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THE KENT HUNDRED ROLLS – INTRODUCTION

The Kent Hundred Rolls of 1274-5, preserved in the National Archives, provide a mine of information for local historians. Many were printed by the Record Commission in the early nineteenth century, but the two bulky volumes are only to be found in major libraries and the rolls are printed in abbreviated Latin. This new website edition by the Kent Archaeological Society comprises the complete rolls for Kent, in the original Latin and in an English translation by Dr Bridgett Jones.

The Kent Rolls are remarkably complete, although there are a few omissions. The major liberties are only mentioned incidentally, namely the lowy of Tonbridge and the hundred of Wachlingstone, in the hands of Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester and Hertford; Wye, in the hands of the abbot of Battle abbey, Sussex; and the Cinque Ports which had their own privileges. In addition, there is no return for Sheppey or Ospringe.

Edward I returned from crusade in 1274 to a kingdom where the crown had been weakened by civil war during the baronial reform period of 1258-65, and where there was extensive local government corruption. According to the heading of the Kent Hundred Rolls, inquiry was to be made into the king’s rights which had been usurped by lay and ecclesiastical lords, and into the excessive demands of sheriffs, escheators and coroners, and also of bailiffs and other officials, whether royal or seigniorial. Many of the encroachments on royal rights, often dating from c.1258-65, were the result of the expansion of royal government and justice in the thirteenth century. As new royal procedures developed, lay and ecclesiastical lords did their best to take them over for their own use, in order to strengthen their hold over their tenants. Henry III had ordered an inquiry into franchises in 1255, and Edward I throughout his reign was intent on building up the rights and powers of the Crown. He and his lawyers considered that all judicial rights belonged to the Crown, and any private liberty or franchise had to be backed up by royal warrant. He was, moreover, a reformer of law and justice, and realised that discontent among his subjects might lead to protest and rebellion. On the other hand, justice and good government would increase his prestige and his revenues.

The procedure for the Hundred Roll inquiry was similar to that of many other royal inquiries of the thirteenth century. Commissioners were appointed, two for each group of counties, who carried out their work between November 1274 and March 1275. The sheriff was ordered to empanel juries for each hundred who were to appear before the commissioners on a set day and place. The names of the Kent hundred jurors, together with those for Canterbury, Rochester, Brasted and Dartford, are recorded on the rolls (see pages 161-66). Judging by the returns for Blackheath and Axtane hundreds (see pp. 153-160), the jurors were unable to answer all the articles of the inquiry. The Blackheath jury, however, had plenty to say about franchises in private hands, recent encroachments on royal rights, the tax of one-twentieth on movable property, and the waste committed by the escheator when the vacant archbishopric of Canterbury was in his custody (1270-2). Their longest complaint concerned the so-called gifts taken by sheriffs, bailiffs and coroners under various pretexts.

Dr Jennifer Ward has written a Commentary on the Kentish Hundred Rolls which will appear in Archaeologia Cantiana, CXXVII (2007). The description above is drawn from the introduction to that paper.
The Kentish Hundred Rolls contain a very large number of place-names not readily identifiable – these are shown in italics in this edition. It has not been possible to undertake an exhaustive study of these unidentified names and is hoped that all with local knowledge, will be able to help in locating as many as possible.

Another issue is the identification of personal names.

Please inform the staff at the KAS Library of any such identifications and supporting evidence:

by email to:  
kentarchaeology@btconnect.com  
header ‘Hundred Rolls Project’

by mail to:  
KAS Hundred Rolls Project,  
Maidstone Museum and Bentlif Art Gallery,  
St. Faith’s Street, Maidstone, Kent ME14 1LH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Hundred</th>
<th>Lathe</th>
<th>Jury p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Aloesbridge</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>161,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13, M14</td>
<td>147,</td>
<td>Axtane</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m5 dorso</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bewsborough</td>
<td>St Augustine’s (Hedeling)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m4 dorso</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Bircholt Barony</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Bircholt Franchise (half)</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m5 dorso</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Blackborne</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12, M15</td>
<td>135,</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bleangate</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Brasted</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m7 dorso</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m1 dorso</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Calehill</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Chart</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m7 dorso</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Chatham and Gillingham</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Codsheath</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cornilo</td>
<td>St Augustine’s (Hedeling)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m5 dorso</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2 dorso</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Downhamford</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td>St Augustine’s (Hedeling)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m7 dorso</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Eyhorne</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m4 dorso</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Felborough</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2 dorso</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>[Great] Barnfield</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Heane</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m7 dorso</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Hoo</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m1 dorso</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kinghamford</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Larkfield</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Lesnes</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m6 dorso</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>[Little] Barnfield (half)</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2 dorso</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Littlefield</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Longport (half)</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m10 dorso</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Loningborough</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Malling</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Marden</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6, M6 dorso</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m10 dorso</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Newchurch</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m6 dorso</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Newenden</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Ospringe</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Oxney</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m1 dorso</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Petham</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ringslow</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m6 dorso</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Rolvenden</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m13 dorso</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Ruxley</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Selbrittenden</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m7 dorso</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Shamwell</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Sheppey</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Somerden</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>St Martin</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Stowting</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m10 dorso</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m4 dorso</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tenham</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m6 dorso</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Tenterden</td>
<td>Scray</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m7 dorso</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Toltingtrough</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Tonbridge Lowy</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Twyford</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Wachlingstone</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>Sutton at Hone</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2 dorso</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Whitstable</td>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m3 dorso</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Wingham</td>
<td>St Augustine’s (Hedeling)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Wrotham</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inquisiciones facte per preceptum domini regis in comitatu Kancie de juribus et libertatibus domini regis subtractis et excessis vicecomitatorum escheatorum et aliorum ballivorum domini regis quorumcunque aliorum ballivorum alioquo modo dominum regem spectantibus anno regni regis Edwardi tercio.

m.1 Hundredum de Blengate lastus Sancti Agustini de comitatu Kancie

Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Blengate solembat tradi ad firmam cum lasto Sancti Augustini et Hedeling pro xxiij libris a tempore Reginaldi de Cobeham vicecomitis. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Blengate est in manus domini archiepiscopi Cant’ sic una medietas et altera medietas in manu abbatis Sancti Augustini set a quo tempore aut quid valet nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium placita de namio vetito wrecceum maris et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ habet forcas et assisam panis et cervisie set a quo tempore aut quo warento ignorant.

Dicunt eciam quod archiepiscopus predictus habet liberam chaciam et warennam de antiquo et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ clamat habere warennam quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod domini Willelmus de Brewose impediuit ejecucionem mandatorum domini regis fieri in hoc quod tenuit januas parci de Trindele clausas ubi preceptus fuit per justiciarios domini regis eas tenere apertas ita quod transeuntes possunt ibidem transire.

Item dicunt idem dominus Willelmus de Brewose inclusit communem stratam que ducit de Cant’ versus Stodm’ in parco suo de Trendele ut gentes ibidem non transirent. Ita cum gentes de Taneto emiserint de communi pecunia quomdam mariscum cum quodam milite nomine Ricardo de Bickel et fecissent murum ut rectius irrent de Teneto ad Cant’ et illud iter super predicto muro per xx annos usi fuissent et ultra alienas terras ubi non emerunt ita iter venit abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ et fecit fossatum magnum ad siccandum mariscum inter caput dicti muri et terras alienas ita quod gentes de Teneto non

Kent Hundred Rolls 1274-1275

Inquisitions made by the lord king’s command in the county of Kent about the lord king’s rights and liberties which have been taken away and the excessive demands of the sheriffs, coroners, escheators and other of the lord king’s bailiffs and of any other bailiffs whosoever appertaining/belonging to the lord king in any way, in the third year of King Edward’s reign 1274-1275.

m.1 Hundred of Bleangate, the lathe of St Augustine in the county of Kent

The jury say that Bleangate hundred used to be demised at farm with the lathe of St Augustine and Hedeling for £24 from the time of Reginald of Cobham the sheriff.

Then they say that the hundred of Bleangate is in the hand of the lord archbishop of Canterbury, thus one moiety and the other moiety is in the hand of the abbot of St Augustine’s but they do not know from what time or what it is worth.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck and other liberties which pertain to the crown and the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale but from what time or by what warrant they are ignorant.

They say also that the aforesaid archbishop has free chace and warnen from ancient times and the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury claims to have warnen but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Braose has hindered the execution of the lord king’s mandates in that he has kept the gates of his park at Trindele [Trenley] closed when he was instructed by the lord king’s justices to keep them open so that people could travel through there.

Then they say that the same Sir William de Braose has enclosed a common way which leads from Canterbury towards Stodm[arsh] in his park of Trendele so that people cannot pass through there. Then since the people of Thanet with a certain knight named Sir Richard de Bickel bought a certain marsh with communal money and had made a [sea?] wall so that they could easily go from Thanet to Canterbury and they have been accustomed to make that journey by the side of the aforesaid wall for 20 years and the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury came over the other lands where they had not bought right of way and made a
possunt ultra metas marisci sui transpire set solitum fuit quondam ibidem esse fossatum antequam iter et murus fient ibidem

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Burn’ quondam vicecomes cepit de Willelmo de Cruce de Chislet v marcas pro felonia facta Johanni de Roffeburn et de Roberto de Heliere cepit xxs pro felonia facta Egidio de Or. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Sarsted cepit de Ada de Hersing pro ipso removendo de juratis vjd et de pluribus aliis pro simili ad estimacionem dimidam marcam. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstell ballivus cepit iijis de Augustino de Bradelond in ultimo Itinere justicariorum apud Cant’. Item dicunt quod Walterus de Berksted cepit de hundredo de Blengat’ xLs de catallis Andrei de Blengat’ feloni et dictum hundredum versus dominum regem inde non aquietavit quare iterum pacavit.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime cepit [sic] de hoc hundredo Ls pro pondere ultra certum numerum denariorum. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor dum fuit custos archiepiscopatus Cant’ cepit de bosco de Reysele et Litlewud iij libras et iijis et de tenentibus ibidem de tallagio x libras. Item Hugo de Thornham clericus eius cepit de eisdem ne eos occasionaret 1 marcam, item de Andreo le plumer, Salomone Atteburn Ricardo le Cruder Roberto de Aula Radulfo de Strathend Jacobo de Halewolding Goldingo Palmario Hamone de Hawe Henrico de Herveford Jacobo de Colwinwod Roberto de Sowinton Thoma Dunstan et Thomas Dunstan extenditoribus instauri de Recluﬀre summam x equorum et iij bovum de precio vj libras vjd et vijid dictum precium in denarios recepit et quare non solverunt ad voluntatem suam americavit eos in iij libris et cepit. Item cepit de eisdem ita quod se non intromitterent de venditione aliqua inpreterum v marcas et de tota curia cepit Cs pro eodem. Item escactor archiepiscopi dimiserunt in manibus prepositi de Reculv’ Ls ad emendandum quoddam molendinum quos denarios Hugo de Thornham clericus excactoris estorsit a manibus dicti prepositi.

Item Johannes Baudifer ballivus dicti exchaitor cepit de Willelmo Milite ut posset dare relevium suum post fratrem suum dimidiam marcam. Item de Milone great ditch to drain the marsh between the head of the said wall and the other lands so that the people of Thanet can not travel beyond the metes of their marsh, as they used to do formerly before the road and wall were made there.

Then they say that Sir Henry de Burn, formerly a sheriff, took 5 marks from William de Cruce of Chislet for a felony committed against John de Roffeburn and he took 20s from Robert de Heliere for a felony committed against Giles de Or. Then they say that Robert de Sarsted took 6d. from Adam de Hersing for removing him from juries and half a mark by estimation from many other men for a similar reason. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstell, the bailiff, took 4s. from Augustine de Bradelond in the last eyre of the justices at Canterbury. Then they say that Walter de Berksted took 40s. from Bleangate hundred for the chattels of Andrew of Bleangate, a felon, and he has not acquitted the said hundred versus the lord king because it paid again.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took from this hundred 50s. by weight more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator while he was the custodian of the archbishopric of Canterbury took £4 4s. from the wood of Reysel and Littlewood and £10 from the tenants there as tallage. Then Hugh of Thornham his clerk took 1 mark from the same men so that he should not prosecute them, then he took from Andrew, the plumber, Solomon Atteburn, Richard le Cruder, Robert de Aula, Ralph de Strathend, James de Halewolding, Golding Palmarius, Hamo de Hawe, Henry de Herveford, James de Colwinwod, Robert de Sowinton, Thoma Dunstan and Thomas Dunstan, the valuers of the stock of Reculver a total of 10 horses and 4 oxen, price £6 6s. 8d., he received the said amount in money and because they did not pay this of their own accord he amerced them £4. Then he took 5 marks from the same men because they had not previously taken part in any sale and 100s. from the whole court for the same reason. Then the archbishop’s escheator delivered 50s. into the hands of the reeve of Reculver to repair a certain mill, but this money Hugh of Thornham the escheator’s clerk extorted from said reeve’s hands.

Then John Baudifer, the said escheator’s bailiff, took half a mark from William Knight that he might give his relief after his brother. Then 10s. from Miles the clerk
clerico ut posset ducere croppum suum seminata quo vellet Xs., item de Gervasio le Taillur inponendo sibi falso quod occidit uxorem suam Xs. Item de Petro de la Sole qui portavit securim in manu sua transeundo per mediam domum ubi sedebat dimidiam marcam, item de Johanne Lucas pro ingressu habendo in terra sua 1 marcam, item de Eote Bermund pro eodem dimidiam marcam, item de Luca capellano quod inposuit sibi quod detinuit inustae servicia suum dimidiam marcam, item de Salomone de campis de Westhalimot quod discessit de Cant’ sine licencia sua in ultimo Itinere justiciarorum viij, de Heldrido de Gravene pro warda puerorum suorum habenda ij marcas, item de Waltero clericio Andreo le Plummer Ricardo le Cruder ut non inprisonavit falso diffamatos XXXs., item de Daniele mercatorre inponendo sibi quod recepit unde suum xLs. Item de Simone Iuven’ ut non dimitteret eum pro debito Judaismorum dimidiam marcam, item de Milone clericio pro eodem 1 marcam, item de borgia de Serr inponendo sibi quod recept quendum garchionem contra defensionem suum dimidiam marcam, item de Ada de Aula ut dimitteret eum ne esset prepositus xxjs., item de Radulfo Algod pro eodem xxjs., de Johanne le Marun pro eodem ij marcas, de Gervasio de la Forde pro eodem xxiijs., de Hamone de Bromfeld pro simili ij marcas, de Jacobo Colewennewod pro simili ij marcas, de Sampson de Ett ut posset ducere bladum quo vellet xvjs., item de eodem ne inprisonaretur pro eisdem denarisi non solutis ad mandatum suum dimidiam marcam, de Stephen Alcorn inponendo sibi falso quod debet fecisse dampnum in bosco de Rihslie xxs., item de Ricardo de Hawe pro concelamento injuste sibi inposito de wrecce maris ij marcas, item de Hamone de Henherst ut non inprisonaretur pro transgressionibus filii sui v marcas et dimidiam, item de Walerano King inponendo sibi quod debuit fecisse dampnum in bosco de Rihshshelie vijs., item de Radulfo de Strethende ne inprisonaretur pro falso crimen sibi inposito iij marcas et dimidiam, item de borgia de Brokesgate quod manuecipit Galfridum Holte et non habuit eum coram justiciaris iiiij marcas, item de eadem borga de catallis eius xxvij et nichiilominus respondit eadem borga de evasione et catallis eius coram justiciarisi, item de Waltero preposito falso sibi inponendo de expensis suis factis in Knavingepoll quod noluit eidem allocare xxvijjs et viijd, de Elia de Romenal pro ingressu habendo in terram suam in gavelikund xxs., de executoribus that he might carry his sown crop where he might wish, then 10s. from Gervase the tailor accusing him falsely of killing his wife, then half a mark from Peter de la Sole who carried an axe in his hand when walking through the middle of the house where he was sitting, then 1 mark from John Lucas for having entry in his own land, then half a mark from Eota Bermund for the same reason, the half a mark from Luke the chaplain because he accused him falsely of unjustly withholding his service, then 8s. from Solomon of the fields of Westhalimote [Minster in Thanet par., lost] because he departed from Canterbury without his licence at the last eyre of the justices, 2 marks from Heldrid of Graveney for having the wardship of his sons, then 30s. from Walter the clerk, Andrew the plumber, Richard the Cruder that he should not imprison them on false accusation, then 40s. from Daniel the merchant accusing him that his wife killed their son, then half a mark from Simon Iuven’ that he should not restrain him for a debt to the Jews, then 1 mark from Miles the clerk for the same reason, then half a mark from the tithing of Sarre making accusation that a certain youth had been received contrary to his prohibition, then 21s. from Adam Hall so that he would excuse him from being the reeve, then 10s. from Ralph Algod for the same reason, 2 marks from John de Marun for the same reason, 24s. from Gervase de la Forde for the same reason, 2 marks from Hamo of Broomfield for a similar reason, 2 marks from James Colewennewod for a similar reason, 16s. from Sampson de Ett that he can cart corn as he may wish, then half a mark from the same man that he should not be imprisoned as this was not paid at his order, 20s., from Stephen Alcorn accusing him falsely that he caused loss in Rihslie wood, 2 marks from Richard de Hawe, accusing him of unjustly concealing a wreck of sea, then 5½ marks from Hamo de Henherst that he might not be imprisoned for his son’s trespasses, 7s. from Waleran King, unjustly accusing him of causing damage in Rihshshelie wood, then ¾ marks from Ralph de Strethende that he might not be imprisoned for a crime of which he was falsely accused, then 4 marks from the tithing of Brookgate because they bailed Geoffrey Holte and did not bring him before the justices, then 27s. from the same tithing for his chatells and nevertheless the same tithing made response before the justices about the escape and chatells, then 28s. 8d. from Walter the reeve falsely accusing him about his expenses incurred in knavingepoll which he was unwilling to allow him, 20s. from Elias of Romney for
Alienore relicte Willelmi de Eneford ne inpediret eos in executione sua xxs., item idem habuit de Petro de Boytun ij boves nomine districcionis precii xvjs numquam eos restituit dicto Petro, item de borghis de Reculver et Brokesgate pro animalibus captis in pastura archiepiscopi tempore aperto ij marcas, item de Waltero Hughelot falso sibi inponendo quod extraxit animalia sua de pastura domini sine licencia dimidiam marcam. Item Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris cepit de debito domini regis de Willelmo Roper dimidam marcam et eum non aquietavit, item de Elia Koc eodem modo Xs., item de Waltero clerico et Johanne Potin eodem modo dimidiam marcam, item de Sarra de Helesole eodem modo dimidiam marcam, item de Henrico de la Grave inponendo sibi quod furabat stipulas in campo domini quas emit Xs.

Hundredum de Preston

Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex habet in manu suo manerium de Middelton cum Merdenn. Item dicunt quod Menstre et Salmoneston solebant esse in manu regis antiquo et modo ea tenentabbas et conventus Sancti Augustini Cant’ a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Monekenteton solebat aliquando esse in manu regum antiquorum et prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant’ modo tenent a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod manerium de Ofspring fuit in manu domini regis Henrici et modo illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains dedit pro comitatu Kancie tenentibus Cs. ad dampnum patrie et tradidit lastum Sancti Augustini et Hedeling cum hundredo de Bregg’ et dimidiam hundredi de Estri pro xxxij libris ad dampnum patrie et modo Thomas de Sutheneye ea tenet pro xxxij libris et antiquitus solebant tradi pro X libris.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ et abbas de Bello clamant habere returnum brevium et alias libertates regis. Item prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ et abbas Sancti Augustini clamant habere wrecceum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie quo warento nec a quo tempore nesciunt. Dicunt eciam quod dominus having entry into his own land in gavelkind, 20s. from the executors of Eleanor, widow of William of Eynsford that he would not hinder them in their work as executors, then the same man took 2 oxen, price 16s. from Peter Boytun as a distraint, he has never returned them to the said Peter, then 2 marks from the tithings of Reculver and Brookgate for their animals taken upon the archbishop’s pasture at a time it was open, then half a mark from Walter Hughelot, falsely accusing him of driving his animals from the lord’s pasture without licence. Then Hugh of Thornham, the escheator’s clerk, took half a mark from William Roper for a debt to the lord king and he has not acquitted him, then 10s. from Elias Cook in the same way, then half a mark from Walter the clerk and John Potin in the same way, then half a mark from Sarra de Helesole in the same way, then 10s. from Henry de la Grave accusing him of stealing stubble, which he bought, in the lord’s field.

Hundred of Preston

The jury say that the king holds the manor of Middleton with Marden in his own hand. Then they say that Minster and Salmoneston [Margate par.] used to be in the king’s hands in ancient time and now the abbot and convent of St Augustine Canterbury holds these, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that Monkton at some time used to be in the hand of the ancient kings and the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury now hold it, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the manor of Ospringe was in the lord King Henry’s hand and now the lady queen, the present lord king’s mother, holds it [Eleanor of Provence, married Henry III 1236 d. 1291, mother of Edward I], they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Henry Malemains gave 100s. to the tenants for the county of Kent with loss to the county and he handed over the lathe of St Augustine and Hedeling with Bridge hundred and half of Eastry hundred for £32 with loss to the country and now Thomas de Sutheneye holds those for £36 and in old times these used to be handed over for £10.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the abbot of Battle claim to have return of writs and other liberties of the king. Then the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and the abbot of St Augustine’s claim to have wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what
Willelmus de Brewuse et Willelmus de Leyburn' clamant habere furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warrento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ prior ecclesie Christi et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ habent et vendunt maritagia et wardas sokemannorum aliter qua deberent quare in Kancia non est warda

Item dicunt quod iidem archiepiscopus prior et abbas Willelmus de Brewuse et Willelmus de Leyburn habent chacias et warrens quo nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Brewuse opturat et deforciat quomdam viam communem hominibus pedibus per medium boscum suo.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes cepit xLs de Dionisia uxore Rogeri ate Nesse, Johannes Baldefar ballivus de Wingeham sub excaitore et Stephanus de Lynmming custos libertatis sub excaitore cepit de eadem Dionisia Ls que Dionisia fuit indictata et diffamata de morte Rogeri viri sui in hundredo de Wengeham.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall serviens listi Sancti Augustini anno regni regis Henrici Lvj et Robertus de Garsted serviens eiusdem lasti post et Thomas de Suthen’ proximo post ipsum ceperunt multociens pro summonitionis assisis redemptione de pluribus hominibus de dicto hundredi, sic dictus Hamo cepit de Paulino de Fonte ijs., de Thomas Belewe vjd., de Roberto de Fonte vjd., de Waltero Lyneth vjd. Item Thomas de Suthen cepit de Johanne de Sewinton xijd, de Godardo et Willelmo de Havekes xvjd.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall serviens dicti lasti occasivavit Ricardum Pertriche de hundredo de Preston inponendo ei concealmenti cepit de eo et quodam alio vjs. anno regis Henrici Lvj de Philippo Atteho et Waltero Budde eodem modo eciam xLd. Item Robertus de Sharsted serviens eiusdem lasti anno sequenti cepit de Radulfo de Pire ijs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyferer collectores vicesime cepurunt de isto hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum xxvjs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stubbeldun et Willelmus de Kerston distrinxerunt homines de Preston quousque habuerunt xLs quare vj homines warrant nor from what time. They say also that Sir William de Braose and William de Leyburn claim to have the gallows, and the assize of bread and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury, the prior of Christchurch and the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury have and sell marriages and wardships of sokemen other than where they ought, because there is no wardship in Kent.

Then they say that the same archbishop, prior and abbot, William de Braose and William de Leyburn have chace and warrens, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the same Sir William de Braose obstructs and damages a certain common way through the middle of his wood for men travelling on foot.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, the sheriff, took 40s. from Denise, Roger ate Nesse’s wife, John Baldefar the bailiff of Wingham under the escheator, and Stephen of Lyminge, the keeper of the liberty under the escheator, took 50s. from the same Denise who had been indicted and accused in Wingham hundred of her husband Roger’s death.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, a serjeant in the 56th year of King Henry’s reign [October 1271-1272] of the lathe of St Augustine and Robert de Garsted, a serving man of the same lathe after him and Thomas de Suth’ the next one after him, took from many men of the said hundred on many occasions for exempting them from summons to the assize; so the said Hamo took 2s. from Paulinus de Fonte, 6d. from Thomas Belewe, 6d. from Robert de Fonte, 6d. from Walter Lyneth. Then Thomas de Suthen’ took 12d. from John de Sewinton, 16d. from Godard and William de Havekes.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, a serjeant of the said lathe, arrested Richard Pertriche of Preston hundred, accusing him of a concealment. He took 6s. from him and another man in King Henry’s 56th year, and 40d. from Philip atte Hoo and Walter Budde in the same way. Then Robert de Sharsted, a serjeant of the same lathe, in the following year took 2s. from Ralph de Pire.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyferer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth from this hundred took 26s. more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that William de Stubbeldun and William de Kerston made distraint upon the men of Preston until they received 40s. because 6 men had been
summoned to Tonbridge Castle by the constable of Dover.

**Hundred of Whitstable**

The jury say that the Whitstable manor pertains to the barony of Aylsham and is held of the lord king in chief and it is worth £2 each year.

Then they say that Alexander de Baillol, the lord of Culham, holds the hundred and warren from ancient times.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and his associates, collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 13s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred and Hamo de la Forstall, the sheriff, took 1 mark unjustly from a certain John Symon’ who had accompanied a certain man towards the church and and he killed that man on returning from church, afterwards the same John was acquitted by the jury. Then the same Hamo took 5s. from Richard le Nute accusing him of being in debt to the Jews and he had never been so. The same Hamo took 5s. from Richard de Bulling in the same way and 3s. from Joceus de la Brok for a similar reason.

Then they say that Richard de Shamelford, the constable of Canterbury castle, took 50s. unjustly and for no reason from William de Wycheford and William le Blund, accusing them of maliciously assaulting Randulph son of Thomas de Estling and they had not done this. Then the same Richard took 16s. from Richard Elfem and 4s. unjustly from John Bleford because he struck a certain woman, whence settlement had been made in the lord’s court and 2s. from Richard Elfem before he could be released from the castle.

Then they say that Richard de Lindested unjustly took a certain horse from William de la Brok and rode it to Canterbury castle and before he was able to have his horse he gave Richard 6s.

Then they say that Thomas de Sutheneye took half a mark from Thomas de Parco and Matthew his brother, for the sale of their own sheep, accusing them of theft.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took 4s from John Galingeham accusing him of theft and he was innocent.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge maliciously arrested John Belfer unjustly and took 10s. from him.

Then they say that William Criel, the coroner, took 4s. before he was willing to perform the duties of his office
de quodam mortuo.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stopindon inposuit iiij hominibus quod fuerunt ad insultum de Tunebrigg’ ad mandatum domini regis et ideo cepit in villa de Witstapel xij marcas.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Toycestr’ distringit injuste Thomas Legerum et cepit ab eo Xd et Morico filio Radulfi xijd et de Juliana relict a Alexandri xijd pro quadam secta quam Reynerus de Pastevil debeat et non ipsi.

m.1 dorse Hundredum de Petham.

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Middeltun unacam hundredo de Mardenn tenetur in capite de domino rege per dominum Johannem de Burgo qui nunc tenet ex dimissione domini regis. Item dicunt quod manerium de Ofspring solebat esse in manu domini regis et nunc illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod tenentes de Heghardres et Robertus de Hardres subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi de Brugg’ per Comitem Glovern’ iam per xx annos de damnano nescient. Item dicunt quod idem Comes subtraxit omnes tenentes de feodo suo in comitatu de sectis et tenet de eisdem visum frankplegium et tenet placitum namio vettio et de sanguine et facit judicium de vita et membris et capitis emendas de pane et cervisia et alis que ad coronam pertinent iam xvj annis elapsis que pertinet ad dominum regem.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cantuar’ habet returnum omnium brevium a tempore regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc set nesciunt quo warrento et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet wrecicum maris et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent et nesciunt quo waranto nisi per libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant’. Item dicunt quod habet liberam chaciam per totum hundredum et warennam excepto tenemento Barrasius de Valoyngnes militis et habuit de antiquo

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Thornham clericus Magistri Ricardus de Clifford excaitoris cepit ij marcas de Willelmo Constable et Johannes Parcenario suo hereditibus cavel pro hereditate ipsos contingente et saysinam inde habenda.

Item dicunt quod cum plures de hundredo summoniti essent ad castrum de Tunebrigg’ obsidendum statim post bellum de Evesham et pace proclamada Gilbertus nunc Comes Glovern’ misit apud Cant’ Willelum de in this hundred, concerning a certain dead person.

Then they say that William de Stopindon accused 4 men of being present at the siege of Tonbridge at the lord king’s command and he took 12 marks from the vill of Whitstable.

Then they say that John of Towcester unjustly made distraint upon Thomas Legerum and took 10d. from him and 12d. from Maurice son of Ralph and 12d. from Juliana relict of Alexander for a certain suit which Reyner de Pastevil owed and which they did not.

m.1 dorso Hundred of Petham

The jury say that the manor of Middleton together with the hundred of Marden is held of the lord king in chief by Sir John de Burgh who now holds it by the lord king’s demise. Then they say that the manor of Ospringe used to be in the lord king’s hand and now the lady queen, mother of the present king holds that. Then they say that the tenants of High [Upper] Hardres and Robert of Hardres have withdrawn themselves from suit of the hundred of Bridge through the earl of Gloucester, now for 20 years, with what loss they do not know. Then they say that the same earl has withdrawn all the tenants of his fee in the county from suits of court and he holds the view of frankpledge for the same tenants and he holds pleas of withernam and bloodshed and he gives judgement on life and limb and he takes the fines of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown, for the past 16 years. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs from the time of King Henry, father of the present king, but they do not know by what warrant and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has wreck and other liberties which pertain to the crown and they do not know by what warrant unless through the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury, Then they say that he has free chace throughout the whole hundred and warren except in the tenement of Sir Barrasius de Valoyngnes, knight, and he has held this from ancient times.

Then they say that Hugh de Thornham, clerk of Master Richard de Clifford the escheator, took 3 marks from William Constable and John his co-tenant as heirs by lot [gavelkind?], concerning their hereditary right and then their having seisin.

Then they say that many men of the hundred were summoned to the siege of Tonbridge castle immediately after the battle of Evesham [1265] and peace having been proclaimed Gilbert, the present Earl
Gaston et Willelmum et Stupesden et minabantur plures de hundredo ita quod finem fecerunt cum predictis ita quod hundredum de Pecham pacavit ad opus Comitis X marcas. Item dicunt quod Ricardus ate Sole cepit equum Iovis Forrdred injuste et illum duxit ad domum Willelmi de Stupesden et ibidem detentus fuit per vj septimanas quousque finivit pro eo ijs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra certum numerum denariorum xiiijs pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod cum homines hundredi de Pecham summoniti essent apud Wingate precepto domini regis et cum dictus Willelmuus de Stupesden serviens Comitis Glovern’ hoc percepisset quod ad summonitionem regis adirent sine precepto suo cepit de Salomone de Stonstret qui ibidem tunc venit xxs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Toucestr’ familiaris dicti Willelmi cepit averaria dicti Salomonis tempore domini regis nunc in tenemento de Herdres inuiste et ea detinuit contra vadum et plegium quousque pacavit dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod cum idem Johannes hospitatus esset ad domum dicti Salomonis crastina die idem Johannes et Hamo de la Forstall servientes domini regis maliciose occasionaverunt dictum Salomonem et extorserunt falso ab eo xvs.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ ( obiit) vendit wardas et maritagia de hiis qui tenerent de eo in gavelikund contra judiciam et statum communitatis licet modo usitatum sit.

Item dicunt quod Robertus de Hardres distrinxit Salomonem de Stonstret quod deberet esset eius prepositus et injuste quousque habuit ab eo Xs. Dicunt eciam quod ballivi archiepiscopi capitis singulis annis pro puchre proclamanda iniuste xiiijs. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Thornham clericus excectoris cepit de Rogero Wokkel xxs ad ejecendum Paulinam de libero tenemento suo. Item dicunt quod Magister Richard de Clifford excactor qui sayset manerum de Pecham in manu domini regis sede archiepiscopi vacante cepit de tenentibus eiusdem hundredi xLs.

Item dicunt quod of Gloucester sent William de Gaston and William de Stupesdon to Canterbury and they threatened many men of the hundred so that they made a fine with the aforesaid men, of which the hundred of Petham paid 10 marks for the Earl’s use. Then they say that Richard ate Sole unjustly took Ivo Forrdred’s horse and rode it to William de Stupesden’s house and it was kept there for 6 weeks until he paid a fine of 2s. for it.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 14s. by weight from this hundred more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that as the men of Petham hundred had been summoned to Wingate at the lord king’s command and when the said William de Stupesden, a serjeant of the earl of Gloucester learnt this that they had gone at the king’s summons without his order he took 20s. from Solomon de Stonstret who then came there. Then they say that John of Towcester, a military follower of the said William, unjustly took the said Solomon’s draught animals in Hardres tenement in the present lord king’s time and kept those contrary to his surety and pledge until he paid half a mark. Then they say that when the same John had been a guest at the said Solomon’s house, on the day after the same John and Hamo de la Forstall, the lord king’s serjeant, maliciously arrested the said Solomon and falsely extorted 15s from him.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury (he has died) sells wardships and marriages for those who may hold from him in gavelkind contrary to justice and the custom of the community and the way it is lawfully observed.

Then they say that Robert of Hardres made distraint upon Solomon de Stonstret because he ought to have been reeve and he had 10s. from him unjustly. They say also that the archbishop’s bailiffs every year take 14s. unjustly for emending faulty pleas. Then they say that Hugh de Thornham, the escheator’s clerk, took from Roger Wokkel 20s. to eject Paulina from her free tenement. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, escheator, who took Petham manor in the lord king’s hand when the see of the archbishopric was vacant [after the death of Archbishop Boniface of Savoy 1270 and before the election of Robert de Kilwardby 1272] took 40s. from the tenants of the same hundred.

Then they say that Hugh de Thornham, the escheator’s clerk, has caused 25 trees, price £4 18s. 6d., to be felled in Bocholte, 11 trees price 32s. and underwood valued
Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit totum prioratum in manu domini regis et multa bona inde percipit set per quantum tempus illum tenuit nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit archiepiscopatum Cant’ in manu domini regis post mortem Bonefacii archiepiscopi et illum tenuit per ij annos et dimidiam

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit abbatiam Sancti Augustini Cant’ post mortem Rogeri abbatis set per quantum tempus nec quid inde percipit nesciunt.

Hundredum de Bregg’

Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Bregg’ est in manu domini regis et reddunt domino rege per annum xxs et de turno vicecomitis ij marcas. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Leyburn tenet unum feodum de domino rege in capite in Burn.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glover’ appropriavit sibi borgham de Heghardres que est quarta pars hundredi per xx annos elapsos ad dampnum regis et communem per annum de iiijs et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod prior de Mertone clamat habere assisam panis et cervisie et habet in villa de Petrichesburn in hundredo de Bregg’ et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Say habet warrenam per omnia dominica sua et clamat habere et nesciunt quo warento.

Robertus de Hardres clamabat habere warrenam per omnia dominica sua et habuit xv annis elapsis et omnes tenentes sui et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Burn vicecomes attachiavit Andream clericum pro quodam equo et equum retinuit et Andream sine plegium dimisit. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes attachiavit Willelmum de Thaldann injuste et ipsum inprisonavit quosque pacavit ei xxs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Braburn ballivus hundredi de Bregg’ attachiavit Gunnoram de Hardres iniuste et eam inprisonavit quosque pacavit ei ad valenciam xxxs. Item Hamo de la Forstall attachiavit Guidonem de

Hundred of Bridge

The jury say that the hundred of Bridge is in the lord king’s hand and pays a rent of 20s. each year to the lord king and 2 marks for the sheriff’s tourn. Then they say that William de Leyburn holds one fee in [Patrix?]Bourne of the lord king in chief.

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester has 20 years ago appropriated the tithing of High [Upper] Hardres for himself which is a fourth part of the hundred, with loss to the king and commonalty of 4s. each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the prior of Merton claims to have the assize of bread and ale and he has this in the town of Patrixbourne in Bridge hundred and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Say has warren throughout his whole demesne and claims to have this and they do not know by what warrant.

Robert de Hardres claims to have warren throughout his whole demesne and he and all his tenants have had this for 15 years and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Henry de Burn, the sheriff, arrested Andrew, the clerk, for a certain horse and he kept the horse and dismissed Andrew without a pledge. Then they say that Henry Malemains, the sheriff, unjustly arrested William de Thaldann and imprisoned him until he paid him 20s. Then they say that John de Braburn, the bailiff of Bridge hundred unjustly arrested Gunnora de Hardres and imprisoned her until she paid him the sum of 30s. Then Hamo de la Forstall unjustly arrested Guy de Brokkeshol regarding a certain lamb and held
Brokkeshol iniuste pro quodam angno [sic] et ipsum tenuit in priona quousque habuit ab eo xs. Item attachiavit quendam Carolum de Pette inponendo sibi falsa crimini furti et inprisonavit eum quousque habuit ab eo xxs. Item idem attachiavit uxorem Johannis de Bosco inponendo sibi falsa feloniam et ipsam tenuit in priono quousque habuit ab ea 1 vaccam et 1 porcum precii xs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Sutheneye nunc ballivus hundredi de Bregg’ attachiavit Thomam le Brok pro felonia et ipsum sine plegium dimisit pro Xs. Item idem attachiavit Walterum de Marais Jordanum de Rede propter furtum et cepit ab eis dimidam marcam et dimisit ipsos quietos. Item Thomas de Leht’ serviens dicti Thome de Suthen’ attachiavit eodem iterato pro felonia et cepit ab eis vjs et dimisit eos quietos. Item Thomas de Leht’ attachiavit quamdam mulierem in villa de Bregg’ inponendo sibi crimini furti et cepit ab ea xijd et eam dismisit.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Bradeburn ballivus hundredi de Bregg’ cepit 1 marcam pro recognitione removendi de assisis et juratis. Item Willelmus de la Dan’ de Taneto ballivus dicti hundredi pro simili cepit de eodem hundredo dimidiam marcam. Item Philipus de Delham baillivus dicti hundredi cepit de eodem hundredo pro simili 1 marcam. Item Hamo de la Forstall ballivus dicti hundredi cepit pro simili de eodem hundredo xxs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupindon cepit de hundredo de Bregg’ quare fuerunt ad insultum de Tunebrigg’ per preceptum domini regis xLs.

Item dicunt quod Reginaldus de Cobeham tradidit Johanni de Bradeburn’ hundredum de Bregg’ ad firmam capiendo 1 markam plus solito. Item Willelmus de la Dane cepit dictum hundredum ad firmam de domino Johanne de Cobeham eadem firma. Item dominus Henricus de Burn tradidit dictum hundredum Hamoni de la Forstall augmentando firmam de xxs. Item dominus Stephanus de Pencestre tradidit idem hundredum Matheo de Kyngessuod’ de crescendo firmam de dimidia marca. Item dominus Henricus Malemains tradidit dictum hundredum contra adventum justiciarorum Hamoni de la Forstall augmentando firmam de 1 marca. Item Hamo de la Forstall ballivus dicti hundredi per potestatem officii sui extortis de Roberto de la Dane v perticatas terre cum croppo precii iiijs sine judicio. Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores

Then they say that Thomas de Sutheneye now the bailiff of Bridge hundred arrested Thomas le Brok for a felony and released him for 10s. without a pledge. Then the same man arrested Walter de Marais, Jordan de Rede for theft and took half a mark from them and released them as acquitted. Then Thomas de Leht’ the said Thomas de Suthen’s serjeant, arrested the same men again for felony and took 6s. from them and released them as acquitted. Then Thomas de Leht’ arrested a certain woman in Bridge vill accusing her of the crime of theft and he took 12d. from her and released her.

Then they say that John de Bradeburn, bailiff of Bridge hundred, took 1 mark for recognition of removal from assizes and juries. Then William de la Dane of Thanet, bailiff of the said hundred, took half a mark from the same hundred for a similar reason. Then Philip de Delham, bailiff of the said hundred, took 1 mark from the same hundred for a similar reason. Then Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of the said hundred, took 20s. from the same hundred for the same reason. Then they say that William de Stupindon took 40s. from Bridge hundred because the men had been at the assault upon Tonbridge by the lord king’s command.

Then they say that Reginald of Cobham demised Bridge hundred to John de Bradeburn’ at farm by taking 1 mark more than customary. Then William de la Dane took the said hundred at farm from the lord John of Cobham, at the same farm. Then Sir Henry de Burn demised the said hundred to Hamo de la Forstall by increasing the farm by 20s. Then Sir Stephen of Pencestre demised the said hundred to Matthew of Kingswood by increasing the farm by half a mark. Then Sir Henry Malemains demised the said hundred to Hamo de la Forstall against the arrival of the justices, increasing the farm by 1 mark. Then Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of the said hundred, extorted from Robert de la Dane 5 perches of land with crops, price 4s. by the authority of his office without any judgment. Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the
Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall cepit pro summonitione scaccarii ut dixit set falso de Willelmo Aunsel dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes Kancie cepit xx s. de villatis de Bregg’ Blakemannesber’ et Netherhardr’ ut dictas villatas aquietavit de Cs. de summonitione scaccarii et non fecit.

Item Hamo de la Forstall ballivus hundredi de Bregg’ cepit xijd de Roberto de Woltun pro remittendo hundredo de debito domini regis et et Thomas de Leht’ cepit xijd de eodem pro simili et de Roberto Flagellatore pro eodem cepit vijjs.

Item dictus Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Roberto Barry xLd ut acquietet eum de debito regis et non fecit.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus filius Hamonis de Forstall summonuit apud Greenewich Willelmum de White, Johannem Gervais et alios contra formam brevis domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall baillivus hundredi de Bregg’ noluit facere inquisicionem de quodam mortuo murdrato in borgha de Patrichesburn’ in predicto hundredo antequam habuit de borgha Xs. Item idem Hamo attachiavit felonem dicti murdri et noluit tenere hundredum ad deliberandum dictum felonem antequam habuit de borgha de Lungesburn iijs.

### Hundred of Kynghamford

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Middeltun cum hundredum de Merdenn est in manu domini regis et valet per annum CC libras.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Kyngeston tenetur in capite de domino rege et dominus Alexander de Baillol per Isabellam uxorem suam suam illud tenet et valet per annum X libras.

Item manerium de Elham tenetur in capite de domino rege et fuit excaeta Normannorum et dominus Henricus rex dictum manerium dedit domino Edmund filio suo et idem concessit illud domino Rogero de Leiburn et modo illud tenet Willelms de Leiburn filius eius et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod quod arciepiscopus Cant’ habet duas partes hundredi de Kynhamford per libertatem ecclesie assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took half a mark from William Aunsel for summons of the Exchequer, as he said, but falsely.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains, sheriff of Kent, took 20s. from the townships of Bridge, Blackmansbury [Bridge par.] and Nether [Lower] Hardres so that he would acquit the said townships of 100s. for summons of the Exchequer, and he has not done so.

Then Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of Bridge hundred, took 12d. from Robert de Woltun for remitting the hundred of a debt to the lord king and Thomas de Leht’ took 12d. from the same man for a similar purpose and 8s. from Robert Flagellator for the same purpose.

Then the said Hamo de la Forstall took 40d. from Robert Barry that he might acquit him of the king’s debt and he has not done so.

Then they say that William, Hamo de la Forstall’s son summoned William de White, John Gervais and other men at Greenwich, contrary to the form of the lord king’s writ.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of Bridge hundred, was unwilling to hold an inquest upon a certain dead person, murdered in Patrixbourn tithing in the aforesaid hundred before he received 10s. from the tithing. Then the same Hamo arrested a felon for the said murder and was unwilling to compel the hundred to deliver the said felon before he had 3s. from the tithing of Lungesburn.

### Hundred of Kinghamford

The jury say that the manor of Middleton with the hundred of Marden is in the lord king’s hand and it is worth £200 each year.

Then they say that the manor of Kingston is held of the lord king in chief and the lord Alexander de Baillol holds that through his wife Isabel and it is worth £10 each year.

Then the manor of Elham is held of the lord king in chief and it was an escheat of the Normans and the lord king Henry gave the said manor to his son Edmund [Edmund ‘Crouchback’ fourth child of Henry III, born 1245, d. 1296] and the same man granted that to Sir Roger de Leyburn and now his son William de Leiburn holds it and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has two parts of Kinghamford hundred through the liberty
Christi Cant’ et Alexander de Baillol habet terciam partem et valet per annum iiijs et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod idem archiepiscopus habet et habere clamat omnes libertates regias per terras suas, Et dominus de Kyngeston habet assissam panis et cervisie et wreccum maris ab antiquo set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus regis cepit de Roberto de Yling ut amoveretur de assisis et juratis apud Grenewich viijd, de Simone le Mercer pro simili vjd., de Elia Wyberd pro simili vjd.

Item Thomas de Leht’ serviens Thome de Suthen cepit de Willelmo Warderob’ pro simili xvd, de Alano Gile pro simili xijd.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Gregorio filio Thome de Denne dimidiam marcam inponendo sibi falso homicidium et de Ada filio Roberti de Donne pro simili dimidiam marcam, de Roberto de Yling ijs inponendo sibi falso quod fuit socius cuiusdam homicide. Item idem Hamo et dominus Henricus Malemains cepit de Roberto de Stochman pro diffamacione homicidii xxs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit xviijs et vjd pro pondere ultra verum numerum denariorum.

Item dicunt quod Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris et Stephanus de Lymming cepit Xs. et viijd anno regis Lv antequam voluerunt tenere curiam ad judicandum quondam felonem de borgha de Chelwing’ et Birt.’

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford qui cepit seysinam manerii de Bisshopesbur’ cepit de tenentibus eiusdem manerii catallagium xLs et Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus eius pro simili xxiiis et iiiijd. Item idem Hugo cepit de eisdem de summonitione scaccarii ut dixit set falso ut credunt v marcas et dimidiam. Item idem Magister Hugo et Stephanus de Lynming cepit de Johanne de Chelwing ut non esset prepositus xxs., de Eustachio de la Brome pro simili Xs., de Johanne le Mei pro simili dimidiam marcam de Willelmo Cleribaund pro simili iiiis.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor fecit prosternere et vendere in bosco manerii Lj quercus precii Lxvs. et amplius et denarios inde recepit.

of Christchurch Canterbury and Alexander de Baillol has the third part and it is worth 4s. each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop has and claims to have all royal liberties throughout his lands.

And the lord of Kingston has the assize of bread and ale and wreck from ancient times, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the kings’s bailiff, took 8d. from Robert de Yling so that he might be removed from the assizes and juries at Greenwich, 6d. from Simon the mercer for a similar reason, 6d. from Elias Wyberd for a similar reason.

Then Thomas de Leht’ a serjeant of Thomas de Suthen’ took 15d. from William Warderob for a similar reason, 12d. from Alan Gile for a similar reason.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took half a mark from Gregory son of Thomas de Denne, accusing him falsely of homicide and half a mark from Adam son of Robert de Donne for a similar offence, from Robert de Yling 2s. falsely accusing him that he had been an associate of a certain murderer. Then the same Hamo and Henry Malemains took 20s. from Robert de Stochman for an accusation of homicide.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 18s. 6d. by weight more that the assessed amount.

Then they say that Master Hugh de Thornham, the escheator’s clerk, and Stephen of Lyminge took 10s. 8d. in the 55th year of the king’s reign [October 1270-1271] before he was willing to hold a court to judge a certain felon in the tithings of Chelwing and Birt.’

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford who took seisin of the manor of Bishopsbourne took 40s. poll-tax from the tenants of the same manor and Master Hugh de Thornham, his clerk, 24s. 4d. for a similar purpose. Then the same Hugh took 5½ marks from the same tenants for summons of the Exchequer, as he said but falsely as they believe. Then the same Master Hugh and Stephen of Lyninge took 20s. from John de Chelwing that he had not been reeve, 10s. from Eustace de la Brome for a similar reason, half a mark from John le Mei for a similar reason, 4s. from William Cleribaund for a similar reason.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, had 61 oak trees, price 65s. and more cut down and sold in the wood of the manor, and he has received the money for it.
Jurati dicunt quod civitas Cant’ tenetur ad firmam de domino rege per annum pro Lx libris ex dimissione domini regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc, Item dicunt quod habet manerium de Middeltun cum Merdenn et suis pertinenciis. Item habet quoddam castrum cum viij denariis annui redditus et uno parco quod valet per annum iiijd in Cantuar’ que sunt in custodia vicecomitis Kancie.

Item dicunt quod gentes manentes extra Westgate fuerunt tempore domini Johnnis regem patris regis Henrici auxiliantes in omnibus pertinentibus ad dominum regem et communitatem civitatis Cant’ sicut cives civitatis set post tempus domini archiepiscopi Huberti Walteri subtrahuntur unde dominus rex et cives deteriorantur eo quod mercatores se trahunt ibidem sicut tannores et alii mercatores a civitate predicta et per dominum archiepiscopum manutenetur et defunduntur ad gravamen civitatis. Levaverunt eciam pillorium contra libertatem civitatis ubi nullum habuerunt ante Iter H. de Baton’ justicarii. Item dicunt quod abbav Sancti Agustini tenent maneria de Menstre in Taneto Chistelet Sturreia et Langeport quod est in suburbio Cant’ per quem et quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glovern’ subtraxit tenentes suos de Heghardres de secta hundredo de Bregg’ et tenentes de Blen’ de hundredo de Wystapel et tenentes de Natindon et Crundal’ ad visum franciplegii faciendum honori Glovern’ a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod eives Cant’ habent returnum omnium brevium placita namio vetiti furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et dominus archiepiscopus habet hec omnia et wrecicum maris per cartas regum ut intelligent. Item dicunt quod abbav Sancti Augustini Cant’ capit wrecicum maris et facit visum franciplegii infra libertatem Cant’ in suburbio et habet assisam panis et cervisie et facit inde judicium sine warento ut intelligent et prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ levavit furcas in suburbio infra libertatem civitatis Cant’ apud Horsfold tempore domini Henrici regis et

The jury say that the city of Canterbury is held at farm of the lord king for £60 each year by demise of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father. Then they say that he holds the manor of Middleton with Marden and their appurtenances. Then he holds a certain castle with 8d. of annual rent and one park which is worth 4d. each year in Canterbury which are in the custody of the sheriff of Kent.

Then they say that the people dwelling outside the Westgate were, in the time of King John [1199-1216] father of King Henry, subject in all things pertaining to the lord king and the community of the City of Canterbury, just as the citizens of the city, but after Archbishop Hubert Walter’s time [abp. 1189-1205] they are withdrawn, whence the lord king and the citizens suffered loss, because merchants there, such as tanners and other merchants, withdrew themselves from the aforesaid city and they are supported and defended by the lord archbishop causing harm to the city. They have also built a pillory contrary to the liberty of the city where they had none before the eyre of the justice H. de Baton. Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s holds the manors of Minster in Thanet, Chislet, Sturry and Langport, which is in a suburb of Canterbury, through whom and by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester has withdrawn his tenants of High [Upper]Hardres from suit of Bridge hundred and the tenants of Blean from Whitstable hundred and the tenants of Nackington and Crundale to make their view of frankpledge for the honor of Gloucester from the time of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the citizens of Canterbury have the return of all writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and the lord archbishop has all these and wreck, through kings’ charters, as they understand. Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury takes wreck and holds the view of frankpledge within the liberty of Canterbury, in the suburb and he has the assize of bread and ale and he administers justice without warrant, as they understand and the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury erected a gallows in the suburb at...
Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Agustini Cant’ tenet placita de namio vetito et prior Sancte Trinitatis similiter et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dictus abbas apopriavit sibi warennam et chaciam et suburbio Cant’ infra libertatem eiusdem civitatis et prior Sancte Trinitatis in hundredo de Felebergeh’. Item dicunt quod idem abbas levavit quoddam stillicidium in fossato civitatis Cant’ apud Queinegate ubi putredines coquine sue ejiciuntur et nocens est omnibus transeuntibus ibidem. Item dicunt quod includit et appropriat sibi quoddam fossatum quod vocatum Burezdihc et levavit iiij appodiamentua lapidis super terram domini regis, unde duu appodiamenta facta fuerunt tempore domini regis Henrici et alia duo tempore domini regis nunc. Item dicent idem levavit quedam murum super terram domini regis de longitudine trium perticatrum ut credunt iuxta portam Sancti Augustini. Item idem abbas tenet tres insulas in ripa domini regis pertinentes ad civitatem Cant’ que augmentate sunt super aquam ad Froxepol. Item idem in halimoto suo in suburbio Cant’ apud Langport facit tenentes suos liberos homines civitatis et dare boreghesaldrespeni nec permittit eos esse in libero plegii civitatis et facit inquirere de assisa panis et cervisie et capit inde emendas contra libertatem civitatis Cant’ et domini regis. In eodem hundredo facit boregheshaved et recipit presentacionem placitorum corone domini regis contra libertatem domini regis ad dampnum civitatis per annum Xs. a tempore domini Henrici proximi. Item dicunt quod idem abbas cepit in suburbio civitatis Cant’ in hundredis de Borgat’ et Redingat’ homines et feminas et eos inprisonavit et detinuit in halimoto suo ad judicandum extra libertatem domini regis et civitatis Cant’ et ad exheredacionem domini regis unde dominus rex Henricus pater domini regis nunc habuit seysinam. Item idem abbas levavit tam sublime molendinum et stangnum xv annis elapsis quod aque reversion inpedit molendinum domini regis ad dampnum per annum de xLs.

Item dicunt quod prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ tenet curiam suam de la coltona de hominibus suis forinsecis et extraxit liberos homines civitatis Horsfold,¹ within the liberty of Canterbury city during King Henry’s time and without warrant. Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds wrongful pleas of distraint upon goods and similarly the prior of Holy Trinity and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the said abbot has appropriated for himself warren and chace and in the suburb of Canterbury within the liberty of the same city and the prior of Holy Trinity in Felborough hundred. Then they say that the same abbot has made a vent in the ditch of the city of Canterbury where putrid smells emerge from his kitchen and this is offensive to all people passing by. Then they say that he encloses and appropriates for himself a certain ditch called Burez ditch and has made 4 stone buttresses upon the lord king’s land; two of these buttresses were made in the lord King Henry’s time and the other two in the time of the present lord king. Then they say that the same man raised a certain wall upon the lord king’s land next to St Augustine’s gate, three perches long as they believe. Then the same abbot holds three islands in the lord king’s water-front pertaining to Canterbury city, which have been extended above the water at Froxepool. Then the same man makes his tenants free men of Canterbury city in his hall-moot at Langport in a suburb of Canterbury and he does not permit them to give boreghesaldrespen² nor to be in free pledge of the city and he makes enquiries about the assize of bread and ale and takes the fines contrary to the liberty of Canterbury city and of the lord king. He makes boregheshaved³ in the same hundred and receives the presentation of pleas of the lord king’s crown with loss of 10s. each year to the city from the lord King Henry’s time. Then they say that the same abbot took men and women in a suburb of Canterbury city, in the hundreds of Bleangate and Ringslow and imprisoned them and detained them for judgement in his hall-moot, outside the liberty of the lord king and of Canterbury city and to the lord king’s disinheritance, whence the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, held seisin. Then 15 years ago the same abbot raised his mill and pond so high that the back-flow of water obstructs the lord king’s mill with loss of 40s. each year. Then they say that the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury holds his court extra-ordinary for his foreigners and has withdrawn the free men of
Cant’ extra Norhtgat’ et per distrueccionem ipsos facit sequi curiam suam ubi nullam sectam debuerunt. Item dicunt quod idem prior et conventus tenent quoddam pratum quod dominus rex tenet in dominicio et est pertinens ad civitatem et scitum apud Holistun extra muros civitatis Cant’. Dicunt eciam quod idem prior et conventus ineluserunt quamdam viam que solebat extendere de Norhtgate fere usque ad Queinegate et habent inde warentum ut dicunt. Item dicunt quod levaverunt quamdam porchiam in vico de Newingate ad nocumentum regie strate et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod levaverunt quamdam schaloriam apud Horsfold ubi prius nulla fuit.

Item dicunt quod Fratres Predicatorum augmentaverunt quamdam insulam et fecerunt ibi purpresturam in ripa regali ad nocumentum domini regis et impedimentum molendini sui. Item idem Fratres obstruxerunt et mutaverunt quamdam viam communem per quam gentes solebant ire ad aquam. Item ineluserunt quamdam terram super ripa regali que continent in longitudine X perticas et in latitudine fere vj pedes.

Item dicunt quod Fratres Minores fecerunt purpresturam in via regia videlicet longitudine X perchas et latitudine xj pedes per loca diversa ad grave dampnum civitatis et patrie. Item dicunt quod Magister hospitalis pauperum sacerdotum augmentavit quamdam insulam in ripa regia unde cursus aque artatur ad nocumentum molendini domini regis et omnium vicinorum et habet in longitudine 20 perchas et latitudine dimidiam perchas per loca diversa. Item idem edificavit super ripa domini regis et fecit ibidem purpresturam longitudine vj perchas et latitudine v pedum. Item idem construxit quamdam grangiam et fecit purpresturam longitudine vj perchas et latitudine vj pedes. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Hardres nuper defunctus fecit purpresturam super ripa regali longitudine xx perticatas et latitudine l perticam.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancte Radegundis tenet quoddam mansum cum petinenciis in fossato domini regis continens in longitudine xvj perticas et in latitudine Lx pedes. Item idem fecit Canterbury city outside Northgate and by distraint makes them do suit at his court where they owed no suit. Then they say that the same prior and convent hold a certain meadow which the lord king holds in demesne and it is pertaining to the city and situated at Holistun outside the walls of Canterbury city. They say also that the same prior and convent have enclosed a certain way which used to extend from the Northgate almost as far as Queensgate and they have warren there, as they say. Then they say that the same men have built a certain piggery in the lane of Newgate to the detriment of the king’s highway and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that they have put up a certain stile at Horsfold where there there used not to be one.

Then they say that the Dominican Friars have extended a certain island and have made an encroachment there upon the royal water-front to the lord king’s detriment and the obstruction of his mill. Then the same Friars have obstructed and altered a certain way across which people went to the water. Then they have enclosed a certain piece of land upon the royal water-front which is 10 perches in length and almost 6 feet wide.

Then they say that the Franciscan Friars have made an encroachment on the highway 10 perches long and 11 feet wide in diverse places, with severe loss to the city and country.

Then they say that the Master of the hospital for poor priests has extended a certain island on the royal water-front, from which a flow of water issues causing damage to the lord king’s mill and to all the neighbourhood and it is 20 perches long and half a perch wide in divers places. Then the same man has built upon the lord king’s water-front and made an encroachment there 6 perches long and 5 feet wide. Then the same man has built a certain barn and made an encroachment 6 feet long and 6 feet wide. Then they say that Robert de Hardres, lately deceased, made an encroachment 20 perches long and 1 foot wide upon the royal water-front.

Then they say that the abbot of St Radegund’s [Alkham par.] holds a certain measure of land with appurtenances in the lord king’s ditch, containing 16 perches in length and 40 feet in width. Then
Item dicunt quod omnes vicecomites qui fuerunt in Kancia xx annis elapsis tradiderunt ballivis extortativis hundreda et huiusmodi ad firmam et talibus de quibus magis percipere potuerunt, sic Thome ballivo de Eyleford, Johanni le Brode, Osberto de Ledes, Thome Andr’ Philipo de Delham et Iovni de Merden.

Item cum dominus rex qui nunc est teneretur Anselmo le Formgir Cant’ in xxvijis et traditi fuerunt Willelmo de Janua avenator archiepiscopi ut redderet idem Willelmu solvit dicto Anselmo unam summam pisorum, precii Vs. et residuum retinuit. Item idem Willelmu solvit Gudoni Pollard pistori Cant’ unam summam pisorum precii Vs de xjs quod dominus rex eadem debuit quos denarios dictus Willelmu receperat.

Item dicunt quod tempore domini regis Henrici Robertus de Beche et Henricus de Ledes nomine vicecomitis distrinxerunt Thomam de Bremble de Faveresham et alios de villa pro summitione scacarii pro civitate de Faversham et vendiderunt averia sua ad valenciam XX librarum et non aquietaverunt eos ut credunt.

Item tempore domini regis nunc venerunt Willelmu de Hever vicecomes Kancie et ministri sui et distrinxerunt civitatem Cant’ pro vicesima et pro ruta habenda ballivi dederunt sibi xLs et nicholominus retinuit ij equos cuiusdem vidue precii Ls. sic Margarete Thalebot nec equos sibi restituit nec allocaciam sibi fecit neque communitate. Item idem Willelmu et Henricus de Ledes venerunt ad domum Laurencii de Fonte in suburbio Cant’ distringens eum pro X marcis de amerciamentis Magistri Rogeri de Seton et ceperunt 1 equum precii viij marcas et dimidiam et duas summas frumenti precii xijx et 1 caretam ferro ligatam precii Xs. et iij saccos precii xijd et unum avelacium de ebore precii iijs et omnia ista retinent et nichil eadem Laurencio allocatur.

Item Willelmu de Evere et Thomas de Sutheneye they say the same man has made an encroachment upon the royal water-front 10 perches long and four feet wide.

Then since the present king [Edward I 1272-1307] is indebted to Anselm le Formgir’ of Canterbury for 28s. and this money was delivered to William de Janua, the archbishop’s avener so that he might refund it; the same William paid one load of peas, price 5s. to the said Anselm and he kept the remainder. Then the same William paid Guy Pollard, a baker of Canterbury one load of peas, price 5s. of the 11s. which the lord king owed him, which money the said William had received.

Then they say that during the lord King Henry’s time Robert de Beche and Henry of Leeds in the sheriff’s name made distraint upon Thomas de Bremble of Faversham and other men for a summons of the Exchequer for the city of Faversham and they sold their draught animals valued at £20 and have not acquitted them, as they believe.

Then in the present king’s time William of Hever, the sheriff of Kent, and his ministers came and made distraint upon Canterbury city for the tax of one-twentieth and the bailiffs gave him 40s. for holding a legal enquiry and nevertheless he kept 2 horses, price 50s. belonging to a certain widow, Margaret Thalebot, and he has neither restored the horses to her nor paid any compensation neither to her nor to the community. Then they say that the same William and Henry of Leeds came to the house of Lawrence de Fonte in the suburb of Canterbury, distraining him for 10 marks of amercements for Master Roger de Seton and they took 1 horse, price 8½ marks and two loads of wheat, price 12s. and 1 cart bound with iron, price 10s. and 3 sacks, price 12d. and one avelacium de ebore harness of tawed leather, price 3s. and they keep all these things and nothing is allowed to the same Lawrence.

Then William of Hever and Thomas de Sutheneye,
Willelmus Peverel Jacobus de Dene Radulfo de Paris Walterus de Hudon Emericus de Sancto Leodogar’ et Nicholas le Porter die Veneris ante festum apostolorum Petri et Pauli anno regni regis Edwardi secundo venerunt ad domum Ricardi de Shamelefford in Cant’ et distrixerunt dictum Ricardum et fregerunt hostium camere sue et ceperunt ibidem unam culcitram precii vj marcas xij mappas precii xLs unam penulam de minuto veram precii xLs viij mantergia precii viij unum cyphum argenti precii xviijs et xj cochlearia argenti precii xjs pro vicesima quam civitas Cant’ prius solverat ad scaccarium domini regis et hec omnia penes se retinent sine aliqua restitucione facta dicto Ricardo.

Item dicunt quod Arnoldus de Esling quondam ballivus et custos castri Cant’ et Radulflus de Esling tum marescallus comitatus fecerunt quemdam probatorem appellare Johnnem Dodeker et Willelmum Smelt de Cant’ homines fideles causa lucri.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus Spicer nuper defunctus erat ballivus Cant’ et cepit xxs de Nicholao Pokel et Godelena de Schalaria pro eisdem dimittendis de prisona qui boni et fideles fuerunt.

Item dicunt quod coronatores et eorum clerici noluerunt exsequi nec facere officia sua sine mangnis [sic] munere neque ballivi viceomitum unde populus multum gravatur.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor et sui ballivi tempore quo fuit custos archiepiscopatus Cant’ maximam et innumerum fecit distractionem in boscis parcis vivarisis warennis homagii et in edificiis eodem modo fecit de abbatia Sancti Augustini Cant’ tempore vacacionis.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Vaus fecit ducere ad portum de Sandwico xLj saccos et ibidem transvit Willelmus de Lumbre per eundem portum X saccos, Jacobus Holte xx saccos per eundem portum. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochull, Johannes de Sarcino, Robertus frater eius Dover’ Thomas de Basing de eadem, Alexander de Crawthorn, Robertus Peni, Johannes Peni, Thomas Peni, Batin Hautun, Robertus le Ferun, Adam Wyberd, Robertus de Stapel, Robertus Vincent, Henricus Weres, Bateman Terye, William Peverel, James de la Dene, Ralph de Paris, Walter de Hudon, Emeric of St Leger and Nicholas the porter came to Richard de Shamleford’s house in Canterbury on the Friday before the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul in the second year of king Edward’s reign [22nd June 1274] and made distraint upon the said Richard and they broke his chamber door and took there one knife price 6 marks, 12 table cloths price 40s., one small fur hood price 40s., 8 towels price 8s., one silver cup price 18s. and 11 silver spoons price 11s., for the tax of one-twentieth which the city of Canterbury had first paid to the lord king’s Exchequer and they kept all these things themselves without making any restitution to the said Richard.

Then they say that Arnold de Esling, formerly the bailiff and custodian of Canterbury castle and Ralph de Esling, then the marshall of the county appointed a certain approver to accuse John Dodeker and William Smelt of Canterbury, both law abiding men, for a reward.

Then they say that Richard Spicer, lately deceased, had been bailiff of Canterbury and he took 20s. from Nicholas Pokel and Godelena de Schalaria for releasing them from prison and they were worthy and law-abiding people.

Then they say that the coroners and their clerks have been unwilling to do or perform the duties of their office without great gifts [bribes], likewise the bailiffs of the sheriffs, whence the people are much burdened.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and his clerks while he was the custodian of the archbishopric of Canterbury caused the greatest and immeasurable destruction in the woods, parks, fish-ponds, warrens, homages [?] and he acted in the same way in the buildings of St Augustine’s abbey while it was vacant.

Then they say that William de Vaus had conveyed 41 sacks [? of wool] to the port of Sandwich and there exported them., William de Lumbre 10 sacks from the same port, James Holte 20 sacks from the same port. Then they say that William de Brochull, John de Sarcino, Robert his brother of Dover, Thomas de Basing of the same town, Alexander of Crawthorn, Robert Peni, John Peni, Thomas Peni, Batin Hautun, Robert le Ferun, Adam Wyberd, Robert de Stapel, Robert Vincent, Henry Weres, Bateman Terye, Hertin Peni, John Peni junior of
Hertinus Peni, Johannes Peni junior de Sandwico omnes ille transfretaverunt lanas per plures particulias set numerum nec quo warento fecerunt nesciunt.

**Hundredum de Ringeslo**

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus rex pater regis nunc tenet in dominico manerium de Ofspring et modo illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod ballivus domini regis qui pro tempore fuerit tenet lastum Sancti Augustini et lastum de Edeling et hundredum de Ringeslo pro xxiiij libris per annum et sunt ibidem iij marcas de turno vicecomitis quas Johannes de Watton vicecomes tempore suo primo levare fecit. Item dicunt quod villati de Munkeneton et Westhalimot solemant sequi ad turnum vicecomitis bis per annum per X homines et subtracti sunt per xx annos et amplius tempore Bonefacii archiepiscopi et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum brevium placita namio vetiti wreccum maris assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warento. Item abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ clamat habere eadem quo warento nesciunt. Item prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ habet ab archiepiscopo returnum brevium et habet placita namio vetiti wreccum maris et assisam panis et cervisie et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod ballivi domini regis solembar tenere hundredum de Ringeslo et ballivi abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant’ non permittebant eos facere officium suum X annis elapsis ad dampnum domini regis set nesciunt de quanto.

Item dicunt quod Cristina de Remmesgate et Johannes filius Martini et fratres eius de eadem opturant et inpediunt quamdam viam comunem apud Remisgat’ ad dampnum patrie per annum de ijs.

**Sandwich, have all exported wool in many parcels but they do not know what number nor by what warrant.**

**Hundred of Ringslow**

Then they say that the Lord Henry, the present king’s father, holds the manor of Ospringe in demesne and now the lady queen, the present king’s mother holds that but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say the lord king’s then bailiff holds the lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling and Ringslow hundred for £24 each year and there are 4 marks each year from the sheriff’s tourn there, which John de Watton first had levied at the time he was sheriff.

Then they say that the townships of Monkton and Westhalimot used to do suit at the sheriff’s tourn by 10 men twice a year and they have been withdrawn for 20 years and more since archbishop Boniface’s time and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the assize of bread and ale and they do not know by what warrant.

Then the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury claims to have the same things, by what warrant they do not know. Then the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury has the return of writs from the archbishop and he has pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck and the assize of bread and ale and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord king’s bailiffs used to hold Ringslow hundred and the bailiffs of the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury have not allowed them to perform the duties of their office for 10 years, with loss to the king, but they do not know how much.

Then they say that Christine of Ramsgate and John son of Martin and his brothers of the same place, obstruct and block a certain common way at Ramsgate with loss of 2s. each year to the country.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains the sheriff, demised the lathe of St Augustine Canterbury and the lathe of Hedeling for £32 to the bailiff Hamo de la Forstall an extortionist causing...
gravamen patrie que ante solebant tradi pro xvij libris. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulo Poyferer collectores vicesime cepit de villatis de Menstre Moneketon et Westhalimot ultra certum numerum vicesime vij libras et iiij.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ et prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ per potestatem suam vendunt wardas de gavelikund contra consuetudinem regni et nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit de Elia le Prude et sociis suis de summonitione scaccarii X marcas per manus Hugonis de Thornham promittens quod ad scaccarium eos aquietavit et non fecit nec unquam inde habuerunt allocanciam ad grave dampnum eorum.

Item dominus Willelmus de Criel coronator cepit pro ij vices per manus Stephani clerici sui pro inquisicione facta de borgha de Bircheton vjs et de Northburna Sancti Petri pro simili cepit iiij et de borgha de Wod’ pro simili iiij.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hever vicecomes cepit de Northburna Sancti Petri 1 marcam ut non occasionaretur de placitis corone et Henricus de Ledes ballivus cepit de eadem pro simili dimidiam mracam.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excitaor tempore vacacionis archiepiscopatus Cant’ cepit de villatis de Reculre et Westhalimot de recognicione ad opus domini regis X libras. Item Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus eius cepit de eiusdem pro gratia habenda 1 marcam. Item idem Magister Ricardus cepit de villata de Menstre ad opus domini regis post obitum Rogeri abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant’ de recognicione xvij libras. Item Johannes Baudefer ballivus dicti excaitoris cepit de Daniele mercatore ut ipsum non inprisonaret xLs. Item de Gervasio le Taillur pro severe hardship to the country whereas before these lathes used to be demised for £18. Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyferer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took £7 4s. more than the assessed amount from the townships of Monkton and Westhalimot.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury by their authority sell wardships of gavelkind contrary to the custom of the realm and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford the escheator took 10 marks from Elias le Prude and his associates for a summons of the Exchequer by the hand of Hugh de Thornham, claiming that he had exonerated them at the Exchequer and he had not done so and they never received any allowance for this, causing them a severe loss.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, bailiff of the lathe of St Augustine Canterbury, took half a mark from the tithing of Minster for holding a hundred court, 9s. from Henry the beadle for a similar reason. Hamo de la Forstall, the king’s bailiff took 4s. from the same tithing for a summons made before the coroner. Thomas de Sutheneie the bailiff took half a mark from Northbourne for a similar reason.

Then Sir William de Criel the coroner on 2 occasions took 6s. through Stephen his clerk from the tithing of Birchington for making an inquest and he took 4s. from Northbourne St Peter for a similar reason and 4s. from the tithing of Wood for a similar reason.

Then they say that William of Hever, the sheriff, took 1 mark from Northbourne St Peter that it should not be harassed for pleas of the crown and Henry of Leeds took half a mark from the same tithing for a similar reason.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £10 from the townships of Reculver and Westhalimot as a recognizance for the lord king at the time of the vacancy of the archbishop of Canterbury. Then Master Hugh de Thornham his clerk took 1 mark from the same places for having his goodwill. Then the same Master Richard took £18 from the township of Minster as a recognizance for the lord king after the death of Roger the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury. Then John Baudefer, the said escheator’s bailiff, took 40s. from Daniel the
Item dicunt quod dominus Magister Ricardus exciator tenuit archiepiscopatum in manu domini regis una cum manerium de Westhalimot pertinente ad hoc per duos annos et dimidiam. Item idem tenuit manerium de Menstre post obitum Rogeri abbatis Sancti Augustini in manus domini regis per iij septimannas.

m 2 dorso Hundredum de Dunhamford

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Elham solebat esse in manu domini regis et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn illud modo tenet et esciunt quo warento et valet per annum LX libras. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Say et canonici de Bello Loco tenent de domini rege in capite feodium 1 militis apud Patrichesburn et valet per annum XL libras. Item dicunt quod prior Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ vendunt wardas sokemannorum heredis Johannis de la Berton pro XLs. et heredum Hugonis Attewud pro iijjs. dum fuit plene etatis contra legem patrie.

Item dicunt quod lests Sancti Augustini Cant’ in quo est hundredum de Dunhamford pertinet ad dominum regem set quod valet hundredum per annum nesciunt et dicunt quod lesta valet per annum xxvj marcas.

Item dicunt quod medicatas hundredi de Dunhamford est de libertate ecclesie Christi Cant’ et altera medicatas de baronia et solebat totum teneri per ballivos domini regis unde abbas Sabcti Augustini Cant’ clamat tenere per senescallos suos dictum hudredum simul cum ballivo domino regis pervj annos elapsos ad damnum regis per annum ijs et amplius et habet in illo hundredo assisas panis et cervisie et alia regalia et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod villa de Litleburn debet sectam ad comitatum per iij homines de quibus 1 de tenemento de Lukedale tempore Reginaldi de Cornhill xx annis elapsis subtrahitur ad damnum regis per annum dimidiam marcam et illud tenementum modo tenet Willelmus de Brewuse et sectam illam subtrahitur.
Item dicunt quod ecclesia Christi Cant’ habet returnum brevium wrecceum maris placita namio vetito assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regias.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Brewouse opturat quamdam viam regiam per medium parcum suum de Trindle per V annos elapos. Item dicunt quod Johannes Sperewe ballivus libertatis ecclesie Christi Cant’ cepit de Guidone de la More iijd ut removeret eum de assis et juratis, de Walter de Cherefeld cepit pro simili vjd, de Nicholaio de Boerland pro simili xijd., de Thoma le Creat pro simili iijd., de Johanne Bledding vjd. Item Thomas le Leht’ serviens eiusdem hundredi cepit de Thoma le Tannur pro simili iijd., de Willelmo Mercatore viijd., de Johanne de Berne pro simili vjd., de Radulfo de Froginhal vjd., de Walter de Suhtburton vjd., de Stephano Attehale Vd., de Roger le Blake iiijd., de Willelmo Asketin vjd., de Henrico Attebrigg’ xijd., de Thoma le Prude vjd., de Waltero Koc vjd., de Thoma Cissor iiijd., de Ricardo de la Dune iijd., de Elia de Brevesham vjd. Item Willelms de Hardres ballivus eiusdem hundredi cepit de Thoma le Tannur pro simili iijd., de Willelmo Mercatore iijd., de Willelmo de Wycham pro amerciamento iijjs cepit ij equos precii xiiijs et numquam eos sibi restituit.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Haute clericus domini Willelms de Brewos amisit xiiijs quos Robertus de Mershward invenit et occasionavit eum super hoc et cepit ab eo 1 acram terre idem ballivus et dominus Willelms de Brewus illam tenent et valet xLs

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemans et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt in hoc hundredo ultra certam vicesimam xLs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemans et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt in hoc hundredo ultra certam vicesimam xLs.

Item dicunt quod quidam Stephanus de Ecclesia inprisonatus fuit in prisona ecclesie Christi Cant’ set qualiter deliberatus fuit nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod quidam Johannes filius Ivonis de Moningham fuit inprisonatus pro burgaria per unum mensem et non potuit deliberi antequam

Then they say that Christchurch Canterbury has the return of writs, wreck, pleas of withername, the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties. Then they say that for 5 years the lord William de Braose obstructs a certain royal way through the middle of his park of Trenley. Then they say that John Sparrow, bailiff of the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury, took 4d. from Guy de la More to remove him from the assizes and the juries, he took 6d. from Walter de Cherefield for a similar reason, 12d. from Nicholas of Buckland for a similar reason, 4d. from Thomas le Creat for a similar reason, 6d. from John Bledding. Then Thomas le Leht’, a serjeant of the same hundred took 4d. from Thomas the tanner for a similar reason, 8d. from William the merchant, 10d. from John de Breveshamme for a similar reason and 1 bushel of oats, 7d. from Nicholas de Swanton for a similar reason, 6d. from William Hartin for a similar reason, 6d. from John de Berne for a similar reason, 6d. from Ralph de Froginahl, 6d. from Walter of Southburton, 5d. from Stephen Attehall, 4d. from Roger le Blake, 6d. from William Asketin, 12d. from Henry Attebridge, 6d. from Thomas le Prude, 6d. from Walter Cook, 4d. from Thomas Cissor, 4d. from Richard de la Dune, 6d. from Elia de Brevesham. Then William de Hardres, bailiff of the same hundred, took 4d. from Thomas the tanner for a similar reason, 3d. from William the merchant, from William de Wycham for an amercement of 4s. he took 2 horses price 14s and he has never given them back to him.

Then they say that William de Haute, a clerk of Sir William de Braose, lost 14s. which Robert de Marshward found and he arrested him for this and took 1 acre of land from him and the same bailiff and the lord William de Braose hold that land and it is worth 40s.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, have taken 40s more than the assessed amount in this hundred.

Then they say that a certain Stephen de Ecclesia was imprisoned in the prison of Christchurch Canterbury but they do not know how he was released.

Then they say that a certain John son of Ivo de Moningham was imprisoned for one month for burglary and he could not be released until John de
Johannes de Haliburegh’ habuit de borgha de Stapel dimidam marcam. Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ cepit de borgha de Aldesham pro evasione cuiusdam latronis iiij libras et nicholominus amerciata fuit coram justicariis in Cs. Item dicunt quod Matheus de Kyngeslond ballivus regis noluit tenere hundredum ad deliberandum quemdam prisonem nisi haberet dimidiam marcam et sic evasit a prisia per quem evasionem prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ cepit de borgha de La Leye Cs. et pertinet huiusmodi ad dominum regem. Item Robertus de Sarsted ballivus eiusdem borghie cepit pro eodem ijs. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus hundredi antequam voluit tenere ad deliberandum Henricum Wyrun inprisonatum pro latrocinio cepit de hundredo dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupesdun et Willelmus de la Gerston ballivi Comitis Glovernie ceperunt de eodem hundredo Cs. quod fuerunt in guerra ad Tunebrigg’ per preceptum domini regis. 

Hundredum de Westgate

Jurati dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent et hundredum de Westgate est in manu sua et valet per annum Lxs. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excactor sede Cant’ vacante cepit de hundredo de Westgate xLs ita quod eos sustinerner eo modo quo ballivi eos tuererunt et occasione illius finis fecit injuste levare de eodem hundredo iiij marcas. Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus et ballivi sui vendiderunt boscum archiepiscopi ad estimacionem xxxijs. et postmodum xxs. Item quidam Robertus ballivus excactoris dictus forestarius vendidit boscum dicti archiepiscopi ad valenciam xxs, set contra voluntatem excactoris. Item idem excactor amerciavit priorem Sancti Gregorii ad iiij marcas quare emit boscum de dicto Roberto et Philippum de Westgate ad xLs. pro huiusmodi emptione et Simonem le Wehtaker pro similis ad iiij. et Robertum de Campo pro similis ad Vs. et Johannem Bercar’ pro similis ad Vs. et

Haliburegh received half a mark from Stapel [Staple Farm] tithing. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury took £4 from Aldesham tithing because a certain robber had escaped and nevertheless the tithing was amerced 100s. before the justices. Then they say that Matthew of Kingsland, the king’s bailiff was unwilling to compel the hundred to deliver a certain prisoner unless he received half a mark and thus the prisoner escaped and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury took 100s. from the tithing de la Ley because of this escape and cases of this nature pertain to the lord king. Then Robert de Sarsted, the bailiff of the same tithing took 2s. for the same. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the bailiff of the hundred took half a mark from the hundred before he was willing to compel it to deliver Henry Wyrun, imprisoned for larceny. Then they say that William de Stupesdun and William de la Gerston, the earl of Gloucester’s bailiffs, took 100s. from the same hundred because the men had been at the siege of Tonbridge as the lord king’s command.

Hundred of Westgate

The jury says that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs and other liberties which pertain to the crown and the hundred of Westgate is in his hand and it is worth 60s. each year. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 40s. from Westgate hundred while the see of Canterbury was vacant so that he might sustain them in that manner which the bailiffs held them and by the reason of that fine he levied unjustly he took 4 marks from that hundred. Then they say that the same Master Richard and his bailiffs have sold the archbishop’s wood estimated at 32s. and afterwards at 20s. Then a certain Robert, the escheator’s bailiff, the said forester sold the said archbishop’s wood valued at 20s. but against the escheator’s will. Then the same escheator amerced the prior of St Gregory’s 4 marks because he bought wood from the said Robert and amerced Philip of Westgate at 40s. for the same purchase and Simon the whitesmith 4s. for a similar reason and Robert de Campo 5s. for a similar reason and John the shepherd 5s. for a
Galfridum Atteweilece pro similii ad Vs. et Petrum de eodem et Robertum Langewelbe pro similii ad Vs. Item dicunt quod dictus Magister Ricardus per potestatem officii sui occasionavit quendam Willelmum filium Johannis de Wenchep ut faceret eum prepositus de bethona de Westgate et quod non esset dedit ei xijs., item de Roberto de Dustinton cepit pro similii iiijs., item de Johanne Balfir’ pro similii Xs.

Item dicunt quod idem cepit injuste de Isaac de Disburn occasionando eum de blado non bene sarclato ut dixit xLs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hundredo de Westgate ultra rectam vicesimam xxjs et Vd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Criel coronator cepit per manus clerici sui de borgha’ de Westgate dimidiam marcam antequam voluit videre quemdam mortuum anno regis Edwardi secundo.

Hundredum de Littlefeld

Hundred of Littlefield

The jury say that the manor of West Peckham from ancient times used to be in the hands of kings, the predecessors of the king and it was first given after the Conquest to Alvered de Bendevill by serjeanty service of keeping one hawk for the lord king and Sir John of Petham now holds part of that manor and the earl of Gloucester holds part because of a debt to the Jews and he has held it for 3½ years and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the whole hundred of Littlefield used to be in ancient times in the hands of kings and now the earl of Gloucester holds that at farm of the lord king for 20s. to be paid annually and thus he has held that from King John’s time, who demised that to the Earl Richard, grandfather of Gilbert the present Earl through William Smalwriter then the lord king’s bailiff and in the same way Gilbert the present Earl holds the Wachlingstone hundred and from the same time, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has return from the archbishop and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint
panis et cervisie et Comes Glovernie similiter habet hec omnia et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod John Sperewe ballivus ecclesie Christi Cant’ cepit de Henrico de Strethend quod non venit ad quemdam assimis ubi non fuit summonitus dimidiam marcam. Dicunt eciam quod Elias le Paumer distinscit villatam de Westpecham exigiendo debito domini regis ubi in nullo tenebatur et extorsit hac de causa eadem villata xLs. Item dicunt quod Nigellus de Pecham cepit iniuste Rogero de Quercu viis et iiijd et de Willelmo Fromund xvs pro debito Walteri Martel et de Gabrielo Attelond cepit 1 bovem et 1 vaccam pro eodem iniuste preci xxixs et de Rogero le Taillur iniuste iijs vjd.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Halburegh senescallus ecclesie Christi Cant’ falso inposuit Nicholao Duraunt felonie et pro eo cepit iijs. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyferrer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo ultra certum vicesimam iijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Merley coronator cepit dimidiam marcam de borgha de Uppepecham pro inquisitione certis de Johanne Turk qui fugit ad execeptionem pro felonie. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor post electionem Ade prioris ecclesie Christ Cant’ ad archiepiscopatum seysit hundredum de Uppecham in manu domini regis et cepit ab eodem de tallagio 1 marcam.

Hundredum de Bernefeld

Jurati dicunt quod Willelmus de Kassingeham tenet vij hundreda de Waldis reddendo ad comitatum per annum Cs. et postmodum dominus Reginaldus de Cobeham vicecomes tradidit ead ad firmam per annum pro X libris. et postmodum dominus Henricus rex pater domini regis nunc concessit eadem hundreda domino Rogero de Leyburn pro Cs per annum reddendis ad scaccarium per manum vicecomitis et post mortem domini regis tenet ea dominus Stephanus de Penecestr’ ad warmesturam castri Dover’ set quid inde reddendo per annum aut quo warento ea tenuit

upon goods and they have a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and the earl of Gloucester has similarly all these things and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John Sparrow, the bailiff of Christchurch Canterbury, took half a mark from Henry de Strethend because he did not come to a certain assize where he had not been summoned. They say also that Elias le Paumer made distraint upon West Peckham township demanding a due for the lord king where they have no responsibility and for this reason he extorted 40s from the same township. Then they say that Nigel de Pecham took 8s. 4d. unjustly from Roger de Quercu and 15s. from William Fromund for Walter Martel’s debt and from Gabriel Attelond he unjustly took 1 ox and 1 cow, price 22s. for the same and 3s. 6d. unjustly from Roger the tailor.

Then they say that John de Halburegh, a steward of Christchurch Canterbury falsely accused Nicholas Duraunt of felony and for this he took 4s. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 4s. more that the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that John de Merley the coroner took half a mark from the tithing of Up (East) Peckham for holding an inquest on John Turk who took flight at blinding? for felony. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator after the election of Adam the prior of Christchurch Canterbury to the archbishopric [Adam de Chillenden, prior 1264-1274] seized Petham hundred into the king’s hand and took 1 mark from the same as tallage.

Hundred of Barnfield

The jury say that William de Kassingeham holds the 7 hundreds of the Weald paying rent of 100s. each year to the county and afterwards the lord Reginald of Cobham the sheriff demised them at farm for £10 and afterwards the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, granted the same hundreds to the lord Roger de Leyburn for 100s. each year, to be paid to his Exchequer by the sheriff’s hand and after the lord king’s death the Sir Stephen of Penecestr’ holds these by garrison service at Dover castle but what he renders for this each year or by what warrant he holds those they
nesciunt.
Item dicunt quod abbas de Bello subtraxit omnes tenentes suos de viij hundredis de sectis hundredi ad laghed’ et de secta leita et hundredi et comitatuum et de turno vicecomitis pro xvj annos elapsos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd et nesciunt quo wareto.
Item dicunt quod abbas de Bello clamat habere returnum et extractum brevium et omnes alias libertates regias per dominum Henricum regem et nesciunt quo wareto.
Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hac dimidia hundredo ultra certam vicesimam ijs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor multa mala fecit in archiepiscopatu Cant’ dum habuit custodiam per dominum regem. in dorso: Lasti Sancti Agusutini de comitatu Kancie pro rege.

do not know.
Then they say that for 16 years the abbot of Battle has withdrawn all his tenants from suits to the hundred at lawdays and from leet suit and suit of the hundred and counties and from the sheriff’s tourn, with loss to the king of 6d. each year and they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that abbot of Battle claims to have return and extract of writs and all other royal liberties from the lord King Henry and they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 2s. more than the assessed amount from this half hundred.
Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, did many outrageous things in the archbishopric of Canterbury while he had custody of it through the lord king.
[on dorso: The lathe of St Augustine in the county of Kent on the king’s behalf.]
| m. 3 Lastus de Hedelinge ashue de comitatu | The lathe of Hedeling still of the county of Kent: 
Kancie: Hundredum de Quernulo. | Hundred of Cornilo |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Quernulo est abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant’ exceptis duabus borghis videlicet Moningham et Dale que sunt prioris Christ Cant’ et prioris Doverie, ita quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ percipit emendum panis et servisie de borgha de Moningham et prior de Doverie de borgha de Dale et est pertinens manerium de Norburne quod est eiusdem abbatis a quo tempore ignorant.</td>
<td>The jury say that the hundred of Cornilo is of the abbey of St Augustine’s Canterbury, except for two tithings, that is of Great Mongeham and Deal which are of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and of the prior of Dover; in addition the prior of Christchurch Canterbury takes fines for the assize of bread and ale of the tithing of Great Mongeham and the prior of Dover that of the tithing of Deal and it is pertaining to Northbourne manor which the same abbots holds, from what time they are ignorant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicunt eciam quod Alexander de Balliolo miles tenet unam borgham videlicet Ridlingwalde et Gregorius de Rokeste borgham de Walemere et inde percipiunt emendas panis et servisie sed nesciunt quo warento et eas eo modo tenuerunt et fructus inde perceperunt iam quinque annis elapsis et amplius et sunt [sic] dicte borghe pertinentes ad eundem hundredum.</td>
<td>They say also that Sir Alexander de Balliol, knight, holds one tithing that is Ringwould and Gregory de Rokeste the tithing of Walmer and there they take the fines for the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant and they have held these in this way and have taken the fines for five years and more and the said tithings belong to the same hundred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicunt eciam quod manerium de Middelton tenetur de rege in capite et Johannes de Burg’ illud tenet per concessionem domini regis qui nunc est. Dicunt eciam quod hundredum de Quernul valet ad opus dicti abbatis per annum xxs. Dicunt quod Gregorius de Rokest’ tenet unum feodum militis in Walemere de rege in capite et hoc tribus annis elapsis rescitur quo warento. Dicunt quod lastum Sancti Augustini traditur ad firmam pro X libris excepto turnum vicecomitis. Dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium et tenet placita namio vetiti et habet wrecustum maris et capiti emendas panis et servisie et habet furcas et simili modo prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ et habent alias libertates regias ut supradictum est et habuerunt longo tempore sed nesciunt quo warento.</td>
<td>They say also that the manor of Middleton is held of the king in chief and John de Burg now holds it by grant of the present lord king. They say also that the hundred of Cornilo is worth 20s. a year for the said abbots’s use. They say that Gregory de Rokest’ holds one knight’s fee in Walmer of the king in chief and has held this for three years; it is not known by what warrant. They say that the lathe of St Augustine’s is demised at farm for £10 except the sheriff’s tourn. They say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has wreck and he takes the fines for the assize of bread and ale and he holds the gallows and in a similar way the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury and they have other royal liberties as is above said and have held these for a long time, but they do not know by what warrant. They say that Henry Malemains, formerly the sheriff, unjustly imprisoned a certain Robert de Napesherst et Radulfum Ruben quousque finem fecerunt de vj marcis et quod idem Henricus cepit injuste de hundredo de Quernulo iiij marcas qui ante solute fuerunt eidem pro americiamento eiusdem hundred injusto. Dicunt eciam quod Hamo de la Forstall tunc serviens domini regis maliciose incomputavit Reginaldo filio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jordani latrocinium quousque redimeretur de vjs. Item idem Hamo cepit injuste de Willelmo Welwat eadem occasione Vs. Item idem Hamo inposuit iniuste Thoma de Northbourne et Roberto filio suo homicideum et cepit ab eisdem iij markas.

Dicunt eciam quod Thomas de Sutheney iniuste cepit Walterum Jopedale et ipsum duxit ad curiam Willelmi de Kyriol et ibidem ipsum inprisonavit donec finem fecit per dimidiam marcam et quod idem Thomas injuste cepit Thomam Ive et minabatur eum de concelemento latrocinii donec finem fecit per Xs. et tunc finet garcione suo iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstalle cepit equos Willemi Mareschall de Monigham iniuste et illas detinuit contra vadum et plegium donec dedit eum ijs.

Dicunt eciam quod Robertus de Becche quondam clericus viceomitis maliciose occasionavit Thomam filium Edmundi de Dale et abstulit ei unam acram terre injuste. Item idem Robertus nomine summonitionis scaccarii cepit injuste de Roberto Havebrond dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstalle cepit de Henrico Porterere dimidiam marcam de summonitione scaccarii et ipsum non aquietavit quare eandem dimidiam marcam iterum solvit Roberto de Beche. Dicunt eciam quod borgha de Ripple solvit dimidiam marcam de summonitione scaccarii Henrico de Borne quondam viceomiti et ipsos non aquietavit quare iterum soluerunt Henrico Malemins viceomiti sequenti. Dicunt eciam quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemins collectores vicesime ceperunt [sic] de hundredo de Quaruni xLs pro pondere ultra numerum denarium. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Sutheney cepit de Willelmo Clis pro respectu habendo respectu de dimidia marca que venit in summonitione scaccarii iij. Item dicunt quod cum totum hundredum summonitum esset ad mandatum egis apud Tonebreg’ ad castrum obsidendum venit Willelmus de Stoppisdon serviens Comitis Giovernie et minabtur hominibus dicti hundredi ita quod per timorem dederunt ei ad opus Comitis x marcas.

Dicunt eciam Magister Ricardus de Clifford eschetor seysivist abbatthian Sancti Augustini Cant’ post mortem abbatis Rogeri et tenuit in manu regis per quod tempus nesciunt et cepit de tallagio de manerio de Northburn X libras.

Jordan of robbery until he was released for 6s. Then the same Hamo unjustly took 5s. from William Welwat making the same accusation. Then the same Hamo unjustly accused Thomas of Northbourne and his son Robert of homicide and took 2 marks from them. They also say that Thomas de Sutheneye unjustly seized Walter Jopedale and brought him to the court of William de Kyriol and there imprisoned him until he made a fine of half a mark and that the same Thomas unjustly seized Thomas Ive and threatened him of hiding a thief, until he paid a fine of 10s. and then he fined his boy 4s.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall unjustly took the horses of William Marshal of Great Mongeham and kept them until he gave him 2s. contrary to surety and pledge. They say also that Robert de Becche, formerly the sheriff’s clerk, maliciously arrested Thomas son of Edmund de Dale and unjustly took one acre of land from him. Then the same Robert unjustly took half a mark from Robert Havebrond for summons of the Exchequer. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall took half a mark from Henry Porterere for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted him since he paid the same half mark again to Robert de Becche. They say also that the tithing of Ripple paid half a mark for summons of the Exchequer to Henry of Bourne, formerly the sheriff and he has not acquitted them since they paid it again to Henry Malemins, the next sheriff.

They say also that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 40s. by weight more than the assessed number of pence from Cornilo hundred. Then they say that Thomas de Sutheney took 3s. from William Clis for having postponement for half a mark which came from a summons of the Exchequer. Then they say that when the whole hundred had been summoned by the king’s command to the siege of Tonbridge castle, William de Stoppisdon, a serjeant of the earl of Gloucester came and threatened the men of the said hundred so that because of this intimidation they gave him 10 marks for the earl’s use.

They say also that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took possession of the abbey of St Augustine’s Canterbury after abbot Roger’s death and held it in the king’s hand, from what time they not know and he took £10 from Northbourne manor as tallage.
Hundredum de Bewesberwe, in eodem lasto

Dicunt quod manerium de Westclive tenetur de rege in capite et modo illud tenet Gilbertus pro uno feodo militis sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Johannes rex dedit abbatis et conventui Sancte Radegundis centum acras de Riparia cum adovvsonis ecclesie eiusdem et unum molendinum et dictus abbas modo tenet sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dictus Johannes rex dedit Salamoni quondam prepositus Doverie centum acras Rip’ia apud Arbertone et Cupland et Salomon de Camp’ modo tenet per tale servicium quod tenebit capellanus domini regis dum transffretabit mare nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus rex dedit residuum riparie Magistro et Fratribus domus Dei Doverie et fuit eschaeta sua sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod abbatis Sancte Radegundis tenet unum feodum militis apud Poltone de domino rege in capite per servicium quod facit sectam ad curiam regis de Revelet. Item dicunt quod dictus abbas habet duas partes unius feodi in Pissingge de dono Bertramini de Kyriol et de Deamande de Pissingge que tenentur de Roberto de Campane et idem Robertus defendit eae duas partes versus dominum de Sancto Johanne et idem dominus de Sancto Johanne versus dominum regem. Item idem abbas tenet medietatem unius feodi in Pissingge de Johanne de Bikenore et idem Johanne tenet illam medietatem de dominio Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de Sancto Johanne de domino regis sed nesciunt quo serviciio. Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Doverie tenet terciam partem unius feodi in Pisingge que tenetur de domino Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes tenet de rege in capite sed nesciunt quo serviciio. Item dicunt quod heredes Henrici de Crammernil tenent unam quartam partem unius feodi apud Soltone de domino Johanne de Sancto Johanne rege in capite. Item dicunt quod dictum manerium de Westcliffe tenetur de rege in capite et valet per annum xL libras. Item dicunt quod lesta Sancti Augustini et Hedelinge posita sunt ad firmam pro xj libris per annum sine turno vicecomitis ad grave damnnum patrie.

Dicunt eciam quod medietas hundredi de Bewesberwe est in manu domini regis et quod firma hundredi numquam separata fuit a firma predictorum lastorum Sancti Augustini et Hedeling sed omnia placita et perquisita predicti hundredi possunt valere per annum

Hundred of Bewesborough, in the same lathe

They say that the manor of West Cliffe is held of the king in chief and now Gilbert holds it for one knight’s fee, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that King John gave the abbot and convent of St Radegund’s a hundred acres in River with the advowson of the church of the same place and one mill and the said abbot now holds it, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the said King John gave Solomon, formerly a reeve of Dover a hundred acres at River, at Arbeton and Cupland and Solomon Field now holds it, by such service as a chaplain of the lord king shall hold while he shall be overseas, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord King Henry gave the rest of the water-front to the Master and Brethren of God’s House at Dover and it was his escheat, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord King Henry gave the rest of the water-front to the Master and Brethren of God’s House at Dover and it was his escheat, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the said abbot of St Radegund’s holds one knight’s fee at Poulton of the lord king in chief by service of doing suit at the king’s court at Revelet. Then they say that the said abbot has two thirds of one fee in Pising [Whitfield or Guston pars] by grant of Bertram de Kyriol and of Deamanda de Pising which are held of Robert de Campane and the same Robert defends his claim to the two parts against the lord of St John and the same lord of St John similarly against the lord king. Then the same abbot holds a moiety of one fee in Pising of John of Bicknor and the same John holds that moiety of the lord John of St John and the same John of St John of the lord king but they do not know by what service. Then they say that the Master of God’s house at Dover holds a third part of one fee in Pising which is held of the lord John of St John and the same John holds of the king in chief, but they do not know by what service. Then they say that the heirs of Henry Crammanil hold one fourth part of one fee at Shoulden of the lord king in chief. Then they say that the said manor of West Cliffe is held of the lord king in chief and is worth £40 each year.

Then they say that the lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling have been demised at farm for £11 each year without the sheriff’s tourn, with serious loss to the country.

They also say that a moiety of Bewesborough hundred is in the lord king’s hand and that the farm of the hundred has never been separated from the farm of the aforesaid lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling but that all pleas and perquisites of the aforesaid hundred can be valued.
Item dicunt quod Borstall subtraxit se per Templarios de sectis hundredi predicti per quadraginta annos ad damnum domini regis xijd per annum quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Colrede subtraxit se per Magistrum et Fratres Domus Dei Doveri de predicta secta per xL annos ad damnum regis per annum xviijd nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Wittefeud subtraxit se de secta predicti hundredi per predictum Magistrum per xL annos ad damnum regis xijd sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Kokelecumbe subtraxit se per Fratres hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerusalemis de secta predicta et tenentes eiusdem apud le Denne subtraxerunt se de facienda cum burgo de Popeshal ad predictum hundredum per predictos Fratres hospitalis Sancti Johannis per sex annos ad damnum domini regis per annum xijd et amplius et tenetur de baronia de Say.

Item dicunt quod sex mesuagia apud Pynham subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi per Magistrum Domus Dei Doverie per xxta annos ad damnum regis per annum vjd. sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Kokelecumbe et tenentes de Ledene cum borgha de Popeshale subtraxerunt se de turno vicecomitis per sex annos per predictos Hospiteliarios ad damnum regis per annum xijd et amplius sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Doverie detinuit turnum vicecomitis de predicta tercia parte unius feodi in Pisinges per xxta annos scilicet per annum viij denario per annum viij denario per annum viij denario per annum viij denario per annum viij denario per annum uij ceiunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod quinque mesuagia apud Cherleltone subtraxerunt se de secta predicti hundredi per libertatem portus Doverie per quindecim annos ad damnum regis per annum vjd per annum nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Vingham subtraxit se de lasto de Hedleinge per xx annos per archiepiscopum sed nesciunt damnum.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et wrecceum maris furcas et assisam panis et servisie sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod prior Novi Operis Doverie habet wrecceum maris at 13s. 4d. to the farm of the aforesaid £10 [sic- £11 above].

Then they say that Borstal [Rochester?], by the Templars, has withdrawn itself from suits of the hundred for 40 years causing a loss of 12d. each year to the king, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Coldred has withdrawn itself through the Master and Brethren of God’s House at Dover, from the aforesaid suit for 40 years with loss of 18s. a year to the king, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Whitfield has withdrawn itself for 40 years through the aforesaid Master, with a loss of 12d. each year to the king, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Kokelecumbe [Lydden par., lost], by the Knights Hospitallers, has withdrawn itself from the aforesaid suit and the tenants of the same at le Denne [Woodnesborough par.] have withdrawn themselves from making suit with the tithing of Popeshal at the aforesaid hundred by the aforesaid Knights Hospitallers for six years, with a loss of 12d. and more each year to the lord king and it is held of the barony of Say.

Then they say that six messuages at Pineham [Whitfield par.] have withdrawn themselves from suit of the hundred, through the Master of God’s House at Dover, for 30 years with a loss of 6d. each year to the king, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Kokelescumbe and the tenants of Lydden with the tithing of Popeshale have withdrawn themselves from the sheriff’s tourn for six years, by the aforesaid Knights Hospitallers with a loss of 12d. and more each year to the king, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Master of God’s house at Dover has not attended the sheriff’s tourn from the aforesaid third part of one fee in Pising for 30 years, that is of 8d. each year, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that five messuages in Cheriton have withdrawn themselves from suit of the aforesaid hundred, through the liberty of the port of Dover for fifteen years, with a loss of 6d. each year to the king, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Wingham has withdrawn itself from the lathe of Hedeling for 20 years, through the archbishop, but they do not know what is the loss.

They say also that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return (of writs) and wreck, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the prior of the New Work
et assisam panis et servisie in borgha Sancte Margarete
nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Gilbertus
Pecche habet wrecce maris et assisam panis et
servisie apud Westclive sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item Templarii habent assisam panis et servicie apud
Ewell sed nesiiunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Doverie habet
assisam panis et servicie apud Riparia Colrede et
Wittefeud sed nesiiunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus Thome de
Sutheneye cepit de Gileberto de Maxtone xvijd. de
Salamone de Westclive vjd. de Simone Gurgeis ixjd.,
de Stephano de Wittefeud vjd., de Johanne de Witham
xijd., de Willelmo filio Jacobi vjd., de Willelmo
Putemite iijd., de Gileberto de Maxtone x denarios.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Horton cepit de
Roberto de Bugham xvjd. Dicunt quod predictus
Robertus maletractavit homines patrie et cepit de eis
plures denarios quorum modo nesciunt numero pro
assisis et juratis removendis.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hever vicecomes
tradidit Roberto de Sharstede lesta Sancti Augustini et
Hedeling custodiendo et idem Robertus cepit inuiste
Ricardum filium Nicholai de Lymburg et inposuit ei
feciisse furtum ubi nullum fecit et voluit duxisse ipsum
ad prisonam donec pacificavit cum ipso dimidiam
marcam. Item dicunt quod Johannem filium
Nicholai de Lymburg iniuste et ipsum inprionavit in
castrum Cant’ quoque sed dedisset unam marcam et
unum equum precii xvjd perdidit.

Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus Thome de
Sutheneye cepit L multones in regia strata de Henrico
Herlewine et Jacobo Lodsterre iniuste et eas detinuit
quoque sedederunt ei ixjd.

Item dicunt quod Philippus de Ho Hamo de la Forstall,
Robertus de Scharstede et Thomas de Sutheneye
ballivi vicesimam sumpserunt xxti iiijor pro xij et
sumpserunt xL vel L pro xxti iiijor et sumpserunt
pauperes ubi debebant sumpsisse divites et sic ceperunt
plures denarios sed nesciunt numero ad grave
dampnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod Fulco Peynfor et Henricus
Malemeins collectores vicesimae ceperunt de eodem
hundredo xLs pro pondere ultra certum numero
denariorum eiusdem vicesime.

Item dicunt quod monachi Novi Operis Doverie
vendideron custodes et maritagia heredum Dionisii de
Guffeston de terra de gavelykinde pro iij marcis et

at Dover has wreck and the assize of bread and ale in the
tithing of St Margaret’s at Cliffe, they do not know by
what warrant. Then they say that Gilbert Pecche has
wreck and the assize of bread and ale at West Cliffe,
but they do not know by what warrant.

Then the Templars have the assize of bread and ale at
[Temple] Ewell but they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that the Master of God’s house at Dover
has the assize of bread and ale at River, Coldred and
Whitfield but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Richard, Thomas de Sutheney’s
clerk, took 18d. from Gilbert de Maxtone, 6d. from
Solomon of West Cliffe, 9d. from Simon Gurgeis, 6d.
from Stephen of Whitfield, 12d. from John de Witham,
6d. from William son of James, 4d. from William
Putemite, 10d. from Gilbert de Maxtone. Then they say
that William of Horton took 16d. from Robert de
Bugham. They say that the aforesaid Robert ill-treated
men of the country and took much money from them,
they do not know the amount, for removing them from
assizes and juries.

Then they say that William of Hever the sheriff
demised the lathes of St Augustine and Hedeling to
Robert de Sharstede to his custody and the same Robert
unjustly seized Richard son of Nicholas de Lymburg
and accused him of committing a robbery where he had
not done so and he wished to imprison him until he had
made peace with him with half a mark. Then they say
that he unjustly seized John son of Nicholas de
Lymburg and imprisoned him in Canterbury castle until
he had given him one mark and he lost one horse, price
16d.

Then they say that Richard, Thomas de Sutheney’s
clerk, unjustly took 50 sheep from Henry Herlwin and
James Lodsterre on the king’s highway and kept them
till they gave him 19d.

Then they say that Philip of Hoo, Hamo de la Forstall,
Robert de Sharstede and Thomas de Sutheneye,
bailiffs, have taken as the twentieth 24 for 12 and have
taken 50 or 40 for 24 and have taken poor men where
they ought to have taken rich men and thus they take
much money, but they do not know the amount, with a
serious loss to the country.

Then they say that Fulk Poyforer and Henry
Malemeins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth
have taken 40s. by weight more than the assessed
amount from this hundred.

Then they say that the monks of the New Work at
Dover have sold wardships and marriages of Dennis of
Guffeston’s heirs from land in gavelkind for 3½ marks
Hundredum de Estri, adhuc in eodem lasto

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex habet quamdam placiam que valet per annum iij marcas unde prior Christi Cant’ capit expleta

Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Erde tenet dimidiam feodi in Denetone de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de domino rege in capite et debet ad wardam castri Doverie per annum Xs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Soles tenet unum feodum in Soles de Johanne de Rokeste et idem Johannes de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite et debet ad cautem Doverie xxs. Item dicunt quod Ricardus Indley et Johannes de Woghoppe tenent dimidiam feodi de Bertramo Tanerey in Berfreyeston et idem Bertramus de Roberto de Sancto Johanne et idem Robertus de rege in capite et debent ad cautem Doverie xxs. Item Willelmus de Herthangr’ tenet 1 feodum in eadem de Simone filio Ade et idem Simon de rege in capite et debet ad cautem Doverie xxs.

Item Radulfus Kalekin tenet dimidiam feodi in Freydevile de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de rege in capite ad quod servicium nesciunt. Item Radulfus Pirot tenet 1 feodum et dimidiam in Knoaltone de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de rege in capite per servicium ad cautem Doverie sed nesciunt quantum. Item Henricus Pyrot tenet 1 feodum de Radulfo Pirot in Ringelt’ et idem Radulfus de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de rege in capite. Item Johannes de Sandwico tenet dimidiam feodi in la Denne de Rogero de Milmannest’ et idem Rogerus de Radulfo Pirot et idem Radulfus de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. Item Simon de Ercheslo tenet 1 quartam in Ercheslo de Radulfo Pyrot et idem Radulfus de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. Item Bertramus Tanerey tenet unum feodum in Betlesantr’ de Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de rege in capite per xxs. per annum ad and the wardships and marriages of Baldwin de Hugham’s heirs from land in gavelkind for 40s. and this was done unjustly contrary to the custom of the country and the royal honour.

Then they say that William de Brothell and Thomas de Basinge, merchants, have purchased wool in the same hundred and have brought it to the ports of Dover and Hythe and afterwards sent it to places overseas, but they do not know how many sacks nor by what warrant.

Hundredum de Estri, adhuc in eodem lasto

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex habet quamdam placiam que valet per annum iij marcas unde prior Christi Cant’ capit expleta

Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Erde tenet dimidiam feodi in Denetone de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de domino rege in capite et debet ad wardam castri Doverie per annum Xs. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Soles tenet unum feodum in Soles de Johanne de Rokeste et idem Johannes de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite et debet per annum ad castrum Doverie xxs. Item dicunt quod Ricardus Indley et Johannes de Woghoppe tenent dimidiam feodi de Bertramo Tanerey in Berfreyeston et idem Bertramus de Roberto de Sancto Johanne et idem Robertus de rege in capite et debent ad castrum Doverie xxs. Item Willelmus de Herthangr’ tenet 1 feodum in eadem de Simone filio Ade et idem Simon de rege in capite et debet ad castrum Doverie xxs.

Item Radulfus Kalekin tenet dimidiam feodi in Freydevile de Willelmo de Say et idem Willelmus de rege in capite ad quod servicium nesciunt. Item Radulfus Pirot tenet 1 feodum et dimidiam in Knoaltone de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de rege in capite per servicium ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt quantum. Item Henricus Pyrot tenet 1 feodum de Radulfo Pirot in Ringelt’ et idem Radulfus de Willelmo de Leyburn et idem Willelmus de rege in capite. Item Johannes de Sandwico tenet dimidiam feodi in la Denne de Rogero de Milmannest’ et idem Rogerus de Radulfo Pirot et idem Radulfus de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. Item Simon de Ercheslo tenet 1 quartam in Ercheslo de Radulfo Pyrot et idem Radulfus de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. Item Bertramus Tanerey tenet unum feodum in Betlesantr’ de Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de rege in capite per xxs. per annum ad and the wardships and marriages of Baldwin de Hugham’s heirs from land in gavelkind for 40s. and this was done unjustly contrary to the custom of the country and the royal honour.

Then they say that William de Brothell and Thomas de Basinge, merchants, have purchased wool in the same hundred and have brought it to the ports of Dover and Hythe and afterwards sent it to places overseas, but they do not know how many sacks nor by what warrant.
castrum Doverie. Item Radulfus de Saandwiz et Johanne filius Bernardi tenet dimidiam feodi de Johanne de Sancto Johanne et idem Johannes de domino rege et debent Xs ad castrum Doverie. Item Johannes Malemains tenet unum feodum et dimidiam in Walwarechare de Willemo de Say et idem Willemus de domino rege in capite per wardam ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt per quantum. Item idem Johannes Malemains tenet dimidiam feodi in Wodenesberg de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite per wardam ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt per quantum. Item Robertus de Sancto Leodeger tenet vj partem unius feodi in Denne de Johanne Malemains et idem de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite per wardam ad castrum Doverie sed nesciunt per quantum. Item Stephanus de [   ] tenet 1 feodum in Hamwold de Willemo de Say et idem Willemus de rege in capite per Xs ad castrum Roffens’. Item Rogerus de Whinkling tenet 1 feodum in eadem de Willemo de Leyburn et idem Willemus de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite sed quod servicium nesciunt. Item Ivo de Schillingeheld tent vj partem 1 feodi in Elminton de Johanne Malemains et idem Johannes de Willelmo de Say et idem Willemus de rege in capite.

Item idem Ivo tenet quartam partem 1 feodi in Elingtone de Gocelino de Badelesmere et idem Goseleynus de Roberto de Crevequer et idem Robertus de rege in capite. Item Willemus de Titm[   ] tenet dimidiam feodum in Tilmannestun de Roberto de Roberto (sic) de Crevequer et idem de archiepiscopo et idem de rege. [   ] anneston tenet dimidiam feodi in eadem de Willemo de Leyburn et idem Willemus de Roberto de Crevequer et idem de archiepiscopo et idem de rege in capite. [   ] hundred de Estre est in manu domini regis et valet per annum xxs.

20s each year at Dover castle. Then Ralph of Sandwich and John son of Bernard hold half a fee of John of St John and the same John of the lord king and they owe 10s at Dover castle. Then John Malemains holds one and a half fees in Walmer of William de Say and the same William of the lord king in chief by guard at Dover castle but they do not know how much. Then the same John Malemains holds half a fee in Woodnesborough of Robert de Crevequer and the same Robert of the king in chief by guard at Dover Castle, but they do not know how much. Then Stephen de [   ] holds 1 fee in Hamwould of William de Say and the same William of the king in chief by 10s. at Rochester castle. Then Roger de Whinkling holds 1 fee in the same place of William de Leyburn and the same William of Roger de Crevequer and the same Robert holds of the king in chief, but they do not know what is the service. Then Ivo of Schillingeheld holds a sixth part of 1 fee in Elinton [Eythorne par.] of John Malemains and the same John of William de Say and the same William of the king in chief.

Then the same Ivo holds a fourth part of 1 fee in Elinton of Jocelyn of Badlesmere and the same Jocelin of Robert de Crevequer and the same Robert of the king in chief. Then William de Titm[   ] holds half a fee in Tilmanstone of Robert de Crevequer and the same man holds of the archbishop and he holds of the king. [   ] anneston holds half a fee in the same place of William de Leyburn and the same William of Robert de Crevequer and the same man of the archbishop ] and the same of the king in chief. [They say] that the hundred of Eastry is in the king’s hand and it is worth 20s. each year.

[They say also that the lathes of Hedeling and] Sancti Augustini positi [sic] sunt ad firmam pro xxvij libris sine turnis [   ] baroniam relinquerunt domos et terras et reversi sunt super archiepiscopatu.

[Dicunt eciam quod lesta Hedeling et] Sancti Augustini positi [sic] sunt ad firmam pro xxvij libris sine turnis et reliquerunt domos et terras et reversi sunt super archiepiscopatu.

[Dicunt eciam quod ] est in manu prioris Christi Cant’ et tenet omnia placita que ad coronam pertinent [   ] ad damnum domini regis per annum .

[Dicunt quod ] et Henricus de Wingham appropriaverunt sibi tenentes de Heygethorne qui sequi solembat [   ] dictum domini hundredum sunt subtrahuntur per xx annos ad grave damnum rege nesciunt quo waranto.
They say also that for 26 years the abbot of St Augustine’s has taken over the tenants of Pett and Tykenhurst who used to do suit at the said hundred by the hand of the lord king, they do not know by what warrant. Then for 28 years the Master of Ospringe has taken over the tenants of Somerfeud who used to follow the said hundred with severe loss to the king, they do not know by what warrant. Then the hundred of Wingham has withdrawn itself from the sheriff’s tourn, they do not know by what warrant and it was accustomed [to do suit]. Then they say that the liberties of the Cinque Ports hinder common justice because they make distraint.

Then they say that Bridge hundred is in the king’s hand and it is worth 40s. each year, Preston hundred is in William de Leyburn’s hand and it is worth 20s. each year. They say that a moiety of Eastry hundred is in the lord king’s hand and the other is in the hand of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, they do not know by what warrant nor from what time. They say that Downhamford hundred, one part is in the hand of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, the second part in the hand of the abbot of St Augustine’s and the third part in William de Braose’s hand, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant and it is worth 100s. each year.

Then they say that the tithing of Eythorne (?) is withdrawn from suit of Eastry hundred for 30 years and now Wingham hundred does suit, they do not know by what warrant and the suit is worth 2s. each year. They also say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the abbot of Battle have return and extract of writs and all...
huiusmodi placita corone quo tempore vel quo warenso nesciunt. Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini et Willelmus de Brewose et Willelmus de Leyburn habent furcas et assisam panis et servisie quo tempore vel quo warenso nesciunt. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet wardas de kavelykinde (sic) et per hoc abutitur libertate. Dicunt eciam quod Walterus de Wengham Willelmus de Leyburn, Willelmus de Breuhose archiepiscopus Cant’ abbas Sancti Augustini et prior Christi Cant’ habent warenso a quo tempore vel quo warenso nesciunt. Item dicunt quod quedam assisa de Esse per preceptum domini regis coram Magistro Ricardo de Stanes arainiata duobus annis elapsis et quinquies apud Grenewic vexata adhuc capi non potuit et una jurata xxiiijor de Wicham arainiata coram eundem [sic] tribus annis elapsis et decies apud Grenewic et alibi vexata adhuc capi non potuit quo racione nesciunt unde patria destructa est ad grave dampnum regis et patria.

Item dicunt quod quedam assisa de Esse per preceptum domini regis coram Magistro Ricardo de Stanes arainiata duobus annis elapsis et quinquies apud Grenewic vexata adhuc capi non potuit et una jurata xxiiijor de Wicham arainiata coram eundem [sic] tribus annis elapsis et decies apud Grenewic et alibi vexata adhuc capi non potuit quo racione nesciunt unde patria destructa est ad grave dampnum regis et patria.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains cepit Xs sub Magistro Ricardo de Clifford custode [words missing] archiepiscopatuus de Dionisia quondam uxor Rogeri de Fraxino defamata de morte dicti Rogeri viri sui et sic evasit quieta. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Kyriol coronator in lasto de Hedelinge cepit ijs pro quodam infortunio in eodem hundredo de borgha de Denne pro officio suo faciendo et de Ada de Witfeld in borgha de Wingham cepit ijs pro eodem et Stephanus clericus suus iijis vjd pro eodem de Hugone de Brentingham occiso.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes Robertus de Beche Hamo de la Forstall Thomas de Sutheneye ballivi et eorum ministri ceperont [sic] munera pro recognitionibus de assisis et jurisit removendis sed nesciunt [sic] quam nec a quibus quod fuerunt de baronia.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes tradidit hundredum de Estria ad firmam Hamoni de Forstall qui cepit et extorsit 1 marcam de Rogero Ledberd quo fine ballivus domini regis arestavitquamdam mulierem rectatam de denariis furatis dicto Rogero postea inde occasionata posuit se et bono et malo super eundem hundredo quod hundredum dictum mulierem de dicto latroninio esse inculpabilem. pleas of the crown of this nature, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. They they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s and William de Braose and William de Leyburn have a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop has wardship of gavelkind and through this misuses the liberty. They also say that Walter of Wingham, William de Leyburn, the archbishop of Canterbury, the abbot of St Augustine’s and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury have warren, from what time or by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that a certain assize of Ash, by the lord king’s command had been arraigned in the presence of Master Richard de Stanes two years ago and had been disturbed five times and could not yet be taken and one jury of 24 from Wickham was then arraigned in the same man’s presence three years ago and it was disturbed ten times at Greenwich and elsewhere and could not yet be taken, for what reason they do no not know and the country was discredited with serious harm to the king and country.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, a former sheriff of Kent, took 40s. and Stephen of Lyminge 40s. and John Baudifer, then the bailiff of Wingham, all by the authority of Master Richard of Clifford the custodian of the archbishopric, took 10s. from Denise formerly Roger de Fraxino’s wife, as she was accused of the death of the said Roger her husband and thus she was released as innocent. Then they say that William de Kyriol the coroner, in Hedelinge late took 2s. for performing the duty of of his office for an unfortunate person from the tithing of Denne in the same hundred and he took 2s. for Adam de Whitfield in Wingham tithing for the same and Stephen his clerk took 4s. 6d. for the same concerning Hugh de Brantingham’s killing.

Then they say that Henry of Leeds, Robert de Beche, Hamo de de la Forstall, Thomas de Sutheneye bailiffs and their ministers have taken gifts for allowing men to be removed from the assizes and juries and they know not how or by whom because they are of the barony.

Then they say that Henry Malemains the sheriff handed over Eastry hundred at farm to Hamo de Forstall who took and extorted 1 mark from Roger Ledberd, for which fine the lord king’s bailiff rightly arrested a certain woman for stealing money from the said Roger. Afterwards, having been accused she placed herself for better or worse upon the same hundred and the hundred decreed that the said woman was not guilty of the said
Item dicunt quod Ricardus de Clifford escheator cepit de tenentibus hundredi xx libras in primo adventu suo et clericus suus xxs. et postea extorsit ab eis viij marcas pro inquisicione habenda utrum avermanni deberent servicium suum vel servicii redempciones et inquisitum fuit per liberos tenentes quod debebant servicium et nichilominus distinxit eos pro utroque et pro respectu habendo cepit dominus Milo capellanus eiusdem escheatoris xxs a dictis tenentibus pro ea capta eorum distinctione et retenta donec extorserat ab eisdem X marcas et Hugo de Thornham dimidiam marcam et postea fecit dictos avermannos ducere finum de Vingham ad manerium suum de Munte nec potuerunt pacem habere de predicto Ricardo donec ab eis extorsit v marcas et clericus suus 1 marcam preterea recepit ab eisdem tenentibus xLs et Magister Hugo de Thornham dimidiam marcam falso occasione.

Then they say that Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £20 from the tenants of the hundred at his first arrival and his clerk 20s. and afterwards he extorted 8 marks from them for holding an inquisition to decide whether men owed carrying service to him or whether there had been a remittance of service and an enquiry was made among the free tenants as to what service they owed and nevertheless he made distraint upon them for both and for having a postponement Miles, the same escheator’s clerk, took 20s. from the said tenants for taking their distraint and kept it until he had extorted 10 marks from them and Hugh de Thornham half a mark and afterwards he made the said men owing carrying service cart dung from Wingham to his manor of Munte and they could not have peace from the aforesaid Richard until he extorted 5 marks from them and his clerk 1 mark, moreover he received 40s. from the same tenants and Master Hugh de Thornham half a mark by a false exaction.

Then they say that William de la Forde and Master Hugh de Thornham, the receivers under Master Richard de Clifford the escheator, took half a mark from Henry son of Hugh, 20d. from Martin Herdman, half a mark from Felicité de Horsete and other pleas owing by summons of the Exchequer and they have not not acquitted them.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge took 1 mark from Thomas Ordrich, Thomas Cotfich and Stephen Arnold at the time of the vacancy of the archbishopric for those whose pledges had been ignored and who had been imprisoned without cause. Then they say that Henry Malemeins and Fulk Perfor’, Nicholas le Bret and Arnold de Esseling took for the tax of one-twentieth from the same hundred £6 by weight more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford the escheator, and Ralph Derby, Hugh of Thornham, William de Forde, the escheator’s bailiffs, have made waste in the wood of Wingham valued at £13.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de la Forde et Magister Hugo de Thornham receptores sub Magistro Ricardo de Clifford escheatore cepit de Henrico filio Hugonis dimidiam marcam, de Martino Herdman xxd, de Felicia de Horsete dimidam marcam et alia placita debita de summonitio sacaccii et eos non acquietaverunt.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Limmigg’ tempore vacacionis archiepiscopatuus cepit 1 marcam de Thoma Ordrich Thoma Cotfich et Stephano Arnold pro eis per plevinam dimittendam qui sine causa incarcerati fuerunt.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeins et Fulco Peyfor’ Nicholaus le Bret et Arnoldus de Esseling ceperunt de vicessima de eodem hundredo pro pondere ultra certum numerum vj libras.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escheator et Radulfus Derby Hugo de Thornham Willelmus de Forde ballivi escheatoris fecerunt vastum in bosco maneri de Wingham ad valorem xij librarum.
Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Middeltun cum toto hundredo est dominicum domini regis sed nunc est in manu domini Johannis de Burgo et valet per annum CC libras. Item manerium de Ospringe est dominicum regis tamquam escheatum de honore de Peverel et est in manu domine regine et valet per annum Lv libras et ad dictum manerium pertinent xv feoda militum et dimidiam ut patet infra unde dominus Hamo de Gattun tenet v feoda videlicet Gattun, Boctun Malherbe, Thrulee, Wedneshelle, Sameleford, Borstall et tenentur de domino rege in capite et faciunt sectam curia de Ospringe. Item Henricus de Crommevile tenet tria feoda militum videlicet apud Graveshende unum feodum et dimidiam et Saltus’ dimidiam feodum, Denham et Deneseye unum feodum et dimidiam et tenentur de rege in capite et subtraxerunt se de secta curie per xxta annos elapsos ad dampnum domini regis X marcas quo warrant nesciunt. Item Johanes de Mares tenet tria feoda militum sic Wathelingh’, Shelve, Hockemere, Senthuke et tenentur in capite et subtraxerunt sectam per xxj annos elapsos ad dampnum dominum regis xmarcas quo warrant nesciunt. Item dominus Willlemus de Leyburn’ tenet unum feodum apud Heriattesham et subtraxit sectam per xxs. annos ad dampnum regis xxs. Item Hugo de Gerunde tenet tria feoda militum sic Wrenstede, Esshert, Dodinton in comitatu Bokingeham Foxcote et facit sectam plenam. Item dominus Luca de Vianum tenet quartam partem unius feodi militis apud Potewudode et Thornherst et facit sectam. Item Radulfus de Essing et heres Philippus Coci et Domus Dei de Ospring per Robertum de London’ tenet quartam partem unius feodi et omnes faciunt sectam preter Domus Dei et ipsa Domus Dei tenet Elverlonde ex dono et venditione Nicholai Servorde qui tenet per medium.

Iterum dicunt quod manerium de Faveresham cum toto hundredo haberent religiosi de Faveresham ex dono regis Stephani salvis homagio et servicio hominum de villa de Faveresham que pertinent ad dominum regem. Item dicunt quod xvij tething’ et dimidiam sunt in manibus religiosorum cum dicto hundredo sed de valore nesciunt. Item dicunt quod tenentes Henrici Malemayns in borgha de Elegrave et Foltwoldefelde subtraxerunt se de turno

Again they say that the monks at Faversham hold Faversham manor with the whole hundred by grant of King Stephen [1135-1154] saving the homage and service of the men of Faversham which pertain to the lord king. Then they say that the 17½ tithings with the said hundred are held by the monks, but they do not know what is the value. Then they say that the tenants of Henry Malemayns in the tithing of Elegrave and Foltwoldefield have withdrawn themselves from the
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Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum

Item quod archiepiscopus vendit

Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes ballivus lesti de
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Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes ballivus lesti de

Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes ballivus lesti de

sheriff’s tourn for 18 years with a loss of 18s. in all to 

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has 

Then that the manor of Stalisfield Green is held of the 

Then they say that the archbishop sells wardship of heirs away from the 

Then they say that John Dyve has warren by a grant of 

Then they say that Osbert of Leeds, bailiff of Scray 

Then they say that Henry of Leeds, the sheriff’s clerk took 12d. from Robert son of 

Again they say that John de Wattun, a former sheriff of 

The names of these sheriffs are: Richard de 

They say that the sheriff takes 7 marks each year from 

Then they say that the sheriff of Kent, during his time handed over the lathe of Scray to his bailiffs for £20, to increase his farm whereas before his time only £10 had been paid and all the sheriffs from then until this time have taken such an amount.
Then they say that Henry Malemeis and Arnulph de Erling and Nicholas de Bret, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, have received 10 marks more that the assessed amount and that the lord Gilbert Earl of Clare took £15 from Faversham hundred for the assault upon Tonbridge castle which they made at the distraint of Sir John de la Hay and while he was an ally of the lord king and it is known that he took the said money by agreement and assistance of the lord king’s bailiffs, who levied that money and to obtain that money they made distraint until they received it.

Again they say that when Sir Henry Malemeys was sheriff he prosecuted Simon the tailor, accusing him of usury and for that reason he took half a mark from him. Then (they say) that John de Hambergh prosecuted Alexander de Strete and for this he made distraint upon him of one bullock which he sold for 18s. and he kept this.

And that Osbert de Kede, the lord king’s serjeant, imprisoned and accused Margery de Rameshelde of breach of the peace against Geoffrey le Mirie and for this he unjustly took 2s. from her.

Then they same Osbert and John de Hambergh his serjeant, prosecuted Geoffrey le Mirie because he sold one bullock at Canterbury which he removed to his house and concealed and kept it, as they say, and thus they have taken 4s. from him unjustly because they wished to clear him of these things and they desired to secure his acquittal.

Then Ivo of Marden, the bailiff of the shire when Henry Malemains was sheriff, accused Walter ate Dane that he bought one horse from a certain thief and that he could have kept it and he was unwilling and thus he unjustly took half a mark from him.

Then Osbert of Leeds accusing the same Walter of the same offence took 2s. from him because of it. Then Ivo of Marden accused John Prest that he impounded a certain pig of his neighbour by bad means and he concealed the said pig and he was unwilling to accept John’s compurgation, but took 4s. from him for this said charge.

Then Osbert of Leeds and John de Hambergh accused John Prest that he set fire to William Humfrey’s house and the said John wished to clear himself by an assize verdict, but they were unwilling and took half a mark
Item Yvo de Merdenn in ultimo Itinere justiciariorum imposuit Henrico de la Woylete quod occidit quamdam feminam et quod eam projecit in quodam puteo et ipsum Henricum attachavit et detinuerit quoque finivit xxx et de Johannis pueri ijs. Item dominus Henricus Malemains cepit de dicto Henrico 1 marcam pro eodem et recessis justicariis et dicto Henrico quietato coram dictis justicariis venit dictus Yvo de Merdenn et cepit a dicto Henrico iij marcas. Item the said Yvo de Merdenn imposuit Willelmo Post quod cum fuit serviens Bartholomei de Eversle per xx annos depredavit dominum suum cum aliis malefactoribus ad valenciam Cs. dictus Willelmus optulit aquietacionem noluit audire sed cepit ab eo vjs. et Gwydo clericus de Thrule xijd. Item Osbertus de Ledes cepit de Osberto de la Forstalle et Willemlo Renewold quod percusserunt unum gacionem extra quamdam tavennam pro contencione quam fecit in domo sine malo portatus fuit. Item Osbertus de Ledes cepit ijs de Alexandro de Rode inponens ei quod furatus fuit ijs boves et ipsum distrinxit quousque solvit. Item Thomas Andr’ inposuit Alicie uxori Roberti Asketin injuste quod interefecit unum hominem et cepit ab ea viijs et Johannes de Hambergh’ iijs. Item dominus Henricus Malemains imposuit Cicelie de Langedon quod fuit cum fratribus suis in quadam domo combusta et cepit ab ea xls et Osbertus de Ledes cepit ab ea pro eodem 1 marcam. Item idem Thomas Andr’ inposuit Alicie uxori Roberti Asketin injuste quod interfecit unum hominem et cepit ab ea viijs et Johannes de Hambergh’ iijs. Item dominus Henricus Malemains imposuit Cicelie de Langedon quod fuit cum fratribus suis in quadam domo combusta et cepit ab ea xls et Osbertus de Ledes cepit ab ea pro eodem 1 marcam. Item quod Thomas Andr’ cepit de Salamone de Folemanneston iijs et unam copam vestoriam precii Xd quare noluit esse pliegium dici Thome et quod Thomas Andr’ inposuit Hugoni Franceis quod usus from him and again John de Hambergh took 6d.
Then Ivo of Marden at the justices’ last eyre accused Henry de la Woylete of killing a certain woman and of throwing her in a certain well and he arrested Henry and detained him until he paid a fine of 20s. and 2s. from John’s boy. Then Sir Henry Malemains took 1 mark from the said Henry for the same charge and after the justices had retired and the said Henry had been acquitted before the justices, Ivo of Marden came and he took 2 marks from the said Henry.
Then the said Ivo of Marden accused William Post that when he had been a servant of Bartholomew de Eversle, he, with other evil associates, robbed his lord of 100s. He was unwilling to hear the acquittance which the said William received but took 6s. from him and Guy a clerk of Throwley took 12d. Then Obert of Leeds took from Osbert de la Forstall and William Renewold because they struck one youth outside a certain tavern because of a disturbance which he made in the house, he was carried away unharmed. Then Osbert of Leeds took 2s. from Alexander de Rode accusing him of the theft of 2 oxen and he distrained him until he paid. Then Thomas Andrew accused Alexander de Rode that he owed William Marshal of Middleton a certain sum of money which he did not owe, since he received tallage from there for this acquittance and he made no allowance for this but took 40d. from him. Then the same Thomas Andrew accused Alice the wife of Robert Asketin of killing one man and he took 8s. from her and John Hambergh took 3s.
Then Sir Henry Malemains accused Cicely of Langdon that she had been with her brothers in a certain house which was set alight and he took 40s. from her and Osbert of Leeds took 1 mark from her for the same reason. And Ivo of Marden took 1 mark from her for the same reason. Then Osbert of Leeds accused the said Cicely of driving away many pigs from the wood whenever she came there and the same man took 4s. from her. Then John de Hambergh took 6d. from her for the same reason. Then that Thomas Andrews took 4s. from Solomon de Folemanneston and one vestment cope price 10d. because he did not wish to act as the said Thomas’s pledge and that Thomas Andrew accused Hugh
Franceis that he had used his pasture while his tenement was in the lord king’s hand and he took 8s. 8d. from him. Then Thomas Andrew took one bed coverlet price 30d. from William Daniel in the town of Faversham and he did this by the authority of his office and he has not yet paid. Then Richard de Gastheld rode Henry de Wyltega’s horse without his permission and the said horse died and he did this by the authority of his office and the said Hamo suffered a loss of 12s. Then the said Richard summoned the said Hamo to Wyvelesbergh’ without a warrant and made him give him 12d. which he took and held and Absolom his associate took 12d. from the said Hamo for the same reason. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall the constable of Canterbury castle, in the 2nd year of King Edward’s reign [November 1273-1274] arrested Richard de Gastfield and threatened to imprison him because he accused him of concealing a certain woman, for which the same Hamo imprisoned Richard and he acquitted himself of the charge and nevertheless the said Hamo took 9d. from the said Richard.

Then they say that Ivo of Marden in the 56th year of King Henry [October 1271-1272] charged that Richard of being absent from the justices’ eyre and so he took 1 mark from the same Richard. Then they say that Henry of Leeds charged John de Meister that he falsely and maliciously indicted the said Richard de Estveld of concealing a robber and he took 30s. from the same John. Then Henry of Leeds took 20d. from Edith Bene for a false claim attributed to her, of which the said Edith cleared herself. Then he took 40d. from William Man and William his son because they falsely claimed that the said Edith must have concealed one hundred weight [quarter of?] of stolen wool. Then Thomas Andrew, bailiff of the shire, wished to borrow John de Hundestell’s horse, in King Henry’s 56th year and the same man was unwilling and by that charge he took two of the same John’s horses and impounded them and kept them until he paid 4s. Then Robert Beche and Henry of Leeds made distraint upon the men of Faversham for cloth and leather valued at 30s. and £6 and they made this distraint at Wye fair in the 54th year of King Henry’s reign

fuit pasturam suam dum tenementum suum fuit in manu domini regis et cepit ab eo viijs viijd. Item Thomas Andr’ cepit unam culcitram pinnatam in villa de Faveresham de Willelmo Daniel precii xxsd et per potestatem officii sui hoc fecit et nondum soluit.

Item Ricardus de Gastheld equitavit equum Hamonis de Wyltega’ contra voluntatem suam et dictus equus moriebatur et hoc fecit per potestatem sui officii et dictus Hamo habuit dampnum xij. Item dictus Ricardus summonuit dictum Hamonem apud Wyvelesbergh’ sine warrento et fecit eum dare xijd quod cepit et habuit et Apsalon socius ipsius cepit a dicto Hamone pro eodem xijd

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall constabularius castri Cant’ anno regni regedi Edwardi ij attachiavit Ricardum de Gastfeld [Estvelde given as alternative] et ipsum minavit inprisonare quare inposuit ei quod fecit concelamentum de quadam muliere qua idem Ricardum inprisonavit et ipse per proportium se aquietavit et dictus Hamo nichilominus cepit ab eodem Ricardo ixd.

Item dicunt quod Yvo de Meredenn tempore domini regis Henrici anno Lvj occasionavit ipsum Ricardum esse absentem in Itinere justiciarorum et sic cepit ab eodem Ricardo 1 marcam.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes occasionavit Johannem de Meister eo quod indictavit dictum Ricardum de Estveld quo fecit concelamentum de latrocinio falsio et maliciose et cepit ab ipso Johanne xxxtas.

Item idem Henricus de Ledes cepit de Edive Bene xxd pro falso clamnio sibi inposita unde dicta Ediva se aquietavit.

Item cepit de Willelmo Man et Willelmo filio eius xLd quare fecit falsum clamnium super dictam Edivam quo debuit concelassse unum quarterium lane furatum.

Item Thomas Andr’ ballivus de schira anno regis Henrici Lvj voluit mutuare equum Johannis de Hundestvell et idem noluit et occasione illa cepit duos equos eiusdem Johannis et eosdem inparcavit et detinuit quousque solvit iiij.

Item dicunt quod Robertus Beche et Henricus de Ledes distrinxerunt homines de villa de Faveresham per pannum et corea at valorem xxxs. et vj libras et illam districionem fecerunt ad nundinam de Wy anno
regni regis Henrici Liiij et adhuc dictam districcionem in manu sua retinent. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Hambergh’ serviens domini regis fecit Johannem de Showesale et Thomam Frethemund mainpernors domini Guncelde de Badelesmere per brevem domini regis ipsis nescientibus unde amerciati fuerunt ad 1 marcam ad scaccarium domini regis anno regni regis Henrici Lv. Item Johannes de Hambergh distrinxit dominum Robertum de Scoteho pro unum equum per summonitionem scaccarii et liberavit dictum equum Henrico de Ledes precii equi ixs et non recupavit. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hevr et Henricus de Ledes vicecomites ceperunt de Johanne de Hert dimidiam marcam per summonitionem scaccarii fraudulenter pro villa de Faveresham ubi non est levans neque culilibet anno regni regis Edwardi primo unde nec ipsum nec villam de Faveresham aquietavit et Henricus de Ledes inustae cepit de relicta prepositi de Westwode per summonitionem scaccarii xiiijs ubi nunquam venit in summonitione. Item Thomas Andr’ serviens domini regis cepit de Ricardo preposito de Westwode per eandem summonitionem dimidiam marcam ubi nunquam venit in summonitione et quod Johannes de Hambergh’ serviens domini regis cepit equum relicto dicti prepositi de Westwode et imparcavit eundem occasione predicta et detinuit quousque fuit mortuus. Item Nicholaus de Hambergh’ et Elia frater eius ceperunt de Simone de Tong et Alexandro de la Strete xxs. per summonitionem scaccarii ubi nulla fuit.

**Hundredum de Bocton Archiepiscopi.**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex tenet in dominico hundredum de Middeltun cum membro videlicet Merdenn. Item dicunt quod aliquando predecesores domini regis habuerunt Moneketun Westhalimot et Menstre in insula Tanet et modo abbasa Sancti Augustini Cant’ tenet manerium de Menstre et prior ecclesie Sancte Trinitatis et conventus tenent manerium de Moneketun et dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ tenet Westhalimot in Tanet quo warrento nesciunt et Henricus rex tenuit in dominiciis suis manerium de Elham et modo dominus Willelmus de Leyburn illud tenet quo waranto nesciunt et quod idem Henricus rex tenuit manerium de Ospring et modo domina regina illud tenuit quo waranto nesciunt. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Bocton est in manu regni regis Henrici Liiij et adhuc dictam districcionem in manu sua retinent. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Hambergh’ serviens domini regis fecit Johannem de Showesale et Thomam Frethemund mainpernors domini Guncelde de Badelesmere per brevem domini regis ipsis nescientibus unde amerciati fuerunt ad 1 marcam ad scaccarium domini regis anno regni regis Henrici Lv. Item Johannes de Hambergh distrinxit dominum Robertum de Scoteho pro unum equum per summonitionem scaccarii et liberavit dictum equum Henrico de Ledes precii equi ixs et non recupavit. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hevr et Henricus de Ledes vicecomites ceperunt de Johanne de Hert dimidiam marcam per summonitionem scaccarii fraudulenter pro villa de Faveresham ubi non est levans neque culilibet anno regni regis Edwardi primo unde nec ipsum nec villam de Faveresham aquietavit et Henricus de Ledes inustae cepit de relicta prepositi de Westwode per summonitionem scaccarii xiiijs ubi nunquam venit in summonitione. Item Thomas Andr’ serviens domini regis cepit de Ricardo preposito de Westwode per eandem summonitionem dimidiam marcam ubi nunquam venit in summonitione et quod Johannes de Hambergh’ serviens domini regis cepit equum relicto dicti prepositi de Westwode et imparcavit eundem occasione predicta et detinuit quousque fuit mortuus. Item Nicholaus de Hambergh’ et Elia frater eius ceperunt de Simone de Tong et Alexandro de la Strete xxs. per summonitionem scaccarii ubi nulla fuit.

**Hundred of Boughton**

The jury say that the lord king holds the hundred of Middleton with its member, that is to say Marden, in demesne. Then they say that some time ago the lord king’s predecessors held Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster in the Isle of Thanet and now the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds the manor of Minster and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity hold the manor of Monkton and the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds Westhalimot in Thanet, by what warrant they do not know and King Henry holds Elham manor in his demesnes and now Sir William de Leyburn holds that, by what warrant they do not know and that the same King Henry held the manor of Ospringe and now the lady queen holds that, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Boughton hundred is in the lord...
 Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis per ministros et baillivos suos cepit 67s. 6d. for 10 great trees sold in bosco de Herst et quod idem Magister Ricardus fecit fieri carbonem in bosco qui vocatur Byssupedenn faciendo destruccionem in quercubus ad valorem xLs. Item dicunt quod idem escaetor cepit de hundredo de Bocoton pro eo quod ipse non tenuit dictum hundredum sic lagheday xLs injuste. Item Magister Hugo de Thornham cepit de eodem hundredo pro eodem 1 marcam injuste et idem cepit de tenentibus de Bocutn instute pro averiis suis inparcamentum de stipulis ubi deberent de jure communem habere et quod dictus Magister Hugo cepit de Philippo de Deregate xLs quod emerat boscum in Byssupedenn de forestariis suis et quod idem cepit de Willelmo filio Philippo de Fraxino iijs ut possit intrare terram cuiusdam heredis qui fuit de etate xxxta annorum et amplius. Item idem cepit pro recognitione et tallagio in primo adventu suo Cs.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupesdun et Willelmus de Gerstun ceperunt de hundredo de Bocoton xx marcas pro insulgaus de Tonebrigg qui se advocaverant baillivos domini Comitis Glovernie et quod dominus Johannes de la Haye tunc temporalis constabularius Dover’ per districtionem suam fecit quosdam de dicto hundredo ire cum eo ad insulgam predicti castri de ‘Tonebrigg’

m. 4 dorso Hundredum de Feleberegh. .

Dicunt jurati quod Alexander de Balliolo et Isabella uxor eius tenent manerium de Chilhehm cum certa parte hundredi de Feleberhegh, Kyngeston Wytstaple Rydlingwalle membra ad baroniam de Chyleh’m tenentur de domino rege in capite per serviculture. Dicunt etiam quod prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant’ tenent maneria de Chartham et Godmeresham archbishop’s hand but they do not know of what value it is and there is every year whatsoever 1 mark from Malling tithing for the sheriff’s tourn which John of Boughton when the sheriff of Kent was the first to levy. Then they say that the archbishop has return and extract of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful drain upon goods and has the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, through his ministers and bailiffs took 67s. 6d. for 10 great trees sold in Herst wood and the same Master Richard caused charcoal to be made in the wood called Bishopdenn causing destruction of oak trees valued at 40s. Then they say that the same escheator took 40s unjustly from Boughton hundred because he has not held the hundred, thus at lawday. Then Master Hugh of Thornham took 1 mark unjustly from the same hundred for the same reason and the same man unjustly took the remainder of the seed from the tenants of Boughton for carrying services, when they were not bound to perform carrying services and 25s. when there was nothing to carry. Then he took inclosed land from the same tenants with its stubble for his own draught animals where the tenants ought by right to have common and that the said Master Hugh took 40s. from Philip of Derngate because he had bought wood in Bishopdenn from his foresters and that the same man took 3s. from William, son of Philip de Fraxino, so that he could have entry to the land of a certain heir, who was 30 years of age and more. Then the same man took 100s. at his first coming for acknowledgement of his authority and for tallage. Then they say that William de Stupesdun and William de Gerstun took 20 marks from Boughton hundred for the assault upon Tonbridge as they themselves supported the lord earl of Gloucester’s bailiffs and that the lord John de la Haye, who was constable of Dover at that time compelled certain men of the said hundred by drain to go with him to the assault upon the aforesaid castle of Tonbridge.

m. 4 dorso Felborough Hundred

The jury say that Alexander de Baillol and his wife Isabel hold the manor of Chilham with a certain part of Felborough hundred. Kingston, Whitstable, Ringlestone, members of the barony of Chilham are held of the king in chief through service. They say also that the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury hold Chartham and Godmersham manors from ancient
item dicunt quod certa pars dicti hundredi pertinet ad manerium de Chilham ut supra et duas partes predicit hundredi habent prior et conventus ecclesie Christi Cant' pertinentes ad maneriam de Chertham et Godmeresham nesciunt quo waranto. Item dicunt quod tenentes archiepiscopatus Cant' racione libertatis predicte ecclesie subtraxerunt se veniendi ad lestum et ad turnum vicecomitis reddendum et hoc per xx annos elapsos et amplius nesciunt quo waranto. Item dicunt quod tenentes archiepiscopatus Cant' habet returnum brevium racione libertatis ecclesie sue nesciunt quo waranto et quod idem archiepiscopus et prior ecclesie Christi tenent placita de namio vetito et habent furcas assisas panis et cervisie et omnes alias libertates regales racione libertatis ecclesie sed nesciunt quo waranto et quod dominus Alexander de Balliolo habet furcas in dicto hundredo assisas panis et cervisie racione manerii sui de Chyleham ab antiquo tempore nesciunt quo waranto. Item dicunt quod quidam homo archiepiscopatus Cant' de manorio de Tenham captus fuit et appellatus in dicto hundredo de latrocinio et morti judicatus et homines hundredi de Tenham calumpniaverunt ad facere executionem justicie dicti felonis eo quod hoc pertinebat ad libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant' et cum ipsum felonem dictis hominibus de Tenham dimisisset duxerunt ipsum usque Tenham nolentes de eo facere executionem nisi aliases in eodem hundredo de Tenham de eodem facto esset appellatus et hoc injuste et contra communem justiciam et hoc factum fuit per Willelmum de Hanygefeld ballivum archiepiscopi et per hundredum de Tenham. Item dicunt quod quidam de hundredo de Pecham captus fuit in dicto hundredo de Felbergo pro diffamacione latrocinii qui per predictum hundredum plene aqviatatus fuit et cum vertisset ad hundredum de Pecham Michaelis de Meynill ballivus archiepiscopi cum aliis tenentibus eiusdem hundredi dictum diffamatum ceperunt et inprisonaverunt eadem occasione contra justiciam. Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi appropiavit sibi warrenum in aqua et terra per tota maneria de Chartham et Godmeresham sed nesciunt quo waranto.

item dicunt quod fratres Domus Dei de Ospringe tenent quoddam tenementum de Hamone de Gattun et times but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that a certain part of the said hundred pertains to Chilham manor as above and the prior and convent of Christchurch have two thirds of the aforesaid hundred pertaining to their manors of Chartham and Godmersham, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the tenants of the archbishopric of Canterbury because of the liberty of the aforesaid church have withdrawn themselves from coming to the lathe and paying at the sheriff’s tourn and this for 20 years and more, they to not know by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return of writs because of the liberty of his church, they do not know by what warrant and that the same archbishop and prior of Christchurch have pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and they have the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and all other royal liberties because of the liberty of the church, but they do not know by what warrant and that Sir Alexander de Baillol from ancient times has the gallows in the said hundred, the assize of bread and ale by reason of his manor of Chilham, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that a certain man of the archbishopric of Canterbury from Teynham manor was captured and accused in the said hundred of robbery and condemned to death and the men of Teynham hundred made objection to committing justice upon the said felon because this pertained to the liberty of Christchurch and when he delivered the felon to the said men of Teynham they brought him as far as Teynham, as they did not wish his execution to be done except in another place in the same hundred of Teynham, where he had been appealed of the same deed and thus unjustly and contrary to common justice. This was done by William de Hanygefield, the archbishop’s bailiff and by Teynham hundred. Then they say that a certain man of Petham hundred was arrested in the said hundred of Felborough and charged with theft and he was fully acquitted through the aforesaid hundred and when he had returned to Petham hundred, Michael de Meynill, the archbishop’s bailiff, with other tenants of the same hundred seized the accused man and contrary to justice, imprisoned him upon the same charge. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch has taken Warren for himself by water and by land throughout the whole of Chartham and Godmersham manors, but they do not know by what warrant.

They say that the Brethren of God’s House at Ospringe hold a certain tenement of Hamo de Gattun and Hamo
ipse Hamo de rege in capite et subtraxerunt se de scotto et lotto que facere consuerunt ad borgham de Sahameleford ad damnum patrie per annum xijd et quod abbas Sancti Augustini subtraxit se eodem modo de predicta borgha ad damnum per annum xijd per x annos elapsos et quod tenentes Templariorum subtraxerunt se eodem modo de scotto et lotto ad borgham de Esture que facere consuerunt ad grave damnum ipsius borghae per xxx annos nesciunt quo waranto.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Sparewe cepit bedellariam prioris cepit iijd de Willelmo Pyner pro assisa relaxanda et dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes tradidit leustum de Scrawinghamhope Yvoni de Meredenn qui posuit Nicholaum le Brett et Robertum att Estynghele pleggia de prisoque super breve domini regis qui numquam pleggia fuerunt pro qua causa amerciati fuerunt in dimidia marca. Item idem Henricus vicecomes tradidit predictum leustum Thome de Faveresham et idem Thomas habuit secum quendam servientem nomine Johannem de Rameshelde qui cepit carectam Stephani de Hemstede iniuste in via regia et eum retinuit quoque dedit ei iijd et eodem modo fecit de multis aliis. Item dicunt quod Ricardus de la Berne constabularius castri Cant’ cepit equum Baldewini de la Denne et ipsum detinuit quousque dedit ei iiijd. Item Jacobus de la Denne constabularius eiusdem castri inprisonavit Nicholaum Mannyng donec habuit ab eo iijd et quod Johnnes de Wattun quondam vicecomes primo levavit turnum vicecomitis in comitatu Kancie unde villati de Chileham dat per annum ad eundem turnum 1 marcam et quod Henricus Malemyens vicecomes injuste occasionavit totum hundredum de Chileham eo quod non responeret ad diversos articulos quod facere non debuerunt neque consueverunt unde amerciavit eos ad xxs et solverunt. Item idem Henricus vicecomes cepit de predictis tenentibus de Chileham pro inspectione rotulorum suorum hundredi tempore Itineris Magistri Rogeri de Seytun 1 marcam de convencione et statim post Iter predictum finitet cepit ab eisdem pro eodem alteram marcam. Item idem Henricus vicecomes cepit de predictis tenentibus pro respectu habendo de summonitione scaccarii in quo amerciati fuerunt usque redderet compostum suum iij marcas et cum eas recepisse statim levavit ab eisdem summonitionem domini regis contra convencione et iniuste. Item Willelmus de Eure vicecomes et [Willelmus- sic] himself of the king in chief and they have withdrawn themselves from scot and lot which they used to make to the tithing of Shalmsford Street [Chartham par.] with a loss of 12d. each year to the country and that the abbot of St Augustine’s has withdrawn himself in the same way from the aforesaid tithing for 10 years with loss of 12d. each year and that the Templars’ tenants have withdrawn themselves in the same way for 30 years from the scot and lot which they were accustomed to make to the tithing of Eastry with severe loss to that tithing, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John Sparrow took the office as the prior’s beadle. He took 4d. from William Pyner for remittance of the assize and they say that Henry Malemains the sheriff, handed the lathe of Scray to Ivo of Mardon who placed Nicholas le Brett and Robert att Estynghele as sureties of the prison upon the lord king’s writ whereas there had never been sureties and for this reason they were amerced at half a mark. Then the same Henry the sheriff handed over the aforesaid lathe to Thomas of Faversham and the same Thomas had a certain serjeant called John of Rameshelde with him who unjustly took Stephen de Hemstede’s cart on the highway and kept it until he gave him 4d. and he acted in the same way towards many others. Then they say that Richard de la Berne, the constable of Canterbury castle, took Baldwin de la Denne’s horse and kept it until he had given him 4d. Then James de la Denne, constable of the same castle, imprisoned Nicholas Mannyng until he had 12d. from him and that John de Wattun, formerly the sheriff first levied the sheriff’s tourn in Kent county, for which the townsfolk of Chilham give 1 mark each year at the same tourn and that Henry Malemayns, the sheriff, unjustly prosecuted the whole hundred of Chilham because they did not respond to various articles, because they were not obliged nor accustomed to do so, thence he amerced them at 20s. and they paid. Then the same Henry the sheriff took 1 mark as a fine from the aforesaid tenants of Chilham for making an inspection of the rolls of their hundred, at the time of Master Roger de Seytun’s eyre and immediately after the aforesaid eyre was finished he took another mark from them for the same purpose. Then the same Henry the sheriff took 2 marks from the aforesaid tenants for having respite from summons of the Exchequer in which they had been amerced until they paid his account and when he had received these he immediately levied a summons of the lord king upon
Henricus de Ledes subvicecomes occasionaverunt injuste villatos de Chilham ad turnum suum tempore regis nunc et ceperunt ab eis Ls. Item idem Willelmus falsa suggestione Petri le Vache attachiavit Robertum Elselm et Radulfum fratrem eius pro quodam contentacione que rexit inter eos et ipsos inprisonavit in castro Cant’ quoque fecerunt finem xLs pro redemptione et idem Willelmus vicecomes adhuc cepit de predicto Roberto pro eodem xxs et alia damnpa habuit et sustinuerunt predicta occasione ad valorem xxs.

Item idem Willelmus vicecomes inprisonavit Robertum le Ber pro quodam contencione que rexit inter ipsum et Petrum le Wasch et eundem Robertum in prisia detinuit quoque habuit ab eo xxs. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes cepit de borgha de Burlonde eo quod non habuerunt Robertum Elselm et Radulfum fratrem eius cum insufficentia ad hoc per predictum vicomitem essent premunita Xs. injuste. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes occasionavit Robertum de Stalar et inposuit ei quod interfuit cuidam Ludovinus Anseris et ipsum distrinxit et ipsum distrinxit quoque fecerat finem de pare iiii duodenii precii iiii quos solvit et de Ricardo Johanne et Rogero de Businge eadem occasione cepit ix auceres precii iiii et de Gileberto Attebrok’ cepit iiii auceres precii ixd et de Willelmo Bot iiii aucas pro eadem occasione precii ixd et de Ada Pistore Hugone Pistore et Johanne fratre suo iiii auceres precii vjd. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes occasionavit Robertum Heseday et inposuit ei quod asportavit quamdam civeram de domo Petri le Wosche injuste qui hoc non fecit qua occasione cepit ab eo Xs. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes inprisonavit Johannem Messeaday iponendo ei quod fregit grangia Galfridi le Bedel qua occasione cepit ab eo Vs. Item idem Willelmus vicecomes distrinxit Guidonem de Solinghelde iponendo ei quod recettavit Ricardum de la Dane utlagatum quod nesciebatur quoque idem Guido dederat ei xLs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de la Garstun et Willelmus de Stupesdon ballivi comitis Glovernie inposuerunt hominibus hundredi de Felborough’ quoq occasione ceperunt de hundredo predicto xxxta marcas injuste quare hoc fecerunt precepto Johannis de la Haye constabularii tunc Dovorie per dominum regis.

them, contrary to the agreement and unjustly. Then William de Eure the sheriff and Henry (William – sic) of Leeds, under-sheriff unjustly prosecuted the townsfolk of Chilham at their turn, in the present king’s time and took 50s. from them. Then the same William by false information of Peter le Vache, arrested Robert Elselm and Ralph his brother because there had been a certain dispute between them and he imprisoned them in Canterbury castle until they paid 40s. fine for their release and the same William, the sheriff, in addition took 20s. from the aforesaid Robert for the same reason and he had other losses and by this prosecution they benefited to the value of 20s. Then the same William the sheriff, imprisoned Robert le Ber because there had been a certain dispute between him and Peter le Wasch and he detained the same Robert in prison until he had 20s. from him. Then the same William the sheriff, took 10s. unjustly from Buckland tithing because they did not hold Robert Elselm and Ralph his brother and insufficient warnings about them were given to the sheriff. Then the same William the sheriff prosecuted Robert de Stalar and accused him that Ludovinus Anseris should compensate a certain person for his goose and he made distraint upon him until he had paid a fine equal to 4 dozen geese, price 4s. which he paid and he took 9 geese price 4s. from Richard, John and Roger de Businge on the same charge and he took 3 geese, price 9d. from Gilbert Atbrook and 3 geese, price 9d. and 3 geese, price 9d. from William Bot for the same charge and 9 geese, price 6d. from Adam the baker, Hugh (sic – Hubert) the baker and John his brother. Then the same William the sheriff, unjustly prosecuted Robert Heseday and accused him of unjustly taking away a certain wheelbarrow from the house of Peter le Wasche, which he had not done and he took 10s. from him for this charge. Then the same William the sheriff, imprisoned John Messeaday accusing him of damaging Geoffrey the beadle’s barn, for which charge he took 5s. from him. Then the same William the sheriff, made distraint upon Guy de Solinghelde accusing him of sheltering Richard de la Dane, an outlaw he did not know, until the same Guy had given him 40s. Then they say that William de la Garstun and William de Stupesdon, the earl of Gloucester’s bailiffs, accused the men of Felborough hundred that they ought to have besieged Tonbridge castle, for which charge they took 30 marks from the aforesaid hundred, unjustly because they acted thus at the command of John de la Haye then constable of Dover castle,
Item dicunt quod Hugo Peyferer et Henricus Malemeins collectores vicesimé ceperunt de predicto hundredo per pondus ultra certum numerum Lxs. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ [obiit] vendit wardas et maritagia de his qui tenent de eo in gavylkende injuste. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Crioll coronator cepit pro officio suo exercendo ad opus clerici sui ijs. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford esceator domini regis seisivit archiepiscopatun Kanc’ post mortem Bonefacii archiepiscopi a festo Sancte Margarete Virginis anno regni regis Henrici Liiij et illum tenuit in manu domini regis usque ad festum Sancte Lucie Virginis anno regni regis Edwardi primo sed nesciunt cui inde respondit neque valorem.

Item dicunt quod domina Isabella de Chileham que tenet de domino rege in capite maritavit cum domino Alexandro de Balliolo sine licencia domini regis.

**Hundredum de Bircholte de Baronia**

Dicunt jurati quod dominus rex habet in manu sua hundredum de Middeltun cum Merdenn et quod maneria de Monketon Westhalimot et Minstre in antiquo fuerunt regum Anglie et nunc abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ tenet maneria de Menstre et dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ tenet Westhalimot et prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ tenent maneria de Monketon sed quo warento nesciunt et quod rex Henricus habuit maneria de Elham et Ospring et modo domina regina mater domini regis nunc tenet maneria de Ospring et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet maneria de Elham quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod rex Johannes habuit maneria de Braburn per escaetam et modo dominus Willelmus de Valence tenet illum maneriun quo warento nesciunt et valet per annum Lx libras et aliorum predictorum maneriaum valorem nesciunt. Item maneria de Wy fuit in antiquo cuiusdam regis Anglie et modo abbas de Bello tenet illum maneriaum quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Valence tenet hundredum de Braburn quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ [obiit] et abbas de Bello habent returnum et extractum brevium et habent placita de namio vetito wrecicum maris et alias through the lord king.

Then they say that Fulk Peyferer and Henry Malemeins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 60s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury (he is dead) unjustly sells wardships and marriages from these tenants who hold from him in gavelkind. Then they say that William de Crioll the coroner took 2s. for the use of his clerk to perform the duties of his office. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, took possession of the archbishopric of Canterbury after Archbishop Boniface’s death and held it in the lord king’s hand from the feast of St Margaret the Virgin in the 54th year of King Henry’s reign until the feast of St Lucy the Virgin in the first year of King Edward’s reign [20\(^{h}\) July 1270 - 13 December 1272] but they do not know to whom it then answered nor what is its value.

Then they say that the Lady Isabel of Chilham who holds of the king in chief has married the lord Alexander de Baillol without the lord king’s licence.

**Hundred of Bircholt with the Barony**

The jury say that the lord king holds in his hand the hundred of Middleton with Marden and that in ancient times the manors of Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster were of the kings of England and now the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds the manor of Minster and the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds Westhalimot and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Canterbury hold Monkton manor but by what warrant they do not know and that King Henry has the manors of Elham and Ospringe and now the lady queen, the present king’s mother holds Ospringe manor and Sir William de Leyburn holds Elham manor, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that King John held Brabourne manor through escheat and now the lord William de Valence holds that manor by what warrant they do not know and it is worth £60 each year and they do not know the value of the other aforesaid manors. Then Wye manor was of a certain king of England in ancient times and now the abbot of Battle holds that manor, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the lord William de Valence holds Brabourne [Bircholt Barony] hundred, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury (he is dead) and the abbot of Battle have the return and extract of writs and they have pleas of wrongful
Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor cepit in manu domini regis archiepiscopatus Cant’ post mortem Bonefacii archiepiscopi et tenuit in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidiam. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochell duxit lanas ad partes transmarinas apud Hethe sed quod saccos nec per quem nec per cuius advocacionem omnino ignorant.

Hundredum de Tenham

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Ospring est de dominico domini regis et nunc est in manu domine regine et hundredum de Midelton est de dominico regis et nunc est in manu domini Johannis de Burg’ qui illud tenet ad terminum vite sue. Item dicunt quod tenentes cuiusdam terre que vocatur Gerundislande in parochia de Lodenham solebant sequi hundredum domini regis apud Eyhorne et modo preoccupati sunt ad hundredum abbatis de Faveresham apud Faveresham fere per xxx annos ad damnun regis nesciunt quantum nec quo warento. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum extractum brevium et placita namio vetito wreccum maris assisam panis et cervisie et furcas de antiquo et quod idem archiepiscopus Cant’ iniuste caput wardas de terris gavilikind contra communem justiciam.

Tenham Hundred

The jury say that Ospringe manor is of the lord king’s demesne and now is in the lady queen’s hands and the hundred of Middleton is of the king’s demesne and now is in John de Burg’s hand who holds it for his life time. Then they say that the tenants of a certain land called Gerundisland in Luddenham parish used to do suit at the lord king’s hundred at Eyhorne and now they have been taken into the abbot of Faversham’s hundred at Faversham for almost 30 years, they do not know what is the loss to the king nor by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the assize of bread and ale and the gallows from ancient times and that the same archbishop of Canterbury unjustly takes wardships from lands in gavelkind contrary to common justice. Then they say that John de Wyneston, formerly beadle of Teynham, took 6d. from Henry the smith at the time of the vacancy of the archbishopric, for removing him from the assize. And that Robert de Serring formerly beadle of Canterbury court, took 6d. from Simon of Dodington for the same reason and 6d. from Henry de Edmelistun that he might be removed from the assize and 6d. from Philip of Buckland for the same. Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulco Peyfufer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took £38 for the twentieth and 22s. by weight more than the assessed amount and that Henry Lowelle, archbishop Boniface’s steward, took half a mark from William de la Dane for Exchequer summons and has not acquitted him because the same William has paid
Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator at the time of the vacancy of the archbishopric caused 10 marks to be levied from the archbishop’s wood at Hockinfaud and there took 200 trees, price 13s. and had them taken to London and that the same Richard took £10 from the tenants of Teynham hundred, unjustly in the name of tallage at his first coming. Then that the same Richard took 6 marks from the same men for carriage of wood and this was unjust because at no time had they been accustomed to carrying service. Then the same Richard took 100s. unjustly from the same tenants for concealing a certain land liable for heriot. Then Richard took 10 marks from John de Hockinfauld because he afterwards levied 100s. from the wood without his instruction. Then they say that John de Wynston bought the right of holding the office of beadle of Teynham for 1 mark from the aforesaid escheator. Then they say that William de Stopisdon took 100s. for the earl of Gloucester’s use from the tenants of Teynham, because they came to Tunbridge at the command of John de la Haye, then constable of Dover.
**m.5 Hundredum de Langebrigge adhuc in comitatu Kancie in lasto de Strawinghope**

Dicunt jurati quod hundreda de Middeltun et Meredenn sunt dominica domini regis et nunc ea tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo per dominum regem et quod maneria de Moneketon Westhalimot et Menstre in antiquo fuerunt regum Anglie et nunc dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ tenet Westhalimot et abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ tenent Moneketun nesciunt quo warento et quod rex Henricus habuit maneria Elham et Ospring et nunc regina mater regis tenet Ospring et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet Elham quo warento nesciunt et quod maneria de Wye in antiquo fuit regum Anglie et nunc abbas de Bello illud tenet quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod maneria de Essedeford tenetur de rege in capite pro duobus feodis militis et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn est tenens quo warento nesciunt et debet ad castrum Doverie de warda xxs per annum et dicunt quod hundredum de Langebrygg’ cum lesto ponitur ad firmam et valet per annum xLs. Item dicunt quod predictum hundredum de Langebrygg est in manu domini regis preter libertatem abbatis de Bello et prioris Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod abbas de Bello tenentes suos in borgha de Kyngeswod de secta hundredi substraxit et sibi appropriavit ad dampnum domini regis per annum dimidiam marcam et hoc a tempore anno regni regis Henrici Lvj quo warento nesciunt et quod tenentes prioris Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ de Merseham faciunt ad hundredum sed non presentant causa libertatis quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ habent returnum extractum brevium et placitum de namio vetito et habent alias libertates regis ut assisam panis et cervisie quo warento nesciunt et quod abbas de Bello habet assisam panis et cervisie et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn habet assisam panis et cervisie apud Essedesford et mercatandiam et nudinaria quo warento nesciunt.

**m.5 Chart and Longbridge Hundred still in the county of Kent in the lathe of Scray**

The jury say that the hundreds of Middleton and Marden are of the lord king’s demesne and now Sir John de Tithing holds them of the lord king and that Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster manors in ancient times were of the kings of England and now the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds Westhalimot and the abbot of St Augustine’s holds Minster manor and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Canterbury hold Monkton, they do not know by what warrant and that King Henry held Elham and Ospringe manors and now the queen, the present king’s mother holds Ospringe and Sir William de Leyburn holds Elham, by what warrant they do not know and that Wye manor in ancient times was of the kings of England and now the abbot of Battle holds that, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the manor of Essedesford [Ashford] is held of the king in chief for two knights’ fees and Sir William de Leyburn now holds it, by what warrant they do not know and he owes 20s. each year for castleguard at Dover castle and they say that Longbridge hundred with the lathe is placed at farm and is worth 40s. each year. Then they say that the aforesaid hundred of Longbridge is in the lord king’s hands apart from the liberty of the abbot of Battle and of the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the abbot of Battle has withdrawn his tenants in Kingswood [Wye par.] tithing from suit to the hundred and appropriated it for himself with loss of half a mark each year to the king and this from the 56th year of King Henry’s reign, by what warrant they do not know and that the tenants of the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury in Mersham perform suit at the hundred but because of the liberty they have not presented themselves, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Canterbury have return (and) extract of writs and they have pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and they have other liberties of the king as the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they do not know and that the abbot of Battle has the assize of bread and ale and Sir William de Leyburn has the assize of bread and ale at Ashford and market and fair tolls, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the prior and convent of Holy
Trinity Canterbury have appropriated for themselves the free chaces and warrens at Mersham and the Countess of Hampshire who holds Ashford manor has appropriated free chaces and warrens in the same way and because of the warren of waters, the aforesaid Countess’s serving men have seized Walter le Heare and William ate Ware and imprisoned them until they paid half a mark as fine and they used Matthew Brun and John Puppere in the same way, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Master Hamo Doge has appropriated warren in Kennington for himself without warrant and that the abbot of Battle has warren and has gone beyond the metes and bounds of his warren at Kennington other than he ought, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that in the second year of the present king [Edward I, November 1273-1274] the rector of Kennington church made an encroachment upon the king’s demesne by entering a certain part of the common land in Kennington, with loss of 1d. each year to the lord king. Then they say that Thomas, the said beadle of Longbridge hundred, took 12d. from Richard Puttak to remove him from the assize and 6d. from Henry de Frome for a customary payment. Then they say that Ivo of Marden, formerly the bailiff of Longbridge charged Elias the tailor of Essedesford that he had immersed a certain youth in his well and he was not guilty and thus he took 1 mark from him. The same Ivo charged Roger Strudard de Essedesford that he received stolen goods and he took 3s. 4d. from him unjustly. The same Ivo charged William Brichin of Kennington that he had sheltered his son, an outlaw and Ivo took 1 mark from him unjustly. Then the same Ivo took 7s. from the same William accusing him that he had been the surety of Gerard de Helbing for good behaviour. Then the same Ivo charged the said Gerard de Helbing accusing him of robbery and unjustly took 14s. from him. The same Ivo charged Richard de Hengselle, Ralph Wolf and John de Rosingbrok and accused them of rape and took 30s. from them unjustly. The same Ivo charged Edilda de Rosingbrok and William Capernet of holding an inquest of the hundred about their good characters and took 20s. from them unjustly. The same Ivo took 3s. from Henry Attenesse unjustly accusing him of imprisoning a certain man. The same Ivo charged William son of Henry de Atelesworthe, accusing him that he had committed murder and he took 9s. from him. The same Ivo charged Ralph Attehale accusing him of receiving stolen goods and he took 20s. from him unjustly.
Then they say that Osbert of Leeds, the bailiff of Longbridge, prosecuted Thomas de Letherst accusing him of finding money in the roof of his house and he took 20s. from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged Richard the smith and the under-bailiff accusing them of committing theft and he took 10s. from them unjustly. The same Osbert charged Richard de Hengselle accusing him that he insulted Thomas the tailor in a way to disturb the peace and he took 1 mark from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged John the son of Roger de Wesile accusing him of stealing hens and he took 5s. from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged Alan de Bosco accusing him that he had been unwilling to arrest a certain felon when he was able to do so and he unjustly took 2s. from him. The same Osbert charged John le Hore accusing him of sheltering a certain outlaw and he took 2s. from him unjustly. The same Osbert charged Mabel of Bromley accusing her of sheltering a certain felon and he took 4s. from her unjustly. Then Robert de Bech took 1 mark from Robert of Kingswood unjustly, accusing him of being in debt to the Jews and he was not. Then Robert in the same way unjustly took 1 mark from William Poynot. Then they say that Stephen of Thanet and Thomas de Bere took eight oxen and 4 mares and 1 colt which were on Robert de Kingswood’s pasture and which were the draught animals of the lord Richard de Hores, with a loss of £8 6s. 8d. to the said Richard because he has not recovered the draught animals. Then they say that the collectors of the lord king’s tax of one-twentieth [took] 20s. more than the assessed amount of money in this hundred and that Guy of Norton, formerly a bailiff of Longbridge took half a mark from Stephen Pund whom he has not acquitted at the Exchequer. Then the same Guy took half a mark from Daniel Sprot in the same way. Then they say that Benedict of Cilworton, formerly a bailiff of the same hundred, took 10s. from Geoffrey and John Pynot whom he has not acquitted and this was during King Henry’s time. Then they say that Ivo of Marden, bailiff of Longbridge hundred, unjustly imprisoned a certain Alan le Pak, but they do not know in what way nor how he delivered him.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took possession of all the manors of the archbishopric of Canterbury after Archbishop Boniface’s death and held them in the lord king’s hands for 2½ years. Then they say that M. de Essedeford who held of the king in chief married Roger de Rolling without the lord king’s
regis. Item dicunt quod quidem Johannes de Bovintun
de parochia de Godwynestun seysivit manerium de
Meresham post mortem Bonefacii archiepiscopi Cant’
et illud tenuit pro octo dies et cept de tenentibus de
Meresham pro recognitione iiij. Item dicunt quod
Willelmus de Brochulle duxit lanam ad partes
transmarinas sed quot saecos nec quo nec per quos
portus nesciunt.

Hundredun de Kaleshulle

Dicunt jurati quod Middeltun et hundredum de
Merdenn sunt de dominico domini regis et nunc ea
habent dominus Johannes de Burg’ ad terminum vite
sue per dominum regem et quod manerium de
Ospring solebat esse in manu regum predecessorum
regis quod quidam manerium est nunc in manu
domine regine matris regis nunc quo warento nesciunt.
Item dicunt quod hundredum de Kalehull est pertinens
ad eclesiam Christi Cant sed est ibi quedam borgha
infra dictum hundredum que est de baronia unde
quedam pars tenetur de abbate Sancti Augustini et
quedam de domino de Chilham quedam de domini
Eudone de Sillingheld et quedam de abbate de Bello
et ministri archiepiscopi non permittunt ballivos
domi regis ministrare in baronia domini regis et
archiepiscopus appropriavit sibi quo warento nesciunt.
Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus capite
summonitionem scaccarii et catalla felonum ubi
ballivi domini regis capere deberent sic
Westkyngeswod, Gorsparruk, Marden in Smarden,
Roting, Wysparrok, Estkyngeswod, Snoddenn,
Everyngekere in hundredo de Kalehulle nesciunt quo
warento.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum
brevium et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet
furas et assisam panis et cervisie et alia huius que ad
coronam pertinent nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt
quod ballivi archiepiscopi Cant’ et prioris ecclesie
Christi Cant nec servent nec sustinent assisam panis et
cervisie sed capiunt denarios pro assisis factis et
judicium non faciunt ad dampnum patrie xLs per
annum et hoc xxii annis elapsis. Item dicunt quod
archiepiscopus habet liberas chacias et warrenam quo
warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod dominus
Willelmus de Hevre tunc temporis vicecomes et
Henricus de Ledes subvicecomes inprisonaverunt
Radulfum de Pynynton pro diffamacione mortis
Thome de Rotyng unde dictus Radulfus perquisivit
licence. Then they say that a certain John de Bovintun
of Goodnestone parish took possession of Mersham
manor after the death of Boniface Archbishop of
Canterbury and held that for eight days and he took 4s.
from the tenants of Mersham for acknowledgment of
lordship. Then they say that William de Brochulle sent
wool to places overseas but they do not know how
many sacks, nor to whom, nor through which ports.

Calehill Hundred

The jury say that Middleton and the hundred of
Marden are of the lord king’s demesne and now Sir
John de Burgh holds them for the term of his life of the
lord king and that Ospringe manor used to be in the
hand of kings, the predecessors of the king, which
manor is now in the hand of the lady queen the present
king’s mother, by what warrant they do not know.
Then they say that Calehill hundred pertains to
Christchurch Canterbury but there is a certain tithing
within the said hundred which is of the barony, thence
a part is held of the abbot of St Augustine’s and a part
of the lord of Chilham, a part of Sir Eudo de
Sillingheld and a part of the abbot of Battle and the
archbishop’s ministers do not permit the lord king’s
bailiffs to officiate in the lord king’s barony and the
archbishop has appropriated this for himself, they do
not know by what warrant. Then they say that the
archbishop takes the summons of the Exchequer and
the chatalls of felons where the lord king’s bailiffs
ought to take these, thus in West Kingswood,
Gorsparruk, Marden in Smarden, Roting, Wysparrok,
estkyngeswod, Snoddenn, Evering Acre [Pluckley par.]
in Calehill hundred, they do not
know by what warrant.
Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has
return of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint
upon goods and he has the gallows and the assize of
bread and ale and other pleas of this nature which
pertain to the crown, they do not know by what
warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of
Canterbury’s bailiffs and those of the prior of
Christchurch Canterbury neither observe nor hold the
assize of bread and ale but keep the money for taking
the assizes and justice is not done, with loss of 40s.
each year to the country and this since 20 years have
passed. Then they say that the archbishop has free
chaces and warren, they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that Sir William of Hever, when he was
sheriff, and Henry de Leeds, the sub-sheriff,
Item dicit quod Henricus filius Burge Attewater aresttatus fuit de fractione domus Wydonis Herebad et quod filiam eiusdem Wydonis depredasse debuit in eadem domo unde dominus Willelmus de Hevre tunc vicecomes noluit pati ut aliquis ipsam attachatus infra libertatem nec extra sed ipsum duxit a patria quo placuit. Item Willelmus Hogheman et Johannis Moys interecerunt duos homines et Henricus Malemeyns dum vicecomes sustinuit ipsos Willelmmum et Johannem et ubi sunt nunc nesciunt. Item dicit quod Robertus le Hunte sumonitor archiepiscopi Cant' cepit de Elya Atter Wyldered pro removenda assisa viijd. et de Thoma de Hylgardenn pro eodem xijd et de Waltero Attebure vjd pro eodem et de Roberto de Stonford vjd pro eodem et de Ada Nyweman vjd pro eodem et de Wulford ate Heghelond iiiijd pro eodem. Item dicit quod Willelmus de Stupesdon Hamo de la Forstall et Johannes Heringod ceperunt de Waltero de Eversle per Comitem Glovernie ut dicebatur xvj marcas in denariis et mobilibus quod idem Walterus fuit apud Tunebrigg per Johannem de la Haye. Item dicit quod Robertus le Hunte recepit in hoc anno libertatem archiepiscopatus Cant' quam habet in vij hundredis ad firmam per xLs ubi numquam ad firmam tradi solebat ad damnum patrie per predictos xLs et amplius. Item dicit quod Johannes Baldefert ballivus de Cerryng per escaetorem vacante sede archiepiscopatus Cant' cepit de Waltero Chastelun iiijs per quandam purpresuram emendam quam idem Walterus fecerat. Item dicit quod idem Johannes Baldefert distrinxit Johannis de Eversle ut esset borgesaldre sine electione borghe sue et sic cepit ab eodem Johanne 1 marcam. Idem Johannes Baldefert eligere fecit plures de tenentibus de Cerryng ut essent prepositi et huius occasione cepit de Willemo Attedunt xvs. et de Johanne de Wyneston xxijis pro imprisoned Ralf de Pynynton accusing him of Thomas de Rotyng’s death, thence the said Ralph sought to obtain the lord king’s writ de odio et atria and by an inquisition taken and returned to the lord king’s court the same Ralph had another writ which delivered him at the next coming of the eyre justices, but they were unwilling to deliver him at the king’s order until he had given the same sheriff's 2½ marks while in prison, before he was released and in addition to this the said Henry the sheriff took the said Ralph’s plough without permission while he was in prison and then used it to plough for 15 days, thence the condition of the aforesaid draught animals deteriorated causing a loss of 30s. and more.

Then they say that Henry, son of Burge Atwater, was arrested for breaking Guy Herebad’s house and that the same Guy’s daughter ought to have been seized in the same house, thence Sir William of Hever, then the sheriff, was unwilling to allow anyone to arrest her within the liberty or without, but took her before a jury which let her go. Then William Hogheman and John Moys killed two men and Henry Malemeyns while he was sheriff supported William and John and they do not know where these men are now. Then they say that Robert le Hunte, the archbishop of Canterbury’s summoner, took 8d. from Elias Atter Wyldered for removing him from the assise, 12d. from Thomas de Hylgardenn for the same reason, 6d. from Walter Attebure for the same reason, 6d. from Robert de Stonford for the same reason, 6d. from Adam Newman for the same reason and 4d. from Wulford ate Heghelond for the same reason. Then they say that William de Stupesdon, Hamo de la Forstall and John Heringod took 16 marks in money and goods from Walter de Eversle through the earl of Gloucester, as he said, because the same Walter had been at Tonbridge by John de la Haye’s order. Then they say that in this year Robert le Hunte received the liberty of the archbishop of Canterbury, which he has in the 7 hundreds at farm for 40s. whereas this liberty never used to be demised at farm, with loss to the country of the aforesaid 40s. and more. Then they say that when the see of Canterbury archbishopric was vacant, John Baldefert, the bailiff of Charing, took 4s. from Walter Chastelun through the escheator as a fine for a certain encroachment which the same Walter had made. Then they say that the same John Baldefert made distraint upon John de Eversle as he had been a headborough without election of his tithing and thus he took 1 mark from the same John. The same John Baldefert made an
election of many of the tenants of Charing in order that they might be reeves and on this occasion he took 15s. from William Attedunt, 22s. from John de Wyneston for the same reason and one cow price 6s. from Henry de Derheye for the same reason. The same John Baldefert accused Gilbert de Stapelyg who was a law-abiding man that he had stolen 5 sheaves of oats in Sir William de Jusne’s field and because of this he arrested him until he paid 10s. fine. The same John summoned 12 men to make a certain extent and because all of them did not come, he took 12d. from each of them, both from those present as well as from those absent.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemeins and the lord Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 40s. by weight more than the assessed amount from the said hundred.

Then they say that while the archbishopric of Canterbury was vacant, certain of the officials of Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, came to the manor of the prior and convent of Christchurch Canterbury at Westwell and they struck Sir John of Battle, a monk and the custodian of the same manor, and they insulted and injured the same monk and many of the said prior’s officials, because they wished the entry of the park to be delivered to them and aforewards they broke the same park gates and captured and carried away 16 deer contrary to the wishes of the said prior and convent. The same Richard de Clifford took wood from Charing manor causing waste of £10. The same Richard took 100s. which he was unwilling to allow for in his account, from William de Edesle, the reeve of Charing.

The same Richard took 10 marks from the tenants of Charing at his first coming and Master Hugh de Thornham, Richard’s clerk, 1 mark against the tenants’ will and the same Master Hugh imprisoned the reeve of Charing, William de Edesle, in the stocks by one leg until he had paid 100s. fine. And he gave him one cow and one heifer price 1 mark and the same Master Hugh made William undertake that he would relate nothing of this for the next two years following. Then the aforesaid Master Richard took 100s. from the tenants of Charing because they did not wish to receive the land of the same manor which had been surveyed at his wish and the aforesaid tenants are not able to integrate the same land in the way in which it had been surveyed. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took possession of the manor of Charing and held that for two years and 13 weeks and the manor is
Hundred de Cherst

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum hoc valet ixs Xd. ab antiquo et turnum vicecomitis est vjs de novo levatum in tempore Johannis de Wattun et quod archiepiscopus Cant’ recipit medietatem hundredi et abbas de Bello decimam partem subtraxit post ultimum Iter justiciarorum. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum et placita de namio et quod dominus de Essedeford habet warennam nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum et placita de namio et quod domini regis et quod dominus de Bello habent libertates predecessorum domini regis et quod dominus de Ashford habet warrenam nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Osbertus de Ledes cepit vjd de Thoma de Northbrok ut removeretur a quadam assisa et quod Thomas de Laveye cepit iij marcas de quodam amerciamento coram justiciariis ubi debuit cepisse xLs. et de alio warento cepisse 1 marcam. Idem cepit iijs de baronia hundredi et imposuit eis quod fuerunt summoniti ad turnum et non fuerunt. Item dicunt quod Thomas Scissor de Cherst fuit attachatus in hundredo de Wy pro uno equo et aquietatus fuit per dictum hundredum et cum esset eundo versus domum venit Willelmu de Burne clericus prioris Cant’ et cepit ipsum Thomam et misit ad primum prioris Christi Cant’ et Willelmu de Haute et Willelmu le Cam’ [ ] prerexerunt propter ipsum et sine judicio deliberatus fuit et dedit dicto Willelmo de Haute xLs et unam acram prati precii xxs.

Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeyns collectores vicesime ceperunt xjs iiijd pro

Hundred of Chart

The jury say that the hundred is worth 9s. 10d. from ancient times and the sheriff’s tourn is 6s., newly levied in John de Wattun’s time and that the archbishop of Canterbury receives a moiety of the hundred and the abbot of Battle has withdrawn a tenth part after the last eyre of the justices. Then they say that the archbishop has return (of writs) and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, from what time they do not know and the abbot of Battle has the liberties of the lord king’s predecessors and that the lord of Ashford has warren, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that a certain felon who was in the prison of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury at Chart escaped with William le Meystere’s assistance; the tenants of the said court were afterwards distrained by John de Aliburge until they paid 100s. Then they say that while the archbishopric was vacant, a certain minister of the coroner came and wanted to have an aid from the prior’s tenants and the prior made presentation at the lord king’s court and procured a writ that the tenants might be left in peace and meanwhile they collected 40s. and the prior ordered this to be returned to the tenants. Then Sir John of Battle, monk of Christchurch Canterbury, forcibly took the said 40s. and kept it. Then they say that Osbert of Leeds took 6d. from Thomas of Northbrook that he might be withdrawn from a certain assize and that Thomas de Laveye, sheriff of Kent, took 6 marks from a half part of the hundred for a certain amercement made before the justices, whereas he ought to have taken 40s. and at another eyre he took 2 marks when he ought to have taken 1 mark. Then he took 4s. from the barony of the hundred and accused the men that they had been summoned to a tourn and they had not been. Then they say that Thomas Scissor of Chart was arrested in Wye hundred for [the theft of] one horse and he was acquitted by the said hundred. When he was returning home William de Burne, one of the prior of Canterbury’s clerks, came and seized Thomas and sent him to the prison of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and William de Haute and William le Cam’ [ ] came and pleaded on his behalf and he was released without a trial and he gave William de Haute 40s. and one acre of meadow, price 20s. Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeyns the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth,
pondere ultra certum numerum.

Item dicunt quod quidam felo captus fuit et et ductus ad castrum Cant’ et habuit judicium suum et postea Philippus de Delham ballivus vicecomitis cepit de X hominibus predicti hundredi xxxiijs iiiijd et de Thoma de Northbrok xijd inponendo eis iniuste quod perererunt domum sine licencia et de borghi dicta feloni inponendo eis quod scierunt latrocinium suum quod fuit falsum. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Laveye cepit iij libras pro quodam amerciamento coram justiciarisi et non debuit cepisse plus quam xLs et de Thoma de Northbrok xijd inponendo eis quod perexerunt domum sine licencia et de borghi dicta feloni inponendo eis quod scierunt latrocinium suum quod fuit falsum. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Laveye cepit £4 for a certain amercement before the justices and he ought not to have taken more than 40s. and Guy of Norton his minister took 12s. from John de Rapetun and Fulke Bulard who were the sureties of Robert Yrlonde, who had fully acquitted them and 40s. from Moses de Hellewode accusing him of changing a footway; the whole hundred acquitted him of this. The same man took half a mark from Thomas de Pote because he did not wish to entertain the same Guy with his four horses and his greyhounds and as a result of his hardship 20 men and more sold all that they possessed and went away. Then they say that Benedict of Ospringe who was a minister under Henry of Bourne, took 40s. unjustly from the whole tithing after it had been acquitted by a jury and Thomas Man of Canterbury took 20s. from the same tithing and accused the men of knowing about a theft made by a certain felon; the tithing had been acquitted of this before a jury. Then Thomas the beadle, the same Henry’s minister, took 40s. from Thomas the baker accusing him of being Ivo the beadle’s surety, thence the same Ivo paid in full. The same Thomas came to Fulke Bulard’s house and he took 2s. 6d. from him because he, Thomas, was unwilling to give him a drink. The same Thomas took 10s. unjustly from Moses de Hellewode for a certain road and 16d. from William de Herst and John de Rapetun because they were unwilling to give him at his wish [ and ] he took 2s. from Robert le Neyd for the same reason. Then a certain man was killed in Geoffrey de la Brok’s house and the said Thomas, who was not the coroner, summoned the two hundreds to hold an inquest and he took 40s. and more thus from this hundred and from Longbridge. Then they say that Humphrey de Luvedun, John his son, Robert le Nerd have paid [ and ] de Swyneford because they made one embankment badly, thence they wished to
m. 5 dorso Hundredum de Blakeburn

Dicunt jurati quod quidam Thomas filii Radulphi de Northmanvyle tenet quoddam manerium suum apud Kenardinton cum Cokryde de domino rege in capite pro uno feodo militis et debet ad wardam castri Dover’ per annum Xs. et sectam curiam de Radlevet et valet per annum xx libras et quod quidam Thomas filius Ricardi de Tunlonde tenet de domino rege in capite la Tunlonde pro dimidia feodi militis et debet per annum ad wardam dicti castri Vs. et sectam curie de Radlevet et valet per annum xxxiijs. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Blakeburn debet per annum ad firmam vicecomitis xvjd et valet per annum cum assisa panis et cervisie et aliis perquisites xLs. aliquando magis aliquando minus quod quidam hundredum est in manu regis unacum aliis vj hundredis et dimidia que quondam Willelmus de Kasingham habuit ad feodum firmam pro Cs et post dececssum dicti Willelmi Reginaldus de Cobbehem tunc vicecomes illa tradidit ad firmam pro X libris. Item post bellum de Evesham Rogerus de Leyburn habuit per dominum regem Henricus dicta hundreda pro Cs. et post mortem ipsius Rogeri Stephanus de Penesherst habuit per dictum dominum regem predicta vj hundreda et dimidiam et adhoc habet et illa tradidit ad firmam pro X libris sic responsis ad castrum Dovor’ que solebant pertinere ad vicecomitem. Item dicunt quod tenentes domini archiepiscopi Cant’ et prioris Christi Cant’ subtraxerunt se de eadem secta et de eodem turno sic iijd per annum per iijd annos elapos et de secta hundredi domini R. de Blakeburn quo warento nesciunt ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd et amplius. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus et abbass de Bello habent returnum et alias libertates quo warento nesciunt et quod archiepiscopus et sui ballivi vendunt wardas gavelikendorum de tenentibus suis injuste a quo tempore ignorant.

Item dicunt quod quidam Johannes de Herst cepit in eodem hundredo de Blakeburne pro recognicione removendi de pluribus iiii anno regni regis Henrici acquit them of this charge and he took 3s. from them unjustly.

m. 5 dorso Hundred of Blackborne

The jury say that a certain Thomas son of Ralph de Northmanvyle holds his manor at Kenardington with Cokryde of the lord king in chief for one knight’s fee and he owes guard at Dover castle at 10s. each year and suit of court at Radlevet which is worth £20 each year and that a certain Thomas son of Richard de Tunlonde holds Townland [Woodchurch par.], of the lord king in chief for half a knight’s fee and he owes guard at the said castle at 5s. each year and suit of court at Radlevet and it is worth 32s. each year. Then they say that Blackborne hundred owes 16d. each year for the sheriff’s farm and it is worth 40s. each year with the assize of bread and ale and other perquisites, sometimes more, sometimes less. This particular hundred is in the lord king’s hand together with the other 6½ half hundreds which formerly William de Kasingham held at fee farm for 100s. and after the said William’s decease, Reginald of Cobham, then the sheriff, demised those at farm for £10. Then after the battle of Evesham [1265] Roger de Leyburn held the said hundreds from the lord King Henry for 100s. and after that Roger’s death Stephen of Peneshurst held the the aforesaid 6½ hundreds from the said lord king and still holds these and he has demised those at farm for £10, thus paying them at Dover castle which used to pertain to the sheriff.

Then they say that the tenants of the lord archbishop of Canterbury and of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury have withdrawn themselves from the same suit and from the same tourn, thus 3d. each year for the last 4 years and from suit of the hundred of the lord R. of Blackborne, by what warrant they do not know, with loss of 12d. and more each year to the lord king. Then they say that the archbishop and the abbot of Battle have return (of writs) and other liberties, by what warrant they do not know and that the archbishop and his bailiffs unjustly sell wardships of gavelkind from his tenants, from what time they are ignorant. Then they say that a certain John de Herst in the 56th year of King Henry’s reign [October 1271-1272] took 4s. for recognition of the removal of the same hundred.
Lvij. Item dicunt quod lesti in comitatu tradidi sunt ad majorem firmam quam quondam tocius baronie. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Wy ballivus vij hundredorum ligare fecit quemdam Godefridum filium Cristine de Belerygge et Jordanum filium dicte Cristine donec dicti Godefridus et Cristina fecerunt eo finem C solidorum et solverunt xLs. Item idem Hugo et Laurencius de Savetuntewell venerunt in hundredum de Blakburn vi et inuiste et plures graviter distrinxerunt ad ducendam queandam domum de Chelmintun apud Bedlesmere cum karris et carectis contra voluntatem eorum. Idem Hugo distingere fecit per servientem suum quendam Johannem de Berburdun per dimidiam marcam de summonitione scaccarii ut dixit et de ipso cepit ijs ad relaxandam. Item dicunt quod in Itinere Nicholai de Turri hundredum de Blakeburn' amerciatum fuit in Xs unde Thomas de la Weye tunc viccomes distrixit baroniam eiusdem hundredi et cepit Vs. Item venit Thomas Sporun clerucis et per summonitionem scaccarii fecit distringere et cepit de baronia pro eodem Vs. Item venit Willelmus de Evere vicesime domini regis ceperunt ultra certum numerum denariorum in eodem hundredo pro pondere ij marcias.

Item dicunt quod tempore domini regis Henrici Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor et ministri sui ceperunt de curia de Aldintun pro inquisitione habenda inter Augustinum de Moresden et alias tenentes archiepiscopi iniuste xx marcias. Idem Ricardus ceperunt de tenentibus dictae curie ut dimitteret eos in pace de extenta manerii injuste X libras. Idem Ricardus cepit a dicta curia in primo adventu suo injuste xxvij libras.

Item dicunt quod Alfredus de Dene tune escaetor cept manerium de Kenardiston in manu domini regis xv annis elapsis unde dominus rex Henricus vendidit wardam et maritagium Galiene de Northmanvill incontinenti pro ccc marcias quas solvit. Item Laurencius de Sokenesse seisivit dimidiam feodi de Tunlone in manu domini regis X annis elapsis unde dominus rex incontinenti dedit wardam et maritagium Magistro Henrico de Lacy coco suo.

Hundredum de Badekele of Blackborne from many things. Then they say that the lathes in the county have been demised at a higher farm than they used to be, with great loss to the whole barony. Then they say that Hugh of Wye, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds, had a certain Godfrey son of Christine de Belerygge and Jordan the said Christine’s son tied up until the said Godfrey and Christine had made a fine of 100s. to him and they paid 40s. Then the same Hugh and Laurence de Savetuntewell came into Blackborne hundred by force and unjustly made severe distraint upon many people, thus coming to certain house of Chelmintun at Badlesmere with hand-barrows and carts against the inhabitants’ will. The same Hugh made distraint through a certain John de Berburdun, his serjeant, for half a mark for Exchequer summons, as he said, and he took 2s. from him to remit this. Then they say that in the eyre of Nicholas de Turri Blackborne hundred was amerced at 10s., thence Thomas de la Weye, then the sheriff, made distraint upon the barony of the same hundred and took 5s. Then Thomas de Sporun, a clerk, came and made distraint for Exchequer summons and took 5s. from the barony for the same reason. Then William of Hever, the sheriff came and made a levy of 5s. from the same barony for the same purpose. Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeyns, the collectors of the lord king’s tax of one-twentieth, took 2 marks by weight more than the assessed amount of pence in the same hundred.

Then they say that in the lord King Henry’s time Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and his ministers unjustly took 20 marks from Aldington court for holding an inquisition between Augustine de Moresden and other of the archbishop’s tenants. The same Richard unjustly took £10 from the tenants of the said court so that he would not harass them about the extent of the manor. The same Richard unjustly took £28 from the said court at the time of his first coming.

Then they say that Alfred de Dene, then the escheator, took Kenardington manor into the lord king’s hands 15 years ago, whence the lord King Henry immediately sold the wardship and marriage to Galiene de Northmanvill for 300 marks which she paid. Then Lawrence de Sokenesse took half the fee of Townland into the lord king’s hands 10 years ago, whence the lord king immediately gave the wardship and marriage to Master Henry de Lacy his cook.

Hundred of Barkley
Dicunt jurati quod Willelmus de Casinghame habuit vij hundreda tempore suo reddendo viceomiti Kancie Cs per annum et postea venit Reginaldus de Cobbeham et tradidit predictum hundredum ad firmam Wydonis de Nortun reddendo X llibras per annum et nunc est appropriatum castro Dover nesciunt quo warento per dominum Stephanum de Penecestr’.

Item dicunt quod tenentes abbatis de Bello subtraxerunt se precepto domini sui predicti de sectis consuetudinibus et serviciis comitatus et hundredi per iiij annos ad dampnum domini regis quolibet anno Vs. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita namio vetito et alia et eciam prior Christi Cant’ hoc idem habet per archiepiscopum et idem archiepiscopus subtraxit sectam leet et turnum vicecomitis sic xLd per annum ad dampnum regis et hoc per xvj annos nesciunt quo waren. Item dicunt quod libertates abbatis de Bello inpedit communem justiciam ex quo nullam faciunt sectam ad regem nec ad hundredum que semper solebant facere exceptis iiijannis elapsis. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Herst cepit de Jacobo Becketelye xvijd injuste pro summonitione scaccarii et de Willelmo Bydenden xijd et de Waltero de Byssupesden vjd et de Simone de Watwalden vjd pro summonitione predicta. Item dicunt quod dominus Stephanus de Penecset’ tradidit predicta hundreda Hugone de Wy ad firmam qui gravavit iniuste Robertum de Hurchinden per procuramentum suum ad faciendum appellacionem super Robertum de Hurchinden fidelem de uno porco quem appellacionem fecit Petrus de Kelche in predicto hundredo et comitatu unde idem Robertus deterioratus est occasione predicta ad valorem X marcas. Item dicunt quod Walterus de Chilmentum cepit de Aliciia de Bresinden xvjs cause quod predictus Walterus inposuit eadem Alicie quo ipsa fecit destruccionem in bosco pueri sui qui fuit in custodia sua et quod idem Walterus cepit injuste et sine judicio de Radulfo Waltero et Johanne de Roklinden xxs quod deberet dixisse quod predicti Radulfi Waltero et Johanne sibi retinererunt per xv annos redditum j obolum ubi nichil debent.
escactor domini regis Henrici vendidit quandam wardam Johannis de Fyle Thome de gavilekende de tenure de Serryng vendita fuit Waltero de Fyleche pro xxx marcis per eundem Ricardum iniuuste quod parentes proprinquores debebunt habere de jure.

**Hundred of Cranbrook**

Dicunt jurati quod vij hundreda teneri solebant de domino rege in capite tempore Willelmi de Canyngham pro Cs. ad vicecomitem domini regis soluendis unde hundredum de Cranbrebrok solebat reddere de porcione sua xxvs per annum et ubi prius dicta hundreda solebant teneri ad vicecomitem ut predictum est modo tenentur de castro Dover’ pro X libris per annum unde dictum hundredum reddit per annum pro porcione sua Ls. et subtraxit se de solucione vicecomeite facta per iij annos per dominum Stephanum de Penecestr’ et tempore Rogeri de Renynden tunc ballivi. Item dicunt quod abbas de Begebemme tenet tenementum de Rodelindenn quod solebat sequi in omnibus lottis et scottis cum hundredo et subtraxit eandem sectam a tempore Nicholai de Halyng’ tunc ballivi sic per xij annos ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd et nesciunt quo warento. Item abbas de Bello tenet tenementa Johannis Joymey, Simonis de Angangle, Agnetis de Angangle qui de eisdem tenementis solebant sequi cum hundredo in lottis et scottis et in omnibus aliis quam sectam idem abbas subtraxit per viij annos ad dampnum regis per annum xvd. Item abbas de Boxle tenet tenementum quinque tenencium de Cetthamesle qui solebant sequi in lottis et scottis et in aliis cum hundredo et idem abbas subtraxit eandem sectam per xvj anos ad dampnum regis per annum iij sed nesciunt quo warento. Item prior de Cumbwelle subtraxit sectam de tribus tenentibus suis qui tenentes solebant sequi in lottis et scottis per tres annos ad dampnum domini regis per annum xijd nesciunt quo warento.

Item abbas de Faveresham tenet tenementum quod fuit Stephani de Hukeregg quod tenementum solebat sequi omnibus cum hundredo et idem abbas subtraxit eandem sectam et lottos et scottos per xij annos ad dampnum regis per annum vjd. Item prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ subtraxit sectam de tenentibus suis qui solebant quondam sequi in lottis et scottis cum hundredo et subtraxit per XL annos et amplius ad dampnum regis per annum ijs nesciunt quo warento.

Item abbess of Faversham holds Stephen of Huckinge’s tenement, which used to follow in all things with the hundred and the same abbot has withdrawn the same suit and lot and scot for 12 years with loss of 12d. each year to the king. Then the abbot of Boxley holds a tenement of five tenants of Cethamesle who used to do suit at the hundred in lot and scot and other things and the same abbot has withdrawn the same suit for 16 years with loss of 2s. each year to the king, they do not know by what warrant. Then the prior of Combwell has withdrawn suit for three years from his three tenants who used to do suit and pay lot and scot, with loss of 12d. each year to the lord king, they do not know by what warrant.

Then the abbot of Faversham holds Stephen of Huckinge’s tenement, which used to follow in all things with the hundred and the same abbot has withdrawn the same suit and lot and scot for 12 years with loss of 6d. each year to the king. Then the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has withdrawn the suit of his tenants who formerly were accustomed to do suit at the hundred with lot and scot and has withdrawn it for 40 years and more with loss.
warento. Idem prior subtraxit sectam de iiiij tenentibus suis apud le Euelle qui solebant sequi cum hundredo et subtraxit per xL annos et amplius ad dampnum regis per annum xijd. Item tenentes archiepiscopi Cant’ qui sunt in eodem hundredo subtraxerunt xiiiij denarios per xx annos quos denarios solebant reddere per annum ad turnum vicecomitis et prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ subtraxit de tenentibus suis xiiijd per annum per eundem terminum de eodem turno.

Item abbas de Boxle subtraxit per annum de tenentibus suis 1d per eundem terminum de eodem turno. Et dominus Willelmus de Valence subtraxit de tenentibus suis per annum xjd per eundem terminum de eodem turno a tempore Willelmi de Wasingeham tune ballivi. Idem dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ (obiit) habet returnum brevium et quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant habet extractum brevium per aarchiepiscopum. Idem prior habet assisam panis et cervisie de tenentibus suis in eodem hundredo ad damnum regis per annum dimidiam marcam jam xL annis elapsis. Abbas de Bello habet eandem assisam de tenentibus suis ad damnum regis per annum xviijd et prior de Cumbwelle habet eandem assisam de tenentibus suis ad damnum regis per annum vjd. Dominus Willelmus de Valence habet eandem assisam de tenentibus suis ad damnum regis per annum ijs xxti annis elapsis nesciunt quo warrento. Predicti prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ abbas de Bello prior de Cumbwelle et dominus Willelmus de Valence habent eandem assisam.

Item dicunt quod prior de Cumbwelle fecit purpresturam super dennam de Creggesen per quam patria impeditur de itinere suo in yeme xij annis elapsis ad damnum per annum vjd et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeyns et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicecesime cepurunt de eodem hundredo xxs ultra certum numerium pro pondere. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Hezham ballivus vij hundredorum et constabularius castri Rocfecn’s inposuit Willelmo de Stonlode qui fedelis est debuit fortunam fecisse de uno bovetto et ob hoc ipsum attachiavit quousque finem fecerat de xLs injuste. Item Yvo de Merdena attachiavit dictum Willelmmum quousque financier ad opus domini Henrici Malemeyns xLs. Item dicunt quod predictus Thomas de Hezham of 2s. each year to the king, they do not know by what warrant. The same prior has withdrawn the suit of 4 of his tenants at [Temple?] Ewell who used to do suit at the hundred and he has withdrawn this for 40 years and more with loss to the king of 12d. each year. Then the tenants of the archbishop of Canterbury who are in the same hundred have withdrawn 14d. for 20 years, which pence they used to render each year at the sheriff’s tourn and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has withdrawn 14d. each year from his tenants at the end of the same turn. Then the abbot of Boxley has withdrawn 1d. each year from his tenants at the end of the same tourn.

And Sir William de Valence has withdrawn 11d. each year from his tenants at the end of the same tourn, from the time of William de Wasingeham who was then bailiff.

The same jury say that the archbishop of Canterbury (he has died) has return of writs and that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has the extract of writs through the archbishop. The same prior has the assize of bread and ale for his tenants in the same hundred with loss to the king of half a mark each year for the last 40 years. The abbot of Battle has the same assize for his tenants with loss to the king of 18d. each year and the prior of Combwell has the same assize for his tenants with loss to the king of 6d. each year. Sir William de Valence has the same assize for his tenants with loss to the king of 2s. each year for the last 20 year, they do not know by what warrant. The aforesaid prior of Christchurch, the abbot of Battle, the prior of Combwell and the lord William de Valence have the same assize.

Then they say that the prior of Combwell has made an encroachment upon the den of Creggesen which for the last 12 years has caused a nuisance for the people of the country when travelling in winter with a loss of 6d. each year and more.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulc Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 20s by weight from the same hundred more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Thomas Hezham, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds and constable of Rochester castle, accused William de Stonlode who was a law-abiding man, that he had stolen one bullock and because of this he unjustly arrested him until he had paid a fine of 40s. Then Ivo of Marden arrested the said William until he paid a fine of 40s. for the use of Sir Henry de Malemeyns. Then they say that the
occasionavit Walterum de Hungereberte et inposuit ei concealamenti quod arestavit mulierem que male debuit recepisse dimidam busselum frumenti de filio suo et propter hoc attachiavit eundem Walterum quousque finem fecit versus dictum Thomam de V marcis et totum injuste. Item Hugo de Wy ballivus vij hundredorum inposuit Waltero le Ros qui recettavit quendam felonem et ob hoc eundem Walterum attachiavit quousque finivit 1 marcam injuste.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de la Weye quondam vicecomites cepit de hominibus hundredi de Cranebrok xxs. de summonitione scaccarii et eos non aquietavit qui quidem xx solidi ab eisdem hominibus dicti hundredi ad hoc exiguntur et tempore quo eosdem denarios dictus Thomas recepit usque nunc sic octo annis elapsis et injuste.

m.6 Hundredum de Selebryghtind in lesto de Scrawynghope

Dicunt jurati quod quarta pars unius feodi tenetur de domino rege apud Lossenham per medium sic per Radulfum de Seyntlegero. Item dicunt quod firmam vij hundredorum solvi solebat per manus vicecomitis ad scaccarium sic X libras per annum et dominu Stephanus de Penecestr’ subtraxit eas ad castrum Dovor’ tempore quo dominus rex Edwardus fuit ultra mare. Item quod villa de Nywindenn quondam fuit una borgha ad hundredum de Selebryhtinden et substringa est per libertatem archiepiscopi et nunc est in manu domini Ricardi le Walays sed nesciunt quomodo.

Item dicunt quod iij marce que solvi solent de vij hundreds de turno vicecomitis dominus Bonefacius archiepiscopus Cant’ ab Itinerre Gileberti de Prestune inde subtraxit ij marcas racione libertatis sue et quod abbas de Bello receptit per manus Ricardi Meridal tune ballivi sui de Johanne de Sepesdenn qui tenuit de rege. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum placta de nambio vetito wrecce maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento nec quo tempore. Item dicunt quod dominus Ricardus le Walays capiti tholneum de batellariis vjd ubi capere consuevit 1d et hoc per xv annos elapsos. Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant clamat habere warennam apud Apeldr’ et apud Ebbene et nesciunt a quo tempore nec per quem.

aforesaid Thomas de Hezham charged Walter de Hungereberte and accused him of making concealment because he arrested a certain woman who wrongly claimed to have received half a bushel of wheat from her son and because of this he arrested the same Walter, totally unjustly until he paid a fine to the said Thomas of 5 marks. Then Hugh of Wye, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds, accused Walter de Ros who sheltered a certain felon and because of this he arrested the same Walter unjustly until he paid a fine of 1 mark. Then they say that Thomas de la Weye, formerly the sheriff, took 20s. from the men of Cranbrook hundred for summons of the Exchequer and he did not acquit them, which particular 20s. were demanded from the men of the said hundred for this purpose and eight years have passed from the time when the said Thomas unjustly received the same money until now.

m. 6 Hundred of Selbrittenden in the lathe of Scray

The jury say that a fourth part of one fee is held of the lord king at Lossenham as mesne tenure, thus by Ralph de St Leger. Then they say that the farm of the 7 hundreds used to be paid at the Exchequer through the sheriff’s hands, thus £10 each year and the lord Stephen of Penecestr’ has diverted this money to Dover castle from the time when the lord King Edward was overseas. Then the vill of Newenden was formerly one tithing with Selbrittenden hundred and it was withdrawn by the archbishop’s liberty and is now in Sir Richard le Walays’s hand but they do not know by what means.

Then they say that the lord Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury, from the time of Gilbert de Preston’s eyre, has withdrawn by reason of his liberty, 2 of the 4 marks which by custom are paid from the 7 hundreds for the sheriff’s tourn and which the abbot of Battle received through the hands of his then bailiff, Richard Meridal, from John de Sepesdenn who held of the king. Then they say that the archbishop has return (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant nor from what time. Then they say that Sir Richard de Walays takes 6d. in toll for boat-hire whereas he used to take 1d. and this for the last 15 years. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have warren at Appledore and Ebony and they do not know from what
Item dicunt quod abbatis Pontis Roberti tenet quarterium unius feodi tam in dominico quam in reddendo de feodo de Hepindenn et est de feodo comitis Hereford qui tenet de rege in capite. Item dicunt quod Willelmus Gnet de Newinden fecit quandam viam extra libertatem super feodum temencium de domino rege apud Lessenham per potestatem officii sui ad damnum nesciunt quantum et quod dominus Henricus Malemeyns tunc vicecomes cepit injuste de Johanne de la More 1 marcam et eum inprisonavit racione cuiusdam alteris habentis nomen ipsius. Item dicunt quod dominus Fulk Poyforer et dominus Henricus Malemeyns collectores vicesime receperunt de dicto hundredo iiijs pro officio suo exercendo et quod Yvo de Merdenn abjecit Chetheloce de Feryngherste a domo sua quousque finiret xLd. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford fecit magnam destruccionem tam in gravando tenentes quam in destruccione bosci in episcopatus Cant’ sed quantitatem dampni ignorant. Item dicunt quod Thomas de Heyham ballivus vij hundredorum seisivit mansionem Johannis de la More injuste et ejecit eum donec finiret ijs.

**Hundredum de Merdenn**

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Merdenn tenetur de domino rege in capite pertinens ad hundredum de Middeltun et valet redditus eiusdem hundredi per annum xiiiij libras xiiij obolus et respondet tam de redditibus quam de perquisitis xx libras ad hundredum de Middeletun et nunc tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo de domino rege ad vitam suam. Item dicunt quod tenentes de densic Folkesherte, Waudesherse, Chilindenn, Pykindenn, Hecham, Wyghetheherst qui sunt tenentes prioris ecclesie Christi Cant’ solebant serv ad hundredum de Merdenn ad ij laghedays per annum et querelare et respondere de sanguine et plaga et de namio vetitio et illi qui venerunt ad etatem suam legitimam feecerunt ibi fidelitatem domino regi et se subtraxerunt de omnibus predictis serviciis per xxvij annos a tempore Ricardi de Puns tunc ballivi quo wareno nesciunt et est damnum regis Xs per annum.

Item tenentes abbatis de Boxle sic Petthehurst, Dokeshurst, Sendenn, Suthland, Starnenn, Smoghele time nor through whom. Then they say that the abbot of Robertsbridge [Sussex] holds a quarter of one fee, both in demesne and paying rent from the fee of Hepindenn and it is of the fee of the earl of Hereford, who holds of the king in chief. Then they say that William Gnet of Newenden, by the authority of his office has made a certain road outside the liberty over the fee of the lord king’s tenants at Lessenham, they do not know how much loss there is, and that Sir Henry Malemeyns, then the sheriff, unjustly took 1 mark from John de la More and imprisoned him because he was using another person’s name. Then they say that Fulk Poyforer and Sir Henry Malemeyns, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, received 4s. more from the said hundred by exercising their office and that Ivo of Marden evicted Chetheloce de Feryngherste from her house until she paid 40d. fine. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford caused great damage both in oppressing the tenants and in destroying wood in the archbishopric of Canterbury, but they are ignorant of the amount lost. Then they say that Thomas de Heyham, the bailiff of the 7 hundreds, unjustly seized John de la More’s dwelling house and evicted him until he paid a fine of 2s.

**Hundred of Marden**

The jury say that Marden hundred is held of the lord king in chief, pertaining to Middleton hundred and the rent of the same hundred is worth £14 13s. 8½d. each year and it contributes £20 both from the rents and from the perquisites to Middleton hundred and now the lord John de Burgh holds it of the lord king in chief for his life time. Then they say that the tenants of the dens, namely Folkesherte, Waudesherse, Chillenden, Pykindenn, Hecham and Wyghetheherst who are tenants of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury used to perform service at Marden hundred each year at 2 lawdays and to plead and to answer in pleas involving wounding and bloodshed and of wrongful distraint upon goods and the tenants who reached their full age did their fealty to the lord king and they have withdrawn themselves from all the aforesaid services for 28 years, from the time of Richard de Puns, then the bailiff, by what warrant they do not know and there is 10s. loss each year to the king. Then the abbot of Boxley’s tenants at Petthehurst, Dokeshurst, Sendenn, Suthland, Standen and Smugley
se subtraxerunt de eisdem serviciis et preterea
solebant habere boregessaldr’ de eisdem tenentibus
dicti abbatis ad respondendum et faciendum in dicto
hundredo quod pertinuit et se subtraxerunt per xx
annos tempore Petri Dodeman tunc ballivi quo
warento nesciunt et est dampnum domini regis per
annum dimidiam marcam.

Item tenentes domini Willelmi de Valence de Sutton
sic Mootingby, Fokingbery, Hethehurst,
Wygetheresl solabant facere feoditatem domino rege
in dicto hundredo de quo subtraxerunt se per xxx
annos quo warento nesciunt et est dampnum regis per
annum ijs. Item dominus Willelmus de Dethling
subtraxit se de secta facienda in dicto hundred bis in
anno per vij annos quamquidam sectam dominus
Willelmus pater eius solabant facere pro terra que fuit
Ade de Petherst et est dampnum domini regis per
annum ijs et similiter tenentes eiusdem Willelmi de
Hundeherst substraxerunt se de lottis et scottis
hundredi predicti per iiij annos et assisam panis er
cervisie ad dampnum regis per annum ijs et reddunt
per annum vjs ad redditum hundredi supradicti. Item
dicunt quod Adam de Ryddenn fecit ardere xxij
fageta de bosco domini regis per Amfridum de la
Rogheyeye qui illas arbores exarsit ad cineres ad
dampnum domini regis xx. Item Petrus Dodeman
fecit destruccione in eodem bosco domini regis et
presentatum fuit coram domino H. Bygod unde idem
Petrus amerciatus fuit coram eodem domino H ad X
libras. Item dicunt quod dominus Reginaldus de
Cobbeham tradidit Petro Dodeman dictum hundredum/ad firmam pro xxij libris ubi dictum hundredum non
solebat tradi nisi pro xx libris ad nocumentum patrie.
Item dicunt quod Johannes de Waudeshes attachatus
fuit per Adam de Ryddenn ballivum de Merdenn qui
inposuit ei feloniam et idem Johannes aquietatus fuit
coram justiciariois et finem fecit cum dicto Ada xxx et
good service and in addition to this, they used to have
headboroughs from the said abbot’s same tenants and
to make contribution and do the things in the said
hundred which pertained and they have withdrawn
themselves for 20 years, from the time when Peter
Dodeman was then bailiff, they do not know by what
warrant and the loss to the king is half a mark each
year.

Then the tenants of William de Valence in Sutton, thus
in Mootingby, Fokingbery, Hethehurst and
Wygetheres were accustomed to do fealty to the lord
king in the said hundred, from whence they have
withdrawn themselves for 30 years, by what warrant
they do not know and there is a loss of 3s. each year to
the king. Then for 7 years Sir William de Dethling has
withdrawn himself from making suit twice a year in
the said hundred, which suit Sir William his father
used to make to provide the land which was of Adam de
Petherst and there is a loss of 2s. each year to the king
and similarly for 4 years the same William’s tenants of
Hundeherst have withdrawn themselves from lot and
scot of the aforesaid hundred and from the assize of
bread and ale, with a loss of 2s. each year to the king
and they render 6s. each year to the rent of the
abovesaid hundred. Then the prior of Christchurch
Canterbury and the abbot of Boxley hear pleas of
wrongful distraint upon goods, which pleas the lord
king used to have and ought to have in his hundred of
Marden and the aforesaid prior and abbot have
appropriated the assize of bread and ale for
themselves, they do not know by what warrant and
there is a loss of half a mark to the lord king because
of the prior’s appropriation and of half a mark because
of the abbot’s appropriation.

Then they say that Adam de Ryddenn caused 22 of the
lord king’s beech trees to be burnt by Amfridus de la
Rogheyeye who reduced those trees to ashes causing a
loss of 20s. to the lord king. Then Peter Dodeman
caused damage in the lord king’s same wood and this
offence was presented before Sir H. Bygod, whence
the same Peter was amerced before the same lord H.
£10. Then they say that Sir Reginald of Cobham
demised the said hundred at farm to Peter Dodeman
for £24 causing harm to the country, because the said
hundred used to be demised at only £20.

Then they say that John de Waudeshes was arrested by
Adam de Ryddenn, the bailiff of Marden, who accused
him of felony and the same John was acquitted after
the justices and made a fine with the said Adam at
Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeymis collectores vicesime ceperrunt ultra certum numerum denariorum Lxs de hoc hundredo pro pondere.

Hundredum de Middiltun

Dicunt quod maneriium de Middiltun est domini regis et quod dominus Edwardus rex qui nunc est tradidit illud domino Johanni de Burgo ad vitam ipsius Johannis. Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Northwude tenet quamdam terram in Northwode de dono Ricardi regis, Stephanus pater dicti Rogeri reddit inde annuatim leprosis hospitalis Langeporte xLs per annum de dono domini regis. Item dicunt quod monachi ecclesie Christi Cant’ tenent xxxta libratus in Bakeshore Leysdun et Osmundesheye de dono regis Henrici avi regis Henrici pro martirio Sancti Thome martiris. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet quandam escaetam in Renham apud Chelesherste de dono Henrici regis patris regis nunc que valet per annum Cs. Idem tenet Mere et la Gare que solebant reddere per annum domino regi xxs et amplius et nunc tenet illa pro fedo [sic] unius militis nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus filius Willelmi de Codestede tenet quandam terram apud Codestede per serjantiam unius spervarii reddendo per annum ad scacarium domini regis que solebat reddere per annum ad manerium de Middeltun xxs. qui condonantur per Johannem regem. Item dicunt quod Thomas Abelyn tenet unum feodum in capite de domino regis in Moriston, Elmele et Milstede. Item dicunt quod dominus Bartholomeus de Munston tenet unum feodum apud Munston de domino Roberto filio Johanne et quod dominus Stephenus de Pencestr’ tenet unum feodum apud Tonstall de eodem rege et quod dominus Radulfus filius Bernardi tenet unum feodum in Tang’ et eodem domino Roberto et idem dominus Robertus aquietat illos versus castrum Dovor per wardam qualler vel per quos vel a quo tempore fuerunt alienati ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperrunt ultra certum numerum denariorum Lxs de hoc hundredo pro pondere.
Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt in dicto hundredo per pondere ultra certum numerum xv libras.

Item dicunt quod quedam terre fuerunt quondam alienate per quodam ballivos tempore quo non constat memoria unde dominus rex habet redditum ad valorem Lxs iijd obolum et dictus redditus solvitur cum dicto redditu de Middeltun et dominus rex nichil est perdens. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Middeltun traditur per dominum regem domino Johanni de Burgo ad vitam eius et quod est hundredum de Merden est membrum dicti hundredi de Middleton et est cum eodem manerio in manu dicti Johannis de Burgo qualiter dictus Johannes illa teneat ignorant.

Item dicunt quod Juliana filia Ade Asty dedit tenementum suum quod tenebat de domino rege in capite monialibus de Scapeye unde dominus rex non habet servicium in dampnum ipsius domini regis per annum xijd. Item dicunt quod dictae moniales tenent unum tenementum quodam vocatum Selveslonde unde dominus rex non habet servicium et dampnum xijd et amplius per annum et quod Sabina de Cumba tenet quoddam tenementum de domino rege in capite et dedit illud dictis monialibus unde rex perdit servicium et relevium ad dampnum xijd per annum et amplius et quod Henricus de Fonte capellanus tenet quoddam tenementum de domino rege in capite et illud dedit dictis monialibus unde dominus rex perdit servicium et relevium ad dampnum xijd per annum et amplius. Item dicunt quod priorissa de Scapeia levare fecit unum juwisum quod vocatur Sean in predicto hundredo in prejudicium regis et quod dicta priorissa appropriavit sibi tenentes suos qui solebant lottiare et scottiare ad villatam de Middeltun et non facerunt ad dampnum patrie per annum vijd et quod Johannes Hemmyng tenet quoddam tenementum in eadem villa de domino rege et illud vendidit dictis fratribus et sororibus unde dominus rex habet the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took £15 by weight more than the assessed amount in the said hundred.

Then they say that certain lands were formerly alienated by certain bailiffs at a time before the memory of man, whence the king has rent worth 60s. 3½d. and the said rent is paid from Middleton and the lord king loses nothing. Then they say that Middleton hundred was demised by the lord king to John de Burgh for the term of his life and that Marden hundred is a member of the said hundred of Middleton and it is in the hand of the said John de Burgh together with the same manor; they do not know how the said John de Burgh holds those.

Then they say that Juliana, daughter of Adam Asty, gave her tenement, which she held of the lord king in chief, to the nuns of Sheppey, for which the king does not have service with loss to the king himself of 12d. each year. Then they say that the said nuns hold one tenement formerly called Selveslonde, for which the king does not have service and the loss is 12d. and more each year and that Sabina of Coombe holds a certain tenement of the lord king in chief and she has given that to the said nuns, whence the king loses the service and relief with loss of 12d. and more each year and that Henry de Fonte the chaplain holds a certain tenement of the lord king in chief and he has given this to the said nuns, whence the lord king loses the service and relief with loss of 6d. Then they say that the prioress of Sheppey has erected a certain pillory called a sean in the aforesaid hundred to the king’s prejudice and that the said prioress has appropriated for herself his tenants who used to pay lot and scot at the township of Middleton and they do not, thus causing a loss of 6d. each year to the county and that Henry son of Martin Wulphze held a certain tenement of the lord king in chief and he gave that to the prior and convent of Leeds, thence the king loses the service and relief with loss of 2s. each year and that John Hemmyng holds a certain tenement of the lord king in the same vill and the prior and convent of Leeds have that, thence the lord king has a loss of 2s. each year and that John of Cliffe’s heirs hold a certain (tenement) in the town of Bredgar and they have sold that to the Brethren and Sisters of St James [hospital] Canterbury, whence the lord king has a loss of 12d. and more and that Gilbert son of Solomon holds a certain tenement in the same vill and has sold that to the said Brethren and Sisters, whence
dampnum per annum vjd et amplius et quod Johannes de Fughelestun vendidit vj aeras terre monialibus de Clerkenewell London’ quas tenuit de domino rege in villa de Syningeburn et defenduntur versus dominum per heredes dicti Johannis per medium et quod dominus Thomas Abelyn appropriavit sibi tenentes suos qui solebant lottare et scotiare ad villam de Burne et non faciunt nesciunt quo warento ad dampnum vj per annum et quod Johannes Cnepehalste vendidit hospitalariis v aeras et dimidiam terre in villa de Radesham quas tenuit de domino rege in capite ad dampnum regis xijd per annum sine redditibus et releviis. Item dicunt quod dominus Willemus de Leyburn appropriavit sibi tenentes de domino rege in villa de Mekelande et Elmstede quod tenent sorores hospitalis Sancte Katerine London, unde dominus rex perdit in releviis eschaetis et aliis per mortem cuiusdam heredis dimidiam marcam utrum sit de libero feodo vel non ignorant. Item dicunt quod nullus habet returnum (brevium) placita navii vetiti in dicto hundredo nisi camerarius de Middiltun.

Item dicunt quod dominus Stephenus de Pencestr’ clamat habere furcas tumberellum et assisam panis et cervisie in Tonstall nesciunt quo warento et quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ habet tumbrelum et assisam panis et cervisie in villa de Nywenton nesciunt quo warento et quod priorissa Scapeye habet tumberellum et assisam panis et cervisie in villa Scapeye apud Menstræ nesciunt quo warento et quod priorissa clamat habere wrecce maris nesciunt quo warento et quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ clamat habere wrecce maris et assisam panis et cervisie apud Leysdun nesciunt quo warento et quod dominus Rogerus de Sylonde habet assisam panis et cervisie et dat per annum domino regi pro eodem xxxs. usus est libertate sua nesciunt quo warento et quod inpediunt regis potestatem et communem justicam ut credunt.

Item dicunt quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ et dominus Willemus de Leyburne appropriant sibi warrenam de novo et metas et fines transcendent nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Maresecall de Synele tenet unam parvam purpcresturam in villa de Sydingeburn et solvit domino regi per annum 1d et dominus rex nichil perdit et quod Petrus de London tenet unam parvam purpcresturam in villa de

the king has a loss of 6d. each year and more and that John de Fughelestun sold 6 acres of land to the nuns of Clerkenwell, London, which he held of the lord king in the vill of Sitingbourne and they are defended against the lord by the said John’s heirs through mesne tenure and that Sir Thomas Abelyn has appropriated for himself his tenants who used to pay lot and scot to the township of [Sitting?] Bourne and they do not do this, by what warrant they do not know and that John Cnepehalste sold 5½ acres of land in the vill of Radesham which he held of the king in chief, to the Knights Hospitallers with loss of 12d. each year to the king without the rents and reliefs. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn has appropriated for himself the lord king’s tenants in the vills of Mekelande and Elmsted which the Sisters of St Katharine’s hospital, London hold, thence the king loses half a mark in reliefs, escheats and other things through the death of a certain heir, whether from a free fee or not they are ignorant. Then they say that no-one has return (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods in the said hundred unless it is the chamberlain of Middleton.

Then they say that Sir Stephen of Penecestr’ claims to have a gallows, tumbrel and the assize of bread and ale in Tunstall, they do not know by what warrant and that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury has tumbrel and the assize of bread and ale in Newington, they do not know by what warrant and that the prioress of Sheppey has tumbrel and assize of bread and ale in the vill of Sheppey at Minster, they do not know by what warrant and that the prioress claims to have wreck, they do not know by what warrant and the the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have wreck and the the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have wreck and the assize of bread and ale at Leysdown, they do not know by what warrant and that Sir Roger de Sylonde has the assize of bread and ale and gives the lord king 30s. each year for it, as part of his liberty, by what warrant they do not know and that these restrict the king’s power and common justice as they believe. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and Sir William de Leyburn are appropriating a warren for themselves and are exceeding its metes and boundaries, the jury do not know by what warrant. Then they say John Marshall de Synele holds one small encroachment in the vill of Sitingbourne and he pays the lord king 1d. each year and the lord king loses nothing and that Peter of London holds one small encroachment in the vill of Sitingbourne and he pays
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod Simon Wiberd bailivus de Middeltun attachiavit Sexburgam de Halesto et ipsum incarceravit pro diffamacione mortis Johannis fratris sui et ipsa Sexburga acquisitata fuit per propriam et adhoc illum deliberare noluit priusquam haberet de illa ij marcas quas injuste solvit eodem Simoni quatuor marcas. Idem Simon attachiavit Nichlaum le Toghe pro diffamacione mortis uxoris sue et fecit finem cum eodem Simone ne inprisonaretur de iiij marcis et solvit et aquietatus fuit per propriam ante et quod ideum Simon incarceravit Adam filium Godfridi tixtoris pro iiij ovibus quas furatus fuit et cepit a dicto Ada xxs et ipsum deliberavit a carcerere sine judicio hundredi et quod dictus Simon incarceravit Thomam le Bedel et deliberari non potuit per propriam priusquam dedisset eodem Simoni viij. Dicunt quod Henricus Malemeis vicecomes Kancie promisit Hamonem le Especer ad intrare debitum suum per xLs quod dictus Hamo sibi promisit sed nichil ei fecit et postea dictum Hamonem incarceravit in castro Cant' donec dictus Hamo dictos xLs sibi solvisset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item dicunt quod Dunstanus de Berstede ballivus de Middeltun incarceravit Dionisiam de la Stone et Isabellam filiam suam pro quadam diffamacione et deliberari non potuerunt per propriam ante quam dedissent ei xLs et solverunt. Item dicunt quod Magister Willelmus de Sydingeburn ballivus de Middiltun incarceravit Philippum Galde de quadam diffamacione qui aquietatus fuit coram justicariis et postquam fuit deliberatus dictus Magister Willelmus cepit ab eo maliciose et injuste xLs. Item dicunt quod Simon Wyberd incarceravit Hamonem le Especer voluntarie ita quod non potuit deliberari antequam haberet ab eo iiij. Item dicunt quod Philippus Swydlet diffamatus fuit et ponebatur per pleggia et preterea dedit dicto Magistro Willelmo Xs ne incarceraretur. Idem Magister Willelmus cepit de Gileberto pistore de Nywentun eodem modo dimidiam marcam Prospice in tergo m.6 dorso Item dicunt jurati infra scripti quod Magister Laurencius de Sokenesse ballivus de Middiltun cepit multociens pro assisis removendis et 1d. each year to the lord king and the king loses nothing. Then Philip de Trypelewye holds a small encroachment in the vill of Newington and he pays the king 1d. for this and nothing is lost. Then they say that Simon Wiberd, the bailiff of Middleton, arrested Sexburga de Halesto and imprisoned her, accusing her of causing her brother John’s death and Sexburga was acquitted by a jury and still he was unwilling to release her until he first received 2 marks for that release, then she paid four marks unjustly to the same Simon. The same Simon arrested Nicholas le Toghe who was accused of causing his wife’s death and he made a fine with the same Simon of 4 marks not to be imprisoned and he paid this and he was previously acquitted by a jury and that the same Simon imprisoned Adam son of Godfrey the weaver because he had stolen 4 sheep and he took 20s. from the said Adam and released him from prison without trial of the hundred and that the said Simon imprisoned Thomas the beadle and he could not be released by a jury before he had given the same Simon 8s. They say that Henry Malemeis the sheriff of Kent promised Hamo the grocer to cancel his debt for 40s. which the same Hamo promised him, but he did nothing for him and afterwards imprisoned the said Hamo in Canterbury castle until the said Hamo had paid him the said 40s.

Then they say that Dunstan of Bearsted, a bailiff of Middleton, imprisoned Denise de la Stone and her daughter Isabel because of a certain accusation and they could not be released by a jury before they had given him 40s. and they paid it. Then they say that Master William of Sittingbourne, a bailiff of Middleton, imprisoned Philip Galde for a certain accusation who was acquitted before the justices and after he was released the said Master William took 40s. from him, maliciously and unjustly. Then they say that Simon Wyberd of his own volition, imprisoned Hamo the grocer, thence he could not be released before Simon received 4s. from him. Then they say that Philip Swydlet was charged and placed on bail and moreover he gave the said Master William 10s. not to imprison him. The same Master William took half a mark from Gilbert the baker of Newington in the same way. See on the back m. 6 dorso Then the jury as written above say that Master Lawrence de Sokenesse, a bailiff of Middleton, many times took 20s. from many people for removing them from the assizes.
aliquando de pluribus xxs.
Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeis cepit de Hugone de Tonstalle quod non venit ad inquisitionem injuste 1 marcam.
Item dicunt quod Tabernarius de Sidingeburn cepit injuste iijs de Roberto Chevere et quod Elyas filius Emme ballivus prioris Can distrinxit maliciose Thomam le Becke ad dampnum ipsius Thome Cs et quod dictus Elyas abstulit Willelmo Yvo domum et terram suam maliciose ad dampnum suum iijs et quod dictus Elyas maliciose distrinxit Robertum de Rygge ad dampnum suum de xLs. et quod Reginaldus de Sorune ballivus de Middiltun cepit de Hamone le Especer unum bovum precii xxs et illum bovem vi detinuit. Item cepit de eodem Hamoni Lx lagenas cervisie precii Vs et nichil solvit et quod Thomas de Hegham amerciatus fuit de Xs tempore Magistri Willelmi et solvit eodem Willelmo pro se et plegiis suis et preterea idem Willelmu americavit pleggios suos in xxiiij et illos cepit sine judicio hundredi et quod Thomas de Burmeo burnus de Middiltun cepit de Waltero Tannatore injuste dimidiam marcam et quod Reginaldus de Sorune cepit de Johanne de Wydegare injuste ijs. Item dicunt quod Arnoldus clericus de Esling cepit injuste de Johanne Landlord Adam Baite et Rogero Cordawanar iijs vjd.

Item dicunt quod Jordanus Kayn ballivus cepit de Roberto Chevere xLd de summonitione scaccarii et ipsum non aquietavit et quod Henricus Malemeis cepit de eodem Roberto vjd eodem modo et quod Henricus de Burmeo burne vicecomes cepit de heredibus Stephani Rysindun xLd pro eodem modo et eos non aquietavit et quod Henricus Malemeis vicecomes cepit de heredibus dicti [Thome –erased] Stephani pro eodem xLs et ipsos non aquietavit et idem Henricus cepit de Henrico filio Egidii dimidiam marcam et non fuit amerciatus.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Babbe vendidit Flammangis dimidiam pise lane et Willelmu Poser vendidit lanas et cepit denarios quantum ignorant. Item Stephanus Pove vendidit unam pisam. Item Robertus de Hyldestone vendidit quartam partem unius pise et Robertus de Pumlonde vendidit dimidiam pisam et Elyas filius Emme vendidit dimidiam pisam Flammangis contra defensionem.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Rynston forestarius tempore Henricus Malemeis fecit vastum et destructionem in bosco domini regis apud Chistens’
Dimidia Hundredum de Bernefeld

Dicunt jurati quod Rogerus Vinitar’ de Malling tenebat lestum de Elesford ad firmam de Johanne de Wattun tunc vicecomite pro X libris per annum et Thomas de Ho qui nunc est ballivus tenuit dictum lestum de Willelmo de Heverc vicecomite in anno preterito pro xxvij libras per annum ad damnum patrie per annum de tanto augmento ultra primam firmam et dicunt quod dimidia hundredi de Bernefeld est in manu domini regis et valet per annum iiij solidos.

Item dicunt quod borgha de Chingele sequi solebat cum dicto dimidio hundredo ad duos laghedays per annum et bis ad turnum et subtraxit se xx annis elapsis per abbatem de Boxle ad damnum regis nesciunt quantum. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle habet assisam panis et cervisie sed nesciunt quo warranto et prior de Cumbwelle habet assisam panis et cervisie et furcas nesciunt quo warranto.

Hundredum de Nywindenn

Dicunt jurati quod vij hundredadas in dominum regem pertinencia dimissa sunt ad firmam Willelmo Barer nesciunt per quem nec quomodo. Item dicunt quod villa de Newynden fuit quedam borgha ad hundredum de Selebrichtindenn quondam nesciunt qui eam subtraxit nec a quo tempore sed nunc est in manu Ricardi le Walays et substractum est per Josephum et (Johannem – erased) Thomam Lugge de eadem villa.

Half of the Hundred of Barnfield [Little Barnfield]

The jury say that Roger Vinitar of Malling used to hold the lathe of Aylesford at farm of John de Wattun, who was then the sheriff, for £10 each year and Thomas of Hoo, who is now the bailiff, held the said lathe in the past year of William of Hever, the sheriff, for £28 a year with loss to the country each year because of such an increase more than the first farm and they say that half of Barnfield hundred is in the lord king’s hand and it is worth 4s. each year.

Then they say that the tithing of Chingele [Chingley in Goudhurst par.] used to do suit at the said half hundred at two lawdays each year and twice at the tourn and through the abbot of Boxley it has withdrawn itself for 20 years, with loss to the king, they do not know how much. Then they say that the abbot of Boxley has the assize of bread and ale, but they do not know by what warrant and the prior of Combwell has an assize of bread and ale and a gallows, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the hundreds of Wachlingstone and Littlefield used to be in the lord king’s hand in ancient times and now the earl of Gloucester holds them in his hand and pays 40s. annually for them, but they do not how how they were alienated in the time of Gilbert Earl of Gloucester, the present earl’s grandfather. Then they say that John de St Clere took 18d. from Barnfield half hundred to hold an inquest upon an unfortunate person and he kept the money.

Then they say that Fulke Poyforer and Henry Malemeis took for the tax of one-twentieth, thus on 52s., by weight 2s. 2d. more than the assessed amount.

Hundred of Newenden

The jury say that the 7 hundreds pertaining to the lord king have been demised at farm to William Barer, they do not know through whom nor how. Then they say that the vill of Newenden was formerly a tithing of Selbritenden hundred, they do not know who withdrew it neither at what time, but now it is in Richard le Walays’s hand and has been withdrawn by Joseph and (John-erased) Thomas Lugge from the same vill.
And that Richard le Walays takes toll from barges and from small boats, that is 6d. for 1 penny to be paid on the occasion and this unjustly for 15 years. Then they say that the same lord Richard of Newenden claims to have a gallows, the assize of bread and ale and this through the liberty of the archbishop as they understand and he holds this throughout his time and the time of his ancestors. Then they say that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claims to have warren at Ebony, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that Sir William de Northye demised his land at Mersham in the county of Sussex to the abbot of Robertsbridge, but they do not know how much he takes nor what is the king’s loss.

Then they say that a certain Robert of Charing (he is dead) in the first year of King Edward’s reign [November 1272-1273] took 12d. from Somon Brech to remove him from the assise and 6d. from John de Sponden for the same reason. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, caused great destruction and waste to be made in things where he acted as custodian for the king, as in his tenantry and woods, but they do not know the amount and that Sir Fulk Peyforcer and Sir Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 8s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Hundred of Tenterden

The jury say that this hundred with the other 7 hundreds is now in the lord king’s hand and they pay £10 each year to Dover castle. William de Cassingegeam held them by payment of 100s. each year for 40 years, in King Henry’s time and Sir Simon of Penecestr’ has appropriated the said £10 at Dover castle for three years and more. Then they say that the archbishop’s tenants and those of the prior of Christchurch have withdrawn themselves through the lord Archbishop Boniface from suits of the lathe in the 7 hundreds and from the 2 marks each year at the sheriff’s tourn from the time of Gilbert of Preston then an eyre justice, with loss of 36 marks to the king, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Hugh of Wy took 12d. from Josia de Smaldenn for removing him from an assize in the present king’s time and that the same Hugh of Wy in the time of the Lord Edward the present king, by the authority of his office impounded Gunilda of Mersham’s mare and would not return it until he received half a mark from her, when she owed him

Hundredum de Tenderden

Dicunt jurati quod hoc hundredum cum aliis vij hundreds est in manu dominii regis et solvunt per annum ad castrum Dovor X libras que Willelmus de Cassingegeam tenuit per Cs per annum tempore regis Henrici per XL annos et dominus Simon de Penecestr’ appropiavit ad castrum Dovor’ dictas X libras per tres annos et amplius. Item dicunt quod tenentes archiepiscopi et tenentes prioris Cant’ se subtraxerunt de sectis lesti per dominum Bonefacii archiepiscopi in vij hundreds et de ij marcis de turno vicecomitis annuati a tempore Gileberto de Prestun tunc justicario Ininerante ad dampnum regis xxxvj marcas nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Wy cepit de Josia de Smaldene xijd pro movendo eum de assisa tempore regis nunc et quod idem Hugo de Wy inparcavit jumentum Gunilde de Merkesham per potestatem officii sui et noluit deliberare donec habuit dimidam marcam ubi nichil ei debet tempore domini Edwardi regis nunc. Idem Hugo cepit per potestatem officii sui...
de Henrico Molendinario Xs pro quodam prisonario qui attachiatus fuit in hundredo de Tenderdene inponens eidem quod evasit per ipsum et falso. Item Hugo misit Josephum Asketun de Essinden et Willelmum filium suum et filiam suam quod venirent ad domum Willelmi de la Feld in predicto hundredo et venerunt et quod ligati fuerunt a latronibus in domibus suis in hundredo de Rulwinden et nesciebant dicere a quibus ligati fuerint cepit ab eis dimidiam marcam. Idem Hugo cepit unam marcam injuste de Henrico Fabro de Tenderdene quod idem Henricus jactavit de clausura suo robam suam lineam et manutergum que vicina ejus ibi pendebat se nesciente et falsa occasione. Idem Hugo inposuit predicto Henrico Fabro dum jacuit infirmus in lecto suo quod fuit usuratus ita quod predictus Henricus promisit eidem Hugoni xxs et solvit et ad opus domini Willelmi de Hevere tunc vicecomitis et solvit ut possit habere inquisitionem de vij hundredis si esset talis aut non quae quidem inquisitionem ipsum bene aquietavit et quod idem Hugo per potestatem officii sui cepit quendam Nicholaum de parochia de Lammhurst per querelam quam Beatrix soror ejus super ipsum fecit sic quod tradiderat ejdem Nicholao denarios sic xx libras quos noluit ei solvere ita quod predictus Hugo retinuit corpus ejus in hundredo de Tenderden donec recepisset predictos denarios inuste et adhuc eos retinet in manu sua unde dicta Beatrix nichil inde habuit nec habebat potest omnia ista facta fuerunt per dictum Hugonem tempore regis nunc adhuc dicunt quod dictus Hugo de Wy cepit viijs pro duobus cursibus teneri hundredi ubi prisonati fuerunt ad deliberandum tempore domini Edwaardi regis.

Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt in dicto hundredo xxs ultra certum numerum denariorum pro pondere. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Wy cepit injuste in manu domini regis Edwaardi domos et terras Henrici filii Henrici Fabri et omnia bona sua Roberti le Waldeys ibidem et Beatricis uxoris eiusmodem et predictum puerum ad domum suam apud Wy duxit et retinuit donec abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ perquisivit de dono Stephano constabulario Dover’ ita quod ad damnum dicti Roberti et Beatricis Lxs et ad damnum Willelmi de la Felde 1 marcam a quo nothing. The same Hugh by the authority of his office took 10s. from Henry the miller on behalf of a certain prisoner who had been arrested in Tenterden hundred, accusing Henry of allowing the prisoner to escape and this was false. Then Hugh sent instruction to Joseph Asketun de Essinden and William his son and his daughter to come to William Field’s house in the said hundred. They came and they were tied up by robbers in their houses in Rolvenden hundred and as they could not say who had tied them up he thus took half a mark from them. The same Hugh took one mark unjustly from Henry the smith of Tenterden because the same Henry threw his linen gown and towel out of his enclosure not knowing this was in the area where Hugh hung things and it was a false charge. Then Hugh accused the aforesaid Henry the smith while he was lying sick in his bed, of being an usurer, this because the aforesaid Henry promised the same Hugh 20s. and he paid this and to the use of William of Hever then the sheriff and he paid in order that he could hold an inquest of the 7 hundreds to determine whether or not he was an usurer. He was entirely acquitted at this inquest and that the same Hugh by the authority of his office seized a certain Nicholas the mason of Lamberhurst parish because of a claim which Beatrix his sister made upon him, that she had given money, £20, to the same Nicholas which he was unwilling to pay her. Thus the aforesaid Hugh kept Nicholas in Tenterden hundred unjustly until he had received the money and he still keeps it in his own hand, whence the said Beatrix has had nothing nor can have anything of it. All these things were done by the said Hugh in the present king’s time, yet still they say that the said Hugh of Wye took 8s. for two writs to be issued for the hundred to release those men who had been imprisoned during the time of the lord King Edward’s time.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 20s. by weight in the said hundred more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Hugh of Wye unjustly took into the lord King Edward’s hand, the houses and lands of Henry, son of Henry the smith, and all the goods of Robert le Waldeys and Beatrice his wife there and Hugh took the aforesaid youth to his house at Wye and kept him there until the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury aquired him by a gift from Stephen the constable of Dover, thus there was a loss of 60s. for the said Robert and Beatrix and a loss of 1 mark for
dictum tenementum tenebatur et ad dampnum et gravamen Thome Mercatoris 1 marcam.

**Hundredum de Rulynden**

Dicunt jurati quod vij hundreda tempore Willelmi de Cassinghem pro Cs tenebantur per annum et post decessum dicti Willelmi per dominum Reginaldi de Cobeham vicecomitem pro X libris ad firmam tradebantur et adhuc dicta firma redditur domino Stephanio de Penecestr’ constabulario Dovorr’ per ballivos suos per annum et dicto castro appropriantur per dictum Stephanum in subtracionem vicecomitis Kancie per iij annos elapsos tempore regis Henrici et Edvardi regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod ab Itinere Gilberti de Prestun archiepiscopus Bonefacius subtraxit omnes tenentes suos vij hundredorum de sectis wapplentacium et de ij marcis turni vicecomitis quo warento nesciunt pro xvj annis ad dampnum regii xxxij marcas et dicti tenentes subtraxerunt se per totum tempus predictum ad dampnum regis Cs. Item dicunt quod abbass Pontis Roberti tenet de feodo de Hechinden iij quarteria dicti feodi per feofamentum Radulfi de Heckinden xL annis elapsis et amplius nesciunt quo warento ad exheredacionem domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Amisius Echermer (obiti) indicatus fuit de Asketino de Eselindene quo ipsum Asketinum noctanter ligavit et bona sua asportavit pro quo indictamento Hugo de Wy ballivus vij hundredorum cepit a dicto Amisius dimidiam marcam ut ipsum in pace dimitteret et idem Hugo cepit de dicto Asketino dimidiam marcam ne ipsum duceret ad castrum Dovor.’ Item dicunt quod quidam Ricardus de Essinden (obiti) qui fuerat ballivus ante dictum Hugonem capiet de hundredo pro officio suo exequendo ad suspensendum ij latrones vs vjd.

Item dicunt quod dictus Hugo de Wy per ij annos elapsos de diversis hominibus cepit ad valorem ij marcas ut aliquos removeret ab assisis et alios poneret loco eorum videlicet de Simone de Meham xij., de Willelmo le Sumetir xvijj, de Ricardo de Cranewell xijj, de Rogero de la Helle et Wulnodo fratre suo xijj, de Herewardo de Stonlond xijj, de Andrea de Cumdene xijj, de Gilberto de Metblingeham xijj, de Radulfo de Stonlond xijj, de Stephano de Mapplisden xijj, de Roberto le Wayte xijj, de Henrico Echmere

William de la Felde from whom the said tenement was held and loss and damage of 1 mark to Thomas the merchant.

**Hundred of Rolvenden**

The jury say that the 7 hundreds were held in William de Cassingham’s time for 100s. each year and after the said William’s decease they were demised at farm by Sir Reginald of Cobham, the sheriff, for £10 and still the said farm is rendered each year to Sir Stephen de Penecestr’, the constable of Dover, by his bailiffs and the money is appropriated to the said castle by the said Stephen and withdrawn from the sheriff of Kent for 4 years during the time of King Henry and of Edward the present king.

Then they say from the time of Gilbert of Preston’s eyre Archbishop Boniface withdrew all his tenants of the 7 hundreds from suits of the hundred and from paying the 2 marks at the sheriff’s tourn for 16 years, they do not know by what warrant with a loss of 33 marks to the king and the said tenants withdrew themselves throughout the aforesaid time with loss of 100s. to the king. They they say that the abbot of Robertsbridge holds 3 quarters of the fee of Hechinden by feoffment of Ralph de Hechinden 40 years ago and more, they do not know by what warrant, thus endangering the lord king’s inheritance.

Then they say that Amisius Echermer (he is dead) was indicted for Asketin de Eselindene that he harmfully tied up Askelin and carried off his goods for which indictment Hugh of Wye, bailiff of the 7 hundreds, took half a mark from the said Amisius so that he should not be taken to Dover castle. Then they say that a certain Richard de Essinden (he is dead) who was bailiff before the said Hugh, takes 5s. 6d. from the hundred to perform the duties of his office to hang two robbers.

Then they say that the said Hugh of Wye took money amounting to 2 marks from divers men in the last two years that he should remove some men from the assizes and place others in their place, that is to say: 12d. from Simon de Meham, 18d. from William le Sumetir, 12d. from Richard de Cranewell, 12d. from Roger de la Helle and Wulnodo his brother, 12d. from Hereward de Stonlonde, 12d. from Andrew de Cumdene, 12d. from Gilbert de Metblingeham, 12d. from Ralph de Stonlond, 12d. from Stephen de
Item dicunt quod Herward serviens dicti Hugonis de Wy injuste distrinxit Gunnora de Ethinden et cepit ab ea ijjs pro summonitio scaccarii ut dixit, idem Herwardus injuste cepit de Ricardo de Ethindenn et de relicta Willelmi de Fugesbrok pro eodem modo ijs et de Andrea de et quod predictus Hugo de Wy cepit de eodem Andrea pro eodem iiijs et quod predictus Herwardus cepit de Matilda et Matilla et quod quidam Robertus de Thring serviens archiepiscopi injuste cepit de Ricardo Daly et Johanne Fabro pro bracino et non brachiavit et quod Hugo de Wy inuiste cepit de Herewardo de Stonland xviijd pro hundredo tenendo ad ipsum deliberandum.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Godington cepit tempore Henrici regis de Hawisa de Meham pro summonitione scaccarii et ipsam inde non acquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Blite constabularius de Rofa tempore regis Henrici fecit attachiare per quendam probatorem nomine Wulbaldi inuiste six legales homines de hundredo de [idene et Willelum Franceys, Alured de Medessele, Alured de Thornden, Ricardum Blund, Willelum fratrem suum et Haro(ludus) de Chell de amdampnum ipsorum xx marcas et quod Fulco Peyforer vicecomes Kancie cepit de eisdem appellatis xLs ut eos deliberaret post breve domino regis et quo Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeins ceperunt de dicto hundredo pro vicesima recepta iiijs et de incremento ultra certum numerum viijs ixd et quod Magister Mapplisden, 12d. from Robert le Wayte, 6d. from Henry Echmere, 2s. from Roger de Bynerden, 6d. from Stephen Hechynden, 6d. from Hubert of the same place, 6d. from Richard de Holwise, 6d. from Ordmerus de Sysske, 6d. from William de Hawceldon, 6d. from Thomas de Pyltesden, 6d. from Nicholas de Blecchescote, 6d. from Luke of the same place, 6d. from Martin de Francesco, 6d. from William le Maystre, 12d. from William de Mappesden, 2s. from Stephen de Halle, 12d. from William le Hewette, 6d. from Thomas Holwsstall, 6d. from Thomas le Franceis, 12d. from Reginald Comener, 6d. from Richard Wyse, 6d. from Asketin de Essilden. Then they say that Henry de Wodintun, who was a clerk of the 7 hundreds before the said Hugh, took half a mark from Hawisa de Meyham for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquited her.

Then they say that, Hereward the said Hugh of Wye’s serjeant unjustly made distraint upon Gunnora de Ethinden and took 2s. from her for summons of the Exchequer, as he said. Then they say that the same Herward unjustly took 2s. from Richard de Ethindenn and from William de Fugesbrok’s widow for the same reason and from Andrew de et that the aforesaid Hugh of Wye took 4s. from the same Andrew for the same reason and that the aforesaid Hereward took from Matild and Matilla et quod et that Robert de Thring, a serjeant of the archbishop, unjustly took from Richard Daly and John the smith for a brewhouse and he has not brewed et and that Hugh of Wye unjustly took 18d. from Herward de Stonland for summoning the hundred for his release.

Then they say that during King Henry’s time, Henry de Godington took from Hawisa de Meham for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquited her of this.

Then they say that in King Henry’s time, Hugh de Blite, constable of Rochester, through a certain approver called Wulbald unjustly arrested six law-abiding men of Rolvenden hundred and William Franceys, Alured de Medessele, Alured de Thornden, Richard Blund, William his brother and Harold de Chell with loss to them of 20 marks and that Fulk Peyforer, the sheriff of Kent, took 40s. from the same accused men, so that he might release them after the lord king’s writ and that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeins took from the said hundred 4s. for the tax of one-twentieth received and 8s. 9d. as an increase above the assessed amount and that Master [Richard]
[Ricardus] de Clifford fecit vastum et destruccionem in vij hundredis de Rulwinden in quercubus fagetis et aliis arboribus precii xLs et amplius et quod [ ] de tenantibus archiepiscopi in Waldis X marcas de fine iniuste. Item dicunt quod ballivi archiepiscopi iniuste capit finem pro warda [ ] in gavelkund per totum Waldum injuste et contra consuetudinem tocius regni.

de Clifford caused waste and destruction in the 7 hundreds of Rolvenden upon the oaks and beeches and other trees, price 40s. and more and that [has taken] 10 marks from the archbishop’s tenants in the Weald unjustly for a fine. Then they say that the archbishop’s bailiff unjustly takes a fine for wardship [from lands in] gavelkind throught the whole Weald unjustly and contrary to the custom of the whole kingdom.
Dicunt jurati quod dominus Osbertus de Lungchamp miles tenet quamdam teram que vocatur Ovenhelle per servicium quod debet exsequi dominum regem in exercitu suo usque in Walliam xL diebus propriis sumptibus cum uno equo precii vs et cum 1 sacco precii vjd et cum brochia ad eundem factum et de illa terra alienantur xvj acre terre quas dominus Stephanus de Cosintun tenet per iiijs annos eidem [Roberto-erased] Osberto reddendum set a quo tempore nec per quem sunt alienate neque in manu quorum regum nesciunt.

Item heredes Johannes le Walays tenent unam acram terre que vocatur Weavering per serjeantiam eodem servicio sed insuper reddunt Roberto de Boctun per annum xLs., Robertus vero de Boctun antecessor Roberti nunc feoffavit Hugonem le Waleys de eadem terra C annis elapsis et amplius et idem Robertus fuit feoffatus a domino rege sed a quo tempore ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle non permittit heredes de Weavering qui tenent illam serjeantiam communicare in pastura de Pynendenn unde serjeantia minuitur quolibet anno ad valorem vs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Borveling tenet unum feodum de domino rege in capite.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Mayden’ est in manu domini archiepiscopi Cant’ sed tamen quando dictum hundredum debet amercedari coram justiciariis Itinerantibus seu inquisitoribus domini regis dominus rex habet quartam partem sed a quo tempore et quo waranto archiepiscopus habeat hundredum et quando hundredum valet per annum ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxle subtraxit omnes tenentes suos ab hundredo domini regis apud Merdenn qui solebant facere sectam ibidem et quod idem abbas subtraxit tenentes suos de Bademinden qui solebant sequi hundredum de Brenchesle xx annis elapsis et subtraxerunt tenentes suos de la Knocke et Chilintun qui solebant sequi hundredum de Merdenne xvj annis elapsis et tenentes suos de Stokebery qui solebant sequi hundredum de Twyforde ad lawdays.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum (et) extractum (brevium) placita namio vetito
wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates que ad coronam pertinent per dominum archiepiscopum a quo tempore ignorant et quod prior ecclesie Christi Cant habet omnes predictas libertates per dominum archiepiscopum a quo tempore ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbass de Boxle excessit metas et fines warenni a tempore xx annorum et amplius quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbass de Begeham recipit annuatim de feodo farma de Detling’ xxs ad damnum domini regis quod si archiepiscopatus esset in manu domini regis per custodem et heredes domini de Becking essent infra etatem per custodium rex haberet custodiam eorum. Ita quod nisi dicti xxs annui redditus essent in retro dominus illos haberet.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Daniel bedellus de Maiden’ in Itinere Magistri Rogeri de Seytun cepit de Hugone de Holstrete ne esset in assisis dimidam bushellum frumenti. Item dicunt quod Ricardus clericus domini Johannis de Merlay coronatoris cepit de Ricardo Muntomere quod non venit ad inquisitionem vjd. Item dicunt quod Johannes Danyel de Mayden cepit de Johanne et Willelmo Haghmund et de Radulfo le Man dimidam marcam ad solvendam ad scaccarium et non fecit et quod idem Johannes recepit codem modo de Nicholao Sparewe et sociis suis de Eastmalling xxs et pro labore suo ijs. et nichil solvit nec homines predictos ad scaccarium nec alibi aquietavit. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford cepit de Stephano serviente Gileberty Elye quem inprisonavit pro eo dimittendo Vs et de Thomae Heverico et Anselmo de Foringdun pro eis dimittendis quos inprisonavit injuste xLs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Merlay assignavit Gilebertum tintoreum ut solveret Bartholomeo Sellario pro eo 1 marcam quam dictus Gilbertus finivit de hoc quod coronator ei inposuit quod quidam Reginaldus qui occidit uxorem Thome Cocci fuit serviens eius et non fuit nisi per dictatum locatus. Item Daniel de Burham cepit de Gilberto pro eodem dimidiam marcam. Item dominus Fulco Peyforer et dominus Henricus Malemeins collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundred xxijvs vjd ultra certum numerum pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford seisivit manerium de Maydenestan et tenuit per iij annos et cepit ad introitum xv libras inuuste et cito upon goods, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other liberties which pertain to the crown through the lord archbishop, from what time they are ignorant and that the prior of Christchurch Canterbury has all the aforesaid liberties through the lord archbishop, from what time they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbot of Boxley has exceeded the metes and boundaries of the warren for a period of 20 years and more, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbot of Bayham each year receives 20s. from the fee farm of Detling with loss to the lord king, but if the archbishopric should be in the lord king’s hand in custody the lord king has wardship and thus if the lord of Becking’s heirs should be under age the lord king should be their guardian because of his wardship. Then unless the said 20s. annual rent should be in arrears the lord may have those.

Then they say that John Daniel, the beadle of Maidstone at the time of Master Roger de Seytun’s eyre, took half a bushel of wheat from Hugh of Hole Street that he should not be in the assizes. Then they say that Richard, the clerk of Sir John de Merlay the coroner, took 6d. from Richard Muntemore because he did not come to an inquest. Then they say that John Daniel of Maidstone took half a mark from John and William Haghmund and Ralph le Man to pay at the Exchequer and he did not and that the same John received in the same way 20s. from Nicholas Sparewe and his companions of East Malling and 2s. for his labour and he paid nothing neither did he acquit the aforesaid men at the Exchequer or elsewhere. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took 5s. from Stephen, Gilbert Elye’s servant whom he imprisoned, for his release and 40s. from Thomas, Hervey and Anselm de Foringdun whom he imprisoned unjustly, for their release.

Then they say that Sir John de Merlay appointed Gilbert the dyer to pay Bartholomew the saddler 1 mark on his behalf and which fine the said Gilbert paid as the coroner made accusation that a certain Reginald who killed Thomas Cook’s wife, had been his servant and he had not been, except upon a daily basis. Then Daniel de Burham took half a mark from Gilbert for the same reason. Then Sir Fulk Peyforer and Sir Henry Malemeins, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took from the said hundred 22s. 6d. by weight more than the assessed amount. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford yook possession of Maidstone manor and held it for 3 years and took £15 unjustly at his entry and immediately afterwards £17 3s. 6d.
post xvij libras iijs vjd iniuste. Idem Magister Ricardus de Clifford seivivit maneria de Ferlygh et Lese in manu domini regis sine precepto domini regis et cepit ad introitum iij marcas et tenuit dicta maneria per iij septimanas et tunc deliberavit dicta maneria precepto domini regis. Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus de Clifford seivivit quoddam manerium prioris ecclesie Christi Cant’ quod capi non deberet et tenuit per iij septimanas et cepit in introitum iij marcas.

**Hundredum de Laverkefeld**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Heryllisford solet esse in manu domini regis et datum fuit Ricardo de Grey per regem Henricum patrem regis qui nunc est pro uno feodo militis xxx annis elapsis et nunc tenet iillud manerium domina Lucia de Grey in dotem et valet per annum xxxij libras. Item dicunt Magister Galfridus de Hospal’ tenet Nesindenn de rege in capite pro dimidio fedo quo warento nesciunt et quod Reginaldus de Mumby tenet manerium de Reyreseede de rege in capite et est baronia et valet per annum xiiij libras et quod Willelmus de Say tenet Berling et Tithingham de rege in capite et est baronia et valet per annum L libras.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Laverkefeld est in manu domini regis et valet per annum Cs et quod hundreda de Littlefeld et Washlingstone solet esse in manibus dominorum regum predecessorum regis qui nunc est et valent Lx (libras) per annum et nunc sunt in manu Comitis Gloveyn pro xLs soluendis domino regi per annum qualiter et quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Adintone ad Otles que Lorna de Scercio nunc in dotem et subtraxerunt sectas hundredi predicti per potestatem Willelmi de Montecanis a tempore belli de Evesham ad dampnum regis iijjs per annum et quod Ricton et Siffletun tenentes Comitis Gloveryn per potestatem eiusdem Comitis subtraxerunt se de secta de lagheday per X annos elapsos ad dampnum regis ijs per annum et amplius quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum brevium et episcopus Roff’ ab archiepiscopo habet returnum a tempore X annorum pro viij libris solvendis archiepiscopo per annum et quod domina Lucia de Grey in curia de Eyleford placitat de namio vetito nesciunt quo warento et comes Gloveryn in curia de Tunebrygg quo warento nesciunt unjustly. The same Master Richard de Clifford took East Farleigh and Loose manors into the lord king’s hands without the lord king’s command and took 4 marks at his entry, held the said manors for 3 weeks and then delivered the said manors at the lord king’s command. Then they say that the same Master Richard de Clifford took possession of a certain manor of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury which ought not to be seized; he held it for 3 weeks and at his entry he took 4 marks.

**Larkfield Hundred**

Then they say that Larkfield hundred is in the lord king’s hand and it is worth 100s. each year and that Littlefield and Washlingstone hundreds used to be in the hands of the lord kings, the present king’s predecessors and the hundreds are worth £60 each year and are now in the earl of Gloucester’s hand by payment of 40s. each year to the lord king, how and by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Addington and Eccles, which Lorna de Scercio now holds in dower, have withdrawn suits from the aforesaid hundred through the authority of William de Montecanis from the time of the battle of Evesham [1265] with loss of 4s. each year to the king and that Ricton and Siffletun, the earl of Gloucester’s tenants, through the same earl’s authority have withdrawn themselves from suit of lawday for 10 years with loss of 2s. and more each year to the king, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and the bishop of Rochester has return (of writs) from the archbishop for 10 years, by paying £8 to the archbishop each year and that the Lady Lucia de Grey has pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods in Aylesford court, by what
Item dicunt quod Rogerus de Leyburn obstupavit quamdam semitam ducentem de Malling verus Berling ad nocumamentum patrie et quod Willelmus de Offeham obstupavit quamdam regalem viam in Offenham et quod Walterus de la Broke et Radulfus Champun obstrupaverunt quamdam semitam ducentem de ecclesie de Addington versus domum Lucie Speche et quod Thomas Eryng obstupavit quamdam viam ducentem de Halebech versus parcum de Halling. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Marlay cepit ijs de Willelmo de Clifford pro officio suo faciendo de abjuratione cuitusdam felonii fugantis in ecclesiam de Elisford et quod idem Johannes de Marlay cepit ijs de Willelmo de Reyersse pro officio suo excercendo de presbitero mortuo in eadem villa invento et quod idem Johannes cepit ijs de villa de Berling pro officio suo excercendo de quodam puero mactato in eadem villa.

Item dicunt quod Robertus filius Lamberti de Cheketelle cepit de Willelmo Blakeman recognitione removendi de assisa vjd et quod Willelms Mamwrech cepit de Willelmo le Mone recognitione removendi vjd.

Item dicunt quod Reginaldus de Cokkeshale cepit unam marcam pro deliberacione Edwardi Molendinarii de Adyngtun qui inprisonatus fuit pro evasione Agnetis de Wilton inprisonata pro latrocinio suo apud Adington.

Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt xxviijs de hundredo predicto pro pondere ultra certum numerum de xx libris.

Item dicunt quod domina Margareta de Say maritata est unde maritagium pertinet ad regem sed nesciunt utrum per licenciam regis aut non.

Hundredum de Wrotham

Dicunt jurati quod domina Isabella tenet medietatem manerii de Wrotham ad firmam de domino rege et reddit inde xx libras per annum usque ad estatem heredis domini Nicholai Cryoll et cepit illam firmam cito post festum Sancti Nicholai anno regni regis Edwardi primo et dominus Willelms de Rokesle tenuit eandem medietatem ante dictam dominam per warrant they do not know and the earl of Gloucester likewise in Tonbridge court, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that Roger de Leyburn has obstructed a certain path leading from Malling towards Birling causing harm to the country and that William of Offham has obstructed a certain highway in Offham and that Walter de la Broke and Ralph Champun have obstructed a certain path leading from Addington church towards Lucy Speche’s house and that Thomas Eynng has obstructed a certain way leading from Halebech towards Halling park. Then they say that John de Marlay took 4s. from William of Clifford for performing duties of his office concerning the abjuration of a certain felon seeking sanctuary in Aylesford church, that the same John de Marlay took 2s. from William de Reyersse for performing duties of his office upon a priest found dead in the same vill and that the same John took 4s. from Birling vill for performing duties of his office for a certain youth slaughtered in the same vill.

Then they say that Robert, son of Lambert de Cheketelle, took 6d. from William Blakeman in recognition of his removal from an assize and that William Mamwrech took 6d. from William le Mone for recognizing his removal.

Then they say that Reginald de Cokkeshale took one mark to release Edward the miller of Addington who had been imprisoned because Agnes of Wilton, who had been imprisoned for her robbery at Addington had escaped.

Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 27s. by weight from the aforesaid hundred more than the assessed amount of £20.

Then they say that the Lady Margaret de Say has married, thence the giving in marriage pertains to the king, but they do not know whether by the king’s licence of not.

Wrotham Hundred

The jury say that the lady Isabel holds a moiety of Wrotham manor at farm of the lord king and she pays £20 each year in rent for this until Sir Nicholas Cryoll’s heir comes of age and she took that farm immediately after the feast of St Nicholas in the first year of king Edward’s reign [6 December 1272] and Sir William de Ruxley held the same moiety before
unum annum per eandem firmam. 
Then they say that the lord archbishop has return (of 
writes) but they do not know from what time. Then they 
say that the township of Shipbourne was of the 
liberty of Wrotham hundred, has through the earl of 
Gloucester and Roger Horn his bailiff withdrawn from 
suit of the aforesaid hundred to the liberty of 
Tonbridge from the time of the battle of Lewes [1264] 
with serious loss to the king and the lord archbishop as 
Shipbourne used to do suit at the said hundred in all 
things concerning the crown and now they withdraw 
suit, but by what warrant they do not know. Then 
they say that in the 55th year of King Henry’s reign, 
father of King Edward [October 1270-1271] 100 acres 
of wood and pasture were inclosed with ditches and 
pales at Tonbridge forest, through the aforesaid earl and 
the aforesaid Roger Horn, from the tenement of 
the lords of Wrotham and the fee now of the lord king, 
because of the wardship of Nicholas of Cruell’s heir. 
Then they say that Sir Walter de Berste, then the 
sheriff, took one carucate of land from Simon of 
Witham in east Kent who was indicted of felony and 
he saved him and fed and clothed him during his 
lifetime. Then they say that John of Towcester by the 
authority of the earl of Gloucester seized Nicholas of 
Eytherne’s horse in Malling market place which he 
found as a pledge for making amends to Gilbert 
Renekyn on behalf of his nephew Robert; thence 
Robert de Shipbourne acted as surety that the same 
Robert the nephew should make amends to the said 
Gilbert on a certain day before 4 men elected from 
both sides, in a certain place in Wrotham hundred and 
when they arrived on the said day, the said Gilbert 
brought Sir Bartholomew de Woteringbir knight and 
many others well armed, threatening that the said 
Robert, nephew of Nicholas and Robert son of 
Godfrey and Robert son of Robert should be taken to 
Tonbridge castle unless they made satisfaction to the 
said Gilbert on his terms and unless Geoffrey Brodok 
made satisfaction to Robert Sagon on his terms. 
Thence the four men driven by fear paid them a fine of 
60s. and in addition Robert de Fonte of Tonbridge took 
Robert of Shipbourne’s plough and his sheep and a 
horse of Deuewyni Sheys in Wrotham hundred and 
took them to the lord earl’s manor at Dachurst 
[Hildenborough] and they were held in the park there 
until the said Robert paid 50s. for the above named 
men of Wrotham, which John le Boxne, the port-reeve, 
received.
Item dicunt quod Johannes le Boxne attaciavit in Tunebrygg Alanum Maken tenentem tunc domini regis Edwardi ad respondendum Roberto de Sagon in portamento de Tunebrygg unde idem Paganus (sic) ibi iniuste occasionatus dedit dicto Roberto Sagon dimidiam marcam et dicto comiti viij viijd. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor et (Martinus) Warinus de Chawcumbe ballivus eius iniuste inprisonavit Johannem filium Thome, Willelmum de Fychele, Galfridum Godynogh, Henricum le Brok, Willelmum le Chun et Thomam fabrum in Wrotham pro bosco quem emerunt de ballivo domini Nicholai de Cryoll ipso vivente et tenuerunt eos in priso na quousque finierunt xxs et solverunt dicto Warino et nichololominus totum predictum boscum amiserunt. Item dictus Magister Ricardus et Johannes de Estwode ballivus eius ceperunt de Walero Carbonario mahemium in Wrotham quod idem Walterus emit de domino Nicholai de Cryoll et de Willemlo Herigod ad valorem X marcas. Item idem Magister Richardus escaetor Johannes de Estwode et Warinus de Chaucumbe balliviti dicti escaetoris iniuste ceperunt de tenentibus qui fuerunt dicti domini Nicholai et Willelmi Herygod in Wrotham viij marcas nomine recognitionis ubi numquam ante tale donum dedunt nec archiepiscopo nec aliis. Item dicunt quod Walterus le Howere tunc ballivus de Wrotham cepit dimidiam marcam de Juliane de Shyburn pro marca amerced et preterea Thomas le Pendere tunc prepositus de Atteford cepit de eadem pro dicta marca ij boves et vendidit eos pro dimidia marca et nichilominus venit in summonitio ne scaccarii dimidia marca predicta. Item dicunt quod Adam Pens de Wrotham inprisonatus apud Otteford pro ij ovibus unde homines de hundredo de Wrotham quesierunt ipsum ibi petentes eum per plevinan et habere non poterunt quousque dictus Adam finivit cum Johanne de Estwode tunc ballivo 1 marcam quam statim solvit eadem. Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de eodem hundredo viij vjd ultra certum numerum pro pondere. Item dicunt quod post mortem Willelmi Herygod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis cepit seisinam medietatis manerii de Wrotham occasione sedis Cant’ vacante videlicet anno regni Henrici Lv et tunc Johannes de Estwode ballivus dicti escaetoris nomine ipsius...
said escheator’s bailiff, in his name destroyed the woods of Wrotham which were of the said William Heryngod, to the value of 20 marks. The after the lord Nicholas de Crioll’s death, Warin de Craucumbe and his [?clerks] unjustly destroyed woods which had belonged to the said Nicholas in Wrotham to value of 10 marks. Then they say that the said escheator took a moiety of Wrotham manor on the Wednesday next after the feast of St Nicholas in the 55th year and held it until the Lord’s circumcision next following [12 December 1270-1 January 1271] and that the same escheator took seisin of another moiety of the said manor of Wrotham aforesaid. After the escheator’s seisin Warin de Chaucumbe came on behalf of the lord Robert Burnel and took seisin of the same and held it for the use of the Lord Edward, to whom the king gave [   ] of that moiety for a year and a half. Then they say through an inquisition of the other hundreds that the earl of Gloucester and Roger de Horn have made an encroachment upon the lord king, [ ] of Hoo hundred, occupying in the lowy of Tonbridge 3 messuages, one corn mill, one fulling mill and 100 acres of land and wood [ ] at the 53rd year of King Henry [October 1268-1269] and in King John’s time a certain William Smalewryte had the custody of Wachlingstone and Littlefield hundreds for the king’s use and he demised those to the earl of Gloucester, thus to Earl Richard the father of Gilbert, grandfather of that present earl, by a rent of 20s. from one hundred and 20s. from the other, thus the said hundreds are worth 60s. each year [sic-recte 40s.] they do not know by what warrant the earl holds these.

Hundredum de Malling sive Villata

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Middiltun est de dominico domini regis et valet per annum ccc marcas et dominus Johannes de Burgo nunc tenet illud hundredum quo werento ignorant et quod manerium de Ospringe est de dominico domini regis et valet per annum C marcas et domina regina mater domini regis nunc ea [sic] tenet quo werento ignorant. Item dicunt quod manerium de Eyllsford fuit de dominico domini regis Henrici patris regis qui nunc est aliquo tempore et valet per annum xL libras et nunc tenent heredes Johannis de Grey quo werento ignorant. Item dicunt quod hundreda de Weccheliston et Lyttlefeld sunt de dominico domini regis tunc tenuit Comes Glovernie reddidit per annum domino regi xLs tempore regis Henrici et fuerunt alienata per ballivos domini

Malling Hundred or township

The jury say that Middleton hundred is of the lord king’s demesne and is worth 300 marks each year and Sir John de Burgh now holds that hundred, by what warrant they are ignorant and that Ospringe manor is of the lord king’s demesne and is worth 100 marks each year and the lady queen, the present king’s mother holds it, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that Aylesford manor was of the demesne of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, at another time and is worth £40 each year and now John de Grey’s heirs hold it, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that Wachlingstone and Littlefield hundreds are of the lord king’s demesne, then the earl of Gloucester held them and paid the lord king 40s. each year at King Henry’s time and they
regis tempore Comitis Glovernie avi Comitis qui nunc est.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita namio vetiti wreccum maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod abbatissa de Malling habet assisam panis et cervisie furcas de antiquo tempore quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn habent warenum et liberas chascias in Leyburn quo warento ignorant.

Item dicunt quod Rogerus de Leyburn pater predicti Willelmi fecit purpresturam super semitam domini regis in Leyburn et Willelmus filius eius adhuc tenet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundredo ultra certum numerum pro pondere duas marcas ultra certum numerum

Item dicunt quod Master Ricardus de Clifford escator domini regis cepit injuste per potestatem officii sui V marcas de Henrico Smoys tempore regis Henrici Lij. Item dicunt quod Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundredo ultra certum numerum pro pondere duas marcas ultra certum numerum

m. 7 dorso Hundredum de Ho in lesto adhuc de Heylisford

Dicunt jurati quod hundredum de Ho est in porcione particione cum Hugone Poynz et abbate de Reding et Henricus de Grey qui est infra etatem in custode domine regine matris regis et sunt in dicto hundredo tres borghe unde predictus dominus Hugo habet unam borgham et inde percipit emendum panis et cervisie et alias emendas transgressionum que accidunt in eadem borgha et abbas eodem modo et regina eodem modo racione warde Henrici de Grey predicti et tenetur de domino rege in capite et sic tenebatur de antiquo sed nesciunt per quod servicium nec quo warento. Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Agulon tenet dimidium feodum militis in dicto hundredo in parochia de Stok racione warde Johannis filii Thome Malemeis quo tenetur de domino regis in capite per xx annos set nesciunt quo warento et valet dictum dimidium feodum per annum X libras. Item dicunt quod manerium de Middiltune tenetur de domino rege were alienated by the lord king’s bailiffs in the earl of Gloucester’s time, the present earl’s grandfather.

Then they say that the archbishop has return and extract of writs and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the abbess of Malling has the assize of bread and ale, the gallows from ancient times, by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn has warren and free chases in Leybourne, by what warrant they are ignorant.

Then they say that Roger de Leyburn, the aforesaid William’s father, made an encroachment upon the lord king’s pathway in Leybourne and William his son still holds it, they are ignorant by what warrant. Then they say that Richard Hunwyn by the authority of his office, unjustly took 5 marks from Henry Smoys in King Henry’s 52nd year [October 1267-1268]. Then they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took two marks by weight more than the assessed amount from the said hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, unjustly and unreasonably took timber, valued at 10 marks from Walter Calyer after the death of Archbishop Boniface and that the same escheator caused damage throughout all the archbishop’s lands but they do not know how much.

m. 7 dorso Hoo Hundred still in Aylesford lathe

The jury say that Hoo hundred is in parts divided between Hugh Poynz, the abbot of Reading and Henry de Grey who is under age and is a ward of the lady queen, the present king’s mother, and there are three tithings in the said hundred, whereof Sir Hugh has one tithing and there he takes the fines of the assize of bread and ale and other fines for wrong-doings which occur in the same tithing, likewise the abbot and the queen also because of the wardship of the aforesaid Henry de Grey and Hoo hundred is held of the lord king in chief and thus it was held from ancient times but they do not know through what service nor by what warrant. Them they say that Sir Robert de Agulon holds half a knight’s fee in the said hundred because he holds the wardship of John, son of Thomas Malemeis, and this is held of the lord king in chief for 20 years but they do not know by what warrant and the said half fee is worth £10 each year. Then they say that
in capite per Johannem de Burgo qui illud modo tenet ex concessione domini regis nunc et quod manerium de Ospring fuit quondam domini regis et illud modo tenet regina mater regis sed nesciunt a quo tempore vel quo warento. Item dicunt quod vicecomes percipit per annum ad turnum suum ad opus regis ij marcas de consuetudine et quod hundredum predictum valet ad opus dominorum xLs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas Malemeis tempore vite sue solebat venire ad communitatem hundredi de Ho ad audiendum precepta domini regis et auxiliandum judicibus dare de sanguine vita et membra una cum hundredo predicte et inde subtraxit se ante decessum suum per vii annos et eodem modo subtrahit se Robertus de Agulum racione warde quam de filio dicti Thome et nesciunt quo warento et hoc per vii annos elapsos ad grave dampnum hundredi.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum brevium wrecceum maris et tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervise et alia que ad coronam pertinet et habuit de antiquo nesciunt quo warento simili modo habent assisam panis et cervisie predicti Hugo et regina racione warde predicte et furcas similiter et fieri faciunt judicium de sanguine vita et membra. Item dicunt quod idem abbas de Reding levavit in eodem hundredo furcas per vii annos elapsos et fieri faciunt judicium de vita et membra nesciunt quo warento sed habet iuste et libere assisam panis et cervisie cum aliis pertinentiis suis predicti. Item dicunt quod idem abbas injuste extraxit unum hominem appellatum et prosecutum de hundredo usque in curia et in eadem curia de eodem fieri facit judicium ubi debuit adjudicari in hundredo nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Turgisius de Heredefeld levavit quamdam purpresturam super regalem viam in hundredo predicto et artatur via regalis ex illo fossato decem pedibus in latitudine et in longitudine xL perticatas et hoc per annum ad damnum regis et patrie per annum iijd et amplius. Item dicunt quod ballivi domini regis solebant ministerare cum servientibus episcopi Roff’ in omnibus executionibus mandatorum regis et quod idem episcopus non habuit eo tempore returnum brevium sed idem episcopus habet modo returnum brevium de

Middleton manor is held of the lord king in chief by John de Burgh who now holds that by the present lord king’s grant and that Ospringe manor was formerly of the lord king and now the queen, the king’s mother holds that, but they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the sheriff takes 2 marks at his tourn each year for the king’s use and that the aforesaid hundred is worth 40s. for the lords’ use.

Then they say that Thomas Malemeis during his lifetime used to come to the community of the hundred of Hoo to hear the lord king’s commands and to support the justices in pronouncing sentences for cases of blood-shed, life and limb together with the aforesaid hundred and then he withdrew himself 7 years before his death and in the same way Robert de Augulum withdraws himself because of his wardship of the said Thomas’s son and they do not know by what warrant and this for 9 years with serious loss to the hundred.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown and he has held these from ancient times, by what warrant they do not know. Similarly the aforesaid Hugh and the queen because of the aforesaid wardship have the assize of bread and ale and similarly a gallows and they give judgement in cases of blood-shed, life and limb. Then they say that 8 years ago the abbot of Reading erected a gallows in the same hundred and passes judgement of life and limb, they do not know by what warrant, but he has the assize of bread and ale with his other aforesaid appurtenances justly and rightly. Then they say that the same abbot unjustly took one man accused and prosecuted in the hundred to the court and he heard the case in the same court whereas the man ought to have been judged in the hundred, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Turgisius de Heredefeld has made a certain encroachment upon the royal highway in the aforesaid hundred and the highway is diverted ten feet from that ditch in length and 40 perches in width and this causes loss to the king and country of 3d. and more each year. Then they say that the lord king’s bailiffs used to officiate with the bishop of Rochester’s serjeants in carrying out all the lord king’s mandates and that the same bishop did not have return of writs at this time, but the same bishop now has return of writs from the
archbishop of Canterbury, and his bailiffs now execute the royal mandates and he has had this from the time of Gilbert of Preston’s last eyre in the county of Kent, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Robert Heryng took 2 lambs, price 12d. from Roger Kempelof for removing him from a certain assize held at Greenwich. Then they say that William de Garston, the earl of Gloucester’s bailiff, accused William the smith of Stoke, through false accusations that he had been an enemy of the king and of the said earl his lord and he had plotted to undermine the king’s prestige and for this malicious rumour he took 40s. from him unjustly and this was after the battle of Evesham [1265]. Then Richard Atteburne had 2 marks from the same William in the same way and for the same reason, that the said William de Garston took 1 mark from Geoffrey ate Rypelonerie for the same reason, again 1 mark from the same William and Hugh the carpenter for the same reason, the same William de Garston took 1 mark from Henry de Bradfeud of the vill of All Saints [Allhallows?] for the same and half a mark from Thomas le Paumer of the vill of St Mary Hoo for the same, half a mark from William Cook of the vill of All Saints for the same, half a mark 2s. from Jordan de la Grange of the same town for the same, 12d. from William Horwood for the same and 4s. from William Lucas and they say that Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 60s. by weight more that the assessed amount in the said hundred.

Then they say that whenever anyone of Hoo hundred is amerced before the justices in eyre, the abbot of Reading shall stand for the third part with the hundred for scot and lot levy, as the third lord of the same hundred and in Master Roger de Seytun’s eyre the said hundred was amerced 40s. and two-thirds of the same hundred paid their portion and the said abbot withdrew himself and his tenants up to the present from the aforesaid scot and the same hundred never came in summons for the said 40s. with severe loss to the country, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Sir Robert de Scottus, the lord king’s sub-escheator, took possession of Henry de Grey’s lands after John de Grey’s death and held these in the lord king’s hand for 1 week and he exacted 5 marks from the tenants there for tallage. The same Robert took possession of Hugh Poynz’s lands after Nicholas Poynz’s death in Hoo and held these in the lord king’s hand for 1 day and exacted 5 marks there for tallage.

Item dicunt quod Robertus de Scotto seisivit terras Hugonis Poynz post mortem Nicholai Ponnz in Ho et tenuit eas in manu domini regis per 1 diem et levavit de tallagio ibidem 2 marcas.
Item dicunt quod Comes Glovernie intravit et cepit super dominum regem in Ho in iustae libertatem suam in Tunbridge quem vocant Lawe tria messuagia duo molendina et centum acras terre et bosci et hoc per V annos ad grave damnum regis et patrie sed nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Simon Mortlak quondam constabularius castri de Tunbrigg occasionavit maliciousse Radulfum de Fraxino per falsas suggestiones et cepit ab eo xx et de Henrico de Bradefeu xij capons preci et eodem modo et de Roberto le Keyere pro eodem xjs et de Johanne Salomone pro eodem iij marcam et Willelmo fabro de Stok pro eodem iij pondus casei dimidiam marcam et quod dictus Simon omnes denarios predictos recepit sed nesciunt cui inde respondit. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Sancto Claro coronator in lesto de Heylisford cepit de borgha Henrici Prude iijis pro officio suo exequendo et idem Johannes cepit de borgha Roberti de Hok iijis pro eodem et de villa de Stok pro eodem ijs et de borgha de Stok pro eodem ijs. Item dicunt quod Johanne de Meryle qui modo est coronator cepit de borgha de Sancta Werburga pro officio suo ijs.

Item dicunt quod post bellum de Evesham rex cepit seisinam de hundredo de Ho et fecit ballivos suos Ricardum Page et Herevicum le Prude qui colligerunt tempore suo redditus ad damnum regis ad valenciam iij librarum xvs. postea dominus Rogerus de Leyburn habuit illud hundredum ex concessione domini regis et fecit ibidem alios ballivos et exigebat a predictis Ricardo et Herewico predictos denarios et ipsi responderunt quod illos denarios solverunt ad scaccarium domini regis et nunc iterum veniunt in summonitione ad grave damnum patrie.

Hundredum de Toltyntur

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Mepeham quondam fuit domini regis et modo est in manu prioris Sancte Trinitatis Cant’ et valet per annum xxx libras sed a quo warento nesciunt nec a quo tempore. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Montecanis tenet baroniam de Talebot ad Swaneschamp de domino rege in capite et inde reddit annuatim custodi castri Roff’ xvij libras set nesciunt quo warento et quod Henricus de Crammavile tenet manerium de Gravesende in capite de domine rege per servicium uniis militis et quod Nicholaus filius Willelmi Reyner tenet manerium de Mistede de Galfrido de Pey per

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester arrived and unjustly, and took from above the king three messuages, two mills and one hundred acres of land and wood in Hoo for his liberty in Tonbridge, which they call the Lawe [Lowy] and this was 5 years ago with severe loss to the king and country and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Simon Mortlake, formerly constable of Tonbridge castle, maliciously charged Ralph de Fraxino through false accusations and took 20s. from him, 12 capons price 3s. from Henry de Bradefeu in the same way, 11s. from Robert de Keyere for the same and 1 mark from John Solomon for the same, from William the smith of Stoke 1 way of cheese price half a mark for the same and that the same Simon received the aforesaid money but they do not know to whom he gave account of it. Then they say that John de St Clare, the coroner in Aylesford lathe, took 4s. from Henry Prude’s tithing to perform duties of his office and the same John took 4s. from Robert de Hok’s tithing for the same, 2s. from the vill of Stoke for the same and 2s. from Stoke tithing for the same. Then they say that John de Marley who is now the coroner took 2s. from the tithing of [Hoo] St Werburga for his office. Then they say that after the battle of Evesham the king took seisin of Hoo hundred and he appointed Richard Page and Hervey le Prude as his bailiffs, who collected the rents during their time of office to the king’s loss of £4 15s. Afterwards Sir Roger de Leyburn held that hundred by the lord king’s grant and he appointed other bailiffs there and demanded the aforesaid money from the aforesaid Richard and Hervey and they replied that they paid that money to the lord king’s Exchequer and now they come again with summons with severe loss to the country.

Toltingtrough hundred

The jury say that Meopham manor was formerly of the lord king and now is in the hand of the prior of Holy Trinity Canterbury and is worth £30 each year, but they do not know by what warrant nor from what time. Then they say that the lord William de Montecanis holds Talbot barony at Swanscombe of the lord king in chief and he pays rent of £18 each year for this to the keeper of Rochester castle, but they do not know by what warrant and that Henry de Crammavile holds Gravesend manor of the lord king in chief by the service of one knight and that Nicholas son of William Reyner holds Minstead [Nursted?] manor of Geoffrey
servicium dimidii feodi. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’tenet hundredrum de Toltentr’ et valet per annum xLs sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus archiepiscopus habet returnum brevium wrecium marcis furcas assisam panis et cervisie et placita namio vetitio nesciunt quo warento et quod episcopus Roff’ habet returnum brevium ab archiepiscopo et reddit sibi inde per annum viij libras nesciunt quo warento et dicunt quod dominus Willemus de Montecanis habet returnum brevium et censum et assumptum de partibus de Toltentr’ et de Swaneschamp in sua baronia et idem suspensi fuerunt tres latrones et per fratres hospitalis ducti fuerunt ad monasterium et in monasterio inuenierunt de illis unum vivum et in ecclesia illa quamdiu voluit moram fecit et postea ad voluntatem eius exivit et adhuc vivit. Item dicunt quod ix anni sunt elapsi quod Adam Toxkemale in dicto loco fuit suspensus super unam quercum qui judicatus fuit in curia de Hertleye et per sectam tocius curie curia ductus fuit ibidem et inuenierunt furcas caducas et relevare noluerunt nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod Adam Elnold fecit quamdam purpresturam in villa de Northflete super regiam viam ad dampnum patrie vjd. per annum. Item dicunt quod Robertus Carlebi subballivus cepit de Johanne le Reg’ iiijs pro eo removendo ab assisa et de Johanne Nyweman vjd pro eodem et de Willelmo de Hetche ijd pro eodem et de Johanne Atteborstalle ijd pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de eodem hundredro ultra certum numerum denariorum pro pondere dimidiam marcam. Item dicunt quod dominus de Craye et Simon Morlak quondam constabularius Roff’ tenuerunt quendam pontis Roff’ ad valorem xL marcarum ad magnum damnum tocius patrie omnium [ ] pere de Northflete sed quadam causa nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis cepit seisinam apud Northflete post mortem archiepiscopi Bonefacii Cant et in custodia et seisa in temporis sui manerium deterioratum fuit sicut in dicto molendino et omnibus aliis rebus dicti manerii ad valorem C solidorum et amplius. Item Magister Ricardus de Clifford fecit removeri in dicto manerio usque manerium suum de Moleseye duos equos carectarios precii xLs et viij stottos precii iij librarum et viij boves precii iij librarum et cepit injuste de villa de Northflet X de Pey by service of a half fee. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury holds Toltentrough hundred and is worth 40s each year, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the said archbishop has return of writs, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, by what warrant they do not know and that the bishop of Rochester has return of writs from the archbishop and he pays him £8 each year for this, they do not know by what warrant and they say that the lord William de Montecanis has a gallows at Swanscombe [Axtane hun.] in his barony and there three robbers were hanged and they were brought to the monastery by the Brethren of the hospital and in the monastery they discovered that one of them was alive and he stayed in the church as long as he wished and afterwards departed when he wished and he is still living. Then they say that 9 years ago that Adam Toxkemale was hanged in the said place upon a certain oak; he had been sentenced in the court of Hartley [Axtane hun.] and by suit of the whole court had been conveyed there when they found the gallows were broken and they did not wish to repair them, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Adam Elnold made a certain encroachment in Northfleet vill on the highway with loss of 6d. each year to the country. Then they say that Robert Carlebi, a sub-bailiff, took 4s. from John le Reg’ to remove him from an assise, 6d. from John Newman for the same, 2d. from William de Heche for the same and 2d. from John Atteborstalle for the same. Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took half a mark by weight more that the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that the lord of Cray and Simon Morlak, formerly constable of Rochester, held a certain pier of Rochester bridge, value 40 marks, causing great loss to the whole country [ ] the pier of Northfleet, but they do not know for what reason. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, took seisin at Northfleet after the death of Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury and during the time of his custody and seisin the manor deteriorated, in the said mill and all other assets of the said manor, to the value of 100s. and more. Then Master Richard de Clifford had 2 cart-horses price 40s., 8 steers price £4 and 8 oxen price £3 removed from the said manor to his manor of East Molesey [Surrey] and he unjustly took 10 marks from Northfleet vill, that Master Hugh de
Thornham, his clerk, (took) one mark and that Robert Deveneye, the said Richard’s serjeant took, as he said of the said Richard unjustly as he said, from John Strange 40s. and as the same John complained he took 1 mark from him and when the same John declined to pay him, the said [man] came to the said John’s house during the night and assaulted him until he raised a hue and cry upon him and that the same Robert unjustly took one ox, price one mark from John de Fraxino his clerk. Then the said Master Richard de Clifford came to the court of Meopham and took seisin there on the lord king’s behalf on the occasion of the election of the archbishop of Canterbury, although the prior was still living and he took £9 6s. unjustly in the said manor. He took 5 marks unjustly from the tenants of the said manor, Adam of Melbourne his serjeant took one and a half loads of wheat as his expenses there and the same man took and unjustly carried off 30s. from the collection of Rochester pontage of the whole hundred and community and the same Adam unjustly took another half mark from John de Fraxino.

Then the said Master Richard de Clifford took 100s. unjustly from John de la Hedge for the escape of two prisoners and again he took 40s. from the same John, and that Robert Deveneys, the said Richard’s serjeant unjustly took half a mark from Thomas de Rundal.

Then they say that the said Master Richard de Clifford took possession of Northfleet manor and stayed in the same manor in his seisin thus for 2 years and 20 weeks, that is from the beginning of August in King Henry’s 54th year [1270] and the manor is worth £100 each year. The same Richard took Meopham manor into the lord king’s hand and held it for 5 weeks until they had been repossessed by the lord king’s command and writ.

**Brenchley Hundred**

The jury say that Buckingfield manor is held of the lord king in chief by Sir Richard de Crevequer and it is worth £15 each year. Then they say that Roger the vintner of Malling holds Aylsford lathe at farm of the sheriffs who then hold office for £10 and now Thomas of Hoo holds the said lathe at farm of the present sheriff for £26 because he owes [ ] with loss to the country because of such amercement. Then they say that Brenchley hundred is in the lord king’s hand and is worth 1 mark each year because it is not in the hundred nor 1d. of the rent. Then they say *Stamendon*
Item dicunt quod Stamendon et Lehal fuerunt due secte et sequi solebant cum hundredo et sunt sustracte per Ricardum de Grey xv annis elapsis ad dampnum patrie per annum xix d [ ] dampnum regis. Item Tong et Suthtong est una secta et subtraxerunt se xv annis elapsis per Walterum de Aldewayk seneschallum Comitis Glovnetiae ad dampnum patrie per annum x [? dampnum ] domini regis quantum nesciunt quidam una secta pro valore per annum et dimidia secta de Hedenn subtraxit se per eundem Walterum ad dampnum patrie per annum Vd ad grave dampnum regis. Item dimidia secta de Upstok shelle subtraxit se per xv annos per Henricum Lovel [ ] ad dampnum patrie Vd et ad gravamen domini regis et una secta de Epergha subtraxit se per xxiiij annos per locatos de Tunebrig quare contencio mota fuit [inter] Comitem Glovneri et Bonefacium archiepiscopum Cant’ et monstratum fuit regi Henrico ita quod per preceptum eiusdem regis apposerunt se in xxiiij de vicinis ad [? curiam] de Epergha infra locatum et postea demonstrabatur in locato ad dampnum patrie per annum Xd et ad grave dampnum regis. Item tenentes abbatisse de [ solebant] sequi ad omnia cum hundredo et subtraxerunt se per xxv annos per Willelmum Peverel ballivum eiusdem abbatisse ad dampnum patrie per annum ijs et ad [grave] dampnum domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glovneri clamat habere returnum (brevium) et tenet placita namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento et abbas de [ ]clamat habere assisam panis et cervisie in tithinga de Lammberherst nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Wetchleston fuit antiquo tempore in manu domini regis et hundredum de Littlefeld codem modo et comes Glovneri tenet predicta hundreda [? et perceptip]jro quolibet xxs per annum sed nesciunt quo modo alienata fuerunt nec quo warento sed est magnum dampnum domini regis quolibet anno. Item dicunt quod Isabella de Charlton [fecit quandam] purpurstem super viam regis de dimidia acra in Brenchale ad dampnum patrie et and Lehal used to be two suits and used to do suit at the hundred and 15 years ago they were withdrawn by Richard de Grey with loss of 19d. each year to the country [ ] loss to the king.

Then Tong and South Tong [Brenchley par.] are one suit and they have been withdrawn by Walter de Aldewyk, steward of the earl of Gloucester, for 15 years with loss to the country of 10d. each year and they do not know what loss to the lord king. One suit of value each year and the half suit of Hedenn has been withdrawn by the same Walter with loss of 5d. each year to the county and serious [loss to the lord king] and for 15 years one suit of Bockingfold [Yalding par.] has withdrawn itself through the same Walter with loss of 10d. each year to the country and severe loss to the said king. Then for 15 years a half suit of Upstoke Hill has withdrawn itself through Henry Lovel [ ] with loss of 5d. to the country and harm to the lord king and for 24 years one suit of Epergham has withdrawn itself through the local people of Tonbridge, because a dispute had arisen between the earl of Gloucester and Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury and it was revealed to King Henry so that through the same king’s precept they put themselves before [a jury] of 24 men of the locality at Epergham court within the lowy and afterwards it was shown in the lowy that there had been a loss of 10d. each year to the country and a severe loss for the king. Then the tenants of the abbess of [? Malling, who] used to do suit at the hundred in all things and have been withdrawn for 25 years by William Peverel, the bailiff of the same abbess, with a loss of 2s. each year to the country and [severe] loss to the lord king.

Then they say that the earl of Gloucester claims to have return (of writs) and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant and the abbot of [ ]claims to have the assize of bread and ale in Lamberhurst tithing, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Wachlingstone hundred was in the lord king’s hand in ancient times and Littlefield hundred in the same way and the earl of Gloucester holds the aforesaid hundreds [and receives] for each one 20s. each year, but they do not know by what warrant, but there is great loss to the lord king each year. Then they say that Isabel of Charlton [has made a certain] encroachment of half an acre over the king’s highway in Brenchley with loss to the country and to
domini regis.

Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Leinham et Nicholaus de Denet vendiderunt abbatii Ponis Roberti dimidium feuodum in Lamberherst xvij annis elapsis [ et clamat] habere custodiam et maritagination sic haberet in manu sua baronim de Crevequer et valet per annum dicta terra xx libras et sic alienata est in prediucium domini regis xx libramur sed quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod Robertus de Borminge quando fuit coronor cepit dimidiam marcam de hundredo ad sepeliendum Adam But et quod Bartholomeus de [ ] ingebe coronor cepit de catallis Elvitha de Sesella unum jumentum precii vijs ad sepeliendum. Item quando Ricardus Horsman interfectus fuit Johannes de Seint Claro [coronator] cepit iijs de hundredo ad sepeliendum et ad inquirementum. Item idem Johannes cepit de hundredo dimidiam marcum pro Johanne de Mettefeld pro eodem. Item Nicholas de Tettesdon cepit de Willelmo de Merber pro eodem iijs. Item quando Johannes Bonyng vacatus fuit in Hoksmundenn Johannes de Marley fecit officium coronatoris quod fuit coronator et tamen [ho]mines hundredi dederunt ei spontanea voluntate ijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus Crevequer inprisonavit Dionisium filium Brun’ nesciunt qua causa et permisit eum abire. Thomas Beke Ricardus Aylward Willemus et Robertus filii Roberti de Rodmerege rettati sunt de fractione cuiusdem domus et Thomas de Ho ballivus cepit de qualibet illorum iijs ne attachiaret eos et postea Henricus de Hid subvicecomes fecit illos attachati donec solvunt. Item predictus Henricus inposuit Godefrido Sleb’ quod debuit emisse porcos furatos et finivit Xs et solvit injuste. Item Henricus inposuit Willelmo Waryn quod deliquit contra ipsum et tenuit ipsum contra voluntatem suam donec finiret xxxv et solvit. Item Thomas Molendinarius rettatus fuit de latrocinio ovium et attachiatus fuit per Robertum de Ho ballivus donec solvit Thomaa Xs. Item dicunt quod dictus Thomas de Ho ballivus et omnes alii ballivi capiunt denarios de pistoribus et braciaticribus pro [? assisiis panis et cervisie capiendis ] et non facientibus de eis et ideo assisa non est servata neque emendata. Item Daniel de Burtham tenuit hundredum [ ] in octo solidis et solverunt. Item Thomas de Ho the lord king.

Then they say that 18 years ago Nicholas of Lenham and Nicholas de Denet sold a half a fee in Lamberhurst to the abbot of Robertsbridge [ and claims] to have wardship and giving in marriage just as he held the barony of Crevequer in his hand and the said land is worth £20 and thus it was alienated with a loss to the lord king of £20, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that when Robert de Borminge was the coroner he took half a mark from the hundred for Adam But’s burial and that Bartholomew de [ Jingebe the coroner took one mare price 8s. from Elvitha de Sesella’s chatells for her burial. Then when Richard Horsman was killed John of St Clare [the coroner] took 4s. from the hundred for his burial and for holding an inquest. Then the same John took half a mark from the hundred for performing the same on behalf of John de Mettefield. Then Nicholas de Tettesdon took 3s. from William de Merber for the same reason. Then when John Bonyng was away in Hoksmundenn [Horsmonden?] John de Marley did the office of coroner, because he was the coroner and however the men of the hundred gave him 2s. of their own accord.

Then they say that Sir Robert Crevequer imprisoned Dennis son of Brun, for what reason they do not know and allowed him to go free. Thomas Beke, Richard Aylward, William and Robert, sons of Robert de Rodmere were charged with wrecking a certain house and Thomas of Hoo, the bailiff took 4s. from each of them so that he should not arrest them and afterwards Henry of Hythe, the sub sheriff, caused them to be arrested until they paid him 20s. fine so that they could be supported through a pledge and they paid. Then the aforesaid Henry accused Godfrey Sleb’ that he had been buying stolen pigs and fined him 10s. which he paid unjustly. The same Henry accused William Waryn that he had acted wrongly against him and held him against his will until he was fined 15s. which he paid. Then Thomas the miller was charged with theft of sheep and was arrested by Robert of Hoo the bailiff until Thomas paid 10s. Then they say that the said Thomas of Hoo the bailiff and all the other bailiffs take money from bakers and brewers for [taking the assizes of bread and ale] and these are not held by them and thus the assize is neither heard nor administered. Then Daniel de Burtham held the hundred [ ] for 8s. and they paid. Then Thomas of Hoo the bailiff employing three
ballivus sustinens tres ministros sub [eo ] Petrus de Berkindenne cepit equm Rogeri Carpentarii injuste [* donec solvit] dimidiam marcam. Item domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt [de hoc hundredo ]

m. 8 Hundredum de Chetham adhuc in lesto de Heylisford

Dicunt jurati quod Middiltun et Merdenn sunt dominica regis et ea tenet nunc Johannes de Burgo et Ospring est manerium domini regis et illud tenet domina regina mater regis Edwarii nunc. Item dicunt quod manerium de Eylisford solebat esse in manibus regum predecessorum regis nunc et illud tenet heres Johannis de Grey quo tempore quo modo nec quo warento fuerit alienatum ignorant. Dicunt eciam quod manerium de Elham solebat esse domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc et illud tenet dominus Willelmus de Leyburn quo warento nec quo modo fuerit alienatum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Crevequer tenet baroniam de Chetham de rege nunc in capite que baronia continet xiiij feoda dimidia et 1 quarterium, unde dictus Robertus tenet de predicta baronia unum feodum in hundredo de Chetham et heres Fulconis de Marsted tenet dimidium feodum et unum quarterium per medium de dicta baronia in Chetham. Item Radulfus Savage tenet unum quarterium unius feodi per medium de eadem in Chetham. Johannes de Northwode tenet unum quarterium unius feodi per medium de eadem in Chetham. Willelmus Bokerel tenet unum quarterium unius feodi per medium de eadem in Chetham; de ceteris feodis de eadem baronia que et per quos tenetur et a quo tempore alienata fuerunt nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium placita namio vetito wrecum maris assisam panis et cervisie per totam libertatem suam nesciunt quo warento et Robertus de Crevequer habet assisam panis et cervisie de antiquo.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis summonuit Adam de Gilling ut fieret miles pro respectu hundredo dedit ei dictus Adam xLs tempore quo archiepiscopatus Cant’ fuit in manu domini regis. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Seint Claro qui fuit coronator tempore Henrici regis ministers under him [ ] Peter de Berkindenne took Roger the carpenter’s horse unjustly [until he paid ] half a mark. Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took [from this hundred …. ].

m. 8 Chatham Hundred, still in Aylsford lathe

The jury say that Middleton and Marden are of the king’s demesne and John de Burgh now holds them and Ospringe is the lord king’s manor and the lady queen, King Edward’s mother, now holds that. Then they say that Aylesford manor used to be in kings’ hands, the predecessors of the present king, and John de Grey’s heir holds it, they do not know from what time, in what way or by what warrant it was alienated. They say also that Elham manor used to be of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, and Sir William de Leyburn holds that, they do not know by what warrant nor in what way it was alienated.

Then they say that Sir Robert de Crevequer holds Chatham barony of the present king in chief, which barony contains 14¾ fees, whence the said Robert holds one fee of the aforesaid barony in Chatham hundred, and Fulk of Marsted’s heir holds a half fee and one quarter through mesne tenure of the said barony in Chatham. Then Ralph Savage holds one quarter of one fee through mesne tenure of the same in Chatham. John of Northwood holds one quarter of one fee through mesne tenure of the same in Chatham. William Bokerel holds one quarter of one fee through mesne tenure of the same in Chatham; they do not know about the rest of the fees of the same barony, who and through whom they are held and from what time they were alienated.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the assize of bread and ale throughout the entire liberty, they do not know by what warrant and Robert de Crevequer has the assize of bread and ale from ancient times. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, summoned Adam de Giling in order that he should become a knight, the said Adam [being reluctant] for respite gave him 40s. when the archbishopric of Canterbury was in the lord king’s hand. Then they say that John de St Clare who was the
Dicunt jurati quod dominus Edwardus rex qui nunc est habet in manu sua vij marcas quatuor denarios et quadratam annui redditus de Cobbeham provenientes de quadam terra que vocatur Hagneslaunde et de tenemento Henrici de Cant’ in villa de Cobbeham sic de Hangingland xxiijs et de terra Henrici de Cant’ V marcas iiijis que et predicte vij marce iiijd que accidebant predicto domino Edwardo regi pro morte comitisse de Albamarle que fuit uxor domini Edmundi fratris regis Edwardi et obit predicti regis anno secundo et est escaeta.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus rex pater regis Johannis dedit Templariis maneriun de Strode cum hundredo de Shamele et valent per annum xx libras et tenentur de rege in capite et quod dictus Henricus rex pater Johannis regis dedit maneriun de Shorne Judlano coroner at King Henry’s time took 4s. from the men of Grain before he was willing to deliver Grain church from two felons who had fled after Adam de Stretende’s death, and John de Aldinge clerke of John de Marley the coroner of Aylesford lathe took 2s. from Middelburga of Gillingham township in Chatham hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator, when the archbishopric of Canterbury was in the late king’s hand, took £10 from Gillingham township within Chatham hundred to sow land in the said township, which was in the lord king’s hands and he carried off those £10 and the lands have not been sown. Then they say that the same Master Richard, at the aforesaid time employed in the aforesaid township of Gillingham 3 men, one pack of dogs, four greyhounds and one ferret for 6 weeks, to destroy the warren at the lord king’s cost.

Then they say that certain merchants, that is Walter and William de Vaus who were known in Chatham hundred in Gillingham township brought and caused to be brought two small boat-loads of wool from the port of Medway to places overseas, they do not know how many sacks, nor for what price nor to what place nor by whose order, arrangement or contract nor what was received for them.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the lord king’s tax of one-twentieth have received from the said hundred 20s. by weight more than the assessed amount of money.

Shamwell Hundred

The jury say that the present lord King Edward holds in his hand 7 marks, four pence and a farthing of annual rent issuing from a certain land which is called Hagneslaunde and from Henry of Canterbury’s tenement in Cobham vill, thus 23s. from Hangingland and 5 marks 4s. from Henry of Canterbury’s land, these and the aforesaid 7 marks 4d. came to the aforesaid lord King Edward by the countess of Aumale’s death who was the wife of the Lord Edmund the king’s brother [Avelina married to Edmund 1269, died 10 November 1274] and she died in the second year of the aforesaid king and this is an escheat.

Then they say that the lord King Henry, King John’s father, gave Strood manor with Shamwell hundred to the Templars which are worth £20 each year and they are held of the king in chief and that the said King Henry, King John’s father, gave Shorne to Judlanus de...
de Neyvile et dominus Rogerus de Northwude habet illud de dono Johannis de Nevyle et tenet de domino rege in capite et valet xx libras per annum. Item dicunt quod dominus Ricardus rex dedit manerium de Westchale Hugoni de Neyvile et Johannes filius eius dedit illum Johanni de Cobbeham veteri et Johannes filius eius modo tenet de Johanne de Neyvile et idem Johannes de rege in capite et valet per annum Cs. et quod dominus Henricus pater regis Johannis dedit manerium de Hegham monialibus de Hegham que modo illud tenent de rege in chief and it is worth £20 each year. Then they say that the lord King Richard gave West Chalk manor to Hugh de Neyvile and his son John gave that to John of Cobham senior and John his son now holds it of John de Neyvile and the same John of the king in chief and it is worth 100s. each year and that the Lord Henry, King John’s father, gave Higham manor to the nuns of Higham who now hold that of the lord king in chief and it is worth £60 each year and the lord King Henry, King Edward’s father, gave Roger de Leyburn 2 marks 4d. in the town of Shorne, which were an escheat after Roger Tanvel’s death and William de Leyburn now holds these by the lord king’s charter.

Then they say that East Chalk manor is held of the lord king in chief and the prior of Beremundsey habet illud de dono dominis Johannis de Burgoiam per iij annos elapsos et sic tenetur per medium et valet per annum Lx libras et dominus rex Henricus pater regis Edwardi dedit Rogero de Leyburni ij marcas iiijd in villa de Shorne que fuerunt escaeta post mortem Rogeri Tanvel et Willelmi de Leyburn nunc eas tenet per cartam domini regis.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Estchale tenetur de domino rege in capite et prior de Beremundsey habet illud de dono dominis Johannis de Burgoiam per iij annos elapsos et sic tenetur per medium et valet per annum X libras et quod domina Johanna de Cobbeham Johannes de Hakinton et Petronilla de Tokintun tenent dimidium feodum in villa de Hegham de comitissa de Insula by mesne tenurie and it is worth 100s. each year and that William of St Clare holds half a fee in Merston [Shorne par.] of William de Montecanis by mesne tenure and the same William of the lord king in chief and it is worth £10 each year and that the lady Joan de Cobham, John of Hackington and Petronilla de Tokintun hold half a fee in Higham vill of the Countess de l’Isle by mesne tenure and the Countess holds of the lord king in chief and it is worth 100s. each year and that William of St Clare holds half a fee in Higham vill of William de Montecanis by mesne tenure and the same William holds of the lord king in chief and it is worth 100s. each year and that John de Cobham holds one fee in Cooling of the Countess de l’Isle by mesne tenure and the Countess herself of the lord king in chief and it is worth £30 each year and that Laura de Godinton holds half a fee in Strood of Geoffrey de Scolande and the same Geoffrey of the earl of Leicester and the same earl of the lord king in chief and it is worth 40s. each year and that Saurus of Strood, Adam Franklayn and Peter Myles hold half a fee in Strood of Simon de Chelesfeud and the same Simon of the earl of Leicester and the same earl of the lord king in chief and it is worth 40s. each year.

Then they say that Shamwell hundred is in the Sir John of Cobham’s hand and he pays 20s. rent each year to the Templars. Then they say that Peter Gardun without warrant, has withdrawn himself from suit of the aforesaid hundred for 3 years with loss of 6d. each
Item dicunt quod Petrus Gardun qui fuit serviens castri Rofens’ cepit de Willelmo Parleben in proximo ante bellum de Lewes tres boves de precio xLs iiiij vaccas de precio iij marcas tres juvencaes precii xvs C et xv oves precii Cs.

Item Simon Marlek qui fuit constabularius eiusdem castri cepit de dicto Willelmo xvj baconos precii xxs et iij carcossia multonum precii xLd et I carcossium bovis precii vjs et I vaccam precii dimidiam marcam et X sectis precii xLs et alia multa bona ad valenciam xx marcarum. Item cepit de eodem Willelmo bladum de xxxij acris unde vij fuerunt de frumento novem de siligine vj de ordeo et V de avena et valuit predictum bladum xv marcas et amplius.

Item dictus Simon Morlak cepit de Willelmo Synoch dimidiam peysam casei precii dimidie marce et dimidiam sumam avene precii xLd. Idem Simon cepit equum Willelmi Sinoch et eum detinuit quousque dedisse ei dimidiam marcam pro borgha de Ostrelaund. Item dictus Simon cepit de Roberto de Scalario de Cobbehame i marciam injuste et de Waltero de Vela dimidiam marcam injuste.

Item dicunt quod domini Fulco et Henricus Malemeis collectores vicesime ceperunt de dicto hundredo xxs ultra certum numerum denario rum pro pondere.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford year and the sheriff’s tourn for 3 years with loss of 3d. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury (he is dead) has return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant and that the lord Roger of Northwood has a gallows, the assise of bread and ale in Shorne, they do not know by what warrant and the bishop of Rochester has return (of writs), pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, a gallows, the assise of bread and ale at Halling, they do not know by what warrant and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury [written above: Holy Trinity] has a gallows, the assise of bread and ale at Cliffe, they do not know by what warrant, and that Peter Gardin now for 3 years has taken the fines for the brewers’ offences at Wichling without a warrant. Then they say that William Franceys took 6d. from John son of Philip for removing him from the assizes and Ralph Kenward 6d. from Gilbert de Ponte for the same reason. Then William Franceys took 6d. from Stephen son of Edmund for the same reason.

Then they say that Peter Gardin, who was a serjeant of Rochester castle, just before the battle of Lewes took three oxen price 40s., 4 cows price 2 marks, three heifers price 15s., 115 sheep price 100s. from William Parleben.

Then Simon Marlek, who was constable of the same castle, unjustly took 100s. from the said William and the same Simon took 16 sides of bacon price 20s. and 4 sheeps’ carcases price 40s. and 1 carcase of an ox price 6s. and 1 cow price half a mark and 10 of young animals price 40s. and many other goods valued at 20 marks. Then he took the grain of 37 acres from the same William, of these 7 were sown with wheat, nine with rye, 6 with barley and 6 with oats and the aforesaid grain is worth 15 marks and more. Then the said Simon Morlak took half a wey of cheese, price half a mark and half a load of oats, price 40d. from William Synoch. The same Simon took William Sinoch’s horse and kept it until he had given him half a mark for the tithing of Ostrelaund [?Oysterland, Stoke par., detached]. Then the said Simon unjustly took 1 mark from Robert de Scalario of Cobham and half a mark unjustly from Walter de Vela.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took from the said hundred 20s. by weight more that the assessed amount of money. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord
escactor domini regis capere fecit per Robertum Deveneys ballivum suum de Johanne Strange injuste xLS et de Johanne de Mydenesse injuste xLS. Idem Magister Ricardus magnam fecit destructionem in archispiscopatu Cant’ sed nesciunt quot et que. Item dicunt quod Alexander de Craneweturum Symon Kydenot et Aufrey Blakedeys mercatores emerunt lanas in hundredo de Shamelde et duerunt eas per mare usque portum de Sandwico sed nesciunt quot saccos nec quo warento.

**Hundredum de Eyhorne**

Dicunt jurati quod manerium de Herezetesham fuit dominicum domini regis Henrici qui illud dedit Hugoni de Cressy veteri quod manerium nunc tenuit per annum Rogerus Leveday de dimissione domini Willelmi de Leyburn et in eodem manerio tenet Johannes de Northwode X libratas redditus et consuetudinum de dono domini Guncelini de Badelemere et tenetur illud manerium de dominio rege in capite pro 1 feodo militis et idem Johannes tenuit dictum redditum per 1 annum. Item dicunt quod manerium de Sutton fuit dominicum domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc quod dedit illud manerium domino Willelmo Comiti Marescallo in maritagio cum domina Elianora sorore sua et mortuo dicto Marescallo dominus Simon de Montefort duxit dominum predictam in uxorem et habuit cum ea illud manerium et mortuo ipso domino Simone post bellum de Evesham intravit in illud manerium dominus Willelmus de Valence qui illud manerium clamat hereditatem uxoris sue et idem Willelms tenet manerium predictum de domino rege in capite nesciunt pro quo feoda militis que pertinent ad marescallam. Item dicunt quod denna de Hedycron cum advocacione ecclesie eiusdem fuit dominum regis Henrici patris regis nunc qui dedit illa hospitali suo de Ospringe in perpetuum elemosinam.

Item dicunt quod Hugo de Girunde tenet dimidium feodum militis in Wrenstede de domino rege in capite et dominus Willelms Peyforer tenet dimidium feodum militis de rege in capite in Wychling et dominus Hamo de Gattun tenet unum feodum militis in Bocton et Wornesell faciendo omnes isti wardam castro Dover et tenent domino rege in capite. Item dominus Robertus de Septevannis et domina

king’s escheator, unjustly took through Robert Deveneys, his bailiff 40s. from John Strange and 40s. unjustly from John de Mydenesse. The same Master Richard caused great damage in the archbishopric of Canterbury but they do not know how much and what sort. Then they say that Alexander de Craneweturum, Symon Kydenot and Aufrey Blakedeys, merchants bought wool in Shamwell hundred and took it by sea to the port of Sandwich, but they do not know how many sacks not by what warrant.

**Eyhörne Hundred**

The jury say that the Harrietsham manor was the lord King Henry’s desme who granted that to Hugh de Cressy the elder. This manor Roger Loveday has now held for a year by demise of Sir William de Leyburn and in the same manor John of Northwood holds 10 pounds-worth of rents and customary payments by grant of Jocelin of Badlesmere and that manor is held of the lord king in chief for 1 knight’s fee and the said John has held the said rent for 1 year. Then they say that Sutton manor was of the desme of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father and he gave that manor to William the Earl Marshal upon his marriage with Lady Eleanor2 his sister and after the said Marshal died the Lord Simon de Montfort married the aforesaid lady and held that manor with her. After the Lord Simon died, William de Valence after the battle of Evesham entered that manor and claimed it by hereditary right of his wife and the same William holds the aforesaid manor of the lord king in chief, they do not know for how many knight’s fees which pertained to the Marshal’s wife. Then they say that Headcorn dens with the advowson of the church of the same place, was the desme of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, who gave it to his hospital of Ospringe in perpetual alms. Then they say that Hugh de Girunde holds half a knight’s fee in Wrinsted [Frinsted par.] of the lord king in chief and Sir William Peyforer holds half a knight’s fee of the king in chief in Wichling and Sir Hamo de Gattun holds one knight’s fee in Boughton and Wormshill, all those men by making castle guard at Dover and they hold of the lord king in chief. Then the lord Robert de Septevannis and the lady Margaret de Valoynes hold 2 fees and one quarter of the king in chief in Aldington [?Thurnham par.] doing castle guard at Rochester for these and the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds Lenham manor of the
Margareta de Valoynes tenent de rege in capite ij feoda et unum quarterium in Aldyntun faciendo inde wardam castro Roff’ et abbas Saancti Augustini Cant’ tenet maneriunm de Lenham de dominio rege in capite ab antiquo tempore et Nicholaus de Cryoll qui est in wardam domini regis nunc tenet in Stokel’ unum feodum et sextam partem unius feodi faciendo inde wardam castro Roff’ quod Gregorius de Rokele tenet nun ex tradicione regis nunc et dominus Willelmmus de Leyburn tenet in Ledes 1 feodum militis per medium sic dominum Robertum de Crevequer qui dicit Robertus solebat tenere in capite de rege et dominus Rogerus de Leyburn adquisivit illud manerium de dicto domino Roberto de tenuit per vij annos.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Eyhorne est in manu domini regis nunc videlicet per annum in redditu assise XLvs et est in eodem hundred levata quedam extorsio vocata turnum vicecomitis per Johannem de Wattun xx annis elapsis sic XLvs. iiijd et valet posterea perquisitus eiusdem hundredi per annum xxvs, salva omni justicia. Item dicunt quod hundredum de Lyttlefeld and hundredum de Wachelingstone solebant esse in manu regis Johannis et comitis Gloveme nunc tenet illa solvendo inde annuatim XLs redditu dominus regi a tempore quo tenuerit et valent per annum Cs et amplius et trahuntur in leucam de Tunebrigg et non sequitur ut solent ad dampnum regi et patrie per annum xLs et borge de Ledes et Homfeld subtrahuntur a secta hundredi de Eyhorn per Rogerum de Leyburn per viij annos ad dampnum regi per annum xijd et ad dampnum secte hundredi eisdem dimidiam marcam per annum. Item dimidia borge de Westbocton sic tenentes Willelmi de Montecanis subtrahuntur a secta hundredi de Hedyton per annum vnijd et ad dampnum secte hundredi vjd per annum. Item dimidia quarterii unius borge in Hedyton subtrahuntur ab eadem seeta per xvijd annos ad dampnum regi per annum vjd per Fratres de Ospringe. Item vn mesuagia in Wycherindenn subtrahuntur a secta hundredi de Wachelingstone per annum vjd. Item Clopham Stonkere Bedemanton et Cenegefold subtrahuntur a dicta secta per Hospitalarios de Scailefeld per xx v annos ad dampnum regi per annum vjd. Item Clopham Stonkere Bedemanton et Cenegefold subtrahuntur a dicta secta per annum nunc per abbatem Sancti Augustini Cant’ ad dampnum patrie per annum vjd et de omnibus istis substraccionibus dicunt quod nesciunt quo warento et similiter villa de Sutton tenentes domini Willelmi de Valence subtrahuntur per multa tempora a dicta secta ad dampnum regi et patrie per lord king in chief from ancient times and Nicholas de Cryoll who is the lord king’s ward now holds one fee and a sixth part of one fee in Stokel’ by doing castle guard at Rochester, and this Gregory of Ruxley now holds by demise of the present king and Sir William de Leyburn holds 1 knight’s fee in Leeds by mesne tenure of Sir Robert de Crevequer, which the same Robert used to hold of the king in chief and Sir Roger de Leyburn has acquired that manor from the said Sir Robert and has held it for 7 years.

Then they say that Eyhorne hundred is in the present lord king’s hand, that is in rent of assize 46s. each year and 20 years ago a levy of 45s. 4d. was exacted in the same hundred through John de Wattun called the sheriff’s tourn and afterwards the assets of the same hundred were worth 25s., saving all justice. Then they say that Littlefield hundred and Wachelingstone hundred used to be in King John’s hand and the earl of Gloucester how holds those, paying a yearly rent of 40s. for them to the lord king from the time he held them and they are worth 100s. and more each year and they are handed over to the lowy of Tonbridge and do not do suit of court, as they are accustomed to do, causing loss to the king and country of 40s. each year, and the tithings of Leeds and Hothfield are withdrawn by Roger de Leyburn for 7 years from suit of Eyhorne hundred with loss of 12d. each year to the king and loss of half a mark to the suit of that hundred each year. Then half of West Boughton [Monchelsea?] tithing, the tenants of William de Montecanis, after the battle of Lewes are withdrawn from suit of the hundred, with loss of 20½d. assize rent each year to the king from and loss of 6d. to suit of the hundred. Then a half of one quarter of one tithing in Hedyton is withdrawn for 16 years by the Brethren of Ospringe from the same suit with loss of 6d. each year to the king. Then for 25 years 6 messuages in Wissenden [Bethersden par.] are withdrawn from the said suit by the Hospitallers of Stalisfield with loss to the king of 6d each year. Then for 30 years Clap Hill [Aldington par.?], Stonkere, Bedmonton [Wormshill par.] and Cenegefold are withdrawn from the said suit by the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury with loss of 6d. each year to the country and they say that they so not know by what warrant all these suits were withdrawn and similarly the tenants of the lord William de Valence in the town of Sutton are withdrawn a long time ago from the said suit, with loss to the king and country of 5s. each year and the town of
Hollingbourne, that is the tenants of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury and of Sir Ralph of St Leger in Ulcombe in the archbishopric of Canterbury, from ancient times do not follow the hundred, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claim to have return of writs, wreck, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale throughout the whole archbishopric, and Sir William de Valence to have pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale at Sutton. Then the abbot of St Augustine claims to have the gallows, the assize of bread and ale in Lenham from ancient times and similarly Sir William de Leyburn in Leeds and the lord Roger Loveday claims to have the assize of bread and ale at Sutton. Then the abbot of St Augustine claims to have the gallows, the assize of bread and ale in Lenham and similarly Sir Roger of Northwood at Thurnham [?], it is not known by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch claim to have warren throughout all their lands, similarly Sir William de Valence at Sutton, Sir William de Leyburn in Leeds, the abbot of St Augustine’s in Lenham, Nicholas de Cryell in Stockbury, Sir Roger of Northwood in Thurnham, they do not know by what warrant. Then the abbot of Boxley claims to have warren in Boxley and Sir Ralph of St Leger in Ulcombe by demise of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father.

Then they say that Elias de Frethenested, the lord king’s serjeant had a writ of the lord king to arrest the Lords Geoffrey Gaselyn, Roger Hunting’ and others named in the writ, except Ralph de Pyntunn. Then Lord Geoffrey, through his serving man William, did not permit the lord king’s serjeant to carry out the duty of his office at East Sutton, according to the tenor of the king’s writ nor was the same Roger Hunting’ willing to permit it.

Then Sir William de Valence claimed that in Sutton a serjeant of the lord king ought not to exercise any of his authority whatsoever, unless through the bailiffs of William himself and he does not permit those serjeants of the lord king to perform their duties, by what warrant it is not known.

Then they say that the prior of Leeds has appropriated for himself 100 acres and more of land in Leeds, thence if the lord king should have a ward in Leeds he
Item dicunt quod prior de Ledes appropriavit sibi in Ledes C acras terre et plus unde si dominus rex haberet casu warde de Ledes haberet dampnum per annum Xs et frateres de Ledes de Modindenn appropriaverunt sibi xL acras et plus ad dampnum regi per annum Vs et haberet wardam de Ledes.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Parker de Harrietsham cepit de Rogero de Erdesles vjd pro removendo assisa, de Thoma Burton vjd, de Petro de Byckenor vjd, de Simon Virg’ vjd, de Olivero Attehale vjd, de Henrico Wybarn et Florencio de Wytingel vjd. Item Thomas de Merle cepit pro eodem de Waltero de Otham iijd de Ada de Clopham xijd, de Gileberto Quether iijd, de Johanne de Capella iijd, de Rogero Pistore de Suttun vjd, de Johanne Taillur vjd, de Moyse Scot vjd.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemeis injuste inposuit Roberto de Lenham quod fecerat feloniam et ipsum inprisonavit quousque habuit de eo Xs et in eodem modo de Radulfo de Rugele cepit V markas et de Johanne Onrett eodem xxs. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Chilecroft cepit pro summnonitione scacarii de Benedicto de Sandputte dimidiam marcam et eum non aquietavit et de Thoma de La eodem modo dimidiam marcam, de Ricardo Howe eodem modo dimidiam marcam, de villa de Aldington eodem modo dimidiam marcam, de Gilberto le Gaunt xLd et ipsos non aquietavit. Item dominus Henricus Malemeis eodem modo cepit de Bartholomeo Attewode dimidiam marcam et eum non acquietavit. Item Johannes de Braburn eodem modo cepit de Johanna Constantin 1 marcam et non acquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Bonburg et Robertus Grayn in Ledes attachiaverunt Thomam filium Petri Tabard utrum juste vel injuste sed promiserunt eum abire pro xxs quos receperunt. Item cum Thomas Wineton esset occisis apud Ledes quidam subscripti fuerunt rettati de morte eius de quibus dominus Willelmus de Ledes cepit bona pro attachiamento dimittendo et gratias eisdem faciendo sic de Orabilia uxore Ricardi Pistoris xLs, de Johanne Tannerne et fratris suis iijd marcas, de Johanne Chirel et sociis suis V marcas.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Seint Cler’ coronator cepit de borgha de Stokebir pro officio execendo iij pro sepelliendo Willelmum filium Johanne de will have a loss of 10s. each year and the Brethren of Leeds of Modindenn have appropriated for themselves 40 acres and more with a loss of 5s. each year to the king and he had a ward of Leedes. Then they say that John de Parker of Harrietsham took 6d. from Roger de Erdesles’ for removing him from the assize, 6d. from Thomas Burton, 6d. from Peter oficknor, 6d. from Simon Virg’, 6d. from Oliver Attehale, 4d. from William Piper, 6d. from Henry Wybarn and Florian de Wytingel. Then Thomas le Merle took 4d. from Walter of Offham for the same reason, 12d. from Adam of Clop Hill, 3d. from Gilbert Quether, 4d. from John of the Chapel, 6d. from Roger the baker of Sutton, 6d. from John the tailor, 6d. from Moses Scot.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemeis unjustly accused Robert of Lenham of committing a felony and imprisoned him until he received 40s. from him and in the same way he took 5 marks from Ralph de Rugele and 20s. from John Onrett for the same. Then they say that William de Chilecroft took half a mark from Benedict de Sandputte for summons of the Exchequer and has not acquitted him and in the same way half a mark from Thomas de La [   ], half a mark from Richard Howe in the same way, half a mark from the vill of Aldington in the same way, 40s. from Gilbert Gaunt and he has not acquitted them. Then the lord Henry Malemeis took half a mark from Bartholomew Attewode in the same way and he has not acquitted him. Then John of Brabourne took 1 mark from Joan Constantin in the same way and he has not acquitted her.

Then they say that John Bonburg and Robert Grayn in Leeds arrested Thomas son of Peter Tabard, justly or unjustly but they promised to release him for 20s. which they received. Then after Thomas Wineton had been killed at Leeds certain people as written below were charged with his death, from whom the lord William of Leeds took goods for releasing them from arrest and for collecting largesse for the same men, thus from Orabilia wife of Richard the baker 40s., from John Tannere and his brothers 2 marks, from John Chirel and his associates 5 marks.

Then they say that John of St Clare the coroner took 3s. from the tithing of Stokebir for performing the duties of his office for burying William, son of John of Bicknor, who had been killed and 5s. for a certain stranger killed in Fretthenestede [Frintsted par.] and he took 4s. in the same way for the death of Roger de Erdeslonde in Hollingbourne and John Kembelef his
Bykenore occisus et pro quodam extraneo occiso in Fretthenestede Vs. et de morte Rogeri de Erdelonde in Holingeburn iiijs eodem modo et Johannes Kembelef clericus eius pro eodem ijs et de morte Stephani filii Pollard in Selve [ ] dominus Johannes de Marleye coronator cepit eodem modo de morte Margerie de Fareburn in Heryetesham iiijs et 1 thalun precii xviijd et in [ de ] morte ij puerorum cepit Vs eodem modo et de morte filii Willemi de Boycote in Walecumbe ijs.

Item dicunt quod dominus [ intravit] manerium de Heryetesham post mortem domini Stephani de Cressy et cepit ibi de bonis Galfridi de Chewyk qui [ fecit vastum et destructionem in ] boscis et bladis xx marcas et plus per Ricardum de Chistelden servientem suum. [ intravit manerium prioris ecclesie Christi Cant' sic Holineborne post obitum Bonefacii archiepiscopi et cepit de tenentibus Xs eodem modo post obitum Rogeri de Leyburn. [Item domini Fulco Peyforer et Henricus Malemeis cepit de] eodem hundredo ultra certum numerum pro pondere [ ] habuit furcas apud Swaneschamp et eis usus est.

clerk took 2s. for the same and for the death of Stephen son of Pollard in Selv’ [ ]. Sir John of Marley the coroner took 4s. in the same way for the death of Margery of Fairbourne in Harrietsham and 1 thalun price 18d. and in [ ] for the death of 2 youths he took 5s. in the same way and 2s. for the death of William de Boycote’s son in Walcombe. Then they say that the lord [ ] entered Harrietsham manor after Sir Stephen de Cressy’s death and there took from Geoffrey de Chewyk’s goods as [he had caused waste and damage] in the woods and crops worth 20 marks and more, through Richard of Chisleden his serjeant. [ ] entered the Hollingbourne manor of the prior of Christchurch Canterbury, after the death of Archbishop Boniface and took from the tenants [ ] 10s. in the same way after Roger de Leyburn’s death. [Then Sir Fulk Peyforer and Henry Malemeis took from] the same hundred over the assessed amount by weight [from this hundred]. [ ] has the gallows at Swanscombe and he has used them.

1 Countess de l’Isle: Isabella de Forz, dowager Countess of Aumale, Countess of Devon and Lady of the Isle of Wight.

2 Eleanor was 5th child of King John and Isabella, born 1215, married William Marshal, 2nd Earl of Pembroke 23 April 1224, d. 1231, married Simon de Montfort 19 February 1238, killed at Evesham 1265. Eleanor died April 1275.
Hundredum de Twyford

m. 8v  Dicunt jurati quod Comes Glovernium tenet manerium de Elding de rege in capite et est membrum de Clare et valent per annum xxx libras et dominus Robertus de Crevequer tenet manerium de Tersten et de Farlee de rege in capite et sunt membra baronie de Chetham et valent per annum xxx libras. Item dicunt quod Rogerus Vinitarius tenet manerium de Heilisford et tenet tenendum de Johanne de Wattun tunc vicecomite ad firmam pro X libris et modo traditur ad firmam pro xxviij libris [sic- de- erased] ad dampnum patrie de quantitate tanti augmenti ultra primam firmam. Item dicunt quod hundredum predictum est in manu domini regis et valet per annum Vs de redditu assisa et fortuno que inde possunt accidere preterea dicunt quod Johannes de Wattun quando fuit vicecomes levavit dimidiam marcam ad turnum vicecomitis prece sua super Farlee et Terstone et Wot’engebur’ et Walterus de Berstede tempore quo fuit vicecomes augebat predictum turnum de xLd et post bellum de Lewes borgha de Fall’ solvit predictum turnum per se quod Woting’ebur’ subtraxit se post bellum de Lewes per potestatem Willelmi de Muchenesy ad dampnum de Farl’ per annum Vs et ad grave dampnum domini regis.

Item dicunt quod tenentes Bartholomei de Woteringesbir sequi solebant cum hundredo de Twyford ad duos laghedayes per annum et subtraxerunt se post bellum de Lewes per Willelum de Montecanis, Nettlestede sequi solebat codem modo ad duos laghedayes per annum et subtraxerunt se xx annis elapsis per Rodlandum de Malling ballivum Ricardi Comitis Glovernium qui tunc fuit. Item dimidiam borgha de Weststede subtraxit se per iij annos per Rogerum de Horn ballivum Comitis Glovenium et sequi solebat ad omnia cum hundredo de Twyford modo tamen redierunt et fecerunt pacem pro substractione cum Thoma de Ho ballivo hundredi per iijis.

Item dicunt quod Comes Glovernium clamat habet returnum (brevium) apud Netlestede per honorem Glovernium et tenet placita namio vetito et clamat habere furcas et assisam panis et cervisie nesciunt quo warento. Item dominus Willelmuus de Munchenesy levavit (furcas) infra istos tres annos apud Woteringebur et dicunt quod nunquam viderunt ibi furcas et habet assisam panis et cervisie et ballivus hundredi de Twyford quicunque fuisset solem habere

Twyford Hundred

m. 8v  The jury say that the earl of Gloucester holds Yalding manor of the king in chief and it is a member of the honour of Clare and is worth £30 each year and Sir Robert de Crevequer holds Teston manor and East Farleigh from the king in chief and they are members of Chatham barony and are worth £30 each year. Then they say that Roger Vinitarius held Aylesford lathe at farm of John de Wattun the then sheriff for £10 and now it is demised at farm for £28 causing a loss to the country by the amount of this increase over the first farm. Then they say that the aforesaid hundred is in the lord king’s hand and is worth 5s. each year from rent of assize rent and the things they are able to acquire by good fortune, moreover they say that when John de Wattun was sheriff he made a levy of half a mark at the sheriff’s tourn by his will upon East Farleigh, Teston and Wateringbury and when Walter of Bearsted was sheriff he increased the aforesaid tourn by 40d. and after the battle of Lewes the tithing of East Farleigh paid the aforesaid tourn for him, that Wateringbury by the authority of William de Muchenesy withdrew itself with loss to East Farleigh of 5s. each year and a severe loss to the lord king.

Then they say that Bartholomew of Wateringbury’s tenants used to do suit at Twyford hundred at two lawdays each year and withdrew themselves after the battle of Lewes, through William de Montecanis, Nettlestede used to do suit in the same way at two lawdays each year and the tenants withdrew themselves 20 years ago through Roland of Malling, bailiff of Richard then Earl of Gloucester. Then half the tithing of Whetsted [Capel/Tudeley pars] withdrew itself 3 years ago through Roger de Horn, the earl of Gloucester’s bailiff, and it used to follow Twyford hundred in all things. Now however they have come back and have made peace with Thomas of Hoo, bailiff of the hundred by payment of 4s. for the withdrawal.

They say that the earl of Gloucester claims to have return (of writs) at Nettlestead through the honour of Gloucester and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he claims to have a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, they do not know by what warrant. Then three years ago the Lord William de Munchenesy raised (a gallows) at Wateringbury and they say that they have never seen a gallows there and he holds the assize of bread and ale and the bailiff of...
assimam panis et cervisie de Wotingebur sed nesciunt quo warento predictus Willelmus habet.

Item dicunt quod Rodland de Okstede avus Rodlandi qui nunc est fecit purpresturam super regiam viam in borgha de Netlested ad quantitatem L perticatarum in longitudine et in latitudine 1 perticam ad novencentum patrie et ad gravamen domini regis. Item Johannes Pykenot fecit purpresturam super regiam viam de duabus daywerks terre in tithinga de Stokingber' in Pecham xxv annis elapsis ad novcentum patrie et ad damnum domini regis. Item Paganus de la Hale fecit purprestuum super communam ville de Pecham ad quantitatem partis unius acre terre ad novcentum patrie. Item xxx annis elapsis Hugo de Beremundeseye avus Hungonis qui nunc est fecit purpresturam super regiam viam apud Ledeford ad quantitatem dimidie acre terre ad novcentum patrie et damnum regis. Item Auvicinus clericus fecit quoddam fossatum in regia via ad novcentum patrie et Alanus de Meyllaner fecit purpresturam super regiam viam de quarta parte unius acre terre ad novcentum patrie et gravamen domini regis.

Item dicunt quod domini reges habuerunt antiquo tempore hundredum de Littlefeld et hundredum de Wethelestan in manu sua modo Comes Glovernie tenet hundreda predicta reddendo per annum domini regi pro quolibet xxs, sed nesciunt qualiter alienata sunt nec a quo tempore.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Sparue cepit de hominibus de borgha de Stokingberi ad removendum de assisa ad quantitatem Xs. Item Hugo Mot cepit de Ricardo Palmere ijs ne duceret eum ad Cantuar'. Idem Hugo inposuit Ade de Cruce quod commendit cum fratre suo qui fuit hustlagatus et cepit ab eo vj denarios ut dimitteret eum in pace. Item dicunt quod Willelmus Champeneys et Rosa mater eius capti fuerunt per latrocinio et liberati Henricus de Ledes subvicecomes et permisit eos abire sine judicio unde patrie est in dubio.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Sancto Claro coronator noluit exequi officium suum priusquam permitteretur certa pecunia unde habuit tempore suo de hundredo predicto ad quantitatem xxs.

Item cum Willelmus de Lodeneford venisset ad Twyford hundred, whosoever he might be, used to have the assize of bread and ale at Wateringbury, but they do not know by what warrant the aforesaid William has this.

Then they say that Roland de Oksted, grandfather of the present Roland, made an encroachment upon the royal highway in Nettlestead to the extent of 50 perches in length and 1 perch wide causing impediment to the country and harm to the lord king. Then 25 years ago John Pykenot made an encroachment on the royal highway of two dayworks of land in Stokingbury tithing in [East] Peckham causing obstruction to the country and loss to the lord king. Then Pagan de la Hale has made an encroachment upon the royal highway of two dayworks of land in Stokingbury tithing in [East] Peckham causing obstruction to the country and loss to the lord king. Then 25 years ago John Pykenot made an encroachment upon the royal highway of two dayworks of land in Stokingbury tithing in [East] Peckham causing obstruction to the country and loss to the lord king. Then Pagan de la Hale has made an encroachment upon Peckham vill’s common in size of an acre of land causing obstruction to the country. Then 30 years ago Hugh of Bermondsey, the present Hugh’s grandfather, made an encroachment upon the highway at Lunsford [East Malling par.] in size half an acre of land causing obstruction to the country and loss to the king. Then Auvicinus the clerk made a certain ditch upon the royal highway to the damage of the country and Alan de Meyllaner made an encroachment upon the royal highway the size of a fourth of one acre of land causing obstruction to the country and damage to the lord king.

Then they say that from ancient times the lord kings have held Littlefield hundred and Wachlingstone hundred in their hands. Now the earl of Gloucester holds the aforesaid hundreds by paying 20s. rent each year to the lord king for each one, but they do not know how these were alienated nor at what time. Then they say that John Sparrow took the amount of 10s. from the men of Stokingbury tithing to remove them from the assize. Then Hugh Mot took 2s. from Richard Palmer so that he should not take him to Canterbury. The same Hugh accused Adam de Cruce that he had associated with his brother who was an outlaw and he took 6d. from him so that he would leave him in peace. Then they say that William Champeneys and Rose his mother were captured by a robber and when they were released Henry of Leeds, the sub sheriff allowed them to depart without trial, thence the jury is in doubt.

Then they say that John of St Clare, the coroner, is unwilling to perform the duties of his office before he has received certain sums of money, thence during his time he has received the amount of 20s. from the aforesaid hundred

Then when William of Lunsford had come to the
comitatum cum hundredo eum quodam presentamento et Henricus Malemeis tunc vicecomes occasionavit eum quod quedam calumpnia facta fuit in domo sua et detinuit ipsum quousque finivit Xs et solvit invenisset pleggios et postea cepit equum Ricardi de Henhurst quando dominus Bartholomeus de Wotingebur’ fuit imprisonatus apud Dover’ Petrus de Barkindenn tunc ballivus domini regis cepit xviijx de herbagio et duos boves precii xxs de bonis dicti Bartholomei et retinuit. Item Nigellus de Chetham fecit triturari de blado dicti Bartholomei xx summas ordei precii summe iijs et xv summas frumenti precium summe Vs quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor domini regis quando seisivit manorium de Pecham in manu domini regis post obitum Bonefacii archiepiscopi cepit de borgha de Stokinbery xxs injuste. Item dicunt quod Hugo Mot subballivus cepit de borgha de Wotingby ad quantitatem iijs per injustam distruccionem.

Civitas Roffensis

Dicunt jurati quod civitas Roff’ tenetur de domino rege in capite pro xij libris per annum ad scaccarium et dono et concessione domini regis Henrici patris regis nunc et quod prior Roff’ habet quartum deveriorum dicte civitatis et habuit de antiquo. Item dicunt quod quoddam tenementum quod situm est juxta portam civitatis versus Medeweye quod fuit Johannis de la Chambre subtrahitur de dicta civitate per heredes dicti Johannis per xvj annos elapsos ad damnum regis per annum iijs. Item dicunt quod xLs cum pertinenciis ad hundredum de Roff’ (sunt) et continentur in dictis xij libris de firma et quod dictum hundredum est regis.

Item dicunt quod heredes Hugonis de Gillingham subtraxerunt se de secta de hundredo de Roff per xvj annos ad damnum regis per annum ijs nesciunt quo warento et dominus Johannes de Burgo subtraxit se de eadem per viij annos ad damnum regis per annum ijs nesciunt quo warento et dominus Johannes de Cobbeham per iij annos ad damnum regis xijd et dominus episcopus Roff’ per xvj annos et amplius ad county with the hundred for a certain presentment and Henry Malemeis who was then the sheriff arrested him because there had been a certain dispute in his house and he detained him until he had been fined 10s. and he paid this, he had found pledges and afterwards he, Henry took Richard de Henhurst’s horse, price one mark for those 10s. and kept them and now the present sheriff makes distraint upon the said William of Lunsford for those 10s. Then after the battle of Evesham when Sir Bartholomew of Wateringbury was imprisoned at Dover, Peter de Barkindenn, who was then the lord king’s bailiff, took 18s. from the crop of hay and two oxen price 20s. from the said Bartholomew’s goods. Then Nigel of Chatham caused 20 loads of barley price 3s. per load and 15 loads of wheat price 5s. per load from the said Bartholomew’s grain, to be threshed, by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that when the lord king’s escheator, Master Richard de Clifford, took Peckham manor into the lord king’s hand after Archbishop Boniface’s death, he took 20s unjustly from Stokinbury tithing. Then they say that Hugh Mot the sub-bailiff took the amount of 4s. from Wateringbury tithing through unlawful destruction.

Rochester City

The jury say that Rochester city is held of the lord king in chief for £12 each year at the Exchequer and by grant and concession of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, and that the prior of Rochester has a fourth of the services of the said city and has had these from ancient times. Then they say that a certain tenement which is situated next to the bridge of the city, towards the Medway which was of John de la Chambre, is withdrawn for 16 years from the said city through the said John’s heirs, with a loss of 4s. each year to the king. Then they say that 40s. with appurtenances belong to Rochester hundred and are included in the said £12 of farm and that the said hundred is of the king. Then they say that for 16 years Hugh of Gillingham’s heirs have withdrawn themselves from suit to Rochester hundred with loss to the king of 2s. each year, they do not know by what warrant, the lord John de Burgh has withdrawn himself from the same for 7 years with loss of 3s. each year to the king, they do not know by what warrant, Sir John of Cobham for 12 years with loss of 12d. to the king, the lord bishop of
Item dicunt quod homines eiusdem hundredi habent returnum brevium placita namio vetito habent furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alia que ad coronam pertinente per cartam confirmatam a domino rege ab antiquo tempore.

Item dicunt quod Benedictus Potyn dum fuit ballivus prior Roffensis non sustinuit execuccionem mandatorum domini regis de uno brevi de recto quod Willelmi Bateman tulit in curiam dicti prioris anno regis Henrici LVI. Item dicunt quod Hugo de Blythe habet iij domos fundatos super murum regis laterando in longitudine se extendit super dictum murum per XL pedes et amplius et dictus murus se extendit in latitudine ad iij pedes et amplius et facia est ista purprestura elapsos vivj annos et amplius et quod quedam domus facta est ultra Watergate de Medewye per Simonem Potyn et quod quedam purprestura facta est super fenellam Sancti Clementis in latitudine per ij pedes et amplius et in longitudine xxxta pedes et amplius per Henricum le Carpentarium et hoc per iij annos elapsos et quod heredes Ricardi de Gren habent quamdam dominum in Brodegheslanse que sita est in regia via in purprestura domini regis in longitudine vj pedes et latitudine viij pedes et amplius et quod Hugo de Blythe habet quondam furnum situm in eadem venella in purprestura domini regis in latitudinine iij pedes et amplius et in longitudinu iij. Idem Hugo levavit quamdam portam cum serura que oppresset quamdam viam per quam ire solabant per medium Chethmes haghe usque ad fletam regis. Item Johannes Potyn et Adam Sterlyng oppresserunt quamdam viam per quam ire solabant ad parcum domini regis ubi latrones solabant pugnare. Item Gylemyn cocus domini Simonis de Grey cepit ij ligna per que porta de Cheldegate pendere solabant et ea duxit in castrum precium ij lignorum xijd. Item Johannes Dillyng levavit quondam murum in Estgate super viam regis in latitudine ij pedes et amplius et in longitudine xx pedes et amplius uno anno elapso. Item Johannes Potyn levavit quamdam portam sub baillio Rochester for 16 years and more with loss of 12d. each year, Roger Pugeys for 6 years and more with loss of 12d. each year to the king and the lord of Little Delce for 6 years with loss of 6d. each year to the king and that thirty two men of Strood from the Templars’ fee used to do suit to the said hundred and this suit was withdrawn for 5 years by the Templars and with the assent of Richard of Grain and Hugh de Celeby, without the whole community’s assent with loss to the king of 16s. each year. Then they say that the men of the same hundred have return of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, they have a gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown, through a charter from ancient times, confirmed by the lord king.

Then they say that while Benedict Potyn was the bailiff of the prior of Rochester he did not execute the lord king’s mandates, namely of one writ of right which William Bateman brought into the said prior’s court in the 56th year of king Henry’s reign [October 1271-1272]. Then they say that Hugh de Blythe has 4 houses which were built along the king’s [town] wall in length extending 40 ft and more along the said wall and the said wall extends in width 3ft and more and that the encroachment was made 16 years ago and more and that a certain house has been made beyond the Watergate of the Medway by Simon Potyn and that 4 years ago a certain encroachment was made by Henry the carpenter, along St Clement’s lane, 2ft and more in length and 30ft and more in width and that Richard of Grain’s heirs have a certain house in Brodeghes lane which is situated in highway and is an encroachment upon the lord king’s land of 6ft long and 8ft wide and more and that Hugh de Blythe has a certain oven/furnace situated in the same lane making encroachment upon the lord king’s land of 4ft and more in length and 4 in width. Then Hugh erected a certain gate with a lock which obstructs the particular way along which men used to pass through the middle of Chatham’s [haghe] to the king’s water-channel. Then John Potyn and Adam Sterlyng have obstructed a certain road along which people used to travel to the lord king’s park where robbers are accustomed to fight. Then Gylemyn, Simon de Grey’s cook, took 2 pieces of timber upon which Cheldegate used to be supported and he took those into the castle; the price of the two pieces of timber was 12d. Then one year ago John Dillyng erected a certain wall in Eastgate 2ft and more wide and 20ft. and more in length along the royal highway. Then John Potyn erected a certain gate below
castri versus occidentem per quam oppressa est quedam via per quam homines ville solebant ire ad terras suas et circa eandem villa.

Item dicunt quod cum Alanus de Kyrkeby constabularius Roff’ tenebatur civitati Cant’ Cs. et Hugoni de Celeby clerico in viij libris iij solidis post mortem eius domini Alani sic anno regni regis Edwardi primo venit uxor dicti Alani in eadem civitate cum viij equis et aliis catallis ad valorem xL marcarum et amplius quod catalla aрестita fuerunt per querelam dicti Hugonis et ibi venerunt Johannes Potyn et Johannes de Mares tunc ballivi eiusdem civitatis et ceperunt de dicta muliere xLs maliciose et eam cum dictis catallis abire permiserunt noctanter. Item dicunt quod Johannes Potyn per potestatem officii sui codem tempore cepit de predicto Hugone lanam quantitatem nesciunt et eandem lanam detinuit donec finisset dimidiam marcam eo quod erat coram baronis de Scaccario ad conquerendum de eo cum tota communitate et quo idem Johannes Potyn emit debita xLvjs quos Stephanus le Teynter debuit Reginaldo le Baud de London pro 1 marca et statim eundem Stephanum distrinxit quousque solvisset eadem Johannis ante terminos suos unde idem Stephanus eccidit in judaismo. Idem Johannes Potyn et Johannes de Mares ceperunt Robertum Stourok et imprisonaverunt in castro per viij dies donec soror eiusdem Roberti finiret xjs et predicti Johannes et Johannes ceperunt et adhuc detinent et habent de Hughone de Celeby clerico catalla ad valorem xvs et amplius quod per ipsum distrinxerunt pro ixs quos ei inposuit quod debuit Sampsoni le Espyc’ et eos non recognovit. Idem Johannes Potyn cepit de Alano filio Marthe nomine distinctionis unam zonam argenteam precio dimidiam marcam et adhuc habet. Idem Johannes per potestatem officii sui cepit de dicto Alano duos cados plenos cervisie precio xjs et eos duxit ad castrum et nichil inde solvit. Idem Johannes fecit dictum Alanum filium Marthe finire cum quodam burgense de Sandwyco xxs pro xvs in quibus dictus Alanus ei tenebatur et tum non haberet unde reddivit et imprisonavit in domum suam prefatum Alanum quosque invadiavit ij domos precii xLs ut ipsum inde aquietaret ad terminum vj annorum. Idem Johannes cepit de dicto Alano xxx boscos precii xvs postquam quietus erat antequam ipsum vellet deliberare et Johannes de Mares cepit pro edem de dicto Alano dimidiam marcam et dictus Johannes Potyn cepit a dicto Alano 1 gladio precii ijs.

the bailey of the castle towards the west; because of this a certain road along which men of the town used to go to their lands and around the town, is obstructed.

Then they say that because Alan of Kirkby, constable of Rochester, was indebted to Canterbury city for 100s. and to Hugh de Celeby for £8 4s., that after the lord Alan’s death, thus in the first year of King Edward’s reign, the said Alan’s wife came into the same city with 7 horses and other chattels valued at 40 marks and more, which chattels were taken for the said Hugh’s claim and John Potyn and John de Mares, then bailiffs of the same city, came there and maliciously took 40s. from the same woman and allowed her to depart at night with the said chattels. Then they say that at the same time John Potyn by the authority of his office took wool, they do not know how much, from the aforesaid Hugh and kept the same wool until he had paid a fine of half a mark, this because he was in the presence of the barons of the Exchequer to complain about him with the whole community and that the same John Potyn purchased the debts of 46s. which Stephen the dyer owed to Reginald le Baud of London for 1 mark and immediately he made distraint upon the same Stephen until he had paid the same John before his terms, thence the same Stephen became indebted to the Jews. Then the same John Potyn and John de Mares seized Robert Stourok and imprisoned him in the castle for 8 days until the same Robert’s sister paid 11s. fine and the aforesaid John and John took and still keep and hold chatells valued at 30s. and more from Hugh de Celeby the clerk, for which they made distraint upon him for 9s. which they accused him of owing to Sampson the grocer and he did not accept this. The same John Potyn took one silver belt price half a mark from Alan, son of Martha, as a distraint and he still holds this. The same John by the authority of his office took two kegs full of ale, price 11s. from the said Alan and he never paid for them. The same John caused the said Alan son of Martha to make a fine with a certain burgess of Sandwich of 30s. for 15s. in which the said Alan stood bond and then he did not have this, whence he returned and imprisoned the aforesaid Alan in his own house until he gave the pledge of 2 houses, price 40s. that he might be acquitted at a term of 6 years. The same John took 30 pieces of timber price 15s. from the said Alan after he had been acquitted, before he was willing to release him and John de Mares took half a mark from the said Alan for the same reason and the said John Potyn took
Item dicunt quod quidam Simon filius Philippi de Delham habuit CCCC marcas et amplius in prioratu Roff' sub custodia cuisuadmonachi eiusdem domus nomine Ade fratris ipsius Simonis qui Simon arettatus fuit de morte cuisuadmoni hominis unde dominus Simon de Grey constabularius tunc habuit preceptum domini regis ut dictos denarios in manu regis caperet et pro hoc cepit X marcas et de dicto monacho C marcas ut dicitur per quod dominus rex amisit totem pecuniam predictam sed qualiter conveniret post inter dictum Simonem et Johanne Potyn et predictum Simonem de Delham ignorant. Idem Johannes Potyn per potestatem officii sui intervenit in domum Godwini qui manet in ballivio domini regis et ostium thalami sui freqet et unum fuerettum ad cuniculorum capiendum precii dimidiam marcam cepit contra voluntatem ipsius Godwini asportavit. Item cum Johannes Havekyn facterat unam naves juxta castrum ut alie naves fieri solebant et dominus Simon de Graye noluit pati ut dictus Johannes eam abducere donec finitum Lxx quos cepit injuste cepit. Item Roger de Leyburn cepit de hominibus de Strode iiij xx libras post bellum de Evesham tempore pacis quod Simon de Morteforti morabatur in Strode in insultu Roff' et hoc fuit contra voluntatem eorum. Item dicunt quod quoddam mesuagium quod fuit Elye Bateman tenebatur civibus Roff' in dimidia marca annui redditis quod tenementum ipsius Godwini asportavit. Item emod tempore idem Simon Morlak cepit Stephanum Blodreth et ipsum in castro predicto imprinnavit quoques finitum xxx. Idem Simon per potestatem etc. cepit de quodam Johanne de la Rye unam naven plenam bladi precii xx marcas et amplius et dicta blada cum aliis bonis ducere fecit in castrum predictum. Idem Simon cepit de quodam homine de Wycheles’ unam naven plenam allcerptionarum precii iiij libras et amplius et ducere fecit in eodem castro et quod dominus Simon de Greye dume fuit constabularius per potestatem officii sui cepit de bonis plurimorum in trave piscibus bladi et vinis et boscis et aliis rebus ad valorem Lx marcarum et amplius

Then they say that a certain Simon, son of Philip of Delham, kept 400 marks and more in Rochester priory in the care of a certain monk of the same house, his brother called Adam. When Simon was arraigned for the death of a certain man, Sir Simon de Grey the constable then received a mandate from the lord king that he should take the said money into the king’s hand and if the said Simon was found he should arrest him. Whence the aforesaid John Potyn protected the same Simon and for this took 10 marks and 100 marks from the said monk, as it is said, because of this the lord king lost all the aforesaid money, but they do not know what happened afterwards between the said Simon and John Potyn and the aforesaid Simon of Delham. Then John Potyn by the authority of his office entered the house of Godwin who lives in the lord king’s bailiwick/jurisdiction and broke the door of his chamber and took one ferret for catching rabbits price half a mark and carried it away against Godwin’s will. Then when John Havekyn moored one ship next to the castle where other ships were moored habitually Sir Simon de Grey was unwilling to permit John to take her away until he paid a fine of 60s. which he took unjustly. Then Roger de Leyburn took £80 from the men of Strood at the time of peace after the battle of Evesham because Simon de Montfort stayed in Strood during the assault upon Rochester and this fine was contrary to the mens’ will. Then they say that a certain message which was of Elias Bateman is in pledge to the citizens of Rochester at half a mark of annual rent, which tenement Simon Morlak bought from the said Elias 8 years ago, from this time until now the said rent has been retained. Then John Barun while he was a serjeant in Rochester castle took, by the authority of his office, 20s. from Richard Lomberdus against his will, after peace had been proclaimed. Then at the same time the same Simon Morlak took Stephen Blodreth and imprisoned him in the aforesaid castle until he paid a fine of 20s. The same Simon by the authority, etc., took one ship loaded with corn, price 20 marks and more from John de la Rye and had the said corn with other goods brought to the aforesaid castle. The same Simon took from a certain man of Winchelsea one ship filled with herrings, price £4 and more and had them brought to the same castle and that Sir Simon de Greye while he was constable, by the authority of his office took from the goods of many people, timber, fish, corn and wine and wood and other
unde nichili solvit [? nec] in predicta civitate et Strode et alibi in patria. Item dicunt quod Ricardus filius Jodlani et Benedictus Potyn asportaverunt duos flaellos de porta domini regis que est versus pontem.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Heure vicecomes Kancie cepit de hominibus Roff' pro respectu quem dedit eis de vicesime Cs et amplius et unam loricam nomine districcionis de Gileberto Elys predicto [ ]quam adhuc habet et dominus Henricus Malemeis tempore suo Lxs pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod cum Hugo de Blythe et Simon Potyn operari fecissent in turri castri Roff' caverunt Cs et amplius plusquam apposuerunt tempore domini Reginaldi de Cobbehame tunc vicecomes Kancie et constabularius Roff. Item dicunt quod cum Comes Waren' et dominus Rogerus de Leyburn fuerunt in castro Roff' tempore gwerre et combusserunt aulam domini regis que fuit in eodem castro et postea cum Simon Morlak fuit constabularius et Johannes Potyn constabularius [fuit ] idem Johannes discooperuit (aulam - sic) cameram domini regis et ibi cepit tria millia tegulorum ad valorem xxs et amplius et idem Johannes habuit plumbum in eodem castro quod valuit [ ] et amplius. Item Johannes habuit maheremium de quodam oriello quod valuit xxs et amplius. Item idem Johannes cepit ij ostia in castro que valuerunt dimidam marcam et amplius. Item dicunt quod (? cum idem Johannes ) fecisset operari in castro predicto per xxx annos elapsos cepit et abduxerat petram que fuit in eodem castro fieri fecit in villa Roff' quondam celariam de eadem [ ] et per operarios domini regis ad dampnum regis X marcas et amplius et quod Alaneus de Kyrkeby Simon Morlak et dominus Simon de Graye dum fuerunt constabularii dicti castri [com]busserunt maheremium in dicto castro de domibus ad valorem xLs et amplius et quod Thomas Atteston de Maydestan [ ] et filii sui de eodem Alanus [de Kyrkeby] et alii de secta sua venerunt apud Roff' et ibi depredaverunt in eadem villa de plumbo domini regis ad valorem Lxs et amplius quodquidam plumbum abduxerunt. Item dicunt quod Johannes le Engleys et Ricardus frater eius duxerunt lanas ad partes transmarinas ter ad valorem 1 marcam et amplius et quod Rogerus Pykston et Walterus Long [? socius] eius duxerunt quatuor saecos [? Lane] precii xx marcas et amplius et things valued at 60 marks and more and he paid nothing neither in the aforesaid city nor Strood nor elsewhere in the country. Then they say that Richard son of Jodland and Benedict Potyn have carried off two pieces of iron from the lord king’s gate which is towards the bridge.

Then they say that William of Hever, the sheriff of Kent, took 100s. from the men of Rochester for the respite from the tax of one-twentieth which he gave them and one hauberk [coat of mail] as a distraint from the aforesaid Gilbert Elys [ ] which he still keeps and Sir Henry Malemeis (took) 60s. in his time for the same purpose.

Then they say that when Hugh de Blythe and Simon Potyn had work done on the tower of Rochester castle and they concealed 100s. more than they spent while Reginald of Cobham was sheriff of Kent and constable of Rochester. Then they say that the earl Warenne and Sir Roger de Leyburn were in Rochester castle during the time of war and they burnt the lord king’s hall which was within the same castle and afterwards when Simon Morlak was constable and when John Potyn was constable, the same John took the roof off the lord king’s chamber and took three thousand tiles, value 20s. and more from it and the same John took the lead in the same castle which was worth [ ] and more. Then John had the timber from a certain oriel which was worth 20s. and more. Then the same John took 2 doors in the castle which were worth half a mark and more. Then they say that [? when the same John] caused work to be done in the aforesaid castle, 20 years ago, he took and carried away stone which was in the same castle and used it to make a cellar in Rochester town by the lord king’s workmen with loss of 10 marks and more to the king and that Alan of Kirkby, Simon Morlak and Sir Simon de Grey, while they were constables of the said castle, burnt the timber of the houses in Rochester castle, value 40s. and more and that Thomas Atteston of Maidstone, [ ] and his sons of the same town, Alan [of Kirkby] and others of their suit came to Rochester and there plundered the same city of the lord king’s lead valued at 60s. and more and have carried away that lead.

Then they say that John le Engleys and Richard his brother have three times taken wool to places overseas, of 1 mark and more in value and that Roger Pykston and Walter Long [? his associate] have taken 4 sacks [? of wool] price 20 marks and more and that Walter
quod Walterus de Vaus et Willelmus socius eius duxerunt lanas ad valorem C marcas et amplius et quod [? Johannes Potyn] et Johannes de Mares ballivi tunc temporis permiserunt Johanne le Engleys et Ricardum fratrem eius transpore pro munere capiendis sed nescient quantum ceperunt. Item Johannes [Potyn et Johannes de Mares] ceperunt de Rogero Pykston et Waltero Longo munera ut transirent sed nescient quantum et quod predictus Johannes Potyn cepit de Philippo et aliis quarterium avene et cortices de quercu et maheremium, que dictus Johannes Philippus duxerunt in partes transmarinas et quod homines Comitisse Flandr’ venerunt et fuerunt in partibus istis et collegerunt [   ] cortices de quercu et maheremium et duxerunt ad partes transmarinas et ex hoc Johannes Potyn et Johannes de Mares tunc ballivos ceperunt de eisdem Cs et eos transire permiserunt.

m.9 Inquisiciones facte in lasto de Shuppweye in comitatu Kancie

Hundredum de Oxeneye

Jurati dicunt quod xijs pro anguillis debentur domino regi annuatim et iijis solvendis ad firmam prima die lune in xL de baronia de Oxen
Dicunt eciam quarta pars hundredi de Oxen est in manu domini regis set valorem eius per annum nesciunt.
Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ clamat habere et habet returnum brevium furcas et assisam panis et cervisie.
Item dicunt quod idem archiepiscopus et prior ecclesie Christi Cant’ clamant habere warennam set quo warento nesciunt.
Item dicunt quod abbas de Ponte Roberto et Matheus de Knoll opturaverunt quamdam viam ducentem a villa de Oxen usque ad villa de Newinde in comitatu Sussex ad mangnum dampnum patrie.
Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Northie quamdam terram dimisit abbatii Pontis Roberti que valet per annum X marcas et amplius.
Item dicunt quod Laurenccius de Whokenesrishe coronator cepit de juratis istius hundredi pro officio suo excercendo quatuor summas avene et aliiis cepit pro simili 1 marcam et certo pro simili de eisdem xxs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemeis dum fuit vicecomes Kancie tradidit lesum de Shuppweye

de Vaus and William his associate have taken wool valued at 100 marks and more and that [John Potyn] and John de Mares the bailiffs at that time took bribes to permit John le Engleys and his brother Richard to export goods, and they do not know how much they took. Then John [Potyn and John de Mares] took bribes from Roger Pykston and Walter Long to allow them to export goods but they do not know what quantity and that the aforesaid John Potyn took from Philip and others a quarter of oats, bark of oak trees and timber which the said John Philip took to places overseas and that the countess of Flanders’s men came and were in these parts and they collected [   ] bark from oak trees and timber and took these to places overseas and for this John Potyn and John de Mares, then bailiffs, took 100s. from the same men and permitted them to go overseas.

m. 9 Inquisitions taken in Shepway lathe in the county of Kent.

Oxney Hundred

The jury say that 12s. is owed yearly to the lord king for eels and 3s. to be paid at farm on the first Monday in Lent from Oxney barony. They say also that a fourth part of Oxney hundred is in the lord king’s hand but they do not know its value each year. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury claims to have and has the return of writs, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale. Then they say that the same archbishop and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury claim to have warren, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the abbot of Robertsbridge [Sussex] and Matthew of Knowle have obstructed a certain road leading from Oxney vill as far as the town of Newick in the county of Sussex with severe loss to the country. Then they say that Sir William de Northey demised a certain land to the abbot of Robertsbridge which is worth 10 marks and more each year. Then they say that Lawrence de Whokenesrishe, the coroner, took four loads of oats from the jury of this hundred for performing the duties of his office and from others he took 1 mark for a similar reason and 20s. from the same people for a similar reason. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemeis, while he was sheriff of Kent, demised Shepway lathe at farm to
Laurentio de Shokenerth ad firmam unde idem Laurencius cepit de baronia de Oxen injuste et quod injuste non occasionaretur xLvs et de Godardo filio Petri inponendo sibi falsa quoq fuit usurarii pro pace habenda habuit xxs et de Godelena de Pessina inponendo sibi quod fecit purpurstem ubi nullam fecit 1 marcam.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen ballivus ibidem post dictum Laurencium per predictum vicecomitem cepit de Thoma de Rmdhamm inponendo sibi feloniam et fuit fidelis pro pace habenda Xs. Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus ibidem post dictum Thomam per dominum Willelmum de Hevere vicecomitem cepit de Waltero de Abbodestond injuste iiii et de Willelmo Passur inponendo sibi quod fuit usuarius et non fuit Xs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excator cepit de villata de Oxen’ domini archiepiscopi injuste iiij marcas et dimidiam et de bosco eiusdem ibidem ij marcas. Item dicunt quod ballivi domini archiepiscopi vendunt custodias de gavelkund contra communem justiciam.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et dominus Fulco Payforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo xiiijs ultra rectam vicesimam.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht’ serviens Rogeri clericii ballivi de Shuppweye venit ad domum Godelene de Pessinden et namiavit eam de 1 equo precii 1 marce et abduxit et eum adhuc detinet.

**Hundredum de Falkestone**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex habet in comitatu Kancie manerium de Middeltun cum membris quod nunc tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo ad terminum viti et manerium de Offspring quod nunc tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc et Magister domus Dei de Offspring tenet partem eiusdem ville set quantum aut quo warento ingornorant [sic] et dominus rex habet in manu sua curiam de Rudlevet que valet per annum xLs.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Wye quod abbass de Bello tenet et manerium de Elham quod Willelmus de Leyburn tenet sunt de dominico domini regis set quid valent per annum aut quo warento ea tenent nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Sandwico et dominus Bertammmus de Crioll tenent baroniam de Lawrence of Shokenerth, thence the same Lawrence unjustly took 45s. from Oxney barony so that he should not make arrests unjustly and he took 20s. from Godard son of Peter to make peace because he falsely accused him that of practising usury and he took 1 mark from Godelena de Pessina accusing her of making an encroachment when she had not made one. Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, the bailiff there, after the said Lawrence took, through the aforesaid sheriff, 10s. from Thomas of Rainham for making peace after accusing him of felony when he was a law-abiding man. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the bailiff there after the said Thomas, took, through William of Hever the sheriff, 4s. unjustly from Walter de Abbodestond and 10s. from William Passur accusing him of being a usurer and he was not.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took ¼ marks from the lord archbishop’s township of Oxney and 2 marks there from the wood of the same place. Then they say that the lord archbishop’s bailiffs sell wardship of minors of gavelkind contrary to common justice. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Sir Fulk Payforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth tax have taken 14s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Thomas le Leht’, serjeant of Roger the clerk, bailiff of Shepway, came to Godelena de Pessinden’s house and made distraint upon her of 1 horse, price 1 mark and he took it away and he still keeps it.

**Folkestone Hundred**

The jury say that the lord king holds Middleton manor with its members in the county of Kent, which now the lord John de Burgh holds for the term of his life and Ospringe manor which the lady queen, the present king’s mother, now holds and the Master of God’s House in Ospringe holds part of the same vill, but they do not know how much nor by what warrant and the lord king holds in his own hand Rudlevet court which is worth 40s each year.

Then they say that Wye manor, which the abbot of Battle holds, and Elham manor, which William de Leyburn holds, are of the lord king’s desmesne but what they are worth each year or by what warrant they are held the jury do not know.

Then they say that Sir John of Sandwich and Sir Bertram de Crioll hold the barony of Folkestone of the
lord king in chief, of this the said John holds 7 fees and the said lord Bertram 7 fees and they hold Folkestone hundred in common for 20s. each year paid to the lord king through the sheriff’s hands. Then they say that Colentena de Columbario holds two fees in Postling in dower, of the king in chief for 20s paid each year at Dover castle. Then they say that the cities of Canterbury and Rochester are held of the lord king, but they do not know in what way. Then they say that a moiety of Newchurch hundred is in the lord king’s hand and the other moiety is in the hand of the lord archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Christchurch there. The tenants of Ruckinge of this hundred withdraw themselves from suit with loss of 4s. each year to the lord king.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, a gallows and the assize of bread and ale, but from what time they do not know nor by what warrant unless through Christchurch Canterbury. Then they say that the Master of the Hospitallers of Swinesfield claims the liberty through which the lord king’s assize of bread and ale in the said hundred is disturbed, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that Sir Roger de Leyburn in his time changed a certain way in Elham parish causing nuisance to the lord king and loss of half a mark and more each year to the country and that John of Eversley has made an obstruction on a certain way at Winsfield causing nuisance to the lord king and loss of 2s. each year to the country. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains, then the sheriff, imprisoned a certain William de Calethe, falsely and maliciously accusing him of the crime of theft and for his release he took 40s. from him, unjustly because his hundred acquitted the same William from every manner of felony and theft. Then they say that Richard, the clerk of Elham, took 7d. from Jordan Atteburegh to remove him from the assize and Nigel Pundherst and John Finet took 12d. from Alan the clerk of Shotmer and John Cucku for a similar reason and Daniel the servant of Master Lawrence de Sticeche, the king’s bailiff, took 6d. from William Pavmir for a similar reason. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains, while he was sheriff of Kent, demised the bailiwick of Shepway to Thomas de Suthen, a bailiff, for £18 and more who oppressed the people immeasurably. The same man
Idem cepit de Willemo Parmentario inponendo sibi falso quod fregit grangiam Henrici Boles de Hethe 1 marcam et dictus Henricus vicecomes de eodem per eadem causam 1 marcam.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Finet et Nicholaus de Pundherst cepit xjs de Johanne de Caseburn, Simone Redwin, Rogero Bone et Thoma de Caseburn pro summonitione Scaccarii de amerciamento coram Magistro Rogero de Seton justicario Itinerante et illos non aquietaverunt. Item idem ceperunt de Rogero Tylor, Willelmo de Aula et Thoma Waltero eodem modo Vs et iijd et de priore de Folkestan ijs et vjd et eos non aquietaverunt. Item dicunt quod Adam filius Walteri de Stonden captus et inprisonatus fuit in domo domini Henrici Malemains injuste et antquam potuit evaderre dedit Nicholao de Stratford servientem predicti Henrici Malemains et Ricardo de Chelinden xxs et nicholominus eidem Henrico Malemains 1 marcam et ita transitiv sine judicio. Item dicunt quod Daniel serviens Magistri Laurencii de Stivech' cepit injuste iijs de Johanne Holman quem voluntarie inprisonavit.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepit de tenentibus domini archiepiscopi Cant' apud Saltwod contra voluntatem ipsorum ij marcas ita quod tractarentur ut consueverant tempore archiepiscopi et de tenentibus archiepiscopi at Caseburn cepit pro simili Lxxs. Item dicunt quod idem excitor cepit de dictis tenentibus de Saltwod quod nolebant capere terram tam caro precio sicut voluit ij marce et Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus excaitoris cepit de eisdem per ij vicesimas xxs pro eodem.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochull fecit ducere lanas et caseum ad partes transmarinas set quantum aut quo warento nesciunt.

Dimidium Hundredum de Langport

Jurati dicunt quod Kotride et Kenwardinton tenentur de domino rege pro 1 feodo in capite quod Thome de Normanvile heres qui est infra etatem tenet pro redempcione matris sue et valet per annum xx libras et Johannes Literihc tenet quartam partem unius feodi de domino Bertrammo de Criot et vocatur Shingledehall et dominus Bertammus tenet illud de domino rege in honore de Harle et valet per annum Cs took 1 mark from William the cloth-comber falsely accusing him of damaging the barn of Henry Boles of Hythe and the said Henry, the sheriff, took 1 mark from the same man for the same reason.

Then they say that John Finet and Nicholas de Pundherst took 11s. from John de Caseburn, Simon Redwin, Roger Bone and Thomas de Caseburn for summons of the Exchequer because of an amercement made before Master Roger de Seton an justice in eyre and they have not acquitted the men. Then the same men took 5s. 4d. from Roger Tyler, William de Aula and Thomas Walter in the same way and 2s. 6d. from the prior of Folkestone and they have not acquitted them. Then they say that Adam son of Walter de Stonden was unjustly captured and imprisoned in the house of Sir Henry de Malemains and before he was able to escape he gave Nicholas of Stratford, the aforesaid Henry Malemains’s serjeant and Richard of Chillenden 20s. and nevertheless 1 mark to the same Henry Malemains and thus he left without trial. Then they say that Daniel, a servant of Master Lawrence de Stivech took 4s. unjustly from John Holman whom he imprisoned arbitrarily.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 2 marks from the archbishop of Canterbury’s tenants at Saltwood against their will, that they might be treated in the way to which they had become accustomed during the archbishop’s time and he took 70s. from the archbishop’s tenants at Caseburn for a similar reason. Then they say that the same escheator took 2 marks from the said tenants of Saltwood because they were unwilling to take their land at such a price as he wished and Master Hugh of Thornham the escheator’s clerk took 20s. from them for 2 taxes of one-twentieth. Then they say that William de Brochull has arranged the export of wool and cheese to places overseas, but they do not know how much nor by what warrant.

The Half Hundred of Longport [St Martin Longport]

The jury say that Cockreed [Hope All Saints par.] and Kenardington are held of the lord king in chief for one fee which the heir of Thomas de Normanvile who is under age holds by fine of his mother and it is worth £20 each year and John Literihc holds a fourth part of one fee of Sir Bertram de Criot and it is called Shingledehall [Eastwell par.] and Sir Bertram holds that of the lord king in the honour of Harle
et heredes Rogeri de Romenal tenent quamdam partem terre cum tenentibus de serjancia que vocatur Offeton de domino Johanne filio Bernardi et idem Johannes illam tenet de domino rege in capite pro 1 falcone custodiendo et valet per annum xvijs.

Item dicunt quod quarta pars borghie de dimidio hundredo de Langport que vocatur Bletching est in manu domini regis et quod borgha de Northen similiter est in manu domini regis et non sunt in ea nisi tres domus facientes sectam ad hundredum et alii tenentes vendunt terras suas hominibus de Romenhal et Magistro Domus Dei Dovor' vendunt duo tenementa de quibus dominus rex solebat habere sectam ad hundredum suum que subtrahitur per dictum archiepiscopum et ballivos suos et faciunt sectam ad hundredum suum ad dampnum regis per annum de ijs et amplius et nesciunt quo warento et dimidia borgha de Langport dimidia borgha de Esewarestun et dimidia borgha de Lide sunt de libertate archiepiscopi Cant’ et secta eadem subtrahitur de hundredo domini regis per 1 annum per dictum archiepiscopum et ballivos suos et faciunt sectam ad hundredum suum ad dampnum regis per annum de ijs et amplius et dicunt quod illa pars istius hundredi que est in manu domini regis cum firma et turno viccomitis valet per annum xvjs et ixd et dicunt quod quoddam tenementum in borgha de Northeneth quod vocatur Stapelteche subtrahitur de firma turni viccomitis per Thomam de Normanvil per x annos ad dampnum patrie per annum de iijd et amplius.

Et dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita de namio vetito tenet et habet wrecceum maris et furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regis per libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium et placita de namio vetito tenet et habet wrecceum maris et furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regis per libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant.

[Haughley?]and it is worth 100s. each year and Roger of Romney’s heirs with tenants, hold a certain part of land which is called Offeton by serjeanty service of Sir John, son of Bernard, and the same John holds that of the lord king in chief by keeping 1 falcon and it is worth 17s. each year.

Then they say that a fourth part of Langport half hundred which is called Bletching [Lydd par.?] is in the lord king’s hand and one quarter of the same tithing is withdrawn from suit of that hundred by the countess of Kent, Hubert de Burgh’s widow for 20 years with loss of 12d. each year to the lord king and now Sir Nicholas Sistlewast holds it and they do not know by what warrant. They say also that a half of Esewarestun tithing is in the lord king’s hand and that Northiam tithing [Sussex] similarly is in the lord king’s hand and in this tithing there are only three houses making suit to the hundred and the other tenants sell their lands to the men of Romney and they sell two tenements from which the king used to receive suit at his hundred, which is withdrawn for 6 years, to the Master of God’s House at Dover with the loss of 6d. and more each year to the lord king; and half the tithing of Dungeness is withdrawn by the abbot of Battle from all suits pertaining to the lord king’s crown for 3 years with loss of 2s. and more each year to the lord king and they do not know by what warrant; and half of Langport tithing, half of Esewarestun tithing and half of Lydd tithing are of the archbishop of Canterbury’s liberty and the same suit is withdrawn from the lord king’s hundred for 1 year by the said archbishop and his bailiffs and they do suit at his hundred with loss of 2s. and more each year to the king; and they say that that part of that hundred which is in the lord king’s hand with the farm and sheriff’s tourn is worth 16s. 9d. each year and they say that a certain tenement in Northiam tithing which is called Stapelteche is withdrawn from the sheriff’s tourn by Thomas de Normanvile for 10 years with loss of 3d and more each year to the country.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has wreck and the gallowes and the assize of bread and ale and other liberties of the king through the liberty of Christchurch Canterbury.

And they say that the abbot of Battle has wreck, the gallowes and the assize of bread and ale and they do not know by what warrant.
Item dicunt quod Jacobus Hunfray cepit vadia injuste in via regali apud Hilines ad dampnum patrie de dimidia marca.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes Kancie tradidit lestum de Shipweye cuidam Thome de Suthen ad firmam tempore suo qui Thomas et Thomas de Leht subballivus eius ceperunt de quadam Cecilia Swein iijs inponendo sibi falsa quod furabatur bladum Johannis Adam de Romenhale et idem Thomas de Suthen cepit injuste de relictâ Randulfi Parin per gravem distrinctionem iijs et dictus Thomas de Leht per eadem districionem xvd et Hugo Sacrista per eandem districionem xijd. Item dicunt quod idem Thomas de Sutheneye attachiavit Walterum Picston et ipsum retinuit quousque habuit ab eo iiij. Item idem Thomas attachiavit quendam Willemum Rob’ pro suspicione furti et antequam voluit tenere hundredum ad eundem deliberare cepit de hundredo iijs. Item idem cepit injuste pro quodam latrone evaso de ecclesia pro sui defectu et pro officio suo faciendo de alio felone de hoc hundredo iiij et Johannes de Brode cepit de eodem dimidio hundredo de summonitione scaccarii vs vd et dictum hundredum inde non aquietavit set alias solvebantur vicecomites. Item predictus Thomas de Sutheneye attachiavit Walterum Picston et ipsum retinuit quousque habuit ab eo iijs.

Then they say that James Hunfray took payments unjustly on the king’s highway at Hilines with loss of half a mark to the country.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, sheriff of Kent during his time of office, demised Shipway lathe at farm to a certain Thomas de Suthen and that Thomas and Thomas de Leht his sub-bailiff took 3s. from Cecily Swein accusing her falsely that the corn of John Adam of Romney was stolen and the same Thomas de Suthen took 4s. unjustly from Randulf Parin’s widow as a serious distraint and the said Thomas de Leht 15d. for the same distraint and Hugh the sacristan took 12d. for the same distraint. Then they say that the same Thomas de Sutheneye arrested Walter Picston and detained him until he received 4s. from him. Then the same Thomas arrested a certain William Rob’ on suspicion of theft and before he was willing to allow the hundred to deliver him, he took 3s. from the hundred. Then the same man took 4s. unjustly from this hundred because a certain robber had escaped from the church because of the hundred’s negligence and for performing the duty of his office in regard to another felon and John de Brode took 5s. 5d. from the same half hundred for summons of the Exchequer and he has not acquitted the said hundred of this but the sheriffs have been paid other sums. Then the said Thomas de Suthen took 6s. unjustly from Osewabeton tithing before they could make presentation before him in the hundred and John de Brode his serjeant took 2s. unjustly from John de Hamon and 2s. from Henry Corby and William Niger and John of Stowting unjustly took 2s. from Martin Betewete for remittance of one assize and 18d. from Thomas Fulsalt for a similar reason.

Then 12d. from Hamo Fulsalt for a similar reason, 6d. from Roger de Hope for a similar reason. Then they say that the said John le Brode took 12d. from Thomas Eylwin for a similar reason. Then the said John of Stowting excused William ate Ructune and William Godfrey from an assize for 12d. Then the aforesaid Thomas de Leht took 2 mares from Richard Coting as distraint and kept them until he had given him one of them. The same Thomas took 2 mares unjustly from Robert Galiot and Thomas Eylwin as distraint and kept them until the said Robert’s mare died and nevertheless he took 2s. from them unjustly for another mare. Then the aforesaid John of Stowting took 2s. from Martin son of Letitia and Geoffrey the Sumner for excusing them from one assize. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the
excaitor cepit de dimidio hundredo de Langport injuste et sine causa xxxvijis.
Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra vicesimam xxxvij.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimidium Hundred de Birihcholt de Libertate archiepiscopi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Middeltun cum Merden est de dominicum domini regis et dominus Johannes de Burgo nunc tenet per dominum regem. Item dicunt quod maneria de Muneketun Westhalimot et Menstr’ quondam fuerunt in manibus regum et nunc abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ tenet maneria de Menstre dominus archiepiscopus manerium de Westhalimot et prior et conventus Sancte Trinitatis manerium de Munketun set nesciunt quo wareneto.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item dicunt quod Henricus rex nunc proximus habuit in manu sua maneria de Elham et de Ofspring et modo domina Eliena regina mater domini regis nunc tenet manerium de Ofspring et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet maneria de Elham et nesciunt quo wareneto. Item dicunt quod maneria de Wy fuit quondam in manibus regum et abbas de Bello nunc illud tenet set nesciunt quo wareneto. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo plusquam vicesimam Xs. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor vendidit boscum in parco archiepiscopi apud Aldinton tempore vacacionis sedis Cant’ ad valorem Lxvjs et cepit in eodem parco xx feras et amplius et idem cepit de tenentibus de Aldinton de recognitione xLij libras. Item idem excaitor cepit de eisdem tenentibus xx marcas inponendo eis quod non extendebat sufficienter terras pertinentes ad dictum manerium.

Hundredum de Stuting

Jurati dicunt quod hundredum de Stuting tenetur de domino rege in capite pro xxs per annum ad turnum vicecomitis et pro xxs ad Scaccarium domini regis per escheator, took 38s. unjustly and for no reason from Langport half hundred.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 36s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Half Hundred of Bircholt of the Liberty of the archbishop [Bircholt Franchise]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The jury say that the hundred of Middleton with Marden is of the lord king’s demesne and Sir John de Burgh now holds through the lord king. Then they say that the manors of Monkton, Westhalimot and Minster were formerly in the hands of kings and now the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds Minster manor, the lord archbishop Westhalimot manor and the prior and convent of Holy Trinity Monkton manor but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that King Henry, the previous king, held Elham and Ospringe manors in his own hand and now the lady Eleanor, the present king’s mother, holds Ospringe manor and Sir William de Leyburn Elham manor and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Wye manor was formerly in the hands of the kings and the abbot of Battle now holds it, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has return and extract of writs, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale, wreck and other royal liberties but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, sold wood in the archbishop’s park at Aldington valued at 66s. and he took 20 deer and more in the same park and he took £42 from the tenants of Aldington for acknowledgment of his lordship. Then the same escheator took 20 marks from the same tenants making accusation that they had not made sufficient valuation of the lands pertaining to the said manor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stowting Hundred

The jury say that Stowting hundred is held of the lord king in chief for 20s. each year at the sheriff’s tourn and 20s. at the lord king’s Exchequer each year by the
Item dicunt quod idem habet liberam chacias in dominicis suis per concessionem domini regis
Johannis per cartam quam Stephanus Heringod adquisivit. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Watton
quonam vicecomes primo levavit turnum vicecomitis in comitatu unde hundredum de Stuting gravatum est de xxx per annum.
Item dicunt quod Stephanus Heringod dominus de Stuting fecit onerare injuste totum hundredum de Stuting ad solvendum ad Scaccarium xxx per annum de firma quam ipse idem reddere debuit et per propriam districcionem.
Item dicunt quod Magister Hugo de Thornham clericus escaitor cepit equum Matilde Atteheth precii
xvjs in parco de Aldinton et illud ad opus suum proprium retinuit injuste et contra voluntatem dicte
sheriff’s hand and now John de Berkley’s tenants
because of the wardship of William Heringod’s heirs,
but they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that John de Tirkebi holds Stowting
hundred because of the wardship of William Heringod’s daughter.
Then they say that Elham manor is held of the lord
king in chief and Sir William de Leyburn now holds
that but by what warrant they do not know.
Then they say that the lord John de Burgh holds
Middleton hundred of the lord king in chief by grant of
the present lord king.
Then they say that Ospringe manor is held of the lord
king in chief and the lady queen, the present king’s
mother, now holds that but they do not know by what
warrant.
Then they say that the lord and tenants of Stelling
Minnis withdrew themselves from from suit of the
hundred (and) of the sheriff after the battle of Lewes
through the earl of Gloucester with loss of 2s. each
year to the king and they say that the tenants of
Elmsted, Waltham and Heroldeshyrok have withdrawn
themselves from lots and suits at the sheriff’s tourn
now for 2 years through Robert archbishop of
Canterbury [Robert Kilwardby 1272-1278] with loss
of 6s. each year but they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that the same archbishop has return of
all writs, wreck, the gallows and the assize of bread
and ale and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon
goods and he has other liberties from ancient times
which pertain to the crown but they do not know by
what warrant. Then they say that the lord of Stowting
has the gallows and the assize of bread and ale but
from what time or by what warrant they do not know.
Then they say that the same man has free chace in his
demesnes by grant of King John through a charter
which Stephen Heringod acquired. Then they say that
John de Watton formerly the sheriff first exacted the
sheriff’s tourn in the county, for this Stowting hundred
is burdened with 20s. each year.

Then they say that Stephen Heringod the lord of
Stowting has caused the whole hundred to Stowting to
be burdened unjustly with a payment of 20s. each year
at the Exchequer for the farm, which the same man
himself ought to pay as his own distraint.
Then they say that Master Hugh de Thornham, the
escheator’s clerk, took Matilda Atteheth’s horse, price
16s. in Aldington park and unjustly kept that for his
own use and against the said Matilda’s will, giving her
Matille de nil sibi dando pro eodem.
Item dicunt quod cum hundredum de Stuting adiisset per preceptum domini regis ad obsidendum castrum de Tunebrig et Willelmus de Stupesdon ballivus Comitis Glovernie pro eo quod filius Willelmi de la Grave fuit ibidem cepit de eodem Willelmo xxs et de Johanne Rauf pro filio suo qui fuit ibidem cepit dimidiam marcam et de Alexandro de Cumbe pro simili iijis et de Willelmo Wudeman pro simili xijd et de Henrico de Sondreye pro simili ijs et de Willelmo Heringod pro simili xx porcos precii xxxs et 1 bovem precii xxxiijs et iijd.

Item dicunt quod cum Willelmus Heringod dedisset Petro de Benhale manerium de Staunford in ultimo vite sue venit Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor et cepit a predicto Petro injuste pro pacifica seysina habenda.
Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus seysivit archiepiscopatum Cant’ tempore domini regis Henrici et illud tenet in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidiam.

Hundredum de Worth

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Eastbrigg’ fuit aliquando in manu regis Johannis et Magister Domus (Dei) Doverie illud nunc tenet et alientatum fuit per Hubertum de Burez ut credunt et valet per annum xvij libras.
Item dicunt quod Henricus rex pater domini regis tunc habuit in manu sua quoddam feodum quod vocatum Grainston et Magister Domus Dei de Ofspring illud nunc tenet et valet per annum Cs.
Item dicunt quod hundredum de Worth reddit domino regi per annum de firma Vs. Item dicunt quod medietas eiusdem hundredi est in manu domini regis quarta pars in manu archiepiscopi Cant’ sexta pars in manu Magistri Domus Dei Dover’ duodecima pars in manu Magistri Domus Dei de Ofspring quid valeat per annum nesciunt et de parte domini regis predicti hundredi substracta est secta vij mesuagiorum ad hundredum de Strete per potestatem dicti Nicholai de Haullo ad dampnum regis per annum de Xd.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ subtraxit sectam vij mesuagiorum de predicto hundredo exceptis duobus laghedais et Magister Domus Dei Dover subtrahit sectam sexe partis nothing for the same horse.

Then they say that when by the lord king’s command (the men) of Stowting hundred had gone to take part in the siege of Tonbridge castle and William de Stupesdon, the earl of Gloucester’s bailiff took 20s. from William de la Grave because his son had been there, he took half a mark from John Rauf because his son had been there, 4s. from Alexander of Combe for a similar reason, 12s. from William Woodman for a similar reason, 2s. from Henry de Sondreye for a similar reason and for a similar reason he took 20 pigs price 30s. and 1 ox price 33s. 4d. from William Heringod.

Then they say that when William Heringod had given Peter de Benhale Stanford manor at the close of his life, Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, came and unjustly took (money) from the aforesaid Peter to allowing him peaceful seisin.

Then they say that the same Master Richard took seisin of the archbishopric of Canterbury during the lord King Henry’s time and held it for 2½ years in the lord king’s hand.

Worth Hundred

The jury say that Eastbridge manor was sometime in King John’s hand and now the Master of God’s house at Dover holds it and it was alienated by Hubert de Burez as they believe and it is worth £17 each year.

Then they say that King Henry, the present king’s father, then held a certain fee called Grainston in his hand and now the Master of God’s house at Ospringe holds that and it is worth 100s. each year. Then they say that Worth hundred pays 5s. each year in rent to the lord king for the farm. Then they say that a moiety of the same hundred is in the lord king’s hands, a fourth part in the hand of the archbishop of Canterbury, a sixth part in the hand of the Master of God’s house at Dover and a twelfth part in the hand of the Master of God’s house at Ospringe but they do not know what it is worth each year and the suit of 8 messages has been taken away from the lord king’s part of the aforesaid hundred to Street hundred by the authority of Nicholas de Haullo, with loss to the lord king of 10d. each year. Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury has withdrawn the suit of 8 messages lawdays and the Master of God’s house at Dover withdraws the suit of a sixth part of Worth hundred
hundredi de Worth et firmam sibi appropriat que valet per annum ijs et vjd et Magister Domus Dei de Ofspring subtrahit sectam duodecime partis eiusdem hundredi et firmam similiter que valet per annum xiiijd.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium wreck maris furcas assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regias et tenet placita de namio vetito et Magister domorum Dei Doverie et Ofspring habent assisam panis et cervisie.

Item dicunt quod Abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ levavit furcas in predicto hundredo anno regni regis Henrici Lvj set quo wereneto nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod libertas baronum V Portuum inpedit communem justiciam et regiam potestatem subvertit in hoc quod distringunt aliquos alios pro aliquo debito quam principales debitores vel pleggios eorum et insuper distringunt forinsecos extra libertates suas ut infra libertates eorum respondeant.

Item dicunt quod in ultimo anno regni domini regis Henrici quidam puer submersus fuit in hoc hundredo et Willelmus Kyriel coronator venire recusavit ad videndum mortuum. Ita quod miserunt post Thomam de Leht ballivum domini regis ad videndum illud infortunium qui venire noluit ad officium suum faciendo ante quam habuit de hundredo dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod occassione quod hoc hundredum traditum fuit ad firmam Hamoni de la Forstall Johanni le Brode Johanni filio sacerdotis et Thome de Sutheneye ballivis vicissim gravantibus populum supra modum tota baronia fere destruitur per eosdem et pars domini regis multum deterioratur.

Item dicunt quod Elias clericus cepit [? no sum given] de Willelmo Gunnild pro jumento suo currente in via regia quod equus suus dictum jumentum sequebatur. Item idem Elias ballivus per potestatem officii sui (cepit) medietatem domus Roberti filii Magistri Parci dimidiam marce et alias reos plures.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall ballivus regis cepit injuste iijjs de Johanne Mercatore. Item idem Hamo cepit iijjs de Roberto filii Magistri Parci pro respectu hundredo de debito de summonitio Scaccarii quod debitum ante solvent at per talia et alia facta huismodi ballivi populum gravant ultra modum et hoc tempore domini regis and appropriates the farm for himself which is worth 2s. 6d. each year and the Master of God’s house at Ospringe withdraws the suit of a twelfth part of the same hundred and similarly the farm which is worth 14d. each year.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, wreck, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and the Masters of the houses of God at Dover and Ospringe have the assize of bread and ale.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury erected a gallows in the aforesaid hundred in the 56th year of king Henry’s reign [October 1271-1272] but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the liberties of the barons of the Cinque Ports obstruct common justice and subvert the royal power in that they make distraint upon any others for any debt both of principal debtors or their pledges and moreover they distress foreigners outside their liberties in the same way as they act within their liberties.

Then they say that in the last year of the lord King Henry’s reign a boy was drowned in this hundred and William Kyriel the coroner refused to come to see the dead boy. Then they after sent Thomas de Leht the lord king’s bailiff to see that unfortunate boy, and he was unwilling to come and perform the duties of his office before he had received half a mark from the hundred.

Then they say that on the occasion that this hundred was demised at farm to Hamo de la Forstall, John le Brode, John the priest’s son and Thomas de Sutheneye, the bailiffs, who greatly oppressed in turn the people in every way so that the whole barony was almost destroyed by them and the lord king’s part greatly deteriorated.

Then they say that Elias the clerk took (?) from William Gunnild because his mare was running upon the royal highway and because his horse followed the said mare.

Then the same Elias the bailiff by the authority of his office took a moiety of the house of Robert, son of the Master of the park, half a mark and many other things. Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall, the king’s bailiff, unjustly took 4s. from John the merchant. Then the same Hamo took 4s. from Robert son of the Master of the park for postponing a debt of summons at the Exchequer due from the hundred which debt it had paid before and by such acts and others of this
Henrici et domini regis nunc.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor post obitum Bonefacii archiepiscopi Cant’ posuit tallagium injuste super tenentes de Worth de xLs.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Wyngeham quondam excaitor domini Henrici regis seysivit in manu domini regis xvij acras terre de serjancia de Hurst que vocatas Dommershe et extenduntur per annum ad scaccarium ad xvjs

Item dicunt quod terra et domus Ade Daniel seysiate fuerunt in manu domini regis Henrici quod fugitivus fuit et nunc tenet dictam terram et domum Magister domus Dei Dover’ et appreciata fuit domus predicta eo tempore ad xxs et dicta terra ad xiiij

Item dicunt quod domini Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt xxviijs de hundredo de Worth plusquam vicesimam.

nature, the bailiffs greatly oppressed the people beyond measure and this was during King Henry’s time and the time of the present king.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, unjustly imposed a tallage of 40s. upon the tenants of Worth after Archbishop Boniface’s death.

Then they say that Henry of Wingham, formerly the lord King Henry’s escheator, took 16 acres of land held by serjeantry at Hurst called Dommarsh into the lord King Henry’s hand and these were assessed at the Exchequer each year at 16s.

They they say that Adam Daniel’s land and house have been taken into the lord King Henry’s hand because he was a fugitive and now the Master of God’s house at Dover holds the house and land and the aforesaid house is appraised at 20s. at this time and the said land at 14s.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 28s. more that the assessed amount from Worth hundred.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.10</th>
<th>Hundred de Alolvesbrigg adhuc in lesto de Shepweye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurati dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ tenet unum feodium in Snave de domino rege set nesciunt per quod servicii. Item quod totus lestus iste traditur ad firmam per vicecomitem ad grave damnum patrie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod medietas hundredi de Alolvesbriggest in manu domini regis et reddit per annum domino regi ixs et vijd sine turno vicecomitis et si ponetur ad firmam nesciunt quid possit valere per annum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod tenentes abbatis Sancti Augustini Cant’ subtrahunt se per eundem abbatem de sectis hundredi domini regis et capit de illis emendas assisas panis et cervisie et furcas levavit de novo sed nesciunt quo warento et facta est ista predicta subtractio per predictum abbatem per iij annos ad dampnum regis per annum dimidiam marce et amplius.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet assisam panis et cervisie furcas wrecum maris et tenet placita de namio vetito set quo warento nesciunt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod Thomas de la Bellhuse subtraxit tenentes suos de secta hundredi domini regis per iij annos ad dampnum regis per annum de Vs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod barones de Quinque Portibus distringunt forinfecos infra libertates suas pro debito ubi non sunt debitores nec pleggios ad grave damnum patrie eo quod ministri domini regis non possunt intrare propter libertatem suam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod minute purpresture facte sunt in dicto hundredo et baillivi regis caput inde expleta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod Willelmus Criel coronator comtempsit pluries exsequi officium suum ad mangnum [sic] gravamen hundredo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod baillivi domini regis cum sumonere deberent xij liberos homines ad assisas vel inquisiciones sumonuerunt xxijij vel plures et tunc aliquos de sumonitis permittunt in pace pro vjd et hoc fecit Thomas de Leht ballivus regis tempore Magistri Laurencii et tempore Thomas de Sutheneye quos sub-bailivus fuit et Symon David fecit eodem modo tempore suo ad grave damnum patrie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.10</th>
<th>Aloesbridge Hundred still in Shepway lathe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The jury say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds one fee in Snave of the lord king but they do not know by what service. Then that that whole lathe is demised at farm by the sheriff with serious loss to the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that a moiety of Aloesbridge hundred is in the lord king’s hand and renders 9s. 7d. to the lord king each year without the sheriff’s tourn and if it should be placed at farm they do not know what it may be worth each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that the tenants of the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury withdraw themselves through the same abbot from suits of the lord king’s hundred and he takes the fines for the assizes of bread and ale from them and has erected a gallows recently but they do not know by what warrant and that the aforesaid withdrawal was done by the aforesaid abbot three years ago with loss of half a mark and more each year to the king.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the assize of bread and ale, the gallows, wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distrain upon goods, but they do not know by what warrant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that Thomas de la Bellhuse has withdrawn his tenants from suit of the lord king’s hundred for 2 years with loss to the king of 5s. each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that the barons of the Cinque Ports make distrain upon outsiders within their liberties for debt, when they are neither debtors nor acting as pledges with serious loss to the country, because the lord king’s minsters cannot enter because of their liberty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that small encroachments have been made in the said hundred and the king’s bailiffs take a levy for this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that William Criel the coroner has on many occasions refused to perform the duties of his office causing serious hardship to the hundred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then they say that the lord king’s bailiffs when they ought to have summoned 12 free men to assizes or inquisitions, have summoned 24 men or more and then for payment of 6d. have granted some men remission from summons and Thomas de Leht who was bailiff during Master Lawrence’s time and sub-bailiff during Thomas de Sutheneye’s time, did this and Simon David acted in the same way during his time of office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Hevere vicecomes amerciavit tempore suo Adam de Grenehull in ijs quod non venit ad inquisiciones suas et Robertum de North’m in ijs pro simili et denarios levavit et inquisicione non remansit capta pro defectu personarum.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes tempore suo tradidit ad firmam Thome de Suthen totum lestum hunc pro xx libris per annum ubi priusquam tradi solebat pro xviiii libris ad mangnum gravamen patrie unde plures relinqunt baroniam pro tali gravamine et conversantur super archiepiscopatum.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen ballivus inposuit Willemo Frei quod fecit purpresturam super regiam (viam) et nullam fecit et ideo cepit ab eo ijs

Item dicunt quod Simon David subballivus Magistri Laurencii de Shokenesshe inposuit Eglentine relicte Ade le Blund quod retinuit redditum domini regis et nullum debuit quare noluit dare ei garbas in autumpno et cepit ab ea eadem occasione vijs et de Jacobo Rufo pro simili iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht predictus subballivus imprisonavit Jacobum Stroggel et Thomam Hunicod inponendo eisdem falso quod furabant 1 angnum [sic] unde non fuerunt culpabiles et post modicum permisit eos abire pro una marca.

Item idem Thomas distrixit pluries homines istius hundredi per equos et boves et tunc junxit eos ad carucam suam et aravit terram suam et vendit arura ad mangnum dampnum hundredi.

Item idem Thomas inposuit Thome Ham’ de Ivecrich quod debuit custodisse quemdam latronem in ecclesia de Snaves et ideo cepit de eo injuste iijs.

Item dicunt quod idem Thomas de Leht levavit per Thomam de Suthen ballivum regis de summonitione Scaccarii de parochia de Snaves xLs et dederunt dicto Thome de Suthen ut eos inde aquietaret Vs et non aquietavit eos set totum retinuit ad grave dampnum eorum.

Item dictus Thomas le Leht levavit vijs de hoc hundredo de redditu domini regis et hundredum inde non aquietavit

Item idem Thomas levavit xLd de summonitione causing serious loss to the country.

Then they say that when William of Hever was sheriff he amerced Adam of Greenhill 2s. because he did not come to his inquisitions and Robert of Northiam 2s. for a similar reason and he raised a levy and the inquisition taken was not valid because of the lack of people.

Then they say that when Henry Malemains was the sheriff he demised this whole lathe at farm to Thomas de Suthen for £20 each year whereas it previously had been demised at £18, thus causing great suffering for the country, whence many people left the barony because of this oppression and have changed their residence to that of the archbishopric.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen the bailiff accused William Frei that he made an encroachment upon the king’s highway and he had not done so and he took 2s. from him.

Then they say that Simon David, the sub-bailiff of Master Lawrence de Shokenesshe, accused Eglantine, Adam le Blund’s widow, that she has kept back the lord king’s rent and she owed nothing since she refused to give him some sheaves at harvest time and he took 8s. from her on this account and 4s. from James Rufus for a similar reason.

Then they say that the aforesaid Thomas le Leht the sub-bailiff imprisoned James Stroggel and Thomas Hunicod falsely accusing them of the theft of 1 lamb and they were not guilty of this and after a short time he permitted them to go for payment of one mark.

Then the same Thomas made distraint upon many men of that hundred for horses and oxen and them he yoked them to his own plough and ploughed his own land and sold the ploughing services, causing great loss to the hundred.

Then the same Thomas accused Thomas Ham of Ivecrich that he should have guarded a certain robber who was in Snaves church and he took 3s. from him unjustly.

Then they say that the same Thomas de Leht made a levy of 40s. upon Snaves parish through Thomas de Suthen the king’s bailiff for summons of the Exchequer and they gave 5s. to the said Thomas so that he should acquit them and he has not acquitted them but has kept the whole amount causing them severe loss.

Then the said Thomas le Leht made a levy of 7s. upon this hundred for the lord king’s rent and he has not acquitted this hundred of this sum.

Then the same Thomas made a levy of 40d. for
Scaccarii de Benedicto filio Simonis et eum inde non aquietavit. Item idem cepit de relicta Godefridi Bacun xijd pro uno quadrante quem debuit de firma ut dixit et nullum debuit. Item dicunt quod dictus Thomas de Suthen levare fecit per predictum Thomam de Leht subballivum suum vijd de Maynardo de Capella quos levasse debuit de domino Willelmo de Orlwestun pro damnis adjudicatis dicto Mainardo pro dissasina quam dictus dominus Wilhelmus sibi fecerat. Item dicte Thomas le Leht distringit Hamonem le Bard per xxiiij vacas lactatas et eas detinuit per iiij dies ad damnum eiusmodem de iijjs et nichilominus cepit pro warda iijjs. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectors vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo plus quam vicesima V marcas.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen baillivus regis noluit tenere hundredum Radulfum le Todeler attachiatum antequam haberet de hoc hundredo iij marcas. Item dicunt quod idem Thomas ballivus cepit de dicto hundredo i marcam pro deliberacione Alani clerici post ultimum Iter justiciarum. Item Magister Laurencius de Suthenesse ballivus regis noluit tenere hundredum ad deliberandum quemdam felonem Godefridum Burdun antequam habuit xxxs. Item dictus Thomas de Suthen’ baillivus cepit de hundredo dimidiam marcam ad deliberandum Thomam Lampeshin felonem. Item dicunt quod subballivus Hamomis de la Forstall ballivi regis attachiavit quemdam hominem extraneum in hundredo de Hamme et injuste eum duxerunt infra istud hundredum quem noluit dictus Hamo deliberare subballivo eius antequam habuerunt de hoc hundredo Xs.

Item dictus Thomas le Leht calumpniavit borgham de Betlingehop de iiijd de redditu domini regis ubi nullum debuit et ea occasione cepit de borgha iijjs et iijjd. Item Thomas de Suthen predictus ballivus regis imposuit Stephano Bate et Henrico fratri suo quod debebant debitum in Judaismo ubi nullum debuit ac tamen ea occasione cepit ab eis iijjs.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Lyming levavit nomine Magistri Ricardi de Clifford excaitoris de summons of the Exchequer upon Benedict son of Simon and he has not acquitted him of this sum. Then the same man took 12d. from Godfrey Bacun’s widow for one farthing which she owed for the farm, as he said, and she owed nothing. Then they say that the said Thomas de Suthen made a levy of 7d. through his sub-bailiff, the aforesaid Thomas de Leht, upon Maynard Chapel whereas he ought to have made the levy upon Sir William de Orlwestun for damages awarded to the said Maynard for the dispossession which Sir William had caused him. Then the said Thomas le Leht made distraint upon Hamo le Bard for 24 milch cows and he kept them for 4 days causing loss of 4s. to the same man and nevertheless he took 4s. for their care. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulco Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 5 marks more than assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, the king’s bailiff was unwilling to hold the hundred court for Ralph le Todeler who had been arrested, before he received 2 marks from this hundred. Then they say that the same Thomas the bailiff took 1 mark from this hundred to deliver Alan the clerk after the last eyre of the justices. Then Master Lawrence de Suthenesse the king’s bailiff was not willing to hold the hundred court to deliver a certain felon, Godfrey Burdun, before he received 30s. Then the said Thomas de Suthen the bailiff, took half a mark from the hundred to deliver Thomas Lampeshin who was a felon. Then they say that the sub-bailiff of Hamo de la Forstall, the king’s bailiff, arrested a certain strange man in Ham hundred and they unjustly took him within that hundred whom the said Hamo was unwilling to deliver to his sub-bailiff before they received 10s. from this hundred. Then the said Thomas le Leht charged the tithing of Betlingehop 4d. for the lord king’s rent whereas they owed nothing and on this occasion he took 4s. 4d. from the tithing. Then the aforesaid Thomas de Suthen, the king’s bailiff accused Stephen Bate and his brother Henry that they were in debt to the Jews whereas they owed no debt and however on this occasion he took 4s. from them. Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge raised a levy of £6 within this hundred in the name of Master.
Richard of Clifford, the escheator of the archbishopric and the priory but for what reason they do not know and 46s. 8d. from the tenants of the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury and for what reason they do not know.

Then that the said Stephen, the bailiff of the aforesaid escheator, took possession of the manor of Snave into the lord king’s hand in the first year of King Edward’s reign, after the death of Roger, the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury and he held that for 3 weeks in the lord king’s hand and took 46s. 8d. from the tenants of the same manor.

Hundredum de Sancto Martino in predicto lesto

The jury say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has wreck and other liberties of the king but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the men of Romney who are of the Cinque Ports make distraint upon outsiders for various debts when they are neither debtors nor pledges, as a result of this neither the sheriff nor any other bailiff of the king is able to correct this situation and therefore the men of Romney undermine the royal authority with serious harm to the whole country and contrary to custom and the jury do not know by what warrant. They say also that Thomas le Leht, the bailiff of Shepway, charged Robert Brice with the death of a certain child and made distraint upon him until he received 2s. and they say that Nicholas Biroc by the authority of the liberty of Romney unjustly took Peter de Hawene’s draught animals and that he was not able to reclaim them by royal authority until he gave the same Nicholas 1 mark and the condition of the draught animals has deteriorated to value of half a mark. They say also that Robert le Pore had a certain serving man called Andrew de Wylhop who stole the same Robert’s cow and he took 40s. from him to permit him to be discharged.

They also say that Peter le Warde distrained Richard le Leygh for 6 sheep and 4 lambs price 8s. because of a half mark which he owed Alan Godfrey and this half mark he paid to the aforesaid Peter and nevertheless he, Peter has kept the said sheep with the lambs for himself. Then they say that upon complaint Thomas le Leht charged Matthew the cooper with the death of a certain child and he made distraint upon him until he received half a mark and he took 5s. from Robert Blakeman on
occasione Vs et de Ricardo Brice eadem occasione et de Lovekyn Stukepen ijs et de Roberto Adam Vs.

Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Liminge tunc bailiffus excaitoris cepti injuste de Matheo Copier occasione predicta ij marcas et de Roberto Brice xxs. et de Willelmo Legat 1 vaccam precii Xs et adhuc eam detinet et de Roberto Willelmo de Dobur’ eadem occasione 1 vaccam precii Xs et eam detinet et de Willelmo Erle 1 markam eadem occasione. Item idem Stephanus cepti injuste de Galfrido le Suniere pro quadam muliere mortua per miseria in febris unde dictus Galfridus non fuit culpabilis xLs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor cepti de tenentibus archiepiscopi in hoc hundredo pro auxilio ad opus regis X libras et Stephanus de Lyminge bailivus eiusdem cepti de Willelmo Norhtman ut non esset prepositus de Aldington 1 markam et de Thoma Pute pro eodem 1 markam et de Hamo Kyvet pro eodem xxs et de Roberto Wastebr’ pro eodem 1 markam et de Henrico Ham’ pro eodem xxs et hec omnia cepti injuste quod non fuit necesse habere ibidem prepositum nisi causa lucri.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicecesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo plus quam rectam vicesimam xLiijs.

Hundredum de Hamme

Jurati dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Orlane stun tenet de domino rege duo feoda militis in eadem villa quo warento nesciunt. Item dicunt quod medietas hundredi de Hamme est in manu domini regis et debet per annum ad firmam redditus et wardas xxxvd et ad turnum vicecomes viiijs et altera pars est in manu archiepiscopi Cant per antiquam libertatem ecclesie Christi Cant’ et valet cum assisis et perquisitis per annum dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod abbas Sancti Augustini Cant’ subtraxit quosdam tenentes suos de hundredo de Hamme et appropriavit sibi de Itinere Magistri Rogeri de Seyton justiciarii ad [grave dampnum domini] regis per annum de xviijd.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ clamat [habere ret]urn et extractum brevium placita de namio the same occasion, [blank] from Richard Brice on the same occasion, 2s. from Lovekyn Stukepen and 5s. from Robert Adam.

Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge, then the excheater’s bailiff, unjustly took 2 marks from Matthew the cooper on the aforesaid occasion, 20s. from Robert Brice and 1 cow price 10s. from William Legat which he still keeps and 1 cow price 10s. from Robert William of Dover on the same occasion which he keeps and 1 mark from William Erl on the same occasion. Then the same Stephen unjustly took 40s. from Geoffreys le Suniere after complaint of a certain woman’s death through affliction of fever, and the said Geoffrey was not guilty of this.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £10 from the archbishop’s tenants in this hundred for an aid for the king’s use and Stephen of Lyminge, the same man’s bailiff, took 1 mark from William Norhtman so that he should not be reeve of Aldington and 1 mark from Thomas Pute for the same reason, 20s. from Hamo Kyvet for the same reason, 1 mark from Robert Wastebr’ for the same reason and 20s. from Henry Ham for the same reason and he took all this money unjustly because it was not necessary to have a reeve there unless for profit.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 44s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Ham Hundred

The jury say that Sir William de Orlane stun holds two knights’ fees in the same vill of the lord king in chief, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that a moiety of Ham hundred is in the lord king’s hand and owes at farm for rents and wards 35d. each year and 8s. at the sheriff’s tourn and the other part is in the archbishop of Canterbury’s hand by an ancient liberty of Christchurch Canterbury and it is worth half a mark each year with the assizes and perquisites.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury has withdrawn certain tenants of his in Ham hundred and appropriated those for himself, from the time of the eyre of justice Master Roger de Seyton with [severe loss to the lord] king of 18d. each year.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury claims [to have the ret]urn and extract of writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, wreck, the gallows
vetito wreccecum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates regias que ad coronam pertinent per antiquam libertatem. Item dicunt quod Stephanus le Horpede de Vetere Romenhal fecit purpresturam in via regali in borgha de Esteham ad magnum gravamen patrie.

Item dicunt quod Thomas le Leht serviens hundredi cepit xLjd de Henrico Spakeman et Willelmno Bishop et de aliis de hundredo de Hamme per particulas cepit xxs ex Itinere Nicholai de Turri justiciarii.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Burn vicecomes tradidit lestrom de Shipweye cuidam Magistro Laurencio qui cepit in hundredo de Hamme de Thome filio Benedicti pro inquisicone habenda de quadam fama Xs et de Koc de Fraxino 1 marcam et de Johanne Palmar qui fuit attaghiato ut possit transire per patriam cepit xxs et xiiij ovae precii Xs de Johanne de Capella 1 taurum precii [ ] de Martino Sired 1 vaccam precii viijis ut ipsum de tanto aquitaret in Judayismo et non fecit et de hundredo de Hamme per X annos quolibet anno xviijis ut ipsos non occasionaret ad duos laghedais et nihilominus eos inquerelavit et quolibet anno cepit de eodem hundredo de injustis amerciamentis et sic ipsos de hundredo excoriavit ita quod destructi sunt et plures evacuaverunt baroniam. Postea venit Henricus Malemains vicecomes et cepit de Hamme 1 marcam quare quidam homo vulneratus fuit in domo sua.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen fuit ballivus per ij annos sub Henrico Malemains vicecomite et cepit lestrom de Shipweye pro xiiiij libris qui solebant capi pro xiiij libris et maletractavit et excoriavit hundredum ita quod vix sunt in baronia XL mansiones pauperes et solebant esse C ad minus.

Item dicunt quod ballivi archiepiscopi capiunt et vendunt wardas de gavelikund iniuste contra regiam potestatem.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo xiiiij et vd plus quam rectam vicesimam.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford exciator cepit in bosco de Subturneswod xLS et de tenentibus eiusdem ville xxxvjs.

and the assize of bread and ale and other royal liberties which pertain to the crown, through an ancient liberty.

Then they say that Stephen le Horpede of Old Romney has made an encroachment upon the highway in East Ham [Ruckinge par.?] tithing causing great harm to the country.

Then they say that Thomas le Leht, a swrjeant of the hundred took 41d. from Henry Spakeman and William Bishop and from others of Ham hundred he took 20s. as itemised, from the eyre of the justice Nicholas de Turri.

Then they say that Sir Henry of Bourne, the sheriff, demised Shepway lathe to a certain Master Lawrence who took 10s. as it is rumoured, in Ham hundred from Thomas son of Benedict for holding an inquest and 1 mark from Koc de Fraxino, 20s. and 14 sheep price 10s. from John Palmer who was under arrest, so that he might be released by the jury, 1 bull price [   ] from John Chapel, 1 cow price 8s. from Martin Sired so that Master Lawrence might acquit him of a debt to the Jews and he has not done so and for 10 years he took 18s. each year from Ham hundred so that he should not prosecute the men at the two lawdays and nevertheless he has sued them and each year he has taken from the same hundred in unjust amerciaments and in this way he has so despoiled men of the hundred that they are ruined and many have departed from the barony.

Afterwards Henry Malemains, the sheriff, arrived and took 1 mark from Ham because a certain man was wounded in his own house.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen was bailiff for 2 years under Henry Malemains, the sheriff, and he took Shepway lathe at £32 which used to be taken at £14 and he maltreated and despoiled the hundred so that there are scarcely more than 40 poor houses within the barony and there used to be at least 100.

Then they say they said the archbishop’s bailiffs unjustly take and sell wards of gavelkind contrary to royal authority.

Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 14s. 5d. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took 40s. in the wood of Subturneswod and 36s. from the tenants of the same vill.

**Hundredum de Hean in predicto lesto**

**Heane Hundred in the aforesaid lathe**
Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex habet in comitatu Kancie manerium de Middeltun cum membris quod tenet dominus Johannes de Burgo ad terminum vite et Ospringe quod tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc et Magister Domus Dei de Ospring et curia de Bed[ sed nesciunt quo w]arento.

Item dicunt quod manerium de Wy quod tenet abbas de Bello [et manerium de ] quod tenet dominus Willelmus de Leyburn solebant esse aliquando in manu domini regis.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Sandwico [ et Bert]ramus de Crioll tenent baroniam de Folkestan de domino rege in capite de qua dictus Johannes tenet vij feoda et dictus [ ] et tenet hundredum de Folkstan in communi pro xxs solvendis per annum domino rege et quod domina Eglentina [ ] tenet Postling cum membris sic [ ] in dote pro xxs solvendis warde Dover’ per annum et tenetur domino rege in capite.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractas brevium placita de namio vetito de (quo) tempore aut quo warento ignorant [sic].

Item dicunt quod Magister de Swinesfeld hospitale vendicat libertatem per quam assisam domini regis in pane cervisia et mensura inpeditur a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod ministeriis de assisis de Walter Horum vjd, de Gileberto de la [ ], de Philippo de Hamwud vjd et de Elia le Blund vjd. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulk
Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 12s. by weight more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that Henry Malemains the sheriff and profit of Thomas de Suthen’. Then they say that Daniel, a serjeant [took] 6d. from Hugh of Langacra. And that Master Lawrence de Smethe maliciously and unjustly took 8s. from this hundred. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took from the archbishop’s tenants at S[   ] so that they might be treated in the manner which they enjoyed during the archbishop’s time and Master Hugh de Thornham unjustly [took] 20s. for 2 taxes of one-twentieth [from] the same tenants and the aforesaid Master Richard took 20s. from the same tenants because [they were unwilling   ] by the appraiser just as he wished and he made waste in the archbishop’s wood in this hundred at Saltwood while [? the archbishopric was vacant]. Then they say that William de Brochell sent wool and cheese overseas but they do not know how much nor by [what warrant]

m.10 dorso Loningborough Hundred in Shepway lathe

The jury say that Elham manor which was of Alice Countess of Aumale, used to be in the lord king’s hand and the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, took that manor into his own hand because it was an escheat of Normandy and he gave that to his son the Lord Edward and the same Lord Edward gave that to Sir Roger de Leyburn by his charter, saving the advowson of the church and Sir Roger de Leyburn now holds that. Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 33s. 4d. more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn holds a moiety of Loningborough hundred by paying 5s. each year at the sheriff’s tourn because of Elham manor and the lord archbishop has the other moiety because of Lyminge manor and they say that Lyminge hundred is worth 2 marks each year. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs and wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods. Then the same man and Sir William de Leyburn have a gallows in the

| Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt de hoc hundredo ultra rectam [vicesimam] pro pondere xijs. | Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains vicecomes [Thome] de Suthen exitus. Item dicunt quod Daniel serviens [ ] de Hugone de Langacra vjd. Et quod Magister Laurencius de Smethe maliciose et injuste cepit de hoc hundredo viijs. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaetor cepit de tenentibus archiepiscopi apud S[   ] ut possent tractari eo modo quo fuerunt tempore archiepiscopi et Magister Hugo de Thornham [ cepit de] eisdem tenentibus xxs pro ij vicesimis injuste et predictus Magister Ricardus cepit de eisdem xxs quare [noluerunt ] preco sicut voluit et fecit vastum in bosco archiepiscopi in hoc hundredo apud Saltwud dum [   ]. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochell fecit ducere lanas et caseum ultra mare set quantum aut quo aut [quo warento nesciunt]. m. 10 dorso Hundredum de Lonesburegh in lesto de Shupweye Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Elham quod fuit Alicie cometisse de Aungo solebat esse in manu dominii regis et dominus Henricus rex patris domini regis nunc cepit illud manerium in manu sua racione excaite Normannie et dedit illud domino Edwardo filio suo et idem dominus Edwardus dedit illud domino Rogero de Leyburn per cartam suam salva advocacione ecclesie et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn nunc tenet illud. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra certum numerum vicesime xxxiijs iiijd. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Leyburn tenet mediatatem hundredi de Lonebergh solvendo ad turnum vicecomitis Vs racione manerii de Elham et dominus archiepiscopus habet aliam medietatem racione manerii de Lemmyng et dicunt quod hundredum de Lemynyg valet iij marcas per annum. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum omnium brevium et wrecicum maris et tenet placita de namiu vetito. Item idem et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn habent in eodem hundredo | Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Brochell fecit ducere lanas et caseum ultra mare set quantum aut quo aut [quo warento nesciunt]. m.10 dorso Loningborough Hundred in Shepway lathe The jury say that Elham manor which was of Alice Countess of Aumale, used to be in the lord king’s hand and the lord King Henry, the present king’s father, took that manor into his own hand because it was an escheat of Normandy and he gave that to his son the Lord Edward and the same Lord Edward gave that to Sir Roger de Leyburn by his charter, saving the advowson of the church and Sir Roger de Leyburn now holds that. Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth, took 33s. 4d. more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that Sir William de Leyburn holds a moiety of Loningborough hundred by paying 5s. each year at the sheriff’s tourn because of Elham manor and the lord archbishop has the other moiety because of Lyminge manor and they say that Lyminge hundred is worth 2 marks each year. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return of all writs and wreck and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods. Then the same man and Sir William de Leyburn have a gallows in the |
furcas et assisam panis et cervisie ab antiquo tempore et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dictus Willelmus de Leyburn habet nundinas apud Elham et valent per annum iijs et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus apud Lymming et dominus Willelmus de Leyburn apud Elham habent chacias et warrenam ab antiquo et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Stupindon ballivus comitis Glovemnie cepit dominum Willelum de Crioll ad domum suam et duxit eum apud Tunebrigg et eum imprisonavit eo quod fuit ad insultum castri de Tunebrigg per preceptum domini regis et predictus Willelmus ballivus cepit de bonis predicti Willeli de Crioll ad valenciam xx librarum tempore pacis post bellum de Evesham.

Item Ernaldus de Eling ballivus lesti de Shupweye cepit iijjs de hundredo de Luneberegh ad videndum Matillem Forwar mortuam apud Halirode.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Crioll coronator cepit iijjs ad videndum Mattildem clerici apud Lymming.

Item idem Willelmus cepit iijjs de domino Radulfo filio Bernardi ad officium suum faciendum pro Ricardo Begelet occiso at Lymming.

Item dicunt quod Thomas de Suthen baillivus lesti de Shipweye fecit summonitionem Henrico Brunman pro quadam recognicione apud London’ et cepit de eo ijs ut possit remanere domi et Willelmus filius Hamonis de la Forstall bailivius eiusdem lesti summonuit Osebertum le Rugg’ ibidem et ut possit remanere domi cepit ab eo xijd et de Johanne Duraunt pro simili vjd et de Roberto Noite vjd et dictus Hamo de la Forstall cepit de Bertramo filio Willelmi de Crioll pro simili ijs.

Item dicunt quod Daniel subballivus Laurencii de Shokeness cepit de Johanne Purs’ xijd pro quadam defalta in una assisa ad quam fuit paraliter apud Coritun. Item idem Daniel venit apud Halirod et secum duxit quondam qui se dixit esse servientem Comitis et petit de tenentis ibidem aurum regine quod prius solverant domino Henrico Perot attune cepit ab eisdem xvjd ut bestie eorum possent morari ad domum suam et Henricus de Ledes cepit ab eisdem pro simili ijs et ixd.

same hundred and the assize of bread and ale from ancient times and they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the said William de Leyburn has the fairs at Elham and they are worth 3s. each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop has chace and warren at Lyminge and Sir William de Leyburn likewise at Elham from ancient times and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that William de Stupindon, the earl of Gloucester’s bailiff, took Sir William de Crioll to his own house and then conducted him to Tonbridge and imprisoned him because he had been at the assault upon Tonbridge castle, by the lord king’s command and the aforesaid William the bailiff took goods to the value of £20 from the aforesaid William de Crioll, in the time of peace after the battle of Evesham.

Then Ernald de Eling, bailiff of Shepway lathe, took 4s. from Loningborough hundred for holding an inquest for Matilda Forwar deceased at Halirode (Stelling par.?).

Then they say that William de Crioll the coroner took 4s. for holding an inquest upon Matilda, daughter of William of Lyminge the clerk, at Lyminge.

Then the same William took 4s. from Sir Ralph son of Bernard for performing the duties of his office, for Richard Begelet who was slain at Lyminge.

Then they say that Thomas de Suthen, bailiff of Shepway lathe, issued a summons to Henry Brunman for a certain acknowledgment of debt at London and he took 2s. from him so that he might remain at home and William the son of Hamo de la Forstall, bailiff of the same lathe, summoned Osbert le Rugg there and he took 12d. from him so that he might remain at home, 6d. from John Duraunt for a similar reason and 6d. from Robert Noite and the said Hamo de la Forstall took 2s. from Bertram son of William de Crioll for a similar reason.

Then they say that Daniel, the sub-bailiff of Lawrence de Shokeness, took 12d. from John Purs for a certain default in one assize at which he had acted in a similar way as he had at Coryton. Then the same Daniel came to Halirod and brought with him a certain man who said that he had been a serving man of the earl and he sought the queen’s gold from the tenants there, which they had previously paid to Sir Henry Perot and then he took 16d. from the same tenants so that their animals might remain at his own house and Henry of Leeds took 2s. 9d. from the same tenants for a similar reason.
Item dicunt quod Willelmus le Bret cepit de Nicholao de Bokenolt xiiijs de catallis Thome de Grimeshaker fugitivi et eum versus dominum regem inde non aquietavit et postmodum Henricus Malemains vicecomes tunc et dictus Nicholaua predictum Willelmum retinuerunt in castro Cant’ donec habuerunt de eo xiiijs et vjd.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excactor facit capere oves Willelmi fili Willelmi de Monte super terram suam et eas posuit cum ovibus suis et faldam suam fecit ponere super terram suam. Ita quod dictus Willelmus non potuit aliquod commodum habere de terra sua antequam terram illam vendidisset ad damnum suum xLs. Item idem Magister Ricardus fecit distinguere Willelum et Robertum Hered et Thomam Burgeis super quadrum terra vocata Cokkeresfeld ita quod nullum commodum inde potuerunt habere donec eidem Magistro Ricardo terram illam vendidisset ad damnum ipsorum de iiiij marcis.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Lovel cepit de Willelmo de Prato de Lymmig xxs ut eum aquietaret de xLvs de debito Judeorum et nichil sibi fecit quare heredes dicti Willelmi predictos xLvs postmodum solverunt.

Dicunt etiam quod dominus Robertus de Scoito subexcaitor Magistri Ricardi de Clifford post obitum Rogeri de Leyburn cepit de tenentibus de Ellham nomine tallagii ij marcas. Item Magister Ricardus de Clifford excactor post obitum Bonefacci archiepiscopi in primo adventu suo cepit de tenentibus de Lymming de recognicione X marcas. Item anno secundo petebat idem Magister Ricardus ab eisdem quaedam redditum xLs quem redditum non debebant et pro inquisitione super hoc facta cepit ab eis Cs et tunc noluit inquisitionem illam facere. Idem idem Magister Ricardus facit vendere in forinseco bosco de Limming Lx quercus precii Cs et de subboscis precii ixs et cariare facit ad domum suam propria xvj quercus ad portam suam faciendam. Item idem cepit de tenentibus de Lymming Cs quare noluerunt capere partem manerii secundum extentam tocius manerii quare voluit retinere boscos prata et molendina ad opus suum proprium et residuum eis tradere tam caro parco sicut totum manerium fuit extentum.

Item idem Magister Ricardus facit capere xxiiij feras in parco de Lymming. Item idem cepit de Willelmo de
Grang’ tunc preposto quod non venit London die quo eum preceperat ad computum suum reddendum. Item idem Magister Ricardus cepit de eodem Willelmo Cs ut eum aquietaret de eisdem denariis versus executores Bonefacii archiepiscopi et non fecit set idem Willelmus quicquid debuit executoribus eisdem solvit.

**Hundredum de Nywecherche in lesto de Syppwey**

Jurati dicunt quod rex habet in manu sua quondam escaetam post obitum Willelmi de Sylevebr’ et valet per annum vijs et Willelmus de Redlente tenet in manu sua ad opus domini regis in hundredo de Nywecherche.

Item dicunt quod Johannes Monsel habuit terciam partem curie inferioris de Bilsintune et post obitum dicti Johannis dominus rex accept illum in manu sua et dedit domino Petro de Pynibus per cartam suam et idem Petrus vendidit illum Johanni Andr’ de Wyncheles’ et idem Johannes escambiavit cum domino Johanne de Sandwico militie qui nunc tenet et valet per annum Cs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Ordlageston tenet dimidum feodum militis quod erat Nicholai Folet de domino rege in capite et dicunt quod Willelmus de Sylenebr’ tenuit de domino rege in capite dimidium feodum et vendidit pluribus et nunc tenent illud abbas de Boxel priorissa Sancti Sepulchri Johannes de Gredle Hugo de Kyrfingeham Hamo le Bret Willelmus de Capella Johannes de Berledindenn.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Ordlageston tenet dimidum feodum militis quod erat Nicholai Folet de domino rege in capite et dicunt quod Willelmus de Sylenebr’ tenuit de domino rege in capite dimidium feodum et vendidit pluribus et nunc tenent illud abbas de Boxel priorissa Sancti Sepulchri Johannes de Gredle Hugo de Kyrfingeham Hamo le Bret Willelmus de Capella Johannes de Berledindenn.

**Newchurch Hundred in Shepway lathe**

The jury say that the king holds a certain escheat in his own hand after the death of William de Sylevebr’ and it is worth 7s. each year and William de Redlente holds in his own hand for the lord king’s use in Newchurch hundred.

Then they say that John Monsel held a third part of the lesser court of Bilsington and after the said John’s death the lord king received it in his own hand and gave it to the lord Peter de Pynibus by his charter and the same Peter sold it to John Andrew of Winchelsea and the same John exchanged it with Sir John of Sandwich knight who now holds it and it is worth 100s. each year.

Then they say that Sir William de Ordlageston holds a half knight’s fee which was of Nicholas Folet, of the lord king in chief and they say that William de Sylenebr’ held a half fee of the lord king in chief and sold it to many people and now the abbot of Boxley, the priorress of St Sepulchre’s [Canterbury], John de Gredle, Hugo de Kyrfingeham, Hamo le Bret, William Chapel (and) John de Berledindenn hold that.

Then they say that the lord king has in his own hand a certain manor which is called Middleton.

Then they say that Newchurch hundred owes each year 10s. 11d. and 4d. for the farm and for rent and these have been taken away by Richard Oyn and it owes 16s. for the tourn.

Then they say that Newchurch hundred, a moiety is of the barony and is in the lord king’s hand and the other part is in the hand of the archbishop and of the priory of Christchurch Canterbury and they withdraw themselves from doing suit except twice a year upon the occasions called lawday and for hearing the lord king’s commands and for 20 years they have thus withdrawn themselves and the jurymen do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Hubert de Burgh had a charter of the lord king concerning the liberty and his son John de Burgh observes the said charter and he held his hundred of his tenants and after the lord King...
sequuntur ad omnia presentamenta cum dicto hundredo.

Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus et abbas de Bello clamant returnum brevium et tenent placita de namio vetito et wreccum maris nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Burgo levavit furcas in hundredo de Alolesbregge et abbas Sancti Augustini in eodem hundredo et prior ecclesie Christi Cant in hundredo de Newecherche sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod tenentes abbatis de Bello solebant sequi cum dimidio hundredi de Langeport et tempore justiciarum itinerantium ultimo in Kancia subtraxerunt aliterquam solebant et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Magister Domus Dei Dovor habet quoddam manerium vocatum Castbregg in hundredo de Wurthe et jacet pro sexta parte dicti hundredi et tenet hundredum de tenentibus suis in curia sua per quod dominus rex est in dampno dimidiam marcam per annum et amplius et nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Ordlingestun habet warennam et forum de novo in Ordlingestun set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Johannes de Sandwico habet warennam in parcis et vivariis in hundredo de Nywecherche sed nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Richardus Oyn de Romenale distrinxit Oyn de Hamigesheerst pro delicto facta extra villam et cepit ab eo xxs. Item Nicholaus Sott distrinxit Hamonem filium Ricardi quare presentavit in hundredo hoc quod accidit et cepit ab eo unam summam avene.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Sancta Cruce rector ecclesie de Bilsintun fecit quamdam purpresturam in regalem vico et arentatus est coram justiciarum Itinerantibus 1 obolum.

Item dicunt quod abbas de Boxel et priorissa Sancti Stephani tenent quartam partem dimidii feodi militis apud Sylembre’ ubi dominus rex amisit relevium et wardam nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Borne cepit de hundredo de Alevesberg 1 marcam pro quadam evasione et nicholominus amerciatum fuerit coram Henry’s death the liberty was taken into the hand of the present lord king and still is in the lord king’s hand and they do suit with the said hundred at all presentments.

Then they say that the lord archbishop and the abbot of Battle claim return of writs and they hold pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and wreck, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John de Burgh has raised a gallow in Alolesbridge hundred and also the abbot of St Augustine’s in the same hundred and the prior of Christchurch Canterbury in Newchurch hundred, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the abbot of Battle’s tenants used to do suit with the half hundred of Langport and from the last visitation of the eyre justices in Kent they have withdrawn in different ways from the procedure to which they were accustomed and the jury do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the Master of God’s House at Dover has a certain manor called Castbridge [Eastbridge?] in Worth hundred and it includes a sixth part of the said hundred and he holds a hundred of his own tenants in his own court, as a result of which the king suffers a loss of half a mark and more each year and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Ordeingestun has warren and market recently in Orlestone but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir John of Sandwich has warren in the parks and fish-ponds in Newchurch hundred but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Richard Oyn of Romney made distraint upon Oyn de Hamigesheerst for a transgression committed outside the vill and he took 20s. from him. Then Nicholas Sott made distraint upon Hamo son of Richard because he made presentment of the event in this hundred and he took one load of oats from him. Then they say that John of St Cross, the rector of Bilsington church, has made a certain encroachment on the royal highway and he was arraigned before the eyre justices at half a penny.

Then they say that the abbot of Boxley and the prioress of St Stephen’s hold a fourth part of half a knight’s fee at Silwel [Newchurch par.] whereupon the king has lost the relief and wardship, they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Henry of Bourne took 1 mark from Alolesbridge hundred because of a certain escape and nevertheless the hundred was amerced before the
Justiciariis.
Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokeness fuit bailivus de Sypwey et distinxit Stephanum de Cupere inusti
et detinuit averia sua donec dedit eidem ij quarteria
avene precii dimidiam marcam.

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenesse accepit de Ada Quikeman pro assisa removenda ijs.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Wattune vicecomes Kancie tradidit Johanni de Kemesing lestum de Sepway pro xvij libriss qui multa gravamina fecit per quod hundredum domini Regis deteriorantar eodem
tempore et quod Henricus Malemeins tradidit dictum
lestum pro xxx libris. Item dicunt quod dominus
Willelmus de Hevere tradidit dictum lestum Laurencio de Sokenesse pro xvii libriss et quod idem Laurencius et
sui ministri fecerunt multas destriccionis in populis ita
quod levaverunt eodem anno de dicto lesto xxxij libriss
et amplius ita quod homines solebant manere super
baroniam remoti sunt in libertatem archiepiscopi et
aliorum dominorum. Dicunt eciam quod Nicholaus
Sarebere qui fuit cum domino Willelmo de
Ordlegestun distrinxit Johannem Gileberd noctanter
per unum pullum precii dimidiam marcam quem
amisit pro eadem districcione.

Item dicunt quod dominus Fulco Poyforer attachaviit
Johannem filium Hugonis pro thesaurio invento et
cepit ab eo 1 marcamm et presentatum est coram
justiciariis Itinerantibus quod idem Johannes invenit 1
cercellum auri precii dimidiam marcam per
sacramentum hundredorum de Nywcherche Wurthe et
hundredi et Sancto Martino.

Dicunt eciam quod Stephanus de Lyminge subescaetor
domini regis fecit multa mala in archiepiscopatu et
cepit de Willlemo de la More 1 marcamm ut non esset
collector ad colligendum redditud.

Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemeyns et Fulco
Poyforer collecterunt vicesimam domini regis et
ceperunt in dicto hundredro pro pondere ultra numerum
Xs.

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenes levavit de
Roberto de Tanihud de summonitione Scaccarii xLjs
et ipsum non aquietavit.

Item dicunt quod Rogerus de Sokenesse dedit Henrico
de Borne vicecomiti qui ipsum summonuit ut fieret
miles xLjs ne esset miles.

Item dicunt quod Ambrosius clericus aliquo tempore
inprisonavit quondam Gerardum filium Thome et cepit

Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenessus fuit bailiff
of Shepway and he unjustly made distraint upon
Stephen de Cupere and took away his draught animals
until he had given him 2 quarters of oats, price half a
mark.

Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse received
2s. from Adam Quikeman for removing him from the
assize.

Then they say that John de Wattune, sheriff of Kent,
handed over the lathe of Shepway to John of Kemsing
for £16 and because he committed many ill-deeds, the
condition of lord king’s hundred deteriorated at the
same time and that Sir Henry Malemains handed over
the said lathe for £30. Then they say that Sir William
of Hever handed over the said lathe to Lawrence de
Sokenesse for £16 and that the same Lawrence and his
ministers caused much distress to the people because
they levied £32 and more upon the said lathe in the
same year, so that the men who used to live within the
barony were removed into the liberty of the archbishop
and of other lords. They also say that Nicholas
Sarebere who was with Sir William de Ordlegestun
made distraint upon John Gilberd at night of one colt,
half a mark in price, which he lost because of the same
distraint.

Then they say that Sir Fulk Poyforer arrested John son
of Hugh for a treasure trove and he took 1 mark from
him and it was presented before the eyre justices that
that same John found 1 small gold ring, price half a
mark by oath of the hundred of Newchurch and Worth
and of the hundred of Martin.

They also say that Stephen of Lyminge, the lord king’s
subescheator, did many harmful things in the
archbishopric and he took 1 mark from William de la
More so that he should not be the collector for
collecting rent.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulk
Poyforer collected the lord king’s tax of one-twentieth
and they took in 10s. by weight in the said hundred
more than the assessed amount.

Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse made a
levy of 42s. for summons of the Exchequer from
Robert de Tanihud and he has not acquitted him.

Then they say that Roger de Sokenesse gave 40s. to
Henry of Bourne the sheriff, who summoned him for
knighthood, so that he might not be a knight.

Then they say that at another time Ambrose the clerk
imprisoned a certain Gerard son of Thomas and took
ab eo quare noluit fideles appellare xLs [erased: ut fideles vocare]. Item dicunt quod Laurencius de Sokenesse cepit de Simone de Tunilonde dimidiam marcam et permisit eum abire a prisona. Item dicunt quod Egidius clericus cepit de burga de Humchild pro prisa deliberanda et quod Laurencius de Sokenesse cepit de burga de Fraxino iijis pro deliberacione Gerardi filii Thome inprisonati. Item Thomas de Sutheneye cepit de burga de Hamyngeherste ij pro deliberacione Roberti filii Thurstani.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Criol coronator non vult venire in hundreda de Nywecherche Hamme Wurthe Alolvesbrigge et in dimidium hundredum de Langport ita occisi et ali mortui fecerent ante quam possint sepeliri et tunc ballivi capiunt munera pro sepeliendo videndo Laurencius de Sokenesse cepit pro ij infortunii 1 marcam de burga de Humchild.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford fecit destructionem et vastum in parcis et vivariis de Aldinton ad X libras et amplus. Item dicunt quod Stephanus de Lyminge cepit de heredibus Hamonis Kyvet dicidum marcam. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford cepit de curia de Aldintun ad opus domini regis ut dixit xxij libras et iterum cepit Cs. Item dicunt quod dictus Magister Ricardus et sui ballivi ceperunt de dicta curia xx marcas quare extenderunt dictam curiam ultra voluntatem eorum. Item dicunt quod Matildem de Essedesford maritata est cum Rogerio de Rolling sine licentia domini regis. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford escaetor et sui ministri tenuerunt archiepiscopatum Cant’ in seisina domini regis per duos annos et xx septimanas ut intelligant.

m.10 dorso Hundredum de Strete in lesto de Sepwey

Dicunt jurati quod rex Henricus dedit Selling domino Willelmo Pucot ad totam vitam suam et post obitum ipsius Willelmi dominus rex dedit illud feodum Hugoni de Vinum in feodum et valet per annum X libras et facit wardam ad castrum de Dover sic Xs per annum et regina mater regis tenet illam terram racione custodis. Item dicunt quod rex habet Vs de hundredo de Strete et quod Johannes de Hadlo tenet unum feodum apud Strete in capite de domino rege per servicum Xs singulis annis ad castrum Dover solvendorum et 40s. from him because he was unwilling to accuse sureties. Then they say that Lawrence de Sokenesse took half a mark from Simon de Tunilonde and allowed him to depart from prison.

Then they say that Giles, the clerk, took from Humchild tithing for gaol delivery and that Lawrence de Sokenesse took 4s. from Fraxin tithing for releasing Gerard son of Thomas who had been imprisoned. Then Thomas de Sutheney took 2s. from the tithing of Hamyngeherste for releasing Robert son of Thurstan.

Then they say that Sir William de Criol, the coroner, was not willing to come to Newchurch, Ham, Worth, Alousesbridge hundreds and Langport half hundred and so there were people slain and others dead who could not be buried and then the bailiffs took rewards to oversee burials, Lawrence de Sokenesse took 1 mark from Humchild tithing for 2 unfortunate cases.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford caused destruction and waste in the parks and fishponds of Aldington at £10 and more. Then they say that Stephen of Lyminge took half a mark from Hamo Kyvet’s heirs. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford took £27 from Aldington court, as they say for the lord king’s use ans he took 100s. again. Then they say that the said Master Richard and his bailiffs took 20 marks from the said court because they had made an extent of the said court against their will. Then they say that Matilda de Essedesford married Roger de Rolling without the lord king’s licence. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, and his ministers held the archbishopric of Canterbury in seisin of the lord king for two years and 20 weeks as they understand.

m.10 dorso Street Hundred in Shepway lathe

The jury say that King Henry granted Selling [Sellindge?] to Sir William Pucot for his entire lifetime and after William’s death the lord king gave that fee to Hugh de Vinum in fee and it is worth £10 each year and he does castle guard at Dover, thus 10s. each year and the queen, the king’s mother holds that land by reason of wardship. Then they say that the king has 5s. from Street hundred and that John of Hadlow holds one fee at Street of the lord king in chief by service of 10s. to be paid each year at Dover castle and James of Wilmington holds
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jacobus de Wylmingtun unum feodum tenet de predicto Johanne per servicium Xs ad castrum et valet per annum X libras. Item Thomas de Marais habet unum feodum apud Otterpole de rege per serviciium Xs ad castrum Dover Xs et valet per annum Cs. Item dicunt quod Godefridus Faukener tenet manerium de Hurst de domino rege in capite per serjanciam per servicium ij falconum custodiendorum et valet per annum viij libras et nesciunt de tempore.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus tenet dimidium hundredum apud Strete per libertatem suam quam habet de domino rege et valet per annum Vs. Item dicunt quod Bonington subtraxterunt se de communi secta hundredi de Strete ubi bis per annum nec bis per annum pro xx annis et amplius nesciunt quo warento ad dampnum domini regis per annum ijs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus habet returnum per totum. Item dicunt quod Johannes de Hadlo tenet iij nundinas per annum de Sancto Martino et capit tholoneum aliter quam facere debet nesciunt quo warento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod gallivi domini regis et gallivi libertatis destruunt patriam eo quo capiunt amerciamenta de assisis fractis et non faciunt justiciam alio modo de pistoribus et braciatoribus et hoc ad magnum dampnum patriae et dicunt quod Egidius ballivus domini regis cepit de Johanne de la Chirke per iij annos iiijs pro bracina. Item dicunt quod Alexander clericius de Bonnyngton pro eodem et per idem tempore de fabis ijs et de Johanna relicta Horald ijs. Item dicunt quod Laurencius ballivus domini regis cepit de predicta Johanna Alexandro et Johanne Harold per spaciunm iij annorum quolibet anno ijs et quod Hamo de la Forstalle ballivus domini regis cepit de fine de borga Selinges pro bracerino iijjs et totum injuste et sine judicio. Item dicunt quod gallivi domini archiepiscopi vendunt wardas gavelkundorum contra consuetudinem regis et hoc diu fecerunt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Curiol coronator domini regis noluit venire ad officium suum facere ad sepeliendum mortuos occisos in dicto hundredo per defectum ipsius coronatoris dictum hundredum dedit one fee of the aforesaid John by service of 10s. at the castle and it is worth £10 each year. Then Thomas de Marais has one fee at Otterpool of the king by service of 10s to be paid each year at the said castle and it is worth £10 each year. Then the prior of the hospital and his parceners hold one fee of the king at Bonnington and they pay 10s. at Dover castle and it is worth 100s. each year. Then they say that Godfrey Faukener holds the manor of Hurst of the lord king in chief through service of serjeanty, by keeping two falcons and it is worth £8 each year and they do not know from what time. Then they say that the lord archbishop holds a half hundred at Street through his liberty which he holds of the lord king and it is worth 5s. each year. Then they say that Bonnington has withdrawn itself for 20 years and more from common suit of Street hundred, where it used to be twice a year it is not once a year, by what warrant they do not know, with loss of 2s. a year to the lord king. Then they say that the lord archbishop has return (of writs) throughout the whole. Then they say that John of Hadlow holds 2 fairs each year at St Martin’s tide [11 November] and he takes more toll than he ought to do, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the lord king’s bailiffs and the bailiffs of the liberty damage the country because they take amercements for breach of assizes and they do not administer justice in any way for the bakers and brewers and this causes great harm to the country and they say that Giles, the lord king’s bailiff, for 2 years took 4s. from John de la Chirke for a brew-house. Then they say that Alexander the clerk of Bonnington for the same and at the same man (took) 2s. for beans and 2s. from Joan widow of Harold. Then they say that Alexander the clerk of Bonnington for the same and at the same man (took) 2s. for beans and 2s. from Joan widow of Harold. Then they say that Lawrence, the lord king’s bailiff, took from the aforesaid Joan, Alexander and John Harold 2s. each year over a period of 4 years and that Hamo de la Forstalle, the lord king’s bailiff took 4s. as a fine from Selling [Sellindge?] tithing for a brewhouse and all was unjust and done without justice. Then they say that the lord archbishop’s bailiffs sell wardships of gavelkind contrary to the king’s custom and they have done this for a long time. Then they say that William de Curiol, the lord king’s coroner, was unwilling to come to perform the duties of his office, to bury dead people slain in the said hundred. Because of the coroner’s default the said
ballivo domini regis sic Egidio clerico ijs ad sepeliendum Robertum filium Willelmi de Forestock. Item dederunt Magistro Lawrencius dimidam marcam ad sepeliendum Matheum de Venghelde et Petronillam uxorem eius qui occisi fuerunt noctanter in domo sua. Item dederunt dicto Laurencio Vs ad sepeliendum Johannem filium Alexandri de Shortun pro infortunio in aqua.

Item dicunt quod Nicholaus de Hadle perquisivit forum apud Strete et fuit per medium semitam curie sue et dictum iter parum amovit a curia sua per quod gentes de marisco debent ire et redire et equitare in quo loco Johannes filius predicti Nicholai fecit unum scalarium ad dampnum et impedimentum patrie.

Item dicunt quod turmum est vocatum furreveturn injuste levatum per Johannem de Wattun tempore quo fuit vicecomes Kancie ad magnam damnum patrie.

Item dicunt quod Daniel Spitewinch cepit de Philippo Bribisun xijd ut ipsum amoveret de assisis et de Johanne Gul vjd pro eodem. Item dicunt quod Laurencius baillivus domini regis cepit de predicto Johanne pro eodem vjd. Item dictus Laurencius cepit de Amisio de Herring et Oseberto fratre suo 1 ijs. Item ditto Laurencius cepit ab eisdem pro eodem xviijd. Item idem Laurencius cepit de Rogerio de Herring pro eodem ijs. Item dicunt quod Nicholas de Pundhurst serviens domini regis attachiavit quondam hominem et uxorem suam pro suspicione cuiusdam panni de blueto de viulnis qui quomdam pannum est ad domum Philippi carpentarii in eodem hundredo et dictus Willelms dictos attachiamentos duxit ad domum Amisii de Herring borewesalde et illi tradidit ut ipsos servaret per 1 noctem et in crastino venit dictus Willelms et dictos attachiatos secum duxit et promisit illos abire set quo modo et postea venit idem Willelms et imposuit dicto Amisio quod dictos attachiatos permisit abire et ideo ipsum Amisium injuste distrinxit et distrinxionem detinuit quousque finivit Hamoni de Forstalle ballivo domini regis hundred gave the lord king’s bailiff, that is Giles the clerk, 2s. for the burial of Robert son of William de Forestock. Then they gave Master Lawrence half a mark for the burial of Matthew de Venghelde and his wife Petronilla who were killed at night in their own house. Then they gave the said Lawrence 5s. for the burial of John the son of Alexander de Shortun after his death by drowning in water.

Then they say that Nicholas of Hadlow acquired the market at Street and it went through the middle way of his court and little by little he removed the said right of way along which the people of the marsh have to come and go and ride horseback from his court and John, the aforesaid Nicholas’s son has made one stile in this place, causing loss and inconvenience to the country. Then they say that the tourn which is called the furreveturn was unjustly levied by John de Wattun at the time when he was sheriff causing great loss to the country.

Then they say that Daniel Spitewinch took 12d. from Philip Bribisun so that he would withdraw him from the assizes and 6d. from John Gul for the same reason. Then they say that Lawrence, the lord king’s bailiff, took 6d. from the aforesaid John for the same reason. Then the said Lawrence took 1 load of oats price 4s. from Amisius de Herring and Osbert his brother for the same reason. Then the same Lawrence took 18d. from the same men for the same reason. Then the same Lawrence took 2s. from Roger de Herring for the same reason. Then they say that Nicholas de Pundhurst, the lord king’s serjeant, took half a load of wheat, price 40d. from Amisius de Herring and that the same Nicholas unjustly summoned Stephen de Stalar to come to Dover castle and because he did not come he took 2s. from him.

Then they say that William son of Hamo de Forstalle, a serjeant of the lord king, arrested a certain man and his wife on suspicion of the (theft) of a certain blue cloth of 7 ells [7 x 44in.], which certain cloth is at Philip the carpenter’s house in the same hundred and the said William took the arrested man and wife to the house of Amisius de Herring, the headborough and handed them over to him so that he might detain them for 1 night and the next day the said William came and took the said arrested man and wife with him and promised to let them go but in some way and afterwards the same William came and accused the said Amisius of allowing the arrested man and wife to depart and thereupon he unjustly made distraint upon
Amisius himself and kept the distrained goods until he paid a fine of half a mark to Hamo de Forstall, the lord king’s bailiff, and he paid this. Then they say that the said Hamo de Forstall took 4s. from Roger de Herring for the same reason, 2s. from Richard Peitcurt for the same reason and 16d. from John Hemund for the same reason.

Then they say that Henry Malemeyns and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the lord king’s tax of one-twentieth, took 6 marks by weight more that the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Nicholas of Hadlow, sheriff of Kent took 100s. from William Peitivin for re-possessing of an encroachment.

Then they say that William of Hever took 20s. from James of Wilmington so that he should not be a knight and that John of Hadlow was distrained for the same reason and they do not know how much he had paid.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the lord king’s escheator in the districts of Kent, took £27 from one manor which is called Aldington and Stephen of Longbridge, the said escheator’s bailiff, collects the said money and another 100s. Then the same Richard and the aforesaid Stephen unjustly took 35 marks from all the tenants and in addition have taken 100s. as a common fine because they wished unjustly to make the tenants reeves. Then they say that Stephen of Longbridge imprisoned Paris of Street and did not permit him to be released until 100s. had been paid as ransom. Then the aforesaid Richard (and) Stephen despoiled the woods, cattle and fish-ponds of the same manor of items valued at £20. Then the said Stephen unjustly took half a mark from Richard Meryhal for making a presentment of his good character before the justice, Master R. de Leyburn. Then they say that the liberty of Street half hundred was amerced before the justice William de Englefield at half a mark and this was paid to Sir Roger de Northwood the lord archbishop’s steward by tally and afterwards the said Stephen made distraint upon the said tenants for 20s and this they paid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Villata de Bradestede</strong></th>
<th><strong>Brasted Township</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurati dicunt quod Comes Glovernie tenet placita de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set per quem aut quo warento nesciunt.</td>
<td>The jury say that the earl of Gloucester holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by whom nor by what warrant. Then they say that while the lord Roger of the Exchequer was steward of Tonbridge he increased the fine of the vill of Brasted at the lawday from 40d. twice in the year and this money is still received through the earl’s bailiffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod dominus Rogerus de Scaccio dum fuit senescallus de Tunebregg augmentavit finem ville de Bradested a la laghedai de xLd bis in anno et adhuc recipiuntur per ballivos Comitis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Villata de Leysnes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lesnes Township</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Leysnes esse solebat aliquando in manu regis et nunc illud tenet dominus Gilebertus Peche nomine Johanne uxor is sue racione dotis quod habuit per Ricardum Doveria quondam virum suum. Item dicunt quod dominus Gilebertus Peche habet in manerium de Leysnes wrecnum maris furcas et assisam panis et cervisie et alia que ad coronam pertinent set nesciunt quo warento. Item dicunt quod tenentes de Leysnes solebant habere omni tempore duos certos laghedais assignatos et dominus Gilebertus Peche dominus ibidem mutavit unum lagheday tenendum ad voluntatem suam et hsec facta sunt per ij annos elapsos ad dampnum predictorum tenencium de xLs et amplius. Item dicunt quod districciones factas in burgo de Leysnes numquam solebant ballivi ducere nec fugare extra burgum set dominus Gilbertus Peche et ballivi sui eas abducunt contra justiciam et hoc per V annos elapsos et contra antiquam consuetudinem ad dampnum dictorum tenencium per annum unius marce et amplius. Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt Xs de villata de Leysnes ultra certum vicesimam.</td>
<td>The jury say the Lesnes manor used to be in the king’s hand at one time and Sir Gilbert Peche now holds that in the name of Joan his wife by her dower which she had from Richard Dover, her former husband. Then they say that Sir Gilbert Peche has wreck and the assize of bread and ale and other things which pertain to the crown in Lesnes manor, but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the tenants of Lesnes used to have at all times two certain laghdays appointed and Sir Gilbert Peche, the lord there has changed to one laghday to be held when he wished, upon which day the defaulting tenants are amerced at the lord’s will without assessment of their peers and this has been the practice for two years with loss of 40s. and more to the aforesaid tenants. Then they say that the bailiffs never used to take or drive away chattels upon which distraint has been made in the vill of Lesnes, but Sir Gilbert Peche and his bailiffs take these away against justice and this has been their procedure for 5 years, causing loss to the said tenants of one mark and more each year. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken from Lesnes township 10s. more than the assessed amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item dicunt quod tenentes de Leysnes solebant habere omni tempore duos certos laghedais appointatos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hundredum de Blakeheth</strong></th>
<th><strong>Blackheath Hundred</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurati dicunt quod Avichia de Rofa dicta de Aula tenuit Modingeham et Wolewyche xv annis elapsis de dominico domini regis que solebant annuatim reddere domino regi X libras quo warento tenet nesciunt.</td>
<td>The jury say that Avicia de Rochester called ‘of the Hall’ has held Mottingham and Woolwich for 15 years of the lord king’s demesne which were accustomed to pay the lord king £10 each year in rent, they do not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item dicunt quod hundredum de Blakeheth reddit per annum domino regi ijs et vjd.
Item dicunt quod villa de Elteham debet sectam ad hundredo de Blakeheth bis in anno et subtracta est secta illa xxx annis elapsis per dominum Ricardum Comitem Glovnerie et per dominium Gilebertum filium suum postmodum set quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod Charles qui tenet quoddam tenementum apud Chintebrok in villa de Le retinuit per unum annum elapsum iiijd et obolum annui redditiuus domino regi pertinenti et adhuc detinet.
Item dicunt quod prior de Leveseham habet assisam panis et cervisie in villa de Grenewich et villa de Leveseham set quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod prior de Beremundes’ habet assisam panis et cervisie et furcas et forum in villa de Cherleton a tempore domini regis Henrici pater domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod Avicia de Aula de Rofa habet assisam panis et cervisie et furcas in villatis de Wolewiche et Modingeham a tempore predicti domini regis Henrici quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et extractum brevium set a quo tempore aut quo warento ignorant.
Dicunt eciam quod episcopus de Rofa habet returnum brevium a predicto archiepiscopo pro xij marcis annuam sibi solvendis.
Item dicunt quod prior de Levesham habet liberas chacias et warennam in villa de Levesham et villa de Grenewich a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus Gilbertus comes Glovnerie habet simili modo eadem in villa de Elteham a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus Willelmus de Say habet simili modo eadem in Westgrenewich set nesciunt quo warento.
Item dicunt quod dominus Nicholaus de Leukenor clausit quamdam viam qua itur de Modingeham versus Elteham que fuit via communis et clausit eandem xvij annis elapsis et heredes domini Ernaldi de Maundevill tenent eam clausam et est purpresturam.

They also say that the prior of Bermondsey has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and the market in the vill of Charlton from the time of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father and they do not know by what warrant.
They say also that Avicia of the Hall de Rochester has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows in the townships of Woolwich and Mottingham from the aforesaid lord King Henry’s time, by what warrant they do not know.
They say also that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs but they are ignorant from what time or by what warrant.
They say also that the bishop of Rochester has return of writs from the aforesaid archbishop for 12 marks to be paid to him each year.
Then they say that the prior of Lewisham has free chace and warren in the vill of Lewisham and the vill of Greenwich, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.
They also say that Sir William de Say has the same things in West Greenwich in the same way, but they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that the Lord Nicholas de Leukenor stopped up a certain way which led from Mottingham towards Eltham which was a common way and has closed the same for 16 years and Sir Ernald de Mandeville’s heirs keep it closed and it is an encroachment.
Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains vicecomes Kancie tempore domini regis Henrici predicti cepit 1 marcam de Roberto Koc felone de Elteham ut tempore suo permitteret eum per vj pleggios usque adventum judicariorum.

Item dicunt quod Adam le Walais de Shorham serviens Philippi de Delham ballivi de Sutton cepit de hominibus de Grenewich injuste pro falsa summonitione xxs tempore Rogeri de Seton justicarii Itinerantis anno regni regis Henrici Lv. Dicunt eciam quod idem Adam cepit de hominibus de Modingeham pro falsa summonitione Scaccarii ijs. Dicunt eciam quod Elias de Lenham ballivus hundredi de la Blakeheth cepit de eisdem pro simili anno regni regis Edwardi primo ijs.

Dicunt eciam quod Hugo de Kokerhurst ballivus eiusdem hundredi cepit de Thoma filio Galfridi de Modingeham pro simili ijs. Dicunt eciam quod Thomas Sorang coronator fecit inquisitionem de quodam mortuo apud Leveseham et cepit de hominibus eiusdem ville pro officio faciendo ijs et Johannes Levold clericus suus xijd.

Item dicunt quod prior de Levesham cepit Elias Swetman et Eliam filium suum et illos tenet in prisona sua quouque fuerint deliberati per ballivos domini regis et nesciunt quo modo.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt Xs ultra certum vicesimam de hoc hundredo.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford exciator habuit in manu sua archiepiscopatum Cant' per iij annos et maximam fecit interim destruccionem in dicto archiepiscopatu in boscis parcis vivariis warennis et homagiis set quantum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Philippus de Delham ballivus de Sutton cepit injuste 1 marcam de hominibus de Modingeham pro falso attachiamento tempore dicti regis Henrici.

**Hundredum de Westerham**

Jurati dicunt quod dominus Robertus de Caunvile tenet de domino rege 1 feodum et dimidium in Westerham et dedit domino Johanni de Camvile

Then they say that when Sir Henry Malemains was sheriff of Kent during the aforesaid lord King Henry’s time, he took 1 mark from a felon Robert Cook of Eltham so that at this time he would allow him to go in peace and before he was declared an outlaw and Sir William of Hever, sheriff of Kent, took 20s. from the same felon so that he would deliver him by 6 men acting as sureties until the justices arrived.

Then Adam le Walais of Shoreham, a serjeant of Philip of Delham the bailiff of Sutton, unjustly took 20s. from the men of Greenwich for a false summons, in the 55th year of King Henry’s reign [October 1270-1271] at the time of Roger de Seton eyre justice. They also say that the same Adam took 2s. from the men of Mottingham for a false summons of the Exchequer. They also say that Elias of Lenham, the bailiff of Blackheath hundred, took 3s. from the same men for a similar reason in the first year of King Edward’s reign.

They also say that Hugh de Kokerhurst, bailiff of the same hundred, took 2s. from Thomas son of Geoffrey of Mottingham. They also say that Thomas Sorang the coroner held an inquest upon a certain dead person at Lewisham and he took 2s. from the men of the same vill for performing the duties of his office and John Levold his clerk took 12d.

Then they say that the prior of Lewisham took Elias de Swetman and Elias his son and held them in his prison until they were released by the lord king’s bailiffs and they do not know in what way.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, held the archbishopric of Canterbury in his hand for two years and meanwhile caused the greatest destruction in the said archbishopric, in the woods, parks, fishponds, warrens and homages, but they do not know what the amount was.

Then they say that Philip of Delham, the bailiff of Sutton, unjustly took 1 mark from the men of Mottingham for a false arrest made during King Henry’s time.

**Westerham Hundred**

The jury say that Sir Robert de Caunvile holds 1½ fees of the lord king in Westerham and he, Robert, gave the half fee to Sir John de Caunvile for the term of his life.
and the same John sold that to the Lord Gilbert who is now the earl of Gloucester and the said Robert holds a whole fee in Westerham.

Then they say that Sutton lathe used to be demised at farm by the sheriff of Kent for £12 and afterwards it was demised though Sir Reginald de Cobham for £18.

They also say that Westerham hundred owes 20s. each year to the lord king for the sheriff’s tourn, of this money the payment of a third part of the aforesaid 20s. from the Upland of Brasted has been withdrawn for 17 years by the earl of Gloucester and his bailiffs and the township of Westerham pays the full amount.

Then they say that Lyndhurst [Ebdonbridge par.] and Werclindenn have withdrawn themselves in the same manner and for the same length of time by John de Stanegrove, who was then the earl of Gloucester’s steward and through the present earl and his bailiffs with serious loss to the country.

Then they say that Westerham hundred is in Sir Robert de Camvile’s hand and has been from ancient times and he holds the assize of bread and ale from ancient times.

Then they say that a certain William le Scut took three perches out of the royal highway in Westerham tithing causing harm to the country.

Then they say that John le Prude, the Lord Robert de Caunvil’s steward, took John and Stephen Atterlake and imprisoned them at Westerham for no reason and he allowed them to be released without warrant or justice.

**Someren Hundred**

The jury say that Middleton and Marden manors are of the lord king’s demesne and the said John de Burgh holds these and they do not know by what warrant. They say also that Ospringe manor is of the lord king’s demesne and the lady queen, the present king’s mother, now holds it and they do not know by what warrant.

They say that Dartford vill is of the the lord king’s demesne and it was given to the earl of Aumale and it again reverts. Then they say that two thirds of Somerden hundred are of the lord archbishop’s liberty; however, one tithing belongs to the lord king by the payment of 3s. 6d. rent each year and it is called Grinstead.

Then the king has 26s. 8d. from the bishop of...
de Rofa de tenentibus suis de Trottisclive xxvjs et viijd. Item idem archiepiscopus Cant’ habet de episcopo de Rofa per annum viij libras set quo racione ignorant.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Wackelstan tempore dominis regis Johannis fuit et antiquo fuit in manibus regum et tradebatur antecessoribus Comitis Glovereii et eodem modo hundredum de Littlefeld et nesciunt quo warento nec per quem Comes Glovereii ea modo tenet et inde respondit domino regi per annum de xLs et plus valent set nesciunt in quantum.

Dicunt eciam quod tenentes eorumdem hundredorum solebant respondere coram justiciariis Itinerantibus et ad ultimas assisas omnes substraxerunt preter duos homines de hundredo de libertate domini archiepiscopi ad grave dampnum domini regis sed nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod totum tenementum de Rufkinghol et omnes iidem tenentes solebant esse intendentes domino regi cum borgo de Gransted et nunc se subtraxerunt per xxij annos per ballivos Comitis Glovereii ad dampnum domini regis per annum de vjd et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod tenentes de Exore et de Wigginden solebant facere sectam ad hundredum de Sumerdenn cum borga de Gransted que pertinet ad dominum regem et solebant scottiare et lottiare cum eadem borga et subtraxerunt se per archiepiscopum Cant’ per xL annos ad dampnum regis per annum de vjd et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Ruttinden et frater eius subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi de Sumerdenn cum borga de Gransted set nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod tenementum de Appelton et de Chekesland et tenentes de Cherecot et tenentes de Everherst et Stonlak fuerunt antiquitus in borga de Gransted et intendentes domino regi et subtrahuntur per archiepiscopos Cant’ per L annos ad grave dampnum domini regis.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum brevium et omnes libertates ad coronam pertinentes et nesciunt quo warento.

Dicunt eciam quod dominus Stephanus de Penecestr’ Rochester and from his tenants in Trottiscliffe, through the archbishop’s hand. Then the same archbishop of Canterbury has £8 each year from the bishop of Rochester but for what reason they do not know.

Then they say that Wachlingstone hundred was in the lord King John’s time and from ancient times used to be in the hands of the kings and it was handed over to the ancestors of the earl of Gloucester and similarly Littlefield hundred and they do not know by what warrant nor by whom the earl of Gloucester now holds these and he pays the king 40s. each year for these and they are worth more, but the jury do not know how much.

They also say that the tenants of the same hundred used to come before the itinerant justices and at the last assizes all were withdrawn apart from two men of the hundred who were of the lord archbishop’s liberty, causing serious loss to the lord king, but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the whole tenement of Rufkinghol and all the same tenants used to be subject to the lord king with Grinstead tithing and now they have withdrawn themselves for 22 years by the earl of Gloucester’s bailiffs with loss of 6d. each year to the lord king and the jury do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the tenants of Exore and Wiggenden used to perform suit at Somerden hundred with Grinstead tithing which belongs to the lord king and they used to be assessed for scot and lot with the same tithing and they have withdrawn themselves for 40 years through the archbishop of Canterbury, with loss to the lord king of 6d. each year and the jury do not know by what warrant.

They also say that John de Ruttinden and his brother have withdrawn themselves from suit at Somerden hundred with Grinstead tithing but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that the tenament of Appelton and of Chekesland and the tenants of Cherecot and the tenants of Everhurst and Stonlak were in Grinstead tithing in ancient times and subject to the lord king and 50 years ago they were withdrawn through the archbishops of Canterbury with severe loss to the lord king.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs and all liberties pertaining to the crown but they do not know by what warrant.

They also say that Sir Stephen de Penecestr’, a justice
appointed by the lord king, erected a gallows in Bugehoh and there in the 53rd year of King Henry’s reign [October 1268-1269] he hanged three robbers upon the archbishop of Canterbury’s tenement and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Roger de Horn, the earl of Gloucester’s steward, made an encroachment upon the lord king’s demesne in the 54th year of King Henry’s reign [October 1269-1270] so expanding the lowy of Tonbridge by 400 acres with loss of 2s. each year to the king and they do not know by what warrant. Then the same Roger made an encroachment upon the archbishop’s tenement so that he enclosed 100 acres within Tonbridge forest, causing serious loss to the country and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that John de Shepregg took 3d. from Ailnot de Medherst for withdrawing him from a certain assize and 4d. from the same man for exchanging one distraint in the lord king’s park and 3d. from William of the mill for withdrawing him from a certain assize.

Then they say that [Sutton at Hone] lathe used to be demised at farm at £12 and now it is demised at £18 and they say that Albred son of William de Marca took from William P[ ]ebien of Somerden hundred and he collected the sheaves and brewed ale causing serious loss to the country and William Malote acted in the same way under Richard Long.

Then they say that the archbishop’s bailiffs hold three lawdays in a year contrary to common justice causing severe loss to the country and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Reginald Crips took 3s. from Thomas Rod accusing him of taking part in the assault upon Tonbridge castle and William de Garston took half a mark from Richard the Wolfhunter for a similar reason.

Then they say that Henry Malemains, the sheriff, imprisoned Martin de Polle, Simon de Gransted, John de Sciprigg, John son of Helewisus, Ralph Chatel, Roger de Leshert and Roger Godman because of one assize at which they were not and could not be released on bail before they had given him 40s. Then Sir William of Hever, the sheriff, took 2 oxen, price 20s. from John de Ruttindenn. Henry of Leeds took 3 animals, price 15s. from the same man and Sir William of Hever the sheriff had laths made from his wood valued at 3s., while the same John was imprisoned. John le Pod took 1 mark from the same John while he was in prison that he might alleviate his
Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Peyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 20s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took £40 and more from the territory of Otford while the see of Canterbury was vacant and he destroyed woods and fishponds estimated at £10.

Then they say that Otford manor was in the lord king’s hand for two and a half years, in the custody of the escheator, Master Richard of Clifford.

Hundredum de Lilteleye

The jury say that Middleton manor is of the lord king’s demesne and Sir John de Burgh holds that and they do not know by what warrant and Ospringe manor is of the lord king’s demesne and the lady queen, mother of the present king, now holds that.

Then they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s holds Plumstead manor of the lord king in chief in his other barony and they do not know by what warrant.

And James de Camera holds one fee of the aforesaid abbot which the same abbot claims against the king and Lesnes manor is held of the lord king and it fell into his hand by wardship, after the death of Lady Joan de Aubrevil and Philip the tailor now holds the said manor and they do not know by what warrant and it is worth £10 each year, but the same Philip holds the said manor at farm of Gregory of Ruxley for £12 each year and the manor of Erde is held of the lord archbishop in chief, which manor the same archbishop claims against the lord king and the said Philip the tailor has the same manor at farm of Sir John of St John for the term of 12 years for £20 each year.

Then they say that a half of Lesnes hundred is held of the lord king and 4s. is paid each year at the sheriff’s tourn from Lesnes and 12d. at the feast of Michaelmas for free rent and 4s. is paid from Limsted at the sheriff’s tourn where 1 mark used to be paid to the same sheriff and thus 9s. 4d. has been taken away by the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury for 19 years, from the time of Gilbert of Preston, the itinerant [eyre] justice and they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and extract of writs, the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has other liberties of the king...
And they say that the abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury has the gallows, the assize of bread and ale and wreck, but they do not know by what warrant, nor from what time. They also say that a gallows was erected at Swanscombe 4 years ago and more by William de Montecanis but they do not know by what right nor by what warrant and three robbers were hanged there, of these 1 man who was not yet dead, was cut down and carried to the church and he was revived and he remained in the same vill of Swanscombe and afterwards took himself from the district and they do not know what has become of him. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has warren in his liberty and the abbot of St Augustine’s claims to have warren at Plumstead and they do not know in what way nor by what warrant. Then they say that the said abbot of St Augustine’s Canterbury holds the manor of Plumstead with appurtenances of the lord king’s demesne, but they do not know from what time nor by what warrant, but they say that the same abbot recovered a moiety of the said manor 30 years ago and more from Richard de Ros by a plea before the justices because he refused the services owing from it. Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 5s. more by weight than the assessed amount from this hundred.

**Hundredum de Godeshethe**

The jury say that Kemsing manor was of the lord king’s demesne at some time and afterwards it was given to Baldwin de Bitton but from what time or through whom they are ignorant and now the Lord William de Valence holds that. Then they say that the lord has 2 marks each year through the hand of the archbishop of Canterbury’s serjeant at Otford which are paid to the lord king’s bailiff of Sutton lathe. They also say that the earl of Gloucester holds Wachlingstone hundred by paying 40s. each year to the lord king but they so not know by what warrant. Then they say that Ruxley, Axtane, Blackheath, Lesnes, Westerham hundreds and the half hundred of Bromley and Grim[n?]stead tithing are in the lord king’s hand but the jury do not know their annual value. And the lord archbishop of Canterbury holds

---

**Codsheath Hundred**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Kemsing fuit aliquando de dominico domini regis et postmodum datum fuit Baudewino de Bitton set de tempore aut per quem ignorant et nunc illum tenent dominus Willelmus de Valenciis. Item dicunt quod dominus rex habet per manum servientis archiepiscopi Cant’ apud Odoford ij marcas per annum que liberate sunt ballivo domini regis de lasto de Sutton.

Dicunt eciam quod Comes Glovernie tenet hundredum de Wehttelston pro xLs per annum solvendis domino rege quo warento nesciunt, Item dicunt quod hundreda de Rokeslye Acstan Blakehetth Littlehe Westerham dimidium hundredum de Bromligh et borgha de Gransted sunt in manu domini regis set quantum valent per annum nesciunt, Et dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ tenet hundredum de
Item dicunt quod dominus Thomas de Audeham clamat habere warrenam per cartam domini regis Henrici pateris domini regis nunc. Et Isabella de Eynesford tenet warennam in manerium de Otelham ubi nullam habere consueverat. Item dicunt quod manerium de Kemsing tenetur de domino rege in capite et tenentes in Holinden Holbeame et omnes manentes super terram quam Georgius de Cantilupo tenuit de predicto manerio de Kemsing subtracti sunt de servicio debito et consueto manerio de Kemsing per Willelum de Camera senescallum Comitis Glovernie apud Tunebrigg' et ipsos sequi faciunt leucatam de Tunebrigg' ad dampnum villate de Kemsing per annum et domini Willelmi de Valenciis Xs et amplius. Item dicunt quod Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit de hoc hundredo ultra certam vicesimam Xs. Item dicunt quod quidam Robertus Malewer Simon Coysire Johannes Jon et Willelmus Thurstan Codsheath hundred and the half hundred of Somerden but they do not know their annual value. They say that when Henry Lovel was the bailiff at Otford, in the time of Archbishop St Edmund [Edmund of Abingdon 1231-1240] he held one lawday more than other archbishops used to hold, with loss of 35s. and more each year to the country. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the return of writs, the gallows and the assize of bread and ale, (and) pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and they say that the bishop of Rochester has return of writs from the archbishop for £8 paid to him each year. Then they say that Sir Thomas de Audeham claims to have warren by a charter of the lord King Henry, the present king’s father. And Isabel of Eynsford holds warren in Otham manor where there used to be none. Then they say that Kemsing manor is held of the lord king in chief and the tenants in Holinden and Holbeame and all those dwelling on land which George de Cantelupe held of the aforesaid manor of Kemsing have been withdrawn from the service due and customary to Kemsing manor by William de Camera, the earl of Gloucester’s steward at Tonbridge, and the tenants now do suit at the lowy of Tonbridge with loss to Kemsing township and Sir William of Valence of 10s. and more each year. Then they say that Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, while he held the archbishopric of Canterbury for the lord king, unjustly took £40 from the men of Otford as tallage and afterwards took into the lord king’s hand all the new lands which were previously demised by the archbishops until he levied a common fine for £20 and he caused trees valued at 20 marks to be felled in the woods of the same manor. The same man made the tenants of the same manor perform carrying service to his house in London whereas he had no authority to compel this unless to Lambeth and he caused the wood of Bersted’s heirs at Hobord and Thelenelond, valued at 20 marks, to be felled. In addition he used the horses and oxen of the men of the country for transporting timber and his corn to London against their will and to their great loss. Then they say that certain men, Robert Malewer, Simon Coysire, John Jon and William Thurstan were
inprisonati fuerunt apud Merdestan et fecerunt finem cum domino Ada de Illigh ad opus domini archiepiscopi ut possent repleggiari iij marcarum. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford exciator maximam fecit destruccionem in parcis vivaris bascis (et) warenniss dum fuit custos archiepiscopatus. Item Magister Ricardus seysivit manerium de Halsted post mortem Willelmi de Malevile et tenuit per iij annos et adhuc tenet heredes et valet per annum X libras.

**Hundredum de Bromley**

Jurati dicunt quod manerium de Betham aliquando fuit in manu domini regis et modo tenet dominus Ricardus de Rupella de domino rege in capite per servicium unius militis set nesciunt quo warento. Dicunt eciam quod dimidium hundredum de Bromley est in manu domini regis et valet per annum Xs et altera medietas eiusdem hundredi est in manu episcopi de Rofa set nesciunt quid valet per annum.

Item dicunt quod quedam terra que vocatur Foxgrave in villa de Betham est de feodo domini regis et modo illam tenet Johannes Malemains de domino Roberto Agillon per servicium quarte partis unius militis set a quo tempore aut qualiter alienta fuit nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dimidium hundredum de Bromley subtrahir per episcopum Roffens’ qui tenet predictum dimidium hundredum per X annos et valet per annum Xs ad dampnum regis per annum xxs. Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ habet assisam panis et cervisie et alias libertates ut sepius ante dictum est set quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod archiepiscopus Cant’ episcopus de Rofa et dominus Ricardus de Rupella habent chacias et warennas in dominicis suis de antiquo set nesciunt quo warento.

Item dicunt quod Adam de Walais tunc ballivus cepit de Radulfo de Langel pro eodem de una assisa removenda xviijd. Item Walkelino de Ponte pro simili vjd de Henrico de Ponte pro simili iijiijd et de pluribus hominibus hundredi de Bromley cepit idem Adam pro simili denarios bladum (et) maeremium ultra modum. Item idem Adam fecit falso summonere homines eiusdem hundredi apud Geldesford et postmodum

imprisoned at Maidstone and they paid a fine of 2 marks to Sir Adam of Illigh for the lord archbishop’s use so that they might be released on bail. Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, caused the greatest destruction in the parks, fishponds, woods [and] warrens while the archbishopric was in his custody. Then Master Richard seized Halsted manor after William de Malevile’s death and held it for 2 years and he still holds the heirs and it is worth £10 a year.

**Bromley Hundred**

The jury say that Beckenham manor was at one time in the lord king’s hand and now Sir Richard de Rupella holds it of the lord king in chief by the service of one knight and they do not know by what warrant. They also say that half the hundred of Bromley is in the lord king’s hand and it is worth 6s. each year and the other moiety of the same hundred is in the bishop of Rochester’s hand but they do not know what it is worth each year.

Then they say that a certain land called Foxgrove [Bekenham par.] in the vill of Beckenham is of the lord king’s fee and now John Malemains holds that of Sir Robert Agillon by the service of a fourth part of one knight’s fee, but from what time or how it was alienated they do not know.

Then they say that half the hundred of Bromley was withdrawn by the bishop of Rochester who holds the half hundred for 10 years and it is worth 10s. each year, with loss of 20s. each year to the king. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the assize of bread and ale and other liberties, as has often been said before but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rochester and Sir Richard de Rupella have chace and warrens in their demesnes from ancient times but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Adam de Walais, then the bailiff, took 18d. from Ralph de Langel for removing the same man from one assize. Then [he took] 6d. from Walkelin de Ponte for a similar reason, 4d. from Henry de Ponte for a similar reason and for a similar reason the same Adam took money, corn and timber beyond measure from many men of Bromley hundred. Then the same Adam falsely summoned the men of this hundred at Guildford and afterwards took much
cepit ab eis pecuniam mangnum pro summonitione eadem relaxanda.

Item dicunt quod Hamo de la Forstall dedit quemdam summam pecunie domino Henrico Malemains vicecomiti ultra antiquam firmam huius lati qua occasione multum gravabat populum et patriam injuste et sic Alexander de Cateford et Ricardus de Halifeld baliivi post dictum Hamonem eodem modo fecerunt et dicunt quod dictus Ricardus cepit de Henrico de Ponte inponendo sibi falsa et injuste latrocinium Xs et de Walkelino de Ponte cepit pro simili Xs et de Ada Fidel pro simili cepit ijs et de Ricardo de la Denne cepit pro simili iij.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford exciator saysivit manerium Betham per dominum regem dicendo quod dominus Ricardus de Rupella mortuus fuit et postmodum cepit 1 dolium vini precii 1 marce de Henrico le Walais qui habuit idem manerium ad firmam antequam terminum firme sue potuit tenere et habere.

Item dicunt quod idem Magister Ricardus exciator maximam fecit destruccionem in archiepiscopatu Cant’ tempore vaccacionis set nesciunt in quanto.

m.13 Villata de Dertford

Jurati dicunt quod villa de Derteford est in manu domini regis per escaetam per mortem Aveline filie et heredis Willelmi de Fortibus Comitis Albermarle que sine heredibus obit per annum cum membris ad endem spectantibus sic Cobeham Gransted Chiselherst et Cumbe Lxvij libras.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis et tenentes sui in Kancia subtraxerunt se de sectis comitatus lati et hundredi de Akestan set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod episcopus Rofa habet in quadam parte ville de Derteford returnum et extractas breviium et tenet placita de namio vetito set a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus de Derteford et episcopus de Rofa habent in eadem villa et habere solebant furcas assisam panis et cervisie sed a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis habet furcas apud Swaneschamp et habuit xvj annis money from them for remitting the same summons.

Then they say that Hamo de la Forstall gave a certain sum of money more than the ancient farm of this lathe, to Sir Henry Malemains, the sheriff, and because of this he greatly oppressed the people and country unjustly and Alexander de Cateford and Richard de Halifield, who were bailiffs after the said Hamo, acted in the same way and they say that the said Richard took 10s. from Henry de Ponte falsely accusing him of robbery, for a similar reason he took 10s. from Walkelin de Ponte, 2s. from Adam Fidel and 3s. from Richard de la Denne.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, took possession of Beckenham manor for the lord king by declaring that Richard de Rupella was dead and afterwards he took 1 tun of wine, price 1 mark, from Henry le Walais who held the same manor at farm, before he was able to hold and have the term of his farm.

Then they say that the same Master Richard, the escheator, caused the greatest destruction in the archbishopric of Canterbury at the time of its vacancy, but they do not know how much.

Then they say that Sir William de Monte Canis and his tenants in Kent have withdrawn themselves from common suits of the county, the lathe and Axtane hundred, but from what time or by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the bishop of Rochester has return and extract of writs in a certain part of Dartford vill and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods, but from what time or by what warrant they do not know.

Then they say that the lord of Dartford and the bishop of Rochester have the gallows in the same vill and were accustomed to have this, the assize of bread and ale, but they do not know from what time nor by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir William de Monte Canis has a gallows at Swanscombe and has had this for 16 years,
elapsis super quibus quidam Simon filius Hugonis fuit suspensus et vivus prostratus per quondam Robertum tunc ibidem warrenarium. Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Munchenes et episcopus de Rofa habent et habere clamat ab antiquo in Stanes et Swanescamp warrenas ex concessione regis a quo tempore aut quo warento nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod abbas et conventus de Lesnes habent quamdam partem tenementi quod vocatur Okkicholt cum pertinenciis quod pertinere solebat ad villam de Derteford per annum xxs et est ad dampnum domini regis quod dictum tenementum per annum V marcarum set quo warento aut a quo tempore illud tenementum nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmus de Hever vicecomes Kancie amerciavit Robertum Munc’ ad ijs et Walterum Cadweker ad ijs et Adam Bellum ad xijd quare non venerunt ad quamdam inquisicionem coram eo et pro defectu personarum non remansit inquisicione capienda et predictos denarios levare ficit. Item dicunt quod Petrus de Berkyng aliquis ballivus domini Rogeri de Leyburn apud Derteford cepit de Willelmo filio Thome de Wylminton injuste 1 markam. Dicunt eciam quod Johannes de Canburegh aliquis ballivus domini Rogeri de Leyburn apud Derteford cepit de Ricardo de Insula injuste 1 vaccam precii Xs et eam cum aeriis dicti Galfridi fugare fecit ad domum suam apud Ledes et eam ibidem detinuit. Item idem Johannes cepit injuste de Waltero et Roberto de Fuleswyth xviij et iijd. Item cepit de borgha de Stoneham ijs quare recepit quemdam Willelmmum Nicole qui imprisonatus fuit pro suspicione et postmodum aquiratus per patriam upon which a certain Simon son of Hugh was hanged and he was cut down while alive by a certain Robert who was then the warrener there. Then they say that Sir William de Munchenes and the bishop of Rochester have and claim to have from ancient times warren in Stone and Swanscombe by royal grant, they do not know from what time nor by what warrant. Then they say that the abbot and convent of Lesnes have a certain part of a tenement which is called Okkicholt with appurtenances which used to pertain to Dartford vill by a sale of a certain Count of St Pol. However, the said canons of Lesnes pay 20s. rent to the lord of Dartford and the said tenement causes a loss to the lord king of 5 marks each year but they do not know by what warrant nor from what time that tenement (? was sold). Then they say that Philip of Delham, the bailiff of Sutton at Hone lathe, and Godfrey de Ros, the serjeant of the same, took 2 marks or 1 from various men of Dartford vill by small items to appoint one person in place of another in the assize at the last eyre of Master Roger de Seton the justice in the county of Kent. Then they say that Sir William of Hever, the sheriff of Kent, amerced Robert Munc at 2s. and Walter Cadweker at 2s. and Adam Bellum at 12d. because they did not come to a certain inquisition to be held before him and because of the lack of people he did not stay to take the inquisition and made a levy of the aforesaid sums of money. Then they say that Peter of Barking, bailiff of Roger de Leyburn, unjustly took 1 mark from William son of Thomas of Wilmington at Dartford. They also say that John de Canburegh, bailiff of the same man there, unjustly took from Geoffrey Marsh 1 horse, price 1 mark and 2 cows, price 16s. and he caused him other very great losses and he harassed him in the possession of a quarter part of a certain mill and that he was not able to sow his own land for 2 years causing a loss to him of 40s. Then the same John the bailiff, unjustly took 1 cow, price 10s., from Richard de Lisle and caused it to be driven with the said Geoffrey’s draught animals to his own house at Leeds and he has kept it there. Then the same John unjustly took 18s. 4d. from Walter and Robert de Fuleswyth. Then he took 2s. from Stoneham tithing because it received a certain William Nicole who had been imprisoned upon suspicion and afterwards he was acquitted by a jury as
Item dicunt quod Adam de Hamestel ballivus lesti de Sutton et dictus Johanes de Wanburegh tunc ballivus de Dertefold falso et maliciose procuraverunt quod Ricardus de Castello de Dertefold inprisonatus fuit apud Cant’ et ibidem detentus quousque aquietatus fuit per patriam et ibidem venit quidam Radulphus de Eseling serviens Comitis Kancie et cepit quemdam equum dicti Ricardi precii 1 marce et adhuc detinet.

Then they say that Adam de Hamestel, bailiff of Sutton at Hone lathe, and the said John de Wanburegh, then bailiff of Dartford, falsely and maliciously arranged that Richard de Castello of Dartford should be imprisoned at Canterbury and detained there until he was acquitted by a jury and a certain Ralph de Eseling, a serjeant of the earl of Kent, came and took a certain horse, price 1 mark, belonging to the said Richard and still keeps it.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor multa dampna fecit in archiepiscopatu Cant’ set quaanta nesciunt.

Then they say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, did much damage in the archbishopric of Canterbury, but they do not know how much.

Hundredum de Axtane

Jurati dicunt quod dominus rex tenet manerium de Dertefold per escaeta et habet in manu sua maneria de Middeltun et de Merdenn.

The jury say that the lord king holds Dartford manor through an escheat and he has the manors of Middleton and Marden in his own hand.

Item dicunt quod dominus rex Henricus pater domini regis nunc tenuit manerium de Eltham et modo tenet dominus Willelmus de Leyburn set quo warento nesciunt.

Then they say that the lord King Henry, the present lord king’s father, held Eltham manor and now Sir William of Leyburn holds it but they do not know by what warrant.

Item dicunt quod idem dominus rex tenet manerium de Ofspring et modo illud tenet domina regina mater domini regis nunc et nesciunt quo warento.

Then they say that the lord King Richard held Ospringe manor and now the lady queen, the present king’s mother, holds that and they do not know by what warrant.

Item dicunt quod dominus rex Ricardus tenuit manerium de Sutton de la Hone et modo illud tenent hospitalarii set nesciunt quo warento.

Then they say that the lord King Richard held Sutton at Hone manor and now the Knights Hospitallers hold that but they do not know by what warrant.

Item Willelmus de Monte Canis tenet maneria de Hertligh et Swanscamp de domino rege in capite et reddit per annum ad castrum de Rofa xvij libras.

Then William de Monte Canis holds Hartley and Swanscombe manors of the lord king in chief and he pays £18 each year in rent at Rochester castle.

Item dicunt quod domina Mabilia Tropel tenet manerium de Esse de heredibus Rogeri de Mumbrai et illi heredes illud tenent de domino rege in capite set nesciunt per quod servicium.

Then they say that the Lady Mabel Tropel holds the manor of Ash of Roger de Mumbrai’s heirs and those heirs hold that of the king in chief but the jury do not know through what service.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus de Valoyngnes tenet de domino rege in capite medietatem manerii de Maplescaump per tale servicium quod si dominus rex venerit usque Maplescaump ad missam sua audientam tunc idem Willelmus inveniret et 1 denarium ad oblacionem.

Then they say that William de Valoyngnes holds a moiety of Maplescombe [W. Kingsdown par.] manor of the lord king in chief by such service that if the lord king shall come to Maplescombe to hear his Mass, then the same William shall provide 1 penny for him as an offering.

Item dicunt quod episcopus de Rofa solebat tenere de domino rege Henrico in capite vij feoda militum et dimidium feodum et modo ea tenet de domino archiepiscopo Cant’ set quo warento nesciunt.

Then they say that the bishop of Rochester used to hold 7½ knights’ fees of the lord King Henry in chief and now he holds these of the lord archbishop of Canterbury, but they do not know by what warrant.
Then they say that Axtane hundred is in the lord king’s hand and it is of Sutton at Hone lathe and the sheriff of Kent at some time used to demise the same lathe at farm for £12 and afterwards for £14 and now Richard de Harifield holds the same lathe for £16.

Then they say that the vills of Hawley [Darenth par.] and Swanscombe which are of Sir William de Monte Caniso used to perform suit twice a year at the lathe of Sutton at Hone and every three weeks at Axtane hundred and the suit is withdrawn for 17 years and more but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the tenants of the prioress of Haliwell of the vill of Ash used to do suit at the aforesaid lathe and hundred in the aforesaid way and they have been withdrawn for 6 years but they do not know through whom nor by what warrant. Then the tenants of the Knights Hospitallers in the same vill used to perform suit there in the above said manner and they have been withdrawn for 50 years and they do not know through whom nor by what warrant.

Then the bishop of Rochester’s tenants in the vills of Stone, Southfleet, Fawkham Green and Longfield used to do suit in the same way and they have been withdrawn for 40 years.

Then the townships of William de Monte Canis of Hawley and Swanscombe used to pay 13s. at the sheriff’s tourn and to pay a rent to the lord king of 8s. each year and they are withdrawn from these payments for 17 years that they have paid nothing, but the jury do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the gallows, wreck and other royal liberties, but they do not know by what warrant.

And the bishop of Rochester receives the return of writs from the archbishop, now for 8 years and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and he has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury has the assize of bread and ale in Sutton vill, but they do not know by what warrant and Sir William de Montecanis has a gallows and the assize of bread and ale and has had this for 17 years, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that the said William has had an old gallows in Swanscombe for 9 years and when Adam Taskemarle a robber had been condemned the men of Hawley hanged him on a certain oak tree in the same
eadem villa eo quod predicte furce fuerunt decease. Item cum iij latrones suspenis in furcis ipsius Willelmus in Swanescaump anno regni regis Henrici Lvj et cum prostrate fuerunt et clericus hospitalis ipsos duxerat ad ecclesiam de Swanescomp unus ex eis vivus fuit inventus et remanit in eadem villa per dimidium annum et amplius.

Item dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Ferningham habet liberam warrenam in Ferningham ex concessione domini regis Henrici nunc proximi et dominus Radulfus Bernard habet similiter in Kyngesdun et dominus Willelmus de Leiburn in Redligh et dominus Willelmus de Faukenham habet similiter in Faukenham et dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis in Hertligh ex concessione predicti regis Henrici et omnes predicti appropriant sibi liberas warrenas tam de terris liberorum tenencium quam de terris suis dominicis set nesciunt quo warranto.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus Malemains et Fulco Poyforer collectores vicesime ceperunt xLs de hoc hundredo ultra rectam vicesimam.

Item dicunt quod Master Ralph de Farningham opturavit muro duas vias communes in villa de Farningham exopposito ecclesie ad nocuntum patrie sed nesciunt quo warranto.

Item dicunt quod Willelmus Elwold et Godefridus de Ros servientes domini regis ceperunt de pluribus hominibus de Esse pluries in ultimo Itinere justicariorum pro recognicione removendi xviijs et de hominibus villate de Redligh pro simili iijs.

Item dicunt quod Richardus de Halifield ballivus predicti lesti cepit injuste de Beatrice de Norththesse xvs, item de Philippo le Hog eodem modo ijs vjd, item de Rosa filia Willelmi fabri eodem modo Xs de Roberto de Bosco eodem modo iijs. Item Willelmus Hog et Johannes Saubon clerici domini Henrici Malemains vicecomitis et balleti sui ceperunt de Henrico le Crower injuste ijs. Item Philosophus de Delham ballivius postmodum cepit de Isabella Chien de Esse injuste ut possit ire Cant’ dissoluta viijs. Item idem cepit de eadem ut possit quitera discedere de Cant’ quod non imprisonaretur 1 marcum et attachiavit ipsam idem Philosophus sine culpa. Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus excitor maximam fecit destruccionem in archiepiscopatum tempore vacacionis sed quantum nesciunt. Item dicunt quod idem excitor seysivit archiepiscopatum Cant’ et vill because the aforesaid gallows was decayed. Then when the 3 robbers had been hanged upon the same William’s gallows in Swanscombe, in the 56th year of King Henry’s reign [October 1271-1272] and when they were cut down and the clerk of the hospital took them to Swanscombe church one of them was found to be alive and he stayed in the same vill for half a year and more.

Then they say that Master Ralph de Farningham has free warren in Farningham from a grant of the last lord King Henry and Sir Ralph Bernard has this similarly in Kingsdown and the Lord William of Leybourne in Ridley and Sir William of Fawkham has this similarly in Fawkham Green and Sir William de Monte Canis in Hartley by grant of the aforesaid King Henry and all the aforesaid men have appropriated free warrens for themselves both from the free tenants’ lands and in their own demesne lands, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Sir Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 40s more that the assessed amount from this hundred.

Then they say that Master Ralph of Farningham obstructed two common ways in Farningham vill with a wall, built opposite the church, causing nuisance to the country, but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that William Elwold and Godfrey de Ros, the lord king’s serjeants, on many occasions took 18s. from many men of Ash at the last eyre of the justices for recognition of their removal (from the assize) and 3s. from the men of Ridley for a similar reason.

Then they say that Richard de Halifield, the bailiff of the aforesaid lathe, took 15s. unjustly from Beatrice de Northesse, then 2s. 6d. from Philip le Hog in a similar way, then 10s. from Rose William the smith’s daughter in a similar way, 3s. from Robert of the wood in a similar way. Then William Hog and John Saubon, the clerks of the Sir Malemains, the sheriff, and his bailiffs took 2s. unjustly from Henry Crower. Then Philip of Delham, the bailiff afterwards, took 8s. unjustly from Isabel Chien de Esse so that she could go unbound from Canterbury. Then the same man took 1 mark from her so that she could depart discharged from Canterbury because she had not been imprisoned and the same Philip arrested her for no reason. Then they say that Master Richard, the escheator, caused very great destruction in the archbishopric while it was vacant, but they do not
tenuit illum in manu domini regis per ij annos et
dimidium.

Item Warinus de Chaucombe et Gregorius de
Rokeslye seysivit custodiam de baronia de Eyneford et
de alis manerii domini Nicholai de Crioll defuncti
et tenuerunt in manu domini regis et adhuc tenent
videlicet maneria de Walemer, Sw[alecliffe], Ostringhanger’
Bromhull Stokebur’ Littleho et medietatem
manerii de Wrotham et Eyneford et dicunt quod
medietatem manerii de Eyneford est in hundredo de
Acstan et valet per annum per extentam xxv libras set
valorem aliorum manerii nesciunt.

Item dicunt quod Johannes de Marisco tenet manerium
de Scantlind de domino rege in capite et valet per
annum X libras.

Item dicunt quod due partes huius hundredi sunt in
manu domini rege et tercia pars in libertate
archiepiscopi et sunt in illo hundredo de redditibus
assisis xLiijs Xd et obolum et de turno vicecomitis
xxs.

Item dicunt quod dominus Henricus de Appeltruefeld
et dominus Johannes de Rokesly et dominus
Nicholaus Pessun subtraxerunt se de secta hundredi et
nesciunt quo warento sic dominus Henricus et
dominus Johannes per xv annos et dominus Nichlaus
Pessun per V annos.

Item dicunt quod Simon de Chelesfeld habet assisam
panis et cervisie et warenam set nesciunt quo
warento.

Item dicunt quod domina Sibilla uxor Roberti de
Marais habet warenam apud Atmere set nesciunt quo
know who much. Then they say that the same
escheator took possession of the archbishopric of
Canterbury and held that in the lord king’s hands for
two and a half years.

Then Warin de Chaucombe and Gregory of Ruxley
took the custody of the barony of Eynsford and of the
other manors of Sir Nicholas de Criol, deceased, and
held them in the lord king’s hands and still hold them,
that is the manors of Walmer, Sw[alecliffe],
Ostringhanger’ [Westenhanger?], Bromhull
[Broomhill?], Stokebury, Lesnes and a moiety of
Wrotham and Eynsford manors and they say that the
moiety of Eynsford manor is in Axtane hundred and is
worth £25 each year by survey but they do not know
the value of the other manors.

m.13 dorso **Hundredum de Rokeslye**

Jurati dicunt quod Willelmus de Say tenet manerium
de Codeham de domino rege in capite et valet per
annum xxx libras et post mortem eiusdem venit
dominus Robertus de Scocho et cepit de tenentibus de
Codeham xxs. et Maria uxor Willelmi de Say dotata
fuit de eodem manerio et maritata domino Roberto de
Ufford et nesciunt quo warento.

The jury say that William de Say holds Cudham
manor of the lord king in chief and it is worth £30
each year and after the same man’s death Sir Robert
de Scocho came and took 20s. from the tenants of
Cudham and Mary, William de Say’s wife, held the
same manor as her dower and she was married to Sir
Robert of Ufford and they do not know by what
warrant.

Then they say that John Marsh holds *Scantlind* manor
of the lord king in chief and it is worth £10 each year.

Then they say that two-thirds of this hundred are in
the lord king’s hand and the third part of the archbishop’s
liberty and in that hundred there are assize rents of
43s. 10½d. and 20s. from the sheriff’s tourn.

Then they say that Sir Henry de Appeltruefeld and Sir
John of Ruxley and Sir Nicholas Pessun have
withdrawn themselves from suit of the hundred and
they do not know by what warrant, thus Sir Henry and
Sir John for 15 years and Sir Nicholas Pessun for 5
years.

Then they say that the archbishop of Canterbury and
the prior of Christchurch Canterbury have the return of
writs, pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and the
gallows and the assize of bread and ale and other royal
perquisites but they do not know by what warrant.

Then they say that Simon of Chelsfield has the assize
of bread and ale and warren but they do not know by
what warrant.

Then they say that the Lady Sibyl, wife of Robert de
Marais, has warren at *Atmer* but they do not know by
Item dicunt quod Richardus Longus bailivus domini regis pro summonitio Scaccarii levavit de Ricardo Hordmer 40d et eum non aquietavit. Item Adam de la Hamstall post levavit tres eosdem 4s et eum non aquietavit. Item Richardus de Halifeld post levavit tercio eosdem 4s a dominus regis per annum si haberet custodiam heredum de iiijs.

Item dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor dum habuit custodiam archiepiscopatus Cant’ cepit de tenentibus de Bixlie 66s 8d et viijd et nunquam ante fuerunt sic gravati. Item idem destruxit parcum de Bixle ad valenciam vij librarum et Xs. Item idem Magister Ricardus cepit de Willelmo de Pam quod aliquatulum renuit esse prepositus xxs.

Item dicunt quod hundredum de Wechselstan et hundredum de Littlefeld fuerunt aliquando in manu domini regis et quidam Willelmi Smalwyriterie ballivus dictorum hundredorum dimisit illa cuidam Comiti Glovernie et sic actenus remanserunt et sunt in manibus Comitis Glovernie et primo dimissa fuerunt Comiti tempore regis Johannis ut credunt et tenet ea Comes Glovernie pro vxs per annum soluendi dominu rege set nesciunt quo warranto ea tenet.

Item dicunt quod dominus Willelmos de Hever vicecomes Kancie aliquando cepit de Johanne de Rutindenn ij boves precii xxs sed qua racione nesciunt. Item idem fecit facere lathas et carbonam de maeremio dicti Johannis dum habuit eum in prisiona.

Item dicunt quod Henricus de Ledes ballivus dicti vicecomitis cepit de dicto Johanne iij animalia precii xvs sine restitucione et nesciunt causam.

Item idem Johannes de Rutindenn dedit Willelmo Pod
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I marcam ut penam eius aleviaret dum fuit in pristona et nichil sibi valuit.</td>
<td>William Pod so that he would alleviate his suffering while he was in prison and he did nothing for him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Quot et que dominica maneria etc. Jurati dicunt quod Avicia de Aula Roffens’ tenet Modingeham et Wolewich V annis elapsis de dominico domini regis que solebant reddere annuatem domino regi X libras quo warento ignorant. | How many and which manors are demesne manors? The jury say that Avicia of the Hall of Rochester holds Mottingham and Woolwich of the lord king’s demesne since 5 years have passed and they are accustomed to pay £10 each year to the lord king, they do not know by what warrant.

Also which manors were accustomed to be so? They know nothing of this.

Concerning the king’s fees and demesne and the tenants, etc.? They know nothing about these things.

Concerning the lands also held of the ancient demesne of the crown etc.? They know nothing about these.

In the same way to make inquiry about the farmers of the hundred: the jury say that Blackheath hundred gives 2s. 6d. in rent to the lord king each year.

Also how many hundreds or wapentakes are there? They know nothing about this.

Concerning ancient suits, customary payments, services etc. The jury say that Eltham vill owes suit to Blackheath hundred at the lawday twice a year which belongs to the king and they have withdrawn this for 30 years and still withdraw it by a certain Lord Richard the deceased earl of Gloucester and the Lord Gilbert the present earl of Gloucester, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Charles who holds a certain tenement at Kidbrook in the vill of Lee withheld for one year and still withholds an annual rent of 4½d. and this rent is owed to the lord king.

What other people claim to have return, etc., from the king? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham has the assize of bread and ale in Greenwich and Lewisham vills until now, from what time and by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the prior of Bermondsey has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and market in the vill of Charlton from the lord King Henry’s time, the father of lord King Edward the present king, and he still has this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Avicia of the Hall of Rochester has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and market in the vill of Woolwich and of Mottingham from the aforesaid time until now and still holds this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and exact of writs and from what time and by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the lord bishop of Rochester has his return from the aforesaid lord archbishop, from the time of

| De eciam maneria esse solebant etc. nichil sciunt. | De sectis antiquis consuetudinibus serviciis etc. jurati dicunt quod villa de Eletham sectam deberet ad hundredum de lageday de la Blakehethe bis in anno que pertinet domino regi et hoc subtraxerunt xxx annis elapsis et ad hac subtrahunt per quemdam annum Ricardum Comitem Giovenerni defunctum et per dominum Gilbertum Comitem Giovenerni qui nunc est quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod Charles qui tenet quoddam tenementum apud Chinebrok in villa de Le retinuet et ad hac retinet iijijd et obolum annualis redditus per unum annum elapsum quem redditus debet dicto regi.

Qui eciam alii a rege clamant habere returnum etc. jurati dicunt quod prior de Leveseham habet assisam panis et servicie in villa de Grenewich et in villa de Leveseham usque nunc a tempore et quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod prior de Beremondeseye habet assisam panis et servicie et furcas et forum in villa de Cherleton a tempore domini regis Henrici patris domini regis Edwardi qui nunc est et ad huc habet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod Avicia de Aula Roffens habet assisam panis et servicie et furcas in villa de Wolewich et in villa de Modingeham a predicto tempore usque nunc et ad huc habet quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus archiepiscopus Cant’ habet returnum et exactum brevium et de tempore et quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod dominus episcopus Renecestri habet returnum suum de predicto domino archiepiscop pro xij marcis annuatum solvendis a tempore Bonefacii archiepiscopi.

How many and which manors are demesne manors? The jury say that Avicia of the Hall of Rochester holds Mottingham and Woolwich of the lord king’s demesne since 5 years have passed and they are accustomed to pay £10 each year to the lord king, they do not know by what warrant.

Also which manors were accustomed to be so? They know nothing of this.

Concerning the king’s fees and demesne and the tenants, etc.? They know nothing about these things.

Concerning the lands also held of the ancient demesne of the crown etc.? They know nothing about these.

In the same way to make inquiry about the farmers of the hundred: the jury say that Blackheath hundred gives 2s. 6d. in rent to the lord king each year.

Also how many hundreds or wapentakes are there? They know nothing about this.

Concerning ancient suits, customary payments, services etc. The jury say that Eltham vill owes suit to Blackheath hundred at the lawday twice a year which belongs to the king and they have withdrawn this for 30 years and still withdraw it by a certain Lord Richard the deceased earl of Gloucester and the Lord Gilbert the present earl of Gloucester, they do not know by what warrant. Then they say that Charles who holds a certain tenement at Kidbrook in the vill of Lee withheld for one year and still withholds an annual rent of 4½d. and this rent is owed to the lord king.

What other people claim to have return, etc., from the king? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham has the assize of bread and ale in Greenwich and Lewisham vills until now, from what time and by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the prior of Bermondsey has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and market in the vill of Charlton from the lord King Henry’s time, the father of lord King Edward the present king, and he still has this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Avicia of the Hall of Rochester has the assize of bread and ale and the gallows and market in the vill of Woolwich and of Mottingham from the aforesaid time until now and still holds this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that the lord archbishop of Canterbury has the return and exact of writs and from what time and by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the lord bishop of Rochester has his return from the aforesaid lord archbishop, from the time of

| De feodis et dominicis regis et tenentibus etc. nichil sciunt. | De terris eciam tenentis de antiquo dominico corone etc. nichil sciunt.

Similiter inquirere de firmariis hundredi; jurati dicunt quod hundredum de la Blakehethe dat domino regi ijs vjd de redditu per annum.

Quot eciam hundreda wapentaca etc. nichili sciunt.

De sectis antiquis consuetudinibus serviciis etc. jurati dicunt quod villa de Eletham sectam deberet ad hundredum de lageday de la Blakehethe bis in anno que pertinet domino regi et hoc subtraxerunt xxx annis elapsis et ad hac subtrahunt per quemdam dominum Ricardum Comitem Giovenerni defunctum et per dominum Gilbertum Comitem Giovenerni qui nunc est quo warento ignorant. Item dicunt quod Charles qui tenet quoddam tenementum apud Chinebrok in villa de Le retinuet et ad hac retinet iijijd et obolum annualis redditus per unum annum elapsum quem redditus debet dicto regi.
Concerning those men who have liberties, etc. They know nothing of this. Concerning liberties granted, etc. They know nothing of this.  
Which men in addition have appropriated things for themselves recently? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham has free chaces and warrens in Lewisham vill and Greenwich and still holds this until now, from what time and by what warrant they are ignorant. Then they say that the Lord Gilbert, the present earl of Gloucester, has free chaces and warrens in Eltham vill from the time of lord King Henry, the Lord Edward the present king’s father, and he still holds this, by what warrant they do not know. Then they say that Sir William de Say has free chaces and warrens in Greenwich and still has this from the aforesaid time until now but by what warrant they do not know. What lords or their stewards, etc.? They know nothing of this.  
Then concerning all encroachments whatsoever which have been made, etc. The jury say that 16 years ago Sir Nicholas de Lynekenore stopped up a certain road which goes from Mottingham towards Eltham which used to be a highway of the lord king and that Sir Arnold de Mandeville’s heirs still keep this road closed and it is an encroachment on the king’s demesne.  
Concerning the knights from each fee: they know nothing of this. Concerning sheriffs taking rewards, etc. The jury say that when the late Sir Henry Malemains was sheriff of Kent during the lord King Henry’s time, the father of the Lord Edward the present king, he permitted and took one mark from a certain felon called Robert Cook of Eltham who was an outlaw, so that in his time he allowed Robert to go free and afterwards when William of Hever was sheriff of Kent and Henry of Leeds the sub sheriff they arrested the aforesaid felon Robert Cook and handed him over to 6 men acting as pledges, thus delivering him to the eyre justices and for the aforesaid arrest the aforesaid Henry unjustly took 20s. from the aforesaid Robert. Similarly concerning the clerks and their other bailiffs: they say that Adam le Waley of Shoreham, Philip de Delham’s serjeant, unjustly took 20s. from the men of Greenwich for a false summons at the time of Master Roger de Seyton and his fellow eyre justices in the county of Kent in 1271-1272. Then they say that Elias of Lenham, who was bailiff of
Blackheath hundred in the first year of King Edward’s reign [1272-1273], unjustly took 3s. from the men of Mottingham for a false summons. Then they say that Hugh de Kokerhurst who was bailiff of Blackheath hundred after the said Elias unjustly took 2s. from Thomas son of Geoffrey of Mottingham for a false summons. Then they say that when Thomas Sorang was coroner and still is, he held a certain inquisition at Lewisham upon a certain dead person and for performing the duties of his office he took 2s. unjustly from the men of Lewisham. Then they say that the same Elias received 2s. 8d. unjustly from Ralph of Eltham for a false summons at the aforesaid term. Concerning sheriffs and bailiffs whosoever taking gifts, etc. They know nothing except as said above. Concerning sheriffs and any other bailiffs whosoever who have amerced those who have been summoned: they know nothing except as is said above. Concerning sheriffs who have delivered the people to bailiffs who oppress them with excessive demands, etc. They say they know nothing of this except as is said above. Then when the sheriffs ought not to hold their tourn, etc. They know nothing except as is said above. Then when there are fines for redisseisins or encroachments: they know nothing of this except as is above said. Then who by power of his office has maliciously charged others, etc.? They know nothing unless as is said above. Who have received the lord king’s mandates? They know nothing unless as is said above. Who have received the lord king’s debts, etc.? They know nothing unless as is said above. Item who have summoned other men that they should be made knights? They know nothing unless as above said. And whether any magnates or others have made distraint etc. They know nothing unless as above. Then if the sheriff or any bailiff, etc. They know nothing unless as above. Then concerning those men who had approvers imprisoned, etc. They know nothing unless as above. Then who has had felons imprisoned, etc.? The jury say that the prior of Lewisham took Elias Swetnam and Elias his son and held them in his prison until they were released by the lord king’s bailiffs and they do not know in what way. Then who has received gifts or other money, etc.? The jury say that Sir Henry de Malemayns and Sir Fulk
dominus Fulco Poyferer collectores vicesime ceperunt Xs ultra certum vicesimam de hoc hundredo. Item quis habuerunt felones inprisonatos etc: jurati dicunt quod prior R(adulfus) de Leueseham cepit Elyam Swettenam et Elyam filium suum et illos tenuit in prisoña sua odio quosque fuerunt deliberati per ballivos domini regis anno regni regis Edwardi ij set nesciunt quo modo.

Item quis vicecomites vel custodes castrorum etc: nichil sciunt. De escaetoribus et subescaetoribus etc. jurati dicunt ut post obitum domini archiepiscopi Bonefacii dominus Ricardus de Clifford fuit escaetor domini regis et cepit archiepiscopatum in manu sua per duos annos et dimidium elapas et in eodem tempore fecit vastum et destruccionem per totum archiepiscopatum sic in boscis vivaris et homagiis set de quantitate ignorant et Lxxvj libras in parco de Wixli ad opus Radulfi de Fingingham.

Item de eisdem si occasionaverunt huiusmodi etc. nichil sciunt nisi ut supra.

Item de eisdem qui ceperunt munera etc. jurati dicunt quod Philppus de Delham tunc tempore ballivus de Sotton cepit ij marcas injuste de Johanne de Mottingham pro quadam falsa attachiamenta tempore domini Henrici regis patris domini regis Edwardi qui nunc est. [Item de eisdem qui] sufficienter etc. nichil sciunt.

Item de eisdem qui prece vel precio etc. nichil sciunt.

tem de eisdem qui reservaverunt etc. nichil sciunt.

Item de eisdem qui procuraverunt etc. nichil sciunt

Item cuiusmodi terras seysierunt etc. nichil sciunt.

Item de terris captis in manu domini regis etc. nichil sciunt. Item si qui durante discordia etc. nichil sciunt.

m.14 Hundredum de Acstane

Johannes de Chambeham Hugo Fraunceys Radulfus de Esse Rogerus de Westcote Gilebertus de Alo Johannes Poyferer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth have taken 10s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred. Item who has had felons imprisoned, etc.? The jury say that Ralph the prior of Lewisham took Elias Swetnam and his son Elias and held them in his prison through his hatred until they were released by the lord king’s bailiffs in the second year of King Edward’s reign [November 1273-1274] but they do not know in what way. Then what sheriffs or keepers of castles, etc.? They know nothing of this. Concerning the escheators and sub-escheators, etc. The jury say that after the lord Archbishop Boniface’s death Sir Richard de Clifford was the lord king’s escheator and he took the archbishopric in his own hand for two and a half years and during the same time caused waste and destruction throughout the whole archbishopric, in the woods, fishponds and homages, but they are ignorant of the amount and £77 in the park of Wixle to the use of Ralph de Fingingham. Then concerning the same men if they have caused waste in this manner, etc.? They know nothing unless as above. Then concerning the same men who took gifts, etc. The jury say that Philip of Delham, when he was bailiff of Sutton, took 2 marks unjustly from John of Mottingham for a certain false arrest, when the lord Henry was king, the father of the lord Edward the present king. [Item concerning the same men who] sufficiently, etc. They know nothing. Then concerning the same men who for prayer payment, etc. They know nothing. Then concerning the same men who have kept back, etc. They know nothing Then concerning the same men who have made provision, etc. They know nothing. Then in what way they have taken possession of lands. They know nothing. Then concerning lands taken into the lord king’s hand, etc. They know nothing. Then if anyone during discord, etc. They know nothing.

m.14 Axtane Hundred [addendum]

John de Chambeham, Hugh Franceys, Ralph de Esse, Roger de Westcote, Gilbert de Alo, John de Deyhey,
de Deyhey Martinus de Hydelegh Johannes Leonays
Johannes de la Hak Rogerus de Muchwode Petrus
Gromblets Johannes de la Cote jurati.

[super alibi] Quot et que dominica maneria rex habet
in manu sua etc. dicunt quod dominus rex tenet
manerium de Derteford per escheatum a festo Sancti
Edwardi Confessoris anno regni regis Edwardi
secundo. Item tenet in dominco suo maneria de
Middleton et Merdem.

Que eciam maneria esse solent in manibus regum
predecessorum regis etc. dicunt quod dominus rex
Henricus tenuit manerium de Eltham et modo dominus
Willelmus de Leyburn illud tenet set quo warento
nesciunt. Item dicunt quod rex Ricardus tenuit
manerium de Sutton de la Hone et modo hospetalarii
illud tenent set quo warento nesciunt. Item quidam rex
in antiquo tenuit manerium de Kingsesdun et modo
dominus Radulfus Barnard tenet quo warento nesciunt.
Item Willelmus de Monte Canis tenet maneria de
Hertleghe et Swanescamp de domino rege in capite et
reedit per annum ad castrum Roffens’ xviiij libras. Item
dicunt quod domina Mabilia Torpel tenet manerium de
Esse de heredibus Rogeri de Moubray et iidem heredes
illud tenent de domino rege in capite set per quod
servicium nesciunt.

De feodis eciam dominicis regis et tenentibus ea que
tenent de ipso in capite etc. dicunt quod Willelmus de
Valognes tenet de rege in capite medietatem manerii
de Maplescamp per tale servicium quod si dominus
rex venerit usque Maplescaump ad missam suam
audiendam tunc idem Willelmus inveniret ei 1
denarium ad oblacionem.

Similiter de firmis hundredi etc. dicunt quod
hundredum de Acstone est in manu domini regis.
Quot eciam hundreda wapentaca etc. sciunt nichil nisi
quod suprascriptum est.

De sectis eciam antiquis consuetudinis et serviciis et
aliis etc. dicunt quod villata de Hertleghe et
Swanescamp que sunt domini Willelmi de Monte
Cansio solebant facere secta bis per annum lastum de
Sutton et ad hundredum de Acstan de iij septimanis in
ijj septimanas et subtrahitur secta per xvij annos et
amplius set quo warento nesciunt.

Qui eciam alií a rege clamant habere returnum etc.
dicunt super hoc articulo quod dominus Cant’
archiepiscopus habet returnum brevium furcas

Martin de Hydelgh, John Leonays, John de la Hak,
Roger de Muchwode, Peter Gromlets, John de la Cote,
the jury.

How many and what demesne manors the king has in
his hand etc.? They say that the lord king holds
Dartford manor by escheat from the feast of St
Edward the Confessor in the second year of King
Edward’s reign [5 January 1274]. Then he holds
Middleton and Marden manors in his demesne.

Also which manors used to be in the hands of kings,
the present king’s predecessors etc.? They say that the
lord King Henry held Eltham manor and now Sir
William de Leyburn holds that but by what warrant
they do not know. Then they say that King Henry
holds Ospringe manor and now the lady queen of
England, King Edward’s mother, holds that but by
what warrant they do not know. Then they say that
King Richard held Sutton at Hone manor and now the
Knights Hospitallers hold that but they do not know
by what warrant. Then a certain king in ancient times
held [West?] Kingsdown manor and now Sir Ralph
Bernard holds it, by what warrant they do not know.
Then Willelmus de Monte Canis holds Hartley and
Swanscombe manors of the lord king in chief and he
pays £18 rent each year at Rochester castle. Then they
say that the lady Mabel Torpel holds Ash manor of
Roger de Mowbray’s heirs and the same heirs hold it
of the lord king in chief, but through what service they
do not know.

Concerning the fees also of the king’s demesne and
the tenants who hold those of him in chief, etc. They
say that William de Valognes holds a moieties
of Maplescombe manor of the king in chief through such
service that if the lord king shall have come to
Maplescombe to hear Mass then the same William
should provide 1d. for him as an offering.

Concerning the farms of the hundred: they say that
Axtane hundred is in the lord king’s hand.
How many hundreds, wapentakes, etc.? They know
nothing unless what is written above.

Concerning the suits, also ancient customary
payments and services and other things, etc. They say
that Hartley and Swanscombe vills which are of Sir
William de Monte Cansio, used to perform suit twice
a year at Sutton lathe and every three weeks in Axtane
hundred and suit is withdrawn for 17 years and more,
but they do not know by what warrant.

What others also claim to have return etc from the
king? They say in answer to this article that the lord
archbishop of Canterbury has return of writs, wreck
wreccum maris et alias libertates regias set nesciunt quo warento et episcopus de Roffens’ receptit returnum brevium de archiepiscopo jam per viij annos et tenet placaia de namio vetito et habet furcas et assisam panis et cervisie set nesciunt quo warento.

De libertatibus concessis et eas aliter usi fuerunt quam facere debuissent etc. Dicunt quod Willelmus de Monte Canis habuit veteres furcas in Swanscamp de iam ix annis elapsis et quidam Adam Taskermale latro cum judicatus fuit homines de Hertligh suspendit ipsum super quadam quercu in eadem villa eo quod predicte furce fuerunt decaese. Item cum iij latrones suspensi fuerint et clericus hospitalis ipsos duxerat ad ecclesiam de Swanescaump unus ex eis vivus fuit inventus et remansit in eadem villa per dimidium annum et amplius.

Qui insuper de novo appropriaverunt sibi liberas chacias vel warrenas. Dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Farningham habet liberam warrenam in Farningham ex concessione domini regis Henrici nunc proximi et dominus Radulfus Bernard habet similiter in Kyngesdun et dominus Willelmus de Leiburn habet similiter in Faukenham et dominus Willelmus de Monte Canis in Hertligh ex concessione predicti regis Henrici et omnes predicti appropriant sibi liberas warrenas tam de terris liberorum tenentium suorum quam de terris suis dominicis set nesciunt quo warento Adam Godhere Roggerus de Cogeshal Ricardus le Warrener Stephanus Wo

Qui eciam domini aut eorum senescalli seu ballivi quicunque seu eciam domini regis ministri etc. Super hoc articulo dicunt quod Magister Henricus Malemains et Fulk Poyforer collectores vicesime cepit xLs de hoc hundredo ultra rectam vicesimam

De omnibus purpresturis quibuscunque factis super dominicum regium etc. Item dicunt quod Magister Radulfus de Ferningham opturat muro duas vias communes in villa de Ferningham exopposito ecclesie ad nocumentum patrie set nesciunt quo warento.

De foedis eciam militaris cuiuscunque feodi etc. Dicunt nichil

De vicecomitibus capiendis munera aut concensiandis ad feloniam concelandam etc. Dicunt nichil

and other royal liberties but they do not know by what warrant and the bishop of Rochester received the return of writs from the archbishop 8 years ago and he holds pleas of wrongful distraint upon goods and has the gallows and the assize of bread and ale but they do not know by what warrant.

Concerning liberties granted and those used otherwise than by right, etc. They say that William de Monte Canis had old gallows in Swanscombe since 9 years had passed and a certain Adam Taskermale, when he had been condemned as a robber was hanged by the men of Hartley upon a certain oak tree in the same vill, because the aforesaid gallows were decayed.

Then when 3 robbers had been hanged upon the same William’s gallows in Swanscombe in the 56th year of King Henry’s reign and when they were taken down and the clerk of the hospital took them to Swanscombe church, one of them was found to be alive and he stayed in the same vill for half a year and more.

Which men recently have appropriated free chaces or warrens for themselves? They say that Master Ralph of Farningham has free warren in Farningham by grant of King Henry, the previous king, and Sir Ralph Bernard similarly has this in Kingsdown, Sir William of Leybourne in Ridley, Sir William de Faukenham similarly has this in Faukenham [Fawkham?] and Sir William of Monte Canis in Hartley by grant of the aforesaid King Henry and all the aforesaid men appropriate free warrens for themselves both in their free tenants’ lands and in their own demesne lands, but they do not know by what warrant: Adam Godbere, Roger of Cogleshall, Richard the warrener, Stephen Hoo.

Also which lords or their stewards or bailiffs whosoever or also the lord king’s ministers, etc.? They say about this article that Master Henry Malemains and Fulk Poyforer, the collectors of the tax of one-twentieth took 40s. more than the assessed amount from this hundred.

Concerning all encroachments whatsoever made upon the royal demesne, etc. Then they say that Master Ralph of Farningham has obstructed two common ways in Farningham vill with a wall opposite the church, causing harm to the country, but they do not by what warrant.

Concerning knights’ fees also of whatsoever fee, etc. They say nothing.

Concerning sheriffs taking gifts or consenting to concealing felony, etc. They say nothing.
Similarly concerning the clerks and other bailiffs of the sheriffs, the coroners and their clerks and bailiffs whosoever etc. They say nothing. Concerning sheriffs and other bailiffs whosoever taking gifts for jury inquest, etc. They say upon this article that William Elwold and Godfrey de Roos, serjeants of the lord king’s bailiff, took 18s. unjustly from many men of Ash vill on many occasions for their removal from jury inquest at the eyre of the justices, thus of Roger de Seyton and his fellows. Also 3s. from the men of Ridley vill for the same reason. Concerning sheriffs and other bailiffs who have amerced those who have been summoned, etc. They say nothing.

Concerning sheriffs who have delivered the people to bailiffs oppressing them with demands, etc. They say nothing. Then when the sheriffs ought not to hold the tourn, etc. They say that this was only done twice. Then when are there fines for redisseisin or encroachments, etc. They say nothing. Then who through the authority of his office has maliciously charged another, etc? They say nothing. Then who have received the lord king’s mandate that they should pay his debts etc? They say nothing. Who have summoned some men that they may become knights, etc? They say nothing. Then whether any magnate or other person has distrained any men without the king’s order, etc? They say nothing. Concerning those who have approvers in prison, etc. They say nothing. Then concerning those imprisoned who have approvers or felons and make those appeal, etc. They say as above. Then who have received gifts or any reward for performing the duties of their offices, etc? They say about this article that Richard de Halyfield, bailiff of the aforesaid lathe, took 15s. unjustly from Beatrice de Northesse by the authority of his office as bailiff, then 2s. 6d. from Philip le Hog in the same way, then 10s. from Rose the daughter of William the smith in the same way, 3s. from Robert de Bosco in the same way. Then William Hog and John Saubon, the clerks of Sir Henry Malemains, the sheriff, and his bailiffs unjustly took 2s. from Henry le Crower. Then Philip de Delham, the bailiff, afterwards took 8s. from Isabel Chien of Ash so that she could go to Canterbury unfettered. Then the same man took 1 mark from the...
ipsam idem Philippus sine culpa.

Et hec omnia inquirantur tam de vicecomitibus coronatoribus et eorum clericis et ballivis: dicunt nichil quod predictum est.

Item qui vicecomites vel custodes castrorum vel maneriorum domini regis de operantibus domini regis etc. dicunt nichil. De eschaetoribus et subescheatoribus facientibus vastum vel destruccionem etc. Dicunt quod Magister Ricardus de Clifford excaitor maximam fecit destruccionem in archiepiscopatum Cant’ tempore vacacionis sed quantum nesciunt. Item dicunt quod idem excaitor seysivit archiepiscopatum et tenuit illum in manu domini regis per ij annos et dimidium. Item Warinus de Chaucumb et Gregorius de Rokeslye seysivit custodiam de baronia de Eyneford et de aliis maneriis Nicholai de Criholl defuncti et tenuerunt in manu domini regis et adhuc tenet vicelicet maneria de Walemer Swanscombe Ostringhangr’ Bromhull Stokeybur Littleho et medietatem maneriourum de Wrotham et Eyneford.

Item de terris captis in manu domini regis qui capi non debuerunt etc. ? Dicunt nichil.

Item durante discordia inter dominum regem et Comitissam Flaundres’ contra inhibitionem et defencionem regis defuncti vel qui nunc est qui duxerunt vel duci fecerunt lanas aliquas ad partes transmarinas? Dicunt nichil.

same woman so that she could depart acquitted from Canterbury because she had not been imprisoned and the same Philip arrested her for no reason. And inquiry is to be made about all these things both about the sheriffs, the coroners and their clerks and bailiffs. They say nothing because it has been said before. Then which sheriffs or keepers of the lord king’s castles or manors, concerning the lord king’s works, etc? They say nothing. Concerning the escheators and sub-escheators who cause waste and destruction, etc. They say that Master Richard de Clifford, the escheator, caused the greatest destruction in the archbishopric of Canterbury when it was vacant but they do not know the amount. Then they say that the same escheator took possession of the archbishopric and held that in the lord king’s hand for two and a half years. Then Warin de Chaucombe and Gregory of Ruxley took possession of the custody of Eynsford barony and the other manors of the late Nicholas de Criholl and held them in the lord king’s hand and still hold them, that is the manors of Walmer, Swanscombe, Ostringhanger [Westenhanger?], Broomhill, Sto[kebury], Littleham and a moiety of Wrotham and Eynsford manors. Concerning lands taken into the lord king’s hands which ought not to have been taken? They say nothing. Then while the hostility was in force between the lord king and the Countess of Flanders who exported or caused to be exported any wool overseas contrary to the restraint and prohibition of the late king or the present king? They say nothing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hundred or township of Canterbury</th>
<th>Hundred of Rolvenden</th>
<th>Hundred of Aloesbridge (continuation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Bleangate</td>
<td>Hundred of Blackborne</td>
<td>Hundred of Folkestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Westgate</td>
<td>Hundred of Barkley</td>
<td>Hundred of Loningborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Milton</td>
<td>Newenden township</td>
<td>Hundred of Stowting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Heane</td>
<td>Hundred of Heane</td>
<td>Hundred of Heane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Wingham</td>
<td>Hundred of Selbrittenden</td>
<td>Hundred of St Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Marden</td>
<td>Hundred of Petham</td>
<td>Half Hundred of Bircholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Ringslow</td>
<td>Hundred of Eastry</td>
<td>Hundred of Faversham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Hundred of Barnefield (in two lathes)</td>
<td>Hundred of Kinghamford</td>
<td>Hundred of Felborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Whitstable</td>
<td>Hundred of Oxney</td>
<td>Hundred of Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Cornilo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hundred of Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William of Bonnington, Roger de Bere, John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hundred of Bewsborough**

Peter de Clemenbergh, John de Bere, William de Langdenn, Hugh de Ber, Thomas de Colkeshelle, Silvano of Westcliffe, Walter the merchant, Geoffrey Graning, Stephen of Whitfield, William Adam, [ ] of the church, Clement de Stupehelde, [ ] de [ ].

(13 jurors).

**Hundred of Downhamford**


**Hundred of Preston**


Whyte, William Underhelde, Robert Oldhame, Walter of Sutton, Peter Burgeys, Richard atte Grene, William the turner.

**Hundred of Ham**

Peter de la Brok, William de Capella, Alan de Pundherste, John of Bromley, Thomas le Rus, Richard le Whyte, Stephen of Snavle, Robert de la Bowe, Roger le Krode, Benedict of Hoo, Amys de la Tune, John son of Alan.

**Hundred of Newchurch**


**Half Hundred of Longport**

Stephen de Hope, Thomas Manning, Andrew the clerk. Henry Colbe, Ethelwyne Makeheyt, William Attesonde.

**Hundred of Aloesbridge**

William the cook, James Andrew, Peter Lampsin, Clement Pavy, Robert de Capella, Henry Bodyn, Hugh Winham, Hugh Roberd [see continuation on p. 163] (*End of column 2 m.16*)

Symenel, Parys of Street, William the smith, Richard Myrinel, Matthew Porpe, Simon Attewyk, Simon de Rayrescotlye, John Segul, Roger atte Childe, John of Bonnington.

**Hundred of Longbridge**


**Hundred of Calchill**


**Half Hundred of Bircholt**

Samuel de Byrcholte, Robert Gregory, Richard Gredle, William Wykere, Stephen Tayllr, Richard Edmund. (*End of column 3 m. 16*)
### Hundred of Boughton

### Hundred of Chart
John de Gadimcusi, Robert de Eynsole, Walter of Chillindenn, Simon of Ham, [ ] de Rapetun, Thomas Wygan, [ ] de Fonte, Richard de Herst, [ ] Louland, Elys de Gratehere, [ ] of Northbrook, Bartholomew de Godinton.

### Hundred of Tenham
Adam de Wyneston, Robert le Sage, Walter of Lynsted, William de Monasterio, Philip de Bodereslond, William of Doddington, Richard de Cruce, Robert de Wyneston, William de Henclue, Adam de Okenfaud, Adam de Wendredestun, Simon of Doddington.

### Hundred of Worth

### Hundred of Cranbrook
Stacius de Corsorn, William de Idenn, Walter de Tolueherst, Richard de Rucherst, Richard de Gucerst, Walter de Hunggeserte, Ralph de

### Half Hundred of Barnfield
Adam the beadle, Geoffrey de Sharvolde, Walter de Spoule, Benedict of Bromley, Richard de Berwurg, William de Rodemundenn.

### Vill of Brasted

### Hundred of Shamwell
John atte Wode, John Hakintun, Robert Arnold, Roger le Shipman of Chalke, William the smith of Estrelond, John le Halnedevel, John Godard, James de Humyberegh, Eakaryas (? Hezekiah or Zacharias) atte Park, Nicholas de Leuce, Stonyng de Hezham, William Parleben.

### Hundred of Larkfield
Philip of Pevensy, Walter de Holewye, Robert Byset, Richard de Reveiling, Ralph de Rouweye, Ralph de Fonte, Lawrence of the mill, Roger atte Legle, Ralph de

### Hundred of Twyford

### Malling
Ralph Colman, John Walkelyn, Walter le Colyere, John de Seyhers, Simon de Seyhers, Robert the vintner, Roger Hoberd, William the baker, Thomas le Brot, William Edmund, William the smith, Joseph of Huntington

### Hundred of Toltentrough

### Hundred of Littlefield
(Probably Little & Lesnes)
Roger atte Hoke, Roger in le Hale, Roger the smith, Roger Magr’, Adam ad Boscum, William son of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hundred of Tenterden</th>
<th>Hundred of Lesnes</th>
<th>Hundred of Blackheath</th>
<th>City of Rochester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>Hundred of of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>Hundred of Lesnes</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of Tenterden</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>Hundred of</td>
<td>City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundred of外资</td>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scobleshell, Walter Hugh,  John de Backe,  Harvey Poce,  Walter le Ker,  William Keclel,  Edgar de Blakbrok,  William le Hanek,  Peter de Pocyn.

Hundred of Axtane
John de Chimbeham,  Hugh Fraunceys,  Ralph de Esse,  Roger of Wested,  Gilbert le Pel,  John de Deshey,  Martin de Hydelheye,  John Leonars,  John del Hacche,  Roger of Southwood,  Peter Erombert,  John de la Roce.

Hundred of Ruxley

End of column 1 m.16 dorso

Robert le Kyng,  William Gilbert,  Nicholas de Wynfeld,  John Cassell,  William atte Sethe,  Henry the baker,  John Seyward.

Hundred of Hoo

Vill of Dartford

Hundred of Littlefield

End of column 2 m.16 dorso.