

XII.

A MEMOIR OF THE MANOR OF HATCHAM
IN THE COUNTY OF SURREY.

BY WILLIAM HENRY HART, Esq., F.S.A.

READ AT THE GENERAL MEETING HELD IN LAMBETH PALACE 31ST OCTOBER, 1856.

Hatcham is thus described in Domesday Survey :—

“ In Brixistan Hundredo.

“ Episcopus Lisoiensis tenet de Episcopo Hacheham. Bixi tenuit de Rege Edwardo. Tunc et modo se defendit pro iij hidis. Terra est iij carrucatarum. Ibi sunt ix villani, et ij bordarii, cum iij carrucatis, et ibi vj acræ prati. Silva iij porcis. Tempore Regis Edwardi et postea et modo valet xl solidos.”

This gives as the first owner of the manor Bixi, from whom *Bixi's stone*, afterwards corrupted into *Brixton*, not far from Hatcham took its name.

At the time of the survey, Hatcham was held by the Bishop of Lisieux under Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, but on the disgrace of the latter it reverted to the crown, and afterwards came to form part of the Barony of Maminot, under the following circumstances :—

Gilbert de Maminot, one of William the Conqueror's chief captains and favourites, was one of those eight barons whom John de Fiennes associated with himself for guarding Dover Castle. For that service considerable lands were given by the king to John de Fiennes, who divided them between himself and the other barons, and bound each of them, by the tenure of their lands, to maintain a certain number of soldiers continually for the defence of the castle.

The share which fell to Gilbert de Maminot under this arrangement consisted of twenty-four knight's fees, of which fees Hatcham formed one.

The superior interest in the manor soon afterwards came to the Say family, lords of Deptford, and there remained till the reign of Richard the Second, when, in Trinity Term, in the nineteenth year of the reign of that monarch, a fine was levied, entailing the manor upon Sir William Heron and Elizabeth his wife (the representatives of the Say family) and the heirs of their bodies, with remainder to her right heirs for ever.

15th May, 2 Henry IV. [1401], Matilda, relict of Thomas Bosenho, and daughter and one of the heirs of Thomas de Aldon, released unto Sir William Heron all her right and interest in this manor.¹

Elizabeth, wife of Sir William Heron, died 23 Richard II., leaving her husband surviving; he died without issue 30th October, 6 Henry IV. [1404], and by an inquisition taken thereupon it was found that he died seized of two knights' fees in *Hecchesham* and *Bertyngherst*, and which, on his death, were taken into the king's hands. Value of each fee 100 shillings.²

The paramount interest in the manor of Hatcham, after remaining with the family of the Says thus far, then became vested in the crown. I will therefore proceed to the consideration of the mesne interest, or that which was held by the inferior tenants under the lords paramount.

In the time of Henry II. Gilbert de Hachesham resided there, and the manor afterwards belonged to James de Vabadune and Roger de Bavent.

In the "Testa de Nevill" it is returned that two

¹ Close Roll; 2 Henry IV., part 2, memb. 19. d.

² Inq. post mortem, 6 Henry IV.; n^o 21.

knights' fees in *Hachesham* and Camerwell were held of Humfrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, by William de Say and the heirs of Richard de Vabadune. This, however, is incorrect to a certain extent; the lordship of Humfrey de Bohun was confined to Camberwell, and did not include Hatcham; moreover, William de Say held directly from the king, not from Humfrey de Bohun.

By a fine levied in the eighteenth year of Henry III., Robert de Retherhee and Agnes his wife, in consideration of seven silver marks, granted to William, son of Benedict, and his heirs for ever, five acres of meadow in *Hachesham*; rendering annually half a pound of cummin and one penny within fifteen days of Easter.

By another fine levied in Trinity Term, 31 Henry III., Avicia, formerly the wife of James the Goldsmith, granted to Laurence, son of William, one third part of ten acres of land in Retherheth and *Hechesham*, being her dower of the freehold which belonged to her husband in those villages; and in consideration of that fine the said Laurence granted to Avicia a rent of one mark issuing out of a tenement in London, held of Laurence by Robert de Herefeld, to be received by her yearly during her life; and after her decease the rent was to revert to Laurence and his heirs for ever.

By a deed dated on the feast of St. James, 52 Henry III. [1268], and made between Adam de Stratton, clerk, of the one part, and Thomas de Heyham and Isabella his wife of the other part, the said Adam granted and demised to the said Thomas and Isabella, and to the heirs of Thomas, in fee farm, one messuage and all the lands and tenements which he possessed in the villages of Retherheth, Bermundeseye, Camerwell, and *Hachesham*, which formerly belonged to Sarah, daughter of

Henry of London, to be holden of the said Adam and his heirs, rendering yearly ten marks at Michaelmas for all services. And, moreover, the said Thomas and Isabella covenanted to sustain the houses, garden, and everything belonging to the said lands and tenements, without waste or destruction, in the same state in which they received them, or in a better, and also all the embankment against the Thames belonging to the said lands and tenements at their own expense; so that, in default thereof, neither the said Adam or his heirs should suffer any diminution in the said rent of ten marks, or the tenants in Rotherhithe or their neighbours suffer any loss or damage; to the faithful performance of all which the said Thomas and Isabella, for themselves and the heirs of the said Thomas, bound all their goods, movable and immovable, present and to come, and also all their lands; and they granted to the said Adam, and his heirs or assigns, power to enter upon the said lands and tenements to distrain in case of any breach in this agreement. And if the water of the Thames should overflow and break through the wall belonging to the Prior of Bermundeseye, or any other wall not so well sustained, and submerge wholly or in part the said land at Retherheth, so that Thomas and Isabella, or the heirs of Thomas, could receive none of the profits thereof, it was agreed that the rent should decrease in proportion to the land they might lose, to be estimated by a jury of good and lawful men, unless Thomas and Isabella, or the heirs of Thomas, could recover by law against those the insecurity of whose walls had occasioned damage. And it was also agreed that if the said Thomas and Isabella could enfeoff Adam of certain lands in the parish of Bysseye within the year next following, then the said Adam would enfeoff the said Thomas and Isa-

bella of all the said lands and tenements which he held in Retherheth, Bermundeseye, Kamerwell, and *Hachesham*, to hold unto Thomas and Isabella, and the heirs of Thomas, by the service of one penny.³

From proceedings in 22 Edw. II. it appears that Adam de Stratton had been guilty of certain transgressions, in consequence of which all his lands were forfeited and seized into the king's hands, but for some reason the lands granted to Thomas de Hecham and his wife were not included in this seizure; whereupon the sheriff of Surrey was commanded to seize them without delay and keep them in safe custody, so that he might answer at the Exchequer concerning the issues. And he was ordered to make a return to the Lord Treasurer and the Barons of the Exchequer, at Easter 22 Edw. II., what lands and tenements were, on that occasion, taken into the king's hands, and their value; at which day the sheriff returned that these lands consisted of forty-two acres, annual value of each acre 12*d.*; and fourteen acres of meadow, annual value of each acre 3*s.*; and rents of assize 24*s.* yearly. Total value 108*s.* per annum. Afterwards came to the Exchequer Philip Burnel, who claimed to hold these lands, and demanded that they should be replevied unto him, which was accordingly done until the Monday next after the Feast of the Ascension, when he was to appear and satisfy unto the king the transgression which he had committed in concealing from him the said rents, and to answer to the king as well for the said rent as for the arrears from the time when the said Adam first incurred the forfeiture of his goods and chattels. Philip Burnel failed in appearing at the time prescribed, wherefore it was adjudged

³ From the miscellaneous deeds in the Chapter House, Westminster.

that these lands should be again taken into the king's hands, and the sheriff was, on the 4th June, ordered to seize them and keep them in safe custody, and to attach Philip Burnel by his body to answer within eight days of St. John the Baptist; but before that time he died, and the king retained possession of these lands.⁴

In 13 Edw. I. the king granted to Adam de Bavent his charter of free warren over all his demesne lands in *Hacchesham*, but in the same year Bavent alienated a part of his estate to Gregory de Rokesley, which afterwards came into the hands of the Burnells, and was called Little Hatcham; what he retained was called the manor of Hachesham Bavent, now corrupted into Hatcham Barnes, and with the history of this manor we will first proceed, as it is the larger and more important of the two.

Adam de Bavent was summoned to Parliament from 6 to 15 Edw. I., and died about 21 Edw. I., leaving Roger, his son and heir, who was then under age, whereupon William de Say, as lord of the fee, became entitled to the custody of the person and lands of the heir; but it being supposed that Roger held of the crown *in capite*, and not of Lord Say, a writ, dated the 5th December, 21 Edw. I. [1292], was issued directing the escheator to seize the lands into the king's hands.⁵

Thereupon William de Say, in Michaelmas Term, 22 Edw. I., came before the treasurer and barons of the Exchequer, and demanded that the custody should be restored to him, asserting that it belonged to him and not to the king, because that Adam de Bavent held of him *in capite* three knight's fees, one of which was in

⁴ Lord Treasurer's Memoranda Roll, 21 and 22 Edw. I. memb. 47.

⁵ Fine Roll, 21 Edw. I. memb. 26.

Hachesham, and nothing of the king by which the custody of the lands or of the heir of Adam could pertain to the king. And the treasurer and barons answered that having examined the rolls and memoranda of the Exchequer, it was found that one Richard de Vabadune, whose daughter and heir, Sarra de Vabadune by name, was married to Roger de Bavent, father of the said Adam (of which Roger and Sarra the said Adam de Bavent, was son and heir), held one fee of the king *in capite ut de coroná* in Hachesham, in the county of Surrey, and the said custody therefore belonged to the king, the tenure by which Adam held of William de Say or of any other person in whatever manner notwithstanding. And William de Say said that Adam de Bavent held of him *in capite* by knight's service, and that the ancestors of William were seized of the custody of the lands and the heirs, the relief, marriage, and homage of all the ancestors of Adam from time immemorial; and in like manner the same William in his time was seized of the homage of the said Adam and of the said custody until he was now newly deprived by the king; and that the king, or his ancestors, never were seized of the custody, marriage, &c. of Adam or his ancestors; wherefore he demanded that the custody should be restored to him as before. And he prayed that the treasurer and barons would attempt nothing in this behalf to his prejudice, nor would proceed against him to judgment, but would leave the matter in its present condition till the parliament after Michaelmas in the same year; that then, before the king and his council, the right of the said William being more fully examined, there should be done to him in the premises what of right ought to be done. And a day being given him at the said parliament, at which the matter

being fully treated, and his right in that behalf being shown and being examined by the king and council, it was told him that he must go to the receipt of the Exchequer, where justice would be done him in that behalf. Whereupon a bill was directed to the Exchequer by William de Say, who appeared in person before the treasurer and barons of the Exchequer and the justices of the Bench, and they, after hearing his reasons, and examining the rolls and memoranda of the Exchequer, declared that the king was entitled to the custody, notwithstanding the seisin of William de Say or any of his ancestors; thus confirming their former decision.⁶

Immediately after Adam de Bavent's death, the custody of Hatcham Barnes was given to Master William de Wymundham until the lawful age of Roger de Bavent, but was taken again into the king's hands for debts owing by Wymundham. It was then granted to William de Hamelton, to hold during the king's pleasure, rendering annually 59s. 7½*d.* in part payment of such debts. The accounts relative to the manor from the time it came to Hamelton's hands, until Roger obtained livery, are all entered on the Pipe Rolls of the period.

A portion of Hatcham Barnes came into possession of John Abel at some time previous to 23 Edw. I., for, on the 16th April in that year, he had a grant of free warren over all his demesne lands of *Hacheham* and *Camerwelle*.⁷

He died on Monday after the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, 16 Edw. II. [1322], and by an inquisition taken the same year, it was found that he died seized of one messuage, with a garden, at *Haches-*

⁶ Lord Treasurer's Memoranda Roll, 21 & 22 Edw. I. memb. 16, d.

⁷ Charter Roll, 23 Edw. I. n^o 21.

ham, held of Roger de Bavent, by fealty and the service of 13*d.* a year; value of the messuage 3*s.* 4*d.* He also held of the heirs of Robert Maunsel six acres of land by fealty and the service of 3*s.* per annum, which is near the true value. He also held of the heirs of Richard Aleyn four acres of land by fealty and the service of 13*d.* per annum; yearly value beyond the services 8*d.* Richard Abel was his son and heir; at that time aged 31.⁸

In Michaelmas Term, 29 Edw. I.,⁹ Roger de Bavent came before the justices of the King's Bench to prove that he had attained his majority, and to pray for delivery of his lands, which, on the 27th October in the same year, upon doing his homage, he obtained.¹⁰

30 Edw. I., Roger de Bavent petitioned the king for remedy against a sum of £30, arrears of castle-guard rent, demanded of him for the manors of Brandeston (in Suffolk) and *Hatchesham*, by the warden of Dover; being the rent for the period during which those manors were in the custody of the king, at the rate of ten shillings for every three weeks;¹¹ and by a writ dated the 10th August in the same year, the king commanded Robert de Burghersh, constable of Dover Castle, to permit Roger de Bavent to go free of this demand.¹²

William de Say died in 23 Edw. I., immediately following the proceedings concerning the custody of Roger de Bavent; but the dispute was revived by his son Geoffrey, who, in 35 Edw. I., preferred a petition to the king and council, in which he stated that Adam de Bavent

⁸ Inq. post mortem; 16 Edw. II. n^o 41.

⁹ Coram Rege Roll, 29 Edw. I. memb. 26.

¹⁰ Close Roll, 29 Edw. I. memb. 2.

¹¹ Rolls of Parliament, vol. i. page 157.

¹² Close Roll, 30 Edw. I. memb. 8.

and his ancestors held of him and his ancestors two knights' fees, one of which was situate in *Haccesham*, in the county of Surrey, and by reason of that tenure his ancestors did always, until then, have the custody and marriage of every ancestor of Adam who was under age, and relief of those who attained their full age after the death of their ancestor; and reciting the judgment of the Court of Exchequer against his father, William de Say, he says that he is ready to prove that Adam de Bavent held nothing of the king in *Hacchesham*, nor in any other place, *ut de coroná*; but of Geoffrey and his ancestors he held a knight's fee in *Hecchesham*, in the county of Surrey, of the barony of Maminot, which barony Geoffrey holds, and his ancestors held of the king by the service of guarding Dover Castle; and upon this he appealed to the books or rolls of the Exchequer, and to the testimony of the warden of Dover Castle, and prayed the king and council that they would command the lord treasurer and the barons of the Exchequer to cause the rolls and books of the Exchequer to be examined; and if, upon inspection, they should discover any error, that then the judgment should be revoked and annulled by them, and the custody be restored to him, with all its issues from the time when the king seized it. It was answered that the question should be reconsidered, and if any error were found, that it should be corrected and amended.¹³

By a fine levied in Easter Term, 7 Edw. II., William de Depyng and Ismania his wife, and Nicholas Donnem, in consideration of a sparrow-hawk, granted to Richard de Dunle and his heirs for ever, one messuage, twenty acres of land, and 6s. 8d. rents, in Rutherhuth and *Hacchesham*.

¹³ Rolls of Parliament, vol. i. page 202.

By a fine levied the 25th June, 7 Edw. II., Richard le Longe, of Wormele, and Emma his wife, in consideration of one sparrow-hawk, granted to Thomas Atte Grene, of Bermundeseye, and his heirs for ever, one messuage, eleven acres of land, and two acres of meadow in *Hacchesham*.

By a fine levied in Easter Term, 11 Edw. II., John de Ritlyng and Cristiana his wife, in consideration of ten silver marks, granted to Roger Husebond, of London, and his heirs for ever, three acres of land in *Hachesham*.

By a fine levied in Michaelmas Term, 11 Edw. II., William de Derham and Alice his wife granted to William de Pyncebek and his heirs for ever ten acres of land, 18*d.* rents, and one moiety of a messuage in *Hacchesham*.

By a fine levied in Trinity Term, 12 Edw. II., Roger de Munketon granted to John de Merkyngfeld, clerk, for his life, four messuages, two tofts, one garden, forty-two acres of land, three acres of meadow, and 11*s.* 6*d.* rents, with the appurtenances in Neweton, Waleworth, Suthwerk, and *Hachham*; and after his decease, then to Laurence de Merkyngfeld and the heirs of his body; and in case of his death without issue, then to Lannallus de Merkyngfeld and the heirs of his body; with remainder to Roaldus de Merkyngfeld and the heirs of his body; remainder to Andrew de Merkyngfeld and the heirs of his body; and with the ultimate remainder to John de Stynetton and his heirs for ever.

These were all inferior tenants under Roger de Bavent. About this time William de Bliburgh, who was keeper of the king's wardrobe, held a small quantity of land in Hatcham Barnes. By an inquisition taken upon his death, 6 Edw. II., it was found that he held of Roger

Bavent, at *Hachesham*, five acres of land, but by what service the jurors were ignorant; annual value ten shillings. Agnes, the wife of Richard de Dunleghe, at that time thirty-one years of age, was his next heir.¹⁴

By a fine levied on the day after the Purification, 5 Edw. III., Nicholas de Besseford granted to Thomas de Betoigne and Joan his wife, and the heirs of their bodies, two messuages, forty-six acres of land, and two acres of meadow, in Camerwell, Pekham, and *Hachesham*; and in case of their death without such issue, then to the right heirs of Thomas for ever.

By a fine levied in Trinity Term, 13 Edw. III., William Maddele and Matilda his wife, in consideration of twenty silver marks, granted to Maurice Turgis, citizen and draper of London, and Katherine his wife, and to the heirs of Maurice, one messuage, twenty acres and a half of land, seven acres of meadow, and 3s. 1d. rents, in *Hachesham*.

By another fine levied in the same term, Laurence Sely, citizen and leatherdresser of London, and Agnes his wife, in consideration of twenty silver marks, granted to the same Maurice Turgis and Katherine his wife, and to the heirs of Maurice, one messuage, seven acres of land, one acre of meadow, and 18d. rents, in *Hachesham*.

By a lease dated on Monday after the Purification, 1343, Roger de Bavent granted his manor of *Hachesham* to Robert de Burton, canon of Chichester, for seven years.¹⁵

On the 1st July, 18 Edw. III. [1344], Roger de Bavent granted, among many other manors, all his lands and tenements, with their appurtenances, in *Hacchesham* to the

¹⁴ Inq. post mortem, 6 Edw. II. n° 17.

¹⁵ Close Roll, 17 Edw. III. part 1, memb. 24, d.

king,¹⁶ who, on the 3rd July in the same year, appointed William de Kelleseye to receive seisin of the same lands.¹⁷ On the 23rd September following, the king granted to William de Kelleseye and William Balle the custody of the same lands during the royal pleasure;¹⁸ and the next year, on the 3rd April, it was transferred to William de Kaynes.¹⁹

Roger de Bavent being at this time indebted to William de Carleton in the sum of £80 upon a "chevancie," the king, on the 25th June, 19 Edw. III. [1345], in order to reimburse Carleton, granted to him the manor of *Hachesham*, to hold to him, his heirs, executors, and assigns, with the corn, hay, and grass growing thereon, unto Michaelmas next, and from that time for two years, in full satisfaction of the £80; that is, valuing the manor at £40 up to Michaelmas, and at £20 for each of the following years.²⁰

This debt, however, would appear to have been soon afterwards satisfied; for, on the 18th May, 1346, the manor was granted by the king to Roger de Bavent, to hold for his life, free from the payment of any rent or service.²¹

By a fine levied in Trinity Term, 24 Edw. III., John Pynsegle and Katherine his wife, in consideration of one hundred silver marks, granted to John Adam de Luk, citizen of London, and Katherine his wife, and the heirs of their bodies, one messuage, seven shops, ninety-two acres of land, eleven acres and a half of meadow,

¹⁶ Close Roll, 18 Edw. III. part 2, memb. 22, d.

¹⁷ Patent Roll, 18 Edw. III. part 2, memb. 30.

¹⁸ Originalia Roll, 18 Edw. III. memb. 12.

¹⁹ Originalia Roll, 19 Edw. III. memb. 3.

²⁰ Patent Roll, 19 Edw. III. part 1, memb. 3.

²¹ Patent Roll, 20 Edw. III. part 1, memb. 2.

thirteen acres of pasture, three acres and a half of wood, and 5s. 5d. rents, in *Hacchesham*; and in case of their death without such issue, then to Guelph Adam de Luk and the heirs of his body; with remainder to James Passhoney and the heirs of his body; and with ultimate remainder to the right heirs of John Adam de Luk.

By another fine levied in Trinity Term, 25 Edw. III., Thomas Brown and Margery his wife granted unto John Adam de Luk and his wife, and to the heirs of John for ever, eighty seven acres of land, twenty acres of meadow, and 22s. 9d. rents, in *Hacchesham*, Camerwell, and Pecham.

The manor was next in possession of John de Wynwyk, William de Thorpe, and William de Peck.

In 29 Edw. III. a reversionary grant of Hatcham Barnes was made by the king to the prioress and convent of Dartford, and on the 12th October, 1361, Alice, the widow of Roger Bavent, released to the king, and also to the prioress and convent of Dartford, her right to this and many other lands.²²

John de Wynwyk died 20th June, 1360; William de Thorpe on the 27th May, 1361; and William de Peck on the 20th September, 1363; and by an inquisition taken at Southwark on the 28th June, 1366, it was found that they held the manor of Hatcham at the time of their respective deaths, by royal grant, together with the knights' fees and church patronage belonging to the said manor; and that they held forty shillings rents at Pitfold, in the county of Surrey, which rents were parcel of the manor of *Hacchesham*; and that the said manor was held of the king *in capite* as of the castle of Dover, rendering for the same ten shillings every thirty-two

²² Close Roll, 36 Edw. III. memb. 43 and 48.

weeks for all services ; annual value of the whole manor £13. 6s. 8d. And it was further found by the same inquisition, that Thomas Vaghan, deceased, at the time of his death held in his demesne as of fee, one messuage and nine acres of land, with the appurtenances, in *Hacchesham*, as parcel of the manor called *Coldeherbergh* in *Hachesham*, holden of the manor of *Hachesham* by the service of fourteen pence paid at the aforesaid manor ; annual value 6s. 8d. And the aforesaid tenements were taken into the king's hands after the death of Thomas Vaghan, two third-parts whereof remained in the king's hands by reason of the minority of Hamo, the son and heir ; the other third-part being assigned to Alesia, the widow of Sir Thomas, for her dower.²³

John Abel (a descendant of Richard Abel before mentioned) dying without heirs, his lands in Hatcham escheated to the prioress of Dartford, and a writ was issued to the sheriff commanding him to deliver them to the prioress.²⁴

By a fine levied Trinity Term, 44 Edw. III., John Folevill and Mary his wife, in consideration of one hundred silver marks, granted to William de Walleworth, citizen of London, and Margaret his wife, and to the heirs of William de Walleworth, two messuages, sixty acres of land, and sixteen acres of meadow, in *Hacchesham* and *Peccham*.

By an inquisition taken at Southwark on the 25th October, 43 Edw. III. [1369], it was found that John the son of John Adam, deceased, at his death, held in his demesne, as of fee of the prioress of Dartford monastery, the demesnes of the manor of *Hacchesham* ; one messuage worth nothing beyond reprises, one garden and one dove-

²³ Inq. post mortem, 40 Edw. III. (first numbers), n^o 40.

²⁴ Close Roll, 43 Edw. III. memb. 6.

house, worth per annum 40*d.*; also nine acres of land, worth per annum 3*s.*, held of the said prioress; also sixteen acres of land in Ombraifeld of the said prioress, worth per annum 5*s.* 4*d.*; also in a certain field called Cokescroft, ten acres of land of the prior of Tounbrige, lying between the wood belonging to Lord Say on the south side and the highway on the north side, worth per annum 10*d.*; also seven acres of land in a croft, called Absolon Crofte, of the said prioress, worth per annum 3*s.* 4*d.*; also in Absolon Crofte five acres of wood, worth per annum 40*d.* and no more, because there was nothing but brambles and thorns; all which were held of the said prioress by knight's service, rendering yearly 8*s.* 11¼*d.* at the feasts of Easter and St. Martin by equal portions, and at the feast of the birth of our Lord one cock and two hens, and at Easter thirty eggs.

By the terms of the service he was also to find a man to * * for one day, or pay 2*d.*; and also to find a man to stack the lord's hay, or pay 1*d.*; and to plough for a day, and to carry the hay if he have a cart; and if he refused to help the reaper during that time, he was to pay one quarter of malt a year, and have by the day for * * * * * performing suit at the court of the said prioress for the said manor from three weeks to three weeks. He held also two acres of land in a croft called Bringchoscroft worth per annum 8*d.*, held of the lord, Nicholas Burnel, by the service of 2*s.* 1*d.* per annum and suit of court to *Hacchesham*. He also held at *Hacchesham* one cottage and one acre of meadow, which formerly belonged to William Shrevesbury, worth per annum 2*s.*, held of the said prioress by knight's service, and paying 20*d.* per annum. He also held of the same prioress by service as before, one messuage, one garden, and two acres of

arable land adjoining, in a croft called Bonnescroft, worth per annum 2*s.*; also three acres of arable land which were formerly pasture, lying in a certain croft called the Lordescroft, worth per annum 3*s.*; also half an acre of arable land called Bridescroft, worth per annum 1*d.*; also one cottage and garden formerly belonging to William Wallis, worth per annum 6*d.*; all which were held of the said prioress by knight's service, and rendering per annum 2*s.*, at the feasts of Easter and St. Martin by equal portions. He also held in a place called S—— eight acres of land, worth per acre 4*d.*, and five acres and three roods of meadow, worth per acre 2*s.*, held of William de Say by the service of sixpence per annum at his manor of Westgrenewych.²⁵

This inquisition is exceedingly defaced and illegible, which will account for the occasional blanks I have been obliged to leave.

17th August, 30 Henry VIII. [1538], the abbess and convent of Dartford, by an indenture under the seal of the monastery, granted a lease of the manor to William Appaire, from Michaelmas, 1539, for forty-one years, at the annual rent of £25.²⁶

On the general suppression of monasteries, the manor reverted to the crown, and by letters patent, dated 27th February, 2 & 3 Philip and Mary [1556], the demesnes and manor of Hatchambarnes were, among many other lands, granted to Anne, Duchess of Somerset, widow of Edward, Duke of Somerset, Lord Protector of England, in full satisfaction and recompense of her dower in her husband's lands, of which she had been deprived by reason of their forfeiture to the crown on his attainder:

²⁵ Inq. post mortem, 43 Edw. III., part I, n° 9.

²⁶ I have not been able to discover the original of this lease, but it is frequently recited in subsequent documents.

to hold unto the duchess and her assigns for the term of her natural life, to be held as of the manor of Estgrenewiche in the county of Kent, by fealty only for all rents, services, and demands whatever.²⁷

By an indenture dated the 30th November, 28 Eliz., she assigned the manor to Walter Cope, and he, by indenture dated the 9th March in the following year, surrendered it to the queen.

The next proprietor of the manor was Walter Haddon. On the 10th March, 12 Eliz. [1570], letters patent were made out whereby the manor, excepting all woods, underwoods, &c., was granted to Haddon, to commence after the expiration of Appaire's lease, and also after the death of the Duchess of Somerset, for the term of thirty years, at the annual rent of £25.²⁸

Walter Haddon died 21st January, 1571-2, and his widow Anne then succeeded to the manor by virtue of his will; she afterwards became the wife of Sir Henry Cobham, who died leaving her surviving.

By letters patent dated the 19th September, 42 Eliz. [1600], the manor, excepting all woods, underwoods, &c., was granted to Anne Broke Lady Cobham, widow of Sir Henry Cobham, for the term of twenty-one years, to commence from the expiration of Haddon's lease, at the annual rent of £25.²⁹ Thus she possessed two terms in the manor, one of thirty years granted to her former husband Haddon, and the other of twenty-one years granted to herself.

6th March, 43 Eliz. [1601], she assigned the term of twenty-one years to Sir John Brooke, alias Cobham, her

²⁷ Patent Roll, 2 and 3 P. and M., part 8, memb. 22.

²⁸ Patent Roll, 12 Eliz., part 8, memb. 21.

²⁹ Patent Roll, 42 Eliz., part 29, memb. 21.

son, who was also in possession of the other term of thirty years.

By an indenture dated the 21st June, 44 Eliz. [1602], made between Sir John Brook, alias Cobham, of the first part, Anne Redman, widow, late the wife and sole executrix of the last will and testament of Thomas Redman, esquire, deceased, of the second part, and Edward Milner, of Carebeale, in the parish of Antoney, in the county of Cornwall, gentleman, of the third part, the manor of Hatcham Barnes was assigned by Sir John Brook to Milner upon various trusts for Sir John Brook and Anne Redman, his intended wife, with a power of revocation, which power was, by a deed, dated the 24th November, 11 James I. [1613], exercised,³⁰ declaring that the manor should from thenceforth be to the only use of Sir John Brooke, his executors, administrators, and assigns.

The woods excepted out of the preceding leases of the manor, and which comprise all that part of Hatcham Barnes lying on the south side of the high road, were kept in possession of the crown until the twenty-ninth year of Elizabeth, when, by letters patent dated 17th March, they were leased to John Cadye.³¹

By letters patent dated the 26th November, 7 James I., [1609], the manor was granted to George Salter and John Williams by the description of the manor of *Hatcham Barnes*, and the lands, &c., in West Greenwich and Lewisham, in the counties of Kent and Surrey, with the perquisites of courts formerly part of the possessions of the monastery of Dertford, in Kent, and theretofore demised under the yearly rent of £36. 2s. 4d., and eleven cartloads of faggots yearly to be delivered.³²

³⁰ Inrolled in Common Pleas.

³¹ Patent Roll, 29 Eliz., part 16, memb. 38.

³² Patent Roll, 7 James I., part 34.

By an indenture dated the 14th March, 9 James I. [1612], and made between George Salter and John Williams of the one part, and Peter Vanlore, of London, esquire, and William Blake, of London, gentleman, of the other part; Salter and Williams bargained and sold to Vanlore and Blake, their heirs and assigns, the manor of *Hachambarnes*, to hold unto and to the use of Vanlore and Blake, their heirs and assigns for ever.³³

By an indenture dated the 6th April, 10 James I. [1612], made between Vanlore and Blake of the one part, and Cristofer Brooke, of Lincoln's Inn, esquire, and William Hakewill, of Lincoln's Inn, gentleman, of the other part; Vanlore and Blake, in consideration of £2,050, bargained and sold to Brooke and Hakewill, their heirs and assigns for ever, the manor of *Hachambarnes*.³⁴

By an indenture dated the 1st November, 11 James I., [1613], and made between Sir John Brooke, alias Cobham, of the Strand, in the county of Middlesex, knight, Christopher Brooke, and William Hakewill of the one part, and Sir John Garrard and Sir Thomas Lowe, knights, and aldermen of London, Robert Offley, and Martin Bond, citizens and haberdashers of London, of the other part; Sir John Brooke, Christopher Brooke, and Hakewill, in consideration of £4,380 paid to Sir John, bargained and sold to Garrard, Lowe, Offley, and Bond, their heirs and assigns for ever—

“All that the manor of Hachambarnes in the parishes of Westgreenwich and Lewsham, in the counties of Kent and Surrey, with all and every, the rights, members, and appurtenances thereof; and all lands, tenements, rents, and hereditaments whatsoever, in the said counties of Kent and Surrey, called or knowne by the name of the manor of Hachambarnes (except as hereafter in these presents is excepted). And all those severall parcels of lands and grounds hereafter particularly men-

³³ Close Roll, 10 James I., part 20.

³⁴ Close Roll, 10 James I., part 24.

cioned, with their and every of their appurtenances, scituate, lying, and being in the said parrishes and counties, or some or one of them : That is to say, one close or parcell of ground commonlie called East Odefield, contayning by estimacion two and twentie acres, be it more or lesse ; one other close or parcell of ground, as the same is nowe inclosed, commonly called South Odefield, conteyning by estimacion twelve acres and a halff, be it more or lesse ; two closes or parcells of ground adjoyning together, the one called fowerteene acres, and thother fifteene acres, both of them conteyning by estimacion nyne and twenty acres and a halff, be they more or lesse ; one other close or parcell of meadowe ground, commonly called Crabtree Meade, conteyning by estimacion sixe acres, be it more or lesse ; all which nowe are, or late were, in the ocupacion or holding of Richard Nettles Butcher or his assignes ; one other parcell of land commonly called twelve acres, adjoyning upon the foresaid parcell of ground, called Crabtree Meade, conteyning by estimacion twelve acres, be it more or lesse ; all those meadowe or pasture groundes now divided into three severall closes, commonlie called the Alders and Horsclose, or by both or one of those names, conteyning by estimacion one and twentie acres, be it more or lesse ; one lane leading from the said closes called the Alders, to the said parcell of land called the Twelve Acres, which parcells last mencioned nowe are, or late were, in the ocupacion or holding of Thomas Large or his assignes ; one close or parcell of ground called foure acrefeild, nowe, or late in the ocupacion of ——— Palmer or his assignes, conteyning by estimacion one and twentie acres and a halfe, be it more or lesse, lying and adjoyning to the north syde of parte of the foresaide ground called the Alders ; one close or parcell of ground called Rushey Close, conteyning by estimacion sixe acres and a halff, be it more or lesse ; one other parcell of meadowe ground as the same is nowe inclosed, conteyning by estimacion two acres, be it more or lesse, and lying betwixt the howse of the said mannor and the aforesaide feild called Odefield, which two last parcells nowe are, or late were, in the possession or holding of Richard Cooke or his assignes ; and also one parcell of marish ground commonly called the Twentie Acres, conteyning by estimacion one and twentie acres, be it more or lesse, nowe or late in the holding or ocupacion of Henry Fesey or his assignes ; and all that close or parcell of meadow or pasture ground, nowe or late in the ocupacion of Marke Bannester or his assignes, conteyning by estimacion fyve acres, be it more or lesse, adjoyning to the south syde of part of the foresaid ground called the Alders, and abutteth uppon the highway there, leading to Debtford towards the south ; except and alwaies reserved out of this present graunt, bargaine, and sale, all those meadowes, pastures, woods, landes, and groundes, with all and singuler their appurtenances parcell of the said mannor and premises, which lye

and be on the south syde of the highway which leadeth from the cittie of London to Debtford, in the said countie of Kent ; and all those one and forty acres, be it more or lesse, of land, meadowe, and pasture, with the messuage or tenement lately built thereuppon, which lye together at the corner or meeting of the two highwayes there, thone of them leading from London to Debtford aforesaide, and thother leading from Peckham to the said towne of Debtford ; and which are scituate and being on the south-west syde of the said highwaye which leadeth from London to Debtford aforesaide:”

To hold unto and to the use of Garrard, Lowe, Offley, and Bond, their heirs and assigns for ever.³⁵

In this deed is mentioned a lease to John Daveis, citizen and haberdasher of London, of the whole manor for twenty-one years, at the yearly rent of £200.

Part only of the manor, it will be observed, was conveyed by this deed, the remaining part, exclusive of the messuage and the one and forty acres mentioned in the exception as lying at the corner of the two highways, and which afterwards came into possession of the Pomeroiy family, was, by indenture of bargain and sale, dated 1st April, 1614, in consideration of £2,800, conveyed by Sir John Brooke and the others to Garrard, Lowe, Offley, and Bond, by the description of—

“ All that messuage or tenement, and all those severall parcellls of lands and grounds hereafter particularlie mencioned, with their and everie of their appurtenaunces, scituate, lying, and being in the parishes of Westgreenwich alias Deptford, and Lewsham, or one of them, in the counties of Kent and Surrey, or one of them ; and now or late parcell of, and belonging to, the mannor of Hacham Barnes, in the parishes and counties aforesaid, and doe lie and be on the south side of the highe waye there, which leadeth from Peckham to Deptford ; that is to say, all that messuage or tenement now, or late in the tenure or occupation of Margerie Rundell or her assignes, and all houses, outhouses, edifices, buildings, barnes, stables, orchards, gardens, and hereditaments, with the appurtenaunces to the said messuage or tenement belonging or in anie wise apperteyning ; and also all that parcell of land, arrable or pasture, conteyning by estimacion eight acres, be it more or lesse, with the appur-

³⁵ Close Roll, 11 James I., part 15, n^o 42.

tenaunces, now or late in the tenure or occupacion of the said Margerie Rundell, and adjoyning to the said messuage or tenement ; and also all that parcell of land now or late being woodland, conteyning by estimacion six acres, be the same more or lesse, with the appurtenaunces, now or late also in the tenure or occupacion of the said Margerie or her assigns, and adjoyning to the said other parcell of land before mencioned on the south side thereof ; one other close or parcell of land, meadow, or pasture, commonly called Brake Close, conteyning by estimacion sixe acres and three roodes, be it more or lesse, now or late in the tenure or occupacion of William Shepley or his assigns ; one other close or parcell of meadowe or pasture ground, commonly called Colliers Close, conteyning by estimacion six acres, be it more or lesse ; one other close or parcell of ground adjoyning thereunto on the south side thereof, commonly called Little Hacham Hill, conteyning by estimacion nyne acres, be it more or lesse, which said two closes called Colliers Close and Little Hacham Hill now or late were in the tenure or occupacion of William Deare or his assigns ; one close or parcell of meadow or pasture ground, conteyning by estimacion tenn acres and three roodes, be it more or lesse, called or knowne by the name of the Wynter Pasture, or by what other name or names ; one close or parcell of meadowe or pasture ground adjoyning to the same, conteyning by estimacion three acres and one roode, be it more or lesse, called or knowne by the name of Three Acre Close, or by what other name or names, both which closes or parcell of ground now or late were in the tenure or occupacion of Symon Rawlins and William Wingrave, or one of them, their or one of their assignee or assigns ; one other close or parcell of ground, called or knowne by the name or names of Maunsford Close, or by what other name or names, now or late in the holding or occupacion of Mark Bannester or his assigns, and conteyning by estimacion five acres, be it more or lesse, lying on the south side of the said close called the Winter Pasture ; one other close or parcell of arrable or pasture ground, commonly called or knowne by the name of Mowlands, or by what other name or names, conteyning by estimacion seaven acres, be it more or lesse, now or late in the tenure or occupacion of Robert Warner or his assigns ; and also all that great wood, woodland, and ground, called or knowne by the name of Hacham Great Wood, or The Great Wood, or by what other name or names, conteyning by estimacion fourescore acres, be it more or lesse, now in the occupacion of the said Sir John Brooke or his assigns, the north part whereof abbutteth uppon the severall closes or parcell of ground before mencioned ; one other close or parcell of ground, commonly called Great Hacham Hill, conteyning by estimacion seaventeene acres and a halfe, be it more or lesse ; one other close or parcell of ground, commonly called Hacham Fieldes, conteyning by estimacion

nyneteene acres and a halfe, be it more or lesse ; which said two closes called Great Hacham Hill and Hacham Field doe lie and adjoyne to the south side of the said great wood, and are now in the occupacion of the said Sir John Brooke or his assignes ; all that parcell of ground now or late being woodground, with the ground and soile of the same, called or knowne by the name of Kents Wood, conteyning by estimacion one and thirtie acres, be it more or lesse, now or late in the severall tenures or occupacions of Richard Clarke, Roger Bradfield, William Stubbs, and John Ewen, or some or one of them, their or some or one of their assignee or assignes ; and all those two closes or parcells of meadow or pasture ground called Kents Land, or by what other name or names, the one of them conteyning by estimacion eight acres, be it more or lesse, now or late in the occupacion of the foresaid Richard Clarke, and the other, conteyning by estimacion seaven acres, be it more or lesse, now or late in the occupacion of Humfrey Hayward, and doe lie and adjoyne together at the south end or side of the said wood called Kentes Wood.”

To hold unto and to the use of Garrard, Lowe, Offley, and Bond, their heirs and assigns for ever.³⁶

In the year 1665, and for a short time following, the manor was the residence of Thomas Pepys, cousin to our old friend Samuel Pepys, of gossiping memory ; and on reference to the diary of the latter we find the following notices of Thomas Pepys and his Hatcham residence :—

May 12, 1665. “ After dinner comes my cozen, Thomas Pepys, of *Hatcham*.”

May 1, 1666. “ At noon, my cozen Thomas Pepys did come to me, to consult about the business of his being a justice of the peace, which he is much against ; and, among other reasons, tells me, as a confidant, that he is not free to exercise punishment according to the Act against Quakers and other people, for religion. Nor do he understand Latin, and so is not capable of the place as formerly, now all warrants do run in Latin. Nor he in Kent, though he be of Deptford parish, his house standing in Surrey.”

June 29, 1667. “ My cozen, Thomas Pepys, of Hatcham, come to see me.”

May 1, 1668. “ Met my cozen, Thomas Pepys, of Deptford, and took some turns with him.”

From this period there will be no necessity to follow

³⁶ Close Roll, 12 James I., part 1, n^o 2.

the history of the manor of Hatcham Barnes; it became vested in its present owners, the Haberdashers' Company, as trustees of the charitable bequests under the will of Mr. Jones, and there are no new features of interest that I can lay before my readers: I will therefore proceed with the manor of Little Hatcham, which, it will be recollected, was divided from Hatcham Barnes.

In 13 Edw. I. Adam de Bavent alienated a part of his estate to Gregory de Rokesley, who in the same year obtained a faculty from the abbot and convent of Begham for his oratory, which he had built for the use of himself and family at *Hechesham*, in their parish of West Greenwich.³⁷

We have thus the origin of the manor of Little Hatcham.

From an intimate acquaintance with this neighbourhood, and the extent and boundaries of the various manors, I am enabled, even at this distant period, to point out with tolerable precision the spot where Gregory de Rokesley's residence must have stood; and as he was a notable individual of his time, having been several times Lord Mayor of London, it may not be uninteresting to pause here awhile, while I offer a remark on this point. The manor of Little Hatcham abuts, as it always has done, on the high road (*i. e.* the Old Kent Road), and Rokesley's residence would naturally be placed on this part of the estate; the simple point is therefore to show the extent of this abuttal, and we shall then have a fair idea of the position of his house. The traveller

³⁷ The church of Saint Nicholas, Westgreenwich (*i. e.* Deptford), at that time the parish church of Hatcham, then belonged to the prior and monks of Begham, having been given to them by Geoffrey de Saye and Alice his wife, and confirmed by a grant of their son Geoffrey.—Dugdale, Mon. Angl., vol. vi. p. 913.

from London, as he crosses the boundary between the parishes of Camberwell and Deptford, will observe on the left a large elm-tree at the corner of a lane; this denotes the commencement of the manor of Little Hatcham; then, if he continue a short distance farther, he will observe the boundary-post of the Haberdashers' Company's estate, which is the other manor of Hatcham Barnes; and it is between this tree and boundary-post that the residence of Gregory de Rokesley must have stood.

This spot is at present occupied by a row of irregularly built houses, known as St. James's Place, which will be immediately recognized by those acquainted with the locality. It can scarcely be conceived what was the particular temptation which led Rokesley to take up his abode here, for at that period the roads and means of access from London were in a very indifferent state; and it appears that shortly after Rokesley's death the manor was frequently inundated by the overflowing of the river Thames. It has even at the present day always been accounted a marshy and swampy locality.

Gregory de Rokesley died 20 Edw. I., leaving Roger de Rislepe his nephew and heir; and, by an inquisition taken upon his death, it was found that he held at *Hachesham* of Adam de Bavent, *in capite*, one messuage and fifty-four acres of arable land, and five acres of meadow, by suit of court to the hundred of Brixton, and he owed to the ward of Dover Castle 7s. 6d. per annum. Annual value of the messuage and garden 5s., each acre of arable 10d., and each acre of meadow 2s.; also rents of assize 6s. 6d. a year. He held also of Henry de Alneto five acres of arable land by the annual service of 1d., annual value 8d. per acre. He held also of Robert Mauncer six acres of arable land by the service of 8d. a

year, annual value 8*d.* per acre. He held also of the master of St. Thomas's Hospital, Southwark, six acres of meadow by the service of 2*d.* a year, annual value 18*d.* per acre.³⁵

Roger Russlep, his nephew and heir, succeeded to these estates, and soon afterwards sold them to Robert Burnel, Bishop of Bath and Wells.

By a fine levied in Trinity Term, 18 Edw. I., Thomas, son of Thomas de Heygham, in consideration of £20 sterling, granted to Robert, Bishop of Bath and Wells, one messuage, twenty acres of land, ten acres of meadow, and 10*s.* rent in Retherheth, Camberwell, and *Hacchesham*. The bishop died at Berwick-on-Tweed on the 25th December, 1292, and by an inquisition taken at Southwark 21 Edw. I. [1293] it was found that he died seized of a capital messuage, garden, and fishpond, at *Hacchesham*, annual value 5*s.*; fifty-five acres of land, annual value 55*s.*; thirty-two acres, annual value 10*s.* 8*d.*; twelve acres of meadow, annual value 36*s.*; four acres of several pasture, annual value 4*s.*; two acres of marsh, annual value 2*s.*; rents of assize of free tenants, 7*s.* 4*d.* per annum; and a cock and a hen, worth 2½*d.*; annual value of the whole manor £6. 0*s.* 2½*d.* This manor paid 7*s.* 6*d.* a year to the court of *Hacchesham* Bavant; and it owed suit to the king's hundred of Brixistan, from three weeks to three weeks, with two of the tenants, and suit of court to *Hacchesham* Bavant, from three weeks to three weeks; so that the clear annual value of the whole manor was £5. 12*s.* 8½*d.* The inquisition states that Robert Burnel bought this manor of Roger Russlep, for his own life, to hold of the said Roger; but it goes on to say, that Philip Burnel was his nephew and heir, so

³⁵ Inq. post mortem, 20 Edw. I., n^o 29.

that it must have been limited over to him after the bishop's death.³⁹

Philip Burnel succeeded to his uncle's estates, but did not long survive him. He died 22 Edw. I., leaving by Maud his wife, daughter of Richard Earl of Arundel, Edward his son and heir, seven years of age.

By an inquisition taken on the death of Philip Burnel, in 22 Edw. I., it was found that he held at *Hatchesham*, in his demesne as of fee, one messuage, with a garden and fishpond, annual value 5s.; fifty-five acres of land, value 55s.; thirty-two acres of land, 10s. 8d.; twelve acres of meadow, 36s.; four acres of several pasture, value 4s.; two acres of marsh, value 2s.; rents of assize of free tenants, 7s. 4d.; a cock and a hen, value 2½d.; annual value of the whole manor, £6. 0s. 2½d. It was held of the heirs of Adam de Bavent, by the service of 7s. 6d. a year, and owed suit to the court of Hatchesham Bavant, from three weeks to three weeks; it also owed suit to the hundred of Brixton, from three weeks to three weeks, with two tenants; clear value of the manor after all deductions £5. 12s. 8d.⁴⁰

15th September 22 Edw. I. [1294], all the lands and tenements which belonged to Philip Burnel in *Hatchesham*, and which were extended at 112s. 8¼d., per annum, were, with many other lands in other counties, assigned to Matilda, the widow of Philip Burnel, for her dower.⁴¹ Edward Burnel, the heir, being under age at the time of his father's death, the custody of his person and lands was given to John de Drokenesford, Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Soon after this, the waters of the Thames broke

³⁹ Inq. post mortem, 21 Edw. I., n° 50.

⁴⁰ Inq. post mortem.

⁴¹ Close Roll, 23 Edw. I., memb. 9, d.

through their embankments and inundated a great part of the manor of Little Hatcham; whereupon it was agreed by the king and his council that John de Drogenesford should keep the water within its proper embankments, and in recompense thereof, he should have all the drowned lands he could reclaim for the term of seven years.

In 8 Edw. II. Edward Burnel laid a petition before the king and his council, complaining that the bishop had retained the lands three years after the expiration of the seven years, and that he had also, under colour of his agreement, appropriated forty acres of land and meadow of the said manor which never were inundated; but the council answered that the petitioner might have his remedy against the bishop at the common law.⁴² He died without issue 23rd August, 9 Edw. II. [1315], leaving Matilda his sister and heiress and Alice his wife him surviving.

Matilda, who succeeded to her brother's estates, was then the wife of John Lord Lovel of Tichmarsh; he died 8 Edw. II., and she afterwards became the wife of John de Handlo, who succeeded to all the estates of Edward Burnel.

By a fine levied in Hilary Term, 14 Edw. II., John de Handlo and Matilda his wife granted to Richard la Veille, for his life, one toft, sixty acres of land, seven acres of meadow, and 8s. rents in *Hachesham*; rendering annually two silver marks, one at Easter and the other at Michaelmas.

By a fine levied 5 Edw. III. the manor of *Hacchesham* was settled upon John de Handlo and Matilda his wife and the heirs male of their bodies; and in default of such issue, to Johanna, Elizabeth, and Margery, daughters of

⁴² Rolls of Parliament, vol. i. p. 331.

the said Matilda; and after their decease, then to John the son of John Lovel and the heirs male of his body; and in default thereof, then to the right heirs of Matilda for ever. John de Handlo had issue by Matilda, two sons, Richard and Nicholas, of whom Richard died in his father's lifetime. This circumstance would appear to have altered John de Handlo's intentions with regard to settling his property, for in 14 Edw. III. another fine was levied, by which this manor was settled upon him for life; and after his decease, then to Nicholas and his heirs, without any remainders over.

John de Handlo died on the 5th August, 20 Edw. III. [1346], leaving Nicholas Burnell his son and heir, who was twenty-three years of age and upwards, him surviving; and by an inquisition taken at Kingston-upon-Thames, 10th October in the same year, it was found that John de Handlo at the time of his death held certain tenements in *Hacchesham* according to the terms of the last named fine: and it was found that the said tenements were held of Geoffrey de Say by the service of one quarter of a knight's fee, rendering five shillings every thirty-two weeks to the guard of Dover Castle. And it was found that there was at *Hacchesham* a capital messuage worth nothing, beyond reprises; and that there were seventy acres of arable land worth per annum 23s. 4d. when well cultivated and sown, and that year it was sown before the death of John Handlo; but when the land was not cultivated or sown, then it was worth 2d. per acre as pasture-land. There were also seven acres of meadow worth per annum 7s., and no more, because the meadow lay in a certain marsh which was frequently inundated and the hay carried away; and also rents of assize of free tenants, five shillings per annum⁴³.

⁴³ Inq. post mortem, 20 Edw. III. (first number), n° 51.

Nicholas Burnell then succeeded to the manor. He died 19th January, 6 Rich. II. [1383], leaving Sir Hugh Burnell, his son and heir, thirty-six years of age; and by an inquisition taken in the same year it was found that Nicholas Burnell died seized of 36s. 4d. rents of assize in *Hachesham*, which rents formerly belonged to the manor of *Hachesham* held of Geoffrey de Say.⁴⁴

Sir Hugh Burnell then succeeded to this estate. He married Joyce the daughter of John Botetourt, grandchild and heir to Sir John Botetourt, knight. Edward Burnell was his son and heir apparent, but he died in his father's lifetime, and in 4 Hen. V. Sir Hugh Burnell entered into articles of agreement with Sir Walter Hungerford, knight, (through the king's mediation by letters) for the marriage of Margery, one of the daughters and heirs of Edward Burnell, unto Edmund Hungerford, son of Sir Walter; and thereupon by a fine settled the manor of Hatcham in the following manner:—that after the death of Sir Hugh Burnell it should remain to Sir Walter Hungerford, Edmund his son, and Margery, to hold unto them and the heirs of the said Edmund and Margery lawfully to be begotten for ever. And in case of their death without such issue, then to the right heirs of Sir Hugh Burnell for ever.

Sir Hugh died 27th November, 8 Hen. V. [1420], and by an inquisition taken thereupon it was found that at the time of his death he held the manor of *Hachesham* according to the terms of the above-mentioned fine, and that this manor was held of the Prior of Wormele, but by what service the jurors were ignorant, and was worth per annum, in all its issues beyond reprises, ten marks. Margery Burnell was eleven years of age at the time of Sir Hugh's death.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Inq. post mortem.

⁴⁵ Inq. post mortem, 8 Hen. V., n^o 116.

The manor then came into possession of the Hungerfords, and continued with that family until the thirty-second year of Henry VIII., when it was granted by Sir Anthony Hungerford to Andrew Fraunces and Margaret his wife, as appears by a fine levied in Michaelmas Term in that year.

Hilary Term 4 and 5 Philip and Mary, a fine was levied between Thomas Hoo and John Heyworth of the manor of *Hatcheham*.

The next owner of the manor that I meet with is Nicholas Brockett of Whethampsted, in Hertfordshire.

By an indenture dated the 1st June, 7 Eliz. [1565], Nicholas Brockett and Margaret his wife, in consideration of £241. 10s., bargained and sold to William Edwardes, citizen and leatherseller of London, his heirs and assigns, this manor by the description of

“ All that their mannor of Lytle Hatcheham, with thappurtenaunces, in the county of Surrey; and all that their mannor of Lytle Hatcheham, with thappurtenaunces, extending, lyeing, and being in the county of Surrey aforesaid, and in the countye of Kent, or in either of the said countayes; and foure acres of lande, thirty acres and a halfe of meadowe and pasture or thereabouts, and one acre of wood; whiche lande, meadowe, and wood conteyne in the whole by estymacion thirty-five acres and a haulfe, whether the same bee more or lesse, sett, lyeing, and being in the townes, parishes, or fields of Hatcheham, Peckham, Westgrenewiche, and Camerwell, in the said counties of Surrey and Kent, now in the severall teanures and ocupacions of the said William Edwardes and one Elizabeth Ardeyne, widowe;”

and also all and singular those manors, &c., conveyed in remainder to Brockett and wife by the fine levied between Hoo and Heyworth. The manor and premises are convenanted by Brockett to be of the clear yearly rent of six pounds above all charges and reprisals. There is also mentioned a lease to Edwardes of the manor,

dated the 13th February, 4 and 5 Philip and Mary [1558], for 41 years.⁴⁶

Out of this transaction arose a question on account of Edwardes being supposed to hold this manor of the Crown *in capite*, in which case a royal license of alienation would have been necessary, and in the eighth year of this reign this question was accordingly tried before the Barons of the Court of Exchequer, when judgment was given in Edwardes's favour.⁴⁷

By an indenture dated the 20th June, 10 Eliz. [1568], Edwardes mortgaged this manor for £300 to Nicholas Toke,⁴⁸ by whom it was afterwards granted to Walter Mayne; he on the 1st April, 1577, conveyed it to Thomas Westwraye,⁴⁹ who in 44 Eliz. granted it to John Edwardes, William Edwardes's heir.

The next owner was Randolph Crew, a merchant of London; and it was during the time which he held it that the disputed question as to whether Hatcham lay in Surrey or Kent was finally settled. This decision arose out of the levy of ship-money by Charles I. In the course of this taxation Mr. Crew was rated in both counties for the manor of Little Hatcham, whereupon he petitioned the Lords of the Council for redress, and they sent the following letter to the judges of assize for Kent and Surrey:—

“ A Letter to the Judges of Assize for the County of Kent and Surrey.

“ Wee send you heere enclosed a peticon presented by Randolph Crew, of London, mercht., who being seized of the manner of Hatcham bordering upon the county of Kent, but dubtfull whether the said manner properly lyeth within the county of Kent or the county of Surry, wherby the two sheriffs of the said counties have charged the

⁴⁶ Close Roll, 7 Eliz. part 23.

⁴⁷ Lord Treasurer's Memoranda Roll, Hilary, 8 Eliz., m. 33.

⁴⁸ Inrolled in Common Pleas, 10 Eliz., Trinity, roll 8.

⁴⁹ Close Roll, 19 Eliz., p. 15.

said manner as lyable to either for the busines of shipping, as you may perceive more perticularly by the said peticon, forasmuch as the peticoner hath (as by certificat appears) payd towards the said service in the county of Surry, where hee hath formerly payd all personall duties, and for that it is not intended that any one shall bee so unequally dealt withall as to pay twice for one and the same thing at one time ; Wee doe therefore heerby pray you, the judges of assize for the said countyes of Kent and Surry, perticularly and carefully to examin the busines, and settle such a finall order, not onely in this perticular, but also in all other publique assesm^{ts} and rates as his m^{ts} service receive no prejudice, and the peticoner know for the future how to conforme himselfe for such payments, and soe, &c.

“ Dated at Whithall, the last of December, 1635.

“ (Signed)	LO: KEEPER.	MR. COMPT ^r :
	“ EA: OF DORSET.	MR. D. CHAMB ^r :
	“ EA: OF SALISBURY.	MR. LOE COKE.
	“ KN : VILMOT.	MR. SEC. WINDBANK.”

In pursuance of this letter the judges entered into an investigation of the matter, and at last came to the conclusion that the manor was entirely in Surrey.

The following is their certificate :—

“ The true copie of a certificat made by the judges of assizes to the lords of the councill for the settleing of the manor of Hatcham in the county of Surry.

“ According to your lordships’ letters of the last of December last, and the peticon of Randolphe Crewe sent us therewithall, we at several dayes perticularly, carefully, and att large, in the presence of the peticoner and of divers inhabitants of Debtford, in the county of Kent, who opposed him, considered the witnesses evidence and proofes of either side, and are fully satisfied that the peticoner’s manner of Hatcham doth lye in the county of Surrey and not in the county of Kent, and ought to be taxed to the busines of the shipping in and with the county of Surrey and not with Kent ; all which wee humbly leave to your lordships’ wisdoms. Vltimo Maij, 1636.

“ FR. CRAWLEY.

“ RIC. WESTON.”