THE URBAN POPULATION OF SUSSEX IN 1340

By R. A. Pelham, m.a., ph.d.

The war tax of 1340 was levied at a time when Edward III was in urgent need of money, the first campaign of the Hundred Years War having ended inconclusively in 1339. For students of medieval Sussex the surviving returns of this tax[1] are of special interest because they throw considerable light upon the economic conditions of the county in the decade preceding the Black Death. The tax, with its threefold classification of the population,[2] covered the whole county, but here we are concerned merely with Chichester and the boroughs. There are several absentees, however:[3] Hastings, Winchelsea, and Rye because, as Cinque Ports, they were exempt from ordinary taxation;[4] Horsham, which normally figured in lay subsidy lists; and Seaford. The omission of Seaford is not surprising, since it always ranked as a 'vill', though it must have resembled the other ports in character.[5]

It is notoriously difficult to ascertain the precise meaning of the term 'borough' at this period, nor can we be certain as to what constituted an 'urban' settlement. We cannot even assume that these boroughs were the largest centres of population, for a perusal of the published returns for the 1296, 1327, and 1332 subsidies reveals still larger numbers of taxpayers in several

---

[1] P.R.O. Lay Subsidies, 189/16 (Enrolled). Separate returns for Lewes, Midhurst, Steyning, and East Grinstead are to be found in 189/19.

[2] A ninth was levied on merchants' goods in the boroughs; a ninth on corn, wool, and lambs in rural parishes; and a fifteenth on the goods of artisans and traders outside the boroughs who did not subsist by agriculture or their sheep.

[3] It is unusual to find Southover ranking as a borough, so it has been omitted from the discussion. In any case, the return is damaged and many names are not identifiable.

[4] The lists of those in the Cinque Ports claiming exemption from this tax are printed in *Nonarum Inquisitiones* (Record Commission, 1807).

[5] Seaford contributed £2 13s. 4d. towards the fifteenth, on a total assessment of £40 (Lay Subsidies, 189/16).

Wealden vills. But since the settlements under consideration appear consistently as boroughs on many occasions,[1] we are at all events spared the difficulty common to many counties in which borough and vill are alternative designations for the same place. There is an initial problem regarding the returns for 1340. The Rev. W. Hudson, in his introduction to the Sussex subsidies of 1296, 1327, and 1332, states that the principle of individual assessment was maintained only until 1334, after which date 'a fixed sum was assigned to each township, on which account the names of individual contributors are no longer recorded'.[2] This clearly does not apply to the 1340 returns, which not only contain the names of individual contributors but also have totals differing from those in the returns for 1334.[3] But the Rev. Hudson goes on to say: 'Later taxes for which the names of contributors are recorded are based on different principles to these.' This may have been generally true, but there are grounds for thinking that the criteria adopted in 1340 differed only slightly from those of earlier subsidies. The method of assessment up to 1334 was simple: a small panel of local jurors would estimate the total value of each person's movable goods —household utensils, grain, stock, &c.—and the amount of tax paid would be a certain fraction of that value.[4] The evidence for 1340 is rather scrappy, though it enables us to see the same principle at work. In the

---

[1] e.g. in the enrolled accounts of the subsidies of 1295, 1307, 1313, 1315, 1316, 1319, 1322, 1332, 1334, and 1336 (J. F. Willard, 'Taxation Boroughs and Parliamentary Boroughs', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. J. G. Edwards, &c., 1933, p. 434).

[2] *Sussex Record Society*, x. 15. This only applied to tenths and fifteenths.

[3] The totals for 1340 are:

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Chichester	182	11	0	Midhurst	22	14	6
Shoreham	45	9	6	Steyning	36	0	0
Lewes	19	2	6	East Grinstead	9	4	6
Arundel	5	17	0				

The corresponding totals for 1334 are as follows (Lay Subsidies, 189/7):

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Chichester	220	0	0	Midhurst	55	0	0
Shoreham	120	0	0	Steyning	49	10	0
Lewes	40	10	0	East Grinstead	37	12	6
Arundel	63	13	9				

[4] J. F. Willard, op. cit., p. 418.

parliamentary grant made on 29 March 1340 it was stated: '. . . Et les Citeyns & Burgeis du Roialme la verrai Neofisme de touz lour Biens,'[1] and, judging by the detailed assessment of Midhurst that has survived, this was carried out in a manner familiar to those who have studied earlier subsidies.[2]

Even so, however, the 1340 lists differ from those of 1327 and 1332 in having lower minimum assessments, and although that fact by itself does not necessarily constitute a serious deviation from principle it is a modification that must be examined. The question naturally arises as to whether this is an indication that poorer burgesses, previously exempt, were thereby included, or whether there was a general levelling down of all assessments. Usually, as Table I shows, the

TABLE I

Lowest individual assessments, excluding jurors of assessment

Settlement	1296 (1/11)		1327 (1/20)			1332 (1/10)		1341 (1/9)	
	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Chichester	11	0		10	0	10	0	4	6
Shoreham	11	0	1	0	0	10	0	7	6
Lewes	11	0		10	0	10	0	9	0
Arundel	11	0		10	0	10	0	13	6
Midhurst	11	0		10	0	10	0	3	0
Steyning	} 11	6		10	0	10	0	4	6
Bramber				10	0	6	11	..	
East Grinstead	11	0		10	0	6	8	4	6

exemption limit was in the neighbourhood of 10s., and all persons with less than that amount of wealth in goods were presumably excluded.[3] If, therefore, there were no deviation from the principle previously adopted, and if the economic and social conditions of the various boroughs were the same in 1340 as they had been a few years before, we should expect the lowering of the exemption limit to increase the numbers of taxpayers.

[1] *Rot. Parl.* II. 112.
[2] Cf. printed lists in *Rot. Parl.* I. 243–64 (Colchester, 29 Edw. I). The details for Midhurst are printed in *S.A.C.* xx, 10–11.
[3] See J. F. Willard, loc. cit. The limit for vills fell to 6s. in 1332.

TABLE II

Total taxpaying population, including jurors of assessment

Settlement	1296	1327	1332	1341
Chichester	111	67	68	121
Shoreham	90	43	56	36
Lewes	65	29	24	31
Arundel	56	53	34	9
Midhurst	36	26	32	33
Steyning	} 34	44	34	29
Bramber		13	14	..
East Grinstead	14	23	23	16

It does (see Table II), but in such an irregular way that one is bound to suspect that other factors were at work, especially as a serious drop in the number of taxpapers is registered in two instances (Arundel and Shoreham). In the case of the former the drop is explained by the fact that all the other men in the borough were taxed on their corn, wool, and lambs. But a further problem arises, for there is also a marked decline in the average individual assessments for 1340, compared with those of 1327 and 1332, except in the case of Steyning (Table III),

TABLE III

Average individual assessments (including jurors)

Settlement	1327			1332			1340		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Chichester	4	10	8	3	18	10	1	10	2
Shoreham	4	6	11	1	18	2	1	5	3
Lewes	2	2	9	1	11	6		14	2
Arundel	1	17	9	1	14	6	1	3	5
Midhurst	2	0	0	1	9	6		15	8
Steyning	1	7	11	1	4	10	1	8	10
East Grinstead	1	13	0	1	7	10		13	2

though this anomaly disappears when we compare the assessments of taxpayers common to the 1340 list and that of either 1327 or 1332 (Table IV). However, the Steyning jurors felt it necessary to offer an explanation for what they considered to be an unduly small total, and their remarks are rather illuminating: '... et dicunt praedicti juratores per sacrum suum quod catalla burgensium praedictorum ad majorem summam taxari non

possunt eo quod solverunt nonas garbarum bladorum suorum collectoribus garbarum ad valenciam xx s. et ultra que blada solebant in singulis aliis taxationibus inter eos taxari cum aliis catallis suis.' This is confirmed in similar language by the Lewes jurors, who declared that they had taxed all goods '. . . praeter garbas ex burgo crescentes de quibus dant nonam garbarum in diversis parochiis ex burgo et semper solebant taxari inter communia dicti burgi'.

TABLE IV

Average individual assessments, excluding jurors of assessment

(1) *Taxpayers common to 1327 and 1340 lists:*

Settlement	No. of taxpayers	1327			1341		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Chichester	16	4	3	2	3	2	11
Shoreham	7	4	0	4	2	5	0
Lewes	4	1	14	2		9	0
Arundel	3	4	10	0	1	5	6
Midhurst	7	1	11	11		16	1
Steyning	11	2	4	0	2	3	3
East Grinstead	5	2	0	10		14	8
	54	3	7	11	1	19	8

(2) *Taxpayers common to 1332 and 1340 lists:*

Settlement	No. of taxpayers	1332			1341		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Chichester	26	4	0	0	2	5	6
Shoreham	17	2	8	8	1	15	1
Lewes	4	1	7	6		11	3
Arundel	2	7	10	0	1	11	6
Midhurst	9	1	10	0	1	1	0
Steyning	7	1	14	11	1	11	11
East Grinstead	8	2	3	4		15	2
	74	2	17	4	1	13	4

N.B.—Several taxpayers in 1327 were jurors in 1332, whilst some of the jurors in 1340 had previously appeared as taxpayers.

It seems clear, therefore, that burgesses whose goods consisted entirely of corn, wool, and lambs produced in neighbouring parishes are absent from these borough lists, which appear to include only those whose wealth

was derived (*a*) wholly, or (*b*) in part only, from other sources.[1] It is not unlikely that the exemption level was lowered in order to bring in those members of group (*b*) who were normally subject to taxation but who, on account of this modification in the method of assessment, would otherwise have been excluded. Table V

TABLE V

Taxpayers who were assessed at less than 9s. in 1340 and whose names appear on the lists for 1327 and/or 1332

Settlement	Taxpayer	1327			1332			1340	
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	s.	d.
Chichester	Adam Shapewyk		..		1	0	0	4	6
	Elias Channs	2	0	0	2	0	0	4	6
	William Ray	1	10	0		..		4	6
Midhurst	Thomas ate Bergh	1	10	0		..		4	6
	William Destden	1	0	0	1	5	0	4	6
Steyning	John Raulot	1	11	8		..		4	6
	Ralph de Wassyngton	2	0	0		10	2½	4	6
	William Trot	1	2	6	1	9	4½	4	6
	John Abbe	1	5	0	2	4	7	4	6
East Grinstead	Richard Matheu		..			10	0	4	6

shows that several taxpayers whose assessment fell below the normal minimum in 1340 were, in fact, well within the taxable limit a few years previously. I have come across no instructions issued to jurors as to what should be the minimum assessment level, and since there never appears to have been any definite ruling on the matter it is probable that local juries were guided by tradition or expediency according to circumstances. If so, we may conclude that the special character of this tax called for some adjustment of the normal level for

---

[1] Those who paid a fifteenth in 1340 are also omitted, though they were apparently not numerous in the boroughs. Steyning is the only borough listed, the assessments being (Lay Subsidies, 189/16):

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Thomas de Merwe . .	22	6	William Lamporte . .	15	0
Walter Bysshop .	22	6	John le Smyth .	10	0
John Wynter .	15	0			

The following names appear under Arundel in the published volume of the Record Commission:

	£	s.	d.
Adam le Prest	5	0	0
John Capun	2	10	0
Thomas le Coteler	2	10	0

those, at all events, who were partly assessed on their corn, wool, and lambs, and the frequent occurrence of 4s. 6d. in the lists suggests that that was the generally accepted minimum on this particular occasion. Even so, the poorest members of the community were doubtless excluded in this, as in other lay subsidies.

In one important respect, therefore, the 1340 taxation lists are disappointing, for they give no accurate clue to the total population of each settlement. But, on the other hand, they throw some interesting light upon the agricultural activities of 'urban' dwellers in Sussex. The participation of townsfolk in farming in the Middle Ages is well known, though it is not easy to obtain statistics on this point. However, in the return for East Grinstead it is definitely stated that the ninth of sheaves amounted to 60s. 6d., whereas the ninth of other goods produced only 20s. 6d. No mention is made of wool and lambs, but they may have been included in the former total.

Turning to the 1340 lists themselves, we may note a few further points of interest. In the first place they reveal considerable fluctuation in the personnel of the taxpaying population. Although less than a decade separates them from the earlier lists, about two-thirds of the names in the latter have disappeared (Table VI).

TABLE VI

No. of taxpapers and jurors of assessment in 1340 who appear in either or both of the earlier lists

Chichester	.	. 29 out of 121
Shoreham	.	. 19 ,, 36
Lewes . . .	. 7	,, 31
Arundel . . .	. 5	,, 9
Midhurst . .	. 13	,, 33
Steyning . .	. 14	,, 29
East Grinstead .	. 11	,, 16
	98	275

Chichester and Lewes suffer most, only a quarter of the original names being entered on the 1340 list. However, in view of the problems already discussed, we ought not to lay too much emphasis on these figures, though it is

F f

worth noting that Chichester was passing through a difficult phase just then. For example, in 1339 commissioners were appointed to survey the walls and put the city in a state of defence at the expense of the mayor, bailiffs, and citizens, but in view of the poverty of the city and the heavy expense entailed the Bishop, Dean, and Chapter agreed to share the burden.[1] Then again, in 1341 £27 of the city's fee farm was remitted on account of the great charges of enclosing the city.[2]

Finally, the lists include the names of a few men who appear in the Sussex customs accounts of 1323–6 as wool merchants (Table VII). Most of them can be

TABLE VII

Wool-merchants in the 1340 list

Settlement	Merchant	Assessment			Average for all taxpayers		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Chichester	William Baret		9	0	1	10	2
	Robert Boscham	6	15	0			
	John Boxgraue	2	17	0			
	John Hardyng	1	16	0			
	Richard Mareschal	1	16	0			
	William le Reyue	1	16	0			
	John Spycer	4	1	0			
	John Stubbe	4	1	0			
	John Taverner	2	5	0			
	John Wylden	1	16	0			
Shoreham	William Lomb	1	7	0	1	5	3
	Richard Seman		18	0			
	Reginald Wassyngton	2	5	0			
Arundel	William Seuebech	1	16	0	1	3	5

traced in the 1327 and 1332 subsidies, where they stand out, as they do here, as a relatively wealthy section of the community.[3] In only two cases do their assessments, in 1340, fall below the average for their respective settlements.

In the following lists the order of the settlements has been altered so as to bring the ports together, and jurors whose names appear also in the column of taxpayers have been bracketed.

[1] V.C.H. Sussex, III. 72.
[2] Ibid.
[3] See S.N.Q. IV. 67–9.

CHICHESTER

Jurors: [Laurence le Frensche]
[John Hardyng]
[John Wyldene]
[Richard Mareschal]
[John de Bridham]
[William Reue]

Taxpayers:

	£	s.	d.
Boniface le Bucke	. 2	5	0
Richard Boxgraue	.	18	0
William Dauy .	. 2	5	0
John Hosteler .	. 2	5	0
John Sadeler .	.	4	6
John Capel	.	18	0
John Tauerner .	. 2	5	0
John Bourshond	. 1	16	0
Alice Baldewyn	. 1	7	0
John Boxgraue	. 2	17	0
John Bergestede	.	9	0
John Stubbe .	. 4	1	0
William Putle .	.	13	6
William Chanet	.	9	0
William Legard	.	13	6
Thomas Jolyf .	. 1	16	0
Richard Dygher	.	9	0
Thomas Bakere	.	9	0
William Tapermakiere		4	6
Robert Horewyk	. 2	5	0
Peter Hatfeld .	.	9	0
Peter Crabbe .	.	9	0
Henry Prickeloue	.	4	6
William Hayling	.	9	0
Richard Somer	. 1	7	0
Nicholas Brower	. 4	10	0
Robert Hurston	. 1	7	0
John Hirdyng .	. 1	16	0
Richard Badecok	.	9	0
Adam Shapewyk	.	4	6
Thomas Giles .	. 2	5	0
Widow of Geoffrey			
Borwer	.	18	0
Robert Hunstan	. 1	7	0
Clarice Mak .	.	9	0
Thomas Merston	.	18	0
William Purchas	. 2	5	0
William Fissher	. 1	16	0

	£	s.	d.
Thomas Etebred	.	18	0
Henry Clenefeld	. 6	15	0
William Orbon	. 2	5	0
Hugh Helpeston	. 2	5	0
Walter de Offham	. 1	7	0
Richard ate Bregh	.	18	0
Bartholomew Baker	.	4	6
William Glover	.	4	6
Peter Bolir	. 1	16	0
John Barber	.	4	6
John Rag	.	4	6
Robert Webbe .		9	0
Alice Wibbe .	.	9	0
Richard Listille	.	9	0
William Craule	.	9	0
Richard Cride .	. 2	0	6
William Baret .	.	9	0
William Wigthring	. 2	5	0
Richard ate Mulle	.	4	6
Stephen Firhot	.	4	6
Robert Boscham	. 6	15	0
John Wygthring	. 1	7	0
John Say	. 6	15	0
Edward Baker .	.	18	0
John Gardener	.	9	0
William Annsocod	.	18	0
John Othyn	.	4	6
William Ray .	.	4	6
Richard Iryssh	. 1	7	0
Godfrey Maydeneston	1	7	0
Robert Pluuer	.	4	6
Walter Peyteuin	. 1	16	0
Richard Smalstret	.	18	0
Robert Bonyng	.	9	0
Godfrey Carpenter	.	9	0
John Marlebergh	. 3	12	0
Thomas Clocher	.	18	0
William Rag .	.	4	6
Benedict Cordewaner	2	0	6
Adam Couk .	. 1	8	6
Thomas le Wyte	. 1	16	0
Richard Wynchestre .	1	7	0
John Spycer .	. 4	1	0
Robert Trenniars	.	4	6
John Melton .	.	4	6
John Pryns .	.	9	0

	£	s.	d.
Walter Taylur . .		4	6
William Berkynden .		9	0
Roger Coteler . .		4	6
Walter ate Solire .		9	0
John Aueray . .	1	7	0
Elias Chauns . .		4	6
John Mundeham .		9	0
William Hunstan .	1	16	0
Alice Podard . .	2	5	0
Roger Eldewyn .	1	7	0
Isabel Capelayn .		9	0
John Bette . .		9	0
John Peyntour, senior		4	6
Robert Flecher .		4	6
Godfrey Sherar .		4	6
Thomas Cordewaner .	2	14	0
Agatha Stedy . .		18	0
John Greynar . .	1	2	6
Robert Seildar . .	1	7	0
John Wynchestre .	2	5	0
John Goude . .		13	6

	£	s.	d.
Prior Domus Beate			
Marie . . .	4	10	0
William Bysshop .		9	0
William Pleyscy .	2	5	0
William de Walton .	4	14	6
John Bayon . .	12	0	0
John Haneker . .	1	16	0
John Bygeneuere .	1	7	0
John Portlond . .	4	10	0
William Stout . .	3	16	6
Elias de Meone .	1	16	0
Agnes Grygghe .	1	2	6
Laurence le Frensshe	1	16	0
John Hardyng . .	1	16	0
John Wylden . .	1	16	0
Richard Mareschal .	1	16	0
John de Brydham .	1	16	0
William le Reyue .	1	16	0
Total .	£182	11	0
Ninth .	£ 20	5	8

SHOREHAM

Jurors: [John Bewchamp]
[William Lomp]
[John Swel]
[Robert Puffer]
[John Bernard]
[Reginald Wassyngton]

Taxpayers:

	£	s.	d.
John Norman . .		18	0
Robert Bas . .		9	0
Walter Tannere .		18	0
John Bakere . .		18	0
Robert Kenne . .	2	14	0
Robert Lokyer .		18	0
Adam Luselon . .	1	7	0
Walter Berge . .	1	16	0
John Bemhard .	1	7	0
Walter Frannke .	1	7	0
John Swel . .	4	1	0
German Hobelit .		9	0
John Beauchamp .		9	0
William Lomb . .	1	7	0
Hugh Norman . .		18	0
William Auenol .	1	7	0

	£	s.	d.
Reginald Wassyngton	2	5	0
Simon Launcyng .		9	0
William Bridham .		9	0
Joan Bemhard . .	2	14	0
Robert Barbir . .		9	0
Philip Porter . .	1	7	0
Reginald Carter .	4	12	0
Thomas Cokestin .		18	0
Robert Puffer . .	4	1	0
Thomas Wodemere .		9	0
Hugh Passur . .		9	0
Walter Catbard .		9	0
Philip Bolter . .		18	0
Walter Dod . .		9	0
Robert Large . .		7	6
Ralph Stacy . .		18	0
Richard Seman . .		18	0
Henry Puffer . .	1	7	0
William Dod . .		9	0
John Coupere . .		9	0
Total .	£45	9	6
Ninth .	£ 5	1	0

LEWES

Jurors:						£	s.	d.
Stephen Bochier								
Robert Bette				John Stoterylt .	.		9	0
Nicholas de Leddrede				Joan ate Chapele	.		9	0
Robert Baker				Walter Eggere .	.		13	6
				William Cicestre	.		9	0
Taxpayers:				Robert Baker .	.		9	0
	£	s.	d.	Simon Orloger	.		18	0
Ralf Tannere .	.	9	0	Julian Comber .	.	1	7	0
John Stokelyng	.	9	0	Richard Hicok .	.		9	0
John Plomer.	.	9	0	John Syre	.	1	7	0
Agnes Bernard	.	18	0	Edmund Bochier	.		9	0
Godfrey Bynt .	.	9	0	Walter Mory	.	1	2	6
William le Frye	. 1	7	0	John Alger	.	.	9	0
William Fyssher	.	13	6	John Tebaud	.	.	9	0
Henry Baker .	. 1	2	6	William Suon .	.		13	6
Thomas Coupere	. 1	2	6	Matilda Aunfray	.		9	0
Seman Spicer .	.	18	0	Total	.	£19	2	6
John Baker	.	13	6	Ninth	.	£ 2	2	6
Richard Scras .	.	9	0					

ARUNDEL

Jurors: Alan le Ferour
Robert de Ludesie
John Suayn
Robert Conte

Taxpayers:

		£	s.	d.
William Seuebech	.	1	16	0
John Morel	.	1	7	0
John Perand	.		13	6
Adam Prest	.	1	7	0
William Kaunuile	.		13	6
Total	.	£5	17	0
Ninth	.		13	0

MIDHURST

Jurors:				£	s.	d.
Richard le Tannere						
John de Bromlegh		Richard de Hayling .		1	16	0
Thomas le Bogher		Thomas de Chidynge-				
Richard le Poppar		fold . . .			9	0
Taxpayers:		Thomas Andrew	.	1	16	0
	£ s. d.	Henry ate Wodegate			13	6
Henry le Botelir, sen.	18 0	John le Werch .	.		4	6
John Mille . .	1 16 0	Matilda le Pipere		1	7	0

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Simon Bosse . .		18	0	Water Snow . .	1	7	0
William Hosie . .		9	0	Stephen le Digger .		13	6
Robert Danekstone .		18	0	Richard de Sangelton		4	6
Thomas le Stubber .	1	7	0	John Squier . .	1	7	0
Alice le Wilde . .		3	0	John Gilot . .		4	6
Thomas ate Bergh .		4	6	Thomas le Salter .		9	0
Richard ate Litegate		4	6	Walter Taupener .		3	0
Henry le Botelir, jun.		9	0	Mabel Goldenyghe .		3	0
Felicia ate Rie . .	1	16	0	William atte Litegate		9	0
William Destden .		4	6	Total .	£22	14	6
Roger le Sadeler .		9	0	Ninth .	£ 2	10	6
Walter de Sangelton	1	11	6				

STEYNING

Jurors: John Chepman
[John le Babbe]
Hugh Bonefamt
Robert Hourhok

Taxpayers:

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
				Ralph de Wassyngton		4	6
Thomas Hally, sen. .	9	0	0	Richard le Webbe .		4	6
John le Babbe . .	2	5	0	Robert Skolace .	4	4	0
Walter Preest . .	2	5	0	Elias de Tortyngton	2	14	0
Robert Snow . .	2	0	6	Walter de Bury .	2	5	0
William Churse .	2	5	0	John le Capel . .	1	16	0
Walter Hally . .		18	0	Jordan Dalecok .	1	2	6
John Raynold . .		18	0	John le Kaa . .		18	0
Stephen Elouf . .		4	6	Richard le Kaas .		6	0
Peter Solloe . .		4	6	William Trot . .		4	6
Thomas Hally, jun. .		18	0	John Abbe . .		4	6
Alice ate Felde . .		4	6	Walter le Smyth .		4	6
				John Raulot . .		4	6
				Richard de Merewe .		4	6
				Total .	£36	0	0
				Ninth .	£ 4	0	0

EAST GRINSTEAD

Jurors: William le Fyssher
Thomas le Rous

Taxpayers:

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
				Geoffrey de Farlegh .	1	7	0
				John Aueray . .		13	6
William ate Soler .	1	7	0	William Payn . .		13	6
William Enghelond .		18	0	Simon Squier . .		9	0
Richard Gonneresone	1	1	0	Thomas Chepman .		9	0
Alice le Clerke . .		13	6	John le Foghel . .		9	0
William le Couk .		9	0	Richard Matheu .		4	6
John ate Soler . .		6	0	Total . .	£9	4	6
Alice Mottyng . .		4	6	Ninth . .	£1	0	6

SOUTHOVER

Jurors: [Robert atte Brok]
[Roger Honnere]
[Alexander Tannere]
[John Lytenorth]

Taxpayers:

	£	s.	d.
Roger Honner .	. 2	5	0
John Hodshorn	.	9	0
John Baker .	.	9	0
Helewys Scoldecok	.	9	0
Robert Aumblur	.	9	0
William Darnel	. 2	5	0
Agnes Delue .	.	9	0
Simon Sage .	.	4	6

	£	s.	d.
Adam Hafter .	.	4	6
Simon Shobury	.	2	3
Robert ate Brok	.		
John Tygheler .	.		
Robert Shereue	.		
Thomas Russel	.		
Alexander Tanner	.		
Simon Curthous	.		
John Gardener	.		
John Horsham	.		
John Lyteref .	.		
Total .	£13	10	0
Ninth .	£ 1	10	0