# ASSESSMENT OF THE HUNDREDS OF SUSSEX TO THE KING'S TAX IN 1334,

## SHOWING THEIR LOCAL ORGANISATION AND ECONOMIC CONDITION.

By the Rev. WILLIAM HUDSON, F.S.A.

The Returns of the national taxation, known as Subsidy Rolls, reach back to the thirteenth century. The early Rolls are among the most valued of our sources of local history, because they contain the names of all the con- tributors as well as the amount of their tax. They furnish the earliest lists of the inhabitants of a country parish. Three excellently preserved Rolls for the whole County of Sussex in 1296, 1327 and 1332 are to be found in the Public Record Office, and have been constantly quoted by local historians. But after the last occasion the subsequent returns lose their interest for the purposes of local enquiry, because they contain no more names, but only the amounts of the various contributing districts.[1] The reason for this change was that for this particular tax (then the only national demand) the amount charge- able on any township or taxable district was permanently fixed, and so remained, as long as the tax lasted, for nearly 300 years afterwards. During all that time the King's Commissioners, knowing the amount payable by a town- ship, if that sum was accounted for, were not concerned to know the names of the local people who paid it.

The tax, the returns for which would have been most valuable had they continued their early fulness of detail,

---

[1] The returns, with names, of some later and different taxes are classed with Subsidy Rolls.

was that finally known as the King's Tenths and Fifteenths. It was originally a tax on people's moveable goods, which may be taken as meaning trade stock in a town and farm stock and produce in the country. Whenever the tax was demanded an inventory was made. The tax for a long time varied, being a tenth, or an eleventh, or a twentieth and so on, as need required. But by the fourteenth century it had become fixed as a Tenth levied on cities, boroughs or places on the King's demesne, and a Fifteenth on the rest of the country. Hence its name. It was the inconvenience of making these frequent inventories and the desire of the King's officials to know what definite sum to expect which led to the settlement which was made in 1334. At that time permanent sums were agreed to by the mutual consent of the King's Commissioners, who would try for a maximum, and the local contributors, who would plead for a minimum. It is from this point of view that the settlement of 1334 possesses an unique interest of its own. It represents, as nearly as can well be ascertained, the resources of the mass of the householders of the country *at that date*. It perhaps includes more than we should describe by that title, for, judging by some existing inventories, a household might contain one or two subordinate members who paid on small possessions of their own. Again, as these returns are always made according to local districts, as counties, hundreds, townships, they furnish reliable evidence as to the comparative prosperity of various counties, or hundreds, or townships, as contrasted with each other.

The attention of the writer of this paper was drawn to this subject by finding in the Muniment Room of the City of Norwich a list of the sums assessed to all the townships of Norfolk in that year. The places are, as usual, arranged in hundreds and townships, which arrangement naturally suggested a comparison between the various parts of the county. A re-arrangement of the hundreds according to their geographical position led to a reversal of the previously accepted opinion as to the source of that county's wealth at that period, when it stood next to

Middlesex and London. This eminence had been ascribed to cloth manufacture in Norwich and the eastern villages. But in the light of this return it became clear that it still rested on the great sheep-farming and wool-growing parishes of the west, which far surpassed their eastern neighbours in their contributions to the tax.

In this present paper is given the assessment of Sussex in 1334 with a view to a similar survey of its several parts at that time. Though no such broad or definite result as that just mentioned reveals itself, it will doubtless help local enquirers to mark the progress of their own districts, especially in the interior of the county. And, incidentally, a very marked difference between the mode of assessment in Sussex as compared with Norfolk throws no little fresh and interesting light on the practice existing in Sussex and Kent of dividing hundreds and sometimes parishes into "boroughs" or tithings. The difference may be thus stated. Norfolk, in a normal fashion, is treated as a whole. The county is divided into 32 hundreds and the names included in each hundred are those of the known villages still existing. One or two names of lost villages occur, but the cases are very few. In Sussex we have, of course, the six Rapes treated as separate units. This, so far, renders our survey easier. But on further examination we find ourselves met with a somewhat baffling difficulty. Each rape is divided into its hundreds and the hundreds contain names which, in the majority of cases, are those of villages. We soon find, however, that while names we should have expected are not mentioned, many places which never were separate villages are entered as tax-paying units, the cases of omission being less numerous than those of unexpected insertion. Thus the first parish on the list, Westbourn, is followed by three names which are those of subordinate members of the parish. In the eastern Rapes of Pevensey and Hastings this practice is very marked. In the hundred of Willingdon, Berlyng, a manor, stands for East Dean and Friston. The adjoining hundred of Eastbourne is rated as Operton, Esthalle and Lamporte. In the hundred of Flexborough, Sutton and Norton

appear as independent units; and the hundred of East Grinstead is entered as Imberhorne, Brembeltye, Asshehurst and Shelvestrode. So, in the Rape of Hastings, Battle is divided into four districts; in the hundred of Baldslow two manors, Inlegh and Wyltyng, take the place of parishes; while the hundred of Goldspur, containing the parishes of Guldeford, ·Iden, Playden, Peasmarsh and Beckley, is taxed under the four names of Knelle, Wyvelrugg, Hope and Helgton.

It is to be understood that all these places which do duty as rateable units are (partly in this Roll and throughout the Roll for 1332) described as "villatæ" or townships, just as if they were separate parishes or villages. This suggests at least a partial explanation of the practice so largely adopted in Sussex. A "villata" was not necessarily synonymous with a village or parish. It was a *responsible community*, usually the men occupying a "vill" or what we should now call a civil parish. Here it is also used of the inhabitants of a portion of a vill. Upon the "villata" the common law of the land imposed certain obligations, as the duty of pursuing a thief or criminal, and in general of preserving the peace and giving evidence when required. In particular, when a dead body was found the Coroner called upon the four neighbouring townships, *i.e.*, villatæ, to attend his inquiry. In default of satisfaction the whole hundred was fined. Now, in Norfolk and most other counties the hundreds contained villages or parishes enough to meet this requirement without difficulty. But in Sussex this was not the case. Many of the numerous hundreds contained only two or three parishes, some contained only one. How could such hundreds satisfy the Coroner ? The neighbouring hundreds would not be willing to share their burden. They solved the difficulty, as suggested in the case of Eastbourne in Vol. XLII. of our *Collections* (p. 189), by utilising another institution, that of tithings. These were associations of 10 or more adults bound by the law to answer for each other's good conduct or to be mutual pledges. The old English word for pledge was "borgh," and by that word a tithing was

described in Sussex. A large parish would contain several such tithings or " borghs," and it was these which were summoned to meet the Coroner like separate parishes or " villatæ." [2]

It is plain that our taxable districts were in some cases these " borghs " of a hundred which contained only one or two parishes. Barcombe, in the Rape of Lewes, is divided into Northborgh, Middelborgh and Southborgh. Rotherfield, which had but one other parish in its hundred, also furnishes a Northborgh; while the four divisions of Battle and East Grinstead, both of them single-parish hundreds, were recognised as tithings of those places. It appears, further, that this artificial system of meeting responsibility had extended itself throughout the county, even in hundreds which had several parishes of their own. The hundred of Willingdon had six parishes, but for purposes of local responsibility they were organised into four boroughs.[3] Four quarters naturally formed a favourite division and it is remarkable that out of 13 hundreds in the Rape of Hastings, 10 are taxed in four divisions each.[4] Evidently the intention was to divide the burden of responsibility with some approach to equality. This may explain some other cases. The addition of three subordinate members to the parish of Westbourne may have originally been due to its greater importance. Although there were several other parishes in the hundred, it could bear the common burdens much better than its neighbours and it undertook four shares.

This may lead us to a further marked characteristic of the Sussex mode of taxation, which confirms what has been already suggested. We seem to have arrived at the conclusion that in Sussex the taxation was based not so much on the accidental size or importance of a parish,

[2] This is the meaning of a " borough " or " tithing " in Sussex and Kent. Instead of a personal association, as it meant originally, it came to mean an administrative district of a hundred and the people who lived in it were its " villata."

[3] *S.A.C.*, Vol. XLIII., p. 193.

[4] In some of the larger hundreds multiples of four occur, as 12 in Westbourne and the same in Easebourn.

but (within a hundred) on an artificial division, which had already been organised for the purpose of bearing other local burdens. If the object of this artificial division was to equalise burdens, we might expect to find traces of such an endeavour in the matter of taxation. Such traces are too evident in our taxation-roll to be disputed, though they had doubtless been modified by local circumstances. To take some of the most evident. In the Rape of Lewes the hundred of Strete has three divisions, one contributing £13. 1s. 10d., the other two together £13. 10s. 7d. The hundred of Barcombe has three divisions, two together contributing £6. 12s. 5d., the third £6. 10s. 4d. In the Rape of Pevensey the hundred of Willingdon has four divisions, one taxed at £7. 9s., the two next together at £7. 8s., the last at £6. 3s. The hundred of Lokkesfeld has three divisions rated at £11. 6s., £11. 5s. and £12 respectively. The hundred of East Grinstead has four, the first and last producing together £4. 19s. 9d., the two others £4. 16s. 7d. The hundred of Longbridge has two, one taxed at £5. 4s., the other at £5. 9s. 4d. In the Rape of Hastings the hundred of Ninfield has four, the first two contributing £4. 9s. 3d., the other two £4. 8s. 2d. The hundred of Battle has four divisions, the first and last (almost equal) taxed at £2. 18s. 9d., the second at £2. 11s. 8d. and the third at £2. 4s.

Even where the equalising process is not carried through the whole hundred, we constantly find two or three of the divisions made equal, as in the hundred of Foxearle, in the Rape of Hastings, three out of four divisions run between £2. 10s. and £2. 18s. A similar case is the hundred of Hartfield, in the Rape of Pevensey, or that of Bosham, in the Rape of Chichester. We may go still further and detect this process in larger hundreds. Take that of Box and Stockbridge, in the Rape of Chichester. The first four districts contribute together £7. 7s. 9d., the next four £7. 4s. 7d., the next three £7. 8s. 4d., the next two £7. 6s. 8d., the next three £7. 11s. 8d. The last three entries, containing places far apart from each other, contribute together £8. 1s.

Or take the hundred of Poling, in the Rape of Arundel. The first four places, which locally stand together, produce £10. 4s. 8d. Then follow Rustington with £7, Ferring and Goring £7, East Preston and Kingston £7. 16s. 8d. Then come two groups of two each, producing £5. 1s. and £5. 13s. 1d., and after a group of two, taxed at £4. 14s., the list finishes, as in the last case, with three separated places, contributing a total of £5. 2s. 5d. The next hundred on the list, that of Bury, has two very evident groups, the first three producing £6. 2s. and the remaining four £6. 12s.

This organisation of the hundreds of Sussex into districts for purposes of local administration must have grown up long before this time, and, no doubt, may be traced back at least to the appointment of Coroners at the close of the twelfth century. But we might think that the adaptation of it to local taxation may have been due to this settlement of 1334. This was certainly not so altogether. The return for 1334 must have been based directly on that of 1332, for the whole order and almost every detail of the arrangement of hundreds and places corresponds throughout, the payments only differing. The earlier rolls of 1296 and 1327 do not correspond quite so much. So far as can be judged, without a minute collation of the documents, the evidence of attempted equalisation of contributions seems greater in our return of 1334. But in the case of Eastbourne[5] in 1296, two out of four districts contribute £10. 18s. 2d., the other two £10. 18s. And in the same return the hundred of Poling[6] bears a remarkable resemblance to the features noticed above.

The exact correspondence between the arrangement of the returns for 1332 and 1334 is a matter of great importance, because, as all the names are given in the earlier return, a local student may have some clue to the locality of some of the less easily identified districts. A word may be added with regard to these archaic names of districts. Most of them may be found on maps as farms or small hamlets. The Society's *Collections* and local

---

[5] *S.A.C.*, Vol. XLII., p. 194.          [6] *S.A.C.*, Vol. VII., p. 159.

histories supply some information. But only special
knowledge of the localities in which they occur can
suggest why they may have come to occupy their pro-
minent position. In the division of a large parish relative
situation may have been a guiding cause. But more
probably manorial claims and rights may have exercised
a still greater influence. The "borough" of Berlyng,
in the hundred of Willingdon, appears to be a case in
point. Though not itself a parish, it included the two
parishes of East Dean and Friston. The lordship of the
Manor from very early times was in the family of Bar-
dolph, and this, no doubt, accounts for the "borough"
taking the name of the lordship. A powerful lord would
prefer to deal with his own tenants, and the King would
be willing that he should be responsible for his neigh-
bourhood.

---

The Return for 1334 begins with a statement of the
Tenth, which was paid by the City of Chichester and
eight Boroughs (using the word in its ordinary sense),
and by six manors forming part of the King's Ancient
Demesne. Some of the Boroughs occur again as paying
a Fifteenth. The sworn burgesses would have to pay
the Tenth, the rest of the inhabitants the Fifteenth. It
may be as well to remark here that the Lowey of
Pevensey, Hastings, Rye and Winchelsea do not appear
on these Subsidy Rolls, the Cinque Ports dealing directly
with the King. In several of the eastern hundreds
Barons of the Cinque Ports were living and claimed
exemption. Their names are given separately and
generally on rolls called by the rather misleading title
of Cinque Port Rolls. The absence of these places
makes our survey imperfect, but they may be classed
with the payers of a Tenth, and with these we need not
concern ourselves further.

After the Tenth comes the Return of the Fifteenth,
which embraces all the rest of the county. The total
amount paid by the whole county was £1,104. 7s. 8½d.
Of this £76. 8s. 4d. was produced by the Tenth and

£1,027. 19s. 4½d. by the Fifteenth. It is with this latter amount that we are here dealing. It was made up in the following proportions by the six Rapes: That of Chichester paid £218. 6s. 4d.; Arundel £167. 17s. 11¼d.; Bramber £133. 5s. 6d.; Lewes £153. 15s. 9¼d.; Pevensey £209. 9s. 8½d., and Hastings £145. 2s. 1¾d.

In comparing counties or parts of counties with one another from the special point of view before us the best available basis of comparison is the relation between area and value, for the contributions to a Fifteenth (as distinguished from a Tenth) were almost exclusively from persons deriving their income from agriculture.

The area of "Land" in Sussex is given in the Ordnance Survey as just short of 930,000 acres. I have, however, for convenience taken the acreage of hundreds and parishes as they are given in Horsfield's *History of Sussex*. His figures, though perhaps not so strictly accurate, are sufficiently so to answer our purpose. Exclusive of the Cinque Ports and their members and the towns and manors which paid a Tenth, the area of the parishes which paid a Fifteenth amounts to 917,150[7] acres, the sum paid being a few pence short of £1,028. The corresponding amounts for the County of Norfolk were a payment of £3,190. 10s. 6d. for an area of about 1,350,000 acres. If we take 30 acres (an average holding) as an area-unit and also apply the same process to the six Rapes of Sussex, we arrive at the following results:

| | Total acreage. | Total produce of a Fifteenth. | | | Average taxation per 30 acres. | | Average value of goods per 30 acres. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | £ | s. | d. | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. |
| Norfolk ... ... | 1,350,000 ... | 3,190 | 10 | 6 ... | 1 | 5 ... | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Sussex ... ... ... | 917,150 ... | 1,027 | 19 | 3 ... | | 8 ... | | 10 | 0 |
| Rapes of Sussex— | | | | | | | | | |
| Chichester ... ... | 142,620 ... | 218 | 6 | 4 ... | | 11¼ ... | | 14 | 0¾ |
| Arundel ... ... | 132,970 ... | 167 | 19 | 11 ... | | 9 ... | | 11 | 3 |
| Bramber ... ... | 133,180 ... | 133 | 5 | 6 ... | | 7⅕ ... | | 9 | 0 |
| Lewes ... ... ... | 128,374 ... | 153 | 15 | 9 ... | | 8½ ... | | 10 | 7½ |
| Pevensey ... ... | 223,902 ... | 209 | 9 | 8 ... | | 6¾ ... | | 8 | 5¼ |
| Hastings ... ... | 151,104 ... | 145 | 2 | 1 ... | | 7 ... | | 8 | 9 |

This comparison of the Rapes is not, however, of so much value, because they do not correspond with any

[7] The totals of the County and the Hundreds are arrived at by adding together Horsfield's acreage of the separate parishes.

natural divisions of the county. There were in 1334 certain districts which must have possessed marked characteristics of their own, the rich maritime land lying between the Downs and the sea from Chichester harbour almost to Brighton; the South Downs between the Adur and Eastbourne, and the Wealden and forest district in the interior of the county. The valuable marsh lands of the Lowey of Pevensey are (as we have seen) not here taxed, and their absence, as well as the large amount of forest land in that Rape, explains its low value.

With regard to the valuation of the first of these districts we may take the hundred of Avisford, in the Rape of Arundel, which on an area of 15,010 acres is taxed at £37. 8s. 4d., giving for 30 acres a tax of 1s. 6d. and a value of £1. 2s. 6d. The adjoining hundred of Poling stands higher still. It contains 17,740 acres and was taxed at £52. 11s. 10d., giving for 30 acres a tax of 1s. 9d. and a value of £1. 6s. 3d.

For the value of purely Down-land we have the hundred of Willingdon, in the Rape of Pevensey, with an area of 11,720 acres and a tax of £21. 0s. 6d., yielding on 30 acres a tax of 1s. 1d. and a value of 16s. 3d. The hundred of Flexborough (including that of Bishopstone) had an area of about 7,400 acres and was taxed at £14. 14s. 2d., giving for 30 acres a tax of 1s. 2d. and a value of 17s. 6d.

When we pass further into the interior of the county the values considerably diminish. The hundreds of Westbourn and Singleton (then rated separately) lie chiefly on the western Downs and contain 33,800 acres, with a tax of £47. 10s., making for 30 acres a tax of 10d. and a value of 12s. 6d. The Wealden hundred of Rotherbridge, in the Rape of Arundel, with 42,260 acres, could only bear a tax of £36. 17s. 11d., showing for 30 acres a tax of $6\frac{1}{3}$d. and a value of 7s. 11d. In the Rape of Pevensey the hundred of Hartfield is taxed at £11. 5s., with 17,500 acres, which gives $4\frac{1}{2}$d. for 30 acres, or a value of 5s. $7\frac{1}{2}$d. Still less is the produce of Rotherfield, in the same Rape. Its 24,140 acres paid a tax of £11. 2s. 3d., giving for 30 acres a tax of $3\frac{1}{3}$d. and

a value of 4s. 2d.  The lowest point of all appears to be reached in the large Wealden hundred of Buttinghill, in the Rape of Lewes, which contained no less than 58,210 acres, but could bear no greater tax than £18. 3s. 9d., with the result that 30 acres could only carry a tax of $2\frac{1}{4}$d., and their rateable value was 2s. $9\frac{3}{4}$d.

The foregoing instances are only examples and are chosen because the hundreds cited were fairly homogeneous in their agricultural conditions.  Local knowledge can better gauge the economic condition of more mixed hundreds, or parts of hundreds.

It is plain, however, that in 1334 the wealth of the county was derived from its maritime agricultural districts, to which we might no doubt add its seaports, if the taxation of the principal ports had been here included.  The interior of the county was still far behind the maritime part in economic progress.  So far as the evidence of this return carries us, the revival of the iron industry, which is thought to have begun by this time, had not yet made sufficient advance to reveal its presence to any extent.

---

ASSESSMENT OF THE TOWNSHIPS OF SUSSEX IN 1334
(P.R.O. Subsidy Roll $\frac{189}{7}$).

Taxacio decime et quinte decime domino Edwardo Regi Anglie tercio post conquestum anno regni sui octavo per laicos concessarum facta in Comitatu Sussex per Abbatem de Bello et Jacobum de Kingeston Ac nomina villarum et summe totales quas homines earundem villarum concesserunt domino Regi pro decima et quinta decima predicta.

| | Decima | | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Civitas Cicestr' .......... | xxij<sup>li</sup> | | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| | Burgus de Midhurst ...... | | cx<sup>s</sup> | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| | Burgus Arundell ........ | vj<sup>li</sup> | vij<sup>s</sup> iiij<sup>d</sup> ob | 6 | 7 | 4½ |
| | Burgus de Shoreham .... | xij<sup>li</sup> | | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Burgi | Burgus de Stenyng ...... | iiij<sup>li</sup> | xix<sup>s</sup> | 4 | 19 | 0 |
| | Brembre ................ | | xxx<sup>s</sup> | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| | Horsham................ | | lxxiij<sup>s</sup> iiij<sup>d</sup> | 3 | 13 | 4 |
| | Lewes ................,..... | iiij<sup>li</sup> | xij<sup>d</sup> | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| | Estgrenestede............ | | lxxv<sup>s</sup> iiij<sup>d</sup> | 3 | 15 | 3 |

Summa totalis Burgorum predictorum
lxiij<sup>li</sup>  xv<sup>s</sup>  xj<sup>d</sup> ob  £63 15 11½

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Est Assheling .......... | xxij$^s$  vj$^d$ | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| West Assheling.......... | xxxviij$^s$ viij$^d$ q$^a$ | 1 | 18 | 8¼ |
| Fontiton [Funtington].... | xlviij$^s$      ob | 2 | 8 | 0½ |
| Southwode ............. | vj$^{li}$    iij$^s$  j$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 6 | 3 | 1¾ |
| Wodering in Hundredo de |  |  |  |  |
| Pageham.............. | x$^s$ | 10 | 0 |  |
| Boseham ................ | x$^s$ | 10 | 0 |  |

*Antiqua Dominica* (bracket label on left)

Summa totalis Antiquorum dominicorum

xij$^{li}$   xij$^s$  iiij$^d$ ob     £12  12  4½

Summa totalis Burgorum et Antiquorum
dominicorum  .. lxxvj$^{li}$ viiij$^s$  iiij$^d$     £76  9  4

## *XV$^a$*     RAPUS  DE  CICESTR'

Hundredum de *Westbourn*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Westbourn[8]................ | lxij$^s$ viij$^d$ | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| Pernested[9] ................ | lxij$^s$  vij$^d$ | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| Aldesworth et Wodemancot.... | lxvj$^s$ | 3 | 6 | 0 |
| Nutbourn ................. | xliv$^s$ viij$^d$ | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Raketon .................. | xlix$^s$ viij$^d$ | 2 | 9 | 8 |
| Walderton[10] ............... | lxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Stoghton .................. | cvj$^s$  ix$^d$ | 5 | 6 | 9 |
| Northmeredon .......... .... | l$^s$  iiij$^d$ q$^a$ | 2 | 10 | 4¼ |
| Estmeredon................. | lix$^s$ viij$^d$ | 2 | 19 | 8 |
| Compton ................. | xxviij$^s$  vj$^d$ | 1 | 8 | 6 |
| Westmeredon ............. | xxij$^s$  xj$^d$ | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Upmeredon................. | xxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 1 | 6 | 8 |

Summa totalis hundredi predicti

xxxij$^{li}$ vij$^s$     j$^d$ q$^a$    £32  7  1¼

Hundredum de *Boseham*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boseham[11] ................ | xliiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ q$^a$ | 2 | 4 | 4¼ |
| Chudeham ................. | xlvj$^s$  xj$^d$ | 2 | 6 | 11 |
| Thornye ................. | xxij$^s$      ob | 1 | 2 | 0½ |
| Stok...................... | xlviij$^s$  iij$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 2 | 8 | 3¾ |

Summa totalis hundredi predicti

viij$^{li}$ xix$^d$ ob    £8  1  7½

Hundredum de *Dempford*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Southertyng ................ | xlviij$^s$  x$^d$ ob | 2 | 8 | 10½ |
| Westhertyng ............... | cxv$^s$ viij$^d$ q$^a$ | 5 | 15 | 8¼ |

[8] The words " Villata de " are entered in this Roll before the names in some of the hundreds ; in the Roll for 1332 they are prefixed to every name throughout the county.  The spelling of the names almost always agrees with that in the Roll for 1332 (Lay Subsidy $\frac{189}{4}$), which is admirably compiled.

[9] This and the three following places are tithings of Westbourne.

[10] A tithing of Stoughton.

[11] Bosham, the King's Manor, is charged with a 10th, as being part of the King's Demesne.  This would be the rest of that portion of the hundred that went by this name.

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dudelyng | xlv$^s$ vj$^d$ | 2 | 5 | 6 |
| Elnestede | l$^s$ | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Esthertyng | lxxiiij$^s$ ij$^d$ ob | 3 | 14 | 2½ |
| Stratiton [12] | l$^s$ | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Chitehurst | viij$^s$ vij$^d$ ob | | 8 | 7½ |
| Treford | xxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Rogate | lxij$^s$ ob | 3 | 2 | 0½ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti |  |  |  |  |
|  | xxiiij$^{li}$ xix$^d$ q$^a$ | £24 | 1 | 7¼ |

**Hundredum de _Esebourn_**

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Esebourne | c$^s$ | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Budyton | xxij$^s$ | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Wolbedyng | xlvj$^s$ | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Stodeham | lx$^s$ | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Ippyng | xxxviij$^s$ | 1 | 18 | 0 |
| Cokkyng | lv$^s$ | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| Bebiton | xl$^s$ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Lynche | xxxv$^s$ | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| Lodesworth | xlvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Suleham | xxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Heshite [Heyshott] | liij$^s$ viij$^d$ | 2 | 13 | 8 |
| Grofham | xl$^s$ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti |  |  |  |  |
|  | xxviij$^{li}$ iij$^s$ | £28 | 3 | 0 |

**Hundredum de _Sengelton_**

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sengelton [13] | xxxiij$^s$ vj$^d$ | 1 | 13 | 6 |
| Cherleton | xxxvj$^s$ vj$^d$ | 1 | 16 | 6 |
| Estden | lviij$^s$ vj$^d$ | 2 | 18 | 6 |
| Westden | lxiij$^s$ x$^d$ | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| Chulegrave | xxxj$^s$ vij$^d$ ob | 1 | 11 | 7½ |
| Bunderton | xlij$^s$ vj$^d$ ob | 2 | 2 | 6½ |
| Lovent | xxxvj$^s$ v$^d$ | 1 | 16 | 5 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti |  |  |  |  |
|  | xv$^{li}$ ij$^s$ xj$^d$ | £15 | 2 | 11 |

**Hundredum de _Pageham_ [now Aldwick]**

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mundeham | lxxj$^s$ viij$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 3 | 11 | 8¾ |
| Pageham | xxix$^s$ v$^d$ ob | 1 | 9 | 5½ |
| Cherleton | xxxj$^s$ vj$^d$ | 1 | 11 | 6 |
| Shryppeux [14] | xx$^s$ viij$^d$ | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Northberghstede | xlix$^s$ viij$^d$ | 2 | 9 | 8 |
| Southberghstede | iiij$^{li}$ vj$^s$ j$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 4 | 6 | 1¾ |
| Bogenore | xxxiij$^s$ ob q$^a$ | 1 | 13 | 0¾ |
| Aldewyk | xxxij$^s$ x$^d$ ob | 1 | 12 | 10½ |

[12] Trotton.

[13] Dallaway (_History of East Sussex_) quotes from a FitzAlan MS. of the thirteenth century, "Sunt in hundredo de Sangleton 6 decennæ [tithings or boroughs]." They are those here given except Cherleton, which was part of the parish of Singleton. Chulegrave and perhaps Bunderton were parts of West Dean.

[14] Shripney. It is spelt Shryppeny in 1332.

|  |  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cremesham ............... | xxiij$^s$ | ix$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 1 | 3 | 9$\frac{3}{4}$ |
| Lovent ................... | lxxvij$^s$ | vi$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 3 | 17 | 6$\frac{3}{4}$ |
| Thedacre.................. | ix$^s$ |  |  | 9 | 0 |
| Tangmere ................ | xlij$^s$ | vi$^d$ | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Slyndon . ...............iiij$^{li}$ | ij$^s$ | q$^a$ | 4 | 2 | 0$\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti |  |  |  |  |  |
| xxix$^{li}$ | x$^s$ |  | £29 | 10 | 0 |

### Hundredum de *Manewod*

|  |  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wyghtryng.................. | ix$^{li}$ | xj$^s$ | 9 | 11 | 0 |
| Bridham ................... | cij$^s$ |  | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Sidlesham ............... | xiij$^{li}$ | vij$^s$ | 13 | 7 | 0 |
| Seleseye ................. | viij$^{li}$ |  | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti |  |  |  |  |  |
| xxxvj$^{li}$ |  |  | £36 | 0 | 0 |

### Hundredum de *Boxe* et *Stokebrugge*

|  |  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Halnaker.................. | lxvj$^s$ | q$^a$ | 3 | 6 | 0$\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Boxgrave ................. | xxvj$^s$ | ix$^d$ | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| Esthampton [Hampnett] ...... | xxiiij$^s$ |  | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Strethampton [ ,, ] ...... | xxxi$^s$ |  | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Westerton ................ | xx$^s$ |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Fisshebourn .............. | xxiij$^s$ viij$^d$ ob q$^a$ |  | 1 | 3 | 8$\frac{3}{4}$ |
| Suburbium Civitatis Cicestrie .. | xl$^s$ |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Wodecote ................. | lx$^s$ | xj$^d$ | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| Ovyng..................... | liij$^s$ | iiij$^d$ | 2 | 13 | 4 |
| Coleworth ................ | xl$^s$ |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Drayton .................. | lv$^s$ |  | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| Mundeham ................. | c$^s$ |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Rungeton ................. | xlvj$^s$ viij$^d$ |  | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Mershton.................. | xlvj$^s$ viij$^d$ |  | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Rumbaldeswyk ...... ...... .. | lx$^s$ |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Hunston .................. | xlv$^s$ |  | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Waltham et Ertham ......... | lxij$^s$ |  | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Aldyngbourn .............. | lxxiiij$^s$ |  | 3 | 14 | 0 |
| Donegheton[15] ............... | xxx$^s$ |  | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti |  |  |  |  |  |
| xlv$^{li}$ | j$^{d\ 16}$ |  | £45 | 5 | 1 |

Summa totalis Rapi de Cicest'  
ccxviij$^{li}$ vj$^s$ iiij$^d$    £218 6 4

## RAPUS DE ARUNDELL.

### Hundredum de *Avesford*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Villata de Forde............. | vij$^{li}$ viij$^s$ | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| Codelawe.................. | lvj$^s$ | 2 | 16 | 0 |
| Stok et Offam............... | xlj$^s$ | 2 | 1 | 0 |

[15] Donnington.

[16] The total amount of the items is 5s. more than here stated. A note on some other Rolls says an allowance of 5s. was made in favour of the Prior of Calceto.

|  | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bulesham[17] et Madhurst ...... iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Felgham .................. lxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Walberton et Bernham........ vij$^{li}$ xvj$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 7 | 16 | 4 |
| Atheryngton et Gate[18] ........ xlv$^s$ | | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Middelton ................. xlvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Tortiton et Benestede ........ xlij$^s$ | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Yabeton .................... lxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xxxvij$^{li}$ viij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | £37 | 8 | 4 |

**Hundredum de *Rutherbrugg* [Rotherbridge]**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Petworth..................... xj$^{li}$ v$^s$ | | 11 | 5 | 0 |
| Treue ...................... c$^s$ | | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Tuliton ................... l$^s$ | | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Iburnehou ................. xxiij$^s$ i$^d$ q$^a$ | | 1 | 3 | 1¼ |
| Stopeham ................. lxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Sutton ..................... iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Wollaviton ................. xix$^s$ iiij$^d$ q$^a$ | | | 19 | 4¼ |
| Berlaviton ................. iiij$^{li}$ ij$^d$ | | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| Duneketon ................. iiij$^{li}$ xiij$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 4 | 13 | 8 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xxxvj$^{li}$ xvij$^s$ xj$^d$ ob | | £36 | 17 | 11½ |

**Hundredum de *Westesewrith***

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Storghton[19] .................... vj$^{li}$ v$^s$ | | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| Wykenholte ... ............. iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Pulbergh ....... ........... lviij$^s$ | | 2 | 18 | 0 |
| Nutbourne et Nytymbre ...... lx$^s$ | | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Billyngeshurst ............. lvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 16 | 8 |
| Dunhurst et Howyk[20] ........ xxxvij$^s$ ix$^d$ | | 1 | 17 | 9 |
| Amberle et Rekham .......... iiij$^{li}$ iiij$^d$ | | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Perham et Gretham .......... lxx$^s$ | | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xxviij$^{li}$ vij$^s$ ix$^d$ | | £28 | 7 | 9 |

**Hundredum de *Palyng***

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eklesdon.................... cvj$^s$ | | 5 | 6 | 0 |
| Estangemeryng .............. lvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 16 | 8 |
| Hamme cum Bargham ........ xlij$^s$ | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Rustyngton.................. vij$^{li}$ | | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Ferryng .................... lx$^s$ | | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Garyng ................... iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Estpreston ................. xlvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Kyngeston ................. cx$^s$ | | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Todyngton ................. xlvj$^s$ | | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Hampton................... lv$^s$ | | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| Lenemenstre ............... xlv$^s$ j$^d$ ob | | 2 | 5 | 1½ |
| Warnecamp .............. lxviij$^s$ | | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Burgham................... xlvj$^s$ | | 2 | 6 | 0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| [17] In Yapton parish. | [19] Storrington. |
| [18] Eastergate. | [20] In Rudgwick parish. |

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wapham ................. | xlviij$^s$ | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| Northstok ................. | xlvij$^s$  v$^d$ q$^a$ | 2 | 7 | 5¼ |
| Palyng..................... | xxxviij$^s$ | 1 | 18 | 0 |
| Slyndefold[21] ............... | xvij$^s$ | | 17 | 0 |

Summa totalis hundredi predicti
lij$^{li}$ xj$^s$  x$^d$ ob q$^a$ £52 11 10¾

Dimidium Hundredum de *Bury*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hoghton ................... | xlv$^s$ | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Bury ...................... | xxxij$^s$ | 1 | 12 | 0 |
| Westburton ............... | xlv$^s$ | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Bygenevere................. | xxviij$^s$ | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| Waltham.................... | xl$^s$ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Fitelworth et Sonde .......... | xliiij$^s$ | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Wysbergh ................. | xx$^s$ | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Summa totalis hundredi predicti
xij$^{li}$ xiiij$^s$  £12 14 0

Summa totalis Rapi de Arundel
clxvij$^{li}$ xix$^s$  xi$^d$ q$^a$ £167 19 11¼

## RAPUS DE BREMBRE.

Hundredum de *Stenyng*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Warnham[22] ................ | iiij$^{li}$ xiiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | 4 | 14 | 4 |
| Wassyngton .............. | iiij$^{li}$ xv$^s$ | 4 | 15 | 0 |
| Cherleton et Shrottesfeld ...... | c$^s$ | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Wistneston .................. | xliij$^s$ | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Coumbes ................... | iiij$^{li}$ | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Annyngedon ............... | xxviij$^s$ | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| Bydelington ............... | lxx$^s$  v$^d$ | 3 | 10 | 5 |

Summa totalis hundredi predicti
xxv$^{li}$  x$^s$  ix$^d$ £25 10 9

Dimidium Hundredum de *Estesewrith*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Thackham ................ | vj$^{li}$  vj$^s$ | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Wormynghurst .............. | xxv$^s$ | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Sullyngton .................. | lxiij$^s$ | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Chiltington.................. | xxxv$^s$ | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| Disshenhurst[23] .............. | xxxvj$^s$ | 1 | 16 | 0 |

Summa totalis hundredi predicti
xiiij$^{li}$  v$^s$ £14 5 0

Hundredum de *Westgrenstede*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grenstede ................ | iiij$^{li}$ xiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | 4 | 13 | 4 |
| Byne ..................... | iiij$^{li}$  vj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 4 | 6 | 8 |

[21] N.E. of Horsham.

[22] In the Roll for 1327, after the "Villata de Warnham," comes "Villata de Rouspar" and then "Villata de Nuthurst." In 1332 the two latter are omitted as here. Some of the Rusper names appear under Warnham, and one from Nuthurst.

[23] Itchingfield, *S.A.C.*, Vol. XLI., p. 105. Spelt Dyschenhurst in 1332.

|  | | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wycham .................. lxviij$^s$ | | | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Eshurst ................ iiij$^{li}$ | xj$^s$ | ix$^d$ | 4 | 11 | 9 |
| Epsle ................... iiij$^{li}$ | iij$^s$ | | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| xxj$^{li}$ | ij$^s$ | ix$^d$ | £21 | 2 | 9 |

**Hundredum de *Brutford***

|  | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Findon ................... iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Clopham .................. lvij$^s$ | | 2 | 17 | 0 |
| Hyen[24] et Offyngton .......... lxiij$^s$ | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Launcyng ................. cviij$^s$ | | 5 | 8 | 0 |
| Sumtyng ................ iiij$^{li}$ | x$^s$ | 4 | 10 | 0 |
| Bradewater ............... iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Duryngton ................. lv$^s$ | | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| Segewyk ............. ....... xlj$^s$ | | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xxviij$^{li}$ | xiiij$^s$ | £28 | 14 | 0 |

**Hundredum de *Burghbech***

|  | | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shoreham ................. lv$^s$ | | | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| Iryngham[25] .... ............. l$^s$ | | | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Bydyng ................. iiij$^{li}$ | vj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Horton .................... xlvj$^s$ | | | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Edburghton ............... xlvij$^s$ | | | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| Ifeud .................... l$^s$ | | | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| xvj$^{li}$ | xiiij$^s$ viij$^d$ | | £16 | 14 | 8 |

**Dimidium Hundredum de *Typenok***

|  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alebourne ................. lxviij$^s$ | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Hanefeld .................... lx$^s$ | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | |
| vj$^{li}$ viij$^s$ | £6 | 8 | 0 |

**Dimidium Hundredum de *Windeham***

|  | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Windeham ................. cvij$^s$ ob | | 5 | 7 | 0½ |
| Iwehurst ................ iiij$^{li}$ | xj$^s$ iij$^d$ ob | 4 | 11 | 3½ |
| Summa totalis dimidii hundredi predicti | | | | |
| ix$^{li}$ xviij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | £9 | 18 | 4 |

**Dimidium Hundredum de *Fisheregate***

|  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kingston .................... cx$^s$ | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Southwyk ................. cj$^s$ | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Summa totalis dimidii hundredi predicti | | | |
| x$^{li}$ xj$^s$ | £10 | 11 | 0 |

|  | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summa totalis Rapi predicti | | | | |
| cxxxiij$^{li}$ | v$^s$ vj$^d$ | £133 | 5 | 6 |

[24] Heene by Worthing.
[25] Between Old Shoreham and Beeding.

## RAPUS DE LEWES.

| Hundredum de *Swambergh* | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Iford ....................iiij$^{li}$ xv$^s$ v$^d$ q$^a$ | | 4 | 15 | 5¼ |
| Kyngeston .................. lvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 16 | 8 |
| Villani Prioris de Lewes de | | | | |
| Kyngeston ................ xxj$^s$ | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Westout[26] ................. lxix$^s$ j$^d$ | | 3 | 9 | 1 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xij$^{li}$ ij$^s$ ij$^d$ q$^a$ | £12 | 2 | 2¼ |

| Hundredum de *Holmstrowe* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Radmeld .................... x$^{li}$ | | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Southese ................... c$^s$ | | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Mechyng[27] ................. cxij$^s$ | | 5 | 12 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xx$^{li}$ xij$^s$ | £20 | 12 | 0 |

| Hundredum de *Yenesmere* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rottyngdene ............... vj$^{li}$ x$^s$ | | 6 | 10 | 0 |
| Ovyngdene ................. xxxiiij$^s$ ij$^d$ ob q$^a$ | | 1 | 14 | 2¾ |
| Baldesdenne ............... xlj$^s$ ij$^d$ ob q$^a$ | | 2 | 1 | 2¾ |
| Falmer cum Burghmere ...... xx$^s$ | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xj$^{li}$ v$^s$ v$^d$ ob £11 | 5 | 5½ |

| Hundredum de *Whalesbone* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pecham cum Blechyngton .... viij$^{li}$ iiij$^s$ v$^d$ ob q$^a$ | | 8 | 4 | 5¾ |
| Preston et Hove............. iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Brightelmston.............. vj$^{li}$ xvj$^s$ vij$^d$ | | 6 | 16 | 7 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xix$^{li}$ xij$^d$ ob q$^a$£19 | 1 | 0¾ |

| Dimidium Hundredum de *Fissheresgate* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aldryngton ................. lxiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Porteslade ................ lxiij$^s$ | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Hangelton ................. lviij$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 18 | 8 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| ix$^{li}$ v$^s$ | £9 | 5 | 0 |

| Hundredum de *Ponynges* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Patching[28] ................. iiij$^{li}$ | | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Ponynges ................. lx$^s$ ix$^d$ ob | | 3 | 0 | 9½ |
| Nytymbre ................. iiij$^{li}$ ij$^s$ | | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Pycombe.................... lvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 16 | 8 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xiij$^{li}$ xix$^s$ v$^d$ ob £13 | 19 | 5½ |

| Hundredum de *Buttinghulle* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clayton Kymere et Hurst...... vij$^{li}$ iiij$^s$ j$^d$ q$^a$ | | 7 | 4 | 1¼ |
| Cokefeld et Slagham......... iiij$^{li}$ viij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 4 | 8 | 4 |

[26] The Parish of St. Mary Westout, Lewes.

[27] Now Newhaven.

[28] Perching, in Edburton, see *S.A.C.*, Vol. XXIII., p. 232.

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Werth .................... | lxv$^{s}$ ix$^{d}$ | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| Burle[29] .................... | lxv$^{s}$ vij$^{d}$ | 3 | 5 | 7 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xviij$^{li}$ iij$^{s}$ ix$^{d}$ q$^{a}$ | £18 | 3 | 9¼ |

Dimidium Hundredum de *Wyndeham*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | vj$^{li}$ iij$^{s}$ v$^{d}$ | £6 | 3 | 5 |
| Summa patet | | | | |

Hundredum de *Strete*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strete ......................xiij$^{li}$ | xxij$^{d}$ ob q$^{a}$ | 13 | 1 | 10¾ |
| Lofelde[30] ................. | lxj$^{s}$ v$^{d}$ ob q$^{a}$ | 3 | 1 | 5¾ |
| Lyndefeld et Lyndefeld[31] ...... x$^{li}$ | ix$^{s}$ ij$^{d}$ | 10 | 9 | 2 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xxvj$^{li}$ xij$^{s}$ vj$^{d}$ ob | £26 | 12 | 6½ |

Hundredum de *Bercompe*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northborgh ............... | lij$^{s}$ iij$^{d}$ | 2 | 12 | 3 |
| Middelborgh ............... iiij$^{li}$ | ij$^{d}$ | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| Southborgh ............... vj$^{li}$ | x$^{s}$ iiij$^{d}$ q$^{a}$ | 6 | 10 | 4¼ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xiij$^{li}$ ij$^{s}$ ix$^{d}$ q$^{a}$ | £13 | 2 | 9¼ |

Dimidium Hundredum de *Southnore* [Southover]

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | lxviij$^{s}$ | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Summa patet | | | | |
| Summa totalis Rapi predicti | | | | |
| | cliij$^{li}$ xv$^{s}$ ix$^{d}$ ob | £153 | 15 | 9½ |

## RAPUS DE PEVENESE.

Hundredum de *Shepelak*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laughton ..... ............ | lx$^{s}$ v$^{d}$ ob q$^{a}$ | 3 | 0 | 5¾ |
| Hodlegh ................... vj$^{li}$ | iij$^{s}$ ix$^{d}$ | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Chyntynglegh............... lxviij$^{s}$ | x$^{d}$ ob | 3 | 8 | 10½ |
| Ripp....................... iiij$^{li}$ xv$^{s}$ | iiij$^{d}$ ob q$^{a}$ | 4 | 15 | 4¾ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xvij$^{li}$ viij$^{s}$ v$^{d}$ | £17 | 8 | 5 |

Hundredum de *Hertfeld*

|  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parrok[32] ................... | lxviij$^{s}$ ob | 3 | 8 | 0½ |
| Folkenehurst ............... | l$^{s}$ x$^{d}$ q$^{a}$ | 2 | 10 | 10¼ |
| Blakehamme[33] ............. | liij$^{s}$ v$^{d}$ q$^{a}$ | 2 | 13 | 5¼ |
| Birchyndenne ............... | lij$^{s}$ viij$^{d}$ | 2 | 12 | 8 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xj$^{li}$ v$^{s}$ | 11 | 5 | 0 |

[29] Between Worth and East Grinstead. It gave a name to a hundred of "Lindfield and Burleigh Arches."

[30] So spelt here and in 1332.

[31] In 1327 these two are entered as separate "villatæ," one being described as "Lyndfeld Bardolph," the other as "Lyndfeld Archn'."

[32] A tithing of Hartfield.

[33] A tithing of Withyham.

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Rutherfeld*** | | | | |
| Rutherfeld ................. | vj$^{li}$ iij$^s$    j$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 6 | 3 | 1¾ |
| Northborgh ................. | liij$^s$        q$^a$ | 2 | 13 | 0¼ |
| Ferthe [34] ................... | xlvj$^s$   j$^d$ q$^a$ | 2 | 6 | 1¼ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xj$^{li}$   ij$^s$   iij$^d$ q$^a$   £11 | 2 | 3¼ | |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Wylyngdon*[35]** | | | | |
| Exete ................... | vij$^{li}$   ix$^s$ | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| Berlyng ................. | iiij$^{li}$   vij$^s$      q$^a$ | 4 | 7 | 0¼ |
| Jevyngton ............... | lxj$^s$  iiij$^d$ ob | 3 | 1 | 4½ |
| Wylyndon ............... | vj$^{li}$   iij$^s$    j$^d$ ob q$^a$ | 6 | 3 | 1¾ |
| Summa totalis predicti hundredi | | | | |
| | xxj$^{li}$       vj$^d$ ob   £21 | 0 | 6½ | |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Estbourne*[35]** | | | | |
| Operton ................. | vj$^{li}$     ij$^s$   ij$^d$ | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Esthalle ................... | lxxiiij$^s$    x$^d$ | 3 | 14 | 10 |
| Lamporte ................. | lxxiij$^s$ | 3 | 13 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xiij$^{li}$    x$^s$    £13 | 10 | 0 | |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Flaxbergh*** | | | | |
| Chyntyng ................. | lviij$^s$   vj$^d$ | 2 | 18 | 6 |
| Blachington ............... | xxxvj$^s$ viij$^d$ | 1 | 16 | 8 |
| Sutheghton ............... | xxxvj$^s$ | 1 | 16 | 0 |
| Sutton .................... | l$^s$ | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Norton..................... | lx$^s$ | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Denton .................. | xxxj$^s$ | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Bishopeston ............... | xxij$^s$ | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xiiij$^{li}$  xiiij$^s$   ij$^d$   £14 | 14 | 2 | |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Middeltone*[36]** | | | | |
| | lxxvj$^s$ | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| Summa patet | | | | |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Ristondenne* [Rushmonden]** | | | | |
| Shiffeld ................. | viij$^{li}$   x$^s$ | 8 | 10 | 0 |
| Horsted Keynes........... | viij$^{li}$ | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Marsefeud et Nutlye ......... | cx$^s$ | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| | xxij$^{li}$    £22 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hundredum de *Lokkesfeld*** | | | | |
| Fremfeld.................... | xj$^{li}$   vj$^s$    i$^d$ ob | 11 | 6 | 1½ |
| Ryngmere ................. | xj$^{li}$   v$^s$ | 11 | 5 | 0 |
| Wadhurst et Maghefeld ...... | xij$^{li}$ | 12 | 0 | 0 |

Lyndefeld et Burghele. Homines istarum villarum
nondum taxantur in hundredo isto pro eo quod
taxantur alibi in hundredo de Brittyngmille et

[34] Frant.

[35] See *S.A.C.*, Vol. XLII., pp. 194-197.

[36] Perhaps Milton, in Arlington.

£   s.   d.

Strete sicut apparet per inquisitionem in fine
istius indenture irrotulatam.[37]

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xxxiiij[li] xj[s] | j[d] ob | £34 | 11 | 1½ |

**Hundredum de _Tottenore_**

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bedyngham ............... | ciij[s] xj[d] ob q[a] | 5 | 3 | 11¾ |
| Preston[38] .................... | xlv[s] ob | 2 | 5 | 0½ |
| Preston ................. | xlvj[s] viij[d] ob | 2 | 6 | 8½ |
| Heghton ................... | lxiiij[s] vj[d] ob | 3 | 14 | 6½ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xiij[li] | iij[d] q[a] | £13 | 0 | 3¼ |

**Hundredum de _Estgrenestede_**

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imberhorne ...............iiij[li] | iij[s] vj[d] q[a] | 4 | 3 | 6¼ |
| Brembeltye................. | xlvij[s] ij[d] ob | 2 | 7 | 2½ |
| Asshehurst ................ | xlix[s] v[d] ob | 2 | 9 | 5½ |
| Shelvestrode .............. | xvj[s] iij[d] | | 16 | 3 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| ix[li] xvj[s] | v[d] q[a] | £9 | 16 | 5¼ |

**Dimidium Hundredum de _Alsiston_**

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Blachyngton et Alfricheston.... | lij[s] | 2 | 12 | 0 |
| Alston .................... | xj[s] viij[d] | | 11 | 8 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| lxiij[s] viij[d] | | £3 | 3 | 8 |

**Hundredum de _Thille_**

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Haillesham ................ | vj[li] x[s] iiij[d] q[a] | 6 | 10 | 4¼ |
| Hellynglegh .............. | lxxvj[s] viij[d] q[a] | 3 | 16 | 8¼ |
| Isenehurst[39]................. | iiij[li] ix[s] vj[d] ob | 4 | 9 | 7½ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| xiiij[li] xvj[s] viij[d] | | £14 | 16 | 8 |

**Hundredum de _Langebrugg_**

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wylmyngton .............. | ciiij[s] | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| Berewyk .................... | cix[s] iiij[d] | 5 | 9 | 4 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | |
| x[li] xiij[s] iiij[d] | | £10 | 13 | 4 |
| Villata de _Seford_[40]................. vij[li] | x[s] | 7 | 10 | 0 |
| Villata de _Appelterham_[41] ............ | xxj[s] ix[d] q[a] | 1 | 1 | 9¼ |
| Summa predictarum duarum villatarum | | | | |
| viij[li] xj[s] | ix[d] q[a] | £8 | 11 | 9¼ |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summa totalis Rapi predicti | | | | |
| ccix[li] ix[s] viij[d] | | £209 | 9 | 8 |

[37] The Inquisition is enrolled at the end of the Roll.

[38] One of these is "Preston Bec-Hellouin," in Glynde, the other "Preston Ferle." Heghton is "Heighton St. Clere," in Firle.

[39] A manor, perhaps corresponding to Waldron. See _S.A.C._, Vol. XIII., p. 95.

[40] Seaford is not taxed with the "Burgi," presumably because of its connection with the Cinque Ports, in which case the "burgesses" would answer with them. The other inhabitants are taxed here.

[41] This place, which was near Chichester, belonged to the Abbot of Battle. In the margin of the Roll for 1332 is entered "Nativi Abbatis de Bello."

## RAPUS DE HASTYNG.

|  |  |  | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dimidium Hundredum de *Bello*** | | | | | |
| Middelburgh | xxix$^s$ vj$^d$ | | 1 | 9 | 6 |
| Sandlak | lj$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 11 | 8 |
| Monioye | xliiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Telham | xxix$^s$ iij$^d$ | | 1 | 9 | 3 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | vij$^{li}$ xiiij$^s$ ix$^d$ | | £7 | 14 | 9 |
| **Dimidium Hundredum de *Naddrefeld*** | | | | | |
| Mundefeld [42] | xliiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Nedrefeld et Penhurst | xxxj$^s$ | | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Brightlyng | xlix$^s$ | | 2 | 9 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | vj$^{li}$ iiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| **Hundredum de *Foxherle*** | | | | | |
| Worthyng [Wartling] | iiij$^{li}$ xvij$^s$ j$^d$ ob q$^a$ | | 4 | 17 | 1¾ |
| Herst [Hurstmonceux] | liiij$^s$ vij$^d$ | | 2 | 14 | 7 |
| Eshbournham | lviij$^s$ q$^a$ | | 2 | 18 | 0¼ |
| Coppedebech | l$^s$ iij$^d$ | | 2 | 10 | 3 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xiij$^{li}$ | | £13 | 0 | 0 |
| **Hundredum de *Nenenesfeld* [Ninfield]** | | | | | |
| Nenenesfeld | lviij$^s$ q$^a$ | | 2 | 18 | 0¼ |
| Catesfeld | xxxj$^s$ iij$^d$ q$^a$ | | 1 | 11 | 3¼ |
| Codyng | xxij$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Hou | lxv$^s$ vj$^d$ ob | | 3 | 5 | 6½ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | viij$^{li}$ xvij$^s$ vj$^d$ | | £8 | 17 | 6 |
| **Hundredum de *Gosetrowe*** | | | | | |
| Brede | vj$^{li}$ xviij$^s$ v$^d$ ob | | 6 | 18 | 5½ |
| Udimere | cxij$^s$ vj$^d$ q$^a$ | | 5 | 12 | 6¼ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xij$^{li}$ x$^s$ xj$^d$ ob q$^a$ | | £12 | 10 | 11¾ |
| **Hundredum de *Baldeslowe*** | | | | | |
| Ore | iiij$^{li}$ xij iiij$^d$ q$^a$ | | 4 | 12 | 4¼ |
| Inlegh | xxxv$^s$ ix$^d$ ob q$^a$ | | 1 | 15 | 9¾ |
| Crouherst | xlvij$^s$ viij$^d$ | | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| Wyltyng [43] | lxiiij$^s$ ij$^d$ | | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xij$^{li}$ | | £12 | 0 | 0 |
| **Hundredum de *Gestling*** | | | | | |
| Gestling | iiij$^{li}$ xiij$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | 4 | 13 | 4 |
| Iklesham | cij$^s$ | | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Putte | xxxj$^s$ | | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Farlegh | lxv$^s$ | | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xiiij$^{li}$ xj$^s$ iiij$^d$ | | £14 | 11 | 4 |

---

[42] Mountfield.      [43] A manor in Hollington.

| | | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dimidium Hundredum de *Buxle* [Bexhill] | | | | | |
| | cxij[s] | ob | 5 | 12 | 0½ |
| Buxle summa patet | | | | | |
| **Hundredum de *Colspure* [Goldspur]** | | | | | |
| Knelle[44] .................... | lxviij[s] | | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Wyuelrugg ............... | iiij[li] xv[s] | | 4 | 15 | 0 |
| Hope ..................... | lxxviij[s] | | 3 | 18 | 0 |
| Helgton .................... | xxxix[s] | | 1 | 19 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xiiij[li] | | £14 | 0 | 0 |
| **Hundredum de *Staple*** | | | | | |
| Iwhurst ...... ............. | ciij[s] ij[d] | | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Sedelscombe ............... | lxvi[s] viij[d] | | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Chitecombe ................ | lxxvj[s] viij[d] | | 3 | 16 | 8 |
| Northihamme ............... | li[s] | | 2 | 11 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xiiij[li] xvij[s] vj[d] | | £14 | 17 | 6 |
| **Hundredum de *Haukisbergh*** | | | | | |
| Warbelton .. ...... .......... | lvj[s] iij[d] ob q[a] | | 2 | 16 | 3¾ |
| Todingwerth[45] ............. | liiij[s] q[a] | | 2 | 14 | 0¼ |
| Burghersh ................. | xlix[s] iiij[d] ob q[a] | | 2 | 9 | 4¾ |
| Byuelhame[46] ............... | lxij[s] iiij[d] ob q[a] | | 3 | 2 | 3¾ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xj[li] ij[s] | ob | £11 | 2 | 0½ |
| **Hundredum de *Showeswell*** | | | | | |
| Passelegh ................. | lv[s] iiij[d] q[a] | | 2 | 15 | 4¼ |
| Hodlegh .................. | liiij[s] x[d] q[a] | | 2 | 14 | 10¼ |
| Tycheshurst ............... | lxxvj[s] v[d] ob | | 3 | 16 | 5½ |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | ix[li] vj[s] viij[d] | | £9 | 6 | 8 |
| **Hundredum de *Henhurst*** | | | | | |
| Funterugg ................. | cx[s] | | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Glettyngham ............... | lxx[s] | | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Salhurst .................. | lv[s] | | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| Irugg ..................... | lxx[s] | | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Summa totalis hundredi predicti | | | | | |
| | xv[li] v[s] | | £15 | 5 | 0 |

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summa totalis rapi predicti | | | | |
| cxlv[li] ij[s] j[d] ob q[a] | | £145 | 2 | 1¾ |

Summa totalis decime et quinte decime in Comitatu
Sussex .............m̃ciiij[li] vij[s] viij[d] ob £1104 7 8½

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inde xv[a] ..............mxxvij[li] xix[s] iiij[d] ob | | 1027 | 19 | 4½ |
| Et x[a]............... lxxvj[li] viij[s] iiij[d] | | 76 | 8 | 4 |
| | | £1104 | 7 | 8½ |

---

[44] In Beckley.      [45] N.E. of Heathfield.      [46] N.W. of Burwash.