

# MID 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY OLD WOKING

The 1332 Tax Return for Woking lists ninety-seven names<sup>1</sup>. Of course not all were necessarily 'residents' of Woking, and there were obviously others exempt from tax as they didn't own property or goods worth more than 10s., but the surviving return is the first time we have a document that lists so many local names.

Some 'families' we have come across before, although it is worth noting that at this stage what we would now regard as a 'surname', is still often just an indication of what they did or where they were associated with – so that the William Hereward recorded in the 1269 Surrey Eyre is not necessarily of the same family as Stephano Hereward mentioned in 1332 – it could be that they just both performed that task.

The 1332 tax was granted in September that year to meet the expense of an expedition to Ireland<sup>2</sup>. Those in the cities, boroughs and crown lands were to pay a tax of one-tenth, whilst those in rural areas such as Woking paid just one-fifteenth on their taxable goods – 'by custom this means horses, cattle, pigs, sheep, grain, peas, beans and hay in the rural districts'<sup>3</sup>.

In Woking there were twenty people paying the minimum of 8d., in tax. Did all of them own exactly 10s., worth of taxable goods? – probably not, the value of any individual's goods (or at least the tax they had to pay) appears to have been rounded (sometimes up, but it seems more likely down), with four people paying 10d. (did nobody own anything between 10s., and 12s.6d.'s worth of items?)

At the other end of the scale, the Countess of Kent (wife of Edmund, 1st Earl of Kent), who still held Woking in dower at this time, paid just 5s., combined, for both her manors of Sutton and Woking – clearly a nominal sum as I doubt that anyone would believe that her taxable goods at each was just £2.

The average payment was just under 2s.2d., so there was clearly quite a difference between the poorest and the richest taxpayer. Apart from the Countess, the highest taxpayers were 'Johanne ate Rude' and 'Ada Chuleburgh', who each paid tax on goods worth £3.17s.6d.

In each Hundred 'sub-taxers were to value the personal property held by the inhabitants of their districts on Michaelmas Day'<sup>4</sup> with half the money due to be paid on the 3<sup>rd</sup> February and the other half the 31<sup>st</sup> May, 1333. The Surrey Roll that survives appears to be the list sent to the exchequer on the 24<sup>th</sup> April that year.

The total from Woking in 1332 (by my calculation) should have been £10.7s.5d., but the actual amount collected seems to have been £10.10s.3d., if the assessment as recorded by the Surrey Record Society is correct<sup>5</sup>.

I did have to check (and indeed triple check) my totals, however, when I found that the Mayford History Society<sup>6</sup> calculated that 'the amount raised from Woking in 1332, £160.3.10, places it among the more prosperous parishes in Surrey, behind only Kingston and Godalming', but I suspect that they were confusing the totals for each 'Hundred', rather than the individual parishes!

It is interesting to note that the 'sub-taxers' (six in the case of Woking Hundred) were only taxed as if they owned 10s., worth of goods! Was their task that onerous (or perhaps disliked) that it warranted such a reward? I assume that most (if not all of them) would have been the most prominent (and possibly the most wealthy) inhabitants of the area – you would have at least have thought, given their task, that they should have been the most trustworthy!

Paying tax is never popular, but whether the collection of the 1332 tax had anything to do with the trouble that Arthur Locke noted took place in Woking in 1333, I do not know. He states that 'for some reason the parson of Eton raided Woking and carried off the widow's cattle and money'<sup>7</sup> (the widow, being the Countess of Kent). The parson in question, William de Kirkeby, apparently 'drove away a bull and 12 oxen worth £20 and carried away goods and £15 in money', and then added to the offence by failing to appear in court (for which he risked being outlawed), but on the 11<sup>th</sup> May 1336 it was reported in the Patent Rolls 'on certificate by William de Herle, chief justice, that he has now surrendered in the Flete prison'<sup>8</sup>.

The Countess of Kent appears to have been particularly unlucky when it came to her property, as it appears that about this time some of her property was also taken by the crown, as in 1339 she made an appeal regarding the confiscation of corn etc., to the sum of £40.19s.2d., from her 'manor of Wockyng and its members Hoke, Sutton and Pirbright' that were 'taken into the king's hands' on the 14<sup>th</sup> March 1331 as part of her husband's estate<sup>9</sup>.

It should be noted that the 1332 tax assessment was not the only time in the 14<sup>th</sup> century that the people of Woking paid tax – just the only time that a complete list of local taxpayers has survived and been published. In 1336 another tax received payment from the taxpayers of Woking of £10.13s.7d.<sup>10</sup> whilst the records of many other assessments have sadly not survived.

During the 1330's and 40's there were a number of agreements recorded in the Feet of Fines. In 1331/2 from Henry Baynard (in Wokkyngg and Bromlygh) to Ralph de Hoo and his wife Juliana<sup>11</sup>; in 1340/1 between Henry de la Blackefanne in Wokkyng and Mayford to Robert de le Blakefanne<sup>12</sup>; and an agreement between William Goldmore and his wife Isabel for land in Wockyng in 1347/8 with Geoffrey de Upton and his wife Isabel<sup>13</sup> – but after that there are no more transactions listed in the Woking area until 1354-6 when Thomas Osborn and his wife Margaret sold land in Wokkyng and a number of other local parishes to Walter Wodelond of Guildford<sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix - I have counted ninety-seven names, but the Woking History Society (Members of the Woking History Society 2014) p13, notes 'the taxation return of 1332 show 82 heads of families throughout the parish'.

<sup>2</sup> TNA E179 Database notes for E179/184/4

<sup>3</sup> p100 (Willard 1933)

<sup>4</sup> p100 (Willard 1933)

<sup>5</sup> p46 (Surrey Taxation Returns - 15th's & 10th's (Part A) 1332 Assessment 1923)

<sup>6</sup> p13 (Members of the Woking History Society 2014)

<sup>7</sup> 'The Earls of Kent; 1327-1437' (Locke n.d.)

<sup>8</sup> p100 (Calendar of Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, Vol 3, 1334-1338 1895)

<sup>9</sup> p140-1 (Calendar of Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, 1339-41 1901) – perhaps that accounts for her 1332 assessment being so low!

<sup>10</sup> p lxxvi (Surrey Taxation Returns - 15th's & 10th's (Part B) - 1332 Assessment 1931)..

<sup>11</sup> p101 (Lewis 1894) – 'Hoo' being either the Hook Heath area or more probably Hoe Bridge

<sup>12</sup> p109 (Lewis 1894) – 'Blackefanne' possibly being what was later recorded as 'Blackness Farm' (where the Bowling Green in Woking Park is today)

<sup>13</sup> p117 (Lewis 1894) – 'Goldmore' presumably being moorland in the 'Goldsworth' area

<sup>14</sup> p126 (Lewis 1894)

## MID 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY OLD WOKING

The year 1348, of course, was when the 'Black Death' started to sweep across the country. Unfortunately records for the Woking area from that period are scarce, but at Farnham, where the Bishop of Winchester's people kept meticulous accounts, it appears that it struck North-West Surrey in the autumn of 1348 (having first entered the country from Bristol). During 1347-8 three properties had to pay heriots (a sort of medieval inheritance tax) to their landlord at Winchester – in the year 1348-9 there were 133 inheritance payments made<sup>15</sup>! We don't know what the population was of the manor at that time, but as the 133 heirs represented only the heads of the household, it has been estimated that the total killed by the Black Death could be as much as a third of the manor's population!

As I say there is no documentary evidence of what affect the Black Death had on the population of Woking, but on the other hand there is no evidence that we would have been spared any more than our poor neighbours in Farnham. Archaeological evidence however, does now appear to be clear (or at least a little clearer). Analysis of the material from test pits in Old Woking have shown a 'decline of 65% by number of sherds and 67% by weight of sherds between the High Medieval and Late Medieval periods'<sup>16</sup>, indicating a sharp fall in activity from before c1350 to the period after (1350-1500).

It was during this period that John, 3rd Earl of Kent, died on what we would now call Boxing Day in 1352<sup>17</sup> (without an heir), and with Margaret the widow of the 1st Earl having died of the plague in the autumn of 1349, Woking passed to John's elder sister, Joan (who is often recorded as the 'Fair Maid of Kent')<sup>18</sup>.

Rather confusingly Edward III decided (with Joan's agreement) to allow John's wife, Elizabeth, to continue to hold Woking in dower 'after taking Elizabeth's oath that she will not marry without the king's licence'.<sup>19</sup>

Arthur Locke<sup>20</sup> records that in the intervening years 'it was recorded that he [the 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Kent] had bought out several of the customary tenants. The services of the remaining tenants were valued at only 10s a year', but he appears to have overlooked what Manning & Bray<sup>21</sup> note as the 'Assised Rents of free Tenents, and ten Natives' which was worth £20.15s0½d. (see Appendix 2). When you add the two together the rent paid of 1353 was not far below that due in 1330 (a total of £23.12s.2d), and above that of 1327 (totalling £18.17s.3¼d).

In the last article I compared the surveys of 1327 and 1330 to each other and the late 13<sup>th</sup> century surveys of 1271 and 1281, but it is clear looking at the survey of 1353 that the person charged with working out the value was perhaps not as diligent as the scribe twenty-three years previous. In 1330 the arable land was almost forensically calculated with the 140 acres divided up into seven different categories by value and location – in 1353 they noted simply that there was '101 acres of arable, more or less, whereof two thirds may be sown, and when sown is worth 8d. an acre'.

What is obvious, however, is that although the amount of arable land had gone down in the intervening years, the value had increased slightly, although it should be noted that whereas previously the meadow land was worth altogether £6.8s.5½d (for 97¾ acres) it was now worth just £4.17s.3d. (for 97 acres, 1 rood) – the meadow 'in different parcels, at 12d, an acre only for mowing, being subject to floods'.

Pasture too had decreased from a total of £1.17s' worth in 1330 to just £1.3s.2d in 1353, with the survey noting 'several' areas of pasture 'value 3s.4d. in summer; in winter nothing because always flooded'.

Interestingly the value of some individual areas of pasture recorded in both surveys remained the same – the pasture in Coresbrook being worth 5s on both occasions, and that in 'King's-worth end' in 1330 being 1s.6d., as was 'Kingswode' in 1353 (although here they did note that was only in summer, as in winter it was worth nothing because it was always flooded'). The pasture in the Park was likewise worth 10s in both surveys, with that of 1353 noting that it was worth that 'beside feeding the deer'.

From the above it seems that the 'several' areas of pasture in 1353 (worth 3s.4d.) must have been at either 'Cogwere' (10s in 1330) or 'Brook-wood' (9s in 1330), although in partial compensation it seems that forty acres of the arable land previously noted at 'La Hoke' were now 'worth 1d only an acres for pasturage, being very dry and sandy'<sup>22</sup>.

The 'underwood in Alder beds and elsewhere' were annually worth £2 in 1330, but by 1353 the underwood of the Park was worthless, 'being cut before the Lord died'.

Manning and Bray<sup>23</sup> note in their interpretation of the survey that there was a 'weak and ruinous' 'water-mill of the value of 6s.8d, with a 'fulling-mill let to Ralph le Fuller at a yearly rent of 8s', but others<sup>24</sup> have noted only the 'fulling-mill demised to Ralph le Fuller', with a 'free fishery worth 3s.3d. yearly in summer', that Manning & Bray record as worth 3s.4d. annually (I do not know which is correct).

Some historians<sup>25</sup>, have been confused by the fact that John's wife, Elizabeth, continued to hold Woking in dower 'till her death in 12 Henry IV'<sup>26</sup> (1411), thinking that Manning & Bray's listing of the survey of 1353 was from 1411.

In 1357, a Nicholas le Fuller – or more precisely a servant of his called Ralph - was caught up in an incident of 'trespass' on the manor of Byfleet, part of the Duchy of Cornwall, owned by Edward, the Black Prince, the eldest son of Edward III. Apparently Ralph, together with John Conestable, the servant of Roger

---

<sup>15</sup> p212 (Robo 1935)

<sup>16</sup> (Savage and Savage 2021)

<sup>17</sup> p46 No46 (Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem Preserved in the Public Record Office, Vol 10, 26-34 Edward III, 1352-1361 1921) notes that 'he died on Wednesday the feast of St Stephen last after the hour of vespers'.

<sup>18</sup> ibid

<sup>19</sup> p531 (Calendar of Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, Vol 9, 1349-1354 1906)

<sup>20</sup> 'The Earls of Kent; 1327 AD to 1437 AD' (Locke n.d.)

<sup>21</sup> p120 (Manning and Bray 1804-14)

<sup>22</sup> Woking, it seems, rarely had 'Goldilocks' land – it was either too dry and sandy or too wet and boggy!

<sup>23</sup> p120 (Manning and Bray 1804-14)

<sup>24</sup> p46 (Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem Preserved in the Public Record Office, Vol 10, 26-34 Edward III, 1352-1361 1921)

<sup>25</sup> David Young and Richard Savage (Poulton 2017) in their chapter on 'The location, disparking and survival of Woking Park' (p26) quoting the survey reproduced by Manning & Bray on page 120 as being from 1411, not 1353!

<sup>26</sup> p120 (Manning and Bray 1804-14)

# MID 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY OLD WOKING

atte Felde and John le Smyth, servant of John Donyton, set fire to the heath at 'Biflete' prompting the prince to file a suit against them. Fortunately for the three men, the 'Fair Joan' intervened and the Black Prince agreed to pardon them for trespass<sup>27</sup>.

According to Cokayne<sup>28</sup>, Joan 'appears when young to have been contracted to marry William Montacute, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Salisbury, but to have about 1348 actually (though privately) married that Earl's Steward, Sir Thomas de Holand, during whose absence from England the said Earl renewed his claim but released her when, by Papal bull, 13<sup>th</sup> November 1349, his contract was declared void and the marriage with Holand confirmed'.

As the previous male line had become extinct, Thomas was created 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Kent in 1360 – shortly before being killed whilst fighting in Normandy in December that year. Their son, also called Thomas, became the 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Kent in 1381, although he didn't take control of Woking, as it was still held by his mother in dower<sup>29</sup>.

In my next essay I will look at the story of the 'Fair Maid of Kent' (and her neighbour at Byfleet, the Black Prince), and how the area developed in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century.

## APPENDIX ONE

Surrey Tax Return, 15<sup>th</sup>'s and 10<sup>th</sup>'s, 1332, based on the list reproduced by the Surrey Record Society<sup>30</sup>, arranged in alphabetical order by 'surname'.

			s	d
Johanne		Apeworth <sup>31</sup>	1	4
Johanne	ate	Bech <sup>32</sup>	1	11
Petro	ate	Beck <sup>33</sup>		8
Roberto		Bercario	2	
Roberto		Bradele <sup>34</sup>	4	2
Hugone	le	Buc <sup>35</sup>	1	10
Johanne	de la	Chambre <sup>36</sup>		8
Ada		Child	1	8
Johanne		Child <sup>37</sup>	1	2
Waltero		Chonderhers	1	
Ada		Chuleburgh	5	2 <sup>38</sup>
Waltero	de	Chuleburgh	2	11
Galfrido	ate	Churche <sup>39</sup>	1	
Willelmo	le	Clerk <sup>40</sup>		8
Willelmo	le	Coupere <sup>41</sup>	1	5
Radulpho	ate	Crofte <sup>42</sup>	4	2
Roberto		Doget	1	4
Roberto		Doget Seniore	2	3
Johanne		Ele		8
Dionis	at	Feld	1	1
Henrico	ate	Felde	1	4
Henrico	ate	Felde	3	6
Wilelmo		Felde <sup>43</sup>	4	8
Waltero	ate	Forde <sup>44</sup>	2	4
Nicholas	le	Fuller <sup>45</sup>	3	7
Gilberto	ate	Goldhorde		8
Johanne	ate	Goldhorde <sup>46</sup>	2	4
Gilberto		Golie	1	2
Richardo	ate	Hacche <sup>47</sup>	2	6
Radulpho	ate	Hale	4	3
Thoma	ate	Hale	3	6

<sup>27</sup> p223/224 (Register of Edward the Black Prince preserved in the Public Record Office (1351-1365) Part IV 1933)

<sup>28</sup> p351 (Cokayne 1892)

<sup>29</sup> 'He was summoned to Parliament 20<sup>th</sup> November 1360 as Earl of Kent, but died a few weeks later, 28<sup>th</sup> December 1360, in Normandy' p351 (Cokayne 1892)

<sup>30</sup> p45-46 (Surrey Taxation Returns - 15<sup>th</sup>'s & 10<sup>th</sup>'s (Part A) 1332 Assessment 1923).

<sup>31</sup> Apeworth, is thought to derive from the personal name 'Apa', with the 'worth' meaning a farm. A Ralph de Apeworth was recorded in the Assize Rolls of 1294, p156 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>32</sup> Bech, is thought to correspond to the later Beechill in Mayford, possibly the home of John ate Beche in a charter of 1214-30, p160 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>33</sup> 'ate beck' could mean by the beck (as in Norse for stream) – although the more local name for a stream is brook or bourne.

<sup>34</sup> The area now known as Bridley, was in the 17<sup>th</sup> century written as Bradley, p160 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934), and could mean a broad clearing in a wood.

<sup>35</sup> 'le Buk' could have had a connection to the bucks of the royal forest – although 'buk' is also the Old English for a beech tree..

<sup>36</sup> 'de la Chambre' – of the Chamber – presumably had a connection with the manor house.

<sup>37</sup> Child is a local surname – a Henry Child being one of the executors of Richard Marchant of Wokkyng's will in 1488 (DW/PA/7/1 f88)

<sup>38</sup> Apart from the Countess of Kent (who paid 2s.8d. for two properties), Ada (and Johanne ate Rude), paid the most at 5s.,6d.

<sup>39</sup> 'ate Churche', presumably lived by the church (or at least had some connection with it).

<sup>40</sup> 'le Clerk' would probably be the clerk to the church or the manor.

<sup>41</sup> The village cooper.

<sup>42</sup> 'ate Crofte' – a crofter.

<sup>43</sup> 'Feld' and 'Felde' would live by the field – presumably the Town Field to the north of the High Street.

<sup>44</sup> 'ate Forde' presumably lived by the ford, but which local ford is uncertain.

<sup>45</sup> The village fuller, presumably working at the fulling mill.

<sup>46</sup> 'la Goldhorde' was first recorded in a deed of 1229, and is thought to refer to a hoard of gold discovered sometime in the area before that date, p157 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>47</sup> 'ate Hacche' presumably lived by the gate, although where exactly that was is not known.

## MID 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY OLD WOKING

Willelmo	ate	Hale <sup>48</sup>	3	3
Simone	ate	Halle	4	1
Willelmo	ate	Halle <sup>49</sup>		8
Johanne		Hamond	4	10
Willelmo		Hamond <sup>50</sup>	4	2
Stephano		Hereward	2	2
Willelmo		Hereward <sup>51</sup>		10
Johanne		Hesegar	3	4
Johanne	le	Heyward	2	10
Willelmo	ate	Hok <sup>52</sup>		10
Radulfo	de	Hoo <sup>53</sup>		8
Radulfo	de	Horton <sup>54</sup>		8
Alicia		Hugh		10
Thoma		Hugh		8
Agatha	ate	Hulle		8
Willelmo	onle	Hulle <sup>55</sup>	1	7
Johanne	ate	Hurne <sup>56</sup>	1	3
Waltero		Justic <sup>57</sup>	3	3
Margareta	comitissa	Kancie <sup>58</sup>	2	8
		Kancie for		
Margareta	comitissa	Sutton <sup>59</sup>	2	8
Willelmo	le	Knyzft <sup>60</sup>	3	7
Willelmo	ate	Lane <sup>61</sup>	4	1
Willelmo		Laste <sup>62</sup>		8
Johanne	ate	Lee	1	1
Johanne	ate	Lee	5	
Wilelmo	ate	Lee <sup>63</sup>	4	
Phillippo	de	Lond <sup>64</sup>		8
Roberto	le	Mason <sup>65</sup>	2	
Ricardo	ate	Mersshe <sup>66</sup>	4	10
Willelmo		Monaco		8
Willelmo	ate	More <sup>67</sup>	2	1
Johanne	ate	Morhacche <sup>68</sup>	2	1
Johanne	de	Mous-hulle <sup>69</sup>	4	11
Alicia		Muleward		8
Ricardo	le	Muleward <sup>70</sup>	1	1
Ada	ate	Mulle	2	10
Simone	ate	Mulle <sup>71</sup>		8
Johanne		Olaf	2	6
Johanne		Ouerbrok <sup>72</sup>	2	8
Ada		Pilegrim <sup>73</sup>		11
Johanne	ate	Rude <sup>74</sup>	5	2 <sup>75</sup>
Nicholao	de le	Rune	1	

<sup>48</sup> 'at Hale' is thought to be associated with Hale End, p160 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>49</sup> 'at Halle' presumably lived at the Hall – i.e. the manor house.

<sup>50</sup> 'Hamond' is a longer version of 'Hamo', meaning home.

<sup>51</sup> The village hayward – an official who supervised the repair of manorial or parish fences, looked after the common stock of animals and impounded stray cattle, p38 B162 (Richardson 1989)

<sup>52</sup> 'ate Hok' is thought to be what we now know as Hook Heath, p158 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>53</sup> p101, item 61 (1331-2) 5<sup>th</sup> Ed III (Lewis 1894) notes the transfer of land at Wokkyngg and Bromlygh from Henry Baynard to Ralph de Hoo and his wife Juliana.

<sup>54</sup> 'de Horton' probably means that he comes from a place called Horton (a common place name) meaning a 'farm on muddy soil'.

<sup>55</sup> 'ate Hulle' is thought to mean 'by the hole' – either a natural hollow, or maybe a man-made pit of some kind.

<sup>56</sup> In Old English a 'hyrne' or 'herne' is a corner or angle (sometimes meaning a bend in a river)

<sup>57</sup> Presumably 'justic' had something to do with the law.

<sup>58</sup> The Countess of Kent for her Manor of Woking

<sup>59</sup> The Countess of Kent for her manor of Sutton

<sup>60</sup> 'The Knife' – it is not clear whether he made them or used them

<sup>61</sup> 'ate Lane' presumably lived in the lane, but which lane is not certain.

<sup>62</sup> The village cobbler or shoemaker who have used a 'last' in his trade

<sup>63</sup> A 'lee, 'ley' or 'lye' in Old English is a 'forest clearing' – as in the modern St John's Lye and Brookwood Lye.

<sup>64</sup> 'de Lond' is thought to mean from London, although it is possible there is some connection to the Celtic word meaning 'wild'

<sup>65</sup> A mason.

<sup>66</sup> 'ate mersshe' presumably lived near the marsh or boggy area

<sup>67</sup> 'ate More' is thought to be connected to Moor Lane, p160 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>68</sup> 'ate Morhacche' is presumably Moor Hatch, although not necessarily connected to the property of that name now.

<sup>69</sup> A mousehole?

<sup>70</sup> The Miller – Mill-ward

<sup>71</sup> At the mill

<sup>72</sup> Over the brook

<sup>73</sup> A pilgrim

<sup>74</sup> Presumably connected to Rude Hall at Goldsworth or possibly 'rude' as in 'cross'

<sup>75</sup> Apart from the Countess of Kent (who paid 2s.8d. for two properties), Johanne (and Ada Chuleburgh), paid the most at 5s.,6d.

# MID 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY OLD WOKING

Radulfo	ate	Rune <sup>76</sup>	1	11
Waltero	de	Runtele <sup>77</sup>	3	1
Ada		Rynuld	1	3
Rogero	le	Smyth	1	5
Willelmo	le	Smyth <sup>78</sup>	2	5
Willelmo	le	Smyth do hoo <sup>79</sup>	4	
Willelmo		Snowesmere <sup>80</sup>	1	8
Simone	de	Stanstede <sup>81</sup>	2	8
Willelmo	ate	Stygahale	4	9
Henrico	ate	Styghele <sup>82</sup>	4	8
Roberto	le	Taillur <sup>83</sup>		10
Johanne	de	Thelebrug	1	8
Thoma	de	Thelebrug	1	9
Ada	de	Tholebrug <sup>84</sup>		8
Johanne		Thomas		8
Willelmo	de	Thornhull		8
Johanne	de	Tone		8
Wilelmo	ate	Watere <sup>85</sup>	1	4
Johanne	le	Webbe <sup>86</sup>	1	
Ricardo	ate	Welle <sup>87</sup>	2	4
Johanne	ate	Wode <sup>88</sup>	2	8
Johanne	ate	Wychegh <sup>89</sup>	1	1
Willelmo	ate	Wycherghere	1	7
Willelmo	ate	Wyehegh		8

## APPENDIX TWO

Based on a survey carried out on the in 1353 upon the death of John, Earl of Kent (Based on Manning & Bray, p120)

1. A Capital Messuage inclosed with Moats <sup>90</sup>	£0.00s.0d
2. ci acres of Arable, more or less, whereof two thirds may be sown, and when sown is worth 8d. an acre; of the yearly value of	£2.05s.0d
3. xcviij acres and one rood of Meadow, in different parcels, at 12d. an acre only for mowing, being subject to floods; the Pasture, common	£4.17s.3d
4. A several Pasture, of the value of 3s.4d. in summer; in winter noting, because always flooded	£0.03s.4d
5. Another Pasture, called Kingswode <sup>91</sup> , worth 1s.6d. in summer, in winter nothing because always flooded	£0.01s.6d
6. A Park inclosed, the Pasture whereof, beside feeding the Deer, is worth	£0.10s.0d
7. The Underwood of the same, being cut before the Lord died, is not known	£0.00s.0d
8. The Pannage of the same, in winter, is worth	£0.03s.0d
9. A Pasture in Coresbrook, common in winter, valued in Summer, at	£0.05s.0d
10. A Water-mill; weak and ruinous, of the annual value of	£0.06s.8d
11. A Fulling-mill, let to Ralph the Fuller, at a yearly rent of	£0.08s.0d
12. Assised Rent of free Tenents, and ten Natives	£20.15s.0½d
13. Salt-silver, being a compositiion for carriage of Salt at Michaelmas	£0.04s.6d
14. A Render of Hens at Christmas, 8s.8d and a Pound of Pepper, 1s	£0.09s.8d
15. A free Fishery, of the yearly value of	£0.03s.4d
16. Works of Customary Tenants in mowing-time and harvest, formerly worth 40s per annum; but now, as there are fewer Tenants, the Lord having taken many tenements into his own hands, only	£0.10s.0d
The whole being holden of the King in chief, by the service of half a Knight's fee	
Beside which, there were at la Hoke, a member of Woking	
XI acres of Arable land, which when sown, were worth 4d. per acre and of the yearly value of	£0.13s.4d
When not sown, worth 1d. only an acre for pasturage, being very dry and sandy	

<sup>76</sup> 'ate Rune' is thought to refer to a rune stone or cross – perhaps an earlier reference to the 'high cross' recorded in the will of Margery Clerke in 1540 (see article on Church Street).

<sup>77</sup> Runtele is thought to have originally denoted a wood (leah) withhold or decayed stumps (runt), p159 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>78</sup> The village blacksmiths.

<sup>79</sup> The blacksmith near the Hoe bridge area.

<sup>80</sup> Snawes mere is mentioned in the bounds of Pyrford, 956, and must have been somewhere on the boundary between Woking and Horsell near Knaphill, p160 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>81</sup> Stansted (in Essex) is thought to derive from the Old English for 'stony place' – so they could either have originated from there, or possibly a more local 'stony place' (Shackleford is thought to mean 'stony ford').

<sup>82</sup> 'ate styghele' (and variants) probably mean 'by the stile'

<sup>83</sup> A tailor.

<sup>84</sup> 'Thelebrug' is thought to correspond to the modern day Elmbridge, p157 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>85</sup> 'ate Watere' is probably at the water – either by the river or more likely a pond or lake.

<sup>86</sup> 'le webbe' is thought to refer to the weaving trade from the Old English webba

<sup>87</sup> 'ate Welle', presumably lived by the well – although where exactly that was is not known

<sup>88</sup> 'ate Wode' presumably lived in the wood – possibly Brookwood

<sup>89</sup> 'Wychegh' and the next name 'Wycherghere' are thought to be connected to the Wych Hill area, p160 (Gover, Mawer and Stenton 1934).

<sup>90</sup> The inquisition noting it as 'dyked' (fossato inclus' (Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem Preserved in the Public Record Office, Vol 10, 26-34 Edward III, 1352-1361 1921)

<sup>91</sup> 'Kyngeswode Heved'

# MID 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY OLD WOKING

## Bibliography

1901. *Calendar of Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, 1339-41*. HMSO.
1906. *Calendar of Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, Vol 9, 1349-1354*. HMSO.
1921. *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem Preserved in the Public Record Office, Vol 10, 26-34 Edward III, 1352-1361*. HMSO.
1895. *Calendar of Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, Vol 3, 1334-1338*. HMSO.
- Cokayne, George Edward. 1892. *Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain & United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct, or Dormant, Vol 4*. George Bell & Sons.
- Gover, J.E.B., A Mawer, and F.M. Stenton. 1934. *The Place-Names of Surrey*. Vols. XI, English Place-Name Society. Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, Frank B, ed. 1894. *Fines Relating to the County of Surrey, 1196-1509*. Surrey Archaeological Society.
- Locke, Arthur. n.d. *Woking Past - A Short History of Woking*. Woking Urban District Council (reproduced by permission of the Woking News & Mail).
- Manning, Rev Owen, and William Bray. 1804-14. *The History & Antiquities of the County of Surrey*. Vol. I. John Nichols & Son.
- Members of the Woking History Society. 2014. *Old Woking - A History Through Documents*. Woking History Society.
- Poulton, Rob. 2017. *The Moated Medieval Manor and Tudor Royal Residence at Woking Palace: Excavations between 2009 and 2015*. Vol. Monograph 16. Spoil Heap Publications.
1933. *Register of Edward the Black Prince preserved in the Public Record Office (1351-1365) Part IV*. HMSO.
- Richardson, John. 1989. *The Local Historian's Encyclopedia*. 2nd (Reprinted). Historical Publications.
- Robo, Etienne. 1935. *Mediaeval Farnham*. E. W. Langham.
- Savage, Ricahrd, and Pamela Savage. 2021. *Old Woking Test-pitting 2009 to 2019: an update, April 2021*. Bulletin 485, Surrey Archaeological Society, p2-8.
1923. *Surrey Taxation Returns - 15th's & 10th's (Part A) 1332 Assessment*. Vol. XVIII. Surrey Record Society.
1931. *Surrey Taxation Returns - 15th's & 10th's (Part B) - 1332 Assessment*. Vol. XXXIII. Surrey Record Society.
- Willard, James. 1933. "The Surrey Roll of Tax of 1332." *Surrey Archaeological Collections* Surrey Archaeological Society.