopo de Rofa per annum viij libras set quo racione ignorant.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Wackelstan tempore domini regis Johannis fuit et antiquo fuit in manibus regum et tradebatur antecessoribus Comitis Glovernie et eodem modo hundredum de Litlefeld et nesciunt quo warento nec per quem Comes Glovernie ea modo tenet et inde respondit domino regi per annum de xLs et plus valent set nesciunt in quantum.

Dicunt eciam quod tenentes eorundem hundredorum solebant respondere coram justiciariis Itinerantibus et ad ultimas assisas omnes substraxerunt preter duos homines de hundredo de libertate domini archiepiscopi ad grave dampnum domini regis sed nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod totum tenementum de Rufkinghol et omnes iidem tenentes solebant esse intendentes domino regi cum borgo de Gransted et nunc se substraxerunt per xxij annos per ballivos Comitis Glovernie ad dampnum domini regis per annum de vjd et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod tenentes de Exore et de Wigginden solebant facere sectam ad hundredum de Sumerdenn cum borga de Gransted que pertinet ad dominum regem et solebant scottiare et lottiare cum eadem borga et substraxerunt se per archiepiscopum Cant' per xL annos ad dampnum regis per annum de vjd et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Ruttinden et frater eius substraxerunt se de secta hundredi de Sumerdenn cum borga de Gransted set nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod tenementum de Appelton et de Chekesland et tenentes de Cherecot et tenentes de Everherst et Stonlak fuerunt antiquitus in borga de Gransted et intendentes domino regi et subtrahuntur per archiepiscopos Cant' per L annos ad grave dampnum domini regis.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium et omnes libertates ad coronam pertinentes et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus Stephanus de Penecestr'

Rochester and from his tenants in Trottscliffe, through the archbishop's hand. Then the same archbishop of Canterbury has £8 each year from the bishop of Rochester but for what reason they do not know.

Then they say that Wachlingstone hundred was in the lord King John's time and from ancient times used to be in the hands of the kings and it was handed over to the ancestors of the earl of Gloucester and similarly Littlefield hundred and they do not know by what warrant nor by whom the earl of Gloucester now holds these and he pays the king 40s. each year for these and they are worth more, but the jury do not know how much.

They also say that the tenants of the same hundred used to come before the itinerant justices and at the last assizes all were withdrawn apart from two men of the hundred who were of the lord archbishop's liberty, causing serious loss to the lord king, but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the whole tenement of *Rufkinghol* and all the same tenants used to be subject to the lord king with *Grinstead* tithing and now they have withdrawn themselves for 22 years by the earl of Gloucester's bailiffs with loss of 6d. each year to the lord king and the jury do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the tenants of *Exore* and *Wiggenden* used to perform suit at Somerden hundred with *Grinstead* tithing which belongs to the lord king and they used to be assessed for scot and lot with the same tithing and they have withdrawn themselves for 40 years through the archbishop of Canterbury, with loss to the lord king of 6d. each year and the jury do not know by what warrant.

They also say that John de Ruttinden and his brother have withdrawn themselves from suit at Somerden hundred with *Grinstead* tithing but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the tenement of *Appelton* and of *Chekesland* and the tenants of *Cherecot* and the tenants of *Everhurst* and *Stonlak* were in *Grinstead* tithing in ancient times and subject to the lord king and 50 years ago they were withdrawn through the archbishops of Canterbury with severe loss to the lord king.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and all liberties pertaining to the crown but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that Sir Stephen de Penecestr', a justice

justicarius assignatus per dominum regem levavit furcas in Bugehoh et ibi suspendit tres latrones super tenementum archiepiscopi Cant' anno regni regis Henrici Liiij et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Horn senescallus Comitis Glovernie fecit purpresturam super dominicum regis augmentando leucatum de Tunebrigg' per cccc acras anno regni regis Henrici Liiij ad dampnum regis per annum de ijs et nesciunt quo warento. Item idem Rogerus fecit purpresturam super tenementum archiepiscopi eo quod inclusit infra forestam de Tunebrigg' C acras terre ad grave dampnum patrie et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Shepregg cepit de Ailnot de Medherst iijd ad removendum eum de quadam assisa et de eodem iijjd ad mutandum unum namium [ ] in parco domini regis et de Willelmo de Molendino ad removendum eum de quadam assisa iijd.

Item dicunt quod lastus [de Sutton] solebat tradi ad firmam pro xij libris et modo traditur pro xvij libris et dicunt quod Albredus filii Willelmi de Marca cepit de Willelmo P[ ]ebien hundredi de Sumerdenn et colligebat garbas et fecit tabernam ad grave dampnum patrie et eodem modo fecit Willelmus Malote sub Ricardo Longo.

Item dicunt quod ballivi archiepiscopi tenent contra communem justiciam tres [la]ghedais in anno ad grave dampnum patrie et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Reginaldus Crips tenet de Thoma Rod iijs [inponen]do sibi quod insultavit castrum de Tunebrigg et Willelmus de Garston cepit de Ricardo le Wulfhunter pro simili dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes inprisonavit Martinum de Polle Simonem de Gransted Johannem de Sciprigg Johannem filium Helewisi Radulfum Chatel Rogerum de Lesherst et Rogerus Godman pro una assisa in qua fuerunt nec poterant aliquo modo repleggiari antequam dederant ei xLs. Item dominus Willelmus de Hevar vicecomes cepit de Johanne de Ruttindenn ij boves precii xxs. Henricus de Ledes cepit ab eodem iij animalia precii xvs et dominus Willelmus de Hevar vicecomes fecit facere lathas de bosco suo ad valorem iijs dum fuit idem Johannes inprisonatus Johannes le Pod habuit a dicto Johanne dum fuit in carcere 1 marcam ut eius penam

appointed by the lord king, erected a gallows in *Bugehoh* and there in the 53rd year of King Henry's reign [October 1268-1269] he hanged three robbers upon the archbishop of Canterbury's tenement and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Roger de Horn, the earl of Gloucester's steward, made an encroachment upon the lord king's demesne in the 54th year of King Henry's reign [October 1269-1270] so expanding the lowy of Tonbridge by 400 acres with loss of 2s. each year to the king and they do not know by what warrant. Then the same Roger made an encroachment upon the archbishop's tenement so that he enclosed 100 acres within Tonbridge forest, causing serious loss to the country and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John de Shepregg took 3d. from Ailnot de Medherst for withdrawing him from a certain assize and 4d. from the same man for exchanging one distraint [ ] in the lord king's park and 3d. from William of the mill for withdrawing him from a certain assize.

Then they say that [Sutton at Hone] lathe used to be demised at farm at £12 and now it is demised at £18 and they say that Albred son of William de Marca took from Wiliam P[ ]ebien of Somerden hundred and he collected the sheaves and brewed ale causing serious loss to the country and William Malote acted in the same way under Richard Long.

Then they say that the archbishop's bailiffs hold three lawdays in a year contrary to common justice causing severe loss to the country and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Reginald Crips took 3s. from Thomas Rod accusing him of taking part in the assault upon Tonbridge castle and William de Garston took half a mark from Richard the Wolfhunter for a similar reason.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, the sheriff, imprisoned Martin de Polle, Simon de Gransted, John de Sciprigg, John son of Helewisi, Ralph Chatel, Roger de Lesherst and Roger Godman because of one assize at which they were not and could not be released on bail before they had given him 40s. Then Sir William of Hever, the sheriff, took 2 oxen, price 20s. from John de Ruttindenn. Henry of Leeds took 3 animals, price 15s. from the same man and Sir William of Hever the sheriff had laths made from his wood valued at 3s., while the same John was imprisoned. John le Pod took 1 mark from the same John while he was in prison that he might alleviate his

aleviaret in carcere.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo ultra certam vicesimam xxs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor sede archiepiscopatus Cant' vacante cepit de tenuta de Oterford xL libras et amplius et nemora et vivaria destruxit ad estimacionem X librarum.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Oterford fuit in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidiam in custodia Magistri Ricardi de Clifford escaitoris.

### **Hundredum de Litleye**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Middeltun est de dominico domini regis et dominus Johannes de Burgo illud tenet et nesciunt quo warento et manerium de Ofspring est de dominico domini regis et domina regina mater domini regis nunc illud tenet.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Plumsted abbas Sancti Augustini tenet de domino rege in capite in alia baronia sua et nesciunt quo warento.

Et Jacobus de Camera tenet de predicto abbate unum feodum quod idem abbas defendit versus regem et manerium de Litleho tenetur de domino rege et cecidit in manu sua per wardam post decessum domine Joanne de Aubrevil et Philippus le Teillur dictum manerium nunc tenet et nesciunt quo warento et valet per annum X libras set idem Philippum habet dictum manerium ad firmam de Gregorio de Rokesly pro xij libris per annum et manerium de Erde tenetur de domino archiepiscopo in capite quod idem archiepiscopus defendit versus dominum regem et dictus Philippus le Taillur habet ad firmam idem manerium de domino Johanne de Sancto Johanne ad terminum xij annorum per xx libras per annum.

Item dicunt quod dimidia hundredi de Litleye tenetur de domino rege et solvuntur annuatim de Litleho ad turnum vicecomitis iiijs et ad festum Sancti Michaelis de libero redditu xijd et de Limsted solvuntur ad turnum vicecomitis iiijs ubi solebat solvi 1 marcam eidem vicecomiti et sic subtrahuntur ixs et iiijd per abbatem Sancti Augustini Cant' a tempore Gilberti de Prestono justiciarii Itinerantis xix annis elapsis et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium furcas assisam panis et cervisie et tenet placita namio vetito et habet alias libertates regis et dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini

suffering in prison

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 20s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £40 and more from the territory of Otford while the see of Canterbury was vacant and he destroyed woods and fishponds estimated at £10.

Then they say that Otford manor was in the lord king's hand for two and a half years, in the custody of the escheator, Master Richard of Clifford.

### **Little Hundred**

The jury say that Middleton manor is of the lord king's demesne and Sir John de Burgh holds that and they do not know by what warrant and Ospringe manor is of the lord king's demesne and the lady queen, mother of the present king, now holds that.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine's holds Plumstead manor of the lord king in chief in his other barony and they do not know by what warrant.

And James de Camera holds one fee of the aforesaid abbot which the same abbot claims against the king and Lesnes manor is held of the lord king and it fell into his hand by wardship, after the death of Lady Joan de Aubrevil and Philip the tailor now holds the said manor and they do not know by what warrant and it is worth £10 each year, but the same Philip holds the said manor at farm of Gregory of Ruxley for £12 each year and the manor of Erde is held of the lord archbishop in chief, which manor the same archbishop claims against the lord king and the said Philip the tailor has the same manor at farm of Sir John of St John for the term of 12 years for £20 each year.

Then they say that a half of Lesnes hundred is held of the lord king and 4s. is paid each year at the sheriff's tourn from Lesnes and 12d. at the feast of Michaelmas for free rent and 4s. is paid from *Limsted* at the sheriff's tourn where 1 mark used to be paid to the same sheriff and thus 9s. 4d. has been taken away by the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury for 19 years, from the time of Gilbert of Preston, the itinerant [eyre] justice and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has other liberties of the king

Cant' habet furcas assisam panis et cervisie et wreccum maris set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod apud Swaneschamps levate sunt furce iij annis elapsis et amplius per Willelmum de Montecanis set nesciunt quo jure nec quo warento et suspensi fuerunt ibidem tres latrones quorum 1 nondum mortuus prostratus et portatus ad ecclesiam et revixit et remansit in eadem villa de Swaneschamp et postmodum de patria se subtraxit et nesciunt quo devenit.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet warennam in libertate sua et abbas Sancti Augustini clamat habere warennam apud Plumstede et nesciunt quo modo nec quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus abbas Sancti Augustini Cant' tenet de dominico domini regis manerium de Plumstede cum pertinentiis set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt set dicunt quod idem abbas recuperavit medietatem dicti manerii xxx annis elapsis et amplius de Ricardo de Ros per placitam coram justicariis eo quod negavit servicia inde debita.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo Vs per pondus ultra rectam vicesimam.

### **Hundredum de Godesheth**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Kemsing fuit aliquando de dominico domini regis et postmodum datum fuit Baudewino de Bitton set de tempore aut per quem ignorant et nunc illud tenet dominus Willelmus de Valenciis.

Item dicunt quod dominus rex habet per manum servientis archiepiscopi Cant' apud Odeford ij marcas per annum que liberate sunt ballivo domini regis de lasto de Sutton.

Dicunt eciam quod Comes Glovernie tenet hundredum de Wehttelston pro xLs per annum solvendis domino rege quo warento nesciunt,

Item dicunt quod hundreda de Rokeslye Acstan Blakeheth Litlehie Westerham dimidium hundredum de Bromligh et borgha de Gransted sunt in manu domini regis set quantum valent per annum nesciunt,

Et dominus archiepiscopus Cant' tenet hundredum de

and they say that the abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury has the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and wreck, but they do not know by what warrant, nor from what time.

They also say that a gallows was erected at Swanscombe 4 years ago and more by William de Montecanis but they do not know by what right nor by what warrant and three robbers were hanged there, of these 1 man who was not yet dead, was cut down and carried to the church and he was revived and he remained in the same vill of Swanscombe and afterwards took himself from the district and they do not know what has become of him.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has warren in his liberty and the abbot of St Augustine's claims to have warren at Plumstead and they do not know in what way nor by what warrant.

Then they say that the said abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury holds the manor of Plumstead with appurtenances of the lord king's demesne, but they do not know from what time nor by what warrant, but they say that the same abbot recovered a moiety of the said manor 30 years ago and more from Richard de Ros by a plea before the justices because he refused the services owing from it.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 5s. more by weight than the assessed amount from this hundred.

### **Codsheath Hundred**

The jury say that Kemsing manor was of the lord king's demesne at some time and afterwards it was given to Baldwin de Bitton but from what time or through whom they are ignorant and now the Lord William de Valence holds that.

Then they say that the lord has 2 marks each year through the hand of the archbishop of Canterbury's serjeant at Otford which are paid to the lord king's bailiff of Sutton lathe.

They also say that the earl of Gloucester holds Wachlingstone hundred by paying 40s. each year to the lord king but they so not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Ruxley, Axtane, Blackheath, Lesnes, Westerham hundreds and the half hundred of Bromley and *Grim[n?]*stead tithing are in the lord king's hand but the jury do not know their annual value.

And the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds

Godeshuth et dimidium hundredum de Summerdenn set quod valent per annum nesciunt, Dicunt eciam quod Henricus Lovel dum fuit ballivus apud Oterford tempore Sancti Edmundi archiepiscopi levavit unum laghed' plus quam alii archiepiscopi habere solebant ad dampnum patrie per annum xxxvs et amplius.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum brevium furcas et assisam panis et cervisie (et) placita de namio vetito et dicunt quod episcopus Rofa habet returnum brevium de dicto archiepiscopo pro viij libris eidem per annum solvendis.

Item dicunt quod dominus Thomas de Audeham clamat habere warenam per cartam domini regis Henrici pateris domini regis nunc.

Et Isabella de Eynesford tenet warenam in manerium de Oteham ubi nullam habere consueverat.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Kemsing tenetur de domino rege in capite et tenentes in Holinden Holbeame et omnes manentes super terram quam Georgius de Cantilupo tenuit de predicto manerio de Kemsing subtracti sunt de servicio debito et consueto manerio de Kemsing per Willelmum de Camera senescallum Comitum Glovernie apud Tunebrigg' et ipsos sequi faciunt leucatum de Tunebrigg' ad dampnum villate de Kemsing per annum et domini Willelmi de Valenciis Xs et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra certam vicesimam Xs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor dum tenuit archiepiscopatum Cant' per dominum regem cepit de hominibus de Oterford xL libras pro tallagio injuste et postmodum cepit in manu domini regis omnes terras novas traditas prius per archiepiscopos quousque fecit communem finem pro xx libris et prosternare fecit in boscis eiusdem manerii arbores ad valenciam xx marcas. Idem averare fecit tenentes eiusdem manerii ad domum suam Lond quod non debebat nisi apud Lambuth et fecit prosternare boscum heredum de Bersted apud Hobord et Thelenelond ad valorem xx marcas. Insuper fecit equos et boves hominum patrie contra voluntatem ipsorum ad carandum maeremium et bladum suum Lond' ad mangnum (sic) dampnum ipsorum.

Item dicunt quod quidam Robertus Malewer Simon Coysire Johannes Jon et Willelmus Thurstan

Codsheath hundred and the half hundred of Somerden but they do not know their annual value.

They say that when Henry Lovel was the bailiff at Otford, in the time of Archbishop St Edmund [Edmund of Abingdon 1231-1240] he held one lawday more than other archbishops used to hold, with loss of 35s. and more each year to the country.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return of writs, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale, (and) pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and they say that the bishop of Rochester has return of writs from the archbishop for £8 paid to him each year.

Then they say that Sir Thomas de Audeham claims to have warren by a charter of the lord King Henry, the present king's father.

And Isabel of Eynsford holds warren in Otham manor where there used to be none.

Then they say that Kemsing manor is held of the lord king in chief and the tenants in *Holinden*, *Holbeame* and all those dwelling on land which George de Cantelupe held of the aforesaid manor of Kemsing have been withdrawn from the service due and customary to Kemsing manor by William de Camera, the earl of Gloucester's steward at Tonbridge, and the tenants now do suit at the lowy of Tonbridge with loss to Kemsing township and Sir William of Valence of 10s. and more each year.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, while he held the archbishopric of Canterbury for the lord king, unjustly took £40 from the men of Otford as tallage and afterwards took into the lord king's hand all the new lands which were previously demised by the archbishops until he levied a common fine for £20 and he caused trees valued at 20 marks to be felled in the woods of the same manor.

The same man made the tenants of the same manor perform carrying service to his house in London whereas he had no authority to compel this unless to Lambeth and he caused the wood of Bersted's heirs at *Hobord* and *Thelenelond*, valued at 20 marks, to be felled. In addition he used the horses and oxen of the men of the country for transporting timber and his corn to London against their will and to their great loss.

Then they say that certain men, Robert Malewer, Simon Coysire, John Jon and William Thurstan were

inprisonati fuerunt apud Merdestan et fecerunt finem cum domino Ada de Illigh ad opus domini archiepiscopi ut possent repleggiari ij marcarum. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor maximam fecit destruccionem in parcis vivariis bascis (et) warennis dum fuit custos archiepiscopatus. Item Magister Ricardus seysivit manerium de Halsted post mortem Willelmi de Malevile et tenuit per ij annos et adhuc tenet heredes et valet per annum X libras.

### **Hundredum de Bromley**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Betham aliquando fuit in manu domini regis et modo tenet dominus Ricardus de Rupella de domino rege in capite per servicium unius militis set nesciunt quo warento. Dicunt eciam quod dimidium hundredum de Bromley est in manu domini regis et valet per annum vjs et altera medietas eiusdem hundredi est in manu episcopi de Rofa set nesciunt quid valet per annum.

Item dicunt quod quedam terra que vocatur Foxgrave in villa de Betham est de feodo domini regis et modo illam tenet Johannes Malemains de domino Roberto Agillon per servicium quarte partis unius militis set a quo tempore aut qualiter alienta fuit nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dimidium hundredum de Bromley subtrahitur per episcopum Roffens' qui tenet predictum dimidium hundredum per X annos et valet per annum Xs ad dampnum regis per annum xxs. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates ut sepius ante dictum est set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' episcopus de Rofa et dominus Ricardus de Rupella habent chacias et warennas in dominicis suis de antiquo set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Adam de Walais tunc ballivus cepit de Radulfo de Langel pro eodem de una assisa removenda xvijjd. Item Walkelino de Ponte pro simili vjd de Henrico de Ponte pro simili iiijjd et de pluribus hominibus hundredi de Bromley cepit idem Adam pro simili denarios bladum (et) maeremium ultra modum.

Item idem Adam fecit falso summonere homines eiusdem hundredi apud Geldesford et postmodum

imprisoned at Maidstone and they paid a fine of 2 marks to Sir Adam of Illigh for the lord archbishop's use so that they might be released on bail. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, caused the greatest destruction in the parks, fishponds, woods [and] warrens while the archbishopric was in his custody. Then Master Richard seized Halsted manor after William de Malevile's death and held it for 2 years and he still holds the heirs and it is worth £10 a year.

### **Bromley Hundred**

The jury say that Beckenham manor was at one time in the lord king's hand and now Sir Richard de Rupella holds it of the lord king in chief by the service of one knight and they do not know by what warrant. They also say that half the hundred of Bromley is in the lord king's hand and it is worth 6s. each year and the other moiety of the same hundred is in the bishop of Rochester's hand but they do not know what it is worth each year.

Then they say that a certain land called Foxgrove [Beckenham par.] in the vill of Beckenham is of the lord king's fee and now John Malemains holds that of Sir Robert Agillon by the service of a fourth part of one knight's fee, but from what time or how it was alienated they do not know.

Then they say that half the hundred of Bromley was withdrawn by the bishop of Rochester who holds the half hundred for 10 years and it is worth 10s. each year, with loss of 20s. each year to the king.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the assize of bread and ale and other liberties, as has often been said before but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rochester and Sir Richard de Rupella have chace and warrens in their demesnes from ancient times but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Adam de Walais, then the bailiff, took 18d. from Ralph de Langel for removing the same man from one assize. Then [he took] 6d. from Walkelin de Ponte for a similar reason, 4d. from Henry de Ponte for a similar reason and for a similar reason the same Adam took money, corn and timber beyond measure from many men of Bromley hundred. Then the same Adam falsely summoned the men of this hundred at Guildford and afterwards took much

cepit ab eis pecuniam mangnum pro summonitione eadem relaxanda.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall dedit quemdam summam pecunie domino Henrico Malemains vicecomiti ultra antiquam firmam huius lasti qua occasione multum gravabat populum et patriam injuste et sic Alexander de Cateford et Ricardus de Halifeld ballivi post dictum Hamonem eodem modo fecerunt et dicunt quod dictus Ricardus cepit de Henrico de Ponte inponendo sibi falso et injuste latrocinium Xs et de Walkelino de Ponte cepit pro simili Xs et de Ada Fidel pro simili cepit ijs et de Ricardo de la Denne cepit pro simili iijjs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor saysivit manerium Betham per dominum regem dicendo quod dominus Ricardus de Rupella mortuus fuit et postmodum cepit 1 dolium vini precii 1 marce de Henrico le Walais qui habuit idem manerium ad firmam antequam terminum firme sue potuit tenere et habere.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus excaitor maximam fecit destruccionem in archiepiscopatu Cant' tempore vaccacionis set nesciunt in quanto.

### **m.13 Villata de Dertford**

Jurati dicunt quod villa de Derteford est in manu domini regis per escaetam per mortem Aveline filie et heredis Willelmi de Fortibus Comitis Albermarle que sine heredibus obiit per annum cum membris ad endem spectantibus sic Cobeham Gransted Chiselherst et Cumbe Lxvij libras.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis et tenentes sui in Kancia subtraxerunt se de sectis comitatus lathi et hundredi de Akestan set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod episcopus Rofa habet in quadam parte ville de Derteford returnum et extractas brevium et tenet placita de namio vetito set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus de Derteford et episcopus de Rofa habent in eadem villa et habere solebant furcas assisam panis et cervisie sed a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis habet furcas apud Swaneschamp et habuit xvj annis

money from them for remitting the same summons.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall gave a certain sum of money more than the ancient farm of this lathe, to Sir Henry Malemains, the sheriff, and because of this he greatly oppressed the people and country unjustly and Alexander de Cateford and Richard de Halifield, who were bailiffs after the said Hamo, acted in the same way and they say that the said Richard took 10s. from Henry de Ponte falsely accusing him of robbery, for a similar reason he took 10s. from Walkelin de Ponte, 2s. from Adam Fidel and 3s. from Richard de la Denne.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took possession of Beckenham manor for the lord king by declaring that Richard de Rupella was dead and afterwards he took 1 tun of wine, price 1 mark, from Henry le Walais who held the same manor at farm, before he was able to hold and have the term of his farm.

Then they say that the same Master Richard, the escheator, caused the greatest destruction in the archbishopric of Canterbury at the time of its vacancy, but they do not know how much.

### **m.13 Dartford Township**

The jury say that the vill of Dartford is in the lord king's hand by escheat through the death of Avelina, the daughter and heiress of William de Fortibus Earl of Aumale who died without heirs, with the members pertaining to the same escheat, thus Cobham, Grinstead, Chislehurst and Combe, £67 p.a.

Then they say that Sir William de Monte Canis and his tenants in Kent have withdrawn themselves from common suits of the county, the lathe and Axtane hundred, but from what time or by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the bishop of Rochester has return and extract of writs in a certain part of Dartford vill and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, but from what time or by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the lord of Dartford and the bishop of Rochester have the gallows in the same vill and were accustomed to have this, the assize of bread and ale, but they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Monte Canis has a gallows at Swanscombe and has had this for 16 years,

elapsis super quibus quidam Simon filius Hugonis fuit suspensus et vivus prostratus per quondam Robertum tunc ibidem warenarium.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Munchenes et episcopus de Rofa habent et habere clamat ab antiquo in Stanes et Swanescamp warennas ex concessione regis a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod abbas et conventus de Lesnes habent quamdam partem tenementi quod vocatur Okkicholt cum pertinentiis quod pertinere solebat ad villam de Derteford de vendicione cuiusdam Comitis Sancti Pauli tamen dicti canonici de Lesnes reddunt domino de Derteford per annum xxs et est ad dampnum domini regis quod dictum tenementum per annum V marcarum set quo warento aut a quo tempore illud tenementum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Philippus de Delham ballivus lasti de Sutton et Godefridus de Ros serviens eiusdem cepit in ultimo Itinere Magistri Rogeri de Seton justiciarii in Kancia et post de diversis hominibus in villa de Derteford per minutas particulas ad ponendum unum pro alio in assisa et ij vel 1 marca.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Hever vicecomes Kancie americiavit Robertum Munc' ad ijs et Walterum Cadweker ad ijs et Adam Bellum ad xijd quare non venerunt ad quamdam inquisitionem coram eo et pro defectu personarum non remansit inquisitione capienda et predictos denarios levare fecit.

Item dicunt quod Petrus de Berkyng aliquis ballivus domini Rogeri de Leyburn apud Derteford cepit de Willelmo filio Thome de Wylminton injuste 1 marcam.

Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Canburegh aliquis ballivus eiusdem ibidem cepit de Galfrido de Marisco injuste 1 equum precii 1 marcam et ij vaccas precii xvjs et alia plurima dampna sibi fecit et inpedivit eum de quarta parte cuiusdam molendini et quod non potuit terram suam seminare per ij annos ad dampnum suum xLs.

Item idem Johannes ballivus cepit de Ricardo de Insula injuste 1 vaccam precii Xs et eam cum averiis dicti Galfridi fugare fecit ad domum suam apud Ledes et eam ibidem detinuit.

Item idem Johannes cepit injuste de Waltero et Roberto de Fuleswyth xvijjs et iiijd. Item cepit de borgha de Stoneham ijs quare recepit quemdam Willelmum Nicole qui inprisonatus fuit pro suspecione et postmodum aquietatus per patriam

upon which a certain Simon son of Hugh was hanged and he was cut down while alive by a certain Robert who was then the warrener there.

Then they say that Sir William de Munchenes and the bishop of Rochester have and claim to have from ancient times warren in Stone and Swanscombe by royal grant, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

Then they say that the abbot and convent of Lesnes have a certain part of a tenement which is called *Okkicholt* with appurtenances which used to pertain to Dartford vill by a sale of a certain Count of St Pol. However, the said canons of Lesnes pay 20s. rent to the lord of Dartford and the said tenement causes a loss to the lord king of 5 marks each year but they do not know by what warrant nor from what time that tenement (? was sold).

Then they say that Philip of Delham, the bailiff of Sutton at Hone lathe, and Godfrey de Ros, the serjeant of the same, took 2 marks or 1 from various men of Dartford vill by small items to appoint one person in place of another in the assize at the last eyre of Master Roger de Seton the justice in the county of Kent.

Then they say that Sir William of Hever, the sheriff of Kent, amerced Robert Munc at 2s. and Walter Cadweker at 2s. and Adam Bellum at 12d. because they did not come to a certain inquisition to be held before him and because of the lack of people he did not stay to take the inquisition and made a levy of the aforesaid sums of money.

Then they say that Peter of Barking, bailiff of Roger de Leyburn, unjustly took 1 mark from William son of Thomas of Wilmington at Dartford.

They also say that John de Canburegh, bailiff of the same man there, unjustly took from Geoffrey Marsh 1 horse, price 1 mark and 2 cows, price 16s. and he caused him other very great losses and he harassed him in the possession of a quarter part of a certain mill and that he was not able to sow his own land for 2 years causing a loss to him of 40s.

Then the same John the bailiff, unjustly took 1 cow, price 10s., from Richard de Lisle and caused it to be driven with the said Geoffrey's draught animals to his own house at Leeds and he has kept it there.

Then the same John unjustly took 18s. 4d. from Walter and Robert de Fuleswyth. Then he took 2s. from *Stoneham* tithing because it received a certain William Nicole who had been imprisoned upon suspicion and afterwards he was acquitted by a jury as



tanquam homo fidelis.

Item dicunt quod Adam de Hamestel ballivus lesti de Sutton et dictus Johanes de Wanburegh tunc ballivus de Derteford falso et maliciose procuraverunt quod Ricardus de Castello de Derteford inprisonatus fuit apud Cant' et ibidem detentus quousque aquietatus fuit per patriam et ibidem venit quidam Radulfus de Eseling serviens Comitis Kancie et cepit quemdam equum dicti Ricardi precii 1 marce et adhuc detinet.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor multa dampna fecit in archiepiscopatu Cant' set quanta nesciunt.

### **Hundredum de Acstane**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex tenet manerium de Derteford per escaeta et habet in manu sua maneria de Middeltun et de Merdenn.

Item dicunt quod dominus rex Henricus pater domini regis nunc tenuit manerium de Eltham et modo tenet dominus Willelmus de Leyburn set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod idem dominus rex tenet manerium de Ofspring et modo illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus rex Ricardus tenuit manerium de Sutton de la Hone et modo illud tenent hospitalarii set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod quidam rex in antiquo tenuit manerium de Kyngesdun et modo illud tenet dominus Radulfus Bernard set nesciunt quo warento.

Item Willelmus de Monte Canis tenet maneria de Hertligh et Swanscamp de domino rege in capite et reddit per annum ad castrum de Rofa xviiij libras.

Item dicunt quod domina Mabilia Tropel tenet manerium de Esse de heredibus Rogeri de Mumbrai et illi heredes illud tenent de domino rege in capite set nesciunt per quod servicium.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Valoyngnes tenet de domino rege in capite medietatem manerii de Mapelescaump per tale servicium quod si dominus rex venerit usque Mapelescaump ad missam suam audiendam tunc idem Willelmus inveniret ei 1 denarium ad oblacionem.

Item dicunt quod episcopus de Rofa solebat tenere de domino rege Henrico in capite vij feoda militum et dimidium feodum et modo ea tenet de domino archiepiscopo Cant' set quo warento nesciunt.

a man of good character.

Then they say that Adam de Hamestel, bailiff of Sutton at Hone lathe, and the said John de Wanburegh, then bailiff of Dartford, falsely and maliciously arranged that Richard de Castello of Dartford should be imprisoned at Canterbury and detained there until he was acquitted by a jury and a certain Ralph de Eseling, a serjeant of the earl of Kent, came and took a certain horse, price 1 mark, belonging to the said Richard and still keeps it.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, did much damage in the archbishopric of Canterbury, but they do not know how much.

### **Axtane Hundred**

The jury say that the lord king holds Dartford manor through an escheat and he has the manors of Middleton and Marden in his own hand.

Then they say that the lord King Henry, the present lord king's father, held Eltham manor and now Sir William of Leyburn holds it but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord king holds Ospringe manor and now the lady queen, the present king's mother, holds that and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord King Richard held Sutton at Hone manor and now the Knights Hospitallers hold that but they do not know by what warrant.

They they say that in ancient times a certain king held [West?] Kingsdown manor and now Sir Ralph Bernard holds that but they do not know by what warrant.

Then William de Monte Canis holds Hartley and Swanscombe manors of the lord king in chief and he pays £18 each year in rent at Rochester castle.

Then they say that the Lady Mabel Tropel holds the manor of Ash of Roger de Mumbrai's heirs and those heirs hold that of the king king in chief but the jury do not know through what service.

Then they say that William de Valoyngnes holds a moiety of Maplescombe [W. Kingsdown par.] manor of the lord king in chief by such service that if the lord king shall come to Maplescombe to hear his Mass, then the same William shall provide 1 penny for him as an offering.

Then they say that the bishop of Rochester used to hold 7½ knights' fees of the lord King Henry in chief and now he holds these of the lord archbishop of Canterbury, but they do not know by what warrant.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Acstan est in manu domini regis et est de lasto de Sutton et vicecomites Kancie solebant aliquot tempore dimittere ad firmam eundem lastum pro xij libris et postmodum pro xiiij libris et modo Ricardus de Harifeld tenet eundem lastum pro xvj libris.

Item dicunt quod villate de Hurligh et Swanescamp que sunt domini Willelmi de Monte Caniso solebant facere sectam bis per annum (ad) lastum de Sutton et ad hundredum de Acstan de iij septimanis in iij septimanis et subtrahitur secta per xvij annos et amplius set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod tenentes priorisse de Haliwell de villa de Esse solebant sequi ad predictum lestum et hundredum modo predicto et subtrahuntur pro vj annos set per quem aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item tenentes hospitaleriariorum in eadem villa solebant facere sectam ibidem modo supradicto et subtrahuntur per L annos et nesciunt per quos nec quo warento.

Item tenentes episcopi de Rofa in villatis de Stane Suhtflete Faukenham et Langfeld solebant sequi ibidem eodem modo et subtrahuntur per xL annos.

Item villate domini Willelmi de Monte Canis et Hertligh et Swanescamp solebant reddere ad turnum vicecomitis xiijs et ad reddendum domini regis per annum viijs et de hiis subtrahuntur per xvij annos quod nichil soluerunt set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' habet furcas wreccum maris et alias libertates regias set nesciunt quo warento.

Et episcopus de Rofa recipit returnum brevium de archiepiscopo iam per viij annos et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod hospitalarii habent in villa de Sutton assisam panis et cervisie set nesciunt quo warento et dominus Willelmus de Montecanis habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et habuit per xvij annos set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus Willelmus habuit veteres furcas in Swanescamp iam ix annis elapsis et quibus Adam Taskermale latro cum iudicatus fuit homines de Herlligh suspendunt eum super quadam quercu in

Then they say that Axtane hundred is in the lord king's hand and it is of Sutton at Hone lathe and the sheriffs of Kent at some time used to demise the same lathe at farm for £12 and afterwards for £14 and now Richard de Harifield holds the same lathe for £16.

Then they say that the vills of Hawley [Darenth par.] and Swanscombe which are of Sir William de Monte Caniso used to perform suit twice a year at the lathe of Sutton at Hone and every three weeks at Axtane hundred and the suit is withdrawn for 17 years and more but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the tenants of the prioress of *Haliwell* of the vill of Ash used to do suit at the aforesaid lathe and hundred in the aforesaid way and they have been withdrawn for 6 years but they do not know through whom nor by what warrant.

Then the tenants of the Knights Hospitallers in the same vill used to perform suit there in the abovesaid manner and they have been withdrawn for 50 years and they do not know through whom nor by what warrant.

Then the bishop of Rochester's tenants in the vills of Stone, Southfleet, Fawkham Green and Longfield used to do suit in the same way and they have been withdrawn for 40 years.

Then the townships of William de Monte Canis of Hawley and Swanscombe used to pay 13s. at the sheriff's tourn and to pay a rent to the lord king of 8s. each year and they are withdrawn from these payments for 17 years that they have paid nothing, but the jury do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the gallows, wreck and other royal liberties, but they do not know by what warrant.

And the bishop of Rochester receives the return of writs from the archbishop, now for 8 years and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Knights Hospitallers have the assize of bread and ale in Sutton vill, but they do not know by what warrant and Sir William de Montecanis has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and has had this for 17 years, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the said William has had an old gallows in Swanscombe for 9 years and when Adam Taskermale a robber had been condemned the men of Hawley hanged him on a certain oak tree in the same

eadem villa eo quod predictae furce fuerunt decase. Item cum iij latrones suspensi fuissent in furcis ipsius Willelmi in Swanscaump anno regni regis Henrici Lvi et cum prostrate fuerunt et clericus hospitalis ipsos duxerat ad ecclesiam de Swanscamp unus ex eis vivus fuit inventus et remansit in eadem villa per dimidium annum et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Farningham habet liberam warennam in Farningham ex concessione domini regis Henrici nunc proximi et dominus Radulfus Bernard habet similiter in Kyngesdun et dominus Willelmus de Leiburn in Redligh et dominus Willelmus de Faukenham habet similiter in Faukenham et dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis in Hertligh ex concessione predicti regis Henrici et omnes predicti appropriant sibi liberas warennas tam de terris liberorum tenencium quam de terris suis dominicis set nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt xLs de hoc hundredo ultra rectam vicesimam.

Item dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Farningham opturavit muro duas vias communes in villa de Freningham exopposito ecclesie ad nocumentum patrie sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Willelmus Elwold et Godefridus de Ros servientes domini regis ceperunt de pluribus hominibus de Esse pluries in ultimo Itinere justiciariorum pro recognicione removendi xviijs et de hominibus villate de Redligh pro simili iijjs.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus de Halifeld ballivus predicti lesti cepit injuste de Beatrice de Northesse xvs, item de Philippo le Hog eodem modo ijs vjd, item de Rosa filia Willelmi fabri eodem modo Xs de Roberto de Bosco eodem modo iijjs. Item Willelmus Hog et Johannes Saubon clerici domini Henrici Malemains vicecomitis et ballivi sui ceperunt de Henrico le Crower injuste ijs. Item Philippus de Delham ballivus postmodum cepit de Isabella Chien de Esse injuste ut possit ire Cant' dissoluta viijs. Item idem cepit de eadem ut possit quietam discedere de Cant' quod non inprisonaretur 1 marcum et attachiavit ipsam idem Philippus sine culpa. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus excaitor maximam fecit destruccionem in archiepiscopatum tempore vacacionis sed quantum nesciunt. Item dicunt quod idem excaitor seysivit archiepiscopatum Cant' et

vill because the aforesaid gallows was decayed. Then when the 3 robbers had been hanged upon the same William's gallows in Swanscombe, in the 56th year of King Henry's reign [October 1271-1272] and when they were cut down and the clerk of the hospital took them to Swanscombe church one of them was found to be alive and he stayed in the same vill for half a year and more.

Then they say that Master Ralph de Farningham has free warren in Farningham from a grant of the last lord King Henry and Sir Ralph Bernard has this similarly in Kingsdown and the Lord William of Leybourne in Ridley and Sir William of Fawkham has this similarly in Fawkham Green and Sir William de Monte Canis in Hartley by grant of the aforesaid King Henry and all the aforesaid men have appropriated free warrens for themselves both from the free tenants' lands and in their own demesne lands, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 40s more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Ralph of Farningham obstructed two common ways in Farningham vill with a wall, built opposite the church, causing nuisance to the country, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that William Elwold and Godfrey de Ros, the lord king's serjeants, on many occasions took 18s. from many men of Ash at the last eyre of the justices for recognition of their removal (from the assize) and 3s. from the men of Ridley for a similar reason.

Then they say that Richard de Halifield, the bailiff of the aforesaid lathe, took 15s. unjustly from Beatrice de Northesse, then 2s. 6d. from Philip le Hog in a similar way, then 10s. from Rose William the smith's daughter in a similar way, 3s. from Robert of the wood in a similar way. Then William Hog and John Saubon, the clerks of the Sir Malemains, the sheriff, and his bailiffs took 2s. unjustly from Henry Crower. Then Philip of Delham, the bailiff afterwards, took 8s. unjustly from Isabel Chien de Esse so that she could go unbound from Canterbury. Then the same man took 1 mark from her so that she could depart discharged from Canterbury because she had not been imprisoned and the same Philip arrested her for no reason. Then they say that Master Richard, the escheator, caused very great destruction in the archbishopric while it was vacant, but they do not

tenuit illum in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidium.

Item Warinus de Chaucombe et Gregorius de Rokeslye seysivit custodiam de baronia de Eynford et de aliis maneriis domini Nicholai de Criholl defuncti et tenuerunt in manu domini regis et adhuc tenent videlicet maneria de Walemer, Sw[ ] Ostringhangr' Bromhull Stokebur' Litleho et medietatem maneriorum de Wrotham et Eynford et dicunt quod medietatem manerii de Eynford est in hundredo de Acstan et valet per annum per extentam xxv libras set valorem aliorum maneriorum nesciunt.

m.13 dorso **Hundredum de Rokeslye**

Jurati dicunt quod Willelmus de Say tenet manerium de Codeham de domino rege in capite et valet per annum xxx libras et post mortem eiusdem venit dominus Robertus de Scocho et cepit de tenentibus de Codeham xxs. et Maria uxor Willelmi de Say dotata fuit de eodem manerio et maritata domino Roberto de Ufford et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Marisco tenet manerium de Scantlind de domino rege in capite et valet per annum X libras.

Item dicunt quod due partes huius hundredi sunt in manu domini regis et tercia pars in libertate archiepiscopi et sunt in illo hundredo de redditibus assisis xLiij<sup>s</sup> Xd et obolum et de turno vicecomitis xxs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Appeltruefeld et dominus Johannes de Rokesly et dominus Nicholaus Pessun subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi et nesciunt quo warento sic dominus Henricus et dominus Johannes per xv annos et dominus Nichlaus Pessun per V annos.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant' et prior ecclesie Christi Cant' habent returnum brevium placita de namio vetito et furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alia regalia set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Simon de Chelesfeld habet assisam panis et cervisie et warennam set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod domina Sibilla uxor Roberti de Marais habet warennam apud Atmere set nesciunt quo

know who much. Then they say that the same escheator took possession of the archbishopric of Canterbury and held that in the lord king's hands for two and a half years.

Then Warin de Chaucombe and Gregory of Ruxley took the custody of the barony of Eynsford and of the other manors of Sir Nicholas de Criol, deceased, and held them in the lord king's hands and still hold them, that is the manors of Walmer, Sw[alecliffe], *Ostringhanger* [Westenhanger?], *Bromhul* [Broomhill?], *Stokebury*, Lesnes and a moiety of Wrotham and Eynsford manors and they say that the moiety of Eynsford manor is in Axtane hundred and is worth £25 each year by survey but they do not know the value of the other manors.

m.13 dorso **Ruxley Hundred**

The jury say that William de Say holds Cudham manor of the lord king in chief and it is worth £30 each year and after the same man's death Sir Robert de Scocho came and took 20s. from the tenants of Cudham and Mary, William de Say's wife, held the same manor as her dower and she was married to Sir Robert of Ufford and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John Marsh holds *Scantlind* manor of the lord king in chief and it is worth £10 each year.

Then they say that two-thirds of this hundred are in the lord king's hand and the third part of the archbishop's liberty and in that hundred there are assize rents of 43s. 10½d. and 20s. from the sheriff's tourn.

Then they say that Sir Henry de Appeltruefeld and Sir John of Ruxley and Sir Nicholas Pessun have withdrawn themselves from suit of the hundred and they do not know by what warrant, thus Sir Henry and Sir John for 15 years and Sir Nicholas Pessun for 5 years.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury have the return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and the gallows and the assize of bread and ale and other royal perquisites but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Simon of Chelsfield has the assize of bread and ale and warren but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Lady Sibyl, wife of Robert de Marais, has warren at *Atmer* but they do not know by

warento.

Item dicunt quod quatuor acre terre de Warlaund de feodo de Scentling elemosinantur abbati et conventui de Lesnes X annis elapsis ad dampnum pauperum tenencium per annum iiijd. Item elemosinantur eisdem de manerium de Scentling per dominum Johannem de Marais Lij acre bruerie ab anno regni regis Henrici xLij usque nunc ad dampnum domini regis per annum si haberet custodiam heredum de iiij.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus Longus ballivus domini regis pro summonitione Scaccarii levavit de Ricardo Hordmer xLd et eum non aquietavit. Item Adam de la Hamstall ballivus post levavit iterate de eodem Ricardo eosdem xLd et eum non aquietavit. Item Ricardus de Halifeld post levavit tercio eosdem xLd et eum aquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor dum habuit custodiam archiepiscopatus Cant' cepit de tenentibus de Bixlie Lxvjs et viijd et numquam ante fuerunt sic gravati. Item idem destruxit parcum de Bixle ad valenciam vij librarum et Xs. Item seysivit manerium de Orpintun quando Adam de Chilindenn prior fuit electus ad archiepiscopatum tunc cepit de tenentibus dicti prioris ad opus domini regis ut dixit Lijs et iiijd. Item idem Magister Ricardus cepit de Willelmo de Pam quod aliquantulum renuit esse prepositus xxs.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Wechelstan et hundredum de Litlefeld fuerunt aliquando in manu domini regis et quidam Willelmi Smalwritere ballivus dictorum hundredorum dimisit illa cuidam Comiti Glovernie et sic actenus remanserunt et sunt in manibus Comitis Glovernie et primo dimissa fuerunt Comiti tempore regis Johannis ut credunt et tenet ea Comes Glovernie pro xLs per annum soluendis domino rege set nesciunt quo warento ea tenet.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Hever vicecomes Kancie aliquando cepit de Johanne de Ruttindenn ij boves precii xxs sed qua ratione nesciunt.

Item idem fecit facere lathas et carbonam de maeremio dicti Johannis dum habuit eum in prisona.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes ballivus dicti vicecomitis cepit de dicto Johanne ij animalia precii xvs sine restitucione et nesciunt causam.

Item idem Johannes de Ruttinden dedit Willelmo Pod

what warrant.

Then they say that 4 acres of land at *Warlaund of Scentling* fee were granted in free alms to the abbot and convent of Lesnes 10 years ago with loss to poor tenants of 4d. each year. Then from the 42nd year of King Henry's reign [October 1257-1258] until now, 52 acres of heath land of *Scentling* manor were granted in free alms to the same abbey by John de Marais, with a loss of 4s. to the lord king each year, if he should have wardship of the heirs.

Then they say that Richard Long, the lord king's bailiff, levied 40s. from Richard Hordmer for summons of the Exchequer and has not acquitted him. Then Adam de la Hamstall, bailiff after him, levied the same 40d. from the the same Richard and has not acquitted him. Then Richard de Halifield afterwards levied the same 40d. a third time and acquitted him.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, while he had custody of the archbishopric of Canterbury took 66s. 8d. from the tenants of Bexley and they had never before been thus oppressed. Then he destroyed Bexley park to the value of £7 10s. Then he seized Orpington manor when Adam of Chillinden, the prior, was elected to the archbishopric [abp. 1270-1272) then he took 53s. 4d. from the said prior's tenants, for the lord king's use, as he said. Then the same Master Richard took 20s. from William de Pam because for a short time he refused to be reeve.

Then they say that Wachlingstone hundred and Littlefield hundred were at some time in the lord king's hand and a certain William Smalwritere, the bailiff of the said hundreds, demised them to a certain earl of Gloucester and thus so far they have remained and are in the earl of Gloucester's hands and they were first demised to the earl in King John's time, as they believe and the earl holds them for 40s. each year paid to the lord king, but they do not know by what warrant he holds them .

Then they say that Sir William of Hever, sheriff of Kent, at some time took 2 oxen, price 20s. from John de Ruttindenn, but for what reason they do not know.

Then they say that the same man had laths and charcoal made from the same John's timber while he was in prison.

Then they say that Henry of Leeds, the said sheriff's bailiff, took 3 animals, price 15s. from the same John without making restitution and they do not know the reason.

Then the same John de Ruttindenn gave 1 mark to

1 marcam ut penam eius aleviaret dum fuit in prisona  
et nichil sibi valuit.

William Pod so that he would alleviate his suffering  
while he was in prison and he did nothing for him.

m. 15 **Hundredum de Blakeheth**

m.15 **Blackheath Hundred** [*addendum*]

Quot et que dominica maneria etc. Jurati dicunt quod Avicia de Aula Roffens' tenet Modingeham et Wolewich V annis elapsis de dominico domini regis que solebant reddere annuatim domino regi X libras quo warento ignorant.

Que eciam maneria esse solebant etc. nichil sciunt.

De feodis et dominicis regis et tenentibus etc. nichil sciunt.

De terris eciam tenentis de antiquo dominico corone etc. nichil sciunt.

Similiter inquirere de firmariis hundredi; jurati dicunt quod hundredum de la Blakeheth dat domino regi ijs vjd de redditu per annum.

Quot eciam hundreda wapentaca etc. nichili sciunt.

De sectis antiquis consuetudinibus serviciis etc. jurati dicunt quod villa de Eletham sectam deberet ad hundredum de lageday de la Blakeheth bis in anno que pertinet domino regi et hoc subtraxerunt xxx annis elapsis et ad huc subtrahunt per quemdam dominum Ricardum Comitem Glovernie defunctum et per dominum Gilbertum Comitem Glovernie qui nunc est quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod Charles qui tenet quoddam tenementum apud Chinebrok in villa de Le retinuit et ad huc retinet iiijd et obolum annualis redditus per unum annum elapsum quem redditus debet dicto regi.

Qui eciam alii a rege clamant habere returnum etc. jurati dicunt quod prior de Levesham habet assisam panis et servicie in villa de Grenewich et in villa de Levesham usque nunc a tempore et quo waranto ignorant. Item dicunt quod prior de Bermondseye habet assisam panis et servicie et furcas et forum in villa de Cherleton a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis Edwardi qui nunc est et ad huc habet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod Avicia de Aula Roffens habet assisam panis et servicie et furcas in villa de Wolewich et in villa de Modingeham a predicto tempore usque nunc et ad huc habet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant' habet returnum et extractum brevium et de tempore et quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus episcopus Renecestri habet returnum suum de predicto domino archiepiscopo pro xij marcis annuatim solvendis a tempore Bonefacii archiepiscopi.

How many and which manors are demesne manors? The jury say that Avicia of the Hall of Rochester holds Mottingham and Woolwich of the lord king's demesne since 5 years have passed and they are accustomed to pay £10 each year to the lord king, they do not know by what warrant.

Also which manors were accustomed to be so? They know nothing of this.

Concerning the king's fees and demesne and the tenants, etc.? They know nothing about these things.

Concerning the lands also held of the ancient demesne of the crown etc.? They know nothing about these.

In the same way to make inquiry about the farmers of the hundred: the jury say that Blackheath hundred gives 2s. 6d. in rent to the lord king each year.

Also how many hundreds or wapentakes are there?

They know nothing about this.

Concerning ancient suits, customary payments, services etc. The jury say that Eltham vill owes suit to Blackheath hundred at the lawday twice a year which belongs to the king and they have withdrawn this for 30 years and still withdraw it by a certain Lord Richard the deceased earl of Gloucester and the Lord Gilbert the present earl of Gloucester, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Charles who holds a certain tenement at Kidbrook in the vill of Lee withheld for one year and still withholds an annual rent of 4½d. and this rent is owed to the lord king.

What other people claim to have return, etc., from the king? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham has the assize of bread and ale in Greenwich and Lewisham vills until now, from what time and by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the prior of Bermondsey has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and market in the vill of Charlton from the lord King Henry's time, the father of lord King Edward the present king, and he still has this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Avicia of the Hall of Rochester has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows in the vill of Woolwich and of Mottingham from the aforesaid time until now and still holds this, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extact of writs and from what time and by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the lord bishop of Rochester has his return from the aforesaid lord archbishop, from the time of

De hiis eciam qui habent libertates etc. nichil sciunt.

Item de libertatibus concessis etc. nichil sciunt.

Qui insuper de novo appropriaverunt etc. jurati dicunt quod prior de Levesham habet liberas chacias et warennas in villa de Levesham et in villa de Grenewich ad huc habet usque nunc quo tempore et a quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus Gilebertus Comes Glovernie qui nunc est habet liberas chacias et warennas in villa de Eletham a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis Edwardi qui nunc est et ad huc habet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Say habet liberas chacias et warennas in Grenewich et ad huc habet a predicto tempore usque nunc set quo warento ignorant.

Quis domini aut eorum seneskalli etc. nichil sciunt.

Item de omnibus purpresturis quibuscunque factis etc. jurati dicunt quod dominus Nicholaus de Lynekenore clausit quondam viam qua itur de Modingeham versus Elteham que fuit regia via domini regis xvj annis elapsis et heredes domini Arnoldi de Mandevile tenet ad huc illam viam clausam et est purpresturam dominici regis

De feodis militariis cuiusquam feodi: nichil sciunt.

De vicecomitibus capientibus munera etc. jurati dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains defuctus tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis Edwardi qui nunc vicecomes Cant' permisit et cepit unam marcam de quodam felone nomine Roberti Koc de Eletham qui fuit utlagatus ut tempore suo permetteret eum in pace et postea venit Willelmus de Hewre qui fuit vicecomes Cant' et Henricus de Ledes qui fuit subvicecomes et attachiaverunt predictum felonem Robertum Koc et dimiserunt illum per vj pleggios unde tradentes justiciariis Itinerantibus et pro occasione predicta predictus Henricus cepit de predicto Roberto xxs. iniuste.

Similiter de clericis et aliis ballivis suis etc. dicunt quod Adam le Waleys de Sorham serviens Philippi de Dalham ballivi de Sottone cepit de hominibus de Grenewich xxs injuste pro falsa summonitione tempore Magistri Rogeri de Seyton et sociorum suorum Itinerancium in comitatu Cant' anno Lv. Item dicunt quod Elyas de Lenham qui fuit ballivus de

Archbishop Boniface for 12 marks paid each year. Concerning those men who have liberties, etc. They know nothing of this.

Concerning liberties granted, etc. They know nothing of this.

Which men in addition have appropriated things for themselves recently? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham has free chaces and warrens in Lewisham vill and Greenwich and still holds this until now, from what time and by what warrant they are ignorant.

Then they say that the Lord Gilbert, the present earl of Gloucester, has free chaces and warrens in Eltham vill from the time of lord King Henry, the Lord Edward the present king's father, and he still holds this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Sir William de Say has free chaces and warrens in Greenwich and still has this from the aforesaid time until now but by what warrant they do not know.

What lords or their stewards, etc.? They know nothing of this.

Then concerning all encroachments whatsoever which have been made, etc. The jury say that 16 years ago Sir Nicholas de Lynekenore stopped up a certain road which goes from Mottingham towards Eltham which used to be a highway of the lord king and that Sir Arnold de Mandeville's heirs still keep this road closed and it is an encroachment on the king's demesne.

Concerning the knights from each fee: they know nothing of this.

Concerning sheriffs taking rewards, etc. The jury say that when the late Sir Henry Malemains was sheriff of Kent during the lord King Henry's time, the father of the Lord Edward the present king, he permitted and took one mark from a certain felon called Robert Cook of Eltham who was an outlaw, so that in his time he allowed Robert to go free and afterwards when William of Hever was sheriff of Kent and Henry of Leeds the sub sheriff they arrested the aforesaid felon Robert Cook and handed him over to 6 men acting as pledges, thus delivering him to the eyre justices and for the aforesaid arrest the aforesaid Henry unjustly took 20s. from the aforesaid Robert.

Similarly concerning the clerks and their other bailiffs: they say that Adam le Waleys of Shoreham, Philip of Delham's serjeant, unjustly took 20s. from the men of Greenwich for a false summons at the time of Master Roger de Seyton and his fellow eyre justices in the county of Kent in 1271-1272. Then they say that Elias of Lenham, who was bailiff of



hundredo de la Blakeheth anno regni regis Edwardi primo cepit de hominibus de Modingeham ijs injuste pro falsa summonitione. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Kokerhurst qui fuit ballivus de hundredo de la Blakeheth post dictum Elyam cepit de Thoma filio Galfridi de Modingeham ijs injuste pro falsa summonitione. Item dicunt quod Thomas Sorang qui fuit coronator et ad huc est fecit quamdam inquisitionem de quodam mortuo apud Levesham et cepit injuste pro officio suo exercendo de hominibus de Levesham ijs. Item dicunt quod idem Elyas habuit de Radulfo de Eltham ijs viijd injuste pro falso summonitione predicto termino.  
De vicecomitibus et ballivis quibuscunque capientibus munera: sciunt nichil nisi ut supra.  
De vicecomitibus et aliis ballivis quibuscunque qui ameriaverunt illos qui summoniti sunt; nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.  
De vicecomitibus qui tradiderunt ballivis excessoribus populum gravantibus etc: dicunt nichil sciunt nisi ut supra

Item cum vicecomites non debeant facere turnum suum etc. nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item cum fines pro redesseisuris aut purpresturis etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item qui per potestatem officii sui sui aliquos maliciose occasionaverunt etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Qui receperint mandata domini regis etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Qui receperint debita domini regis etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item qui summonuerint aliquos ut fierent milites etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Et si aliqui magnates vel alii destrinxerunt etc. nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item si vicecomes vel aliquis ballivus etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item de hiis qui habuerunt probatores inprisonatos etc: nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item qui habuerunt felones inprisonatos etc. jurati dicunt quod prior de Levesham cepit Elyam Swetnam et Elyam filium suum et illos tenuit in priona sua quousque fuerunt deliberati per ballivos domini regis et nesciunt quo modo.

Item quis dona et aliqua lucra receperunt etc. jurati dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Malemayns et

Blackheath hundred in the first year of King Edward's reign [1272-1273], unjustly took 3s. from the men of Mottingham for a false summons. Then they say that Hugh de Kokerhurst who was bailiff of Blackheath hundred after the said Elias unjustly took 2s. from Thomas son of Geoffrey of Mottingham for a false summons. Then they say that when Thomas Sorang was coroner and still is, he held a certain inquisition at Lewisham upon a certain dead person and for performing the duties of his office he took 2s. unjustly from the men of Lewisham. Then they say that the same Elias received 2s. 8d. unjustly from Ralph of Eltham for a false summons at the aforesaid term. Concerning sheriffs and bailiffs whosoever taking gifts, etc. They know nothing except as said above. Concerning sheriffs and any other bailiffs whosoever who have amerced those who have been summoned: they know nothing except as is said above. Concerning sheriffs who have delivered the people to bailiffs who oppress them with excessive demands, etc. They say they know nothing of this except as is said above.

Then when the sheriffs ought not to hold their tourn, etc. They know nothing except as is said above.

Then when there are fines for redisseisins or encroachments: they know nothing of this except as is above said.

Then who by power of his office has maliciously charged others, etc.? They know nothing unless as is said above.

Who have received the lord king's mandates? They know nothing unless as is said above.

Who have received the lord king's debts, etc.? They know nothing unless as is said above.

Item who have summoned other men that they should be made knights? They know nothing unless as above said.

And whether any magnates or others have made distraint etc. They know nothing unless as above.

Then if the sheriff or any bailiff, etc. They know nothing unless as above.

Then concerning those men who had approvers imprisoned, etc. They know nothing unless as above.

Then who has had felons imprisoned, etc.? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham took Elias Swetnam and Elias his son and held them in his prison until they were released by the lord king's bailiffs and they do not know in what way.

Then who has received gifts or other money, etc.? The jury say that Sir Henry de Malemayns and Sir Fulk

<p>dominus Fulco Poyferer collectores vicesime ceperunt Xs ultra certum vicesimam de hoc hundredo.</p> <p>Item quis habuerunt felones inprisonatos etc: jurati dicunt quod prior R(adulfus) de Leueseham cepit Elyam Swettenam et Elyam filium suum et illos tenuit in priona sua odio quousque fuerunt deliberati per ballivos domini regis anno regni regis Edwardi ij set nesciunt quo modo.</p> <p>Item quis vicecomites vel custodes castrorum etc: nichil sciunt.</p> <p>De escaetoribus et subescaetoribus etc. jurati dicunt ut post obitum domini archiepiscopi Bonefacii dominus Ricardus de Clifford fuit escaetor domini regis et cepit archiepiscopatum in manu sua per duos annos et dimidium elapsos et in eodem tempore fecit vastum et destruccionem per totum archiepiscopatum sic in boscis vivariis et homagiis set de quantitate ignorant et Lxxvij libras in parco de Wixli ad opus Radulfi de Fingingham.</p> <p>Item de eisdem si occasionaverunt huiusmodi etc. nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.</p> <p>Item de eisdem qui ceperunt munera etc. jurati dicunt quod Philppus de Delham tunc tempore ballivus de Sotton cepit ij marcas injuste de Johanne de Modingeham pro quadam falsa attachiamenta tempore domini Henrici regis patris domini regis Edwardi qui nunc est.</p> <p>[Item de eisdem qui] sufficienter etc. nichil sciunt.</p> <p>Item de eisdem qui prece vel precio etc. nichil sciunt.</p> <p>tem de eisdem qui reservaverunt etc. nichil sciunt.</p> <p>Item de eisdem qui procuraverunt etc. nichil sciunt</p> <p>Item cuiusmodi terras seysierunt etc. nichil sciunt.</p> <p>Item de terris captis in manu domini regis etc. nichil sciunt.</p> <p>Item si qui durante discordia etc. nichil sciunt.</p> <p>m.14 <b>Hundredum de Acstane</b></p> <p>Johannes de Chambehm Hugo Fraunceys Radulfus de Esse Rogerus de Westcote Gilebertus de Alo Johannes</p>	<p>Poyferer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.</p> <p>Item who has had felons imprisoned, etc.? The jury say that Ralph the prior of Lewisham took Elias Swetnam and his son Elias and held them in his prison through his hatred until they were released by the lord king's bailiffs in the second year of King Edward's reign [November 1273-1274] but they do not know in what way.</p> <p>Then what sheriffs or keepers of castles, etc.? They know nothing of this.</p> <p>Concerning the escheators and sub-escheators, etc. The jury say that after the lord Archbishop Boniface's death Sir Richard de Clifford was the lord king's escheator and he took the archbishopric in his own hand for two and a half years and during the same time caused waste and destruction throughout the whole archbishopric, in the woods, fishponds and homages, but they are ignorant of the amount and £77 in the park of <i>Wixle</i> to the use of Ralph de Fingingham.</p> <p>Then concerning the same men if they have caused waste in this manner, etc.? They know nothing unless as above.</p> <p>Then concerning the same men who took gifts, etc. The jury say that Philip of Delham, when he was bailiff of Sutton, took 2 marks unjustly from John of Mottingham for a certain false arrest, when the lord Henry was king, the father of the lord Edward the present king.</p> <p>[Item concerning the same men who] sufficiently, etc. They know nothing.</p> <p>Then concerning the same men who for prayer payment, etc. They know nothing.</p> <p>Then concerning the same men who have kept back, etc. They know nothing</p> <p>Then concerning the same men who have made provision, etc. They know nothing.</p> <p>Then in what way they have taken possession of lands. They know nothing.</p> <p>Then concerning lands taken into the lord king's hand, etc. They know nothing.</p> <p>Then if anyone during discord, etc. They know nothing.</p> <p>m.14 <b>Axtane Hundred</b> [<i>addendum</i>]</p> <p>John de Chambehm, Hugh Franceys, Ralph de Esse, Roger de Westcote, Gilbert de Alo, John de Deyhey,</p>
---	--

de Deyhey Martinus de Hydelegh Johannes Leonays Johannes de la Hak Rogerus de Muchwode Petrus Gromblets Johannes de la Cote jurati .

[super alibi] Quot et que dominica maneria rex habet in manu sua etc. dicunt quod dominus rex tenet manerium de Derteford per escheatum a festo Sancti Edwardi Confessoris anno regni regis Edwardi secundo. Item tenet in dominico suo maneria de Middelton et Merdenn.

Que eciam maneria esse solent in manibus regum predecessorum regis etc. dicunt quod dominus rex Henricus tenuit manerium de Eltham et modo dominus Willelmus de Leyburn illud tenet set quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod rex Henricus tenet manerium de Ospringe et modo domina regina Anglie mater regis Edwardi illud tenet set quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod rex Ricardus tenuit manerium de Sutton de la Hone et modo hospitalarii illud tenent set quo warento nesciunt. Item quidam rex in antiquo tenuit manerium de Kingesdun et modo dominus Radulfus Barnard tenet quo warento nesciunt. Item Willelmus de Monte Canis tenet maneria de Hertleghe et Swanscamp de domino rege in capite et reddit per annum ad castrum Roffens' xvij libras. Item dicunt quod domina Mabilia Torpel tenet manerium de Esse de heredibus Rogeri de Moubray et iidem heredes illud tenent de domino rege in capite set per quod servicium nesciunt.

De feodis eciam dominicis regis et tenentibus ea que tenent de ipso in capite etc. dicunt quod Willelmus de Valognes tenet de rege in capite medietatem manerii de Mapelescump per tale servicium quod si dominus rex venerit usque Mapelescaump ad missam suam audiendam tunc idem Willelmus inveniret ei 1 denarium ad oblacionem.

Similiter de firmis hundredi etc. dicunt quod hundredum de Acstone est in manu domini regis.

Quot eciam hundreda wapentaca etc. sciunt nichil nisi quod suprascriptum est.

De sectis eciam antiquis consuetudinibus et serviciis et aliis etc. dicunt quod villata de Hertlegh et Swanscamp que sunt domini Willelmi de Monte Cansio solebant facere secta bis per annum lastum de Sutton et ad hundredum de Acstan de iij septimanis in iij septimanas et subtrahitur secta per xvij annos et amplius set quo warento nesciunt.

Qui eciam alii a rege clamant habere returnum etc. dicunt super hoc articulo quod dominus Cant' archiepiscopus habet returnum brevium furcas

Martin de Hydelgh, John Leonays, John de la Hak, Roger de Muchwode, Peter Gromlets, John de la Cote, the jury.

How many and what demesne manors the king has in his hand etc.? They say that the lord king holds Dartford manor by escheat from the feast of St Edward the Confessor in the second year of King Edward's reign [5 January 1274]. Then he holds Middleton and Marden manors in his demesne.

Also which manors used to be in the hands of kings, the present king's predecessors etc.? They say that the lord King Henry held Eltham manor and now Sir William de Leyburn holds that but by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that King Henry holds Ospringe manor and now the lady queen of England, King Edward's mother, holds that but by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that King Richard held Sutton at Hone manor and now the Knights Hospitallers hold that but they do not know by what warrant. Then a certain king in ancient times held [West?] Kingsdown manor and now Sir Ralph Bernard holds it, by what warrant they do not know. Then Willelmus de Monte Canis holds Hartley and Swanscombe manors of the lord king in chief and he pays £18 rent each year at Rochester castle. Then they say that the lady Mabel Torpel holds Ash manor of Roger de Mowbray's heirs and the same heirs hold it of the lord king in chief, but through what service they do not know.

Concerning the fees also of the king's demesne and the tenants who hold those of him in chief, etc. They say that William de Valognes holds a moiety of Maplescombe manor of the king in chief through such service that if the lord king shall have come to Maplescombe to hear Mass then the same William should provide 1d. for him as an offering.

Concerning the farms of the hundred: they say that Axtane hundred is in the lord king's hand.

How many hundreds, wapentakes, etc.? They know nothing unless what is written above.

Concerning the suits, also ancient customary payments and services and other things, etc. They say that Hartley and Swanscombe vills which are of Sir William de Monte Cansio, used to perform suit twice a year at Sutton lathe and every three weeks in Axtane hundred and suit is withdrawn for 17 years and more, but they do not know by what warrant.

What others also claim to have return etc from the king? They say in answer to this article that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, wreck

wreccum maris et alias libertates regias set nesciunt quo warento et episcopus de Roffens' recepit returnum brevium de archiepiscopo jam per viij annos et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set nesciunt quo warento.

De libertatibus concessis et eas aliter usi fuerunt quam facere debuissent etc. Dicunt quod Willelmus de Monte Canis habuit veteres furcas in Swanscamp de iam ix annis elapsis et quidam Adam Taskermale latro cum judicatus fuit homines de Hertligh suspendit ipsum super quadam quercu in eadem villa eo quod predictae furcae fuerunt decase. Item cum iij latrones suspensi fuissent in furcis ipsius Willelmi in Swanescaump anno regni regis Henrici Lvi et cum prostrati fuerunt et clericus hospitalis ipsos duxerat ad ecclesiam de Swanescaump unus ex eis vivus fuit inventus et remansit in eadem villa per dimidium annum et amplius.

Qui insuper de novo appropriaverunt sibi liberas chacias vel warentas. Dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Farningham habet liberam warentam in Farningham ex concessione domini regis Henrici nunc proximi et dominus Radulfus Bernard habet similiter in Kyngesdun et dominus Willelmus de Leiburn in Redligh et dominus Willelmus de Faukenham habet similiter in Faukenham et dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis in Hertligh ex concessione predicti regis Henrici et omnes predicti appropriant sibi liberas warentas tam de terris liberorum tenentium suorum quam de terris suis dominicis set nesciunt quo warento Adam Godhere Roggerus de Cogeshal Ricardus le Warrener Stephanus Wo

Qui etiam domini aut eorum senescalli seu ballivi quicumque seu etiam domini regis ministri etc. Super hoc articulo dicunt quod Magister Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit xLs de hoc hundredo ultra rectam vicesimam

De omnibus purpresturis quibuscumque factis super dominicum regium etc. Item dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Farningham opturavit muro duas vias communes in villa de Farningham exopposito ecclesie ad nocumentum patrie set nesciunt quo warento.

De feodis etiam militaris cuiuscumque feodi etc.

Dicunt nichil

De vicecomitibus capiendis munera aut concensandis ad feloniam concealendam etc. Dicunt nichil

and other royal liberties but they do not know by what warrant and the bishop of Rochester received the return of writs from the archbishop 8 years ago and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has the gallows and the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant.

Concerning liberties granted and those used otherwise than by right, etc. They say that William de Monte Canis had old gallows in Swanscombe since 9 years had passed and a certain Adam Taskermale, when he had been condemned as a robber was hanged by the men of Hartley upon a certain oak tree in the same vill, because the aforesaid gallows were decayed. Then when 3 robbers had been hanged upon the same William's gallows in Swanscombe in the 56th year of King Henry's reign and when they were taken down and the clerk of the hospital took them to Swanscombe church, one of them was found to be alive and he stayed in the same vill for half a year and more.

Which men recently have appropriated free chaces or warrens for themselves? They say that Master Ralph of Farningham has free warren in Farningham by grant of King Henry, the previous king, and Sir Ralph Bernard similarly has this in Kingsdown, Sir William of Leybourne in Ridley, Sir William de Faukenham similarly has this in *Faukenham* [Fawkham?] and Sir William of Monte Canis in Hartley by grant of the aforesaid King Henry and all the aforesaid men appropriate free warrens for themselves both in their free tenants' lands and in their own demesne lands, but they do not know by what warrant: Adam Godbere, Roger of Coggleshall, Richard the warrener, Stephen Hoo.

Also which lords or their stewards or bailiffs whosoever or also the lord king's ministers, etc.? They say about this article that Master Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 40s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Concerning all encroachments whatsoever made upon the royal demesne, etc. Then they say that Master Ralph of Farningham has obstructed two common ways in Farningham vill with a wall opposite the church, causing harm to the country, but they do not by what warrant.

Concerning knights' fees also of whatsoever fee, etc. They say nothing.

Concerning sheriffs taking gifts or consenting to concealing felony, etc. They say nothing.

Similiter de clericis et aliis ballivis vicecomitum coronatoribus et eorum clericis et ballivis quibuscunque etc. Dicunt nichil.

De vicecomitibus et aliis ballivis quibuscunque capiendis munera pro recognitione etc. Dicunt super hoc articulo quod Willelmus Elwold et Godefridus de Roos servientes ballivi domini regis ceperunt de pluribus hominibus per plures vices de villata de Esse in Itinere justiciariorum sic Rogeri de Scheyton et sociorum suorum injuste pro recognitionibus removendis xvijjs. Eciam de hominibus de villata de Redlegh pro eodem ijs.

De vicecomitibus et aliis ballivis quibuscunque qui americiaverunt illos qui sommoniti fuerunt etc. Dicunt nichil.

De vicecomitibus qui tradiderunt ballivis excessoribus populum gravantibus etc. Dicunt nichil.

Item cum vicecomites non debeant facere turnum etc. Dicunt quod non fecerunt nisi bis.

Item cum fines pro redisseisinis aut purpresturis factis etc. Dicunt nichil.

Item qui per potestatem officii sui aliquos maliciose occasionaverunt etc. Dicunt nichil.

Item qui receperunt mandatum domini regis ut eius debita solverent etc. Dicunt nichil.

Qui summonuerunt aliquos ut fierent milites etc. Dicunt nichil.

Item si aliqui magnates vel alii sine precepto regis aliquos distrinxerunt etc. Dicunt nichil

De hiis qui habuerunt probatores inprisonati etc. Dicunt nichil

Item de hiis qui habuerunt probatores aut felones inprisonati et fecerunt eos appellare etc. Dicunt ut supra

Item qui dona vel lucra aliqua receperunt pro officiiis suis exercendis etc. Dicunt super hoc articulo quod Ricardus de Halyfeld ballivus de lesto predicto cepit injuste per potestatem ballive sue de Beatrice de Northesse xvs Item de Philipo le Hog eodem modo ijs vjd. Item de Rosa filia Willelmi Fabri eodem modo Xs de Roberto de Bosco eodem modo iijs Item Willelmus Hog et Johannes Saubon clerici domini Henrici Malemains vicecomitis et ballivi sui ceperunt de Henrico le Crower injuste ijs. Item Philippus de Delham ballivus postmodum cepit de Isabella Chien de Esse injuste ut possit ire Cant' dissolute viijs. Item idem cepit de eadem ut possit quieta discedere de Cant' quod non inprisonaretur 1 marcam et attachiavit

Similarly concerning the clerks and other bailiffs of the sheriffs, the coroners and their clerks and bailiffs whosoever etc. They say nothing.

Concerning sheriffs and other bailiffs whosoever taking gifts for jury inquest, etc. They say upon this article that William Elwold and Godfrey de Roos, serjeants of the lord king's bailiff, took 18s. unjustly from many men of Ash vill on many occasions for their removal from jury inquest at the eyre of the justices, thus of Roger de Seyton and his fellows. Also 3s. from the men of Ridley vill for the same reason.

Concerning sheriffs and other bailiffs who have amerced those who have been summoned, etc. They say nothing.

Concerning sheriffs who have delivered the people to bailiffs oppressing them with demands, etc. They say nothing.

Then when the sheriffs ought not to hold the tourn, etc. They say that this was only done twice.

Then when are there fines for redisseisin or encroachments, etc. They say nothing.

Then who through the authority of his office has maliciously charged another, etc? They say nothing.

Then who have received the lord king's mandate that they should pay his debts etc? They say nothing.

Who have summoned some men that they may become knights, etc? They say nothing.

Then whether any magnate or other person has distrained any men without the king's order, etc? They say nothing.

Concerning those who have approvers in prison, etc. They say nothing.

Then concerning those imprisoned who have approvers or felons and make those appeal, etc. They say as above.

Then who have received gifts or any reward for performing the duties of their offices, etc? They say about this article that Richard de Halyfield, bailiff of the aforesaid lathe, took 15s. unjustly from Beatrice de Northesse by the authority of his office as bailiff, then 2s. 6d. from Philip le Hog in the same way, then 10s. from Rose the daughter of William the smith in the same way, 3s. from Robert de Bosco in the same way. Then William Hog and John Saubon, the clerks of Sir Henry Malemains, the sheriff, and his bailiffs unjustly took 2s. from Henry le Crower. Then Philip of Delham, the bailiff, afterwards took 8s. from Isabel Chien of Ash so that she could go to Canterbury unfettered. Then the same man took 1 mark from the

ipsam idem Philippus sine culpa.

Et hec omnia inquirantur tam de vicecomitibus coronatoribus et eorum clericis et ballivis: dicunt nichil quod predictum est.

Item qui vicecomites vel custodes castrorum vel maneriorum domini regis de operantibus domini regis etc. dicunt nichil.

De eschaetoribus et subeschaetoribus facientibus vastum vel destruccionem etc. Dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor maximam fecit destruccionem in archiepiscopatum Cant' tempore vacacionis sed quantum nesciunt. Item dicunt quod idem excaitor seysivit archiepiscopatum et tenuit illum in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidium. Item Warinus de Chaucumb et Gregorius de Rokeslye seysivit custodiam de baronia de Eynford et de aliis maneriis Nicholai de Criholl defuncti et tenuerunt in manu domini regis et adhuc tenent vicelicet maneria de Walemer Swanscombe Ostringhangr' Bromhull Stokebur Litleho et medietatem maneriorum de Wrotham et Eynford.

Item de terris captis in manu domini regis qui capi non debuerunt etc. ? Dicunt nichil.

Item durante discordia inter dominum regem et Comitissam Flaundes' contra inhibicionem et defencionem regis defuncti vel qui nunc est qui duxerunt vel duci fecerunt lanas aliquas ad partes transmarinas? Dicunt nichil.

same woman so that she could depart acquitted from Canterbury because she had not been imprisoned and the same Philip arrested her for no reason.

And inquiry is to be made about all these things both about the sheriffs, the coroners and their clerks and bailiffs. They say nothing because it has been said before.

Then which sheriffs or keepers of the lord king's castles or manors, concerning the lord king's works, etc? They say nothing.

Concerning the escheators and sub-escheators who cause waste and destruction, etc. They say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, caused the greatest destruction in the archbishopric of Canterbury when it was vacant but they do not know the amount. Then they say that the same escheator took possession of the archbishopric and held that in the lord king's hand for two and a half years. Then Warin de Chaucombe and Gregory of Ruxley took possession of the custody of Eynsford barony and the other manors of the late Nicholas de Criholl and held them in the lord king's hand and still hold them, that is the manors of Walmer, Swanscombe, Ostringhanger [Westenhanger?], Broomhill, Sto[c?]kebury, *Littleham* and a moiety of Wrotham and Eynsford manors.

Concerning lands taken into the lord king's hands which ought not to have been taken? They say nothing.

Then while the hostility was in force between the lord king and the Countess of Flanders who exported or caused to be exported any wool overseas contrary to the restraint and prohibition of the late king or the present king? They say nothing.

TNA, Kent Hundred Rolls: Nomina omnium juratorum hundredorum comitatus Kancie anno regni regis Edwardi tercio, 1274-1275

<p>m.16 (<i>column 1</i>)</p> <p><b>Hundred or township of Canterbury</b> Thomas Chiche, Peter Durant, Simon Preble, John Terry, Anselm le Furnag, Henry Canon, James Hord, Ivo Pollard, Robert Oredelyn, James Dod, Reginald de Riggeby, William Smelt.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Bleangate</b> Philip of Sturry, John de Webster, James de Hathewolding, William Underwalle, Ralph de Westebrok, John de Hathewolding, John of Strood, William de Hatheburne, Hamo de Fayrporte, John de Wysebeche, William le Gynur, William de Bradelonde.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Westgate</b> Dunstan le Moneur, William Brussel, Anselm the tailor, Hugh de Norywyt, John Swon, Henry de Winterburne, John de Campo, Robert de Fossato, Vincent de Foce, John of Bishopsbourne, Henry Bolle, Richard Tryweman.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Milton</b> John de Godhynetun, Hugh de Tunstalle, John de Ores, William le Dinere, Turpin of the mill, John the clerk of Middleton, Simon of Chilton, Robert de Crofte, Adam son of Giles, Adam the reeve, John the clerk of Widegate, Batholomew de Wattun.</p>	<p>m.16 (<i>column 2</i>)</p> <p><b>Hundred of Rolvenden</b> Robert de Fordham, Hugh de Kasingham, Osbert Malemeyn, Osbert de Fordham, Richard de Casingham, Thomas de Hawete, William de Chesindenn, Alured de Thornden, Richard Blundus, Alured de Medselle, Auvisius de Besindenn, Thomas de Hathelden.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Blackborne</b> William de Sidokesherst, John de Reseweeye, Richard de Poundey, Richard de Hocwolden, Thomas Gengmay, Hugh de Gosebarn, Moses de Calinden. John de Bertusden, Peter de Keche, Luke atte Cherche, Thomas de Scherle, Hugh son of Thomas Joce.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Barkley</b> Richard de Tache, Simon de Lethinden, Peter de Eldehalle, Richard de Ladekele, Robert the tailor, Thomas de Thebden, Eudo de Byssopenden, Simon de Besinden, James Beketilthe, Walter de Byssupenden, Walter of Spelderhurst, Richard de Orthinden.</p> <p><b>Newenden township</b> William of Bromley, Simon Fraunceys, William the turner, Robert Rufus, William of Lewes, Robert the baker, John de la Barre, John de Sponden, Walter de Kungeshurst, Simon Albre, Simon Brech, Robert le Pomere.</p>	<p>m. 16 (<i>column 3</i>)</p> <p><b>Hundred of Aloesbridge</b> (<i>continuation</i>). John Elys, William son of John, Robert Edrya, James Rufus.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Folkestone</b> William the tailor, Henry de E[ ], William de Forindon, John Herold, John Cotton, Robert Lucas, Roger de Wyppingwele, Alan de Brad, Reginald de Bercherde, Simon de [ ], William Welysape, Robert de Herne.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Loningborough</b> William de Boywyk, Robert Peres, Henry Brummay, William Burgenek, Stephen Sone, William Burgeys, Walter de Boywyk, Adam Levenot, Thomas de Parco, William de Parco, Robert de la Lese, Elias son of Alexander.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Stowting</b> John de Wodesoke, John le Jouene, Richard de Edinge, John de la Linche, Henry of Barnfield, Nicholas son of Walter, Henry de Bykeforde, Gilbert Weselmay, Roger son of William, Augustine de la Holte, Robert Benedict, Hugh son of Clement.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Heane</b> William de Brochelle, Elias le Whyte, Stephen de la Done, Robert de Hyttlece, Walter Bronyng, Andrew de Poding, Hugh the parker, Robert atte Stone, Hamo Becke, Philip de Honywode, William Cosyn, Richard atte Stone.</p>
---	---	--

**Hundred of Wingham**

Thomas of Godnestone, Ivo of Bonnington, Thomas atte Dane, John de Hakyng, Stephen de Athalte, Alexander of Uffington, Thomas de Podding, Thomas le Granger, Robert of Kingswood, Hamo de Prato, Serles atte Steclude, Rykemund of Wingham, Henry of Pedinge (*13 jurors*).

**Hundred of Marden**

Edmund of Luddenham, Richard of Ruckinge, Adam de Wyke, Richard Eytmot, John of Egham, Walter of Egham, Ralph de Cropinden, Thomas son of Alexander, Thomas de Mereseye, Richard de Byxbiche, Wolmerus Pyk, William de Sengdenn.

**Hundred of Ringslow**

Walter de Ripple, Robert le Visunce, Henry de Shorne, William Oswald, John Oswald, William Bocharde, Henry of Manston, Henry of Fleet, Hamo of Birchington, Peter of the same place, Elias le Prude, Thomas de la Hale.

**Half Hundred of Barnefield**

(*in two lathes*) Ralph of the castle, Simon the clerk, Walter Fraunceys, John de Tryndle, Thomas of the church, Richard de Segele.

**Hundred of Whitstable**

John Belsire, Richard Aleyn, Richard Elphethery, Hamo atte Cherche, Robert son of Osbert, Thomas Leger, John de Hakinblen, Osbert atte Brok, Alan Sprynget, Solomon atte Hethe, John de Fraxino, Somon Loue, Adam de Hakinblen (*13 jurors*).

**Hundred of Cornilo****Hundred of Selbritten**

Reginald de Bederindenn, William de Hope, John de la More, Gilbert de Bederindenn, Adam de Twisdenn, Roger de Fythindenn, John de Pledessedess, William de Feld, Simon de Baydesdenn, Walter de Hope, William de Homstede, Roger atte More.

**Hundred of Petham**

Nigel the cook, Edward de Remesfeld, Hervey de Langedenn, John de Haite, William de Kenesfeud, William Mustard, Andrew Betel, Ivo Fordred, Solomon of Stone Street, Sacrius Trochere, John de Beres, Simon le King.

**Hundred of Eastry**

John de Soles, Richard de Godding, Sir Henry Peret, Bartholomew Tanere, Thomas de la Chambre, Benedict of

Woodnesborough, Richard de Worhope, Alan of Crowthorne, John de Sellington, Richard atte Sole, Stephen de Feldwarelonde, John the merchant, William the mercer (*13 jurors*).

**Hundred of Kinghamford**

John of Bourne clerk, William le Waldisse, John Draper, Robert de Meryle, John de Camera, Eustace de la Brome, Alan de Selinge, Simon of the same place, Alan son of Luke, John son of Robert, John Potel, John Doket.

**Hundred of Oxney**

John de la Grave, Peter Bruming, William le Pot, Reginald de Bylkinden, Thomas le Wyce, Richard le

**Hundred of St Martin**

Robert Bryce, John son of William, Peter de Marynes, Adam Wasteth, Richard de Lyghe, William atte More, Alan Awstyn, Philip atte Stone, Stephen atte Hyling, Walter son of Richard, Martin of Newchurch, William Munyn.

**Half Hundred of Bircholt**

William Edyn, John de Herste, Walter de Prato, Matthew Fraunceys, Godfrey de Suteford, Guy Butere.

**Hundred of Faversham**

Peter of Ham, Richard Bath, Ralph de Eynglynton, William de Gode, John son of Agnes de Asling, Simon de Trynghe, Peter de la Lose, Henry Kentby, William de Podewode, William de Foxton, Robert le War de Holbeme, Roger atte Stone.

**Hundred of Felborough**

Thomas de Ensing, Walter de la Dane, Richard de Ensing, Robert Hardyman, Geoffrey de Aldelonde, John Baldewyne, Robert de Dene, Stephen atte Velde, John le Fyr clerk, William de Pynere, Giles de Forstalle, Adam de Denstede.

**Hundred of Bridge**

William de Delte, Warin le Jolfine, William of Nackington, William de Northinton, Luke of Egham, Richard de Parco, Godfrey la Hame, William le Whyte, John Gervays, Robert de la Dene, Geoffrey de Cruce, Henry Sturgys.

**Hundred of Street**

William of Bonnington, Roger de Bere, John



John le Brode, Robert Hathedbrand, Elias of Betteshanger, Thomas of Cleryvaus, Henry Toypin, Alan atte Children, Adam de Monyngham, Gilbert de Mertun, John atte Sole, John de Stourene, Elias Ornoch, Thomas Prone.

**Hundred of Bewsborough**

Peter de Clemberegh, John de Bere, William de Langdenn, Hugh de Ber, Thomas de Colkeshelle, Silvano of Westcliffe, Walter the merchant, Geoffrey Graning, Stephen of Whitfield, William Adam, [ ] of the church, Clement de Stupehelde, [ ] de [ ].  
(13 jurors).

**Hundred of Downhamford**

[?Steph]ano de la Lee, Thomas de Cotyng, T[ ] de Trykeleshale, William de Dyholte, Thomas de Forde, Eudo de la More, Walter the cook, Thomas le Geldene, Henry de Poce, William Messor, William Cleyne, John de Thekbrigg.

**Hundred of Preston**

William Atteneline, William de Heringand, Stephen de la Done, Richard Wygge, Ralph de Pype, Walter Lineche, Richard Bethered, William de Havelslond, Stephen Gemcas, William Cot, William de Done, John Stake  
(End of column one)

Whyte, William Underhelde, Robert Oldhame, Walter of Sutton, Peter Burgeys, Richard atte Grene, William the turner.

**Hundred of Ham**

Peter de la Brok, William de Capella, Alan de Pundherste, John of Bromley, Thomas le Rus, Richard le Whyte, Stephen of Snavel, Robert de la Bowe, Roger le Krode, Benedict of Hoo, Amys de la Tune, John son of Alan.

**Hundred of Newchurch**

Hamo de Grane, Robert de Tanlonde, William Andrew, William Jordan, John Hireghe, William Elys, Robert de Runte, Richard Orgraver, Walter Godard, John le Dore, William Ireland, William de Harvell.

**Half Hundred of Longport**

Stephen de Hope, Thomas Manning, Andrew the clerk. Henry Colbe, Ethelwyne Makeheyt, William Attesonde.

**Hundred of Aloesbridge**

William the cook, James Andrew, Peter Lampsin, Clement Pavy, Robert de Capella, Henry Bodyn, Hugh Wingham, Hugh Roberd [see continuation on p. 163] (End of column 2 m.16)

Symenel, Parys of Street, William the smith, Richard Myrinel, Matthew Porpe, Simon Attewyk, Simon de Rayrescotlye, John Segul, Roger atte Childe, John of Bonnington.

**Hundred of Longbridge**

Robert of Kingswood, William de Wynesleg, Daniel Sprot, William Poymanut, William de Aqua, John de Fonte, John of the mill, Robert de Wymde, Stephen Pund, Richard Punthe, Michael de Bertun, Alan de Wynde.

**Hundred of Calehill**

Sir William Juvenis knight, Ralph of Sturry, Roger of Pette, Walter of Eversley, John de Porta, Nicholas de Solelurdenn, Henry de Deyhelmestunn, Walter de Deneford, Ralph de Egerindenn, Guy de Freud, Thomas de la Dethey, William de Eddesleye.

**Half Hundred of Bircholt**

Samuel de Byrcholte, Robert Gregory, Richard Gredle, William Wykere, Stephen Tayllur, Richard Edmund.  
(End of column 3 m. 16)

<p>m.16 dorso (<i>column 1</i>)  <b>Hundred of Boughton</b>  Walter de Hovene, Hamo of Nackington, William de Helesten, Hamo son of Elys de Dune, Walter de Hawe, Solomon de Jorapeldre, Gilbert de Sanuse, John de Cheldryn, Walter de Lese, Thomas Harte, Walter de Cruce, William son of Philip de Simon, John of Stokes</p>		
<p><b>Hundred of Chart</b>  John de Gadimcusi, Robert de Eynsole, Walter of Chillindenn, Simon of Ham, [ ] de Rapetun, Thomas Wygan, [ ] de Fonte, Richard de Herst, [ ] Louland, Elys de Gratehere, [ ] of Northbrook, Bartholomew de Godinton.  <b>Hundred of Tenham</b>  Adam de Wyneston, Robert le Sage, Walter of Lynsted, William de Monasterio, Philip de Bodereslond, William of Doddington, Richard de Cruce, Robert de Wyneston, William de Hencliue, Adam de Okenfaud, Adam de Wendredestun, Simon of Doddington.  <b>Hundred of Worth</b>  Richard Wareman, Colyn Sperke, Germannus le Folere, Robert Tyete, John le Rye, Thomas le Heite, John Aufrey, William le Bustre, Robert le Gull, John Raufer, John Goldwyne, William Eryflyn.  <b>Hundred of Cranbrook</b>  Stacius de Corsorn, William de Idenn, Walter de Tolueherst, Richard de Rucherst, Richard de Gucerst, Walter de Hunggeserte, Ralph de</p>	<p>m. 16 dorso (<i>column 2</i>)  <b>Half Hundred of Barnfield</b>  Adam the beadle, Geoffrey de Sharvolde, Walter de Spoule, Benedict of Bromley, Richard de Berwurg, William de Rodemundenn.  <b>Vill of Brasted</b>  Peter Halling, Thomas Russell, Adam atte Water, Richard Eclythe, Roger Saleman, Robert the carpenter, Roger the tailor, Philip son of Richard Philip, Edward Gamen, William the tanner, Ralph Gamen, Richard Stephen.  <b>Hundred of Shamwell</b>  John atte Wode, John Hakintun, Robert Arnold, Roger le Shipman of Chalke, William the smith of Estrelond, John le Halnedevel, John Godard, James de Humyberegh, Eakaryas (? Hezekiah or Zacharias) atte Park, Nicholas de Leuce, Stonyng de Hezham, William Parleben.  <b>Hundred of Larkfield</b>  Philip of Pevensey, Walter de Holeweye, Robert Byset, Richard de Reveling, Ralph de Rouweye, Ralph de Fonte, Lawrence of the mill, Roger atte Legle, Ralph de</p>	<p>m. 16 dorso (<i>column 3</i>).  <b>Hundred of Twyford</b>  Gilbert de Snodbery, William de Lodeneford, Alexander de Helthe, Gilbert Scissor, Gilbert Burgeys, Godfrey Furst, Richard Messag', John de Tutesham, Ralph the clerk of Farlee, Philip de Saltrer, John Morcok, Vyvel de Bosco.  <b>Malling</b>  Ralph Colman, John Walkelyn, Walter le Colyere, John de Seyhers, Simon de Seyhers, Robert the vintner, Roger Hoberd, William the baker, Thomas le Brot, William Edmund, William the smith, Joseph of Huntington  <b>Hundred of Tolentrough</b>  Reginald de Mildenwacr', Walter of Northwood, Richard de Lamere, Simon Gakin, Geoffrey Wynegold, Richard le cornesyr (? <i>cordwainer</i>), Alexander atte Pette, Richard le Hunte, John de Bidenerse, Ralph Lorunynghe, Robert atte Punte, John de Regg.  <b>Hundred of Littlefield</b>  (<i>probably Little &amp; Lesnes</i>)  Roger atte Hoke, Roger in le Hale, Roger the smith, Roger Magr', Adam ad Boscum, William son of</p>

<p>Semdenn, John de Lellesdenn, Amys de Byssupindenn, William the clerk, Geoffrey de Bleggindenn, Thomas de Hathereg.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Tenterden</b> John de Fresingehey, Thomas de Gatesden, Richard de Havelherst, William de la Felde, Thomas the merchant, Thomas of Sandhurst, Stephen de Fresingthey, Ralph the cook, Amisius Joce de Castrisle, Scotland de Castrisle, John Clement, Hamo Katingheld.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Lesnes</b> Osbert Goldhaugh, William Kreps, John Segod, John Poteke, Thomas le Wyne, Adam de Knowehelle, Walter le Kreps, Gilbert le Shouke, Adam Burre, Geoffrey Attebroke, Richard le Vinnur, Simon Hammund.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Blackheath</b> Elphine of Greenwich, Roger de Enburgh, Thomas Randulf, William Fraunceys, Adam atte Forest, Alexander Short, John Philip, Peter Bissele, Richard de Horne, William le Ropere, Nicholas Parlebe, John Nel.</p> <p><b>City of Rochester</b> Robert Tarceryn, William Alexander, Lawrence Vuwyne, Robert son of Hugh, William Pakeman, John Parmis Maresk ( ? John the farrier- <i>mariscallus</i>), Andrew Cundut, Luke Permentar, Robert of Strood clerk, Henry le Pultar, John son of Ivo, Adam le Pulet.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Bromley</b> John of Foxgrove, John Wymer, Gilbert of Raunesden, Ralph de</p>	<p>Perre, Lambert Russel, Ivo de Reyerse.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Somerden</b> Richard le Wulfhunte, Adam de Kynmereg, Hamo le Felag, William le Bat, Adam de Hoderegg, Solomon of the same place, Richard de Hameselle, Aylnoch de Modherst, William de Brocdenn, Gilbert de Chercote, Richard Wykyng, Philip de Wynellesty.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Westerham</b> Henry Crede, Robert de Hameshell, Ralph de Fonte, Roger Awbrey, Theobald Kene, Edmund de Casinhell, John de la Welde, Richard Walebrin, William Beneyt, Nicholas Noreys, Ralph de la Nuphuse, Roger Seluayn.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Maidstone</b> William of Stone, Thomas Wakeryld, Thomas de Barneling, Richard Muntemor, Walter Lot, Joceus Conseyl, Hugh de Helstrete, Thomas de Esthinton, Richard of Stone, Robert Page, William Silvester, John the clerk.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Codsheath</b> John Ketel, William de Sherygg, Hubert de Chevenyng, Peter of Danehill, Gilbert de Halle, John Wylde, Richard de Tumbledene, Lawrence the baker, James son of Reginald, Thomas Champeners, Hugh de Kakerherst, Alan de Chevalescombe.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Wrotham</b> Robert of Shipbourne, Robert son of Peter, Acard de Aldeham, Nicholas de Eyteham, Lerewin Sehys,</p>	<p>Geoffrey, Henry Fromond, Henry atte Helle, Nicholas Bode, William Morcok, Roger Pen, William ad Boscum.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Eyhorne</b> Hubert Wykenore, William de Port, Philip de Beregested, Roger son of Alexander, Robert de la Dane, Stephen de Erdeslese, John de Capella, James of Charlton, Daniel de Eyford, John de Foreslestun, William de Loressinge, John de Boycet son of Gerard.</p> <p><b>Hundred of Chatham and Gillingham</b> Stephen son of Thomas, Luke of Longport, Walter Blake, Walter Pase, John of Ham, Richard le Maystre, Adam of Ham, John de Lydesinge, John Holdegrave, Guy de Kyle, John de Bryslonde, Guy de Sedwyntun, Osmerus of Chatham.</p>
---	--	--

Scobleshell, Walter Hugh,  
John de Backe, Harvey  
Poce, Walter le Ker,  
William Kecler, Edgar de  
Blakbrok, William le Hanek,  
Peter de Poctun.

**Hundred of Axtane**

John de Chimbeharn, Hugh  
Fraunceys, Ralph de Esse,  
Roger of Wested, Gilbert le  
Pel, John de Deshey, Martin  
de Hydelheye, John Leonars,  
John del Hacche, Roger of  
Southwood, Peter Erombert,  
John de la Roce.

**Hundred of Ruxley**

John of Upton, Simon de la  
Hole, Sir Nicholas Pessun,  
William de Grey, Geoffrey  
del Hawett, Bartholomew of  
Longfield, Richard Godmed,  
Walter Golewyn, Geoffrey  
de Bruer, Herald Stodland,  
Roger del Brok, Robert de  
Oledesbeye, William le  
Fevere. (13 jurors).

*End of column 1 m.16 dorso*

Robert le Kyng, William  
Gilbert, Nicholas de  
Wynfeld, John Cassell,  
William atte Sethe, Henry  
the baker, John Scyward.

**Hundred of Hoo**

Solomon of Hoo, William de  
Aula, John of Delham,  
Robert de Wodefled,  
William Moyses, Hugh de  
Bewis, Roger de Gren,  
William of the marsh, Philip  
of the church, Stephen son  
of Robert Alayn, William of  
the marsh, William Pade.

**Vill of Dartford**

Robert Munce, John de  
Ponte, William son of  
Thomas de Wilburton,  
William son of William de  
Wilburton, Adam Belle,  
Roger son of William of  
Ramsden, John son of John,  
Maurice Warin, Matthew de  
Stonham, Robert Funtayne,  
Adam son of Isaac de  
Catemere, William de  
Fuleswych, William de  
Bocleswite.

**Hundred of Littlefield**

Philip Squinner, John le Erb,  
Germannus Randulf, John de  
Cruce, Robert Payn, John  
Matthew, Walter le Mayster,  
John the clerk of Erde, John  
Lewyne, John le Kyng,  
Godfrey of Hoo, Adam in  
Camera.

*End of column 2 m.16 dorso.*