

# FARNHAM AND THE BISHOPS OF WINCHESTER.

## THE CHARTER OF 1249.

BY  
ETIENNE ROBO.

---

THE town of Farnham, like the rest of the hundred, belonged to the Bishops of Winchester. Its inhabitants, however, could not be expected to perform the customary services, mowing, ploughing, reaping, due to the bishop by his other tenants. They were town bred, and few of them had horses and carts. At some early date, before 1208, some agreement was made between the people of Farnham and the bishop of Winchester. In exchange for a lump sum paid yearly, they were exempt from rent of assize, fines of land, customary services, heriots, maritagium; they had their own court for minor transgressions, and kept the fines, and they were entitled to tolls and market dues. This seems a legitimate inference, since none of those items appear in the pipe rolls of the manor, as long as the farm of the borough is paid.

This comparative freedom was, however, precarious and limited. In the absence of a written agreement, every progress of the town was noted by the steward, and instead of benefiting the burgesses, caused an instant increase of rent. Between 1208 and 1220 the farm is of seven pounds; even during the French occupation in 1216 and 1217, it was paid regularly and there were no arrears. For the first time they missed a payment in 1221-2, possibly on account of civil disturbances. The roll for that year is missing, and it is the next roll which tells us that the borough was in arrears for a sum of £7 7s. Note the increase, which was only the first of a series, for the rent in 1222-3 was £7 13s. 4d., that is, half a mark more than in 1221. No reason is given for raising the rent either that year or the following year, when another half mark was added to the farm. The clerk merely

appended a note to the effect that in the future—that is from Michaelmas 1223—they will be answerable for eight pounds. In 1225 they still paid eight pounds; by 1232 the rent had been raised to £8 13s., and so on by increases of half a mark at a time. In 1235 and 1236 the rent was £9 6s. 4d., and probably remained stationary at that sum until a written agreement was reached and a proper charter given by Bishop William de Raleigh.

On the whole des Roches made use of his right with moderation, but the king, during the vacancy, squeezed the borough to the utmost, and seized the whole revenue of the town, rent of assize, fines, tolls and market dues. When William de Raleigh took possession of his see he continued at first to let the constable and the steward manage the town and collect its income. It was a good one. Apart from the recognition money (66s. 8d.), the town paid into the bishop's treasury £13 12s. 8d. in 1245-6 and £10 18s. 6d. the following year, and £17 16s. 8d. in 1247-8. The finances of the bishopric were in a very bad way, and the bishop might have been tempted to leave things as they were; but he decided otherwise and made with the town a written agreement: in exchange for a fixed payment of £12 a year, he granted them a certain measure of independence. This agreement is known as the Farnham Charter.

This venerable document is still in existence, and is in the possession of the Farnham Urban Council. It is a small sheet of parchment measuring  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$  inches. A comparison with the pipe rolls of the same period shows that it belongs to the date to which it is ascribed, although it is not in the writing of the Winchester scribe who copied out the steward's accounts. The margin all round is very small, and it has been kept folded, with the result that two holes are visible where the folds meet. The ink has faded somewhat and is almost pink, yet very clear. The seal has gone, although the strip of skin to which it was appended, has remained in position.

We reproduce here the Latin text, not contracted as in the deed itself, but in full. The English translation of the charter which follows, was made more than 300 years later for the burgesses, and used subsequently in the Kilvert case. We

have taken the liberty to correct it where it did not agree with the original, such passages being printed in italics.<sup>1</sup>

The date of the charter is the 5th of the Ides of February and the 5th year of the translation of William de Raleigh from Norwich to Winchester,<sup>2</sup> that is, February 1249.

#### LATIN TEXT OF THE FIRST CHARTER

*Omnibus Christi fidelibus has litteras visuris aut audituris Willelmus Dei gratia Wyntonice episcopus salutem in domino. Noveritis nos concessisse, dimississe, et ad feodi firmam tradidisse burgensibus nostris de ffarnham totum burgum nostrum de ffarnham et totam villam adiacentem cum omnibus eorum pertinenciis, exceptis hutesio levato, sanguine fuso, et latronibus captis et eorum catallis, et exceptis eschaetis omnium terrarum et tementorum suorum, et exceptis Willelmo le Parker, Gervasio de Sneleslinche et Ricardo Bruton qui nobis in capite respondebunt sicut prius consueverunt. Volumus etiam et concedimus pro nobis et successoribus nostris in perpetuum quod predicti burgenses et heredes sui habeant omnes libertates et liberas consuetudines subscriptas sicut prius habere consueverunt. Videlicet habere debent feriam nostram de ffarnham integram ad festum omnium Sanctorum sine aliqua diminucione. Item eligere debent ballivos suos voluntate sua et instituere et removere quotiens voluerint sine contradictione quorumcunque ministrorum nostrorum. Item habere debent assisam panis et cervisie, ita quod panem capere debent ad domum pistoris, et ponderare et probare et cervisiam tastare in burgo, et in villa et per unam leucam in giro et emendas habere debent tam panis quam cervisie, nisi*

<sup>1</sup> The text supplied by the *Victoria County History* differs from ours in many particulars. We cannot agree that in 1225 the accounts of the borough were noted separately (Vol. II, p. 585), nor that the date of the Charter is 1247. Many discrepancies are no doubt due to the fact that the dates of the rolls were not verified by the author.

<sup>2</sup> As Wm. de Raleigh, elected in 1243, did not enter in possession until September 1244, there was some difficulty in deciding which was his fifth year. One roll, dated "the second year of the translation of William," supplied us with the information that in that year the feast of S. Luke fell on a Wednesday. Tables of reckoning told us at once that this happened in 1245 and that we had in our hands the Rent Roll for 1245-6. February of the 5th year of Raleigh was February A.D. 1249.

*pistor ad pilloriam aut braciator ad tumberellam debeant condemnari, quod ad nos reservavimus. Item habere debent totum tollum quod aliquo modo potest accidere in spacio predicto. Item de omni secta Curie nostre erunt quieti, praeter quod ad duo hundred de Lagheday ad castrum nostrum de ffarnham per annum et ad Capitula regalia respondere debent sine occasione, et sectam ad curiam suam propriam coram ballivis suis facere debent sicut coram ballivis nostris facere quondam consueverunt. Item facere debent omnia atachiamenta et omnes sumoniciones et omnes districciones quae accidunt in burgo predicto et in villa predicta, exceptis illis quae tangunt ballivum nostrae libertatis. Haec omnia predicta, sicut predictum est, concessimus dictis burgensibus et heredibus suis pro nobis et successoribus nostris sine impedimento et contradictione omnium ministrorum nostrorum in perpetuum. Et pro ista dimissione, concessione, et ad feodi firmam tradicionem, predicti burgenses et heredes sui dabunt annuatim nobis et successoribus nostris per manus prepositi nostri de ffarnham duodecim libras argenti ad Hokeday et ad festum Sancti Martini pro equali porcione, ubi aliquo tempore tantum novem libras reddere consueverunt. In cujus rei testimonium huic scripto signum nostrum apponi fecimus. Datum apud Essere quinto idibus februariis anno translacionis nostrae quinto. Hiis testibus: Magistro Walterio archidiacono Surriensi, dominis Othone de Eysholte, Rogerio Veaupel senescallis nostris, dominis Othone et Fulchero tunc capellanis nostris, Willelmo de Hukeford, Roberto de Essex, Johanne de ffroyle tunc constabulario nostro de ffarnham, Jacobo le Beel, Gervasio de Sneleslinche et aliis.*

“To all the faithful of Christ that shall see or hear this present writinge, William by Divine permission, Bishop of Wiinton, greeting in our Lord. Know you that we have granted demised and let to fee farm to our burgesses of Farnham all our Borrow of Farnham, and all the towne adjoyninge, with all their appurtenance—except penalties for hue and cry raised, for bloudshed, and fellows taken and their chattels—except escheats of all their (*the burgesses'*) lands and tenements. And except William Parker Gervase, of Sneleslinche, and Richard Bruton, who shall answer to us in cheife as they have been formerly accustomed to do.

Wee will also graunte for us and our successors for ever, that the said burgesses and their heires for ever shall have all lyberties and free customs hereunder written, as heretofore they have had.

That is to saye—They shall have all our ffaire of Farnham at the feast of All Saints, whole without any deniall,

Item. They shall choose their bailiffs at their owne will and appoynte and remove them as often as they please without contradiction of any of our ministers or officers whatsoever.

Item. They shall have the assize of bread and ale, so as they shall take the bread at the baker's house, and weigh and trye the same, and taste the ale in the borrow and in the town, and within any league rounde aboute. And they shall have their penalties both of bread and ale, unless the baker be to be condempned to the pillory, or the brewer to the tombrill, which we reserve to ourselves.

Item. They shall have all the *tolls* that any way may come within the said compasses.

Item. They shall be *exempt from* all suit of our courts, savinge that they shall answer to the lords of the hundred at the two Lawe days, holden at our Castell of Farnham yearely *and* to the king's chapitor without denial, and shall make their own suite att their courts, before their bayliffs, as they were wont to do before our bayliffes.

Item. That they shall make attachments and all sommons and all distreignes which happen in the borrow *and in the towne* aforesaide, except those which concern the bayliffes of our liberties. All those things as aforesaid we have granted to *the* aforesaid burgesses and their heires for us and our successors without any impediment or contradiction of any of our officers for ever.

All for this demise, grante and *lettinge to fee farme* the said burgesses and their heires shall yields to us and our successors by the hand of our steward of Farnham, twelve pounds of silver att Hocke day and att the feast of St. Martin by even portions, while for some time before they have only paid nine pounds. In witness whereof we have to this writing caused our seal to be put. Given at Esher the *fifth* of the ides of February, the *fifth* year of our translation.

Witnesses :—Walter Archdeacon of Surrey.

Masters Otho de *Eysholte* and Roger Veaupeul our seneshalls, lord Otho and Fulcher then our chaplains, Wm. de Hakeford. Robert de Essex. John de Froyle then our constable of Farnham. James le *Beel*, Gervase de Sneleslinche and others."

The opening paragraph grants in general terms to the burgesses of Farnham, some of the rights which belonged to the bishop. The expression "our borough of Farnham and the town adjoining" means the enclosed town and the houses next to the town ditch, for Weststreet and Dogflud did remain in the hands of the bishop, as is shown by an examination of the pipe rolls of a later date. The "grant of the borough with all its appurtenances" transferred to the town the rent of assize due to the bishop as landlord. The value of this was about fifty shillings yearly. The town became entitled to any increase of that rent and also to lettings of pitches in the market place. There were fourteen such lettings in 1246-7. Their value was twopence yearly for a

pitch, and one penny for half a pitch, besides a shilling or sixpence for the first grant of it.

The bishop kept, however, the fines for bloodshed and the chattels of criminals, which means that the burgesses were given no criminal jurisdiction. This was a wise and merciful provision. In the boroughs where the burgesses enjoyed full judicial powers, the penalties were frequently savage to the extreme. At Sandwich, murderers were drowned in the fourteenth century and buried alive in the fifteenth. At Portsmouth the penalty for men was burning, while women were tied to a stake at low water and drowned by the tide. Even for robbery the punishment was incredibly brutal. At Portsmouth, a man convicted of robbery "was scalde and his eyen put owte" while women had "their tetys kyt off." At Hastings and Dover felons were thrown over the cliffs.<sup>1</sup> Hanging is the only penalty mentioned in our rolls and prisoners were sent to Guildford or Winchester to be judged.

Three men, who probably lived in the town (otherwise the exception is meaningless), remained under the bishop's jurisdiction. One is William Parker, who had charge of the park and was an important officer of the bishop. So probably were Gervase of Snayleslynch and Richard Bruton.

After that general introduction the charter goes into details and specifies the liberties and free customs which are granted to the burgesses. Note the expression "as heretofore they have had" (*sicut prius habere consueverunt*) which means that previous to 1249 the burgesses of Farnham had already enjoyed a great measure of self government with the bishop's consent.

The first grant is that of the fair which had been established by royal letters sixteen years before. It is given them whole and without restrictions. This referred to the tax levied on the traders who did not belong to the town. The Farnham fair held on the feast of All Saints brought in 13s. in 1245, 17s. 3d. in 1246, and 18s. in 1247.

The second privilege was to choose, appoint and remove the bailiffs at their will. We cannot say how the election of bailiffs was made, nor how long they remained in office, for there was great variety in the methods of local government.

<sup>1</sup> See collection of borough customs published by the Selden Society.

Four hundred years later, in 1673,<sup>1</sup> they were elected annually. Between 1363 and 1402 the same names head the accounts of the borough year after year, but during that period the borough was again in the hands of the bishop, and the bailiffs may have been appointed by him.

The honour of being a bailiff was offset by the disadvantage of being responsible for the payment of the farm, but except in exceptionally bad years, there must have been a good surplus, and the bailiffs may possibly have used the balance for their own personal pleasure and advantage.

The third privilege was the granting to the burgesses of the assize of bread and ale in the borough and within a league of it. The assize "settled the weight of bread according to the price of corn, and the price of ale according to the price of wheat, barley and oats."<sup>2</sup> Considering the price of cereals between 1208 and 1250 ale must have cost a penny for three gallons at Farnham in the days of des Roches and Ralegh. The breaking of the law was punished by the manor courts by a fine of sixpence, sometimes a shilling. The extension of the jurisdiction of the town to one league beyond its boundaries, was not so valuable as it looked, for there were practically no bakers or brewers outside Farnham, while in the town itself every other inhabitant must have been selling bread or ale. In 1246-7 only one man and two women were convicted for selling against the assize outside the town, but in the borough twenty-seven men and three women were fined for selling bread under the legal weight, and twenty-two women and nine men were fined for selling ale above the legal price. The following year eleven people were convicted for breaking the assize in the whole hundred, but in the borough, five bakers were fined "for small bread," one trader for using wrong measures, and no less than twenty men and thirteen women for dear ale. Needless to say, these fines made in the aggregate a handsome addition to the income of the borough. It is also possible that the duty of going round the ale-houses was not altogether distasteful to the bailiffs.

<sup>1</sup> Aubrey, *The Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey*, Vol. VIII, p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> *English Gilds*, edited by Toulmin Smith. Note on the Old Usages of Winchester, p. 363.

It is obvious, however, that in the hands of the local officials the power to inflict heavy punishments would have been open to abuse in a small town, and the bishop wisely refused them the right to condemn to the pillory or the tumbrel.

The next concession concerned tolls. "They shall have all the tolls." Toll was a tax levied on all the goods sold in the town, especially on market days, that is, every Thursday. There was probably a discriminating tariff in favour of local goods, but the rolls supply no evidence of this. The figures given for town tolls show that a good deal of trade must have been done. In 1245-6 the tolls realized £3 15s. 8d.; in 1246 £4 os. 9½d.; in 1247 £4 2s. 2½d. After 1363, when the burgesses were supposed to hand over to the bishop all the revenue, it is strange that the tolls produced only a small and curiously fixed sum of 25s. a year or thereabouts. It looks as if the bailiffs cooked the accounts, put down a fictitious and invariable amount and concealed the real profit of the tolls.

The last privilege granted by the bishop to the burgesses was the right to have their own court and to be tried and judged by their own bailiffs. This borough court was competent to judge all petty cases, such as brawling, bad language, petty thefts, breaking the assize or local regulations. It inflicted fines and kept them. The revenue raised from this source was considerable. In 1246 it was only £3 8s., but the year after it rose to £10 3s. 4d., and in 1273 £15 6s. A century later, during the episcopate of William de Wykeham, this court perquisites oscillated between eight and ten pounds a year. We have already remarked that the figures for that period may be fictitious: the sameness of the amounts of court perquisites, like those of the tolls, year after year makes one suspicious. It is a fact worth noting that the clearest part of the town income was derived from fines. This was not financially sound.

The court may have been held every three weeks like the manor courts. If the customs of other boroughs may be taken as a guide the people may have been summoned by the ringing of bells or the blowing of horns to attend the court held at the market place at 6 a.m. in summer and at 9 a.m. in winter. There was another court held on market days

to settle all the differences on the spot and the "clerk of the market" was the arbitrator of these disputes.<sup>1</sup>

The charter makes one exception to the privilege of the town to have its own courts. The burgesses remained bound to attend the two annual courts of the hundred held at Blackheathfield at Hockaday and S. Martin's, like the other inhabitants of the hundred. In exchange for the privileges thus granted, the borough was to pay yearly to the bishop and his successors the sum of twelve pounds of silver by even portions at the two Hundred courts, instead of the nine pounds which they had paid for some years past. We have already noted that the exact sum was nine pounds six shillings and fourpence.

They remained bound—though the charter is silent on this point—to pay the gift of recognition to every new bishop on his taking possession of the see. This was for the borough, a fixed sum of 66s. 8d., the same in the days of Ralegh as in the days of de Pontoise or William de Wykeham.

This charter granted much. Above all the people knew where they stood. The steward could no longer raise the farm at will. If the town grew prosperous, the burgesses, not the lord, would benefit by it, and they obtained nearly complete commercial and political independence. It was not a royal charter, and therefore they were not given the right to form a corporation, to have a mayor and a seal, to own property or to inflict heavy punishments; nor were they given the right to send representatives to Parliament. In 1249 the question could not be raised yet, and when in 1310 Farnham sent in its representatives to Parliament for the first time, Thomas Sutton and Thomas Tyghelere, it was not in virtue of the charter.

This charter of 1249 is the one which for ever after governed the relations between town and bishop. Even when it had to be renewed under John Gervase and Cardinal Beaufort the conditions on both sides remained identical.

The history of the charter does not end here. For reasons difficult to elucidate the agreement lapsed at times, and we must here give an account of the vicissitudes of the charter,

<sup>1</sup> Pipe Roll for A.D. 1400. Fines and amerciaments made before the clerk of the market: 13s. 4*d.*

which probably correspond each time to some crisis in the history of Farnham.

At first everything goes on smoothly: the farm of the borough is paid regularly year after year. In 1253, however, while the twelve pounds of the farm are paid as usual, we note in the repairs to house and castle two puzzling items: the thatching with straw of a market outside the gate of the castle, and of another market inside, and these appear again from time to time. Why did the bishop require two markets or even one market? Was Aylmer de Valence breaking the contract and encroaching on the privileges of the borough? That wild young man was certainly capable of it. The burgesses kept their part of the bargain and went on paying their yearly farm until 1257. The next roll is missing, and for a few years the bishopric is in the king's hands. Bishop John Gerveys in 1262 receives £6 (the first half of the farm having been paid to the king), and twelve pounds in 1263-4 and 1264-5. What happened in 1265 and 1266 we do not know, as the two rolls are missing, but for some reason or other the charter must have lapsed since it had to be confirmed again in 1266 by John Gervase. We do not possess the original text of this charter, but it was reproduced in the text of 1410, which is identical with that of 1249, except for the names of the witnesses: these are Thomas de Wynton, official. Wm. de Wyntersulle, steward, John de Farnham, clerk, Robert Trapes and others. The date given is the 13th of the Kalends of July 1266.

Payments are resumed, but curiously enough they were not made in 1273-4, and instead we find suddenly the borough in the hands of the bishop, Nicholas of Ely. The rent of assize is 56s. 1d. for the year. Stude gavel<sup>1</sup> gives 26s. 4d. The assize of bread and ale: £15 6s. The tolls of the fair and of the market yield £4 12s. 9½d. The total is £24 os. 14¼d. It was certainly not poverty which had suspended the charter. Was it that no burgesses had been willing to assume the responsibilities of being bailiffs? It was not an enviable post. We can see no other possibility. The interruption was a short one. Both the year before, as the year after, the twelve pounds were paid, and there

<sup>1</sup> An expression we have found but very seldom.

was no renewal of the charter, which was merely suspended for one year. Nicholas of Ely was a generous man, who did not wish to take advantage of a temporary difficulty, though he was legally entitled to do so.

Under John de Pontoise everything went on smoothly. A hundred years later (in 1363) the burgesses alluded darkly to an agreement settling the dates of the two annual payments which they thought had been made in the seventh year of Bishop John de Pontoise.<sup>1</sup> But although we examined the records of the seventh and of the seventeenth year of de Pontoise, we found nothing to give colour to that assertion, and all the rolls of his pontificate which we have consulted show that the farm of twelve pounds was paid regularly in two instalments as before.

Nothing worth mentioning happens afterwards, and things go on smoothly between the town and the bishop. In the roll for 1345-6 we note the following explanation "At S. Martin's, nothing, because that was during the king's time. At Hockaday: six pounds, Total, six pounds." This makes it clear that during vacancies the king took all the income of the bishopric, including the farm of the borough.

Then came the Black Death. This caused no interruption in the payments, which continued regularly. The twelve pounds of the farm appear in the rolls for 1349, '50, '52, '54, '56, '59. There was another bad outbreak of the plague in 1361, and this neighbourhood again suffered; yet that year, and the following, the farm of the borough was paid without demur. Suddenly, in 1363 (Roll No. 159374), the burgesses found themselves unable to keep up payments. The first half of the year seems to have been duly settled, but not a penny was paid for the second half "*Debent totum.*" There had undoubtedly been a loss of population and a loss of trade, but how is it that the full effect of this was not felt at an earlier date? Whatever the cause, the burgesses came to the bishop in a body and resigned the charter into his hands. They promised to give him every year a full account of all the profits and revenues of the town, and to be responsible

<sup>1</sup> Prout patet in pipa Johannis de Pontissara . . . de anno suo septimo et in alia pipa ejusdem ep̄i. Pipe Roll for 1363-4.

individually and collectively for a minimum payment of £12 a year to his steward.

In 1364-5 they paid their arrears of £7 17s., but it was again a bad year, and they remained in debt to the treasurer for the current year. It is only in 1366 that they manage to balance their accounts properly, and pay £15 11s. 8d. in full discharge of their past and present obligations.

Soon, however, they took the bishop's measure. He was a man of kindly and generous disposition, and they were quick to take advantage of him. The minimum payment of £12 a year became practically their maximum, and whatever the income of the town they seldom paid more than the old figure. No wonder that during his long episcopate they never tried to recover their lost privileges.

For instance in 1367 they ought to have paid £15 6s. 8d. They pay £12, and still owe a sum of 66s. 8d., the gift of recognition they are bound to make to every bishop on his accession to the bishopric. In 1368 they pay £12 os. 15d. The 15d. stand there, no doubt, as a symbol of goodwill and a sign of their loyal efforts to discharge their debt. But they still owe their recognition money. In 1369, the same comedy: the tolls realize 30s; the court perquisites, which had realized £8 12s. 4d. in 1367, and £8 14s. 4d. in 1368, are now £8 10s. 10d. They pay the bishop £12 2s. 4d. and still owe him the recognition money, 66s. 8d.

And so it continued to the end of the century. Receipts may fluctuate: they may rise or fall, but the bishop never receives more than his £12 or thereabouts. Not only did the bishop let arrears of debt accumulate until they reached a figure of £21 3s. 6d. (in 1399) but he even made them a present of all tolls and customary dues that they might spend these on improvements to the town. The debt was a personal liability of the bailiffs. These, Richard Serle, John Blockhole and Robert James, continued to owe those twenty-one pounds until 1401-2, when William de Wykeham forgave them "by special favour" and gave them a roll of protection sealed with his seal. The year before, the town had made a big effort and paid 19s. 10d. above the customary sum. Needless to say, this effort could not be sustained, and in 1401 they gave the steward £12 very exactly. We cannot help sus-

pecting them of manipulating the receipts so that tolls and court perquisites should always be kept down to the same level; even then there was a surplus. Their tenacity perhaps deceived and certainly tired the stewards and the bishops, and the first act of Beaufort was to accept the situation.

The farm of the borough reappears in 1407<sup>1</sup> paid as formerly in two instalments, and thereafter the pipe rolls contain no longer a detail of the receipts and defaults of the borough, but the old formula "Farm of the Borough £12 paid in even portions at Hockaday and at the feast of S. Martin's."

The situation was regularized by a new charter in 1410. This document is still extant, and, like the charter of 1249, is in the hands of the Farnham Urban Council. It is a strip of parchment  $14\frac{5}{8} \times 11\frac{1}{4}$  inches, slightly damaged by damp. Some initial letters of the top line are ornamented with graceful designs, much as some of the steward's accounts for the same period. It has a very wide margin, and portions of the red wax seal of Cardinal Beaufort are still adhering to the green cord which was attached to the charter.

It reproduces the charter of John Gervase, which was a copy of the earlier one, and bears the ratification of the cardinal with the date "Given at our Manor of Southwark on March 19. the year of the lord 1410 the seventh year of our translation." It is signed by John Catrik, Archdeacon of Surrey, John Forest, master of St. Cross Hospital, John Clippesham, Knight, and John Farnham.

The following year, on April 27, 1411, this charter was ratified by the prior and chapter of the cathedral; as Farnham belonged to the cathedral of Winchester, the consent of the chapter was required for its validity. This charter of *inspeximus* is also in the possession of the Farnham Council. It is in very good state of preservation, and like that of Cardinal Beaufort has portions of the seal adhering to its green cord.

After this, the story of the charter loses its interest. Payments were kept up, and the borough tolls and court cease to appear separately in the accounts. It is said that Bishop Waynflete renewed the charter in 1452, but we possess neither the original nor the copy of this confirmation.

<sup>1</sup> The Roll for 1405 is missing, and in that for 1406 Farnham does not appear at all.