

## THE TOWN AND PORT OF NEW ROMNEY.

BY EDWARD BACHELER WALKER.

AMONGST the Archives of New Romney, still preserved in the Town Hall, are some of peculiar and especial interest, not only in so far as they relate to the old town and port itself, but in the opportunities they give us for carrying ourselves back some five centuries or more, and searching into the habits and manner of living of our long-buried and long-forgotten ancestors; drinking with them, and eating with them; or journeying with Master William Holyngbroke and his servants to the Parliament at Westminster, or to the Lord Warden's court in old St. James's Church at Dover, and perhaps even being allowed a glimpse at his comely spouse, who remained at Romney, driving those hard bargains with the purchasers of her blankets which, at least in part, served to provide the means for the grandeur of her lord at Westminster, or at Dover. I think too that it may be of some comfort to us (if anything can be so), during our too-frequent interviews with the collectors of rates and income tax, to reflect that, however much we may object to the few pence in the pound demanded by the one or the other, they would be but as a drop compared to the ocean of taxation in which our forefathers contrived not only to live, but, as is abundantly proved by these records, to enjoy themselves. Perhaps indeed, to a very strict moralist, some of their little transactions may appear somewhat questionable; such transactions I mean as making handsome presents to any accessible, or one might almost say inaccessible, person who might be likely to have the ear of, or to "stand well with" the Lord Warden, "that he might speak for us with the said Lord." And these instances occur in almost any paragraph that

records a suit, whether with the men of "Hethe," or of Lydd. With the latter, the quarrels were frequent and bitterly fought out, a circumstance to which is perhaps to be attributed the existing, but now happily friendly, rivalry between the two places.

As is the case with so many other places, the earliest detailed information as to New Romney and its inhabitants is to be found in the Domesday Book, at the compilation of which there appear to have been no less than 156 burgesses in "Romenel," as it is there called: eighty-five of these belonged to the Archbishop's manor of Aldington, "and were worth to the lord £6;" the Archbishop also had twenty-one burgesses in Romenel belonging to the manor of Lamport, and Robert de Romenel had the remaining fifty. As to their privileges, we find that of them the king had all service, and they were quit, on account of their maritime service, of all customs except three: theft, breach of the peace, and forestel, *i.e.* robbery or assault on the highway.

The earlier manner of government and privileges of the town, and its original incorporation, supposed by some to date from the reign of Edward the Confessor, seem lost in the mists of antiquity. There is however preserved in the library of St. Catherine's College, at Cambridge—whether it came there by fair means or foul no one seems to know—a manuscript, bound, and with the arms of the Corporation of New Romney upon the cover, written in Norman-French in and after the 26th year of Edward III, [1352] by Daniel Rough or Rowe, one of the early predecessors of our friend Mr. Stringer in the office of Town Clerk. This document contains "the usages of Romene from time out of memory there used; first, it is the usage from year to year to elect twelve jurats to keep and govern the said town." Woe, however, to the luckless wight, who being elected a jurat is unwilling to serve! "If any baron, after the election of the said community, will not be obedient to do the said office of jurat, the bailiff, with all the community, shall go to his house, and the said disobedient, his wife, and his children, and other household, shall turn out of his house, and shall shut the windows, and his door they ought to seal and seques-

trate, and so they ought to remain until he wish to set himself right by doing the said duty of jurat." The powers of the jurats at this time were considerable; among other things they held powers of distress "upon all whom they shall deem rebels, touching the service of our lord the king, and in all points touching the maintenance and profit of the common franchise." The "service of our lord the king" I take to mean service in the ships of war, belonging to the corporation and furnished by them, when required by the sovereign. The dignity of the jurats too was carefully protected from any disrespectful conduct on the part of less exalted mortals, as, "If any man shall curse any one of the jurats, and lay hands, upon him, against the peace of our lord the king, the bailiff shall have power to imprison him, and keep him in prison until he shall have paid a fine, by assessment of the other jurats, to the jurat so offended by him." And such fines were likely to be no very light ones, as may be judged from the proceedings in like cases of the aldermen of the city of London, who enjoyed similar power. It was also in the power of any freeman to claim to buy a share in all kinds of merchandise landed upon the quay, belonging to a non-freeman; and no Fleming nor other alien might be taken by his host, to buy or sell merchandise, without leave of the bailiff, and then only in the presence of his host; from this and a somewhat similar regulation in force at about the same period at Great Yarmouth, I should imagine that the innkeepers were in some degree held responsible for the transactions of foreigners, and others who lodged with them. Judging from the severity of the following regulation, growing wood must either have been so plentiful as to have been a general temptation to dishonesty, or even a greater rarity than at present. "Also if any person is found cutting wood within the franchise, he is to have the pillory the first time, to have his ear cut off, and to be taken to the other end of the town and made to abjure it;" on a second occasion he is to lose the other ear; and on a third offence to suffer death.

From the following letter of the barons of Romney "to their dear brothers, and combarons, and friends, the Mayor and barons of La Rie," we gather that their interest in their

fellow townsmen, or at any rate in their widows, did not always cease upon the fair ladies leaving their jurisdiction. "On the dolorous plaint of Deany, now the widow of T. Swain their late neighbour, who has now removed to La Rie, they hear that one Elizabeth Badch has heinously and evilly slandered her, in a public and open place, as having been of evil fame, and has asserted that for her larceny and bad character she has been driven from the town of Romene, and dare not return thither. Therefore for the love of God she has asked them therein to bear witness to the truth. They therefore testify to her good conversation, that she left for no evil cause, and that she may return whenever she pleases, and they further beg that she may have her former good character restored to her."

Time however will not allow us to linger over this interesting volume, and we will now turn to the papers in the Town Hall to which I have before alluded. The earliest of these (a poll-tax list) has been alluded to by Mr. Boys in his *Materials for the History of Sandwich*, yet for many years after the publication of that work it was lying and rotting in one of the Corporation chests, where it had been thrown together with a vast quantity of parchments and papers of all kinds, old and new. Its rescue from utter obscurity and the able translation of it are due to one who, had he been spared, would have taken much interest in our Society's meeting here, and who most certainly could have given more ample information on the early history of New Romney than almost any man now living. I mean the late Henry Thomas Riley. To his advocacy is due the present well-cared for condition and restoration of the volume. This manuscript, written in part by the same Daniel Rowe or Rough who was the writer of the book now at St. Catherine's College, commences in the year 1380. It contains the names of the different wards of the town, and the names of all persons above the age of fifteen of both sexes in each ward, and also the amount\* for which each individual was assessed. I may mention that this assessment is for that poll-tax which

\* I have omitted to mention that this, so far as I can find, is the only complete assessment for this poll-tax handed down to us.—E. B. W.

caused the rebellion headed by Wat Tyler, and which spread from the coasts of Kent to the Humber. The wards of Romney, at that time thirteen in number, were named the wards of Holyngbroke, of Bocherye, of Hospital, of Codde, of Joce, of Sharle, of Bartelot, of High Mill, or Hyghmelle or Mill Ward, of Hamersnoth or Hamersnod, of Olbeth, of Colbrond, of Deme, and of Hope. Of most of these, all trace of their name and position is lost; Holyngbroke and Bocherye (Butchery) are names now unknown; that of Hospital Ward has however probably been preserved in the name of a roadway, to the N.W. of the town, known as Spital Lane. High Mill, the earliest form of which name is Mill Ward, must surely have taken its name from a mill in the same position as the present windmill; and this seems the more certain, as the predecessor of the present mill, and the surrounding buildings, belonged formerly to the corporation, and traces of more than one mill in the same situation are to be found among the town records, in the shape of bills and vouchers for their maintenance and repair. I do not know at all the average duration of a windmill, but though the continually occurring improvements of these days may necessitate frequent changes and rebuilding, I should imagine that before the seventeenth century such improvements caused few if any changes of structure; and as the site of the present mill, the highest point in the town, has certainly been occupied by a mill for more than two hundred years, if not longer, we may surely assume that one on the same site gave its name to the ward in 1380. The name of Deme exists in Demechurch or Dymchurch, a neighbouring village on the east, but as to whether this was itself considered to be one of the wards of Romney there is no evidence whatever; as the village seems never to have had any share in the privileges of the Cinque Ports, as a limb of Romney or otherwise, I should infer that the village gave its name to the ward nearest it, rather than itself constituted the ward. The same remarks may possibly apply to Hope Ward, Hope being the commonly used abbreviation of Hope-All-Saints, the name of the neighbouring parish to the north. All this however is a mere matter of conjecture.

We find that in the whole thirteen wards, in 1380, there were assessed to the subsidy (*i.e.* the poll tax) granted to the king, nine hundred and forty-one persons, and the total sum assessed was £48 9s. 6d., *i.e.* about 1s. per head of the population above fifteen years of age, which, allowing for the difference in the value of money, would amount to about 15s. per head, in addition to the local taxation or town dues called maltotes, and in addition also to the costs of and service in their ships when demanded by the king, "whereto they were bound 'always to be ready with their bodies and chattels;'" no slight tax in itself I should think, when wars with France were perpetually recurring. As to these maltotes themselves, we find that in the same year (1380) an internal cess was levied upon thirteen butchers and their shambles "per la Rawe" for the use of the corporation, £5 1s. 3d.; and the shares of herrings caught by fishermen and estimated upon oath, being the produce of eight boats, amounted to £4 13s. 3½d., even after deducting the riphere, barelhere, axhere, etc. The cess upon the Ripiers (or as they would now be termed "'long-shore-men'"), who to this day call a basket which they carry slung over their backs a "Rip" basket, amounted to £1 5s. 9½d. The lucky vintners however, perhaps owing to the forbearance of the Sir Wilfred Lawson of the period, seem to have escaped the most easily, as ten of them only paid in the aggregate a sum of 17s. 2d., as compared with the £5 1s. 3d. of the thirteen butchers, though they seem to have driven no bad trade; the duties upon wine were but 6d. for every tun sold by retail, and for those sold by wholesale 4d.; for a pipe sold by retail (*vendita in tappynge*) 3d., and by wholesale 2d. Thus, supposing the amount of wine sold by wholesale and retail to have been about the same, there were consumed over 40 tuns of wine in one year; malt liquor does not seem to have been taxed at all. In addition to the above items, maltotes (town dues) were levied upon porpoises (1d. each if cut up and sold in the town, 1s. if taken outside), which seem to have been considered a great delicacy; also upon sea coal, on the carpenters of ships 'of new passage,' on cooks, lard, herrings, onions, ironmongers, carpenters of

houses (at that time practically builders, as most houses were built of wood), shoemakers, cobblers, all ship's carpenters at work, wine, timber, on the hire of vessels and boats, sprats, master fishermen and their mates, 2d. on every pound lent, on carters and barbers, on "coyfyn" (p seasoned wood for making coffers), on silk and canvas, on goldsmiths, on tilers, and lastly on pie-makers,  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. each per week. So much for the easy taxation of those good old times.

Passing on now to some of the other documents, and omitting for want of time many interesting matters that have been handed down to us by the industry of successive town clerks and chamberlains, we come to an entry in the chamberlain's accounts of 1391, that refers to a dispute with the Archbishop of Canterbury, which dispute was kept alive for many years, certainly until after 1521; "Paid for the expenses of eighteen best men of the town, riding to the lord Archbishop of Canterbury, to protect the liberty of the town, that the said lord might not usurp it, 28s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d." Very large sums too were spent upon a ship of war "hired and arrayed for the king's service." In 1394 we find a curious item, being £10 for the expenses during eleven weeks of one John Pecham riding to Ireland for the community. Putting aside the evidently wonderful performances of Mr. Pecham's horse, one cannot help wondering whether the corporation of New Romney spent so much upon a message to the Lord Warden, who was then in Ireland. In 1396 a new barge or ship of war was purchased, at a cost of £53 6s. 8d., and other expenses connected with the fitting out of the same amounted to £28 10s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., making a total of £81 17s. 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., truly a sum which would be moderate in the eyes of a First Lord of these days. In 1398, money was received from the commander of a ship of war, on account of his voyage to Dunkirk; as to this, Mr. Riley says that such items tend to shew that the corporation of New Romney sometimes earned money by freightage, when on foreign service; I, however, though with the greatest possible diffidence, rather incline to the opinion that such items account for prize-money, if they were not the results of what would now be called, piracy. We find it stated that "in early times a sailor was more distinctly

a sailor of his port than of his country; and between different ports, whether of different countries or not, there might be, and not unfrequently was, a state of war; the Cinque Ports might be at war with Normandy, whether there was war between the kings of England and France or not, and a very bloody war between the Cinque Ports and Yarmouth is a prominent feature in the naval annals of the closing decade of the thirteenth century.”\* My opinion in this matter seems, I think, to be confirmed by a remarkable agreement, made in the year 1412, between the masters and mariners of Romney and Lydd on the one side, and the masters and mariners dwelling on the coast of France, from Harfleur as far as Hendrenesce, and the boundaries around, on the other, for their mutual ransom when taken prisoners. The masters were to be acquitted on payment of six nobles, and the mariners on payment of three nobles, and a half noble for a safe conduct; neither were to be charged more than 20d. per week for table expenses whilst prisoners. Any gentleman or merchant, however, who might be taken, was expressly exempted from the benefits of the above agreement. Those who should contravene this agreement were to pay a sum of 100s. (one hundred shillings) to the churches of St. Nicholas or Hope-All-Saints. In the same year, 1412, there were also made several stringent regulations for the cleansing and draining of the town; and it was also ordained that all priests, and those who commonly frequent taverns, shall be in their houses, where they ought to pass the night, by nine o'clock at the outside, under a penalty of 6s. 8d. to be applied by the bailiff and community in equal parts; and further, that all curs shall be expelled the town, or safely kept so that they do no harm, under a penalty of 20d.

From many other curious items I have selected a few which may prove interesting, though they are not all of them connected with the period to which I have hitherto been referring, viz., from the middle of the fourteenth to about

\* Nicholas's History of the Royal Navy, and also a lecture delivered at the Royal United Service Institution, by Mr. J. K. Laughton, M.A., R.N.

the beginning of the fifteenth century. Some, however, belong to this period, for instance, the expenses of the burghesses sent to Parliament in the fifth year of Richard II, headed "Costs of Parliament." "First for the expenses of William Holyngbroke and William Childe, with whom also were John Stondene (Standen) their servant on horseback, and Robert Holiere (Ollier) on foot, on this occasion, namely, that from Monday next after the Commemoration of All Souls, in the fifth year of the reign of King Richard, they were at London for some time, staying for Parliament, which Parliament was not carried into effect, but deferred until after the Queen's coming into England. And on the feast of the Conversion of Saint Paul next ensuing, the said Parliament was commenced; at which Parliament the said Wm. Holyngbroke and Wm. Childe were present, as commissioned at the beginning thereof. The expenses of the said persons were £7 18s. 6½d., for themselves, two servants and three horses, with remuneration of the said two servants, and hire of their said three horses." To this period also belong several highly interesting accounts, of the expenses incurred in fitting out a barge or man-of-war, which was ordered to be furnished by the corporation of New Romney, for the bringing over of the Queen of Richard II, Anne of Bohemia; from these I will make a few extracts, especially those that give us the history of this same ill-fated barge. "In the month of October: Also preparation of the barge for the coming of the Queen, as we had commands sent by our Constable (*i.e.* Constable of Dover Castle). First, paid for one barrel of tar bought of Andrew Colyn, which went for tarring the shroud, 3s. 4d., and for wages of Nicholas Colman, *Parrot of Spain*, and others, uniting to take down and prepare it for, and then tarring the shroud and hanging it again, 2s. 1d.; also for the wages of J. Mersshe in setting the mast and mending the top-castle 3d., and for nails for the same 1d., etc., etc. Amount of this preparation in the month aforesaid, 15s. 4d.; and the Queen (at this time) did not come to England, nor did she wish to come until peace should be made again of the rebels aforesaid." This allusion is of course to the insurrection headed by Wat Tyler, and

although it was put down by the end of June, I suppose the good news could not have been sent to Anne of Bohemia and her answer received until the beginning of November, in which month the preparations of the barge are recommenced. "In the month of November: Also, preparation of the barge aforesaid, for the coming of the Queen, as we had commands by the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. First for throwing out the water from the barge, as it was in the delf, 8d. Also for bread, ale, and meat given to certain mariners while tackling the barge, while it was in the delf, 16d. And when the said barge was brought from its delf towards the pale, there was given to John Leg and his fellows for ale, 20d." Then follows a list of the various fittings and stores purchased, after which, "also paid Richard Lullynge, carpenter, for the making of the cabin for the use of the Lady the Queen, and for the stocking of the gun and for the mending the lower side of the fane\* with his own timber, 3s. 8d.; and for nails bought for making the cabin, 6d., etc., etc. And when the said barge was taken to Fogelnesse, there in a short time it was driven up on the sea shore, and so for six shovels bought for digging beneath it there, 10d. Also for the wages of Lawrence Moryce and his fellows, in taking out the ballast, and digging beneath the barge, and getting it back again into the Channel, 3s. 6d., and in ale, 15d. Also for the wages of N. Colman and many other mariners, watching the barge within the harbour divers nights, 2s. 8d. Amount of this preparation in the month aforesaid, 68s. 11d." Then follow numerous charges for stores and provisions, etc., etc. "Which Barge, so prepared, set sail on Saturday, the eve of the Conception of the Blessed Mary, and on the Tuesday following, when they were trying to enter the harbour of Calais, the said barge was cast away on the sea shore there, namely, in going to fetch the Queen." Not even yet despairing however, the chamberlain, who from his dolorously sympathetic account must surely have been on board, if not in command, made gallant attempts to recover his barge. Let him, however, tell his own sad tale. "And for five

\* On which the banner was to be hoisted in honour of the Queen.

pipe cokers (empty wine pipes), bought there for raising the barge, 8s. 7d. ; also for spykings bought for the purpose of attaching the tilting, that it might not burst asunder, 5s. ; so at last our barge was there broken !” Earlier in the same year (June 7th) we find “Thomas Wottone and William at Chapel and others coming here with letters patent, and the standard of the lord the King, touching the insurrection of the people in divers counties ;” they are liberally entertained at the house of William Holyngbroke, and 13s. 4d. is charged in the corporation accounts “for a present given to the said Thomas, as a mark of respect for the letters patent, and the standard of the said lord the King, and for his trouble.” As this was but five days before Tyler and his hundred thousand men sacked the house of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, and demolished the prisons of the Marshalsea and the King’s Bench ; and as the greater part of Kent\* was at this time openly siding with the rebels, who appeared to be getting altogether the upper hand of the authorities throughout the southern and eastern parts of England, I take this to have been a very exceptional proof of loyalty on the part of the barons of Romney ; and the more as they seem, as we shall soon see, to have succeeded in raising some men at least who were afterwards employed in putting down the rebellion in the east—possibly as they may have been supposed less likely to have sympathised with rebels far from home, than with those who were nearer neighbours to them. Again on the 27th of June, and ten days after the quelling of the rebellion and the death of Wat Tyler at the hands of the Lord Mayor of London, “John Justere, Sergeant at Arms of the lord the King, came here for the reason before stated,” *i.e.*, touching the insurrection. This second message was probably the revocation of the charters of enfranchisement and pardon granted to the rebels on the field by Richard II, and revoked by him as soon as he had sufficiently broken their power to enable him to do so. That the men raised under the standard of the King by the barons of the five ports were not permitted to return to

\* Including the Mayor and Corporation of Canterbury, who had been compelled by force to join them.

their homes, after the suppression of the insurrection in the neighbourhood of London, but were sent on to perform the same work in the eastern counties, under Henry Spencer, known as the "fighting bishop of Norwich," we learn from a mandate from the king, on the 26th of August, "for the arrest of men, passing over to serve under the venerable Father, Henry, Bishop of Norwich, on the 3rd of September, if returning without leave." The service, however, must have been unpopular and the barons unwilling to execute the mandate of the king; for on the 14th of September another letter arrived to "arrest all men sound of body, and horses unhurt, with harness, that had come from following the said Bishop." Whether this second mandate was obeyed or not does not appear, but the bringer of it does not seem to have been so well treated as his predecessors. Now that we have been touching on the subject of rebellion I may mention a hideous item occurring in the accounts for 1450, the year of Jack Cade's rebellion; "Given to a man carrying a quarter of a man, to supersede the said quarter, 3s. 4d." *i.e.*, the man was bribed to carry his ghastly burden, a part of the body of one of the rebels, out of the town.

In 1382 occurs this entry: "Paid for one little bag of leather for the treasure of the community, 2½d." Evidently the shape, size, and material of the "common purse" have been handed down for centuries, as it consists to the present day of a "little bag of leather." The present purse bears the date 1682.

"Small-sport" was the appropriate nickname which familiarly denoted a prison in Romney, and men were paid 6d. a day to "watch" beside the prison, when delinquents were in "small-sport," in the reign of Henry VIII. Occasionally, criminals were hanged at Romney; and notably elaborate are the entries which record the chamberlain's expenses in 1592-3, occasioned by the execution of Jeremy Whatelow. Timber for the gallows cost 8s.; for setting it up two men received 20d.; the rope cost 4d. Edward Michell officiated as hangman, and received for that service the sum of 5s., together with some apparel, made for the occasion at a cost of 7s. 5d. One Father Gaskyn had also been

engaged to hold himself in readiness to act, if need required, and to him was paid 6d. The bellringers received 18d., for ringing at Whatelow's burial. The criminal's goods and chattels were valuable; the town paid 10s. for counsel's opinion respecting them, and 9s. for a supper given to those who appraised them. Whatelow's sheep were sold for £19; and other goods with his household stuff realized £8 8s. 0d., when sold at the market cross.

The following quaint letter, though of comparatively recent date (31st January, 1664), is worthy of note.

“ Mr. Bostock,

“ Wee much wonder that (keeping still in yo<sup>r</sup> hands this Vicaridge of New Romney) you provide not that the cure thereof be duly officiated; you cann be content to receive tithes, but you will neither reside on y<sup>r</sup> benefice yo<sup>r</sup> selfe nor provide a curate. Wee have been wholly destitute since Christmas day last and from yo<sup>r</sup> departure until Christmas wee had indeede a nimble curate who read Divine service once every Lord's Day, and was usually in his sermon and prayer before it about a quarter of an houre. These things if complayned of will neither sound to y<sup>r</sup> commendation nor proffitt, for sure wee are that if you cann obtain a dispensation for yo<sup>r</sup> non residence (whereof we much doubt), yett must it be conditionally, and noe longer in force then you provide that the cure bee well and sufficiently supplied. Wherefore in the behalfe of the p<sup>r</sup>ysioners and inhabitants here wee doe require and advise you, forthwith upon receipt hereof, to provide that the cure be officiated by yo<sup>r</sup> self or some other able divine, or otherwise for yo<sup>r</sup> apparent neglect herein we intend to take such advantage for o<sup>r</sup> relief as the laws of Church or State doe affoord, wherein we shall omitt noe opportunity in case you faile in p<sup>r</sup>formance of our request, soe expectyng yo<sup>r</sup> answeere wee rest,

“ Yo<sup>r</sup> Friends though neglected,

“ THE MAIOR AND JURATS OF NEW ROMNEY.”

“ From New Romney under the seale of office, etc., etc.”

We have seen that so early as the close of the fourteenth century, disputes arose between the barons of Romney and the Archbishops of Canterbury, concerning alleged encroachments by the Archbishops on the liberties of the town. Any such attempted encroachments were at all times sturdily resisted by the jurats, but seem to have been renewed from

time to time by various primates, and in 1521 became the occasion of a regular lawsuit between the parties. The details of this suit have been published in *Boys' History of Sandwich*.

In 1521, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, exhibited against the jurats and inhabitants of Romney articles setting forth:—

1st. That his predecessors had granted to the jurates strenne and strond of the sea; and claiming by the hands of his bailiff, passage, anchorage, and soulage of all ships resorting thither.

2nd. Ergo that the sea having now left and lost his course of flowing half a mile and more from Romney, whereby 400 acres and more were left dry and had become marsh land and good pasture, which belonged of right to the Archbishop.

3rd. That the jurats by a surreptitious charter do make leases of the said marsh or pasture for 10 marks by the year, and have received 170 marks of which the Archbishop requires restitution.

4th. The jurats will not permit his grace's bailiff to exercise his office within the town, in spite of notice and commandment from Sir Edward Poynings, Lord Warden, that they do accept, admit, and obey him.

5th. The custom hath been for the *bailiff and jurats* to determine all pleas real and personal, except points belonging to Court of Shepway, but the jurates frowardly keep the said courts without the bailiff, proclaim the said court, and determine the pleas.

6th. The Archbishop, by reason of his law-day should have all issues, fines, and amercements for all offences inquirable at law-day; whereas the said jurats set the fines, and take three parts to themselves and leave scanty the fourth to the bishop, whereof he requireth restitution.

7th. By maintenance of said jurats divers persons withhold the Archbishop's rents, customs, and services from his said seignory.

8thly. The jurats have encroached upon the liberty and franchise of the said lord by colour of liberty of barony, whereas the town is all bishoprick.

To these eight articles the jurats and inhabitants by no means agree, and sturdily and promptly answer is made that,

1st. The Town and Port is and hath been, time out of mind, one of the capital five ports, and has liberties ratified and approved by the great Charter of England.

2nd. They deny that the jurats and inhabitants, or their predecessors, ever had any grant of strenne and stronde of the Archbishop's predecessors, or that any person but the king can grant them any privileges but what they now use and have used, time out of mind.

3rd. That the north side only of the town is holden of the Archbishop, and that the rest is and has been holden of the king "by service to find certain ships for his voyage royal to the parts beyond the sea."

4th. That the old stream or creek in that part is holden of the king, and the part holden of the Archbishop neither is nor was any part of any creek or water, but a void place called the Strond, and used as a weekly market, where the Archbishop had picage, stylage, and stallage, which market hath been a long time disused.

5th. That the Archbishop can only send a bailiff into the town when the office is vacant, and that the present bailiff, admitted seven or eight years past, is yet living and of good name and fame, and hath not surrendered his interest "and so the place is not void." Whereas the person lately sent by the Archbishop is indicted of felony, "whereof he is not acquitted;" and he brought not any letter of attendance with him, wherefore the jurats refused him.

6th. That such bailiff was an executive officer, not a judge of their court.

7th. That his sitting among the jurats was of favour and not of duty.

8th. That the Archbishop never had any leet, or law-day, or any amercements whatever.

9th. That no fines or amercements, which the Archbishop ought to have, have been withheld from him.

10th. They admit that the officers and ministers of the Archbishop may distrain for rents where they are due.

11th. That part of Romney being held of the king and not of the Archbishop the jurats have not encroached upon the liberty of the Archbishop, but only for execution of justice as bound to do.

In these matters the jurats seem to have gained all their points except the seventh.