

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

a thing as the inactivity of Christ, and therefore He, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, was active among His creation when as yet they were but children in understanding. Who shall say when revealed religion began? It has been there from all time, for how can the presence of God in the universe be ineffective? *Τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ Θεός.*

[It will have been noticed by those who are conversant with the subject that in dealing with the essential elements of sacrifice the writer has not taken into consideration the theory recently put forth by the late lamented Professor S. I. Curtiss. Professor Curtiss maintains that the essential element in sacrifice is the "bursting forth" of blood. He bases his theory on certain observations made during three journeys in Syria and the Sinaitic Peninsula. The writer hopes, in a subsequent article, to deal somewhat in detail with the two theories championed respectively by Professor W. Robertson Smith and Professor Curtiss. It must suffice at present to say that there is reason for regarding both theories as correct; they do not exclude one another; the facts support both, and it may well turn out that each theory witnesses to the truth, and that they are complementary. It should be mentioned that Professor Curtiss' theory does not affect the general argument of the above article; this will be clear when we deal with it more fully.]

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.



THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THEIR CONNECTIONS WITH SUSSEX.

PART IV.

BETWEEN the death of Archbishop Peckham and the consecration of his successor, ROBERT WINCHELSEY, an interregnum of some length intervened, in which South Malling was the scene of various encroachments on the rights of the see on the part of the Lord of Lewes. The temporalities of Canterbury being in the King's hands, proceedings were taken against these infringements of the rights and trespasses on the property of a manor so large and important to its possessor as South Malling, and the Crown therefore initiated a suit which the records call "longum placitum in jure archiepiscopatus." In this suit "touching the liberties of the Lord Archbishop as well in the riparian fishery of South Malling as in the chace there, and in a certain place called Stanmerfirth," it appears that the

men of the Earl of Warenne had seized the nets and taken the greyhounds of the King's servants—high-handed proceedings which had landed them in the Tower of London. Ultimately these culprits were liberated by order of the King.

In 1294 Robert Winchelsey—whose name suggests he was a native of Sussex—received consecration, previous to which he had already made acquaintance with some of the properties of the see in that county, having resided for a while at Mayfield, for which he appears to have conceived a decided liking, since most of his recorded visits in Sussex were made to that manor. Apparently, he extended this predilection to its people, for he executed a deed granting to the poor of that parish all the profits of the valuable rectory, except such portion as should be necessary to the repairs of the church and the manor-house. In 1296 he was again at this *peculiar*, proceeding in August to South Malling, where he received a letter from Rome asking permission for William de Langton, elect of Coventry, to be consecrated abroad, where he was then residing. The Archbishop replied that he must first consult his Chapter of Canterbury, which he would not be able to do immediately, “on account of the great distance and the difficulty of a road rough and mountainous”—“*propter distanciam longam et viæ asperæ ac montuosæ discrimen.*” It is difficult to avoid the opinion that the Archbishop was by no means anxious either for the consecration of the Bishop by a foreign pontiff or prelate or for the consultation with his Chapter on the subject, since the season was summer, and no conceivable route between Lewes and Canterbury under present geological conformations could be considered truthfully described as mountainous. Two years later the Archbishop was again resident at South Malling, and thence he addressed a letter to all suffragans directing them to hold services of thanksgiving for the King's victories over the Scots. In the autumn of the same year he went on to Slindon, whence he wrote to the Prior of Canterbury warning him to admit to the Benedictine Order only those who are not only pure in mind and life, but also having no blemish or noticeable deformity of body—“*nullam maculam vel deformitatem notabilem in corpore.*” In the following year the Archbishop was again at Mayfield, whence he wrote a letter on the subject of sending a present to the Pope, following it by another addressed to a certain Hamo de Gatele directing him to make the gift, an order which he did not, however, carry out. Tarring also was visited the same year, and while resident there the Primate wrote to the Chapter at Canterbury, forbidding them to appoint John de St. Clair as their counsel, as he was an enemy of the Church. In the latter days of his

primacy Winchelsey was much concerned with the affairs of his Sussex neighbour, the Earl of Warenne, whose open immorality and defiance of the Bishop of Chichester, whose palace he even invaded with armed followers, called for archiepiscopal admonitions. In 1300 he was again at South Malling; but that Mayfield was his favourite and most commodious residence is evidenced by the fact that he more than once entertained the King there—viz., in 1297, 1299, and 1305. Mayfield, being in the neighbourhood of Ashdown Forest, wherein abounded the tall red deer which his ancestor the Conqueror had “loved like a father,” doubtless contributed to bring Edward I. often into this district. At Maresfield, close by, was a royal hunting lodge, where many a monarch stayed at various times—viz., John, Edward I., Edward II., and Edward III., and doubtless other later Kings who have left no record of their presence. The Archbishop himself seems to have been inclined to sport, for about this time he assisted Prince Edward, then in exile in Sussex, to acquire the stud of hunters lately belonging to the Earl of Warenne. Having experienced the aid of the Primate in this matter doubtless moved the Prince to apply to him on a kindred subject, for not long afterwards he requested the loan of a stallion from the archiepiscopal stable. About this period Winchelsey, in spite of his entertainments of the King, and very possibly partly on account of his friendship with the Prince, fell into disgrace with Edward I., was accused of treasonable practices, dispossessed of his property, and forced to withdraw to the Continent, falling into such poverty that he was only saved from actual want by the charity of his monks of Canterbury. He remained abroad for some years, but on the accession of Edward II. he was recalled, and restored to his honours and temporalities. We have already described his settlement of the Hailsham difficulty, which had taken place some years previously.

We meet with this Archbishop's name occasionally in the public records in connection with a subject with which most of the Primates were only too unwillingly associated at various times, and that is the matter of poaching offences in some one or other, or in several at a time, of the numerous parks, warrens, and chaces, fish-ponds and riparian fisheries of the see. A case of illegal fishing is referred to in a Close Roll of the beginning of Edward II.'s reign, which orders the release of a certain William le Pestur of Uckfield—at that time a sub-infeudation of Buxted—who had been imprisoned for various sporting offences, *inter alia* for “a trespass committed in the fish-pond of the Lord Archbishop at Plottesbridge.” Such was the reputation of this prelate for piety that miracles were

said to have been effected at his tomb, a particular instance being that of William Andrew of Mayfield, reputed to have been thus cured of blindness.

Winchelsey was succeeded by WALTER REYNOLDS. Like many of the Archbishops, he visited Mayfield in the first year of his primacy, desirous of making acquaintance with perhaps the fairest manor and mansion of the see. Soon after his consecration he was called upon to meet the Bishops and Papal Inquisitors in the iniquitous prosecution—or rather persecution—of the Templars, an Order which held several properties in Sussex pertaining to their preceptories of Saddlescombe and Shipley. The Primate does not appear to have taken any prominent part against the accused, as did the Bishops of Chichester and London, but it fell to his part to promulgate the Bull of Clement V., dissolving this honourable and historic Order of military monks. Appointed Chancellor of the realm in 1310, he contributed to the expenses of the Scotch war 150 quarters of wheat, 15 quarters of beans, 200 quarters of oats, and 300 quarters of flour, the products chiefly of his Sussex manors, and he sent them to the base at Newcastle by the Sussex ship *La Sainte Marie*, sailing from Shoreham, at that day a by no means unimportant port. In conjunction with the Archbishop of York, he vainly endeavoured to procure the release of a brother prelate, John de Langton, Bishop of Chichester, imprisoned by Edward II. in revenge, because, when Chancellor, he would not allow the Prince to draw *ad libitum* from the treasury under his charge. In the last year of his primacy he wrote *litera monitoria* to the Dean of Pagham, directing him to solemnly celebrate as a double feast the festival of the dedication of Pagham Church in its dependent chapels of Bognor and Bersted. The chapel of Bognor was dedicated to St. Bartholemew, but has long since been destroyed, and little is known of its character. Bersted had two chapels, north and south, one dedicated to the Holy Cross, the other to St. Mary Magdalene. The former has suffered the same fate as that of Bognor, but St. Mary Magdalene still serves the parish. It consists of chancel, nave, and two aisles, and a tower supported by large buttresses. There is no chancel arch, a wooden screen probably effecting the division originally. The arches between nave and aisles are alternately round and octagonal. On some of them are paintings, as of St. Christopher and St. Thomas Aquinas, and decorative designs round the capitals.

Reynolds was succeeded by SIMON MEPHAM, whose primacy only extended over six years. His connection with Sussex and his *peculiaris* therein seems to have been limited to visitations. When residing at Mayfield he summoned the

Synod, called *Concilium Magfeldense*, in which was discussed the subject of feasts and holy days, as the result of which it was ordered that, besides the usual festivals of saints, the anniversaries of the dedications of parish churches were to be celebrated as feasts. Three years later this Primate was taken ill and died at his mansion at Mayfield.

He was succeeded by JOHN DE STRATFORD, brother of Robert de Stratford, Bishop of Chichester. He appears to have had little particular connection with Sussex. He obtained, however, an endowment for the see from a certain Richard de Twyverton, who bestowed upon it a windmill at Mayfield. In the last year of his primacy he also acquired for the see, by exchange with the Abbot of Bruyton, in Somerset, lands, rents, and 300 acres of wood in Waltham and Ertham, in Sussex. It was during the primacy of this Archbishop that the *Nonarum Inquisitiones* were held, and put on record. They contain much information of an interesting nature concerning the Sussex manors of the see. The fertility and wealth of Pagham is noted by the Commissioners, only one manor, Bosham, exceeding it in value in the whole of Sussex. It is noticeable, as testifying to the industry and intelligence of owners, overseers, and operatives of church manors as farmers, that almost all lands held by ecclesiastical corporations and sees are seen to have been more prosperous and valuable than the average in lay tenancy. Bosham itself, it will be remembered, was a manor of the See of Exeter. We learn further from these records that, prosperous though it was, Pagham had suffered much, in common with other lands along the southern shore, from irruptions of the sea, no less than 2,700 acres having been "devastated" by this means. At Tarring, Athelstane's endowment of the see, it is recorded that the crops had been "deteriorated" by the inclemency of the weather; while at Wittering not only had lands been damaged by the sea, but crops had been "devoured by the rabbits of the Bishop of Chichester [who held neighbouring land] to the value of eleven marks," reminding us of the similar complaints against the Lord of Lewes by his tenants, to which Archbishop Peckham had asked him to attend.

Like his predecessor, Archbishop Stratford died at Mayfield. On the temporalities thus falling into the royal hands, the King appointed a Sussex Knight, Bartholomew de Burghersh, keeper of all the parks and chaces of the see, a position of some importance and profit, in view of the large number of them belonging to the primates, a considerable proportion of which were in Sussex. The Archbishop now appointed to the vacancy, THOMAS UFFORD, or OFFORD, by name, had no particular connection with Sussex other than

the usual visitations; but his successor, THOMAS BRADWARDINE, had at least the association of birth, having been born either at Hartfield, Heathfield, or near Chichester, according to differing authorities. His six weeks' tenure of the see was too short to allow of any special connection with Sussex.

His successor was SIMON ISLIP, a Primate of whom we soon find a record connecting him, by implication, with Sussex, for the *Originalia Roll* of 24 Edward III. (1351) records that the King, "at the supplication of the venerable Father Simon," released the servile tenants of the See of Canterbury from the payment called *Palfrey Silver*, due to the King on each vacancy of the archbishopric. Two hundred years later Edward Storey, Bishop of Chichester, left 200 marks to his tenants to pay their debt due to the King called *Palfrey Money*. In the early part of 1355 Archbishop Islip was at his palace of Mayfield, the greater part of which, indeed, he erected, particularly the great hall, with its minstrels' gallery. Nor did he neglect opportunities of adding to the estate there, for we find that by Patent Roll of the same year 75 acres were added to the park, and not long after 400 acres were enclosed under the name of Frankham Park, while the manor also possessed a fish-pond no less than 9 acres in area. While at Mayfield he wrote to the Prior of Canterbury urging him to give his monks a University education; while in another letter he requested the convent to grant a respite to one of their debtors. In the summer of 1360 he was again staying at his Sussex palace, and thence he wrote inviting the Prior of Canterbury to visit him. The Prior, however, was ill, and begged to be excused. In the following year a somewhat unusual case connected with one of his Sussex *peculiaris* called for his intervention, for a certain Thomas Palmer, son of Elanus Palmer, a serf in the hamlet of Southerham, one of the vills of South Malling, had obtained Holy Orders without the license of his lord. The Archbishop therefore liberated Thomas from "the whole bond of servitude," in the usual formula, as exemplified in the case of Robert de Hempstede, manumitted by Archbishop Peckham.

Another affair connecting the Archbishop with one of his West Sussex *peculiaris* is recorded in the late autumn of 1362. It appears that the Earls of Arundel had long been wont by ancient custom to render annually at the Archbishop's Manor of Slindon thirteen bucks or harts "of greece," and thirteen does or hinds. In accordance with a natural and increasing tendency to commute these customary payments into money transactions, an arrangement was made to terminate this annual render, with due regard to mutual benefit. In return for the payment of 240 marks by the Earl, the

Archbishop relinquished all further claim to the bucks and does, this considerable sum to be devoted to the purchase of certain lands to be added to the permanent possessions of the see. In the spring of 1363 Archbishop Islip was again resident at Mayfield, and while staying there perfected the arrangements for the foundation of New College, Oxford, and shortly afterwards added to its endowments the valuable Rectory of Pagham, a parish whose tithable products we have already shown from the Nonæ Rolls to have been exceeded by Bosham alone of the 272 parishes scheduled in Sussex. Doubtless, too, it was at the instigation of the Archbishop that his nephew, William Islip, added his Manor of Woodford to the endowments of the same college.

In several other years the Primate visited his Manor of Mayfield, as shown by various letters dated there, as in 1351, when a Papal injunction to hold a Convocation was issued from the palace there. His visits to Slindon were less frequent, and it consequently appears less often in archiepiscopal records. But in 1349 we find noted the appointment by Islip of John Spyney as keeper of the park, warren, and outside woods of the Manor of Slindon, at a salary of a bushel of wheat weekly and one mark for a robe and shoes. In the spring of 1361 the Archbishop was again at Mayfield, and while there he granted a charter of manumission to a certain Nicholus atte Brook (a serf on his Manor of Framfield) "for the good service he has rendered, and will yet render, to us and to our church," including in the benefaction all his children, Richard, John, and William, with the only exception of the youngest, Walter by name, who, with all his descendants in perpetuity, "we do not wish to have or enjoy any liberty," but to remain as serfs on the manor for ever. Fortunately for the good repute of the Primate and the credit of the Church, as well as for the sake of the serf himself, such a conditioned charter is rare.

W. HENEAGE LEGGE.

(To be continued.)

