

THE MANORS OF THE ARCHBISHOPS IN SUSSEX.

BY MARY S. HOLGATE.

IN the Cathedral Library at Canterbury, there is a MS. volume of great interest to Sussex students. It consists of a volume of about 176 folios, parchment and vellum, closely written on both sides of the page. It was bound in the eighteenth century and an inscription in modern writing describes it as part of a Register of the Archbishop's Manors with tenant's names, services and customs, a Custumal as we should call it.

It is undated, but judging from the writing it is a copy of an older document made at the end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth century. The original was probably at least a hundred years earlier as far as it can be dated by internal evidence. Mention is made in the text of three Archbishops: Edmund (1234), Boniface (1245) and Robert (1273). All are spoken of in the past tense, but as if the arrangements made in their days were still familiar to the existing tenants. There are two mentions of Edmund in the Sussex portion of the MS., one of which speaks of him as St. Edmund. His canonisation took place in 1247. Among the tenants mentioned is Robert de Hempsted of Framfield. His manumission is recorded in Reg. I. f. 193, *Ch.Ch.Cant.*, in the seventeenth year of Edward I., 1283, and he also appears as a taxpayer in 1296 (*S.R.S. X.*, 38). Other well known Sussex names also recorded are William Curtehope, Walter de Scoteny, Walter de Berkeley, Sir Roger de Leukenore, Cristina relicta Wyott.

The manuscript is imperfect, having apparently lost some leaves at the beginning, the leaves at the end are also in a very tender condition. There is no title page, but the text begins at the top of the page under the heading of Wingham (Kent).

The Sussex portion begins at f. 91, v., with a short statement regarding Stanmer of a completely different character to the rest, which follows the ordinary course of recording tenant's names, holdings, and rents in money, hens and eggs. The Stanmer entry is very short and mentions none of these things but deals with Blodwyte, Childewyte, and Maritagium. The manor also has to provide two ploughs with twelve oxen and eight horses, or twenty-one oxen and four horses. A note above the title "Stanmer," states that the annual wage of the carrucarius was 4s., the bovarius 3s., the bercarius 3s., the porcarius 3s., and the daga (daya) 2s. 8d. The evidence points to the Stanmer entry being copied from an earlier manuscript than the remainder.

Below are given the headings of the manors with their respective sub-headings, and in the case of South Malling, the additional sub-division of the boroughs. By far the largest part of the Sussex portion of the MS. is concerned with South Malling (31 ff), but there is much interesting information as to names and places in all the manors.

There has been great confusion between this manor of South Malling belonging to the Archbishops and the manor of South Malling belonging to the College of St. Michael, South Malling. The former, which is treated of in the MS. in question, no longer exists, but is, I believe, represented by the manors of Framfield, Mayfield and Uckfield. It is often alluded to as stretching from Lewes to the borders of Kent, and seems to have completely overshadowed the other manor of the same name in the minds of many.

The manor of South Malling, belonging to the College, still exists under the lordship of the Earl of Chichester, though shorn of much of its huge extent, which

stretched from Mulston in Falmer on the southern side of the Downs to the Surrey boundary of the county. The gift of this land to the College by Aldnoulf, *cir.* 765, is recorded in Birch, *Cart. Sax.*, vol. I., No. 197.

A portion of the parish of Ardingly lies within the College Manor, and it was in my search for information about it that I came across this Custamal of the Archbishop's Manors.

I shall be very grateful if any one can identify Watstead in Mayfield. It has been confused with Walstead in Lindfield in the College Manor, but unless there is a scribal error there is no ground for the confusion. At the same time the duplication of names such as Stone, Hapstead Busses, Ludwell, etc., makes confusion between the two manors easy.

I cannot pretend to have made a study of the Canterbury MS. in the short time available, but I feel that its existence should be recorded for the use of Sussex students.

Reference: Ch. Ch. Cant. E 24, X.Y.Z.

STANMER. f. 91, v, 1 f.

PAGHAM. Bergsted, North Berghsted, Bogenore, Charlton, Alde-
wyke, Nytymbre, Shrippeney, Portus de Wytheryng, 10 ff.

SLINDON. 9 ff.

TANGMER. Akerlands, Smythlands, 3 ff.

LOVENTON. 2 ff.

TERRYING. Waldis Marlepost, 3 ff.

SOUTH MALLING. Droflond, South Cornersley, Steddyngselegh,
Pelle, Bercle (2),¹ Cronherst. de verg' Bayouge, Arleygh
Alerdynden, Muleshale, Ryseden, Stanley hregge, Betesfeud,
Leneslye, Mapletreherst.

Borgha de Maufeud.

? oadeshorn, Knotte, Watyard, Isenhurst, Haddeleygh, Eversfeud,
Ludewill, Yardherst, Bimewater, Watstead, Stone, Stanleggh.

Borga de Grenherst.

Droflond, Dalyeferd, Fugglyegh, Stapelyegh, Turtelond, Bebyng-
werth.

Borgh de Fremefeud.

Wyckeresham, Broke, Tone, Chercheyard, Hemsted, Lefsyte fort,
Rammeslygh, Yardherst, Bisse, Upeton, ? Cherlewood, Possing-
werth, Watyard?

Borgha de Uckefeud.

Burgenses, Shoppe, Fuleburne, Benetle, Ferling de Benetle, Regge,
Ludestern, Chirychyard, Stone, Busse, Wyle, Stukeles ferling.

Borgha de Northlynton.

Droflond.

Borgha de Wellyngeham.

Mollond, Droflond.

Borgha de Gote et Myddelham.

Clyve, Mallings, Isefeud.

Borgha de Suthram.

Suthram, Cutfelling, Caneherth (2),¹ Gerserth, Stonham.

¹ Bercele (2) and Caneherth (2) meaning 2 divisions of the same name.