

THE MANOR OF EASTBOURNE,

ITS EARLY HISTORY; WITH SOME NOTES ABOUT THE
HONOURS OF MORTAIN AND AQUILA.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM HUDSON, F.S.A.

BESIDES the principal Manor of Borne (Eastbourne) Domesday Book mentions some portions of other lordships as being included in the "vill" or district so called. The same is the case in later documents. But the identification of these minor manors at successive periods, even when they had assumed permanent names, is so obscure that in this Paper I have not attempted to enter into any systematic investigation of their history. I have confined myself to mentioning them as they occur in conjunction with the great manor.

On the other hand, the principal manor was so mixed up, especially in its early days, with the great lordships of its neighbourhood that it seems desirable, in tracing its early history, to take note of any groups of associated manors with which from time to time it came in contact.

I.—*In the time of King Edward the Confessor.*

Our earliest notice shows us that in the time of King Edward¹ the manor was in the possession of the King and held by him in his own hands. It was rated at 46 hides and rendered to the King the obligation known as "firma unius noctis." The rest of the description, though no doubt true of the time of King Edward, refers more strictly to the date of making the survey in 1086, and may therefore be left till we speak of that time.

¹ Domesday Book, 20b (Sussex D.B., Xa).

But we will notice its hidage of 46 hides. This at once indicates that it was, or had been, among the larger and most important estates in the county. In particular, it stands in remarkable juxtaposition with nine other manors lying in this part of Sussex. Taking them, not as they occur in Domesday, but in their geographical order, starting from the east, they are these: Borne, rated at 46 hides, Willendone² at 50, Alsistone³ at 50, Ferle⁴ at 48, Beddingham⁵ at 52, and beyond Lewes, Dicelinges⁶ (Ditchling) at 46 and Piceham⁶ (Patcham) at 60. Then up the River Ouse, on its west bank, are three: Ramelle⁶ (Rodmell) rated at 79 hides, Niworde⁶ (said to be Iford) at $77\frac{1}{2}$ and Mellinges⁷ (South Malling) at 80.

We see at once that we have here a series of five similarly situated estates stretching in an almost continuous line from Eastbourne to Lewes, all consisting of arable lands at the foot of the Downs and backed by extensive tracts of pasture. To these we may add the entirely analogous manor of Ditchling a little further on, and we observe that the difference in the rating of the whole series of six is only between 46 and 52 hides. Patcham, also on the Downs, is rated at the rather higher figure of 60 hides. Then we have the three on the banks of the Ouse, all having arable land and the river and backed by the Downs (for Mellinges included the large isolated hill which culminates in Mount Caburn). All three are assessed at between $77\frac{1}{2}$ and 80 hides. We can hardly doubt that there had been some arrangement at an earlier period, by which large estates in this part of the county had been assessed (we might almost think, parcelled out) on a rough-and-ready basis of equality, at the rate of 50, 60 and 80 hides, without much regard to accuracy of detail. The similarly hidated series of six had manifestly been agricultural only. The three on the Ouse may have already added a commercial element, as we shall see they had done at the time of the Conqueror's Survey.⁸

² D.B., 21a.⁴ D.B., 21a.⁶ D.B., 26a.³ D.B., 17b.⁵ D.B., 20b.⁷ D.B., 16a.⁸ See Note 14, p. 170.

All but two of these manors were in the hands of the King and the family of Earl Godwin. King Edward himself held Borne, Beddingham and Dicelinges; Queen Eddid held Niworde; Earl Godwin, Willendone; Alnoth, his youngest son, Alsiston; Earl Harold, Ramelle and Piceham. Mellinges was held by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Ferle by the Abbey of Wilton.

The one with which Borne would be most intimately connected was Beddingham. Both of these manors contributed the "firma unius noctis." In our last volume,⁹ I have already referred to the meaning of this service. It was a food-rent sufficient for the consumption of the King's household for one day. It would have been interesting to know what form the contribution took, the character and amount of the supplies, as well as the methods by which they reached the King's household. We shall see 100 years later that the two manors were being worked together and we should naturally conclude that such must have been the case when actual food and not money was demanded. Though there were many manors throughout the kingdom which contributed the like service, there was only one other in Sussex, Beddinges (Beeding, near Bramber). It returned "unum diem de firma," one day of food.

Besides the principal Manor of Borne, mention is made of the Manor of Medehei¹⁰ (Meads). It was held under the King by Oswald, who was free to "go with his land where he would." That is, he might transfer his fealty and services to any overlord he pleased. It was rated at three rods ($\frac{3}{4}$ hide) and was valued at £4. Also King Edward held one hide "in Burne,"¹¹ which paid no geld and was valued at 20s.; and $\frac{1}{2}$ hide "in Borne"¹¹ on similar conditions as to geld and value. Also "in the same hundred"¹¹ were one hide and $1\frac{1}{2}$ rods. The owner of this last piece, in King Edward's time, is not mentioned. It paid no geld and belonged to the three manors of Ratendone (Ratton), Willendone and Ferle, and was worth 22 shillings. This information is so scanty that we may leave it for the present.

⁹ "S.A.C.," Vol. XLII., p. 182.

¹⁰ D.B., 18a.

¹¹ D.B., 19b.

II.—*In the time of King William.*

We pass over 20 years to the time of the compilation of Domesday Book in 1086.

So far as the Manor of Borne is concerned, we find a change of ownership. King William did not retain it in his own hands, but gave it to his half-brother, Robert, Count of Mortain. The Count held it in demesne and it was rated as before, at 46 hides. It is described as having land for 28 ploughs, that is, 28 plough-lands. In demesne were four plough teams, and there were 68 villains and three "bordarii" with 28 teams. In addition there were a mill worth 5s., 16 saltpans worth £4. 3s. 4d., 25 acres of meadow and pasture valued at £6. Two hides and one rod were reckoned as belonging to the Rape of Hastings.

There were in the manor four separate parcels of land, presumably freehold. One hide was held by a tenant called William, one by Alured, who may have been an important person of whom we read later. Two hides were held by the "Keepers of the Castle" and three rods by Roger, a clerk. In demesne (?of the freeholders) were one team and a half and two villains and six bordars with half a team.

We may suppose that in the interval between the death of King Edward and the grant to the Count the food-rent had fallen into abeyance, and, moreover, it is certain that from all the royal or semi-royal manors in this neighbourhood a large drain must have taken place both of men and supplies to furnish Harold's army. When therefore it was first received by the Count it was only worth £30. But by the time of the Survey it had recovered so far that the Count's demesne was worth £40 and that of his men 67s.

The chief practical result of the Conquest and transfer of ownership was that the men of the manor had to render to their lord a money-rent instead of a food-rent. The rent does not appear to have been excessive, for, reckoning a plough-land at 120 acres, a rent of £40 for 3,360 acres works out at rather short of threepence per

acre. But the hidage of 46 hides was a continuance of an undue assessment, for a fiscal hide was in theory supposed to be a fair valuation of a plough-land, so that 28 plough-lands should correctly have been rated as 28 hides. Sussex had been an over-rated county.¹² But we shall see directly that the Count more than took care of himself in this matter. The effect of the Conquest on the manor was, however, much more than merely a change in the character of the rent. The manor became for the time an integral unit in the new system of the Rape of Pevensey. The Sussex Rapes under the Conqueror were above all military districts, each with its castle. The Rape of Pevensey, which was assigned to the Count of Mortain, had its centre at Pevensey, where the Count must almost immediately have built his tower or keep within the walls of the old Roman "castrum." The expression "custodes castelli" occurring in the Domesday description of Borne can only refer to the special "castellum" of the rape and the word would not be used of a ruined Roman "castrum."

The whole of the lands within the rape (with some exceptions)¹³ are called in Domesday Book "Terra Comitis Moritonii." But he did not hold them all in the same way. A large number were held by tenants under him as their overlord. Some, however, he retained "in dominio" and of others it is said "Ipse comes tenet," which seems to imply much the same tenure. A brief survey of the more important of these will show the extent of the possessions which formed the foundation of the "Honour of Mortain" in Sussex.

First, besides the Castle, there was the Burgh of Pevenesel which lay outside the castle. In this amongst

¹² That is, the number of hides (or rateable units) was on the whole much larger than that of the actual plough-lands, though both were supposed to express the same area. The division into hides was much the older of the two, and in later times had been found to differ in places considerably from the reality. Yet it was retained as a basis for collecting the King's geld, with varying results in different counties, some being under and some over-rated (see Maitland, "Domesday Book and Beyond," 461 and 475).

¹³ Reredfelle (Rotherfield) was on the "King's Land," Mellinges on the Archbishop's, Bishopstone on the Bishop of Chichester's, Alcistone on the Abbot of Battle's, &c.

other things he had 60 burgesses "in dominio." Then he held four of the five manors between Borne and Lewes.¹⁴ They were Borne, Willendone, Ferle and Beddingham. The terms on which he held them are worthy of notice. Borne was held "in dominio" at a rent of £40, Willendone and Ferle were similarly held at a like rent of £40 each and so was Beddingham with a rent of £30. The equality of the rents in the first three cases did not correspond to the number of plough-lands, which were 28, 36 and 40. As to hidation, Borne retained its 46 hides; Beddingham, which had stood at $52\frac{1}{2}$ hides, was reduced to 50; while Willendone was reduced from $50\frac{1}{2}$ and Ferle from 48 hides to "nothing." The treatment of these four manors seems to tell its own story. They had been over-rated, 137 plough-lands standing as 197 hides. The Count now obtained the privilege of reducing the rateable value to 96 hides—a reduction of more than one-half. The reason why Borne and Beddingham were left untouched may be ascribed to their having been royal manors and therefore not capable of being dealt with to the same extent as the others.

Besides these four large manors the Count held in his own hands a group of almost contiguous manors, which occur together in Domesday Book¹⁵ and may be considered as forming a fifth unit of similar size to the others. They lay in the low-lying district to the north of the present line of railway between Berwick and Glynde Stations, which is traversed by the upper streams of the Ritch or eastern branch of the Ouse. It was a district rich in arable and meadow land and at that time was penetrated to its utmost limit by tidal water utilised for saltpans. The chief of these manors was Ripe, with 10 plough-lands and the high rating of 22 hides. Leston

¹⁴ Of the remaining six of the ten large manors described above, Alsistone was given to the Abbey of Battle, and Mellinges remained with the Archbishop. The other four became part of the "Land of William de Warren," or Rape of Lewes, and Earl William himself held them all. It is noticeable that all four as well as the Archbishop's Manor of Mellinges had burgesses or "hagæ" (enclosed lands with houses) in Lewes, no doubt for market or commercial purposes. But Beddingham had none, although it was so close to Lewes, nor are any of the large manors in the Rape of Pevensey recorded as having such holdings in Pevensey.

¹⁵ D.B., 22a and 22b; Sussex D.B., XIIIb. and XIVa.

(Laughton) had 16 plough-lands, Claveham four; some demesne lands in Achiltone (Eckyngham) and Calvintone (Chalvington) contained six and Estochingeham (in Beddingham) eight, making 44 plough-lands in all, with a total rating of 47 hides.

There were also a number of smaller holdings throughout the rape, especially in the valuable Pevensey Marshes, which raised the Count's personal holdings by about another portion of equal extent to the five already mentioned.

These large possessions, together with the overlordship of the other tenants and the feudal rights and profits attaching to the lordship of the whole rape, combined to form the "Honour" or "Barony" of Mortain. In connection with the organisation of the Barony a somewhat interesting question arises in regard to the group of which Ripe was the centre. In the thirteenth century we find Ripe being treated for some purposes as a centre of the whole Barony. There the tenants were summoned to a Barony Court.¹⁶ Moreover, from an early time the Pevensey Castle Guard Rents and the "Sheriff's Aid" were by custom collected by the holders of a Manor of Endlewick, in Arlington, on the borders of this district, the Sheriff not being allowed to enter the "liberty" to collect the latter himself.¹⁷ In commenting on this matter in "S.A.C.," Vol. XXIV., p. 222, Mr. Daniel-Tyssen remarks, "Why Ripe, always a place of inconsiderable population, was selected for the three-weeks' Court is unknown. It is by no means a central spot." This is, no doubt, true of modern and even much earlier times. But if we can suppose that the holding of the court dated back to the days of the Counts of Mortain, with their great holdings situated as described above, its position, as shown on the map, is by no means inconvenient. The question turns upon the lines of communication which in Norman times existed in this part of Sussex.

¹⁶ Ministers' Accounts, 1082 (P.R.O.).

¹⁷ This reason is given at the close of a Rental in "Duchy of Lancaster Depositions" (P.R.O.), Vol. 24, fol. 40.

The Minor Manors.—Our information about these is little more explicit than in the time of King Edward. When the Survey was made Medeheï was held by Wibert of the Count of Eu and therefore was presumably reckoned as belonging to the Rape of Hastings, being entered under the “*Terra Comitum de Ow.*” Its value after the Conquest had dropped from £4 to 20s., but by this time had risen to 110s.

All the three other manors mentioned above were held by one tenant, Reinbert.¹⁸ The value of the second of them, after falling from 20s. to 10s., had now risen to 45s. The other two retained their former value. These three, like Medeheï, are entered under the land of the Count of Eu, or Rape of Hastings. This was perhaps because Reinbert belonged to that Rape. He had a large number of small holdings, including many in the Rape of Pevensey, but all entered under the Count of Eu. His principal manor, though only a small one, was Dodimere (Udimere), almost as far eastward as Rye and Winchelsea. I cannot say where his lands in Borne were situated.

III.—*In the Twelfth Century.*

Robert, Count of Mortain, was succeeded by his son William, who, siding with Duke Robert of Normandy against King Henry I., was captured at the battle of Tenchebrai in 1106, and all his possessions were confiscated. The Honour of Mortain, with the Castle of Pevensey and the feudal rights and emoluments, were given to Gilbert de Aquila, from whom it was afterwards called the “*Barony de Aquila,*” or “*of the Eagle.*” But the grant did not carry the manors which the Counts of Mortain had held. Borne must have escheated to the Crown or, perhaps more correctly, been “*resumed*” by the King as though part of his demesne. What happened to it for the next 40 years or more we have no means at present of knowing. At the end of that interval, probably about the close of Stephen’s reign, we find it in the hands of a certain Adelardus Flamengus, or Adelard the

¹⁸ See “*S.A.C.*,” Vol. XL., p. 70.

Fleming. In the Chartulary of Lewes Priory¹⁹ are four deeds relating to a grant by him to the Priory. The first is by Adelard himself. He grants "1 hide in my manor of Burn in that part which is called Langport," viz., " $\frac{1}{2}$ hide at the death of my wife Murieldis for my soul and the soul of Adelard my son," and " $\frac{1}{2}$ hide at my death for my soul & the souls of all my parents." By another charter William, son of Adelard, confirms the donation of his father, calling it "1 hide in my manor of Burne in the part called Langport," and offering it "for the souls of my father, my mother Murieldis, Adelard my brother and all my parents." The half hide promised by Adelard at his own death must have fallen in before the other, for by a third charter²⁰ it is confirmed by "Matildis de Port formerly wife of Adelard." She mentions "Henry my son." By the fourth charter²¹ William Flameng makes the same grant and adds another hide in the same manor and also "in Langport," with "men meadows pastures and other appurtenances," for the souls of his wife, father, mother and all ancestors. The witnesses to all these four charters are very much the same, so that Adelard's gift may have been made on his death bed just before his son William inherited the manor. Among the witnesses to William's charter are "Hugo de Petroponte," who was alive about the beginning of the reign of Henry II.,²² and "Radulfus Walensis," who witnesses three of the four charters. He is described in another deed in the Chartulary (fol. 86^d.) as "Radulfo Milite Cognomine Walensi," and appears as witness to a charter in 1153.²³ Several of the other witnesses occur in conjunction with the names of persons living at about this date. As we shall find the manor soon after this time in King Henry's hands apparently in a state of decay, we may place this tenancy during the latter years of Stephen's reign. The head-quarters of the family in

¹⁹ Brit. Mus., Cotton MS., Vespasian, F. xv., fol. 80.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, fol. 95.

²¹ *Ibid.*, fol. 69.

²² "S.A.C.," Vol. XLII., p. 237.

²³ Round, "Geoffrey de Mandeville," 419.

the following century were at Pulborough, in West Sussex. Adelard's gift is witnessed by "Richard chaplain of Puleberga" and by "Ailwyn' fil' presbiteri de Puleberga." So is his son William's confirmation and that of his widow, Matilda.

I may here quote another grant²⁴ (possibly of not much later date) to the Priory of Lewes, referring to Eastbourne, though not to the Manor. Lecelina de Denton, in free widowhood, having been the wife of Richard de Hertefeld, with assent of Walter de Hertefeld, son and heir of Richard, grants one acre "in parochia de Burna in valle ex orientali antiqui itineris, illam videlicet ex septem acris que plus jacet versus orientem." Among the witnesses is "Radulfus de Lesthalle," which is plainly "del Esthalle," so that we have here very early mention of two Eastbourne names, Hertefeld (Hartfield) and Esthall, the now lost name of one of the boroughs discussed in our last volume.²⁵ This "ancient" road must have gone over the Downs. In connection with old roads, there is an interesting statement in our Volume III. (p. 54), where we read that while Bishop Ralph de Nevill was holding the Manor of Burne as well as Bexhill on one side and Bishopstone on the other, his steward advised him that it would be easy to work Burne and Bishopstone together, but not Burne and Bexhill, on account of the obstacle caused to a man on horseback by "the water of Pevenesell." This seems to imply a good horse-road from Pevensey by Eastbourne to Bishopstone *circa* 1230, just the route taken by Edward II.²⁶ in 1324.

Not long after the tenancy of the Flamengs, the manor once more fell into the hands of the King, with the result that the sheriff of the county for several years not only accounts in the Pipe Rolls for the incomings from it and some neighbouring manors, but occasionally adds some valuable information as to the expenditure of the money.

²⁴ Lewes Chartulary, fol. 95.

²⁵ "S.A.C.," Vol. XLII., p. 206.

²⁶ "S.A.C.," Vol. VI., p. 46.

The entries with regard to Burne begin in 11 Henry II. (1165) and are continued annually till the 19 Henry (1173), when they cease. The first of them stands as follows:²⁷

“De purpresturis.

Idem Vicecomes reddit compotum de xl^s de firma de Cuntuna de dimidio anno

Idem Vic' reddit Comp' de xij^{li} v^d de firma de Burna

Idem Vic' redd' Comp' de vj^{li} xvij^s de terra vigilum de Pevensel et de Muntagu de iij terminis

Idem Vic' redd' Comp' de v^s j^d de terra Ricardi portarii de dim' anno

Idem Vic' redd' Comp' de xxxij^s de firma de Bedingeham.”

In the following year the receipts stand thus:²⁸
 “Cuntuna, £4; Burna, £18. 18s. 0d.; old ferm of Hecton ‘terra vigilum de Pevensel et de Muntagu,’ 38s., new ferm of the said land, £14. 5s. 0d.; Bedingeham, £6. 1s. 10d.; Land of Ricardus Portarius, 53s. 4d.”

Before proceeding we may consider the manors here associated with Eastbourne. Cuntuna (Compton) was in the parish of Ferle. In Domesday Book the Count of Mortain held four hides there “himself,” which had formerly been held by Harold under the King.²⁹ It stood therefore in the same position as Burna and Bedingeham. All three were at present reckoned as part of the King’s demesne to be retained in his hands when not granted by him to another. The explanation of the other two entries is not so easy. The “vigiles de Pevensel” must surely be the “Custodes Castelli” of Domesday. It will be remembered that they held two hides in Borne under the Count of Mortain. They also held three hides and 20 acres in Ferle under the Count. Their land is here described as “Hecton,” which in the Sussex Domesday volume is identified with Eckington in Ripe. In this case it seems more likely to have been Heighton (afterwards called Heighton St. Clere) in Ferle. But why is “de Muntagu” or “de Monte Acuto” added? Perhaps some light may be thrown upon this when we

²⁷ “Pipe Roll Society,” Vol. VIII., p. 93.

²⁸ “Pipe Roll Society,” Vol. IX., p. 91.

²⁹ These four hides were rated in Laughton. In 1247 Henry III. gave this land to Theobald de Englescheville, who afterwards gave it to the Knights Templars (“Rot. Hund.,” II., 205; “S.A.C.,” Vol. IX., p. 241).

come to speak at a later date of the rise of the largest tenancy under the Honour of Aquila. Ricardus Portarius was an official of Pevensey Castle. He occurs several times in the Chartulary of Lewes Priory. A grant of his is recorded by Lower.³⁰ It is probable that his title means that like a family of De Palerne he held his lands on the tenure of keeping the gate ("custodiendi portam") of Pevensey Castle. On the whole, as Richer de Aquila in the Pipe Rolls for these years accounts for his own payments, we may assume that these lands were forfeited portions of the Honour of Mortain which had not been granted to the De Aquilas.

The rents here accounted for are received irregularly, as though things were not in a normal condition, and this was actually the case, as we see by the account for 1167,³¹ which is much more explicit. The sheriff begins by accounting for a year's ferm of Cuntun 100s., which has been duly paid into the Treasury. Then he proceeds:

"Old Ferm of Burna, 33s.; excused for the Brethren of the Hospital by writ. New Ferm, in Treasury, £12. 3s. 10d.; stocking of manor, 20 oxen, 60s.; 2 horses, 6s.; repairing granges, 8s.; 313 sheep, £5. 4s. 4d.; stocking of Bedingham, £3. 2s. 10d. Total, £24. 5s. 0d.

For the future to render £40."

"Also of Ferm of Ricardus Portarius, £4. 6s. 0d. In Treasury, 19s. 8d. Stocking, 100 sheep, £1. 13s. 4d.; 8 oxen and 1 horse, £1. 7s. 0d. Owes 6s."

"Also for Ferm of Hecton, land of 'vigiles de Pevenesel' and of 'Montacute,' £12. 15s. 6d. In Treasury, £3. 3s. 10d. Stocking, 100 sheep, £1. 13s. 4d.; 24 oxen and 2 horses, £3. 18s.; 8 hogs, 4s. 8d.; corn seed for sowing said land, £1. 13s. 4d.; barley, oats, wheat and boonwork³² of ploughs (precaria carr'), £2. 2s. 4d. Total, £9. 11s. 8d.

For the future to render £22."

"Also of Ferm of Bedingeham, £5. 3s. 4d. Stocking, 70 sheep, £1. 3s. 4d.; 24 oxen and 2 horses, £3. 18s.; seed, £1. 13s. 4d.; 1 grange and 1 cowshed repairing, £1. 11s. 6d. Total, £8. 6s. 2d., of which £3. 2s. 10d. are of the Ferm of Burn.

For the future to render £10."

The stocking of the manors and re-settlement of the future rents show that things had been greatly let down

³⁰ Lower, "Chronicles of Pevensey," p. 16 n.

³¹ "Pipe Roll Society," Vol. XI., p. 37.

³² Boon (or bene) works were extra works, which a lord by custom might ask for, and, in case of non-performance, he might demand a fixed compensation.

as was probable during the anarchy of Stephen's reign. Burne is raised to its old rent of £40. Beddingham is reduced from £30 to £10. This was, no doubt, because a considerable portion of the land had been alienated by the second Count of Mortain to the Abbey of Bec-Hellouin in Normandy, and the religious house was allowed to keep it.

The prices of animals are: a sheep, 4d.; an ox and a horse, 3s.; a hog, 7d.

The Hospital, on account of which 33s. were excused from the "old ferm" (*i.e.*, arrears) of Burn, was a cell of the Military Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, who held 55 acres of land at Okelyng,³³ which may have been given by the Counts of Mortain or the King. An abatement of £2 on the rent of £40 was allowed in consequence.

After 1170 the ferm of Hecton drops out of the Pipe Roll accounts for a time, the land having ceased to be in the King's hands. In 1171³⁴ the four other rents are accounted for to their exact amount, £59. 6s. in all, for which the Sheriff thus answers:

	£	s.	d.
Paid into the Treasury in 4 tallies ³⁵	28	13	3
50 horse loads of corn sent to the army in Ireland ..	4	11	1
40 weys (pensis) of cheese.....	10	0	0
Fitting of ships		1	4
Payment of 8 captains (gubernatores) and 152 sailors for 15 days by the king's writ	10	10	0
Working ³⁶ of lime and stones for works at Hastings..	3	3	4
Owing this year on the land of the Hospitallers	2	0	0
Payment to a sergeant who was sent with the afore- said provision (garnisone)		7	0
Total	£59	6	0

³³ "The Hospitallers in England," Camden Society, No. LXV. (1857). Their Okelyng Manor was under the Preceptory of Poling, and contained 52 acres of land at 12d. the acre, three acres at 18d. the acre, and pasture for 200 sheep.

³⁴ "Pipe Roll Society," Vol. XVI., p. 128.

³⁵ That is, the Sheriff had paid this amount on four occasions and at each payment the amount paid had been registered on a notched stick, one half of which had been kept at the Treasury and the other half he now brought with him as a voucher.

³⁶ "Attractus"—Obtaining by labour (Du Cange, "Glossary").

This account gives us some idea of how the public work of the country was carried on. The Sheriff of Sussex was ordered by writ to spend money received from these local manors in forwarding the commissariat and transport arrangements for the expedition to Ireland. He supplied partly goods and partly money. The wages of the captains or pilots come to 2d. a day and those of the sailors to 1d. The price of the corn and the cheese differs from that accounted for in 1173,³⁷ when the sheriff sent to the provisioning of Hastings Castle 100 loads of corn, valued at £10, or 2s. a load, and 10 weys of cheese at £3, or 6s. the wey. The "summa" or pack-horse load was eight bushels and a wey of cheese about 2 cwts. There was some extensive work being done at Hastings Castle at this time.³⁸ In 1172 was spent £13. 1s. 0d. in working of rock and lime ("petre et calcis") for "making tower of Hastings," and in 1173, besides the provisions just mentioned, the Sheriff spent £43. 12s. 9d. "in work at the Castle of Hastings."

In this year, apparently in addition to their ordinary rent, these four manors have a heavy charge laid upon them, described as "Assissa facta pro Dominia Regis," by which it seems as though they were treated as part of the royal demesne. Burna and Bedingeham pay 20 marks (£13. 6s. 8d.) and 5 marks (£3. 6s. 8d.), equivalent to one-third of their annual rent. The other two are let off more easily, Cuntona paying 20s. and "Lampport" only one mark (13s. 4d.). It seems unreasonable to doubt that by "Lampport" here is meant the fourth of these manors, elsewhere described as "terra Ricardi Portarii." We shall have occasion to notice this in commenting on the remaining evidence contained in the Pipe Rolls.³⁹

In the Roll of 1168 is an entry both interesting and perplexing. In that year the King demanded from his tenants an "Aid" on the occasion of the marriage of his daughter, and the various contributions are entered in the Roll. Rateable responsibility was not then reckoned

³⁷ "Pipe Roll Society," Vol. XIX., p. 25.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. XVIII., p. 130.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XII., p. 195.

by hides or plough-lands, but by "knights' fees." A knight's fee has been understood to be a fixed amount of land, or land to the value of £20. But the latest writer⁴⁰ on the subject concludes that it was an arbitrary arrangement between the King and the tenants-in-chief, who sub-divided the responsibility among their sub-tenants. The lists of knights' fees in a district form a sort of supplement to Domesday Book and by the help of some still existing lists we may learn much of the changes which were taking place in the lordship of this part of Sussex. The earliest of these lists belongs to the period with which we are now dealing, but it is so much better understood by comparison with one 100 years later that to avoid repetition I will here confine myself to what immediately relates to the Manor of Burne.

The passage referred to has already been printed in our "Collections,"⁴¹ in the original Latin. I will therefore here translate the portion with which we are concerned. After giving the contributions of the great Sussex lords of fees, the record gives what the writer of the paper thinks are "the contributions of the manors, towns and tenants on the King's demesnes." This portion is headed "Burna" and contains six entries under that heading. It runs thus :

"Burna."

"Richard de Lamport renders account of 100s. of the same aid. In the Treasury 50s. And he owes 50s.

Harding renders account of 20s. of the same aid. In the Treasury 10s. And he owes 10s.

Wulmar renders account of half a mark of the same aid. He has delivered it in the Treasury. And he is quit.

The 'Commune' of the said town (*Commune ejusdem ville*) renders account of 2 marks of the same aid. In the Treasury 1 mark. And owes 1 mark.

The men of Bedingeham render account of 3 marks of the same aid. They have delivered them in the Treasury. And they are quit.

The same Sheriff renders account of 1 mark from the land of Richard "portarius" of the same aid. He has delivered it in the Treasury. And he is quit."

The heading "Burna" would not necessarily imply that all the entries belonged to that place, but only that

⁴⁰ Round, "Feudal England," p. 261.

⁴¹ "S.A.C.," Vol. XXVIII., p. 33.

they were of a similar character.⁴² We should, however, expect to find the entries corresponding to those which record the annual rents at the same period. In this particular year the rents, as we have noticed, were paid for Cuntona, Burna, the land of Richard Portarius, Hecton and Bedingeham to the full amount in each case. There are also in that year two other items in the same rent account, "land of Rand' de Bealmes" and "land of Wepham of Rolland de Dinan." In the account of the Aid these two persons have already been mentioned among the separate contributors, so that the above entries ought to correspond to the five just mentioned as occurring annually for several years. Three of them are the same—Burna, Bedingeham and Ricardus Portarius. These are the three last on the list. The three first are not so easily identified and the difficulty is increased because the rate of payment is so unequal. It was supposed to be one mark on each knight's fee. Now it is known that the Flamengs held Burne (as did all their successors) as one knight's fee, yet here the men of Burne pay two marks, while Bedingeham, whose rent was one-fourth of that of Burna, pays three marks. It is fairly evident that while the great tenants-in-chief were being taxed on a fixed limit and even favourably treated, the unfortunate tenants on demesne or escheated lands were being mulcted at the royal pleasure. Burne appears to count for two knights' fees of £20 annual value. For what land in our rent account can Richard de Lamport have been charged 100 shillings or 7½ marks? Can it be Hecton, the land of the keepers of the castle and of Montacute? We have seen that in 1173 the land of Ricardus Portarius seems to be described as "Lamport." Can Richard de Lamport and Ricardus Portarius be the same person? And if so, can he further be the "Ricūs filius Willelmi," who was the largest sub-tenant of the Barony of Aquila and whose group of 15 knights' fees we shall find the Testa de Nevill assigning to John de Montacute?

⁴² In "Testa de Nevill," p. 226, "Burna" comes under the heading "Verdictum de Boseham," that being also a royal Sussex manor.

Leaving this question for the present we will notice the very interesting expression used in reference to Burne, "Commune ejusdem ville." First, to what rateable unit does it refer? "Villa" ought to include not only the principal manor, but the minor manors also. Yet if this is a list of escheated lands answered for by their custodians or else, as in the case of Burne and Bedingeham, by the people themselves, it is to be remembered that it was the principal manor only that had escheated to the King. It must, I think, mean the men of the manor only. Next, what does it imply? We are not to claim for Burne and some other places in this Pipe Roll the honour of preceding London and Gloucester in the establishment of a "Communa." The offence of that proceeding in the eyes of royal authority was the taking of a common oath by the members, who were thus setting up an "imperium in imperio." It can hardly mean more here than that the places so described had for the time no responsible head to answer for them. Still, however much we minimise its importance, it remains as a striking instance of the growth of a technical term. It might almost seem to have been brought into use in England by the Commissioners or Receivers of this Aid (for I imagine no earlier use can be found), but it is not quite clear what they intended. One cannot see, for instance, why Burna should have a "Commune," a sort of corporate unity, while Bedingeham should pass as a set of "homines." In some cases it seems to imply the general body of contributors in a vill or manor as apart from a certain few who are specified by name. Thus, in Suffolk the "Homines de Burc"⁴³ [Burgh] in Loingeland render £7. 6s. 8d. to the aid." Then their names are mentioned and then follows: "Radulfus de Burc et Commun' ville—1 marc." So of Waltham,⁴⁴ in Essex, "Commune ville reddit comptum de xl^s. de eodem auxilio. Ceteri homines ejusdem ville—£4. 3s. 4d." At Axeminstre⁴⁵ the "Homines" are distinguished from "De comuni."

⁴³ "Pipe Roll Society," Vol. XII., p. 23.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

We can hardly gloss it over as a mere "common payment." The last instance referred to might be explained as "*De communi auxilio.*" But a "*commune ville*" which renders an account, even though we should hesitate at this early time to qualify its vague substantivity by adding such a word as "*corpus,*" can scarcely be denied the possession of a certain communal personality capable of a recognised communal action. It is the first inchoate form of the "*communitas ville*" which has become common 100 years later.

IV.—*In the Thirteenth Century.*

After the year 1173 "*Burna*" is no longer accounted for in the Sheriff's Pipe Rolls. Presumably it was again granted by the King to some favourite whom he wished to reward. For more than 100 years, so far as our present information goes, it passed through the hands of a number of separate owners. For the first part of the period our knowledge is scanty. The "*Testa de Nevill*" supplies the name of one tenant:⁴⁶

"*Fulco de Cantelupo tenet manerium de Burn de domino Rege unde antecessores Alardi Flameng faciebant domino Regi servicium unius militis.*"

This name occurs constantly in the records of the reign of King John and we may therefore assign the tenancy of Fulco to that period, between 1200 and 1216. A previous entry states that at the same time the Earl of Warren was holding $30\frac{1}{2}$ fees of the fee of Gilbert de Aquila, by fine made with the King. The Earl was deprived of the custody of Pevensey Castle in 1216. The expression "*antecessores Alardi Flameng*" is ambiguous. If it means "the predecessors of Alard Flameng," it must refer to some previous tenants after the forfeiture of the Count of Mortain, whose names have not come down to us.

We may, perhaps, place the tenancy of Fulco de Cantelupe rather early in King John's reign, for our next

⁴⁶ "*Testa de Nevill,*" p. 226.

evidence seems to require us to find room for another tenant before 1217.

The enquiries made by King Edward I., in 1275, which are preserved in the "Hundred Rolls," provide us with a specially valuable summary of the devolution of the Manor of Eastbourne through a considerable part of the thirteenth century. In reply to the question about the King's manors the jurors of the Hundred of Burne make the following statement:⁴⁷

"They say that the Manor of Burn was in the hand of King Henry by escheat of Peter de Crown and it is worth £40 per annum and more, and the said Henry gave the said manor to Ralph, Bishop of Chichester, and after the death of the said Bishop the same King gave the said manor to Imbert de Halynes and the said Imbert leased the said manor to Simon de Munford at ferm [and] the said Simon [leased] the said manor to Peter de Savoy [and] after the death of the said Peter the Lady the Queen entered the said manor, who now holds it; how she entered the said manor they say they know not."

Here we have a succession of six tenants of the manor, whose combined tenancies must have covered more than seventy years, for Queen Eleanor, the last of them, did not die till 1291.

In some respects the first of the series, Peter de Crown, deserves the most notice. The connection of his family with the manor was by no means confined to him. It continued to run what may best be described as an underground course throughout this whole period, emerging to the surface from time to time just sufficiently to prove its existence. The facts are these :

The family was a Norman family whose name is variously spelt as Creon, Craon, Crohun, Croun. One of them, Maurice de Creon, was in great favour with King Henry II., and it is quite possible that the Manor of Burne may have been given to him when it ceases to be accounted for in the Pipe Rolls. Henry gave him lands in Surrey⁴⁸ which were afterwards held in conjunction with Burne. They were in Ewell, Ham and other places. Peter was, perhaps, son of Maurice, and he certainly held both Burne and the Surrey lands. His forfeiture was

⁴⁷ "Rot. Hund.," Vol. II., p. 204.

⁴⁸ Brayley, "Hist. of Surrey," Vol. IV., p. 375.

doubtless connected with the disturbances which marked the close of the reign of King John. In 1 Henry III. (1217) we have the following entry in the Close Rolls: ⁴⁹

“Rex Roberto de Den . . salutem. Sciatis quod concessimus domino Wintoniensi Episcopo terram de Burn que fuit Petri de Crown quandiu nobis placuerit. Apud Aulton 13^o Martii.”

This seems to imply that the then Bishop of Winchester held the manor for a short time. Not, however, for long. Peter had a brother, Amauric' or Almeric, of whom we read thus in 6 Henry III. (1221): ⁵⁰

“Eodem modo scribitur Vicecomiti Sussex pro Amaur' de Crohun de terra de Burne cum pertinenciis quam dominus Rex Henricus ei reddidit. Ap^d Westmon' x^o die Novemb:”

In the same year is an Order from the King ⁵¹ to “deliver the Manor of Hamme [in Surrey] to William Joynier which Peter de Crohun has pledged to him (ei invadiavit) and whereof William has confirmation from Amaur' de Crohun brother of Peter to the term appointed by William to Peter which was taken into our hands on the ground that we ordered our escheats to be seized into our hands.”

Also in the same year is another Order to give due seisin of land at Ewell to Amauric' or Eymeric de Croun, such as Peter de Croun had on the day that he died.

It can hardly be by a mere accident that, when a little later, Ralph, Bishop of Chichester, was holding the Manor of Burne, his steward recommended him to apply to the King for the wardship of Sir Amauric de Croun until the full age of the heir. ⁵² It is true he does not suggest that this desirable ward is the heir of the manor.

Again, however, when we come to the next tenant, Imbert de Salinis, another curious coincidence crops up. From the Inquisition ⁵³ taken after his death we find him in possession (like the De Creons) of land in Walton and rents in Walton and Ewell. This must imply a connection with the family of De Creon.

⁴⁹ “Rot. Claus.,” p. 299b.

⁵¹ “Rot. Claus.,” p. 482.

⁵⁰ “Rot. Claus.,” p. 479.

⁵² “S.A.C.,” Vol. III., p. 64.

⁵³ Inq. post mortem, I., 46.

Still later the evidence becomes again more definite. In 1287,⁵⁴ even though Eleanor, the Queen Dowager, was holding the Manor of Burne, we discover that the King is paying to "Isabella Domina de Croun" arrears of money due to her "ratione maneriorum de Hamme, Walton, Well [? Ewell], et Bourne."

In 1292 the Hundred of Burne is said to be "in the hands of Maurice de Croun."⁵⁵

About 1300 an Emmeric de Croun holds the Manor of Bourne⁵⁶ on the service of one knight's fee, and so late as 1304 Almaric de Croun is ordered to "enfeoff Mathias de Monte Martini & Matilda his wife of the Manor of Bourne held in capite."

In the face of all this evidence it is difficult to doubt that for more than 100 years this family had some sort of lien upon the Manor of Eastbourne. But why through all the period only two members of the family should have actually held it, one at the beginning and one at the end, it is not easy to understand.

The Bishop of Chichester named in the Hundred Rolls was Ralph de Nova Villa (Nevill), who was Bishop from 1222 to 1244. When he began to hold the manor is uncertain, but he is known to have been holding it at his death, when at the inquest into his possessions an "Extent" of this manor was presented. As it is probably the earliest local descriptive document after Domesday Book (except the slight notices in the Pipe Rolls), I will give a translation in full:⁵⁷

"Extent of the Manor of Burne by writ of the King on the death of the Bishop of Chichester. Taken at Reading 8th February 28 H. (1244)."

"Extent of the Manor of Burne, to wit by the underwritten Hervey de Heye Rikeward de Beverinton John de Beverinton William de la Cumbe Ralph de Stapele Richard Frankelein Ranulph de la Wyke Mathew de la Dune Ralph de ponte Ranulph de Langeport William of the Mill and Gerard de la lote Who say upon their oath that in the said manor there are in demesne 62 acres of arable land which are worth yearly 31s., the price of each acre 6d., and 26 acres of land worth

⁵⁴ Palgrave, "Ancient Kalendars, &c.," p. 43.

⁵⁵ Ministers' Accounts (P.R.O.), 1027 m. 3.

⁵⁶ Lay Subsidy 182.

⁵⁷ Inq. p.m., 28 Henry III. (10).

yearly 8s. 8d., the price of each acre 4d. Also 10 acres of meadow worth 10s. And a certain little meadow which is called Smalewys [Smallwish] worth yearly half a mark (6s. 8d.). And one marsh worth yearly 1 mark. Also they say that the pasture on the hills (super montes) is worth yearly 1 mark. And a certain pasture 'in le linche' worth 2s. 6d. Also they say that a certain pasture on the hills which the shepherds hold is worth yearly 1 mark. Also in rent of free men £8. 11s. 11d. In rent of cottages with the rent of the mill 14s. 5d. In rent of the villains for 35 virgates of land which they hold £17. 10s. In the works of the said villains £4. 7s. 6d. Also in rent of 4 shepherds⁵⁸ . . . 6s.

Sum of the whole £39. 17s. 8d."

Forming a rough judgment from this inquest one would conclude that there was considerably less arable land in cultivation on the manor than at the time of Domesday Book. Eighty-eight acres in demesne are mentioned and 35 virgates, that is 35 times 30 acres, or 1,050 acres held by the villains. To make up the extent of 3,360 acres in the 28 plough-lands of Domesday, this would leave 2,222 acres to be assigned to the freeholders. But their rent in that case would scarcely exceed 1d. per acre, whereas the "villani," in addition to labour, paid on an average 3d. per acre. However, freeholders' rents in mediæval manors were so unequal that it is unsafe to draw conclusions from their total amount. There was a great deal of burdensome court and jury work to be done in Burne, being a Hundred in itself, as witness the fact that in this very instance a jury with local names apparently had to attend at Reading. It is likely enough that large holdings might have been very beneficially held on condition that the holder was bound to attend the local courts and answer all summonses to act on juries.

We have already alluded to the interesting series of letters commented on by Mr. Blaauw in our 3rd volume, which passed between the Bishop and his energetic steward. They contain several notices of his Manor of Burne. About one matter there was a serious difference of opinion between the steward and the "men of Burne."⁵⁹ The Bishop seems to have demanded from them an annual

⁵⁸ Parchment torn. Some item is missing.

⁵⁹ "S.A.C.," Vol. III., pp. 50, 65.

“aid” of 100s. On one occasion they “all with one voice” said that he had remitted it to them. In a later letter the steward says he would not distrain them because they had said they would come to the Bishop “ad habendam inde deliberationem”—“to have a release from it.” The result is not recorded in the letters.

About the three tenants who followed Bishop Nevill there is little local information to be given.

Of Imbert de Salines (“de Salinis”) we have seen that he was connected with the same manors in Surrey as those held by the family of De Creon. It appears that he held the manor directly from the King “in capite,”⁶⁰ and that he, not the King, leased it to his successor, Simon de Montford, and on Simon’s death he received this and the Surrey manors back from the King.⁶¹

Simon was the well-known Earl of Leicester, victor of the Battle of Lewes, who held several manors in the Rape of Pevensey as of his Honour of Leicester, though Bourne was not one of those so held.

Peter de Savoy was the favourite of King Henry III. and uncle of his Queen, Eleanor of Provence, who at his death in 1269 “entered” the manor, as the Jurors put it, as though they thought she had no real authority for taking possession. Nevertheless she retained it till her death in 1291. Her tenancy again brought the manor into touch with the neighbouring lordships and within the purview of existing public records. Before commenting on their evidence it will be convenient to finish what little remains to be said concerning the early history of the Manor of Bourne.

We have already seen that the De Creon family continued to this time to have some sort of claim upon the Manor and Hundred of Bourne, and that Almeric de Creon was holding it about the year 1300.

In 1304 he gave it over to Mathias de Monte Martini.⁶² This last tenant, so far as we can judge, was the only

⁶⁰ “Rot. Hund.,” p. 205.

⁶¹ “S.A.C.,” Vol. VI., p. 221.

⁶² “Rot. Pat.,” 1304, m. 14.

one of all the early series who seems to have had an intention of making Eastbourne his principal dwelling place. In 1307 he obtained a licence⁶³ from the King to "enclose and crenellate his manse of Burn in the County of Sussex with a wall of stone and lime."⁶⁴ Had he carried out his purpose, "Eastbourne Castle" might have rivalled that of Hurstmonceux. Why he did not do so we do not know.

In June of the following year the "Manor of Bourne, lately of Mathias de Monte Martini,"⁶⁵ was granted by King Edward II. to Bartholomew de Badelsmere. At first the grant was only conditional. Amongst other things he was to give over to the King all profits beyond 100 marks (£66. 13s. 4d.). In 1310 he had a grant⁶⁶ of Chilham, in Kent, and Bourne was to revert to the King. Finally, in 1314, the manor was fully granted⁶⁷ to him, and from that date the early history of the manor may be said to terminate. The subsequent devolution of its lordship is well known.⁶⁸

I will add only one fact which suffices to show the comparative importance of Eastbourne about this period. In 1302 the King required some ships for a Scotch expedition. Seford and Burn⁶⁹ were called upon to provide one between them. As against this demand we find that one other ship was divided between Shoreham, Hove, Brighthelmstone and Aldrington. This was an understood obligation, for three years later, when the "Communitas de Seford" was called to account for not supplying a ship properly equipped, they excused themselves on the ground that the "Villa de Bourn" had not helped them as it ought.⁷⁰

V.—*Queen Eleanor and the Barony of Aquila.*

We will now return to the tenancy of the Queen. In speaking of the Hundred of Eastbourne in our last

⁶³ "Rot. Pat.," 1307, m. 14.

⁶⁴ "S.A.C.," Vol. XIII., p. 108.

⁶⁵ "Rot. Pat.," 1308, m. 3.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1310, m. 17.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 1314, m. 15.

⁶⁸ "S.A.C.," Vol. XIV., p. 121.

⁶⁹ "Rot. Pat.," 1302, m. 2.

⁷⁰ Abbrev. Placit., 34 E. I.

Volume⁷¹ I had occasion to mention how the Queen in 1276, four years after her son, Edward I., had come to the throne, retired into the Nunnery of Amesbury, where she continued till her death in 1291. All this time she held both the Barony of Aquila (including the Hundred jurisdiction and other profits of the Rape of Pevensey) and also certain manors, such as Burne. Her affairs were managed by a steward who rendered her an annual account. At the time of the Hundred Rolls her steward was Richard de Pevensey, of whose exactions and oppressive proceedings the Hundred Jurors are never tired of telling the King's Commissioners. At a later time he was succeeded by a certain Lucas de la Gare, who managed the Queen's possessions in Sussex, Kent and Essex. A series of his accounts, beginning at Christmas, 12 Edward I. (1283), and extending to Michaelmas, 1291, just after the Queen's death, is preserved in the Public Record Office.⁷²

The Sussex receipts are kept to themselves, but are included in the annual total. Burne did not belong to the Honour of Aquila, but it is mixed with estates which did belong to it. One of these annual accounts will suffice. This is the Sussex portion of the account rendered at Michaelmas, 1284 :

	£	s.	d.
From Robert Martin, reeve of the Leucate of Pevensey	24	12	3½
„ Robert, reeve of Burne	51	7	0
„ Thomas de Leem, reeve of Willendon	109	19	0
„ William Crepp, sergeant of the Castle Court of Pevensey	3	10	7
„ William de Endlenewyk	83	11	4
„ Alexander, reeve of Leston	49	19	7
„ Martin, reeve of Maresfeld	14	4	4
„ William de Gulderingg, master forester of Essendon	12	15	7
„ Robert ate Berneste, sergeant of Sefford	6	0	0
„ Alexander ffoghell, sergeant of Grensted	2	10	9¾
„ William de Horham, sergeant of la Rye [?Ryp] ⁷³	19	16	6
Total	£378	6	11¼

⁷¹ "S.A.C.," Vol. XLII., p. 188.

⁷² Ministers' Accounts, 1088.

⁷³ This must be meant for Rype. See above, p. 172. In these accounts the word is sometimes spelt "Rye," sometimes "Rpe."

It will be observed that the manors are accounted for by a reeve ("prepositus"). The office of reeve was a burdensome one, for which the holder was generally rewarded by special privileges. In a semi-independent manor like Burne, he would be a leading tenant. During these years the office alternates between Robert Thorn and Ralph Selet, or Selede. The latter family are amongst the largest contributors in the contemporary Subsidy Rolls.

Besides this Sussex amount Luke de la Gare accounts for the rest of his "bailiwicks," and the grand total reaches a large sum. At Michaelmas, 1287, he accounts for £960. 3s. 2d., and the year before for £1,069. 5s. 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. Out of this income he charges for certain expenses, as in journeys to London or Amesbury, in paying wages, and on one occasion "in expenses in going to la Rye to hold a court there." At Michaelmas, 1289, after recording receipts amounting to £452. 9s. 2d., he accounts for a balance of £290. 10s. paid to the "garderoba" of the Queen at Amesbury. The same proportion would give over £600 out of the sums recorded above. Considering the value of money at that time, the Queen could have had no difficulty in making ends meet in a nunnery.

VI.—*Knights' Fees of the Honours of Mortain and Aquila.*

As already observed, Burne itself was not a member of the Honour of Aquila. But it was part of the Rape of Pevensey, of which at that time the Barony of Aquila was the most prominent feature. I may be held therefore not to be exceeding the limits of our subject if I take up the story of the Honour of Mortain, where we left it in the earlier part of this Paper, and make a few comments on the changes which had taken place in the distribution of lordship throughout the Rape.

The outward expression of lordship, as we have noted, had long taken the form of knights' fees. The Jurors of the Hundred of East Grensted, in their reply to the enquiries recorded in the Hundred Rolls (*circa* 1275),

say⁷⁴ that in the Barony of Aquila there were at this time "62 knights' fees which pertained to Castle Guard of Pevensy." If this number was correctly given it could hardly have been true of the Barony of Aquila, and must have included all the knights' fees held in the Rape by the holders of the liberties outside the Barony. A contemporary list to be referred to gives $46\frac{1}{2}$ in the Rape, meaning those which had originally belonged to the Count of Mortain.

In any case there is distinct evidence that the number reckoned as belonging strictly to the Barony of Aquila was $35\frac{1}{2}$, and the devolution of these furnishes an interesting chapter of local history. We may clearly trace them at three periods.

The first record is the "Carta," or certified return made by Richer de Aquila in 1165. The original of this is printed in the Paper before mentioned in our Vol. XXVII., p. 31. It runs as follows:

"To his most beloved lord H. King of England Richer de Aquila greeting and faithful service. Know that I have a fee of thirty and five knights and one half. And the whole fee I had on the day and year on which King H. your grandfather was alive and dead. Nor since that day have I enfeoffed anyone: of these then

- (a) Richard Fitz William holds a fee of 15 knights
- (b) Ralph de Dene 6 knights
- (c) William Malet 4 knights' fees
- (d) William Fitz Richard 3 knights
- (e) William Malfed 3 knights
- (f) William de Akingeham 2 knights
- (g) Robert de Horstude 2 knights
- (h) Andrew de Alvricheston half a knight."

Here we have a statement that Richer de Aquila owed King Henry II. the service of $35\frac{1}{2}$ knights, the responsibility for which was distributed among eight tenants; and, moreover, he states that all these subinfeudations had been in existence in the lifetime of King Henry I., who died in 1135. These minor fiefs therefore were in existence within a generation after the forfeiture of the 2nd Count of Mortain, and some at least may have been created in the time of the Mortains. For convenience of

⁷⁴ "Rot. Hund.," Vol. II., p. 204.

comparison with the later documents I have distinguished them by eight letters.

Our next document is taken from the "Testa de Nevill." It comes under a heading which states that "Peter de Savoy holds the Honour of Aquila." This would limit its date to between 1241 and 1269. It runs thus:

"These hold of the same Honour, viz.:

- (a) The Heirs of John de Monte Acuto hold 15 knights' fees of the same Honour whereof 2 are in the County of Northampton
- (b) The Heirs of Guy de Sakevill 6 fees in Chauinton
- (e) Wiþ de Engelfeld, with the heirs of Walram Maufe 3 fees in Chiuinton
- (d) Wiþ de Exete 3 fees in Exete
- (f) Wiþ de Echyngnam 2 fees in Pykeden [in East Dean]
- (c) Hen: de Hertfeld 4 fees in Hertfeld
- (g) Wiþ Davy 2 fees in Horstede
- (h) Walter de Alfrecheston $\frac{1}{2}$ fee in Alfrecheston "

It is manifest that we have here exactly the same grouping of the $35\frac{1}{2}$ knights as in the earlier list, though not quite in the same order. The identity of the groups in each list cannot admit of much doubt, especially if we correct a manifest confusion of the original compiler of the list. A comparison with the next document to be given shows that "Chivinton," assigned as the site of the third manor must be meant for "Jevington" and has been misplaced from the first group, to which it belongs. "Chauinton" is "Chalvington," rightly assigned to the second group. The true site of the third manor, "Eckington," has dropped out altogether.

The third document is one of such value for the early history of this part of Sussex that local students may be glad to have it for reference.⁷⁵ It is classified in the Public Record Office as the second of the Sussex Subsidy Rolls. It is more correctly a "List of Knights' Fees in the Rape of Pevensey." In the Office Catalogue its date is conjecturally assigned to 31 Edw. I. (1303). Several of the names occur in the Subsidy Roll of 1296. So it may fairly be dated at about 1300. Unfortunately, in

⁷⁵ Lay Subsidy, 182.

several places the MS. is very much defaced and portions of the parchment are torn away. Consequently some gaps are unavoidable and some of the names are difficult to decipher and may have been misread. Local knowledge will perhaps suffice to correct such errors. The entries have been numbered for convenience of reference.

“Inquisitio de feodis militum In Rapo de Pevensey facta per subscriptos videlicet per Johannem de Barkham Robertum le h . . stor Johannem de Holyndale Willelmum atte halle Hugonem de la chaumbre Robertum le Coker Philippum de Cessynghame Galfridum de ff . . ham Johannem de Cakkestokk Henricum Gileberd Osbertum Gyffard Walterum Wardon Thomam de Lulleham Thomam Grisilon Robertum Davy Walterum de Ryp Robertum de Yweregge Simonem de Chirenton Juratos qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod

1. Domina Regina Anglie tenet Baroniam de Aquila de domino Rege In capite pro duobus feodis et dimidio militum et debet defendere omnia feoda subscripta In Baronia predicta, viz.
- (a) 2. Nicholaa que fuit uxor Baldewyni de Aldeham tenet xv feoda In manerio de Geuyngton unde dominus Rex tenet In Comitatu Norhamton In manerio de Preston unum feodum nomine Warde filii heredis dicti Baldewyni.
- „ 3. Walterus Peche tenet de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Comitatu Norhamton duo feoda
- „ 4. Johannes de Lacy tenet de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Willyndon in Comitatu Sussex unum feodum
- „ 5. Item Tenentes Tenementi quod vocatur Holyndale tenent de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Willyndon in Comitatu predicto unum feodum vidz Aufridus Coleman Robertus Jop Henricus Rector de Geuyngton Johannes de ffulchinge Hugo de Okle Ricardus de h . . tenentes de dicto manerio
- „ 6. Richer de Refham tenet de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Cherleton In Comitatu Sussex unum feodum
- „ 7. Andreas de Saukevill tenet In Aumbefeld farnscrett Otteham et Teliton In Comitatu Sussex de predicto manerio de Genyngeton duo feoda
- „ 8. Regngius atte Wode Walterus de Horne Girardus de Pyggeferl⁷⁶ Prior de Michelham et Simon de Horstede tenent de dicto manerio de Geuyngton duo feoda In Burton Dytton et Sydenore
- „ 9. Wifts de Echingham tenet de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Crawelynke duo feoda
- „ 10. Robertus de Passelegh Robertus Wodelond et Walterus Euenyng et ceteri tenentes tenent de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Bourne unum feodum militis

⁷⁶ Sic in MS.

- (a) 11. Wiſs Maufe tenet de dicto manerio de Geuyngeton In manerio suo de Chougelegh unum feodum dimidium et j quarterium et in borne . . berforde et Albricheston et Isecombe unde tenentes de Isecombe tenent sextam partem unius feodi Et Prior de Lewes tenet In . . berhorne quartam partem unius feodi Et Abbas de Ponte Roberti et Roggerus de Cobbeford tenent . . feodi Et Roggerus Maufe octavam partem unius feodi In Wenge . . et Albricheston Et P . . de . .
- „ 12. Laurentius de Mepham tenet terciam partem unius feodi Et idem Wiſs Maufe unum quarterium unius feodi
- „ 13. Michael de Ponyng tenet de dicto manerio de Geuyngton In Preston in Comitatu Sussex unum feodum Et predicta Nicholaa In dicto manerio de Geuyngton dimidium feodum et unum quarterium j feodi
- (b) 14. Andreas de Saukevill tenet In manerio de Chalvinton sex feoda unde Johannes Herengaud tenet de dicto manerio In Westdene friston et Sutton tria feoda et dimidium Et dictus Andreas in dicto manerio de Chalvinton Boggelegh et Bokherst duo feoda et dimidium
- (e) 15. Wiſs Maufe tenet In manerio suo de Eghinton tria feoda unde Ricardus de Hured tenet In Comitatu Norhamton j feodum Et Radulfus de Horsye et tenentes de Lamporte tenent terciam partem unius feodi Et Robertus de Burghersh tenet terciam partem feodi in Libertate quinque portuum apud Pevenese Et Abbas de Begham tenet terciam partem j feodi . . Wiſs Paynell tenet apud Walderne dimidium feodum Et dictus Wiſs Maufe tenet in predicto manerio dimidium feodum . .
- (d) 16. Thomas Peverel et Nicholaa de Aldeham tenent In Exete et Bourne unum feodum . . feodum Item idem Thomas tenet In Graneherst Chreyngel et ffrogferle unum feodum
- (f) 17. Wiſs de Eghingeham tenet In Pegheton duo feoda militis
- (c) 18. Wiſs de Brom Horet de Hertefeud Et prior de Michelham Et Robertus Yweregge et Walterus de la Lynde Thomas Peverel Et Johannes de Rademelde tenent quatuor feoda In Hertefeud Beueringeton Bourne et Albricheston unde dimidium feodi quod fuit Walteri de Albricheston in Albricheston est inter predicta quatuor feoda
- (h)
- (g) 19. Robertus Dauy tenet in Horsted ij feoda unde prior de Lewes In Langeneye et Horstede tres partes unius feodi Et Relicta . . de Albricheston tenet tres partes unius feodi Et Wiſs de Echingeham tenet In Pekeden j quarterium Et dictus Robertus Dauy tenet In parva Horsted unum quarterium unius feodi. Et sciendum quod omnia predicta feoda . . feodo Moretyn

Isti subscripti tenent de Domino Rege In capite In Rapo de Pevenese Mortyns

20. Thomas Peuerel tenet In Blachington duas partes unius feodi

21. Simon Euenyng Wiſts le Bat et Ricardus de Hamme et alii tenentes de tenemento quod fuit Gilberti le frank tenent In Beuerington terciam partem unius feodi
22. Johannes de Rademelde tenet In Beuerington de tenemento quod fuit Ricardi et Philippi de Beuerington terciam partem unius feodi
23. Heres Johannis de Say scilz Wiſts de Lymfeld tenet tenementum quod fuit Johis In ffernthe vidz unum feodum
24. Emmeric de Croun tenet In manerio de Bourne unum feodum quod fuit ffulconis de Cantelupe
25. Abbas de Ponte Roberti tenet In Sutton duo feoda militis que fuerunt Walteri de Auerigges

Feoda de Leicestr' In rapo predicto de feodo de Mortyn

26. Rogerus de sancto Andrea et Nicholas de sancto Mauro . . de Radynden et Alicia de Mucegrose . . feod'. Nicholas de sancto Mauro tenet j feodum. Johannes de Radinden dimidium feodi . . C . . ham Haddon in Comitatu Norhamton j feodum et Alicia Mucegros in Redd . .

in dorso

Adhuc de feod' Leycestr' In Rapo predicto

27. Nicholaa de Aldeham tenet In Lanerketye dimidium feodi
28. Wiſts Paynell tenet In ffechyng terciam partem unius feodi
29. Johannes le Warre et Gilbertus Sakelfot tenet sextam partem unius feodi
30. Wiſts de Woghe tenet in Horsted et Retherfeud unum feodum
31. Ricardus Hereward tenet In Erlyngton et Wilyndon unum feodum unde prior de Lewes Robertus Grinte et Robertus Gubbe tenent de eodem feodo de dicto Ricardo Et similiter Hospit' sci Johannis de Okelyng de Wiffo Goldyng set de eodem feodo
32. Robertus de Lewkenor tenet tria feoda militis in dicta Baronia de Pevenese De quibus Abbas de Bello et Abbas de . . tenent unum feodum In Sekynton Et alia duo feoda jacent unum In Heghton et Aliud In Shirenton . .

In cuius testimonium predicti Jurati presenti Inquisitioni Sigilla sua apposuerunt

Summa feodorum istius Rapi xlvj feoda preter elemosinas⁷⁷

finis Rapi. xlvj feoda [? et di.] et tercia pars unius feodi de feodo Mortyns

lvij^{li} xvij^s viij^d."

This last document plainly deals with the knights' fees which had belonged to the Honour of Mortain. They are here divided into three classes. In the first and third

⁷⁷ The lands held in pure almonry by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Prior of Lewes, the Abbot of Battle, &c.

they are said to be "de feodo Mortyns. The same is implied in the second. If any more definite description was applied at the end of the first class it is unfortunately lost.

The three groups of tenants are—Firstly, those who held the $35\frac{1}{2}$ fees belonging to the Barony of Aquila; secondly, those who held of the King "in capite;" and thirdly, those who held under the Honour of Leicester.

The Fees of the Honour of Aquila.—It is evident on examining this list that it follows the second of our former lists in exactly the same order, with the single exception that Walter de Alfriston's half-fee (h) is joined to the four fees of (c). They run thus:

(a)	Comprising entries 2 to 13 includes	15 fees
(b)	entry 14	6 "
(e)	" 15	3 "
(d)	" 16	3 "
(f)	" 17	2 "
(c) and (h)	" 18	$4\frac{1}{2}$ "
(g)	" 19	2 "
		—
		$35\frac{1}{2}$

The only difficulty is with (a) which, as the list is made out, contains more than 15 fees. Yet that is the number assigned to Nicholaa de Aldeham in the second entry as of her Manor of Gevington, and that number seems required for the total number accounted for,⁷⁸ viz.: Honour of Aquila, $35\frac{1}{2}$; Tenants in capite, $5\frac{1}{3}$; Honour of Leicester, 6; Total, $46\frac{1}{2}$ fees and one-third. The half-fee is omitted. Possibly the Aquila Barony only paid for 35. That was certainly the case in the "Aid" of the 14 Henry II., where Richer de Aquila, who had acknowledged $35\frac{1}{2}$ knights in his "Carta," pays £14. 11s. 8d. at the rate of 8s. 4d. for each knight, which accounts for the 35 without the half. Or perhaps as stated in entry 18, Walter de Alfriston's half-fee was no longer reckoned, being absorbed in the four fees of (c).

⁷⁸ The service of $2\frac{1}{2}$ fees rendered by the Queen for the Barony itself is not included. Nor, apparently, are the Northamptonshire fees of the Honour of Leicester in entry 26. But in entry 15 William Maufe's three fees of his manor of Eghinton [Eckington] must include one in Northamptonshire.

But, leaving the question of how Nicholaa's 15 knights are to be counted, we may notice with interest that with the help of this list we may feel our way back to the "Carta" of 1165, and localise all the eight groups of fees there mentioned. There had doubtless been some subinfeudations created during the thirteenth century. But the eight main groups remained constant from first to last, that is, as we have seen, from at least as far back as the reign of Henry I.

The first of them (a) has the most suggestive history, for it may be traced with reasonable probability to its original founder. Baldwin de Aldeham, the husband of Nicholaa, was son of Thomas de Aldeham and his wife, Isabella, who had previously been wife of Robert de la Hay. Isabella de Aldham and her sister, Margery, wife of William de Echingham, were co-heiresses of Sir William de Montacute. On Margery's death Isabella de Aldham became her heir. This Sir William was brother of John de Montacute, whose heirs were holding this fee at the time of our second record, the Testa de Nevill. John appears to have been dead in 12 Henry III.⁷⁹ The link which connects the Montacute family with the "Ricardus filius Willelmi," who held the fee when Richer de Aquila made his return to Henry II., in 1165, is not so clear, but there certainly was some link, as we gather from the succession of lordship in the case of the Manor of Preston in Northamptonshire, here mentioned.⁸⁰ Richard FitzWilliam is further described in the Lewes Chartulary as "Ricūs fil' Wiñ fil' Aluredi" in a deed⁸¹ in which he grants to the Priory a hide of land in Sidenore, a manor by Selmeston, mentioned in the eighth parcel of Nicholaa de Aldeham's fee. Now Mr. Round⁸² identifies Richard FitzWilliam's grandfather with Aluredus who was "pincerna" of Robert, the first Count of Mortain, and who occurs in Domesday Book as the holder of manors in various counties under the Honour of

⁷⁹ "Rot. Cl.," 12 Henry III.

⁸⁰ See p. 199.

⁸¹ Fol. 72 ; also fol. 44, quoted by Round in "S.A.C.," Vol. XL., p. 69.

⁸² "S.A.C.," Vol. XL., p. 74.

Mortain. It is reasonable therefore to conclude that it was he who first laid the foundation of this extensive and scattered fee. A strong confirmation of this is found in the fact that certain manors in Northamptonshire are reckoned as belonging to it. Of the one mentioned in the second entry of the above list, Preston, we find⁸³ that it belonged to the Moreton Fee and the Honour of Aquila; that in Domesday Alured held $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates "in Prestetone;" that in 1222 it was held by John de Montacute, and that it then followed the same succession as that just recorded down to Baldwin de Aldham and Nicholaa.

Whether we may connect Alured's grandson, Richard, with the Richard de Lamport, who was charged so heavily for the "Aid" in 1168, and with the land at Hecton, described as "terra vigilum de Pevenesel et de Muntagu," there is hardly sufficient evidence to show.

It seems strange that an estate held on the service of 15 knights and partly in a distant county should be called the "Manor of Jevington." There is no reason to suppose that any of Baldwin de Aldham's ancestors had ever made a home there, or that it ever had the importance which this document would lead one to suppose. The Montacutes held lands there. William de Montacute gave to the Priory of Michelham "the chapelry of Jovington,"⁸⁴ with lands and rents." We may probably explain the title as an illustration of the changed meaning which the word "manor" had now assumed. It is observable that the groups of holdings under the Honour of Aquila, which are here called manors, were in no sense similar to the great agricultural organisations held by the Counts of Mortain. Each one of them was a manor in the old sense, but not the whole as one unit. Nor can we suppose that the scattered tenants were summoned to a manorial court at Jevington. If, however, it was a bailiwick, administered as the Queen's holdings were by Luke de la Gare, it would matter little which of the

⁸³ "Baker's History of Northamptonshire," Vol. I., p. 431.

⁸⁴ "Rot. Pat.," 14 Henry III.

separate rent-paying units gave its name to the whole. Some temporary cause may have first led to the use of "Jevington" as the title of the "caput manerii."

The entries marked 15, 16 and 18 probably deal with the minor manors of Burne, but so indefinitely that it is useless to discuss them here.

The Tenancies in capite.—These are very few in number, but they closely concern Eastbourne and its neighbourhood. Number 24 is the principal Manor of Bourne. Numbers 21 and 22 were also certainly partly in Bourne. In the Eyre of 1288,⁸⁵ under the heading of the "Hundred of Estburn," Gilbert Franck was called to account for sub-dividing the lands which he held as one-sixth part of a knight's fee. The Manor of Radmell Beverington long existed in Eastbourne, and one of its "boroughs" had the name of Beverington.

The Honour of Leicester.—When this portion of the Honour of Mortain took this name I have not succeeded in ascertaining. The separation was evidently subsequent to the connection between Sussex and Northamptonshire, and it might have taken place any time after the forfeiture of the 2nd Count of Mortain. The Northamptonshire manors named at the beginning of this section of the list (in entry 26) are apparently not to be counted amongst the $46\frac{1}{3}$ fees of the rape, and any further discussion of them is outside the object of this Paper. They are, however, of great interest to Sussex enquirers, for East Haddon and also Preston, Brampton and Haldenby were all held by Sussex tenants or in conjunction with lands in Sussex.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Assize Roll 930, m. 8.

⁸⁶ Much information regarding these manors may be found in "Baker's Northamptonshire": Brampton (held by the family of Dive), Vol. I., p. 82; Wood Preston, or Little Preston, p. 431; East Haddon, p. 504, and West Haddon, p. 600 (both also held by the Dive family). The "Calendarium Genealogicum," p. 746, contains an extract from an Inquisition taken in 25 Edw. I. on the estates which had belonged to Simon de Montford, Earl of Leicester, and had passed into the hands of Henry III. at the Earl's death and forfeiture, in 1265. The extract deals with the families mentioned in this list, giving details of their succession in the interval.