

NOTES AND QUERIES.

CONTENTS.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The Chaucer MS. at Petworth House. | 6. Roman Pottery in Sutton Church. |
| 2. Ashdown Forest and Boxgrove Priory. | 7. Rottingdean. |
| 3. Poynings. | 8. Priory of St. Martin in the Wood. |
| 4. Gold found at Mountfield. | 9. Tradesman's Token, Steyning. |
| 5. Gold Bracelets found at Eastbourne. | 10. A Feast, A.D. 1500. |
-

1.—*The Chaucer MS. at Petworth House.*

In the brief notice of this beautiful manuscript which I introduced into my paper on Petworth (see pp. 12 and 13 of the preceding volume), I stated that it was executed for Henry Percy, the third Earl of Northumberland, who is well known to have espoused the cause of the Earl of Lancaster in the dispute of this House with that of York, and to have been slain in the battle of Towton, in 1461. Since the issue of that volume I have been informed that this was not the case, but that the manuscript was written and illuminated for his son, Henry Percy, the fourth Earl, who was murdered, with several of his household, at his residence, Cocksedge, near Thirsk, Yorkshire, the 4th of Henry VII. (1489), by the populace, after a forceable entry into his house in the night-time, for refusing to submit quietly to the payment of a tax unjustly imposed upon him by that overbearing and avaricious monarch. That it was executed for this Earl is, I am told, clearly shown by the coat of arms, which I have represented as emblazoned on the last page of this manuscript, and which is similar to the arms on his garter plate, he having been installed a K. G. in 1471, an honour which his father, the third Earl, never enjoyed; and that the quarterings are those of Poynings, Fitzpayne, and Bryan, the mother of the fourth Earl having been the daughter and heir of Richard Baron Poynings, and Baroness Poynings, Fitzpayne, and Bryan, in right of her grandfather, Robert, in whose lifetime her father died. I am indebted to W. D. Cooper, Esq., for a knowledge of these important facts, not being sufficiently acquainted with the details of heraldry to have discovered them myself.

I will avail myself of this opportunity of rectifying another inaccuracy into which, in the preparation of the same paper, I inadvertently fell. In speaking at p. 4, of Elizabeth, the daughter of Joceline, the eleventh and last Earl of Northumberland, becoming, at her father's death, Baroness Percy, in default of heirs male, I have called her "the elder of his two daughters," from which it will very naturally be inferred that two daughters were then living, which was the impression on my mind at the time. I have, however, since ascertained that this impression was erroneous. For

though Joceline had three children, a son and two daughters, Henry, the son and second child, died before he had completed his second year; and Henrietta, the third, in her infancy. At the time, then, of her father's death, Elizabeth was his only surviving child, and should have been so described; and at p. 9, l. 6, where I allude to her marriage with the Duke of Somerset, she should have been called "his (Joceline's) sole heir," instead of his "sole child."

ROGER TURNER, M.D.

2.—*Ashdown Forest and Boxgrove Priory.*

I avail myself of this early opportunity to rectify an important error which appears in my account of this Forest, in the preceding volume of our Sussex Archæological Collections. It occurs in the date of the Shrievalty of John Payne, of Legge's heath, Eastgrinstead (see pp. 44 and 45), one or more of whose ancestors held the office of Ranger of this Forest. I have there said that the Legge's heath Squire was Sheriff of Sussex in 1768, having been misled by the fact that no other sheriff of this name appears in the Roll of County Sheriffs, as it is given by Horsfield in his History of Sussex. I have, however, since been informed that the John Paine who was Sheriff of Sussex in that year was of a different family from the John Payne to whom I have alluded, the one family spelling their names with an i, and the other with a y. The Sheriff of 1768 was John Paine, Esqre., of Falmer, who died of the small-pox during his year of office, and his son finished for him the remaining portion of time he had to serve. Col. Paine, of Patcham Place, is his grandson. The Sheriff to whom my anecdote is intended to apply was appointed to the office four years earlier, and will be found in Horsfield's Roll, under the date 1764, as "John Pay," the two last letters of his surname, "ne," being omitted. For 1768 then read 1764, and for "John Pay" read "John Payne," and the mistake into which I was inadvertently led, and which has been the means of bringing some discredit on my statements, will, I trust, be satisfactorily rectified.

I must also here rectify another very material error of which I have been guilty in my account of the Priory and Church of Boxgrove, given in the present volume, and which, unfortunately, I did not discover until the printing of my paper was completed. In referring (p. 106) to a history of the same Priory and Church read before the Archæological Institute, at the annual meeting of its members and their friends, held at Chichester, in 1853, to which the Revd. W. Turner, the then Rector of Boxgrove, contributed some historical remarks and conjectures, and which history has since been published by Mr. Mason, of Chichester, I have attributed it to Mr. Sharpe, instead of to Mr. Petit, to whom I now find it properly belongs. I have then to request that for Mr. Sharpe's name, wherever I have introduced it, in referring to that history, the reader will kindly substitute that of the Revd. J. L. Petit.

Since Mr. Petit's history was written no farther discoveries have been made, tending to throw more light on its interesting subjects.

EDWARD TURNER.

3.—*Poynings.*

Since my paper in this volume has been printed I have caused the fragment of old walling in the churchyard, mentioned at page 47 as part of the supposed remains of the former church, to be uncovered, and additional excavations to be carried on as far as was practicable without disturbing graves. It was met with again about a foot beneath the surface, measuring 2ft. in thickness; and was found to extend 17ft. north and south, with corresponding returns, 12ft. in length, running up to the base of the western wall of the south transept, but intermittent in some places, where probably it had been broken through in grave digging. In the intermediate space, a foot deeper, and a foot below the level of the pavement of the present church, appeared portions of smooth, white mortar, or plaster, as if of the bed in which the flooring of encaustic tiles had been laid, nearly a dozen more of which, mostly broken, were turned up. Two large pieces of sandstone, slightly chiseled, lay along the top of the west wall, fixed in mortar, bearing resemblance to part of the sill of a doorway. These were removed, and have been preserved above ground. More than a wagon-load of loose flints, to many of which adhered mortar full of sea-shingle, were taken out, and the walling itself, left intact, was covered over as before.

The only bar to the confirmation *hereby* of the conjecture that the exterior of the east side of the south transept may be a relic of the former church, seems to be the difference in the breadth of the rough-cast thereupon compared with the extent of the recently-exposed foundations in the same direction; the former reaching 20ft., the latter only 17ft. Yet it is clear that this could not have been a compartment abutting upon the *present* church, inasmuch as, besides being incongruous with the symmetrical uniformity of the whole structure, it would have interfered with the west window of the transept, and there would have been an useless and unseemly slip of open ground between it and the wall of the nave, 12ft. by only 2ft. The walls of the present church, be it likewise observed, are 3ft. thick, excepting those of the porch, which are but 1ft. 9in.

The Revd. J. L. Petit, to whom I have communicated the result of this search, is of opinion that these are the remains of the older church, which must have been almost entirely destroyed before the erection of the existing one; and that it having probably been constructed on a much smaller scale, did not require a greater thickness of wall than two feet.

By admeasurements since, likewise, obtained, it appears that the *dimensions* of the otherwise similar windows at West Tarring, Alfriston, and Poynings are nearly the same. Those of the latter, taken outside the church, including stonework, are, in round numbers:—

	ft.	ft.
East end window	21	by 13
The other end windows.....	15	„ 9
Side windows	11	„ 6

I find that in my description of the great chancel window, p. 42, I omitted to state, as the strongest argument for the present being the original tracery complete, that whereas the keystones of the archlets over

the lower lights next adjoining are portions of, and form bases to, the perpendicular mullions springing from them, those of the two outer ones, in question, are quite smooth at the top, and without any indication of mullions having been broken off.

Moreover, as the figures on the engraved ground plan, p. 33, are not very full or distinct, I will add that the interior area of this church measures, roundly, 90ft. by 70ft. (through the transepts), and 22ft. across in chancel, nave, and transepts.

Alfriston church, I am informed by the intelligent and obliging parish clerk there, Mr. Richardson (who has kindly furnished me with the dimensions of its chief parts and objects taken by himself,) measures, in the same way, altogether, 117ft. by 70ft. Its proportions, therefore, although they have sometimes been described as representing the Greek cross, are not so near thereto as Poynings'. Indeed, the *approximation* here was, I apprehend, not a matter of design, but of necessity, in consequence of the restricted limits of the site before remarked, especially at the western end, where, until 20 years ago, the soil of the churchyard sunk steeply from the door down to the bottom of the fence-wall, leaving merely a narrow ledge at the top of the bank upon which two persons could not walk abreast. This void was then filled up with earth taken from the south-west corner of the church, where was a mound some feet high above the general level, caused probably by the debris of the older building, immediately over whose yet remaining foundations it lay. It is gratifying to find the opinions of that eminent ecclesiologist, Mr. Petit, expressed in the *Archæological Journal* for July, 1849, in which he gives a brief account of this church (and which I have only just met with,) coinciding with mine respecting the probable later date of the porch, the cause of the peculiar shape of the church, &c.; and that he has supplied a beautiful pictorial illustration of the similarity of the altar windows at Alfriston, West Tarring, and Poynings. I should, however, acknowledge that Mr. Petit is one of the many who consider the Poynings tracery at the points in question, as now existing, imperfect.

Regarding the *Manor Place*, too, I might have mentioned that on the south side of the road forming its southern boundary there was until a few years ago, when it was levelled for farming purposes, a low mound containing bricks and flints, which more than once attracted the attention of that zealous antiquary, the late Revd. James Douglas, sometime Curate of Preston, and which is traditionally reported to have marked the position of a summer-house of olden times. Nor is it unworthy of observation that the hedges adjacent to the spot, and for a considerable distance therefrom, abound with Sycamore trees; descendants, probably, of plants imported from Eastern climes at an early date, by the lords of the demesne, as of a rare exotic, appreciated the more on account of the Scriptural incident in which its ancestral congener bore a humble part. For, as is shown in that delightful book by a Sussex man, "*Sylva Florifera*" (1823), the sycamore cannot have been a native of this country. In proof of this, Mr. Phillips cites the famous botanists, Gerarde, Parkinson, and Evelyn; their testimony extending from 1597 to 1640. The first of these affirms—"The great maple is a stranger in England, only it groweth in the walks and places of pleasure of noblemen, where it especially is planted for the

shadowe's sake, and under the name of sycomore tree." Chaucer is likewise quoted therein as writing in the 14th century:—

" The hegge also, that yeden in compas,
And closed in allè the grene herber,
With sycomor was set, and eglatere," &c.

In conclusion, I beg leave to avail myself of this opportunity to rectify some inaccuracies in my paper, whether caused by author or printer, which unexplained might tend to obscure the sense:—viz., page 3, after "Punnings" the word *Latinised* should be added. 7, second paragraph, first line, the date should be 1369 only, and the round bracket after "Moleyns" ought to come after "year," in the next line. 10, the square bracket in the middle of the page ought to have been omitted. 23, for "having," &c., substitute "*A transcript having been procured.*" 26, the sentence in the margin, "The Earl is here termed," &c., is misplaced, but were better omitted altogether. 29, the paragraph on a "county rate," of 1649, should have been inserted in the *secular* division of the parochial history, *ante*. 39, 5th line, after "alme" dele "de," and, in note, after "contradistinction," for "of" read *to*. 44, near the bottom, after "picture," insert a square bracket. 55 middle of page, end of line, after "such" there should be a full stop.

The few errors in the Latin charters, pp. 20 and 21, and in the French will, p. 23, and the many, (perhaps,) in the "Literæ Testimoniales," pp. 26—28, will mostly be obvious to scholars; although neither accuracy of transcript, nor minute correction of the press, was quite practicable, owing to the indistinctness and abbreviations of the antient deeds, whence the copies used were taken, and the (to elderly eyes) dazzling smallness of the type in which these documents are printed.

T. A. HOLLAND.

4.—*Gold found at Mountfield.*

This most extraordinary find, which must be looked upon as the great Archæological event of the present year, was made on the 12th of January last, while ploughing the Barnfield belonging to the Taylor farm, Mountfield. At a distance of about 30 feet from the hedge the ploughshare became suddenly entangled in a piece of bright metal, so as to impede the progress of the plough. This the ploughman removed, and upon looking back to see from whence it came, he discovered a hole which the plough had gone through, measuring four or five inches across the top, and about twelve inches in depth, in which, upon examination, he found a considerable quantity more of the same metal. It consisted of several articles, some of which were of a circular, others of a semicircular shape, the semicircular pieces being finished off at their ends like a trumpet. Of these the piece found adhering to the ploughshare was much the largest. When interred they had evidently been placed in a box, or some other receptacle of wood, which had totally gone to decay; the earth about the hole in which they were lying, being of a much darker colour than that of the field generally. Unfortunately none of this blackened earth was saved. Indeed, when I

visited the spot with Mr. T. Ross, the late Mayor of Hastings, the hole had been completely dug out, and the soil scattered about by parties trying to find more treasure. Of the nature or value of the articles thus accidentally brought to light the ploughman had not the slightest notion; he, therefore, took them home to his master, who, supposing them to be brass, gave them to him, and he kept them in his master's stable ten or twelve days, before he took any steps for disposing of them; and when he made the attempt to sell them he had some difficulty in meeting with a purchaser, no one caring to buy them. After, however, several unsuccessful endeavours, into the details of which I need not enter, he at last disposed of them to a Hastings man, who had a suspicion that the metal was gold, at the price of old brass, viz., 6d. per pound, the metal weighing eleven pounds. The purchaser's suspicions having been confirmed, he lost no time in taking what he had thus purchased, together with some other pieces which he had himself dug up, to a gold refiner's, in London, who bought them of him for £529 12s. 7d., the weight of the gold after being melted down being 153ozs. 12grns. As a piece had been previously sold to a Hastings jeweller for £18, the whole sum realized by this treasure trove was £547 12s. 7d. The weight of the whole quantity of gold found upon this occasion (for two or three pieces subsequently found were not consigned to the refiner's crucible) was estimated at twelve or thirteen pounds, and its worth at £650.

The Lord of the Manor, who was the first claimant, having failed in establishing his right to this gold as treasure trove, a claim to it was set up by the Crown, and the Treasury Solicitor sent down to substantiate it. But in order to do this it was necessary to prove to the satisfaction of a jury, that it was actually treasure trove—that is, the finding of a treasure, be it gold or silver, which has been concealed beneath the surface of the soil for time long since gone by. Under the authority of a Statute then, as old as the 4th of Edward I., an inquisition was held by the Coroner of Hastings Rape, the result of which was a decision in favour of the prerogative of the Crown. But, unhappily for the cause of Archæology, while the different proceedings taken by the claimants were pending, the greater part of the gold thus found had been disposed of in a way that left no hopes of its recovery. The inquest, however, was useful to the Archæologist in this important respect, that from the evidence given upon it, we are able to form a tolerably accurate judgment of what the different articles which gave rise to it consisted; it left no doubt that they were partly Celtic, or ancient British ring money, and partly ornaments, with which the inhabitants of this country were accustomed to adorn themselves, two centuries or more before the Norman invasion. The principal article disinterred, viz., that which was found adhering to the ploughshare is described as a large curved ornament having its extremities trumpet shaped, and as constructed of three pieces of flattened gold placed together, and then twisted so as to give it a grooved appearance. The length of this piece was stated to be about three feet. Upon it when found were several rings of gold, varying in size, and formed, some of them, in the same twisted manner, while others were solid. In the same hole with these were several broken pieces of other rings, and one or two rounded lumps of gold, having the appearance of nuggets, but which were pronounced by those that saw them to have been submitted to the process

of smelting. Considering that this treasure must have been in the earth 2,000 years, it was in a good state; much of the gold still retaining its original brightness. There are in the British Museum some ornaments found in Wales very similar to these discovered in Mountfield, and drawings of others found at different times in different parts of the kingdom. These are considered to have ornamented the breastplate, or some other article of personal protection, worn by the ancient Celtic Chiefs in their wars.

It is manifest then, that there was a value attached to this treasure trove far exceeding its intrinsic worth, and it is much to be regretted that so little of it should have been saved from the melting pot; particularly as the finder, or purchaser, in this case, had he pursued the right course, might have profited as much as he did, and the treasure itself have become a valuable addition to the National Collection of Antiquities deposited in the British Museum. As a means then of saving from destruction any treasure that may hereafter be discovered, in this or any other county, the Treasury Solicitor's representation of the case, made at the commencement of the inquest, cannot be too generally known—viz., that the Crown is not in the habit of seizing such treasure as this, and applying it to its own use, without any notice being taken of, or any consideration given to the finders, but that it deals most liberally and generously in such cases with all parties concerned, making ample compensation to them; so that had the man who, in the Mountfield case, was brought forward as the concealer of the treasure found, instead of disposing of it in the way he did, gone and given information in the right quarter, either through the instrumentality of the clergyman of, or some other influential and intelligent resident in the parish, as he was bound to have done, his case would have been considered, and the value of the gold, which in this instance amounted to a very considerable sum, probably have been given to him. In all such cases, as the Coroner very justly remarked, in summing up the evidence to the jury, as in every other transaction of life, "honesty will be found in the end to be the best policy."

The case was tried at the Summer Assizes at Lewes, on Wednesday, the 22nd of July, before Baron Bramwell, the prosecution being conducted on the part of the Crown; the learned judge, in his summing up, remarking on the rarity of the case, and explaining to the jury that the real question before them was whether this treasure had been buried, and if so, whether the prisoners concealed it, knowing it to be gold, and dealing with it to their own advantage. The jury at once returned a verdict of guilty against the parties who had bought the gold from the finder. Notice of appeal was lodged in consequence of some technical error, and the case stands over to be argued next Hilary term in London. The prisoners were bailed out for £600.

B. H. COMBE.

5.—*Gold Bracelets found at Eastbourne.*

At page 127 of the preceding volume Mr. Chambers, in his *History of Eastbourne*, has briefly alluded, among the Archæological incidents of that place, to the accidental discovery, in 1805, of four ancient gold bracelets; and he concludes his account of this discovery by stating that he had been

unable to ascertain what eventually became of them. I have much pleasure, then, in laying before the readers of the present volume some interesting particulars connected with the finding and subsequent disposal of these valuable relics of antiquity; by which it will be seen, that, falling into the hands of an intelligent tradesman, they happily escaped the fate which, it is much to be deplored, awaited the very valuable Celtic gold ornaments lately found in a field on the Taylor farm, at Mountfield, by which they have become lost to the Archæological world. These particulars were kindly communicated to me by the daughter of Mr. Holt, who was settled at the time as a watchmaker at Eastbourne, but afterwards migrated to Petworth, and who, it will be seen by his daughter's letter, purchased the bracelets of the man who found them, and instead of melting them down was the means of their being placed in the British Museum, where they now are. No apology, I feel, need be made for bringing Miss Holt's statement under the notice of our society, which I shall do, as far as I am able, in her own words, first observing that Mr. Holt died at Petworth about seventeen years ago, and that his daughter is still resident here.

After confirming Mr. Chambers' account of the time and mode of these bracelets being brought to light, after many centuries, Miss Holt goes on to say that "they were picked up by a man who, though he had but one eye, was nevertheless noted for his tact in finding lost property. His real name I forget, but I have a perfect recollection of his being known by the nickname of Jumper Hutches. He first found one bracelet only, which he brought to my father, who gave him three pounds for it, which so astonished him that he exclaimed, 'Why, Mr. Holt, surely you are mad!' My father replied, 'Oh, no, Jumper, go and search well, and you will doubtless find more.' He did so, and found two more, which he also brought to my father, who purchased them of him. Mr. Chambers says that three more were found, but my impression is that this man only found two the second time of his search; the fourth, however, might have been obtained subsequently. Sir Joseph Banks, hearing of this discovery, wrote to my father about it, and through his instrumentality my father exhibited them to the Society of Antiquaries in London,¹ together with an arrow head, and three celts of brass found with the bracelets; after which Sir Joseph became the purchaser of the bracelets, giving my father, I think, thirty pounds for them, and they have been placed in the British Museum, where I myself saw them some thirty years ago. This happened in 1807, so that they were two years in my father's possession before he sold them. What became of the brazen arrow head and Celts I know not. Possibly they, too, might have been placed in the British Museum. Sir Joseph's autograph letter to him on the subject of this find my father kept, and greatly valued; but unfortunately since his death we have either lost it or given it away."

Miss Holt concludes her letter by relating another anecdote of her father

¹ The bracelets were exhibited 19th March, 1807 (Arch. Vol. 16, p. 363, plate 68), together with three celts (palstaves), two socketed celts, a sword (not an arrow) head, and three lumps of pure copper, showing that they must have

been lost or hid by some native maker of bronze implements. They went to the British Museum from Mr. R. Payne Knight's Collection, *circa* 1835. W. D. C., Ex inf. A. W. Franks, Esq., Dir. Soc. Ant.

connected with the business which he followed during the time he was resident at Eastbourne, which I shall also give in Miss Holt's own words, feeling that this anecdote cannot fail to be interesting to the *Sussex Archæologist*.

"I must," she says, "also state that my father, during his residence at Eastbourne, became possessed of an ancient small silver coin in a very curious manner. My mother, who, like a good wife, was brushing his Sunday coat for him, previous to its being put away, with the rest of his Sunday habiliments, on Monday morning, found, snugly hid, at the bottom of one of the pockets, what she at first took to be a sixpence, though it was, she thought, somewhat smaller. She, therefore, took it to my father, who was at first puzzled with it; having some very good books on coins, he consulted them, and after much investigation and trouble, found it to be a Saxon coin, struck for Quindred, Queen of Offa, the King of Mercia, A.D. 758. This coin Sir Joseph Banks also purchased of my father, giving him six pounds for it. The only way in which my father could at all account for the possession of this coin was by its being accidentally taken by him, and placed in his pocket, with other old silver money of the realm, a new coinage having taken place about that time, and he being employed to collect the old, which had been withdrawn, in and about Eastbourne.

"All this, I must tell you, happened before I was born; but I can vouch for the accuracy in both instances of the particulars which I send you, having often heard them narrated by my parents."

The weight of each of these four bracelets, is as follows:—the heaviest of them weighed 3ozs. 1dwt.; the next, 1oz. 10dwts.; the third 18dwts. 3grs.; and the fourth, 16dwts. 4grs. They are supposed to have been ancient British ornaments.

ROGER TURNER, M.D.

Petworth, May, 1863.

6.—*Roman Pottery in Sutton Church.*

In the course of the last year some repairs became necessary to be done to the foundation walls of the chancel of this interesting conventual church, for the purpose of effecting which the workmen employed were compelled to remove the earth in order to obtain a view of them, and in doing so they came down to a hole withinside, at no great distance from the flooring, in which, upon examination, they discovered several broken pieces of pottery, of a dark colour, and of a thin, hard texture, very similar to the specimen of a small sepulchral urn found somewhere in the neighbourhood of Pulborough—I believe at Hardham—many years ago, and up to the time of his death, in the possession of that active and intelligent geologist and antiquary, the late Mr. Martin. These fragments, after they had been inspected by those who were present at the time they were found, were replaced in the hole from whence they were taken, and again covered up. It is to be regretted that the investigation was not carried far enough to ascertain whether there were any ashes and pieces of charred wood and bone in or about the place of this deposit, as was the case with the sepulchral urns found in lowering the earth within the area of the tower of Blatchington Church in 1860, a short account of which is given by the Incumbent in vol. xiii., p. 309, note 9, of our *Sussex Archæological Collections*; for had it

been so, there would doubtless have been found this additional evidence of an ancient Roman interment. Still that the Sutton pottery was Roman, does not, even in the absence of this confirmatory testimony, admit of any doubt. Both the churches of Sutton and Blatchington must have been built upon sites previously occupied by the ancient Britons or Romans as burying places. This is somewhat remarkable, but less so perhaps in the case of Sutton than of Blatchington; for the parish of Sutton adjoins that of Bignor, and the churches of both parishes are close to the old Roman via called Stane Street, connecting Regnum (Chichester) with London; an interesting account of which, with its diverging vicinal ways, by the same Mr. Martin, is given in vol. xii., pp. 127 to 148. During the many years he passed as a Medical Practitioner at Pulborough, he made its history, and the evidences of the direction it took from the Southdowns to Hardham, a distance of about five or six miles, as they were occasionally brought to light, his particular investigation and study. Nothing escaped his notice that could in any way be brought to bear on this important subject, and the result was the memoir to which I have just alluded, together with the illustrative map which accompanies it, in which the line of this Roman via is very accurately pointed out. So rich in Roman remains is this immediate neighbourhood, that Roman bricks and tiles, sometimes whole, at other times in a broken state, are to be found built into the walls of some of our churches. This is particularly the case with the interesting little church of Hardham. This church being also on the same via, and near to a Roman station, such bricks and pieces of paving and other tiles might have been, at the time it was erected, more easily attainable as a building material than any other, and consequently have been adopted by the builder, so far as he could make them available.

Sutton Church, which is supposed to have been originally built and endowed by the Prior and Convent of Lewes, in whose patronage it was from about the middle of the twelfth century to the period of its dissolution, and to have had a residence near to it capable of accommodating three or four monks, still retains much of its pristine beauty. The Abbey of Robertsbridge, too, possessed in 1221 two knights' fees in Sutton, the gift of Henry III., to whom they had been forfeited. See the Patent Rolls, of the date of the fifth of this king's reign.

THOS. R. TURNER.

7.—*Rottingdean.*

A very interesting Archæological discovery was made in this parish early in the present year. In order to effect some improvements in the cricket-ground, which is situated on an eminence generally known by the name of the Beacon Hill, it became necessary to remove a long tumulus, or hillock, of which many are to be found on the South, sometimes single, at other times in groups, and which were constructed to mark the site either of Roman or Ancient British interments. While engaged in doing so, the workmen employed opened a grave towards the mound, of an oval shape, in which were skeletons of four adults, lying with their heads towards the north. To the south of this grave, and at no great distance

from it, a small sun-baked sepulchral urn was found, which, judging from its capacity, might have contained the bones of a child. In other parts of this tumulus, the circumference of which was quite thirty yards, traces of other skeletons, and fragments of other urns of a similar texture and type, but of a much larger size, were met with. Four more graves of an oval form were exposed in the progress of the work; in these, however, nothing was found except a few small pieces of bone. No warlike weapons, or personal ornaments of any kind appear to have been interred with the bodies. The perfect urn, as well as such portions of the broken ones as were deemed worthy of preservation, were carefully collected, and have been presented by the Revd. Arthur Thomas, the Incumbent of the parish, to this Society's Museum.

The varied contents of this tumulus make it difficult to determine to what particular period it belongs. Douglas divides them into orders which he calls the higher and the lower; each being to be satisfactorily distinguished by its own peculiar indicia. In the higher or more ancient order are found, he tells us, urns plain and friable in their composition, and generally containing human bones, which have passed through an ardent fire; the lower, or less ancient, the body or bodies inhumated entire. Here, then, we have a tumulus partaking of the nature of both. And of such Douglas speaks as having met with in the course of his extensive barrow investigations; which led him to the conclusion, that "the barrows of the lower order are not unusually found on the sites of the higher and more ancient barrows." The urn taken from the Beacon Hill tumulus was pronounced by those who saw it to be "clearly of Celtic or Ancient British type." The Barrow then to which this, and the urns of which fragments only were found, must have originally belonged, was doubtless of the higher order; but adopted at a later period for the interment of the uncremated bodies there discovered; and hence the bones as well as the whole and fragmentary which it contained. How it was then that this tumulus escaped the keen eye of the author of *Nænia Britannica* it would now be difficult to discover; for it doubtless had not been opened until February last. And yet he tells us, that while resident at Preston, he "opened a group of between twenty and thirty at Saltdean above Rotten or Rattendean." The lowness of the Beacon Hill barrow led, perhaps, to its escaping his notice.

A few days after the discovery which the removal of this tumulus brought about,—and which may be considered one of the most important that has taken place of late years among the barrow of the South Downs,—Messrs. Lower, Figg, and J Cooper, with some other members of the Sussex Archæological Society, visited the spot, partly to see what already had been done, and partly for the purpose of prosecuting such further researches as they might then and there deem advisable. The visit however led to no profitable results. The barrow had been too thoroughly opened and investigated, for additional relics of any importance to be discovered.

It is worthy of note that the views to be obtained from the site of this ancient cemetery are very extensive. It not only commands a view of the town and bay of Brighton, but also of a long line of coast westward, extending uninterruptedly many miles. And hence arose the circumstance

from which it derived its present name. It was called the Beacon Hill, from its having been selected as one of the heights along the Sussex coast well fitted for a beacon. On these eminences huge piles of wood and other combustible substances were erected, for the purpose of being lighted as signals in case of any attempt at invasion. In the construction of each of these beacons many hundreds of fagots were used.

E. TURNER.

8.—*Priory of St. Martin in the Wood.*

Can any of the members of our Sussex Archæological Society, or their friends, give me any information as to what Priory is alluded to under this title, and where it was situated?—I find it mentioned in a deed given by Thorpe at page 22 of his Battle Abbey Records, and entitled—"a deed of gift from Henry, the Prior, and the Monks of St. Martin in the Wood, to the Abbot and Convent of St. Martin's, Battle." This gift, the deed goes on to tell us, was made to enable them to construct a Water-gang, of the width of sixteen feet, through the middle of the marsh of the manor of Hoo, for the purpose of carrying off into the sea the surplus water, which by flowing back upon it doubtless, damaged their marsh land. The names of several witnesses are attached to this deed, one of which is Gilbert Barrier, who is described as being at the time Sheriff of Sussex, (tunc Vic: Sussexiæ). Now by a reference to the Sheriff's Roll of this County we find that this Gilbert was Sheriff for Sussex and Surrey, by himself in the 3rd of Henry III. (1219); and in conjunction with Matthew Fitzherbert in the 13th, 15th, and 17th of John; and the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th Henry III.; which furnishes us with a clue to the date of this transaction. In the Sheriff's Roll he is called in 1219 Gilbertus Barrarius; at other times Gilbert de Barrier. Could the Abbey of Robertsbridge, which was founded by Alured St. Martin, ever have been called by this name of St. Martin's in the Wood? I have looked in vain into Mr. G. M. Cooper's history of this Religious House for some mention of its having been so designated. This House too has always been described as an Abbey, while St. Martin's in the Wood is called a Priory. That the Town of Battle dates its origin from the erection of the Abbey, admits, I think, of but little doubt. There are however some who maintain, that there was a town there previous to this, and that it was called "St. Mary's in the Wood." See Sir William Burrell's Manuscript Collections for Sussex. Addit: MS. Brit. Mus., 5679, p. 67. This however is certainly a mistake. I fully concur with Mr. M. A. Lower in the opinion which he has expressed in his Chronicle of Battle Abbey, that at the time the event took place from which it derived its name, the whole of the Battle district was still unreclaimed Forest.

Unable then to identify this Priory myself, or to obtain any clue to its locality, I shall be obliged for any information any one possessing a knowledge of its history will be kind enough to impart to me. I take for granted that Thorpe is correct in his designation of this Priory.

EDWD. TURNER.

9.—*Tradesman's Token, 17th Century.*

*Henry
Barnes.*

*Rev. M. Stening, 1667. B.
H. A.*

W. FIGG.

10.—*A Feast Temp. Hen. VII. (1500.)*

Upon the point that nothing of importance could be well done without a dinner our forefathers had very much the same ideas as the present generation. In the White Book of the Cinque Ports, 14th Henry 7th (1499), appears the entry of an order for a "Cheste sufficiente to be made with 3 keys to that same belongyng for Suer Garde and Custode of the Charters laste by our Soverayne Lorde the Kynge graunted and afermed;" and at the next Brotherhood, St. Margaret's day, 1500, we find the following record of the feast:—"At this present Brotheryeld was adjudged expensis and costs of Maist: Leiftenant with dyverse of the Mairs Baileiffs and jurats wth hym ther being at Dynner. First for Hastings, 6s. 8d. For Wynchelsey, 6s. 8d. For Rie, 6s. 8d. For Romney, 6s. 8d. For Hithe, 6s. 8d. For Dover and Faversham, 6s. 8d. For Sandwiche, 6s. 8d. Sum total, 46s. 8d. Whereof paid in dyverse pcell of expensis as hereaft: followith.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
First for Bredd	...	0 14	Item for Salte and Otemele	...	0 3
Item for Ale	...	3 6	Item for the Torner of Spitts	...	0 4
Item for Clarett Wyne	...	2 8	Item for 7 Pasties of Moton	...	0 7
Item for White Wyne	...	2 4	Item for Horsemete	...	2 4
Item for Befe	...	0 6	Item for the Coks labor	...	3 4
Item for Moton and Lambe	...	0 16	Item for 3 qrts. of Wyne after Dynner	...	0 6
Item for 4 Pyggs	...	0 20	Item for the making of the cofre for the Custodie of the Charters	...	10 0
Item for 4 Gese	...	0 20	Item in reward to the Chamberlayne and Hastyng and Sandewich, to do all things ordeyned	...	0 8
Item for 6 Caponys	...	6 0			
Item for 6 Copill of Conyes	...	2 0			
Item for Spices	...	0 6			
Item in Flowr	...	0 6			
Item for Wood	...	0 12			
Sum total, 43s. 4d."					

The total sum is really 42s. 10d. I presume the odd 6d. was given to the Clerks of the House, which was not unusual, "for ther paynes;" and thus was the Charter of Henry 7th to the Cinque Ports, duly deposited in its place of safe custody.

THOMAS ROSS.