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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldingbourne</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuldram</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlavington</td>
<td>J1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnham</td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bepton</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdham</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosham</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxgrove</td>
<td>K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, All Saints</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Andrew</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Bartholomew</td>
<td>O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Martin</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Olave</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Pancras</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Peter-sub-Castro</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, St. Peter the Less</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidham</td>
<td>L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilgrove</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chithurst</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocking</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didling</td>
<td>J2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnington</td>
<td>L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncton</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnley</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eartham</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easebourne</td>
<td>K2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastergate</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dean</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lavant</td>
<td>I1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lavington</td>
<td>I3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Marden</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wittering</td>
<td>I3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egdean</td>
<td>J4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsted</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhurst</td>
<td>I2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbourne</td>
<td>J5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funtington</td>
<td>L5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffham</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halnaker</td>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harting</td>
<td>L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyshott</td>
<td>A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunston</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iping</td>
<td>A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linchmere</td>
<td>K3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodsworth</td>
<td>L7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurgashall</td>
<td>K5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merston</td>
<td>B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midhurst Castle chapel</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midhurst, St. Denis</td>
<td>O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Lavant</td>
<td>E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milland</td>
<td>E6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Chapel</td>
<td>B11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Marden</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mundham</td>
<td>N1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nytimber</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oving</td>
<td>L7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagham, St. Andrew's Chapel</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagham</td>
<td>M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petworth</td>
<td>O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racton</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogate</td>
<td>M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumboldswyke</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selham</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsey</td>
<td>K6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidlesham</td>
<td>O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slindon</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bersted</td>
<td>N2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedham</td>
<td>O7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>O8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangmere</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwick</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillington</td>
<td>E7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treyford</td>
<td>A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trotton</td>
<td>B12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trundle, St. Roche</td>
<td>B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up Marden</td>
<td>J6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up Waltham</td>
<td>H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walberton</td>
<td>M5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warblington</td>
<td>O9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne</td>
<td>O10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dean</td>
<td>K7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hampnett</td>
<td>E8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Itchenor</td>
<td>B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Stoke</td>
<td>E10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Thorney</td>
<td>M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering</td>
<td>K8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolbeding</td>
<td>E9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 46 Possible Plan Types of Minster Churches

- **Breamore**
- **Dover**
- **Hadstock**
- **Titchfield**

Post-Conquest conversion to axial tower: Rottingdean

Post-Conquest conversion to cruciform: Burpham
COMPTON
1 Probable original church
2 Chancel probably built outside original in C13 when aisles added

EARTHAM
1 Chancel probably widened in C13
2 Probable original church

EARNLEY
1 Probable original church
2 Possible original separate chancel
3 Possible east end of original unitary church

Examples of different nave proportions from the same setting out rectangle

FIGURE 47 Early Chancels and the Setting out of Naves
FIGURE 48 Nave Area and Domesday Book Population
FIGURE 49 Percentage Occurrence of Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Plans in the Study Area and Other Localities
TYPES

1. Woolbeding phase 1 (1) 5. Earham (1)
2. Cut through wall (3) 6. Mid-Norman (5)
3. Rubble (1) 7. Carved heads (2)
4. Linchmere type (15) 8. Tower doorways (7)

1.1. WOOLBEDING PHASE 1

This has a flat lintel with Escomb jambs (A). Taylor stated that on the interior the lintel rests on two blocks which are hollow chamfered on their lower, inner faces but all of the masonry is recent and appears to have been laid to form an alcove during the restoration (sh.E9). There may have been a tympanum, now removed or plastered over. The exterior has only been exposed recently.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Fisher lists only one other flat-headed doorway in Sussex but eight with tympana although this is not a complete list (e.g. Wisborough Green is not included). The tympanum type is common in Baldwin Brown's Lincolnshire 'Overlap' churches.

1.2. CUT THROUGH WALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner</th>
<th>Outer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selham</td>
<td>2.60 x 770 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8 ft 5 ins x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dean</td>
<td>2.75 x 635 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9 ft x 2 ft 1 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Stoke</td>
<td>2.25 x 840 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 ft 4 ins x 2 ft 9 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incomplete Burton south nave doorway (sandstone), also probably belongs in this category.

CONSTRUCTION

All have irregularly-shaped voussoirs. (West Dean seven, Selham six, West Stoke ten). West Dean (only one doorway is now exposed) has worn, chamfered impost. Selham has impost of through stones with a profile consisting of upper vertical face, quirk, roll moulding and hollow chamfer. The jambs at West Dean were said by Fisher to be throughs but are not. West Stoke is said to contain Roman brick, now plastered over. It has a later inner rebate.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Fisher listed 19 similar 'Saxon' doorways and 14 fragments which may belong to this type, but this is not reliable. Taylor stated that doors cut straight through the walls are a probable Saxon feature and widely
distributed. He placed Selham in period C3 but did not consider the other two.4

1 Fisher, p.208.
2 Jessep, p.56.
3 Fisher, p.19.
4 Taylor, pp.537,815.

Other references
Fisher, pp.170-1, 214; Guides, 33 p.2; Nairn, pp.318,368,375; Poole, pp.36-42,58,49,537,818; V.C.H. 4, pp.80-81,99-10,194.

B. Selham north doorway, exterior

I.3. RUBBLE

Bosham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outer</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.90 m x 890 mm</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION
The head has been formed from selected pieces of sandstone, like the rubble windows (sh.2.1, A). The western jamb has been lost and the eastern jamb is indistinct.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
This may have been contemporary with the phase 1 tower windows and phase 1 chancel (sh.02). It has been described by Taylor, who listed 19 Anglo-Saxon ground floor rubble doorways.1

1 Taylor, pp.84, 805-7.

A. Bosham south chancel doorway
**1.4. LINCHMERE TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Inner</th>
<th>Outer</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linchmere</td>
<td>2.75 x 1.10 m (9ft x 3ft 6ins)</td>
<td>2.35 x 955 mm (7ft 7ins x 3ft 1ins)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>west wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easebourne</td>
<td>2.45 m x 925 mm (8ft x 3ft 1 in)</td>
<td>2.15 x 925 mm (7ft x 3ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsted</td>
<td>2.75 x 1.10 m (9ft x 3ft 6ins)</td>
<td>2.35 x 955 mm (7ft 7ins x 3ft 1ins)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>north and south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurgashall</td>
<td>2.90 x 1.25 m (9ft x 4ft 1in)</td>
<td>2.30 x 1.25 m (7ft 5ins x 4ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>west wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwick</td>
<td>3.10 x 1.40 m (10ft x 4ft 6ins)</td>
<td>2.30 x 1.25 m (7ft 5ins x 4ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treyford</td>
<td>2.45 x 1.25 m (8ft x 4ft)</td>
<td>2.30 x 1.25 m (7ft 5ins x 4ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>north and south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton (possible)</td>
<td>c. 1 m wide</td>
<td>1.85 x 925 mm (6ft x 3ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocking (possible)</td>
<td>c. 1 m wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up Waltham (fragment)</td>
<td>c. 1 m wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering (possible)</td>
<td>c. 1 m wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>north nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolbeding phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>north chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olave, Chichester</td>
<td>2.45 x 635 mm (8ft x 2ft 8ins)</td>
<td>2.15 x 635 mm (7ft x 2ft 1ins)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin, Chichester</td>
<td>fragments only lost (sh.12)</td>
<td>1.85 x 925 mm (6ft x 3ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>south nave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION**

The most complete examples have a rear arch about 450-600 mm higher than the outer. (A, B) Several apparently thirteenth-century doorways have the same feature and it is possible that at least the jambs of the inner doorway are of this period. The voussoirs are irregularly shaped, numbering between five and eight, generally crudely finished on the interior, less so on the exterior. Stones are large but not massive and there are no throughs. At Linchmere and Terwick where the doors are in the west end, there is a single-splay window of the Tangmere type above. Joints are generally narrow.

At Chichester, St. Olave the masonry is more regular and better-finished than the others. At Lurgashall (C) the masonry is generally more regular, with wide joints with a similar rear arch to Stopham, just outside the study area. It is possible that where only the outer or inner doorway survives, there was not a higher rear arch and that the doorway was straight through.

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**

Poole listed 10 doorways within seven churches in Sussex which are of this type and approximate dimensions. He considered these to have been built between 1066 and 1086. Fisher's list of Saxon doorways did not distinguish this as a type. Taylor dated St. Olave as 'probably Norman'.

---

2. Taylor, pp.156,582,685.

**Other references**

**Inner**  
3.10 x 1.15 m  
(10 ft x 3 ft 9 ins)  
  
**Outer**  
2.25 x 1.15 m  
(9 ft x 3 ft 9 ins)  
  
**Materials**  
Caen  
  
**Position**  
west wall  

**CONSTRUCTION**  
The voussoirs (12 inner, x 12 outer (A)) are irregular and roughly the same size as the blocks used for the jambs. There is a square lintel with blank tympanum and an inner rebate of 150mm. The construction method with wide joints is Caenais style.¹

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**  
Gem dates Caenais in England to 1070-1090x1100. Fisher lists six doorways of this type in Sussex but there are more, e.g. at Wisborough Green,² Baldwin Brown discussed the distribution of very similar (post-Conquest) doorways in Lincolnshire churches.³

¹ Gem, ‘Great rebuilding’, p.25.  
² Fisher, p.19; Guides, 10.  
³ Baldwin Brown, pp.394-6.

**Other references**  

---

**1.5. EARTHAM**

---

A. Eartham west doorway, interior

B. Linchmere west doorway, exterior

C. Lurgashall north doorway, interior
Inner
1.85 m x 910 mm
(6 x 3 ft)

Materials
clunch

Position
south aisle

Aldingbourne

Bosham (fragments)

East Lavant

2.30 x 1.30 m
(7 ft 6 ins x 4 ft 3 ins)

Materials
clunch

Position
west

East Wittering

1.90 x 1.10 m
(6 ft 3 ins x 3 ft 8 ins)

Materials
local sedimentary

Position
south nave

Hunston (drawing only)

North Marden

1.8 x 900 mm
(6 ft x 3 ft)

Materials
Caen

Position
south nave

CONSTRUCTION

East Lavant doorway is an almost exact copy of one in the south west corner of the cathedral as is Bosham (A). Aldingbourne is in the same style as the cathedral retrochoir. East Wittering (B) is of one order of outer chevrons and inner roundels with narrow hood moulding having narrow band of ribbon ornament on its inner face. There are nook shafts with simple abaci, scalloped capitals and moulded bases. The columns are nineteenth-century replacements. North Marden and Hunston (C) also have chevrons. The latter was of one order with rounded hood moulding, simple imposts and plain jambs of very large stones. The former is of two orders: the inner plain, the outer with chevrons, balls and hood moulding, with jambs of small stones and small imposts repeating the ball motif.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Johnston noted that ornamented Norman doorways are infrequent in Sussex. The original for East Lavant is dated to c. 1140x1150 and for Aldingbourne to c. 1188x1207. Nairn placed North Marden in 1130x40 and East Wittering at about the same period. Hunston was cruder and may slightly be earlier.

2 Johnston, 'Churches', p. 349.

Other references

Carved Romanesque heads are found on the west door at Aldingbourne (A) where they have been positioned around a thirteenth-century doorway and at Itchenor (B). Here they may be an original feature of a poorly-restored doorway which measures c. 1.8 m x 900 mm (6 ft x 3 ft) internally.

CONSTRUCTION
Both of the triangular-headed doorways (A) have lintels of two stones with jambs of roughly evenly-sized small blocks. The Bosham lintels are throughs. Bosham upper doorway (B) has a monolithic head and jambs of stone and flint rubble. It is cut straight through the wall, as are the Warblington doorways (C) which are entirely of rubble.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Taylor listed 34 doorways from towers leading into naves, with gable-headed being frequent. The Bosham doorways fall within Bosham phase 1 which is pre-Conquest (sh.02). If the double-splayed windows at Singleton are original (sh.05), then the Singleton doorway is probably post-Conquest. Taylor listed 20 external tower doorways (not including Warblington), only three of which are of rubble construction.

1 Aldsworth, 'Singleton', pp.61.
2 Taylor, pp.826.
4 Aldsworth, 'Singleton', p.65.
5 Taylor, pp.834-5.

Other references
1.8. TOWER DOORWAYS

**B. Bosham phase 1 doorway in upper tower**

**C. Warblington south doorway, exterior**
## TYPES

1. Bosham rubble and refaced windows (6)
2. Chithurst type (12)
3. Tangmere type (16)
4. Wide tower windows (2)
5. Incomplete round-headed windows (2)
6. Aldingbourne (1)
7. Double-splayed windows (6)
8. Round windows (3)
9. Belfry openings (7)
10. Twelfth-century monastic windows (3)

### DIMENSIONS

Average tower window (5) external dimensions 510 x 970 mm (1 ft 8 ins x 3 ft 2 ins). Chancel window (1) incomplete but probably of the same phase.

### CONSTRUCTION

The splays of the tower windows are of sandstone rubble construction, but the external faces are dressed symmetrically with blocks and voussoirs of Quarr stone (A). The chancel window interior splay (B) has a head composed of selected stones (not voussoirs) and rubble jambs.

### DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Taylor considered the tower windows to be Norman with later modifications. However, Aldsworth's detailed examination showed them to be original but refaced, probably in phase 2 (c. 1180-1110). The tower originals and the chancel window fit Taylor's class of large rubble Anglo-Saxon windows.

---

**2.1. BOSHAM RUBBLE AND REFACED WINDOWS**

![Bosham tower north window](image1)

![Bosham chancel window](image2)

---

1. Taylor, pp. 82, 582-3.
3. Taylor, pp. 582-3.

**Other references**

### 2.2. CHITHURST TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Interior splay</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apuldram (2) heads c. 125 mm wide</td>
<td>1.2 m x 750 mm (4 ft x 2.5 ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>head only, nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chithurst 815 x 165 mm (2ft8insx61/2ins)</td>
<td>1.2 m x 750 mm (4 ft x 2.5 ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>Blocked nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocking 600 x 150 mm (2 ft x 6 ins)</td>
<td>900 x 600 mm (3 ft x 2 ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates 600 x 150 mm (2 ft x 6 ins)</td>
<td>600 x 150 mm (2 ft x 6 ins)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhurst (2) 620 x 115 mm (2 ft 10 ins x 41/2 ins)</td>
<td>1.05 m x 600 mm (3 ft 6 ins x 2 ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>nave and chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linchmere (2) 560 x 150 mm (1 ft 10 ins x 6 ins)</td>
<td>1.05 m x 600 mm (3 ft 6 ins x 2 ft)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>nave and west end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumboldsweye lost</td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedham (2) Nave 1 destroyed 1 now high in west gable</td>
<td></td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhampnett (2) 750 x 175 mm (2 ft 6 ins x 7 ins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION**

Heads are cut from a single stone (A) except at Westhampnett. The jambs are formed of large stones with their long axes horizontal. The internal splays (B) are edged with small and irregularly-cut dressed stone.

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**

Fisher discussed similar windows in Sussex, but does not give a complete list.\(^1\) In Taylor's category of Anglo-Saxon single-splayed windows the splays are generally narrower and the jambs are most often formed of stones on edge.\(^2\) He also noted that monolith-headed windows with rubble jambs occur in Anglo Saxon, Norman and later contexts although he considered Westhampnett to be early. By implication he dated this type as post-Conquest. Poole noted the type in his list of 'Domesday A-churches' and considered the upward edge of the sill to be a Norman characteristic.\(^3\) Johnston considered Chithurst's internal splay to be narrow and therefore early, dating it to c. 1080, comparing it with Hardham, but most of the splays are about the same size.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Fisher, pp.81,211.  
\(^2\) Taylor, pp.847-852.  
\(^3\) Poole, pp.51,55,67-8,71.  

**Other references**

### 2.3. TANGMERE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Interior splay</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnham</td>
<td>660 x 225 mm</td>
<td>1.2 m x 750 mm</td>
<td>Pulborough nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft 2 ins x 9 ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 x 200 mm</td>
<td>1.2 m x 750 mm</td>
<td>Pulborough nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft x 8 ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lavant</td>
<td>600 x 200 mm</td>
<td>1.2 m x 750 mm</td>
<td>Pulborough nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft x 8 ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastergate</td>
<td>580 x 185 m</td>
<td>1.35 m x 825 mm</td>
<td>sandstone north chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft 5 ins x 7½ ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft 6 ins x 2 ft 9 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Marden</td>
<td>625 mm x 200 mm</td>
<td>1.45 m x 1.17 m</td>
<td>sandstone west gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft 1 in x 8 ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft 9 ins x 3 ft 10 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slindon (2)</td>
<td>550 x 175 mm</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 ft 10 ins x 7 ins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangmere (4)</td>
<td>600 mm x 200 mm</td>
<td>1.2 m x 750 mm</td>
<td>Pulborough nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft x 8 ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwick</td>
<td>600 mm x 200 mm</td>
<td>1.1 m x 750 mm</td>
<td>sandstone west gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft x 8 ins)</td>
<td>(3 ft 8 ins x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorney (2)</td>
<td>600 mm x 200 mm</td>
<td>1.2 m x 760 mm</td>
<td>limestone nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft x 8 ins)</td>
<td>(4 ft x 2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wittering</td>
<td>Largely lost</td>
<td></td>
<td>local sedimentary nave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION**

The type is very similar to Chithurst with a monolithic head (A) and internal splay, but the windows are wider. One of the Tangmere windows has a re-used carving in Pulborough Stone at its head (B).  

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**

The V.C.H. and Nairn generally describe these windows as ‘Norman’. Taylor considered that Tangmere and Eastergate might be Anglo-Saxon but that there is no conclusive evidence.  

1. Tweddle, pp.185-6.  

**Other references**


---

A. Barnham nave window, exterior  
B. Tangmere carving in window head
24. WIDE TOWER WINDOWS

**Window Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Width x Height</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easebourne</td>
<td>900 mm x 375 mm</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 ft x 1 ft 3 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering</td>
<td>900 mm x 450 mm</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 ft x 1 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction**

Both are in the west walls of towers. Easebourne has a monolithic head, West Wittering's head is of two stones (A).

**Distribution and Date**

No discussion of this as a type has been found in the literature. The V.C.H. dates both as thirteenth-century, without stating why, but dates the tower as twelfth century and the window does not seem to be an insert.\(^1\)


---

2.5. INCOMPLETE ROUND-HEADED

**Materials Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocking chancel (2)</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selham east end</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>exterior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction**

Cocking north window has three upright jambs, a springer and 10 voussoirs. The southern window has three jamb stones about 300 mm x 150 mm and two slightly larger voussoirs. Selham has three jambs with wide joints and part of a voussoir (A).

**Distribution and Date**

The Cocking windows are probably the internal splays of a Tangmere type window. They post-date a grave cover built into the chancel foundations which may be mid-eleventh-century.\(^1\) Selham is the only survival of a pre-thirteenth-century east window in the study area and appears to be one of two separate windows of the same size, similar to eleventh-century east windows in Normandy.

\(^1\) Tweddle, p. 190; Nairn, p. 192.

**Other References**

2.6. ALDINGBOURNE

Window Interior splay
750 mm x 250 mm 1.05 m x 900 mm
(2 ft 6 ins x 9 ½ ins) (3 ft 6 ins x 3 ft)

CONSTRUCTION
This window is almost certainly contemporary with the doorway beneath it, dated to 1188 x 1207 and executed by the cathedral workshop. (A)

1 Nairn, p. 77.

2.7. DOUBLE-SPLAED WINDOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Interior splay</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singleton (4)</td>
<td>1 m x 390 mm (3 ft 3 ins x 1 ft 3 ins)</td>
<td>Quarr</td>
<td>tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton (2)</td>
<td>1.10 m x 330 mm (3 ft 7 ins x 1 ft 1 ins)</td>
<td>Quarr</td>
<td>porticus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION
The windows are very similar, but at Stoughton the outer splay is less than a third of the way through the wall (A, B). At Singleton it is between a half and a third (C, D). The heads are formed from between four and seven irregularly-shaped voussoirs. Fisher stated that the Stoughton voussoirs are throughs but this is wrong. The jambs are of irregular, but dressed, stone 300 mm or more high, with wide joints.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Double-splayed windows in rubble are found at several places in Sussex in possible Anglo-saxon contexts. With dressed stone they are also found in the late eleventh century at Lewes Priory, and at Shipley which probably dates from c. 1140. Taylor gave other examples of post-Conquest windows of this type and Gem considers it to be widespread in domestic architecture up to the end of the twelfth century. Baldwin Brown considered Sussex double-splayed windows to be post-Conquest. Fernie considers them to be both late pre- and early post-Conquest, quoting several post-Conquest instances, such as Hales, while Nairn dated Stoughton as late twelfth-century.

1 Fisher, pp. 173, 196.
2 Nairn, p. 322; Taylor, pp. 348-9, 759.
CONSTRUCTION

The exteriors appear to be concrete (one stamped 1871). Interiors are of segmented modern masonry. They are equidistant along the elevation, and not related to the thirteenth century arcade beneath.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Taylor identified several round Anglo Saxon windows. The V.C.H. suggests an Anglo Saxon date, but Nairn considered them to be contemporary with the arcade. However, the nave wall had an aisle roof up to its top between the sixteenth century and the restoration of 1865. Glynne in 1848 stated that there was no clerestory when the wall was lower than at present (sh.02). They are almost certainly Victorian. It is possible that they were blocked at a lower level and repositioned in the restoration, but this seems most unlikely.

2.8. ROUND WINDOWS

Other references

Baldwin Brown, p.436; Clapham, Before, p.114; Fisher, p.60; Nairn, p.112.
Other references
Baldwin Brown, p.436; Clapham, Before, p.114; Fisher, p.60; Nairn, p.112.

2.9. BELFRY OPENINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approx. dimensions</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosham phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double (2)</td>
<td>600 mm x 1.9 m</td>
<td>chalk, Quarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 ft x 6 ft 4 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single (1)</td>
<td>550 mm x 1.8 m</td>
<td>chalk, Bembridge, Ditrupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 ft 10 ins x 6 ft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair (2)</td>
<td>400 mm x 1.05 m</td>
<td>rubble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 ft 4 ins x 3 ft 4 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phase 2 double</td>
<td>400 mm x 1.4 m</td>
<td>Quarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 ft 4 ins x 4 ft 8 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>500 mm x 1.75 m</td>
<td>Quarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double (1)</td>
<td>(1 ft 8 ins x 5 ft 10 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION
The Bosham phase 1 double openings are cut straight through the walls. They have small, irregular voussoirs and jambs Escomb fashion, with projecting stones acting as imposts. The top (formed of Roman tiles) and bottom of an apparently slender mid-wall shaft (A) survive. Although only the outline of the south opening is present, it appears to have been the same size as the north. The single west opening is also of the same proportions. There is a very wide range of materials. The pair of round-headed openings of rubble construction are also cut straight through, just below top of phase 1 of the tower. Bosham phase 2 (B) and Singleton (C) are of similar size Quarr blocks and voussoirs, but the Bosham mid-wall shaft has a chamfered cubic capital and a moulded base on a square plinth.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Double openings are widely distributed and occur in four other Sussex towers as well as Worth nave. Bosham phase 1 is in Taylor's intermediate category of belfry openings on the basis of the irregular voussoirs and Escomb jambs. Paired openings appear in probable Anglo-Saxon, but undatable contexts at Colchester. Bosham phase 2 and Singleton are similar in construction. The mid-wall at the former is very similar to some Lincolnshire types which Baldwin Brown dated as post-Conquest. Aldsworth dates phase 2 as a whole to 1080 x 1100, which is surely right, not least because it has a chamfered cubic capital.

1 Aldsworth 'Bosham', pp.59-62, 68
3 Taylor, p.82.
4 Taylor, pp.872-83.
5 Baldwin Brown, p.41.

Other references
Nairn, p.111; V.C.H.4, pp.187, 120.
CONSTRUCTION

Boxgrove transepts and nave have several large windows in Caen stone of a widely-distributed twelfth century type found in monastic buildings. In Stoughton chancel there are three windows in Caen stone rebated internally and externally (A). Fragments of masonry in the chancel indicate that there may have been a fourth. The V.C.H. considers that these may have been twelfth-century windows to which internal shafts were later added, but there is no evidence for this and it seems very unlikely. Nairn considered them to be thirteenth-century.

2 V.C.H. 4, p.124.
3 Nairn, p.344.
3: CHANCEL, TOWER AND PORTICUS ARCHES

TYPES

1. Westhampnett (1)  
2. Bosham and Stoughton chancels (2)  
3. Elsted group (3)  
4. Cocking group (7)  
5. Selham (1)  
6. Eartham (1)  
7. Bosham tower (1)  
8. Stoughton porticus (2)

DIMENSIONS

c. 1.8 m x 2.1 m (6 ft x 9 ft). The arch is known only from Hills’ 1867 drawing (A). Taylor gave a wall thickness of 660 mm (2 ft 2 ins) but the wall was completely rebuilt in 1867 when the arch was removed.

CONSTRUCTION

The jambs were of unknown stone, laid Escomb fashion. The head was of tiles c. 380 mm x 255 mm x 38 mm laid in the same way as those at Brixworth. The chancel wall was almost entirely of Roman material.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

There are no other examples of this type in Sussex, and Taylor gives no examples other than Brixworth.

2 Taylor, p. 645.  

Other references

3.1. WESTHAMPNETT

A. Westhampnett chancel arch, after Hills and Taylor

3.2. BOSHAM AND STOUGHTON CHANCELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Overall height</th>
<th>Wall thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosham</td>
<td>3.40 m (11 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>8.00 m (26 ft)</td>
<td>765 mm (2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>3.30 m (11 ft)</td>
<td>6.15 m (20 ft)</td>
<td>730 mm (2 ft 5 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

Stoughton is of Bembridge limestone with quite wide joints of the Caenals style of c. 1070-90, but not as wide as at Eartham. Bosham’s stone has not been identified.

ARCHES

The arches contain the same number of voussoirs (24 outer, 22 inner) and are of the same cross section (A, B). They are of two orders with a soffit roll and an angle roll on each side (F). On the outer edge there is a cavetto which is more pronounced at Bosham.

THE JAMBS

Both jambs have soffit rolls and two angle shafts (C, D), but at Bosham the angle shafts are set further away from the inner face of the arch.

THE BASES

The Bosham bases are large circles/ellipses c. 1.10 m x 200 mm (3 ft 6 ins x 8 ins) with half-round edges (E). They are made up of several uniform sections. They rest on square stones which are about 1.2 m x 1.2 m x 200 mm (4 ft x 4 ft x 6 ins). Above the bases there are concentric chamfered bases to the shafts. The Stoughton bases comprise three superimposed rings resting on rectangular plinths.

A-D. Sketch cross sections of arches and jambs
THE IMPOSTS
The Bosham imposts consist of a flat rectangular top with circular discs below, both cut from the same stone. Below, the capitals of concentric rings are mirror images of the bases. At Stoughton there are rectangular imposts with hollow chamfered abaci which extend across the face of the chancel wall as a string course (G), the wall being formed of similar masonry. The capitals are ornamented with very crude volutes.

The arch at Bosham is inserted. This is particularly noticeable from the chancel. Stoughton arch could well be contemporary with the salient corner plan (sh.08), unless the whole chancel wall was re-faced at the same time.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Soffit rolls are found elsewhere in Sussex at Botolphs, Sopenting and Clayton, and Boxgrove chapter house. However, Gem, Winterbotham and Bony agree that the sophisticated moulding of the Bosham and Stoughton arches (plus the jambs at Stoughton) and the distinct cavetto place them in the period 1070-90, although Fernie considers the cavetto to be of English derivation. Bosham imposts and jambs may be earlier than the arch, but not much earlier when compared to the arch moulding. The V.C.H. and Winterbotham consider that the Stoughton capitals are crude volutes attempting, but not understanding, Corinthian capitals and this is surely correct. They are very similar to Eartham’s (sh.3.6). There is nothing to indicate that the Bosham bases are the ‘in situ remains of a Roman basilica’ although the masonry appears to be Roman.

1 Gem, ‘Great rebuilding’, p.27.
2 Winterbotham, pp.77-9.
4 Winterbotham, pp.77-9; V.C.H. 4, p.124.

Other references
3: CHANCEL, TOWER AND PORTICUS ARCHES

3.3. ELSTED GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elsted</th>
<th>Rumboldswyke</th>
<th>Chithurst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To springing</td>
<td>2.75 m (9 ft)</td>
<td>2.60 m (8 ft 7 ins)</td>
<td>2.70 m (8 ft 10 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total height</td>
<td>4.55 m (14 ft 9 ins)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.45 m (13 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposts</td>
<td>200 mm (8 ins)</td>
<td>225 mm (9 ins)</td>
<td>200 mm (8 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>2.35 m (7 ft 8 ins)</td>
<td>2.30 m (7 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td>2.2 m (7 ft 4 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plinth</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall thickness</td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>635 mm (2 ft 1 ins)</td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of voussoirs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Clunch</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION

There are irregular voussoirs but no through stones. The impost are of large stones, similar in size and method of construction to Cocking (sh.3.4). Elsted impost are square (B) but the other two have chamfers and Chithurst has a plinth (A). Elsted has been inserted into a herringbone wall, but the other two appear to be contemporary with the chancel walls.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Fisher identified 16 Sussex chancel arches of plain square section. Lyminster is notably similar, but larger.¹ Twenty-four of Taylor’s 36 Anglo-Saxon chancel arches, which include Chithurst and Rumboldswyke are of plain square section.² He placed them in period C3.³ Baldwin Brown placed them in Overlap.⁴ Johnston placed Rumboldswyke as late pre-Conquest, the others as post-Conquest.⁵

---

¹ Fisher, p.19.
² Taylor, pp.785-6.
³ Taylor, pp.157,525.
⁴ Baldwin Brown, p.546.

Other references

Fisher, pp.19,105,169,80-1; Hills, 'West Hampnett', pp.34-7; Nairn, pp.170,186,218; Poole, pp.63-5; V.C.H. 4, p.5,9,172.
3.4. COCKING GROUP

To springing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cocking</th>
<th>Coates</th>
<th>Singleton tower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m (ft ins)</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 ft 4 ins)</td>
<td>(7 ft 3 ins)</td>
<td>(7 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total height

- 3.35 m (11 ft 4 ins)
- 3.30 m (11 ft)

Width

- 2.50 m (8 ft 6 ins)
- 2.55 m (8 ft 8 ins)
- 3.05 m (9 ft 10 ins)

Plinth

- 750 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
- 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
- 815 mm (2 ft 8 ins)

Wall thickness

- 750 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
- 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
- 815 mm (2 ft 8 ins)

Materials

- sandstone
- sandstone
- Quarr

Incomplete: Terwick, Compton, Up Waltham, Westbourne.

CONSTRUCTION

Complete archways survive only at Cocking (A) and Coates. Singleton (B) has an Early English arch over impost of this type and there is one through stone. The surviving voussoirs and jamb stones are similar in size to the Linchmere doorways (sh.1.4), except at Singleton, where they are larger.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Neither Fisher nor Taylor described this as an Anglo-Saxon type of arch. Johnston dated Cocking to c. 1080 and Coates to 1070-1120. It is possible that jambs of the four incomplete arches are not in situ and that there may be other survivals.


Other references


3.5. SELHAM

DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS

2.10 m (6 ft 11 ins) to springing 2.45 m (8 ft) high, 840 mm (2 ft 9 ins) wide. Limestone similar to Caen stone, including probable re-used Roman material.

CONSTRUCTION

The arch has been described in detail by Taylor and Fisher. It is semi-circular, of plain square section with three concentric roll mouldings on its western archivolt face (A). There are eight asymmetrical voussoirs on the eastern face and ten on the west. The jambs are also of square section and are offset about 200 mm (8 ins) from the arch where they are exposed on the north side. The stones are side-alternate. They have three-quarter round shafts, each of three sections. The
central sections of the north shaft are exactly the same size as the top and bottom sections of the south shaft. At the base, the floor rises by two steps. Each shaft has a square plinth which rests on the lower step and rises to the next. On the plinths, each shaft has a moulded circular base and bell-like profile.

The northern impost appears to be a section of Roman masonry with its original classical moulding on the soffit face (B). The similar pattern of foliage on the western face is less sharply cut than on the soffit but is of the same quality as the same face of the south impost. The abacus is a section of basket weave with a sloping face: the carving stops short of the edge at the eastern end and is continued on the west face. However, the soffit face appears to be more weathered than the archivolt face, and is poorly-executed at the corner. The abacus was thus also probably part of a larger piece of masonry.

The northern capital has volutes at each corner which run almost to the fillet separating the capital from the shaft. The stems then turn upwards and outwards as 'typical Anglo-Saxon palmette leaves'. The junction between arch and impost is poor, with a large amount of mortar.

The southern impost is covered in a continuous pattern of simple loops (C). The carving is irregular and quite weathered and the eastern end breaks off in an incomplete loop. There is a serpent on the soffit face and this stone, too, appears to have been re-used. The abacus has palmette leaves which are abruptly broken off at the eastern end. On the western face of the abacus the pattern is the same as the soffit face, but this has also probably been added. The abacus does not fit flush to the impost or the capital.

The southern capital was described by Taylor as a typical Anglo-Saxon device whereby the heads of the monsters occupy the upper corners, while the intertwined bodies are carved as the lower parts.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Although Taylor placed the arch in period C3, the moulding on the archivolt face and the shafts probably place it in the post-Conquest period, as discussed by Winterbotham and Twaddle. Winterbotham noted the similarity of the capitals and imposts to Bargham phase D (10 km away) which the excavator placed in the eleventh century. The columns and at least some of the rest of the masonry must be from a Roman building. It is quite likely that all the material came from this source, perhaps with the re-use of the shafts giving the appearance of a later date than may actually be the case.

1 Taylor, pp. 536-9; Fisher, pp. 170-3.
2 Taylor, pp. 536-9.
3 Taylor, pp. 536-9.
4 Winterbotham, pp. 79-89; Twaddle, p. 172.

Other references: Jessop, pp. 55-6; Naim, pp. 318-9; Poole, pp. 49-50; Twaddle, p. 172; V.C.H. 4, p. 80; Winterbotham, pp. 79-89.
3.6. EARTHAM

**DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS**
c. 2.4 m (8 ft) by 900 mm (3 ft) by 750 mm (2 ft 6 ins) thick. Caenais construction.

**CONSTRUCTION**
There are 17 radially-symmetrical voussoirs and an arch of two orders with half-round shafts on the jambs (A). On the northern side there is a capital with two volutes, very similar to those at Stoughton, with a man’s face between. On the southern side the capitals have a hare and a foot. In both cases the abacus is continued on the square respond as an impost.

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**
The distribution is unknown. Johnston’s list for the period gives no other examples. However, Caenais construction and the similarity of the volutes to Stoughton place it probably in c. 1070-1090.


### Other references

---

3.7. BOSHAM TOWER

**DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS**
2.65 m (8 ft 8 ins) high, 2.10 m (6 ft 11 ins) wide, 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins) thick. Quarr stone, Bembridge limestone.

**CONSTRUCTION**
The jambs are Escomb fashion of through stones with projecting stones forming imposts with simple chamfers (A). Above these, the lower part of the arch is formed by horizontal stones and the head by small irregular voussoirs of Bembridge limestone. These are a later addition, but probably not much later than phase 1 (sh.02) since pink mortar was used.

1 Aldsworth, ‘Bosham’, p.62.
2 Taylor, p.82.

### Other references
Fisher, p.58; Nairn, p.111; V.C.H. 4, p.185.

---

A. Chancel arch and nineteenth-century arches based on altar recesses

A. Tower arch
DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS
Bernbridge limestone. 3.75 m x 4.00 m x 735 mm (12 ft 6 ins x 13 ft 2 ins x 2 ft 6 ins)

CONSTRUCTION
The arch is pointed with two orders of quite elaborate moulding (A), but the jambs have columns with a simple palmette leaf design with necking and bases identical to the chancel arch (B). The simple square impost on the north side is replaced by two different and much larger impost on the south side, similar to the chancel arch string course and probably re-used. Unlike the chancel arch, the jointing is very small.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
The arches are dated as late twelfth-century by Nairn\(^1\) and Winterbotham pointed out the similarity to those in the cathedral retrochoir.\(^2\) However, it is possible that the arch was rebuilt using columns, capitals and part of the impost from the arch contemporary with the chancel arch.

\(^1\) Nairn, p.344.
\(^2\) Winterbotham, p.86-8.

Other references
4. ARCADES

TYPES

1. Round-headed arches of one order with irregular piers
2. Pointed arches of one order with irregular piers
3. Round-headed arches of one order with round piers and capitals
4. Pointed arches of one order with round piers and capitals
5. Pointed arches of two orders with round piers
6. Boxgrove type
7. Miscellaneous

4.1. ROUND-HEADED ARCHES OF ONE ORDER WITH IRREGULAR PIERS

LOCATION AND MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. arches</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldingbourne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nn Caen stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walberton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nn, Sn sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nn clunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION

Only the heads of the Aldingbourne arches survive (A). They have irregular but radially-symmetrical voussoirs with geometrical pattern painted on the archivolts and soffits. The voussoirs are of the same size and material as the archway leading from the south aisle to the south chapel (sh. M1). Walberton arches have heads of more-or-less evenly-sized voussoirs which rest on square piers with simple abaci (C). Jessep stated that the heads originally had Roman brick, but this is belied by the restoration records. The Elsted arches were cut through the herringbone wall (B). They have square abaci with a slight chamfer and are very similar to the chancel arch (sh. 3.3).

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Johnston cited only these three as nave arcades of the period 1070-1120 in Sussex. The V.C.H. considers Aldingbourne arches to have been 'probably part of the Domesday Book church'. Nairn gave early twelfth-century. Tristram considered that the paintings were contemporary with the arches, dating them to c. 1200 which is the approximate date of the south chapel (sh. M1). Walberton arcades were dated as twelfth-century by Steer, Peckham and Nairn. Elsted arches have been described by all authors as twelfth-century or Norman.

Other references

4.2. POINTED ARCHES OF ONE ORDER WITH IRREGULAR PIERS

**LOCATION AND MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. (?)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnham</td>
<td>Nn, Nc</td>
<td>clunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dean</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>clunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldingbourne</td>
<td>Nn, Nn</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION**

At Barnham and East Dean there are very small chamfered abaci and the arches appear to have been of one order (A). The two Aldingbourne arches may be of different dates. The western arch is similar to the round arches and has the same painting (above, 4.1). Pre-restoration drawings show the exterior arches as round (sh. M1). The eastern (B) arch has a chamfered edge. A blocked arch on the east wall of the tower may also be contemporary.

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**

Arcades of pointed arches of one order are quite frequent in the study area (below, 4.4) and elsewhere in Sussex, but most are supported by round piers. Johnston dated Barnham to c. 1190 and the V.C.H. dates East Dean to thirteenth-century. However, pointed arches were in use in Sussex at New Shoreham c. 1160 and Johnston himself dates the more complex arcade at West Chiltington to c. 1150. If it is assumed that there was an 'evolution' towards type 5 then this group would be earlier, but there is no evidence that this was the case.

1 Johnston, 'Churches', pp. 367-8; V.C.H. 4, p. 96.

**OTHER REFERENCES**


---

4.3. ROUND-HEADED ARCHES OF ONE OR TWO ORDERS WITH COLUMNS AND CAPITALS

**LOCATION AND MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>Nn, S</td>
<td>clunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogate</td>
<td>Nn, Sn</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering Lady Chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION**

Compton arches rest on square capitals. A small amount of crude waterleaf carving survives with simple necking below. The Rogate capitals are also square, with simple moulding (A). The West Wittering arches are much more elaborate, with two moulded orders, resting on square responds and a column of Purbeck marble with rounded bases and capitals.

**DISTRIBUTION AND DATE**

Although ornamented round arches are quite frequent in Sussex, plain ones are not. Johnston and Nairn dated Compton to c. 1190. The carving of the capitals is very similar to West Wittering nave (c. 1180) below. The Rogate arcade is dated to the twelfth century and West Wittering to c. 1200.

1 Johnston, p. 368; Nairn, pp. 313.  
4.4. POINTED ARCHES OF ONE ORDER WITH LOCATION AND MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graffham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sn Nn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorney</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sn Nn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION

The common characteristics of this group is that the arches are pointed and of one order, with, at the most, a slight chamfer on the edge of the arch. The piers and capitals, however, vary considerably. At Graffham there are square scalloped capitals in a finer pattern than the Boxgrove type (below, 4.5) with simple necking, circular piers and moulded bases. They were re-tooled, and possibly rebuilt, in 1874 (sh.A4). West Thorney (A) also has square abaci, simple concave capitals, necking and square bases. The columns are shorter than average. At Selsey (B) there are round capitals with slightly more elaborate moulding and responds with scalloped capitals. At West Wittering round and hexagonal columns alternate and there are crudely-carved, square, foliage capitals. The Harting arches, larger than the rest (C), are supported by hexagonal piers, which appear to be modified sections of the original wall.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Selsey, Graffham, Thorney and West Wittering were placed by Johnston, Nairn and the V.C.H. in the period 1170-90 (although Nairn places West Wittering and Thorney slightly later). However, Johnston places some of the Apuldram type which have more complex moulding and arches of two orders at about 1180, so this apparently simpler, cruder group may be earlier, perhaps mid-century. On the other hand, West Wittering may be a poor attempt at carving foliage patterns of a much more sophisticated model of c. 1200. Harting has been placed outside this range (as late as the fourteenth century by Nairn) perhaps because the arches are assumed to be contemporary with later, smaller arches to the east (sh.L6), but they are surely much earlier and similar to mid twelfth-century arches cut through Overlap churches in Norfolk.

4: ARCADES

4.5. BOXGROVE TYPE

LOCATION AND MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boxgrove</td>
<td>Ruined</td>
<td>Caen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldingbourne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhampnett</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slindon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION

The surviving part of Boxgrove nave has alternate round and shafted piers (A). The former have square bases, simple necking, scalloped capitals, round abaci and plain, chamfered pointed arches of two orders. This style is identical in the churches listed. It is quite likely that they were imported as finished work direct from the Norman quarries.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

Boxgrove is generally agreed to be c. 1170 (Pettit traces the development of a transitional style from purely Norman work in the eastern part of the church). Aldingbourne and Slindon are placed in the same period or slightly later (up to 1185). Westhampnett has waterholding bases of mid to late thirteenth century style.

1 J.L. Pettit, ‘The architectural history of Boxgrove Priory’ (1853), pp.3-4.

Other references


4.6. APULDRAM TYPE

LOCATIONS

| Apuldram | South Bersted |
| Bosham | Pagham |
| Donnington | Slindon |
| Funtington | Sidlesham |
| Heyshott | Warblington |
| Mundham | Singleton (rebuilt in the fifteenth century) |

Material is mainly Caen stone.

CONSTRUCTION

The arches are of two plain chamfered orders with round abaci and capitals with simple moulding.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE

The type is so common nationally and in Sussex that Nairn called it ‘standard’. Johnston dated it to c. 1200-20. As with the Boxgrove type, many of the dimensions and mouldings are so similar that they may have been produced as standard units in the quarries or by the same masons in situ.

1 Nairn, p.272.

Other references

4.7. TILLINGTON

LOCATION AND MATERIALS
2 x 3 arches of sandstone at Tillington.

CONSTRUCTION
The arches are of two chamfered orders, with octagonal abaci, capitals of crude palmette leaves similar to twelfth-century types (Nairn called them crockets) and round piers (A). There is a western respond with scalloped capitals.

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Nairn dated the arcade to c. 1200 but calls the responds 'Norman'. It seems more likely that they are contemporary and of c. 1180 as suggested by Johnston.

1 Nairn, p. 371.

4.8. WARBLINGTON

LOCATION AND MATERIALS
Warblington south arcade 3 arches: Caen stone and Purbeck marble.

CONSTRUCTION
These are pointed arches of two chamfered orders, foliate capitals and clustered shafts of Purbeck marble with moulded bases (A).

DISTRIBUTION AND DATE
Although in a much more elaborate style, the arcade is probably of the same 1200-20 date as the northern arcade of the Apuldram type.
A1. PAGHAM, ST. ANDREW'S CHAPEL

DIMENSIONS
Unknown

MATERIALS
Sandstone

DEVELOPMENT
J.F.'s sketch of 1795 (A) shows what was probably a blocked thirteenth-century chancel arch with a sixteenth-century archway inserted. Only a small amount of this wall now survives.

Other references

A. J.F.'s sketch of 1795

A2. CHICHESTER, ST. PANCRAS

The church was damaged in the Civil War, but not completely demolished since it was used by sharpshooters. Speed's map of 1610 shows only a castellated tower but by the eighteenth century the site was a timber yard. It was rebuilt in 1751 by William Ride who chose a fifteenth-century style 'from a plan already made'. Fabric may have survived for the demolished church to have been a model for Ride. If this was the case, the footprint of the 1751 church may reflect the medieval one, comprising a nave, chancel and west tower. The church has been substantially altered since, but Gardener's plan of Chichester of 1769 (A) shows the ground plan of the rebuilt church. It is possible, therefore, that the medieval church was of two cells with a later west tower. But the church may have been completely demolished and rebuilt on a new orientation parallel to Stane St.

2 Welch, 'Rebuilding', p. 263.
3 Nairn, p. 171.

Other references
EpI/26/5,f.31; EpI/88/3,f.14; Burrell,3699f.185; Dunkin,39f.96,43f.416.

A. Gardener's map of 1769.
St. Mary

DIMENSIONS
Nave 11.60 x 4.40 m (38 ft x 14 ft 6 ins)
Chancel 5.20 x 4.40 m (17 ft x 14 ft 6 ins)
Tower 3.95 x 3.95 m (13 ft x 13 ft)
Nave walls 660 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 910 mm (3 ft)

MATERIALS
The nave and chancel have been rebuilt or refaced with flint and coursed sandstone, although the large sandstone quoin stones on the chancel may be earlier. The tower is a mixture of flint, clunch, two types of sandstone and a few large blocks of Quarr.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1/2. The walls (except the tower) have been rebuilt/refaced and the thirteenth-century lancets evident in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century illustrations have been renewed (A, C). But the present form of the church appears to reflect a two-cell plus tower plan of the thirteenth century, originally with regularly-spaced lancet windows. The nave and chancel are of the same width, separated by a nineteenth-century Early English style arch, perhaps a copy of a thirteenth-century original. There are no quoins or masonry differences where the tower meets the nave. The wide variety of stone used in the tower, some of it dressed, indicate that there was an earlier church which could have been two cell, as shown in B.

Subsequent phases: There were changes to the fenestration in the later medieval period. The tower underwent several phases of repair and massive brick quoins were built in the seventeenth century.

1 Par17/4/1-2.
2 Nairn, p.100.

Other references
Epl/26/5,f.10; Par17/4/15; Par17/12/1;
Visitations, pp.26,189; Sharpe (S);
Burrell,3699f.146; Harrison, p.45; Horsfield 1, p.97; V.C.H.4, pp.41-43.
DIMENSIONS
Pre-restoration nave  8.30 x 4.95 m (27 ft x 15 ft)
Pre-restoration chancel  3.35 x 3.30 m (11 ft x 10 ft 10 ins)
Nave walls  685 mm (2 ft 3 ins)
Chancel walls  710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint with sandstone ashlar.

DEVELOPMENT
The church was almost entirely rebuilt in 1874 (A). The two western bays of the arcade, with versions of Boxgrove capitals retooled at the restoration, appear to be all that was retained. Sharpe's illustration of the church before the restoration (D) shows probable thirteenth-century lancets in the tower and chancel.

Phase 1. The early plan is largely speculation. It is possible that there was a three-square or longer single-cell church on the footprint of the pre-restoration nave and chancel (B), but more probably a two-cell plan with a nave of approximately two-square proportions since D shows a lower roofline for the chancel.

Later phases. In the late twelfth century an aisle/aisle chapel was added and in the thirteenth the chancel was enlarged and refenestrated. The original tower is of uncertain date (D).

1 Epl/40/5510.

Other references
Epl/26/Sf.70; Epl/40/5510; Epl/88/Sf.20; Visitations, pp.32,194; PD791; M.P.1532; Tracey (S); Glynne,55f.4; Harrison, p.93; O.H. Leeny, 'References to ancient Sussex churches "The Ecclesiologist", S.A.C. 86 (1947),pp.162-4; Naim,p.231; V.C.H. 4, pp.58-60
Iping church was demolished in 1840 and rebuilt with a tower.\(^1\) With the exception of the tower, it was again demolished and rebuilt in 1885.\(^2\) At the second rebuilding it was specified that old masonry was to be cleaned and reused, but no medieval masonry in its original form appears in the present building. Burrell described the church in 1782 as consisting of a small nave and chancel but since he described churches like Duncton which were unicellular, with a partition between nave and chancel, in this way, it may nevertheless have been a unitary church.\(^3\) The only illustration found is Sharpe’s (A) showing a sixteenth-century window in the nave south wall and a lancet and priest’s door in the chancel, the last perhaps being twelfth-century with its round head and substantial imposts. At the east end, above three lancet windows, there was a small lancet, again possibly twelfth-century, and what could have been two blocked lancets either side of the east window.

\(^1\) V.C.H. 4, p.63; Epl/88/3,f.26.
\(^2\) Parl10/4/1.
\(^3\) Burrell,3699f.241.

Other references
Visitations, pp.30,196; Dunkin,431,822.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 9.55 m x 4.90 m (31 ft x 16 ft)
Chancel 5.24 m x 4.90 m (17 ft x 16 ft)
North nave wall 500 mm (1 ft 8 ins)
South nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is flint with sandstone ashlar.

DEVELOPMENT
The nave buttresses and south door are thirteenth-century. The north wall is cut by an arcade of the Apuldram type (sh.4.6) although it is very thin and may have been rebuilt in the nineteenth-century restoration. The north aisle was described as just a narrow passage until rebuilt in 1883 (C). It is more likely to have been cut through an earlier wall than to be part of thirteenth-century church so the nave may be earlier. A thirteenth-century pottery kiln has been discovered at the west end which may mean that the church was not built or extended until later in the century, or that it was disused for part of the period. The chancel is of the same width as the nave. It was rebuilt in the nineteenth century, but it and the chancel arch are apparently faithful copies of the earlier structure.
The buttress at the nave/chancel south junction is similar to those on the western corners, and the most likely sequence of development is that the chancel was built or widened after the nave.
Phase 1. On balance, phase 1 is most likely to have been a two-square or shorter nave with a chancel of unknown size (B).
Phase 2 (C) shows the probable thirteenth-century church.

1 Anon, ‘St. James’ Church, Heyshott’ (nd); V.C.H.4, pp.62-3.
2 Epl/26/5f 75; Anon, ‘Church’; V.C.H.4, pp.62-3.
3 Anon ‘Church’.

Other references
Visitations, pp.31,196; Sharpe, (S); Tracey, (S); Harrison, p.103; Nairn, p.240.
DIMENSIONS

Nave 14.15 x 4.90 m (46 x 16 ft)
Chancel 6.80 x 4.90 m (22 x 16 ft)
Nave and chancel 20.90 x 4.90 m (68 x 16 ft)
Nave walls 610 mm (2 ft)
Chancel walls 610 mm (2 ft)

MATERIALS
The church is mainly clunch with a twelfth-century doorway of sandstone from Henley Wood, 7 km away.

DEVELOPMENT

The church is now a ruin. It was recorded in detail by P.M. Johnston and R.C. Troke in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Troke suggested that a twelfth-century nave about 9 m long was extended eastwards and westwards in the thirteenth century to form the present plan (A, B). The only twelfth-century feature is the top of a blocked Linchmere doorway in the north wall (sh. 1.4). The nave south wall was rebuilt in the late eighteenth century. Troke's drawing of the north wall internal elevation shows no change in masonry at the junction shown on his plan (D). He may have had unrecorded evidence for stating that the western end of the nave had been extended, or it may have been based on the fact that the porch and windows west of it are thirteenth-century. He stated that the remains of a chancel arch can be traced, but there is no evidence of this in his drawings, the beginning of the chancel walls being marked only by a string course. Sharpe (E) showed a joint but no difference in height between nave and chancel.

Phase 1 was either a nave about 9 m long or a nave about 14 m long with or without a chancel, or the surviving unitary plan, c. 20 m long (B).

Phase 2. Thirteenth-century additions comprised a triple lancet at the east end, two lancets in each of the north and south chancel walls, the north doorway and two lancets at the west end (C).

Phase 3. A wide archway to a 'transeptal chapel' was constructed on the north side in the fourteenth century (D). Troke was unable to find its foundations.

2 Troke, Treyford, p.50; N.M.R. Treyford.
3 N.M.R. Treyford.

Other references
Par80/7/1; Par199/4/5; Visitation, p.206; Sharpe (NE); Tracey (NW); Burrell,3699f.311; Dunkin,43f.1420; Harrison, pp.167-8; Nairn, pp.354-5; V.C.H. 4, p.32.
St. Peter

DIMENSIONS
Nave 8.95 x 4.60 m (29 ft x 15 ft)
Chancel 7.70 x 4.60 m (25 ft x 15 ft)
Walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
Most of the church is flint with Quarr, sandstone and Caen ashlar. There is clunch in the blocked north doorway.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The chancel is the same width as the nave, but the roof is lower. The north walls are continuous, with no evidence of a join, but the south walls are slightly offset (A). This may be the result of nineteenth-century restoration of the south wall of the chancel separately from the nave: the flint work of the chancel south wall is different in style and has ribbon pointing. ¹ Phase 1 (B) could therefore have been either a unitary church on the present footprint, or two-square with a chancel that was later enlarged. The latter seems more likely since the north (D) and south doorways are quite far west. The V.C.H. dates the nave to the twelfth century, but there is no evidence for this other than the fact that the chancel is thirteenth-century. ²

Phase 2. The chancel was either added, rebuilt or refenestrated in the thirteenth century (C). Two single lancets survive at the east end, the one in the north wall being blocked.

¹ Peat, pp.127-9.
³ Harrison, p.137-8.

Other references
EpI/26/5f.112; Visitations, p.26; J.F.(S,N); Sharpe(SE); Burrell,13699f.281; Dunkin,43f.122; Glynne,101ff.76-7; Nairn, pp.311-2.
B1. CHICHESTER, ALL SAINTS IN THE PALLANT

DIMENSIONS
Nave and chancel 18.80 x 6.50 m (63 ft 6 ins x 22 ft)
Walls 900 mm (3 ft)

MATERIALS
Flint with sandstone dressing.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The church is a largely unaltered thirteenth-century structure. There is a triple lancet at the east end, five lancets in the south side and five in the north, probably the remains of an original arrangement of seven lancets on each side, as can be seen from B. A thirteenth-century doorway in the south-west nave wall is presumably a later addition since it cuts one of the lancets.

Subsequent phases. The west door was rebuilt in the fifteenth century and a window added above it which was replaced in 1842 with one in Early English style.

1 Sharpe (W).

Other references
Epl/26/5, f.25; Epl/38/3, f.13; Par36/8/1; Tracey (W); Burrell, 369f.165; Dunkin,39f.88,40f.2,43 f.348; L. Fleming, 'The Little Churches of Chichester, Chichester Papers 5 (1953), p.22.


B2. CHICHESTER, ST. ANDREW OXMARKET

DIMENSIONS
Nave and chancel 19.85 x 6.52 m (67 ft x 22 ft)
Walls 700-780 mm (2 ft 4 ins - 2 ft 7 ins)

MATERIALS
Flint with sandstone dressing. All external surfaces have been rendered with rough cast.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The footings and different masonry of the lower 1.3 m of the west end indicate a first phase of unknown date (B).

Phase 2. Most fabric appears to belong to a single cell of the early thirteenth century (B). Two lancets survive in the chancel, which was separated from the nave by a screen referred to in 1603 x 4. The lancets are in the same position and the church is of almost the same size as All Saints in the Pallant. The west door is also probably original thirteenth-century.

B2. CHICHESTER, ST. ANDREW OXMARKET


Other references
EpI/26/f.26; Par37/2/1; Par37/4/3; Par37/4/4; Sharpe (W); Tracey (SE); Burrell, 3699f.172; Glynne, 102f.37; Naim, pp.168-9; V.C.H.3, pp.161-2.

B3. CHICHESTER, ST. PETER-SUB-CASTRO

DIMENSIONS
C. 16.2 x 5.4m 54 ft x 18 ft.

The building had fallen into disuse by c. 1575. Depositions of 1609 give the dimensions and state that there was a door in the south wall. 1

1 Peckham, 'Parishes', pp.73-79.

Unknown

The church was demolished in 1876. 1 It was described by Burrell (c. 1776) as comprising a small nave and chancel, but Glynne (1853) stated that there they were not structurally separate, the chancel only being marked by a step down. 2 The latter described lancet windows in the north side and sixteenth-century windows on the south, which is borne out by two photographs and A. 3 These show a west entrance with a small window over it described as 'Norman' by Glynne. It is impossible to judge the proportions of the church but it was always described as 'small'. It appears to have been uncellular and twelfth-century or earlier, judging from the size of the quoins.

1 Harrison, p.82.
2 Burrell, 3699f.208; Glynne, 101f.23; Glynne, 101f.23.
4 EpI/26/f.47.

4. DUNCTON

A. The church from the south east, 1795
DIMENSIONS
Nave and chancel  17.85 x 6.25 m (58 ft x 20 ft 6 ins)
Nave north wall   660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)
Nave south wall   710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
Chancel north and south walls  710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of flint with small sandstone quoins, with seventeenth-century and modern brickwork.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The church was probably originally a single cell (B). The north chancel wall is slightly further north than the nave wall. There are plinths of differing styles east and west of the brick buttress just to the west of the chancel on the south side as a result of seventeenth-eleventh-century rebuilding. There is a southward lean in both nave walls, indicating that they were probably not rebuilt in the twentieth century and there is no internal difference between nave and chancel. Sharpe (C) showed a break between nave and chancel roofs but this is not shown in other engravings and the height of the roof was the same. The exterior difference can probably be explained by separate phases of repair and restoration of nave and chancel, and the lancet windows and north door are probably part of a thirteenth-century phase 1.

Subsequent phases. The most substantial change appears to have been in the seventeenth century when brick-edged windows were inserted in the west and south walls, butresses were also added to these walls, and high plinths added or rebuilt in the south, east and part of the north walls.

1 Epi/40/9; Dunkin,43,f.958; Epi/41/30; Epi/88/3f.29.

Other references
Epi/28/5f.55; Epi/41/30; Par133/4/19; Par 1334/4; Par133/7/4; Visitation, pp.28,211; Sharpe (SW,NE); Tracey (SE); Burrell,3669f.253; Dunkin,43f.958; Harrison, p.123; Naim, p.259; Peat, p.170; V.C.H.,4 pp.107-8.
DIMENSIONS
Nave  9.40 x 4.30 m  (41 ft 6 ins x 14 ft 6 ins)
Chancel  5.25 x 4.30 m  (17 ft x 14 ft)
Nave walls  760 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls  760 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of beach pebbles, local sedimentary stone rubble and ashlar.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The chancel roof is slightly lower than that of the nave, and although there is no difference between nave and chancel walls on the south elevation, they are of separate construction on the north. The nave is of approximately three-square proportions and has thirteenth-century lancets (C). The chancel may have been added or widened (B).

Subsequent phases. The chancel was built or rebuilt in the fourteenth century2 and the building was largely refaced and refenestrated in the nineteenth-century restoration.

1 J.F.(S); PD992; PD2342; PD2340; F/PD218.
2 Guides 46, pp.2-3.

Other references
Epl/26/51.49; Epl/40/1971; Par72/1/5/1;

A. Present state

B. Possible original plans
1. Probable east end.
2. Possible original chancel.

C. The church from the south east, 1804
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halnaker</td>
<td>16.5 x 6.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nytimber</td>
<td>15.3 x 6.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halnaker walls</td>
<td>c. 900mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nytimber walls</td>
<td>c. 750mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS
Nytimber: Caen stone, Bembridge limestone, glacial boulders, beach pebbles, Bognor rock.

DEVELOPMENT
Halnaker chapel is now a ruin, with only the lower part of the wall still standing to the level of the springing of the window arches. 1 Nytimber was restored by Guermonprez in 1903 when the eastern half of the chapel, which still stands, was discovered. 2 They are of almost identical size with three lancets at the east end, three in the south wall at Halnaker (one only surviving at Nytimber) and west doors (A, B). Both buildings were thirteenth-century, but Guermonprez suggested that the very mixed stone in Nytimber east wall, the large north-eastern quoin stones and the use of Bembridge limestone which was probably re-cut, indicated a 'Norman' chapel on the same site, roughly contemporary with the aula discussed in Vol. 1. 3

3 Guermonprez, pp.147-8.

Other references
DIMENSIONS
Nave and chancel 15.10 x 5.20 m (50 ft 6 ins x 17 ft)
Walls 800 mm (2 ft 7 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint and rubble with small sandstone quoin stones. It is rendered on the north side.

DEVELOPMENT
Phases 1 and 2. The earliest features of the church are the north (D, now blocked) and south doorways. The church may have been founded in 1174 x 80, but the doorways and the Romanesque animals heads (sh.1.7) seem earlier than this.1 West of the doors there are pairs of lancets on the north side of the chancel, a single lancet in the south wall and a triplet at the east end. The walls were rebuilt or re-faced in the nineteenth century, so that no masonry junction between nave and chancel is apparent. Sharpe showed a difference in the roofs but nothing is shown on other early illustrations.2 It seems likely that the church was a single-cell three-square church of the mid-twelfth century (B) with lancets inserted in the chancel in the early thirteenth century (C).

1 Acta,65.
2 Sharpe (NE,SW); J.F. 1795 (SE); Tracey (E).

Other references
Ep1/26/5f. 157; Gomme, p.277; Guides,28; Harrison, p.102; Visitation, pp.29,221; Burrell,3699f.335; Dunkin,43f.834; Nairn, p.373.

---

A. Present state

B. Phase 1

C. Subsequent phases 1. C13 lancets inserted.
2. C15 windows.
3. C16 windows.

D. The church from the north west, 1795 (J.F.)
DIMENSIONS
Present nave and chancel 16.0 x 5.1 m (52 x 17 ft)
Walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
Most of the church is rendered. There are quite large sandstone quoin stones and exposed patches of sandstone, pebbles and (probably post-medieval) brick.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave plus chancel are exactly three-square. The V.C.H. states that there is a join on the south wall between the nave and chancel but this is now rendered.¹ The capitals of the arcade leading to the narrow north aisle are thirteenth-century, but the bases, as at Funtington (sh.L5), are fourteenth-century. There are thirteenth-century lancets in the north and south walls (A, B, C), a triple lancet in the east end and a lancet at the east end of the south aisle.² The first phase could have been a unitary church of the present size dating from some time before the thirteenth century (B), or it could have been contemporary with the lancet windows with the north arcade being built in an outdated style or re-using masonry from elsewhere. It is also possible that the nave was shorter, with or without a chancel, with the present chancel being added in the thirteenth century. There is no evidence for a chancel arch, so the first possibility seems likely.

Phase 2. The present arcade may have been preceded by an earlier one, perhaps contemporary with the lancets at the east end of the church, being rebuilt in the fourteenth century.³

¹ V.C.H.4, p.159.
² V.C.H.4, p.159.
³ V.C.H.4, p.159.

Other references
EpI/28/5f.93; Visitations, pp.27,215-16; J.F.(SE,W); Tracey (E); Burrell,369f.258; Harrison, p.125; Horsfield 2, p.49; Nairn, p.207; Peat, pp.105-10.
The medieval church was pulled down and completely rebuilt at some time between 1804 (A) and the mid nineteenth century and was again rebuilt in the 1870s. The demolished church was a single cell building (A, B) with large quoins, at least at the east end, and windows which could have been thirteenth-century lancets, as well as much later ones. From A and B, the proportions appear to have been roughly three-square.

1 Glynne, 101f. 35; Naim, p. 283; Harrison, p. 65; Epl/40/509.

Other references
Epl/26/5f. 98; Epl/88/3f. 31.

A. The church from the south east, 1804 (Sharpe)

B. The church from the north east, 1779 (Grimm)

B12. THE TRUNDLE, ST. ROCHE

DIMENSIONS
4.30 m x 3.35 m (14 ft X 11 ft)

DEVELOPMENT
A chapel was still standing in 1723 (A) although it had been a ruin since 1570. It was replaced by a windmill in 1773 and there is now nothing above the surface.


A. St. Roche chapel in 1723
DIMENSIONS
Nave and chancel  25.05 x 8.25 m  (81 ft 4 ins x 26 ft 9 ins)
Walls  915 mm  (3 ft)

MATERIALS
The church is of roughly-dressed sandstone with sandstone ashlar in the quoins and buttresses. The tower and some other parts are rendered. The windows and internal masonry are of Caen stone.

DEVELOPMENT
The unitary church (A) is almost entirely of a single phase, c. 1300, with symmetrical fenestration and buttresses and a prominent and uniform plinth. The tower, which has single lancet windows, is said by the V.C.H. to be contemporary with the rest of the building, but Nairn considered it to be thirteenth-century.¹

¹ V.C.H., 4, pp. 33-9; Nairn, pp. 355-6.

Other references
Epl/26/51.146; Par200/1/1; Par200/4/1; Visitation, pp. 31, 206-7; Grimm(S); Tracey(N); Burrell, 3699, f. 310; Glynne, 101; Harrison, p. 168.

From V.C.H. 4

A. Present state

20m  60ft
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chithurst</th>
<th>Cocking</th>
<th>Tangmere</th>
<th>Earham</th>
<th>Terwick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nave</strong></td>
<td>6.20 x 4.60 m (27 x 15 ft)</td>
<td>9.40 x 5.60 m (30 ft 11 ins x 18 ft 5 ins)</td>
<td>11.80 x 6.10 m (39 x 20 ft)</td>
<td>8.85 x 5.20 m (29 x 17 ft)</td>
<td>10.35 x 5.35 m (34 x 17 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancel</strong></td>
<td>3.20 x 3.35 m (10 ft 6 ins x 11 ft)</td>
<td>4.80 x 3.70 m (16 ft x 12 ft)</td>
<td>4.90 x 4.55 m (16 ft x 15 ft)</td>
<td>5.20 x 5.20 m (17 x 17 ft)</td>
<td>5.20 x 4.10 m (17 x 13 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nave south wall</strong></td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>710 mm</td>
<td>650 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>725 mm</td>
<td>785 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nave north wall</strong></td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>735 mm</td>
<td>650 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>875 mm</td>
<td>785 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancel south wall</strong></td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>630 mm (2 ft 1 in)</td>
<td>650 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>620 mm (2 ft 1 in)</td>
<td>800 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancel north wall</strong></td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>650 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>650 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>820 mm (2 ft 7 ins)</td>
<td>780 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancel arch</strong></td>
<td>660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>740 mm (2 ft 5 ins)</td>
<td>850 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
<td>760 mm (2 ft 8 ins)</td>
<td>370 mm (14 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

Chithurst is built of sandstone rubble with sandstone ashlar quoins. Most of the external walls of Cocking were refaced with flint in the nineteenth century. The quoins are mainly Henley sandstone and there is some clunch in the tower. Tangmere is mainly of flint with fragments of Roman brick, now rendered, with Quarr stone quoins. Earham is built with sandstone quoins. Clunch has been used for the west doorway and Caen stone for the chancel arch. Terwick is built of sandstone rubble with sandstone ashlar quoins.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. These churches have a nave and chancel with the chancel outer walls aligned with the nave inner walls, except at Earham (E). Here the chancel arch is twelfth-century (sh. 3.6) and the original chancel walls could well have been immediately inside the present ones (E). Nave dimensions vary between 11.9 to 8.2 m by 6.1 to 4.6 m with length to breadth ratios ranging between 1:1.94 and 1:1.68 and chancel length to breadth ratios of between 1:1 and 1:1.3 although they could all have been set out from a double square (Appendix 10). The probable original west doorway survives only at Earham (sh. 1.5) and perhaps in a completely reconstructed form at Terwick. There are, or were, west doorways on the remainder, and no north or south ones except a thirteenth-century south door at Tangmere (C).

Four churches have Overlap windows. There are four in the nave at Tangmere where an eleventh-century carving in Pulborough stone has been re-used as a head stone (sh. 2.3) one in Cocking chancel (sh. 2.5), one of the Tangmere type in Cocking nave (sh. 2.2) and one of the Chithurst type in the west end of Terwick.

Cocking, Earham and Chithurst also have Overlap chancel arches (shs. 3.3, 4.6). At Earham, altar recesses either side of the...
chancel arch were opened out as arches in the nineteenth-century restoration.\(^3\)
Extensively, herringbone work is visible at Eartham in the restored nave walls and was shown on late eighteenth-century engravings at Terwick and Cocking.\(^4\) Chithurst has random megalithic quoins of sandstone and there are large stones in the quoins of the other four churches.

**Later Phases.** Only Cocking and Eartham have seen significant development from the original nave and chancel plan (F,G). The principal change to the other churches has been the insertion of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century windows, evident in the pre-restoration engravings.\(^5\) At Cocking lancets were inserted in the chancel in the thirteenth century. In the following century the south aisle was built, with an arcade of two bays being cut through the south nave wall.\(^6\) A west tower was added and this shows several phases of modification. The final phase was the addition of a north aisle and vestry in the nineteenth century and a substantial rebuilding of the south aisle.\(^7\) At Eartham (G) the chancel was lengthened and a south aisle 1.5 m wide added in the thirteenth century.

---

\(^1\) Par54/4/4.
\(^2\) Epl/40/4184.
\(^3\) Par 175/4/11.
\(^4\) Cocking: J.F. (NE); Sharpe (E); Terwick; Sharpe (S).
\(^5\) Fn 4, plus: Chithurst: Grimm (SE), Sharpe (NE), Tracey (NE); Tangmere: Lambert (SE), J.F. (SE, NN), Sharpe (S); Eartham: J.F. (SW), Sharpe (S).
\(^6\) P.M. Johnston, 'Cocking and its church', Arch. J. 78 (1921), pp.174-204.
\(^7\) Par53/4/4; Johnston, 'Cocking', p.200.

**Other references**

Epi/26/5ff. 37,41,139,50,141; Epl/40/4146,20, 52,1997; Par53/4/12; Par53/7/26; Par53/7/34; Par53/12/1; Par192/4/1; Par175/4/11; Par194/1/12; Visitation, pp.27-29,190-1; Tracey: Cocking (NE), Tangmere (S), Eartham (S), Terwick (S); Burrell,369ff.191,199,313; Dunkin,43f.237,1359,1641; Fisher, pp.79- 82,88-92,201-2; Glynne,5ff.43,101,68,74-5; Harrison, pp.75,82,163-5; Horsfield 1, pp.61, 91,96; Jessep, pp.49-50,61; P.M. Johnston, 'Chithurst church', S.A.C. 55 (1912), pp.99- 107; Nairn, pp.188-7,192,347,210-1; Peat, pp.66-8,156-7; Poole, pp.72,62-5,70-1; Taylor, pp.157,721 App B; V.C.H.4, pp.4-6,45-7,237- 8,152-4,28-30.
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nave</th>
<th>Chancel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>8.85 x 4.50 m (29 ft 14 in x 15 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td>3.75 x 3.55 m (12 ft 4 in x 11 ft 7 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates</td>
<td>8.10 x 4.70 m (26 ft 6 in x 15 ft 7 ins)</td>
<td>4.90 x 3.70 m (16 ft 12 in x 12 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selham</td>
<td>8.50 x 4.50 m (25 ft 4 in x 14 ft 10 ins)</td>
<td>3.35 x 3.35 m (11 ft 10 in x 11 ft 10 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumboldslyke</td>
<td>11.70 x 5.85 m (38 ft x 19 ft)</td>
<td>6.00 x 3.60 m (18 ft x 12 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nave south wall: 635 mm (2 ft 3 in)
Nave north wall: 635 mm (2 ft 3 in)
Chancel south wall: 460 mm (1 ft 6 in)
Chancel north wall: 460 mm (1 ft 6 in)

MATERIALS

Burton is built of sandstone, ironstone and tufa rubble with substantial herringbone work (E) and large, irregular, sandstone quoin stones.

Coates is of sandstone with small quoin stones, and is partially rendered and re-pointed.

Selham has sandstone rubble with megalithic sandstone quoins. Rumboldslyke has flint with internal and external dressed sandstone. There is occasional Roman brick and tile and patchy render.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. All churches originally comprised a nave and chancel (A-D) with three having herringbone masonry and random megalithic, and occasionally side-alternate, quoins (E, F).

According to Johnston, Rumboldslyke’s walls had large amounts of Roman brick until the 1866 restoration and according to Jessep the nave east wall, which is now plastered, had herringbone work and Roman tiles.

The north doorways appear to be cut straight through the wall at Selham and Coates (sh.1.2). At Rumboldslyke an apparently similar doorway to Selham was removed in 1866.2 There is a Tangmere window in the south nave wall (sh.2.4) at Coates. At Rumboldslyke a high thirteenth-century lancet and a window blocked with Roman tiles in the nave south wall may mark the location of early windows.3 At Selham there are the remains of a pair of windows at the chancel east end, probably contemporary with the chancel arch and doorway (sh.2.5). Coates (sh.3.4), Selham (sh.3.5) and Rumboldslyke (sh.3.3) have widely differing chancel arches, but all are overlap.

Subsequent phases. At Burton windows were inserted in the north and west ends in the fifteenth century and a thirteenth-century east window was replaced during the restoration. At Coates, Selham and Rumboldslyke, lancet windows were inserted in the chancel and nave in the thirteenth century and the north door was rebuilt in the sixteenth.4 A small lancet in the west gable of Selham church is described by Fisher as a ‘very Saxon’ feature but appears to be thirteenth-century and is in a wall substantially rebuilt in 1681.5 In the fourteenth
century a chapel was built on the south side of Selham church (H), but it was completely rebuilt in the nineteenth century. According to Dallaway, there was a tower at the west end.\(^6\)

The west wall contains a modern Decorated style window replacing one of the sixteenth century. Rumboldswyke acquired a thirteenth-century south doorway and sixteenth-century west door (I) with a west window possibly of that date above, but appears to have been otherwise largely unchanged until 1866.\(^7\)

6. Dallaway 1, p.236.
7. V.C.H.,4, pp.80-1.

Other references
Epl/26/5ff. 43; Epl/88/3ff.21,40,116,119; Visitations, pp.189-90,202-3,236,267; Grimm: Selham (E), Rumboldswyke (SW); Sharpe: Selham (E), Rumboldswyke (SE); Tracey, Burton (W), Selham (E); J.L. André, 'Burton church, Sussex', Arch. J. 47 (1890), pp.89-100; Baldwin Brown, p.456; Burrell,369ff.23,47, 188,286; Dunkin,43, pp.224,273; Glynne,55f.4,101f.4; Guides, 29; Harrison, pp.62,70,75,146-7; Jessep, pp.55-6; Nairn, pp.123,170,192,318-9; Poole, p.49; Taylor, pp.525,536-9.
St. Mary

DIMENSIONS
Nave 10.30 x 4.95 m  (33 ft 6 ins x 16 ft)
Chancel 5.70 x 5.10 m  (18 ft 6 ins x 10 ft 6 ins)
Nave north wall  585 mm  (1 ft 11 ins)
Nave south wall  585 mm  (1 ft 11 ins)

MATERIALS
The exterior was refaced with flint in the nineteenth century. Most quoins are small and modern, with a few older ones in the chancel. The north arcade is of clunch, and the rest of the interior mainly of Caen stone.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The church was substantially rebuilt in 1849. From a plan of that date (A) there must have been an original two-cell plan with the chancel at an angle to the nave (B) and probably an arch of the Cocking type (sh.3.4).
Phase 2. The church was enlarged c. 1190 (sh.4.3) by the addition of a north aisle/chapel (C) with a south aisle being added shortly afterwards.
Later phases. Subsequently, probably in the thirteenth century which is the date of the windows, the chancel was enlarged outside the line of the earlier one (C) and the chancel arch was widened, retaining the old jambs. The north aisle was demolished at an unknown date leaving the small church with the clumsy junction of nave and chancel (A) until 1849. When the nave was extended, the chancel was rebuilt on the same orientation as the nave, and the south aisle enlarged (C).

1 Epl/40/54; Par56/5/1.

Other references
Epl/28/5f.43; Epl/38/3f.15; Epl/40/46; Epl/40/3; Par 56/4/2; Par56/4/8; Visitations, pp.4,24,210; Sharpe (SW), Tracey (N), Burrell, 3699f.197; Dunkin,43, pp.514,591,606-7; Harrison, p.75; Nairn, pp.311-2; Poole, p.54; V.C.H.4, pp.116-8.

D. The church from the north, Grimm
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>9.40 x 5.45 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>6.60 x 4.25 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North aisle</td>
<td>9.40 x 3.00 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave walls</td>
<td>710 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel west wall</td>
<td>650 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MATERIALS

The surviving parts of the original nave (north, east and west walls) are of clunch laid herringbone fashion. The chancel arch and north arcade are sandstone from Henley Wood, 5 km away.  

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. Fisher asserts that the first phase (B) was a single cell, but although the chancel arch has been inserted, there could have been a chancel contemporary with phase 1. The chancel quoins are megalithic but are largely hidden by buttresses. The south doorway of the Linchmere type may have been the original entrance. It was moved to the north wall in 1873 and re-erected in the new south porch in the 1952 restoration.  

Phase 2. Two arches were cut through the north wall (C), and the chancel arch was inserted (shs.4.1.3.3).  

Phase 3. The chancel, dated by Troke to c. 1230, has been re-faced and the window masonry renewed, but the windows are copies of the thirteenth-century originals, with two lancets in each of the north and east walls and a single and a double in the south wall.

---

2 Fisher, pp.105-9; Taylor, p.234.  
5 Troke, *Elsted*, p.16.  

Other references

Epl/26/51.60; Par80/4/1; Par80/4/2; Par80/4/3; Par80/7/1; Par80/7/2; Par80/7/28; N.M.R. NBR AA 1531/7538; Visitations, p.193; Sharpe (S); Tracey (SE); For other illustrations see Troke; Burrell,3699f.128; Harrison, p.85; Jessep, pp.50-1.
A church comprising nave, south aisle and chancel was demolished in 1885. There may at one time have been a west tower and a porch, but their form is unknown and they had disappeared by the seventeenth century. The south aisle arcade was of three 'pointed' arches but there was a mid-Norman south aisle doorway (sh.1.6). Engravings and photographs show a double lancet in the west wall of the south aisle (A) and a churchwarden window in the south wall. There was massive buttressing against the west wall and irregular masonry below a west belfry which may have been part of the east wall of a tower (A). G.M. of 1792 stated that the roof of the church 'is now much lower than when first built, as is evident from the angle of the roof in the wall' although this is not apparent from A.

The earliest phase was presumably a two-cell church. The south aisle doorway dates to 1125 x 1145 and was probably re-positioned.

1 Par 108/4/1.
2 Par 108/7/5; Dunkin, 43, ff. 796-8.
4 G.M., p. 805; Sharpe (W); Tracey (W, doorway); Nibbs (W); M.P.387.

Other references
DIMENSIONS
Nave 12.95 x 5.35 m (42 ft 6 ins x 17 ft 6 ins)
Chancel 5.20 x 3.95 m (17 x 13 ft)
Walls 750 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The faces are rendered, except the east end which is flint and sandstone rubble, and the chancel south wall which is flint with Roman brick in herringbone pattern (C). Quoins are mainly modern except the south-eastern corner of the nave which are large blocks of tufa and sandstone.

Phase 1. The herringbone in the south wall and the Tangmere window in the north wall of the chancel indicate a probable Overlap two-cell church where the south-east quoins of the nave may survive from the original church (B). Paintings around the chancel windows are said to be twelfth-century. The chancel arch was removed in 1883.

Later phases. Lancets were placed in the south nave wall in the thirteenth century and there is a blocked north doorway of the same date. The nave windows are fourteenth-century and the door and window at the west end are sixteenth. The vestry was added in 1883 when the church was heavily restored but the original windows were copied.

Other references
Epl/26/ff.55; Sharp (S); Baldwin Brown, p.456; Burrell,369f.64; Glynne,55f.445; Harrison, p.84; Nairn, p.214; Taylor, App B; Johnston, 'Churches', pp.362-3.
DIMENSIONS
Nave (original) 8.30 x 5.35 m (28 x 18 ft)
Chancel 7.70 x 5.35 m (25 x 18 ft)
Nave and chancel 15.60 x 5.35 m (51 x 18 ft)
Chancel wall 790 mm (2 ft 8 ins)
Arcade wall 640 mm (2 ft 2 ins)
Nave south wall 850 mm (2 ft 10 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint with occasional sandstone rubble and sandstone ashlar quoins. 'Antique quoins' were reused in the 1875 restoration at the west end when all walls were re-faced. 1

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Before restoration (D) the nave and chancel walls were on the same alignment, but the nave was shorter (B). It dates from the Overlap period since there is a Chithurst window (sh.2.2) in the south-eastern corner. The chancel roofline was lower, and it is unlikely that there was originally a three-square church since the chancel arch, removed in 1875, would have been too far west. 2 Phase 1 was probably therefore a two-cell church with the chancel walls inside the present ones (C).

Subsequent phases. The chancel was rebuilt in the thirteenth century but there was otherwise little change until the nineteenth century when the church was substantially enlarged and rebuilt. 3

1 Epl/40/5592,5780; Par121/4/6; Par21/7/3.
2 See fn.1.
3 See fn.1.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.96; Par121/7/3; Tracey (SW); Visitations, pp.216,218; Sharpe (NW);
Burrell,3699f.264; Dunkin,43,ff.875,892;
Harrison, p.116; Nairn, p.206; Peat, pp.99-110;
V.C.H.4, p.105-8.

A. Present church

B. The pre-restoration church

C. Probable original plan

D. The church from the south east in 1804 (Sharpe)
DIMENSIONS
Nave  7.70 x 4.40 m (25 ft 3 ins x 14.5 ins)
Chancel  3.80 x 2.6 m (12 ft 6 ins x 8 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
Mainly sandstone (local Greensand) rubble with occasional ferruginous sandstone pebbles and chalk. Some stone is coursed with a sandstone plinth at the west end.¹

DEVELOPMENT
Recent survey by Magilton and Kenny shows herringbone work in the north nave wall and repositioned Chithurst windows in the south chancel wall (A). Referring to Sharpe's illustrations which show the south chancel roof slightly forward of the nave wall (B) and the north chancel wall set in from the nave (C) they proposed a two-cell Overlap church (D) which subsequently partially collapsed. It was rebuilt in timber, and rebuilt again with the south chancel wall outside the timber wall (D) similar to Didling (sh.J2). This is more convincing than the unitary church proposed by the V.C.H. and explains the timbers set in the chancel wall.²


Other references
Visitations, p.30; Sharpe (S,NW)

---

A. Present state (after Magilton and Kenny)

B. The church from the north west 1805 (Sharpe)

C. The church from the south east 1805 (Sharpe)

D. Magilton and Kenny's suggested sequence of development

---

KEY
Modern
Post Medieval
Timber

---

Cym
Norman
Sixteenth-century
1804

---
DIMENSIONS
Nave 12.30 x 5.75 m (40 ft 6 ins x 19 ft)
Chancel 5.95 x 3.70 m (19 ft 6 ins x 14 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls 690 mm (2 ft 3 ins)
Chancel walls 740 mm (2 ft 5 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of sandstone ashlar and rubble.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Until the nineteenth century the church comprised nave, chancel, south aisle and thirteenth-century tower south of the chancel (C). The irregular spacing of the south arcade which can be dated to the late twelfth century (sh. 4.7) shows that the church was originally of two cells, but although part of the original chancel north and south walls survive there are no features to date them. Phase 1 was therefore a two-cell church (B) of the mid-twelfth century or earlier.

Subsequent phases. The south aisle and tower were added in the late Middle Ages. In 1807 the tower was rebuilt slightly further east. Later in the nineteenth century, before 1853, the porch, north aisle and north chapel were built, the chancel was extended and the south aisle rebuilt.

1 Burrell, 1699; f. 128; Sharpe (NE).
2 Plans, 75.
3 Plans, 75; Glynne, 101f. 1.

Other references
EpI/26/5f. 143; J. F. (SE); Sharpe (NE);
EpI/88/3f. 39; Harrison, p. 167; Nairn, p. 351.
St. Peter

DIMENSIONS
Nave 14.65 x 5.70-5.25 m (47 ft 6 ins x 18 ft 6 ins-17 ft)
Chancel 5.40 x 3.85 m (17 ft 6 ins x 12 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls 660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)
Chancel walls 610 mm (2 ft)

MATERIALS
The church is built of flint, Roman, medieval and post-medieval brick and tile, and small amounts of several other stones. The quoins are mainly modern but there are some large stones of Quarri.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The chancel arch (sh.3.1) may be pre-Conquest, and the pre-restoration chancel west wall was constructed of Roman tile and brick. The chancel north and south walls have Chithurst windows, but, despite Taylor's assertion, these need not be pre-Conquest (sh.2.2). Pre-restoration drawings (E, F) show large side-alternate quoin stones in the east and west nave walls and herringbone work in the west. There is therefore no reason to believe the assertion of Hills and the V.C.H. that the nave was extended westwards after the thirteenth century. Phase 1 was thus a two-cell, possibly pre-Conquest, church.

Phase 2. An arcade of the Boxgrove type was cut through the eastern part of the nave south wall in the late twelfth century (C, sh.4.5), but the bases of the piers are of the thirteenth-century water-holding type. These may have been rebuilt/recut at a later date or the arcade may have been built in the thirteenth century in imitation of an earlier style.

Phase 3. Although the tower is shown by the V.C.H. as late twelfth-century, the north and west arches around the compound pier forming the north-western corner are of thirteenth-century style with moulded capitals. The upper lancet window in the south elevation is probably contemporary: the lower may be a nineteenth-century insertion (E). The upper stage of the tower was timber until the nineteenth century (E). The original two storey structure would have been in a similar position to the larger and slightly later one at Aldingbourne (sh.M1). The chapel below was associated with the cult of St. Richard of Chichester and so may date from after his death in 1253. The chancel was extended in the thirteenth century.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.126; Par207/4/1; Grimm, (N,SE); J.F., (SE); Sharpe, (SE,W,SW); Visitations, p.221; Baldwin Brown, p.456; Burrell 3699f.237; Dunkin,39f.1552; Fisher, pp.208-12; Glynne,55f.45; Gomme, p.336; Harrison, p.175; Jessep, p.41; P.M. Johnston, 'The low side windows of Sussex churches', S.A.C. 62

4 A.A. Evans, 'Westhampnett, the Parish Church of St. Peter' (nd).
St. Peter (1899), p.150; Johnston, 'Ford', p.155; Naim, pp.372-3; Poole, p.51; Taylor, pp.643-5.

E. From the south west, 1795 (J.F.)

F. From the north east, 1795 (J.F.)
**Dimensions**

Nave: 10.70 x 5.95 m (34 ft 5 ins x 19 ft 3 ins)
Chancel: 3.50 x 4.50 m (11 ft 6 ins x 14 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls: 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls: 790-865 mm (2 ft 7 ins - 2 ft 10 ins)
Tower, Internal: 2.45 x 2.95 m (8 ft x 9 ft 6 ins)

**Materials**

The exterior is almost entirely rendered sandstone rubble except the tower (exposed rubble) ashlar, quoins and pilaster strips, which are sandstone.

**Development**

**Phase 1.** The nave (B) has pilaster strips on the north and south walls and the remains of a string course on the west wall which Taylor equated with the string courses at Corhampton and Headbourne (D). The north-west quoin is megalithic side-alternate. The earliest south doorway had a square lintel, and Escomb fashion jambs (sh. 1.1). The top was replaced with a lower, round headed arch (sh. 1.4).

The chancel destroyed in the 1870 restoration was small and at an angle to the nave. It could have been contemporary with the phase 1 nave, but Dallaway says that it was built or rebuilt in the eighteenth century. The narrow west tower, similar to West Dean (sh.K7), was built in 1728 to replace a 'stipple' of unknown date and appearance. It had a west doorway with a semi-circular head until 1870 which, the V.C.H. suggests, could have been re-used eleventh-century. Phase 1 was thus probably Anglo-Saxon two-cell church, perhaps with a west doorway.

**Subsequent phases.** The chancel arch removed in 1870 was Early English in style. An east window, subsequently re-used in the present chancel, was inserted in the fourteenth century (C). The medieval fenestration is unknown: the windows shown in the earliest illustrations are probably sixteenth-century or later. Large windows at the west end of the nave were almost certainly to light the eighteenth-century gallery. They would have been roughly contemporary with the building of the tower and the cutting of doorways (now blocked) at the extreme end of the nave north wall.

---

2. Par 216/4/1.
3. Dallaway, 1, p.236.
5. Grimm (NE).

**Other references**

Epl/26/5f.166; Epl/88/3f.41; Visitations, pp.30,307; Sharpe, (W); Tracey (S); Burrell,3699f.332; Dunkin,43ff.1514,1732; Fisher, pp.216-7; Glynne,101f.74; Harrison, p.183; Nairn, p.385; Poole, pp.44-5.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 9.25 x 5.70 m (30 ft x 18 ft 6 ins)
Chancel 7.40 x 4.60 m (24 ft x 15 ft)
Nave walls 790 mm (2 ft 7 ins)
Chancel walls 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)

MATERIALS
The building is of flint with Quarr and a small amount of Caen quoin stones with a few Roman tiles.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave has megalithic side-alternate quoins with wide gaps, patches of herringbone and small patches of Roman tile. There are no original windows, although a round-headed window with Roman brick was found above the chancel arch in 1931 and is now plastered over. The north doorway is cut straight through the wall (sh.1.2). The south doorway is mainly thirteenth-century, but a jamb similar to the one in the north is present. There is no evidence for a west door. The chancel quoins have intermittent megalithic stones laid side-alternate, but with smaller joints than the nave. It seems likely that the chancel was originally smaller and was enlarged using some of the original quoin stones in the thirteenth century.

Phase 2. In addition to the rebuilding of the chancel with symmetrically-arranged lancet windows (C), a two-storey south porch was added in the thirteenth century.

Subsequent phases. In the 1841 restoration the chancel arch was widened.

Other references
EpI/26/5f.159; Par 186/4/1; Visitations, pp.221-2; J.F. (S); Sharpe, (SE); Tracey (SW); Burrell, 3699f.290; Fisher, pp.213-5; Harrison, p.161; Nairn, p.375; Peat, pp.152-3; Poole, pp.43-6; V.C.H.4, pp.193-5.
All Saints

DIMENSIONS
Nave (before 1870) 10.15 x 6.15 m (33 ft x 20 ft)
Crossing 3.85 x 4.30 m (12 ft 6 ins x 14 ft)
Chancel 6.15 x 4.30 m (20 ft x 14 ft)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint with small quoins of sandstone. There is clunch in a blocked, late twelfth-century arch.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave was 3 m (10 ft) shorter until the 1870 restoration (B). It is offset by one wall's thickness from the crossing, which is approximately square and probably the site of the chancel of a two cell-church. Either the nave was widened from the original plan, perhaps when the late twelfth-century porch and the north aisle were built, or the chancel was narrowed. The former seems more likely.

Phase 2/3. The crossing now has plastered round-headed arches of one order, probably formed during the 1870s restoration, but above there is twelfth-century work within the bell ringing chamber. On the north side, the transept and nave are cut by arches probably dating from the late twelfth century, so that the cruciform plan must be twelfth-century or earlier (C). Although the V.C.H. shows the north and south transept walls as fourteenth-century the windows (which are now nineteenth-century copies) may have been inserted. Either there was a conversion to cruciform plan followed by the construction of the north aisle, or they were both built at the same time.

Subsequent phases. The chancel was rebuilt in the 1870s but has copies of thirteenth-century lancets: it is possible that the south chancel wall was moved south in the 1870s when the buttress was at the south west corner was built (A) but this could not explain the blocked square window at the west end. Lancets in the south wall of the nave may be copies of original thirteenth-century features, but may also be part of the 1870s restoration. The tower may have been raised or modified in the thirteenth-century.

1 Peat, pp.68-9.
2 V.C.H.4, pp.95-6; Nairn, p.213.
3 Peat, pp.68-9.

Other references
Visitations, pp.28,211; Sharpe (SE); Tracey (NE); Harrison, p.78; Glynne,103ff.2-3.
**DIMENSIONS**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>13.25x6.25 m</td>
<td>(43 ft 6 ins x 20 ft 4 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original nave?</td>
<td>9.85x6.25 m</td>
<td>(32 ft x 20 ft 4 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original chancel</td>
<td>7.30x550 m</td>
<td>(24 x 18 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave walls</td>
<td>710 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 4 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel walls</td>
<td>710 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 4 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATERIALS**

The church is of flint rubble. The twelfth-century ashlar is clunch and Caen stone, the thirteenth Bembridge limestone, the fifteenth Pulborough and the nineteenth, Bath.

**DEVELOPMENT**

This is a difficult church to interpret. The evidence given by the restorer and excavator of 1866 is not consistent.¹

**Phase 1.** This was probably a short nave 9.85 x 6.25 m with a chancel of unknown length (B). Jackson found the probable remains of a small chancel arch with lateral altar recesses similar to Earham (sh.3.6) and excavated the probable original west wall. A single-splayed window of the Chithurst type (sh.2.2) in the north nave wall, one in the south chancel wall and a lost window in the north chancel wall date this phase to the Overlap period.²

**Phase 2/3.** A south aisle was added in the late twelfth/early thirteenth century (C). The arcade is of the Apuldram type. A north chapel/chantry may have built at an unspecified time. It is known only from Jackson's excavations.

**Phase 3.** The present chancel windows were inserted in the 13th century.

**Phase 4.** The next phase may have been the extension of the nave and south aisle, the addition of a north aisle and of a tower on the north-eastern corner in the fifteenth century (D). However, there is an unexplained westwards projection of the present nave south wall. Jackson's original notes show a corresponding projection of the nave north wall.² The nave may therefore have been extended to the western wall of the present tower, giving a nave 17.40 x 6.25 m (E).

**Phase 5.** According to Jackson, the north east tower was replaced by the present one in the fifteenth century. However, if E is correct, the nave could have been shortened and the tower built against a new west wall. The door to the north of this (A) could have led to a vestry or similar building against the central tower, rather than an earlier north west tower.

² Epl/40/50; Par 175/4/2.

**Other references**

Epl/26/5f.125; Par175/4/3-4; Par175/7/2; Par 175/7/6; Par175/9/1; Visitations, p.234; J.F.(NE); Sharpe (E); Tracey (NE); Burrell,3699f.110; Harrison, pp.153-4; Naim, pp.326-7; Peat, p.141; Poole, p.54; V.C.H.4, pp. 235-6.
**DIMENSIONS**
12.9 x 6.4 m (38 ft 9 ins x 19 ft 2 ins)

**MATERIALS**
The church was of flint with sandstone ashlar.

**DEVELOPMENT**
St. Martin's was demolished in 1906 and turned into a garden, the north wall of which contains masonry from the church (D) but it is not clear whether this is in situ or whether the wall (600 mm, 2 ft) thick was rebuilt.¹

Phase 1. The north and east walls were found to be 'rough ashlar work and very irregular stonework' in 1906 and the north wall still is (A, D). They were much older than the south and west walls. There is the head of a Linchmere doorway (sh. 1.4) discovered in 1906 in the north wall about 2.7 m above ground level. It looks more like the exterior than the interior face: it may have been reversed or may have been a door without a rear arch of the Lymminster type. Burrell described a north aisle in 1776 but there is no other evidence for this and it seems more likely that this was a mistake for south aisle which may have preceded the one constructed of lathe and plaster in 1802 (A). It seems most likely that phase 1 was a single-cell of about 13 m x 6.4 m of Overlap date.

Phase 2. The blocked 'gothic' window found in 1906 and still evident in the north wall appears to be fourteenth-century. Although it is possible that the west doorway was a re-used Linchmere type (C), it seems much more likely that it was contemporary with the rest of the windows, the crenelated top and tower, and probably sixteenth-century.

¹ E.G. Street, 'St Martin's church, Chichester', S.A.C. 50 (1907), pp.47-60.

**Other references**

---

D. The site at present from the west

---

B. Subsequent phases
1. C14 window.
2. Windows of unknown date.
3. C16 door and windows.
4. Churchwarden wall and windows.

---

C. From the south west, 1804 (Sharpe)
DIMENSIONS
Nave 7.60 x 5.20 m (25 ft 6 ins x 17 ft 4 ins)
Chancel 4.05 x 4.10 m (73 ft 8 ins x 13 ft 10 ins)
Nave walls 780 mm (2 ft 7 ins)
Chancel walls 780 mm (2 ft 7 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint, unidentified rubble and (probably Roman) tile. All exposed dressed stone is modern. The interior was heavily plastered in 1956. Freeman called some of the old stone 'sandstone' comparing it with the earliest stone at the cathedral, which is Quarri.¹

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. There is a Linchmere doorway in the north wall (sh.1.4), but of better masonry than most, which led Taylor to call it Norman.² 'Vast numbers' of tiles were found in the 'south walls' at the restoration.³ There was herringbone work in the east wall (demolished and rebuilt in 1831) and possibly in the south wall of the chancel. A single-light 'Norman' window, now lost, was found at the east end.⁴ A vault discovered in 1851 under the chancel was once thought to contain an arch of Roman tiles, but the whole structure is much more likely to date from the late seventeenth century.⁵ The phase 1 plan therefore probably consisted of the present footprint of the church.
Subsequent phases (B). The west doorway, east window and chancel arch (B) all date from the thirteenth century and trefoil-headed windows were added to the chancel in the fourteenth. The west window and external string course are nineteenth-century features.⁶

² Taylor, p.56.
³ Freeman, 'St. Olave's', p.218.
⁴ Freeman, 'St. Olave's', p.222.
⁵ G.M. (1852), pp.164,272-3; Freeman, 'St. Olave's', pp.218-20.
⁶ Epl/2615 f. 30.

Other references
Par42/8/1; N.M.R. NBR AA56; Fleming, 'Churches', pp.7-10; Jessep, p.49; Harrison, p.70; Nairn, p.179; V.C.H.3, pp162, 166.
G3. ST. PETER THE LESS, CHICHESTER

DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>7.20 x 4.30 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel (C13th)</td>
<td>5.15 x ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>9.80 x 6.25 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

Flint with sandstone dressing.

DEVELOPMENT

The church was heavily restored in 1862 and demolished in the 1950s.

Phase 1 (B). Three lancets in the nave north wall appear to have been nineteenth-century copies of originals: the wall was of roughly-coursed flint in contrast to the ashlar of the chancel. There was a door of the same date in the west front and lancets in the north and south walls of the chancel. A triple lancet at the east end may also have been original.

Subsequent phases. In the early fourteenth century a south aisle and tower were added (C), with lancets in the nave south wall probably being moved to the aisle wall. In the restoration of 1862 the church was substantially renewed and enlarged.

1 Ep/P/40/68; Par45/8/2.
2 Glynne, 102 f.38.
3 Peckham, 'Parishes', p.72.
4 See fn.1.

Other references

Epl/26/5f.34; Par45/1/1; Par45/8/1; Par45/8/2; Sharpe(W); Tracey(W); N.M.R.25481,25487,25488,25490; NBR AA 55784; Burrell,3699f.168; Dunkin,39ff.77-8; Fleming, Churches, pp.1-7; V.C.H.3, pp.163,166.

G4. MIDHURST CASTLE CHAPEL

DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>6.25 x 5.50 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>4.55 x 4.55 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave walls</td>
<td>750 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel walls</td>
<td>600 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapel was excavated in 1913 and dated to the twelfth century (A).1

1 Hope, Easeboume, pp.3-4.
**H1 Chilgrove St. Margaret?**

**H2 Up Waltham Ascension**

**H3 North Marden Unknown dedication**

### DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up Waltham</th>
<th>Chilgrove (from excavation)</th>
<th>North Marden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nave</strong></td>
<td>11.8 x 6.8 m</td>
<td>11.3 x 6.8 m</td>
<td>10.80 x 5.40 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38 ft 9 ins x 22 ft 4 ins)</td>
<td>(37 ft 2 ins x 22 ft 4 ins)</td>
<td>(35 ft 17 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancel</strong></td>
<td>4.0 x 4.8 m</td>
<td>5.2 m x 5.8 m</td>
<td>2.30 m x 5.40 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13 ft x 15 ft 9 ins)</td>
<td>(17 ft x 16 ft 5 ins)</td>
<td>(7 ft 6 ins x 17 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nave walls</strong></td>
<td>800 mm (2 ft 7 ins)</td>
<td>700 mm (2 ft 4 ins)</td>
<td>600 mm (2 ft 2 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancel walls</strong></td>
<td>800 mm (2 ft 7 ins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MATERIALS

Chilgrove wall footings are chalk and flint. Up Waltham is mainly rendered rubble and flint with quoin stones of Quarr. Most internal work is of Caen stone. North Marden is flint with sandstone and Caen stone ashlar.

### DEVELOPMENT

**Phase 1.** Up Waltham and Chilgrove (known only from excavation) have naves of almost exactly the same size and apsidal chancels.¹ The chancel at Chilgrove was larger, being aligned on the mid point of the nave wall, rather than the inside (B). Aldsworth considered that the Chilgrove apse may have been a later addition since there is no bonding to the nave, but the Up Waltham structure appears to have been of one phase. Unstratified pottery indicates that Chilgrove may have been pre-Conquest but there is no firm evidence, and Aldsworth considered that both were probably post-Conquest. The only pre-fourteenth century features of Up Waltham, apart from the plan are: the imposts of the chancel arch of the Cocking type (sh.3.4) re-used in the thirteenth century; the piscina formed from a free-standing capital carved on all four sides (perhaps dating from the 1140s) and the very weathered quoin on all corners except the south east. This supports Aldsworth’s early post-Conquest date. North Marden (C) is a single apsidal cell with a mid/late Norman south doorway (sh.1.6) and a probable contemporary west window of the Tangmere type (sh.2.3) but with an external rebate.

**Subsequent phases.** Both Up Waltham and North Marden had a variety of late and post-medieval windows prior to restoration. These were replaced with exact copies in the restoration of the former, but at North Marden they were replaced with mock Norman ones.²

² Sharpe, (SE); Tracey (E).

### Other references

Epl/26/ff.99,149; Par201/7/2-3.7; Visitations, pp.27,216; Sharpe: Up Waltham (SE); Tracey, (SE); Burrell,3699ff.89,196,256; Dunkin,43f.1008; Glynne,1011.2; Guides,27; Gomme, p.327; Harrison, pp.124,171; Nairn, pp.268-9,361, Peat, p.108; V.C.H.4, pp.100-1,109-10,174-5.


### Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Nave</th>
<th>Chancel</th>
<th>Nave north wall</th>
<th>Nave south wall</th>
<th>Chancel wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Lavant</td>
<td>13.40 x 5.50 m (44 ft x 18 ft)</td>
<td>10.70 x 6.10 m (35 ft x 20 ft)</td>
<td>840 mm (2 ft 9 ins)</td>
<td>940 mm (3 ft 1 ins)</td>
<td>610 mm (2 ft) re-built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Wittering</td>
<td>14.00 x 5.50 m (46 ft x 18 ft)</td>
<td>5.50 x 4.30 m (18 ft x 14 ft)</td>
<td>760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td>760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td>(2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhurst</td>
<td>15.25 x 5.50 m (50 ft x 18 ft)</td>
<td>4.90 x 3.40 m (16 ft x 14 ft)</td>
<td>510 mm (1 ft 8 ins)</td>
<td>460 mm (1 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td>965 mm (3 ft 2 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Materials

East Lavant is flint with sandstone and Lavant stone ashlar. There is brick facing to the tower. Fernhurst is local sandstone rubble, some of which is rendered. There are sandstone ashlar quoins. East Wittering is of blue sedimentary stone rubble and ashlar.

### Development

**Phase 1.** The three churches share a nave and chancel original plan with a nave c. 5.5m wide and between 15.25 and 13.40m long. The chancel north and south walls of Fernhurst are probably contemporary with the nave (there are Chithurst windows (sh. 2.2) in both, but the east end is nineteenth-century. East Wittering's chancel is the same size as Fernhurst's, but has thirteenth-century lancets and was rebuilt in the nineteenth century. The chancel of East Lavant was rebuilt in the early nineteenth century, probably outside the walls of an earlier chancel. The original chancel may thus have been similar to the present ones at Fernhurst and East Wittering. East Lavant has a mid-Norman west doorway (sh. 1.6). Fernhurst had a west doorway of unknown date which is lost. East Wittering has a mid-Norman south door (sh. 1.6) with a corresponding blocked thirteenth-century doorway in the north side. It also has a blocked window of the Chithurst type visible only on the interior north wall.

**Subsequent phases.** East Wittering has remained substantially unchanged since phase 1. Fernhurst was largely unchanged until the nineteenth century, apart from the addition of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century windows, buttresses, a probable post-medieval bell turret and south porch (D). It was rebuilt and greatly enlarged in 1858 and 1881. Only at East Lavant was there substantial medieval development.

**East Lavant Phase 2.** A north aisle or chapel was added in the late twelfth/early thirteenth century (E), separated from the nave by two arches. The arcade was completed only in the nineteenth century, at which time the external walls were completely refaced. The west aisle window is described by the V.C.H. as thirteenth-century but is of the Chithurst type (sh. 2.2). It may be in situ, or could have been removed from the nave north wall.

**East Lavant Phase 3.** A tower was built in 1671. It is on a base of flint and re-used ashlar and it is quite possible that there was an earlier
structure on this footprint. It has been suggested that the church was cruciform, but this would mean that the ‘north transept’ would have been demolished to make way for the north aisle.8

1. Epl/40/4899; Par 82/4/1-6.
3. Dunkin,43f.192; Dallaway 1, p.117.
4. J.F. (SW); fn.1.
5. fn.1.
6. fn.3; Epl/40/5592.
7. Dunkin,43ff.875,880-1; Guides,47.

Other references
Epl/26/5ff.54,61,57; Par120/4/1-2; Par120/4/6-7; Par121/713; Par212/7/9; W.S.R.O.Add.Ms.35544; Cowdray Archive,1750,1968; Visitations, pp.193-4,214,233,237,240-1,277; Grimm: Fernhurst (SE), E. Lavant (W); J.F.: Fernhurst (SE), E. Lavant (E); E. Wittering (SE); Tracey: Fernhurst ( W); E. Lavant ( W); Burrell,3699f.243,237; Guides,50; Harrison, pp.88,115,181; Naim, pp.220,360,210,1; V.C.H.4, pp.56-8,102-4,215-7.

D. Development of Fernhurst before the nineteenth century
1. C13 windows.
2. C13 window.
3. Churchwarden windows.
4. C16 ‘cloister’.

E. East Lavant phase 2
1. Re-used Chithurst window.
2. Late C12 arcade and aisle.
3. C14 window.
6. C14 window.
7. C16 window.
8. C13 door.
9. C17 tower.
MATERIALS
The church is of sandstone rubble with Pulborough stone ashlar.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Arcades of the Apuldram type (sh.4.6) but with square abaci were cut through what appears to have been a unitary nave. The north-west quoin of the nave has very weathered stones, but nothing can be dated earlier than the arcades, so that phase 1 was a two-cell church of the mid-twelfth century or earlier (B).

Subsequent phases. The arcades are probably contemporary with the chancel arch and north and south lancets which were copied in the 1873 restoration. The west window was replaced in the fourteenth century. The north aisle/chapels had disappeared and the archways were blocked by 1804 (C). The south aisle is said to have survived in a ruinous state until it was rebuilt in 1873 but this is contradicted by Burrell who described only a nave and chancel.2

1 Dunkin, 43f.14,13; Guides, 43, pp.1-2.
2 Fn1; Burrell, 3699f.23.

Other references
EpI/89/3f.8; J.F. (W,SW); Sharpe (NE); Harrison, p.40; Nairn, p.99.


B. Phase 1

C. The church from the north east, 1804 (Sharpe)
DIMENSIONS
Nave  7.60 x 4.60 m  (25 ft x 15 ft)
Chancel 4.57 x 3.70 m  (15 ft x 12 ft)
Nave walls 760 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The north and south walls are rendered: the east and west are brick. The exposed quoin stones are sandstone.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1 (B). The church was originally of two cells. There are two lancet windows in the north chancel wall, two re-fixed in the east wall and one in the west. These could be features of the church that may have been newly-built in 1218 x 1222 although the font is of the tub type and may be earlier.¹

Phase 2. In the fourteenth century the south chancel wall, containing two trefoil-headed lancets, was rebuilt on the line of the nave (C, see also E6, Milland). A window was probably also placed at the western end of the nave and was re-fashioned in a very ramshackle way during the 1878 restoration.²

¹ Chi. Chart., p.89.
² Epl/26/57.45; R.C. Troke, Elsted, Treyford and Didling (1967), pp.74-6.

Other references
Visitations, pp.206-7; Burrell, 3699f.207; Harrison, p.80; Naim, p.208; V.C.H.4, p.6.

A. Present state

B. Phase 1

C. Phase 2

---

20m
60ft
DIMENSIONS
Nave 12.65 x 4.85 m 41 ft 6 ins x 16 ft
Chancel 8.25 x 3.65 m 17 ft 6 ins x 12 ft
Nave walls 800 mm (2 ft 8 ins)
Chancel walls 650 mm (2 ft 2 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of sandstone but almost all of the masonry was renewed at the restoration.

DEVELOPMENT
The church was heavily restored in the late nineteenth century when the nave was said to have been lengthened, presumably by extending beyond the arcade of two bays of the Apuldram type (sh.4.4) which is probably original (A). Early Illustrations (C) show only sixteenth-century windows which were replaced at the restoration with Early English ones, but there may have been lancets of unknown date on the aisle nave and south chancel walls before this (A).

Phase 1 was thus probably a single-cell church twelfth-century church, perhaps c. 10 m long (B) which would make it roughly two-square, with a chancel of unknown size.

Phase 2 comprised the addition of the north aisle, rebuilding or re-fenestration of the chancel and probable addition of the chantry chapel in the south side.

1 Dunkin,44f.117; Nairn,p.215; Harrison,p.116.

Other references
Epl/28/5f.165; Visitations, p.208;
Burrell,3699f.133; J.F. (NE).
DIMENSIONS
Nave 8.5 x 5.7 m (27 ft 10 ins x 18 ft 6 ins)
Chancel 5.5 x 3.4 m (18 ft x 11 ft 1 in)
Walls 750 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of sandstone and ironstone with brick quoins and chancel arch.

DEVELOPMENT
The church is said to have been built in 1623 and the quoins and windows certainly indicate this, although there was drastic nineteenth-century restoration when the vestry was added (A). However, masonry incorporated into the west window appears to have been from an earlier building and there are very large stones at the base of the west wall. The footprint may be that of the church in existence by 1145, but the nave is shorter than those of this period.²

¹ EPL/40/1848.
² Lewes. Chart. 2, p.77.

Other references
EPL/26/5f.59; J.F. (NE); Burrell,3699f.216; Harrison, p.85; Naim, pp.217-6; Dunkin,43f.611.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 9.65 x 4.20 m  (32 ft 6 ins x 14 ft 2 ins)
Chancel 5.20 x 3.70 m  (17 ft 6 ins x 12 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls 740 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 740 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The oldest part (chancel) is rendered flint and rubble but has exposed quoins of varying materials. The remaining external surfaces are almost entirely modern and comprise flint, stone, concrete and render. However, on the west elevation older stone, including Roman masonry has been used.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The church was substantially rebuilt in 1847, but a plan prepared before work started (A) shows a separate chancel narrower than the nave, as did Sharpe in 1804 (D). A north aisle added in 1821 had its east wall at the nave/chancel junction, but the nave and chancel walls are on the same alignment. It seems likely that the north chancel wall was rebuilt on an alignment slightly further north, not least because it contained only a single window and not the usual two symmetrical Early English lancets. It is possible that the north aisle was on the site of the chantry of St Mary mentioned in 1524, but there is no direct evidence for this.

On the south side of the chancel there are two lancet windows which appear to be thirteenth-century originals, although much restored. The one on the east end had been shortened by 1804 (D). There are two similar shorter lancets on the north side. The western one is not shown in 1847 and does not appear to show any older masonry. The very weathered quoins at the east end are presumably original.

None of the pre-restoration windows in the nave survives, but it seems probable that phase 1 was a two-cell Early English church (B).

Subsequent phases. The fate of the thirteenth-century nave windows is unknown. A wide lancet window present in 1804 is of uncertain date and a sixteenth-century window was inserted in the east end. In 1847, the north aisle, dating from 1821, was extend westwards and a south aisle added. The nave was extended eastwards but may have retained some of its original masonry including re-used Roman stone. The church was further extended to the north in 1972.

1 Epl/88/3f.14; Epl/11/13/5,14/15; Burrell, 3699, f.226.
3 fn.1.
4 Par85/4/20.

Other references
Epl/26/5; Par85/4/13-4,17; Par85/12/2; Visitations, p.236; Nibbs (SW); Harrison, p.69; Nairn, p.224; V.C.H., pp.155-6.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 11.45 x 5.80 m  (37 ft 6 ins x 19 ft)
Chancel 9.30 x 3.95 m  (30 ft 6 ins x 13 ft)
Nave walls 750 mm  (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 700 mm  (2 ft 3½ ins)

MATERIALS
The walls are of flint, partially or completely rendered, with quoin stones of sandstone and Quarr. There are repairs and infilling with brick, especially the eastern buttresses.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. This is generally considered to be an unrestored thirteenth-century two-cell church, although the tub font is earlier (A, B).¹ There are four symmetrically-placed lancets in the chancel and six in the nave, a triplet in the east with a common rear-arch and north, south and west doors of the period. A wider west window, low down, and partially blocked by the tower is of uncertain age. The walls are bowed heavily inwards, but this is probably the effect of early post-medieval re-roofing which may also have caused the chancel arch to bow. The head of the latter lies above a gable-headed arch once though to be 'Saxon' (D).² It has crude torus impost, through stones with random tooling and is narrowed at the base by about 500 mm on either side, a feature also seen in seventeenth-century rebuilding of the arches at Stedham (sh.O7). It is possible that the arch was inserted in about 1625 when the improprorator was presented to the consistory court because the chancel was about to collapse.³ The brick buttresses may also be of this date. The masonry could, however, be re-used eleventh-century, as suggested by the V.C.H. and others.⁴

Subsequent phases. From the position of the blocked window at the west end (C), it appears that the tower was a later addition, although its single lancet window is the same as those in the nave and chancel.

¹ Nairn, pp.269-70; V.C.H.4, pp.112-3.
³ V.C.H.4, pp.112-3.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.148; Visitations, pp.27,210; Sharpe (S); Tracey, (SE); Burrell,3699f.36; Dunkin,43f.1142; Harrison, p.124; Jessep, pp.59-60.
MATERIALS
The church is built of flint and Caen stone

DEVELOPMENT
The nave of the monastic church was used by the laity, separated from the monks by a pulpitum (A): it was demolished after the Reformation. It had a south aisle, but unusually, the cloisters abut the north wall of the nave (which is solid and not a blocked arcade) and there is only a narrow north aisle at the west end (A). The V.C.H. and Pettit suggested that there was either a building or graveyard prohibiting a north aisle. The building would have been about 17m long (B) similar to the first church at Easebourne (sh.k2) but there is no direct evidence for it and resistivity survey showed only the inner square of the cloisters (Appendix 3).

Phase 1. The eastern archways of the transepts with simple torus moulding are the earliest standing features and are most likely to date from the fully conventual establishment of 1115, although in style they could be up to 40 years earlier. The arches east of the pulpitium are also of very simple form and there are blocked early twelfth-century windows in the north transept. The inward-facing parts of the crossing piers are additions, having late twelfth-century fluted columns. If a phase 2 tower was built resting on the outer parts of the piers it must have been very large. Pettit and others suggest that there may have been an apsidal chancel/sanctuary at this stage and that the difference between phases 2 and 3 was delay rather than rebuilding of the nave.

Phase 2. The transepts and eastern part of the nave were raised, the nave and aisles west of the later pulpitum were built and the present tower was erected in the late twelfth century. The purpose of the north aisle is uncertain. It is very narrow and could not have been built to make the west front symmetrical, as suggested by Pettit, since it is narrower than the south.

Phase 3. A pulpitum was built to divide the parochial nave from the monks' church (B): there is a piscina against the east face and two doors through it.

Phase 4. The choir was built in Early English style at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

2 The possibility of a collegiate church which preceded the monastery is discussed in Vol. 1. Recent excavations found a wall under the south arcade which cut a burial tentatively dated to the 'middle Anglo-Saxon period' (M.F. Gardener and G. Priestly-Bell, 'Boxgrove Priory: recording and trial excavation', A.C.D. (1995), pp.16-7.
3 Pettit, pp.2-5.
4 Pettit, pp.6-7.
5 Nairn, pp.113-8; Pettit, pp.8-12.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.18; Par 27/4/1-6; Par 27/12/1; M.P. 109; Grimm (interior); Sharpe (E,W, interiors); Tracey (S); Burrell,3699ff.156-8,5675 f.82;
B. Phase 1 and 2  1. Possible earlier building or graveyard.

Nativity of St Mary

DIMENSIONS
South nave 16.45 x 5.50 m (54 ft x 18 ft)
North nave 16.45 x 6.00 m (54 ft x 20 ft)
Presbytery 6.00 x 6.00 m (18 ft x 18 ft)
Tower 4.27 x 3.00 m (14 ft x 10 ft)
South nave wall 610 mm (2 ft)
Arcade 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
Presbytery walls 610 mm (2 ft)

MATERIALS
The church is of local sandstone throughout.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The earliest fabric is the south wall and north west corner of what is now the south nave (B). This has herringbone work on the exterior and a blocked Linchmere doorway (sh. 1.4). The south-west quoin is of large slabs. The west corners are shown by the V.C.H. as eleventh-century, but are obscured by later masonry. This dating may be based in unpublished work by Hope. There is a gable end weathering strip on the east wall of the tower, very near the top, showing that the roof was once higher. It may be associated with this or the subsequent phases. Phase 1 could therefore have been a three-square single-cell with high walls. Although St. John Hope stated that a narrow north aisle was built in the early-mid twelfth century, there is no present-day evidence to separate the construction of the south west corner of the north nave from the rest and it is possible that there was originally a phase 1 double plan (B).

Phase 2. There is one original octagonal pier in the arcade. The other two are either eighteenth/nineteenth-century or were uncovered when the wall forming the north side of the nuns' quire was removed in the nineteenth century. Phase 2 was therefore either the construction of a north aisle or breaking through the party wall of the double church to form an arcade (C).

Phase 3. A west tower was added in the late twelfth century (C). It has a wide twelfth-century window in the west elevation (sh. 2.4) and a very wide range of masonry sizes.

Phase 4. Hope and the V.C.H. attribute the building of the north nave and the walling off of the eastern part of the south nave (D) to the creation of a nunnery in the early thirteenth century. A presbytery may have been added at this time, but the earliest plan shows walls on the same alignment and of the same thickness as the south nave. Subsequent phases. After the Reformation, the nuns' quire and presbytery were unroofed. In 1776 Burrell described the church as comprising a small nave, chancel, south aisle and tower plus the Montague chapel on the site of the presbytery. In 1876 there was drastic restoration by Blomfield, opening up the walled-off quire, building a new chancel and chapel and renewing almost all of the windows.

1 Fisher, pp. 98-100; N.M.R. Easebourne
2 V.C.H. 4, pp. 52-3; Hope, Easebourne, pp. 95-9
3 Hope, Easebourne, pp. 95-9.
4 Epl/40/5691; Hope, Easebourne, pp. 95-9.

A. The church before the restoration

B. Phase 1 1. Possible second 'church'.

C. Phases 2 and 3 1. Late C12 tower.
2. Short north aisle according to Hope.
3. Wall or arcade.
4. North 'church'/aisle linked with arcade.

20m
60ft
Nativity of St Mary

5 V.C.H. 4, pp. 52-3.
6 Hope, Easebourne, pp. 98-9; V.C.H. 4, pp. 52-3.
7 EpI/40/5691.
8 Hope, Easebourne, pp. 95-9; Burrell, 3699 f.213.
9 EpI/40/5691; Hope, Easebourne, pp. 95-9; V.C.H. 4, pp. 47-53.

Other references
EpI/26/5f.51; EpI/40/5293; EpI/88/3f.17; Par75/4/3; Par75/4/4; Par75/4/6; Par75/4/7; Visitations, pp. 31, 192; Dunkin, 39f. 39; Grimm, (S); J.F., (SE); Sharpe, (NW); Tracey, (N); Harrison, p. 83; Nairn, pp. 212-3.

**K2. EASEBOURNE**

D. Phase 4

2. Nuns' quire walled off.
3. Original form and date of presbytery unknown.

20m 60ft
DIMENSIONS
Nave and chancel 14.65 x 4.30 m (48 ft x 14 ft)
Nave north wall 685 mm (2 ft 3 ins)
Nave south wall 535 mm (2 ft 1 ins)
West wall 685 mm (2 ft 3 ins)
Chancel walls 685 mm (2 ft 3 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of local sandstone. The older work is of variable sizes, but coursed and with large quoin stones (D). The nineteenth-century work is more regular.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. At the end of the eighteenth century the church consisted of the present nave and chancel, a rectangle 14.65 m by 4.30 m (A). There was a Linchmere west doorway (sh.1.4) with a small Tangmere window (sh.2.3) above it. Another Tangmere window, now displayed in the lower wall at the west end of the nave, was discovered higher up in the nave during restoration together with one in the middle of the south nave wall.²

The V.C.H. states that the nave was separated from the chancel by a wall, the upstand of which appears on engravings by Grimm and Petrie (E). However it was not shown by J.F. in 1795 and seems more likely to have been part of the roof.³ All early illustrations show a large corbel, still present today. This would have served no purpose if there was an upstand, but could have supported an addition to the roof which would have looked like an upstand. Moreover, there is a continuous plinth on the south side of the church and no apparent difference between nave and chancel. No partition wall is mentioned in the account of the restoration.⁴ The original plan was therefore almost certainly a single cell (B).

Subsequent phases (C). Lancet windows were added in the thirteenth century. An east window was added in the following century, and a narrow north aisle at some time before 1850.

¹ Grimm (S); Sharpe (SE); V.C.H.4, pp.69-70.
² Par 124/4/2-3.
³ J.F. (SE,N).
⁴ Tracey (N); Par 124/4/2-3; V.C.H.4, pp.69-70.

Other references
Epl/26/51.87; Visitations, pp.197-8,237,244; Burrell,6399f.332; Harrison, p.120; Nairn, p.261.

1. North aisle/chapel unknown date.
2. Possible later
3. C13 lancets.
4. C14 windows.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 12.55 x 4.95 m (41 ft 3 ins x 16 ft 3 ins)
Original chancel 5.00 x 4.20 m (16 ft 6 ins x 13 ft 9 ins)
Nave walls 630 mm (2 ft 1 ins)

MATERIALS: The building is of local sandstone of two different types.

DEVELOPMENT
Until the 1840s the church consisted of nave, chancel and tower (C). The development of the nineteenth-century church with transepts, arcades and aisles is described in a notebook of the Hollist family.¹
Phase 1. The western end of the nave has large, probably side-alternate quoins (the north and south faces are hidden by the nineteenth-century aisles). There is a very large quoin stone at the base of the junction of the south transept and chancel which the V.C.H. describes as the "plinth of the ancient quoin".² This may be so, but the whole of the eastern end of the church was rebuilt in the 1840's when the chancel was lengthened by seven feet and the nave quoins may also have been moved.³ Before the rebuilding, the chancel appears to have been very slightly narrower than the nave, but not aligned on the inside nave wall. Phase 1 was probably therefore a roughly square chancel, and a nave with a ratio of about 1:2.55 (B). The medieval windows had been lost by 1804 (C) and while the quoins may indicate a twelfth-century or earlier date, Nairn, who supported this, was unable to give any firm evidence.⁴

Subsequent phases. The west tower was built at the end of the thirteenth century and has survived unrestored. Little else is known about the church until the 1840s restoration.

¹ M.P. 1976.
² V.C.H. 4, p. 73.
³ M.P. 1976.
⁴ Nairn, p. 264.

Other references
EpI/88/325; EpI/26/5t.89; Par128/4/1-2; Cowdray Archives, 1908-12; Visitations, p. 199; Sharpe (SE); Tracey (NW); Harrison, p. 122.

C. The church from the south east in 1804
St. Lawrence

DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nave</th>
<th>Chancel</th>
<th>Nave walls</th>
<th>Chancel walls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.50 x 5.95 m</td>
<td>10.20 x 6.55 m</td>
<td>900 mm</td>
<td>750 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

The church is built of sandstone. The older parts are of random rubble with patches of herringbone work. Other sections were probably re-faced in the nineteenth century and are of roughly-dressed, coursed stone. Quoins, buttresses, door and window dressings are of at least two different types of sandstone.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. The nave had opposite north and south doorways of the Linchmere type (sh.1.4). The former is now blocked, and only the rear arch of the latter survives. To the west there are narrow eleventh-/twelfth-century buttresses (D). The western quoin stones are of moderate size, except at the base where they are larger and upright. The lower west wall has roughly-coursed Ironstone (B), similar to Burton (sh.D1) and although Godfrey showed the wall as re-faced, this does not seem to have been the case. At the north-eastern end of the nave there is a large medieval buttress which was built into the north transept in 1855. A buttress of identical size was built in to the fourteenth-century south tower (C). The chancel has thirteenth-century lancets. It is slightly wider than the nave, with thinner walls, and not quite on the same alignment. It seems likely that the church was originally a single cell of the Overlap period (B). Phase 2. A chancel arch was probably cut through the east nave wall, perhaps contemporary with the lancets. At this time or later (the arch is fourteenth-century in style, rebuilt in 1855) buttresses were necessary to support the nave east wall (C). Subsequent phases. Phase 3 comprised the construction of the chancel. In the fourteenth century a tower was built on the south side with a prominent plinth and was rebuilt in the seventeenth.

---

1 Plans, 37.
2 Epl/40/5720,5471; Par130/4/2-6.
3 Epl/40/5720,5471; Par130/4/2-5.
4 Harrison, p.122.

Other references

Epl/26/51; Epl/40/5720,5472-5; Par130/4/3; Par130/4/9; Par130/7/13; Visitations, p.199; J.F. (E, SW, NE); Sharpe (W); PD1848; Tracey (NW); Burrell 3699f. 248; Fisher, pp.139-40; Johnston, 'Churches', p.364; Nairn, p.266.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 18.20 x 5.25 m (59 ft x 17 ft)
Chancel 9.85 x 4.60 m (32 ft x 15 ft)
Nave walls 620 mm (2 ft 1 in)
Chancel walls 890 mm (2 ft 9 ins)

MATERIALS
The chancel is rendered: it has modern stones in the quoins and windows. The external walls of the aisles have been completely rebuilt from medieval masonry which seems to have been re-tooled. The quoins have been renewed. The nave arcade is of Caen stone.

DEVELOPMENT
In 1864 the church west of the chancel arch, which at that time consisted of nave, aisles and a ruined west tower (A) was removed and rebuilt within the village of Selsey. The chancel remains on its medieval site.1

Phase 1. The nave dates from before the late twelfth century when it was cut by arcades of the Apuldram type (B). At the west end there are piers of two half-round columns with a small section of wall between (D). These could not have been to create arches of equal span, since the eastern arches are wider than the rest. Johnston suggested that they indicate a western narthex (which would make the original nave about 14 m long) but there is no other evidence for this.2 Before rebuilding, the west wall was at an angle to the nave and aisles (A), which may mean that the nave had been shortened. Phase 1 is thus likely to have consisted of nave with narthex of the same width, with or without a chancel.3

Phase 2. The unitary nave was pierced by arcades, perhaps contemporary with the lancets in the west aisle walls and the chancel. The north aisle may have continued eastwards as a chapel overlapping the nave and chancel, since the pre-1864 north aisle wall (A) was out of square and St. Aubyn, the restorer, noted the line of the former east wall on his drawing.4 Subsequent phases. The aisles (except the west ends) were refenestrated in the fifteenth century (E) and a west tower was built in 1662.5

1 Heron-Allen, Selsey, p.84-97.
3 A narthex survives in this position at West Dean in East Sussex (Plans, 23).
4 Heron-Allen, Selsey, p.200.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.120; Visitations, p. 223; G.M. 1798 (E); Grimm (S); J.F. (S,E,SE,N); Sharpe (SE,NW); Tracey (E); Burrell,3699f.289; Dunkin,43f.1203; Glynne,101ff.45-6; Harrison,p.147; Nairn, pp.319-20; V.C.H.4,pp. 208-10.

A. St. Aubyn's plan of the church before removal in 1867

B. Phase 1

C. Phase 2

D. One of the compound piers
DIMENSIONS
Nave 12.30 x 6.00 m (40 ft x 19.5 ft)
Chancel 6.45 x 4.00 m (21 ft 13 ft)
Crossing 5.00 x 4.15 m (16 ft 3 ins x 13 ft 6 ins)
Nave north walls 610 mm (2 ft)
Nave south walls 675 mm (2 ft 2½ ins)
Tower (internal) 3.15 x 3.15 m (10 ft 3 ins x 10 ft 3 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint, mainly rendered, with sandstone quoins.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave has a possible Anglo-Saxon north doorway cut straight through the wall (A, B, sh. 1.2). A similar doorway on the south side was discovered in 1934 but is now plastered over. ¹ High up to the west of both of these doors there are depressions in the wall marking blocked windows. They may have been early, but may have led to an post-medieval gallery. A tower was built in 1726 from material piled in the churchyard: some very weathered quoin stones, perhaps from an earlier tower, were re-used. ² It has roughly the same footprint as Woolbeding (sh. E9).

The length of the phase 1 church is unclear. Godfrey inspected it when it was severely fire-damaged in 1934 and reported that the pre-Conquest nave was of the same dimensions as the present one. ³ The nave is almost exactly two-square. However, pre-restoration engravings show continuous nave walls as far as the chancel. Etchell’s report after the 1934 fire stated that three of the arches at the ‘crossing’ were of brick: this is borne out by photographs in the N.M.R. ⁴ Were it not for Godfrey’s comments, the logical explanation would be that the nave was originally c. 17.85 mx6.00 m (B) but the eastern parts of the walls were moved inwards to create the crossing in the 1880 restoration in the same style and at about the same time as East Dean (sh. F1). ⁵ A third explanation (C) is that there was a chamber between nave and chancel prior to 1880, with the transepts being the successors to side chapels or porticus.

Phase 2. The east end of the chancel had thirteenth-century lancets (D), and a lancet was inserted in the nave. Unusually, there were no lancets in the chancel north and south walls, unless they had been blocked by the eighteenth century (F).

The transepts. The transepts were completely rebuilt in 1880 (E). ⁶

¹ Par65/1/6.
² Par65/4/9.
³ Par65/1/6.
⁴ NMR West Dean WHG. 1935.
⁵ Par65/1/5/1.
⁶ Par65/1/5/1.

Other references
Epl/40/5786; Par65/4/18; Par65/9/1; Visitations, pp.220-221; Sharpe (SE); Tracey (N.E); Burrell,3699f.202-3; Fisher, pp.207-8; Harrison, p.79; Jessep, p.56; Naim, pp.368-9; Peat, pp.69-71; Poole, p.48; Taylor, pp.982,986; V.C.H.4, pp.99-100.
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>15.85 x 5.85 m (51 ft 6 ins x 19 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>9.85 x 5.35 m (32 ft x 17 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave north wall</td>
<td>635 mm (2 ft 1 in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave south wall</td>
<td>485 mm (1 ft 7 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

The church is built of flint, beach boulders and clunch (tower). The ashlar is mainly nineteenth-century renewal, but there is some re-used Quarr and Bembridge limestone.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. The north wall of the nave has herringbone work. The lower masonry at the west end is of roughly-coursed beach pebbles and the thirteenth-century blocked west doorway may have replaced an earlier one. The north doorway has a high rear arch of the Linchmere type (sh. 1.4). The chancel/nave wall is not square to the nave, and while the chancel north wall is aligned on the inner line of the nave wall, the south wall is continuous with the south wall of the nave. The latter must date from before c. 1200 when it was cut by an arcade of two round-headed arches to form the lady chapel (sh. 4.8). It is possible therefore that phase 1 consisted of a longer building than the nave, subsequently divided by the insertion of a chancel arch in the thirteenth century (B).

Phase 2. The south aisle and lady chapel are roughly contemporary (C). Both were substantially rebuilt, refenestrated and raised in the 1875 restoration. Eighteenth-century illustrations show an apparently continuous wall from the nave/chancel wall to the west wall of the lady chapel and it is possible that the latter was moved during restoration (C,E).

Phase 3. In this phase (D), a tower was added. Its windows are thirteenth century, but it contains, a timber staircase said to be twelfth-century. On the east wall there is a blocked doorway which may have led to a structure of unknown date at the junction of the tower and the chancel. Thus while it is possible that there was an earlier tower it was rebuilt or extended in the thirteenth century. The chancel also may have been rebuilt or extended at about this time. The chancel arch was built or rebuilt and the chancel north wall may have been moved inwards by one wall thickness.

Other references

EpL/26/5f.161; Visitations, pp.29,222; J.F. (NE); PD1154/1 (SW,NE); Sharpe (NE); Burrell,3699f.330; Dunkin,43f.1552; Glynne,55, p.23; Gomme, pp.340-1; Harrison, p.182; Nairn, pp.376-7; Peat, pp.175-8.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 9.40 x 5.25 m (30 ft 6 ins x 17 ft)
Chancel 8.60 x 5.25 m (28 ft x 17 ft)
Nave walls 660 mm (2 ft 3 ins)
Chancel walls 660 mm (2 ft 3 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is mainly flint with Caen ashlar, but the lower courses of the chancel north wall are of unidentified rubble.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The chancel is continuous with the nave in height, width and roofing, but there is a difference in masonry. The lower courses of the chancel are a local sedimentary stone. On the north side there are several patches of different types of stonework, in contrast to the uniform, re-faced nave. However, dressed stone near the junction of nave and chancel on the south side is almost certainly the jamb of an early window, which had been blocked by 1804, rather than quoining. High up in the corresponding position on the north side, a line of dressed stone relates to an external access or to the stairs to the rood loft, or a window lighting the stairs. Just to the west of this, there is a blocked doorway below the top of a late twelfth-early thirteenth-century porch. The top of a Chithurst window (sh.2.2) has been used in the blocking. Despite the roof loft stairs and the hagioscope in the south aisle, there is no evidence of a stone chancel arch, and it is likely that there was a timber rood screen. It is possible that the doorway was an original feature, with the stair and window added later. The doorway is too far east (B) to have been that of a two-cell church and it seems likely that phase 1 was three-square.

Phase 2. In the thirteenth century the chancel was rebuilt with symmetrical groups of lancets with moulded rear arches on Purbeck marble shafts with moulded capitals and bases. There was a priest's doorway in the north-east corner (C). The north doorway may have been moved westwards at this time and the south aisle with its arcade of the Apuldram type (sh.4.6) may be contemporary with this rebuilding. It has a west lancet window and another, now blocked, to the east of the porch.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.4; Par7/12/1; Visitations, 1724, p. 212; J.F. (W, NE, SE); Sharpe, (SE); Tracey (1850); Nibbs, (SE); Burrell, 3699f.145; Dunkin, 46f.27; Glynne 101f.3; G. M. pt 2, p. 977; Guides 32; Harrison, p.36; O. H. Leeny, 'References to ancient Sussex churches in "The Ecclesiologist"', S.A.C. 83 (1943), pp.149-50; Nairn, p.83; V.C.H.4, p.138.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 17.55 x 7.40 m (57 ft x 24 ft)
Chancel 7.10 x 4.30 m (23 ft x 14 ft)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The tower is rendered. It has quoin and buttresses of sedimentary stone. The nave is similar sedimentary stone and sandstone rubble. The chancel was completely refaced in the nineteenth century.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave walls are offset about 900 mm from the outside wall of the chancel (A). It is possible that there was a three-square phase 1 nave with walls immediately inside the present ones and aligned with the outside walls of the chancel (B). In 1795 (D) there was a shorter chancel than at present with large quoin stones. This may have been contemporary with the suggested narrower nave. Leeny noted 'Norman' stone in the blocked north doorway, which has now been re-opened.

Phase 2. The nave is described by the V.C.H. and Steer as fourteenth-century. But there is a thirteenth-century south door and a diminutive north door. A probable thirteenth-century lancet on the south wall, shown on eighteenth-century engravings, has now been lost. One on the north wall is described by the V.C.H. as fourteenth-century 'in spite of its form' but seems to be thirteenth. The other north window is a copy of a sixteenth-century window made during the 1863 restoration. On the south side, windows in sixteenth and fifteenth-century style replaced churchwarden windows. The only fabric probably attributable to the fourteenth century is the chancel arch and it is quite likely that phase 2 consisted of widening the nave in the thirteenth century (C).

Phase 3. Although the tower was substantially rebuilt in the mid-sixteenth century the bell framing dates from the fourteenth century. Phase 3 may therefore have been the addition of a tower and rebuilding of the chancel arch (C).

1 Par23/4/1.
4 PD850 (SW).
5 V.C.H.4, pp.100-1.
6 Leeny, 'Ecclesiologist', pp.121-3.
7 Wills, 41, p.152; Guides, 31, p.3.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.14; Epl/88/3f.13; Par23/4/1,6-10,11; Par23/12/1 (vestry minutes); J.F. (SW); Sharpe (SW,NE); Tracey (NE); Visitations, pp.27,212; Burrell,3599.f.163; Glynne,25ff.25-6; Gomme, p.276; Harrison, p.47; Nairn, pp.105-6.
**DIMENSIONS**

Nave 17.70 x 5.85 m (57 ft 6 ins x 19 ft)
Chancel 7.40 x 5.25 m (24 ft x 17 ft)
Nave walls 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

**MATERIALS**

The church is of flint with small Caen quoin stones. Clunch and fragments of other rubble have been re-used in all walls.

**DEVELOPMENT**

Phase 1. There are no features of the present church earlier than the thirteenth century. However, the nave is three-square and incorporates blocks of clunch, presumably from an earlier church. It is possible therefore that it was rebuilt on an earlier footprint (B).

Phase 2. There are copies of thirteenth-century windows in the chancel, three lancets (one blocked) in the nave and north, south and (blocked) west doorways of the period. The chancel arch is thirteenth-century, rebuilt in the nineteenth. A lancet high up in the west end presumably lit the bell chamber which was substantially rebuilt in the nineteenth-century restoration. The arcade to the north aisle chapel is fourteenth-century (C). There is a blank north wall and east and west windows of that date, but it may be a rebuilding associated with the development of the cult of St. Cuthman.¹


**Other references**

Epl/26/5f.35; Visitations, p.26; J.F. (NE); Sharpe (SW); Tracey (E); Burrell,3699f.194; Dunkin,43ff.447,1641; Harrison, p.71; Horsfield 1, p.73; Nairn, pp.375-6; V.C.H.4, pp.88,196-7.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 12.20 x 4.90 m (40 ft x 16 ft)
Chancel 8.10 x 4.60 m (20 ft 6 ins x 15 ft)
Nave walls 600 mm (2 ft)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of blue sedimentary stone rubble with occasional larger blocks of sandstone and quoin stones of variable size. There is some nineteenth-century work in flint.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The present nave is pierced by asymmetrical Apuldram arcades. There are very narrow aisles with sixteenth-century windows (B). It is likely that there was originally an unaisled nave. In the south-west corner of the chancel there is a fragment of wall on the same alignment as the south nave wall (A). It is possible that the nave extended further east with the later development a separate chancel (B).

Phase 2. Arcades were cut to form aisles or side chapels, perhaps at different times. The north aisle was without windows, except at the east end. The only thirteenth-century window evident is a restored one in the south aisle east wall. The chancel, with three north, south and east lancets is also of this phase (C).

Phase 3. The Trinity Chapel, probably originally the chantry of St. George, was completely rebuilt in the 1940s. A possible fourteenth-century window appears on nineteenth-century engravings (E).

Phase 4. The tower has sixteenth-century doorways and windows and is probably of that date. The south-west arch of the arcade was blocked when the tower was constructed (D).

1 Guides, 37, p. 1; V.C.H. 4, p. 150.

Other references
EpI/40/51; Par68/4/11,13,14; Par68/4/48; Par68/4/20,22; Visitations, p. 27; Sharpe, (SE); PD990; Burrell, 3699f. 205; Glynne, 101f. 4,48; Nairn, pp. 208-9; Peat, pp. 71-3.
St. Mary

DIMENSIONS
Nave 14.80 x 4.95 m (48 ft x 16 ft)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
All external walls were rebuilt or refaced with flint or render in the nineteenth century. External ashlar has been completely renewed, as has most of the internal.

DEVELOPMENT
The church was comprehensively rebuilt in 1859 when most of the earlier fabric was removed, rebuilt or re-tooled. The oldest features are the thirteenth-century north aisle and western part of the north chapel (A).

Phase 1. The north arcade is of the Apuldram type (sh.4.6), although the bases of the piers approach nearly to fourteenth-century forms. The nave is narrow and three-square. The chancel wall is of the same width, but judging from eighteenth-century engravings it was widened in 1859. Phase 1 may therefore have been a three-square nave, with or without a chancel (B).

Phase 2. Although the south arcade was completely rebuilt in 1859, it matches the north and may be an exact copy of a thirteenth-century original. Symmetrical north and south aisles, much narrower than at present (C, E), may have been contemporary with the north arcade, and a small chapel/vestry was built on the north side of the chancel in the late thirteenth century.

Phase 3. In the fourteenth century a chapel/chantry was added on the south side of the chancel and a new window inserted in the east end (D). A chantry is not mentioned in the chantry returns or late medieval wills.

Other references
Epl/26/6f.68; Epl/88/3f.19; B.L.Add.Ms. 39423f.129; Visitations, pp.214-5,236-7; Burrell,369ff.225; Dunkin,43ff.708-9,724; Glynne,101ff.63-4.

E. The church from the south east in 1795 (J.F.)
DIMENSIONS
Nave 14.40 x 4.95 m (46 ft x 16 ft)
Nave wall south 740 mm (2 ft 5 ins)
Nave wall north 740 mm (2 ft 5 ins)
West wall lower 975 mm (3 ft)

MATERIALS
The nave comprises mainly modern, but also much older, local sandstone and flint. The south transept is flint, clunch and sandstone with greyer sandstone, clunch and flint on the east transept/south chancel wall. The east end is flint and sandstone. The chancel north wall and the north transept are flint and clunch with some brick patching and sandstone quoins. The north wall of the north aisle is flint, clunch and grey sandstone. The quoins are sandstone and the tower is rendered, boarded and shingled.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Within a late thirteenth-/early fourteenth-century cruciform church there is a narrow nave with arcades of three arches, the western two of which have been cut through as pointed arches of one order (sh.4.4). The west end above the west window is ‘very slight’ and the nave walls are thin. The original nave roof was lower and at a steeper pitch, as can be seen from the marks on the wall above the crossing arch. It is possible, therefore, that phase 1 was a three-square nave with or without a chancel (B).

Phase 2/3. In c. 1300 the church was enlarged to its present plan (C). However, there was an earlier phase, now evident only as dog-tooth moulding on the chancel arch. The north and south transepts are not of equal size. The chancel is wider than the nave and is at a lower level, perhaps indicating that if there was a chancel contemporary with phase 1 it stood on the site of the tower.

Later history. In about 1576 there was a major fire. As a result, crutch arches were inserted at the crossing and there was substantial rebuilding of the walls with only a single lancet high up. The late-medieval church and the restorations are discussed by Godfrey and Hunter.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.73; Epl/40/5546; Epl/40/5588; MP 2677; Par98/1/1; Par98/1/5/2; Par98/2/2; Par98/7/2,3,8,14,98,104; Par98/12/1; W.S.R.O.Add.Ms.878: Visitations, p.30,195; Grimm, (W); Sharpe, (SE,S); Tracey, (SE); Burrell,3699f.232; Glynne, 101ff.71-2; H. D. Gordon, The History of Harting (1877), pp.220-30; Harrison, p.99; Naim, pp.236-8; Peat, pp.90-4; V.C.H.4, pp.18-21.
**DIMENSIONS**
Phase 1 nave 14.20 x 5.55 m (46 ft x 18 ft)
Present chancel 8.60 x 5.55 m (28 ft x 18 ft)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

**MATERIALS**
The church is of flint (mainly nineteenth-century) with ashlar of Caen and Bembridge limestone. The north and south doorways are of clunch. Quoin stones are mainly small and nineteenth-century. Davey stated that much masonry from before the 1840 restoration was re-used. If so, it must have been re-tooled since it is not evident today.

**DEVELOPMENT**
Phase 1. During restoration in 1881 walls were found which ran in a straight line eastwards from about three feet either side of the tower arch (B). The nave is 14.20 m long. If the inner edge of this wall was 900 mm from the tower arch, the original nave would have been the same width as the chancel with proportions of c. 1:2.6. If the nave and chancel were on the footprint of a unitary structure it would have been about 20 m long and of approximately four-square proportions (B).

Phase 2. The church was completely rebuilt to an unaisled cruciform plan with a west tower (C) in the thirteenth century.

---

1 H.M. Davey, 'A history of the parish of Oving', undated pamphlet, p.15 (M.P.1535).

Other references
Epl/26/51.103; Epl/40/4943; Visitations, p.217; Grimm (SE); J.F. (SW,SE,NE,NW); Sharpe (SE); Tracey (SE); Burrell,3699/275; Dunkin,43 f.1039; Glynne,55f.44; Harrison, p.129; Horsfield 2, p.53; Nairn, p.288; Peat, pp.114-116; V.C.H.4, pp.163-70.

---

A. Present state
B. Phase 1 1. Possible continuation on line of chancel.
C. The church from the north east in 1775
**DIMENSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>19.45 x 4.90 m</td>
<td>(63 ft 10 ins x 16 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>8.35 x 4.90 m</td>
<td>(28 ft x 16 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>2.80 x 2.65 m</td>
<td>(9 ft 3 ins x 8 ft 9 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South chapel</td>
<td>2.95 x 2.75 m</td>
<td>(9 ft 9 ins x 9 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North nave wall</td>
<td>760 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South arcade</td>
<td>760 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATERIALS**

The nineteenth-century work is of flint with small ashlar quoins. The older parts of the church are rendered with some large, weathered Quarr quoin stones exposed, particularly at the east end of the chancel. Internally, the stone is mainly clunch and Caen.

**DEVELOPMENT**

The development in the twelfth century is unclear and the sequence given here is tentative.

**Phase 1.** The irregular spacing of both arcades indicates that the nave was originally probably unaisled (B). There is no difference in alignment or thickness between nave and chancel walls and no evidence that there was ever a chancel arch. The eastern part of the nave was 450 mm higher than the rest until the nineteenth century. Parts of three blocked round or round-headed windows are just visible above the spandrels of the east end of the south aisle arcade and presumably belong to this phase.

**Phase 2.** Four irregularly-spaced round-headed arches (sh.4.1) were cut through the north west wall of the nave (C). These are probably early twelfth-century. It is possible that openings were also cut through the south wall at about this time and rebuilt, since the spacing of the phase 3 arcade is very irregular.

**Phase 3.** An arcade of the Boxgrove type (sh.4.) was formed on the south side (D).

**Phase 4.** Not long after phase 3, possibly as a delayed part of the same building programme, the south door (sh.1.6) was built (D). The blocked window above (sh.2.6) may be contemporary. The two-storey chapel (F) at the east end of the south aisle, separated from it by a thin wall, is twelfth-century but the stone vaulting is thirteenth and it was, probably also the work of cathedral masons. Despite the apparent symmetry of this two-storey structure within the tower, there does not appear to have been a cruciform phase.

**Phase 5.** It is difficult to date the north tower, which was of wood above the string course until the nineteenth century. It is at latest thirteenth-century. If the lancet in the blocked arch on the west wall is in its original position, then the north aisle would have been demolished in the thirteenth century. Resistivity survey (Appendix 3) shows that the aisle may have been no more than 3 m wide.

**Phase 6.** The chancel was built or rebuilt in the thirteenth century with lancet windows. This may have been roughly contemporary with the tower.

**Subsequent phases:** The roof was probably lowered and the present parapet on the south side constructed in the sixteenth century. Several windows appear to have been added.
or rebuilt at this time, but the whole church was refenestrated in the 1867 restoration.  

1 Epl/40/4345
2 Nairn, pp. 77-8
3 Nairn, pp. 77-8; L.R. Hoey, 'Stone vaults in English parish churches in the early gothic and decorated periods' J.B.A.A. 147(1994), pp.30-51
4 Nairn, pp. 77-8; V.C.H. 4, pp. 136-8
5 Epl/40/4345

Other references
Epl/26/5ff.1; Epl/40/56; Epl/40/1; Epl/40/5383; Epl/40/5658; Epl/40/4345; Epl/88/3ff.5; Par1/4/2; Par1/4/8; Par1/4/9; Par1/4/15; J.F. (SE, NW, NE); Sharpe (N); Visitations, pp.34-5; Burrell, 369ff.142; Dunkin, 43ff.7; Fisher, pp.27-30; Harrison, p.34; Johnston, 'Churches', pp.326-7; P. M. Johnston, 'An ancient painting in Aldingbourne church', S.A.C 49 (1906), pp.157-8; Plan, 55; Poole, p.54.

D. Phases 3 and 4
1. Mid-late C12.
2. Late C12.

E. Phase 5/6
2. C13 tower.

F. The south chancel chapel
**DIMENSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present nave and chancel</th>
<th>25.20 x 6.70 m (82 ft 8 ins x 22 ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original nave</td>
<td>19.50 x 6.70 m (64 x 22 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible original unitary church</td>
<td>29.15 x 6.70 m (95 x 22 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave walls</td>
<td>760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel walls</td>
<td>760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATERIALS:** The building is of flint and rubble, mainly rendered. It has small quoins and external dressing of Pulborough stone. The north arcade is mainly clunch, with internal dressing of Caen and Binstead stone.

**DEVELOPMENT**

The nave and north aisle originally extended further west (A). Reference in 1724 to a shattered steeple are presumably to a bell turret not a west tower, since the west wall has a sixteenth-century door and window. The chancel roof is slightly lower than the nave roof. There is no chancel arch and the junction of nave and chancel is masked by a shallow buttress on the south side and by a prominent and irregular bulging on the north (A). There are two Tangmere windows (B, sh. 2.3) in the south wall of the nave.

Phase 1 could therefore have been a three-square nave extending as far as the present nave/chancel division (B), or it could have been a unitary church about 29 x 6.7 m, roughly the same size as Pagham phase 2 and Aldingbourne phase 1 (shs. M3, M1).

Phase 2 (C). Archways (sh. 4.2) were cut through the north wall in the twelfth century. There were three in the nave and one in the chancel, and there may have been another in between. These could have been associated with at least three chantries, the earliest mention of which was 1323 x 4. The modern vestry appears to have been built on the footprint of the east end of the aisle (A).

Phase 3. There are six single thirteenth-century lancets in the chancel with a double lancet of the same date in the west end of the south wall (D). Phase 3 is thus likely to have been either the refenestration of the east end of a unitary church or the widening of an earlier chancel.

Phase 4 (D). The window and door in the west wall are sixteenth-century. Fragments of carved masonry of this period or a little earlier are built into the east end of the church and are presumably from the chantry on the site of the vestry.

---

1. R. Barnett, Barnham Church and Parish Magazine (Nov. 1903) and Guide 51 state that the present west end was 3.2 m longer and the aisles 3.9 m wide. This has been confirmed by resistivity survey (Appendix 3).
2. Dunkin, 43f. 94; Visitations, pp. 23, 59-80.

**Other references**

Epl/26/5f. 9; Epl/40/46/52; M.P. 3764; Sharpe, (S); Burrell, 3699f. 26; Dallaway 2, p. 42; Glynne, 10, f. 54-5; Harrison, p. 41; Nairn, pp. 99-100; Peat, p. 34; V.C.H. 5.1, pp. 244-5.
DIMENSIONS
Phase 1 4.6 m wide (15 ft 1 in)
Phase 1 walls 900 mm (2 ft 11 ins)
Nave 22.5 x 6.8 m (73 ft x 22 ft)
Chancel 11.1 x 6.8 m (36 ft x 22 ft)

MATERIALS
Most of the church was re-faced with sandstone in the nineteenth century and the quoin stones replaced. There are re-used stones in the north clerestory, and herringbone in beach pebbles with a jamb/quoin of Bembridge limestone in the chancel (E).

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Excavation has revealed the west end of a probably pre-Conquest church built of very hard mortar and faced with dressed stone (B).¹
Phase 2. A longer church (C) was built outside the walls of phase 1, spanning the crossing of the present building. It may have extended as far as the west end of the present nave. The irregular arcades were rebuilt and made more symmetrical in the nineteenth century, when the west wall was completely rebuilt.² To the east, the chancel is the same width as the nave. The chancel roof is lower, but the nave roof was probably raised when the clerestory was added in the fourteenth century. The herringbone in the chancel (E) has what is generally described as a quoin adjacent, but it is more like a jamb. This may be part of phase 2, although the excavated walls were faced with dressed stone. The phase 2 building may thus have been over 29 m long. On the north side, Freke's 1976 excavation showed a gap in the wall leading to a porch or chapel, but hardly justifies his suggested north aisle contemporary with phase 2.
Phase 3. In the thirteenth century the church was made cruciform. North and south aisles were added (perhaps rationalising nave chapels) and a tower was built in the north western corner.

¹ Freke, pp.245-56.
³ Freke, pp.245-56.

Other references
Epi/26/51.104; M.P.448; J.F., (SW,N,NE,NW); Sharpe, (SE,NW); Tracey, (SE); Visitations, pp.228,234; Burrell,3699ff.279-9; Fisher, pp.161-2; Fleming, Pagham, pp.336-9; Harrison, p.130; Nairn, p.289; Peat, p.117; Poole, p.55; V.C.H.4, pp.231-2.
St. Thomas Becket
St. Andrew

DIMENSIONS
Phase 1 4.6 m wide (15 ft 1 in)
Phase 1 walls 900 mm (2 ft 11 ins)
Nave 22.5 x 6.8 m (73 ft x 22 ft)
Chancel 11.1 x 6.8 m (36 ft x 22 ft)

MATERIALS
Most of the church was re-faced with sandstone in the nineteenth century and the quoin stones replaced. There are re-used stones in the north clerestory, and herringbone in beach pebbles with a jamb/quoin of Bembridge limestone in the chancel (E).

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Excavation has revealed the west end of a probably pre-Conquest church built of very hard mortar and faced with dressed stone (B).¹
Phase 2. A longer church (C) was built outside the walls of phase 1, spanning the crossing of the present building. It may have extended as far as the west end of the present nave. The irregular arcades were rebuilt and made more symmetrical in the nineteenth century, when the west wall was completely rebuilt.² To the east, the chancel is the same width as the nave. The chancel roof is lower, but the nave roof was probably raised when the clerestory was added in the fourteenth century. The herringbone in the chancel (E) has what is generally described as a quoin adjacent, but it is more like a jamb. This may be part of phase 2, although the excavated walls were faced with dressed stone. The phase 2 building may thus have been over 29 m long. On the north side, Freke's 1976 excavation showed a gap in the wall leading to a porch or chapel, but hardly justifies his suggested north aisle contemporary with phase 2.²
Phase 3. In the thirteenth century the church was made cruciform. North and south aisles were added (perhaps rationalising nave chapels) and a tower was built in the north western corner.

¹ Freke, pp.245-56.
³ Freke, pp.245-56.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.104; M.P.448; J.F., (SW,N,NE,NW); Sharpe, (SE,NW); Tracey, (SE); Visitations, pp.228.234; Burrell,3699ff.278-9; Fisher, pp.161-2; Fleming, Pagham, pp.336-9; Harrison, p.130; Naim, p.289; Peat, p.117; Poole, p.55; V.C.H.4, pp.231-2.

A. Present state
B. Phase 1
C. Phase 2 1. Possible chapels/porch contemporary with phase 2.
E. The chancel south wall
DIMENSIONS
Nave 14.40 x 5.25 m (48 ft x 17 ft 6 ins)
Chancel 8.85 x 5.25 m (29 ft x 17 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls 690 mm (2 ft 3 ins)
Chancel walls 690 mm (2 ft 3 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of local sandstone throughout.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave and chancel are the same width (A, B) and a tapering of the north east nave wall and a pronounced outward lean are continued through the chancel. It is possible, therefore, that the nave and chancel were originally continuous, although the present chancel was built or rebuilt in the thirteenth century, and rebuilt in the nineteenth. The nave was cut by arcades in the early twelfth century (sh. 4.1). There was a west door until 1874 which may have been an original feature. 1

Phase 2. Although the north and south chancel chapels (A) were completely rebuilt in the nineteenth century and the arches leading to them from the chancel are thirteenth century, F shows a doorway of the Linchmere type on the outside of the north chapel. Perhaps the south chapel, which of identical dimensions, was built at the same time (C).

Phase 3. In the early twelfth century two round-headed archways of one order (sh. 4.1) were cut through the north and south nave walls (D). The form of the side chapels/aisles that they led to is unknown: eighteenth-century illustrations show sixteenth-century windows on the north and south walls which were copied in the restoration and there were thirteenth-fourteenth-century lancet in the west walls. 2

Phase 4. The chancel arch, the arches to the chapels, and perhaps the whole of the rest of the chancel and the west end of the south aisle were built or re-built in the thirteenth century.

1 Par159/4/2; Sharpe (NW).
2 Par15/4/3-5; Johnston, 'Churches', pp. 422.
3 Par15/4/2.

Other references
Epl/26/51.113; Epl/40/5300; Epl/40/5713; Par159/4/1; Par159/7/2; Grimm (NE); Sharpe (NW, SE); Tracey, (NW); Burrell, 3699f. 283; Glynne, 101f. 67; G.M. 1811, pt. 2, pp. 10-11; Harrison, p. 139; Horsfield, p. 92; Nairn, p. 315; V.C.H. 4, pp. 26-7.

F. From the north east, 1776 (Grimm)

A. Present state

B. Phase 1

C. Phase 2 1. Early C12 chapel. 2. Possible C12 chapel.

D. Phase 3 1. Early C12 arcades.

St. Mary

DIMENSIONS
Nave 16.30 x 5.55 m (53 x 18 ft)
Chancel 10.45 x 7.10 m (34 x 23 ft)
Possible original unitary church 26.20 x 5.55 m (85 x 18 ft)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint with sandstone and Quarr ashlar.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The nave is three-square (B). The west end is said to have been pre-Conquest but this is unlikely. Fisher and Johnston refer to a pre-restoration west wall and quoins of Roman brick. But this is not mentioned in Hope's pre-restoration survey and it may be that the brickwork was early nineteenth-century. Two small windows are shown in pre-restoration illustrations. One of these was re-set just below the gable and is an elongated version of the Tangmere (sh. 2.3) type. The best that can be said is that the nave dates from before the early twelfth-century arcade (sh. 4.1). A small section of masonry in the south-east wall of the nave may be from a window which preceded the arches. The inner faces of the chancel walls are continuous with the outer faces of the nave walls: it is possible that before the chancel was rebuilt in the thirteenth century, the nave and chancel were unitary (B) with a chancel arch being inserted at that time. Phase 1 could thus either have been a three-square nave, with or without a chancel, or a unitary long church.

Phase 2. The nave was pierced by two round-headed arches on the north side and three on the south (C) in the twelfth century. The west nave walls remained entire until the early nineteenth century when arches similar to the twelfth-century ones were cut.

Phase 3. The lancet windows in the chancel and the north porch are thirteenth-century (D). The thirteenth-century aisles were demolished and completely rebuilt in 1903.

1 Plans, 78; Fisher, pp.203-4; P.M. Johnston, 'Cocking and its church', Arch. J. 78 (1921), p.188.
2 Par202/7/20; Par202/12/1.
3 Par202/4/9-12,20.
4 Par202/4/5.

Other references
Epl/25/51.150; Par202/4/11; Grimm (SE); Sharpe (SE); Visitations, p.73; Baldwin Brown, p.483; Harrison, p.171; Jessep, p.56; Nairn, p.362; Poole, p.53; V.C.H.5.1, pp.242-3.

A. Present state

B. Phase 1

C. Phase 2

1. Early C12 arcades and chapels/aisles.

D. Phase 3

1. Aisles formed in C13 or later.
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>15.55 x 5.20 m</td>
<td>(51 x 17 ft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>11.10 x 5.20 m</td>
<td>(36 ft 6 ins x 17 ft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave south wall</td>
<td>620 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 1 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave north wall</td>
<td>775 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 6½ ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel south wall</td>
<td>760 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel north wall</td>
<td>760 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 6 ins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South aisle</td>
<td>15.55 x 5.20 m</td>
<td>(51 x 17 ft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>4.90 x 4.90 m</td>
<td>(16 x 16 ft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(walls 1.2 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

The church is of flint with patchy render. There are blocks of clunch in the south nave wall and small quoins of Caen stone and sandstone. Internal ashlar is Caen stone.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. The earliest features are two Tangmere windows (sh.2.3) in the chancel (A,B) which may be contemporary within the base of a column built into a thirteenth-century chancel window (D). The chancel wall is continuous with the nave. The thicknesses of the nave walls vary but this could well have been the result of rebuilding the walls when the late twelfth-century arcades were blocked (C). There is no evidence that there was ever a chancel arch and phase 1 is likely to have been a unitary church extending from the present west wall of the nave to at least the Tangmere windows.

Phase 2. Arcades were cut irregularly through the nave to form very wide aisles (Appendix 3). The tower was probably added at the same time, since the surviving fragment of the west wall of the south aisle appears to be integral within it. Although only three archways either wall can be seen today, the restoration accounts and the V.C.H. indicate that there were four. The chancel was also extended eastwards or rebuilt (B).

Subsequent phases. The thirteenth-century tombs adjacent to the south aisle (A) have been taken as an indicator that the aisles were blocked soon after they were built. But they are very unlikely to be in situ and the demolition of the aisles may have been as late as 1608 when the church was ‘re-edified’.²

¹ Epl/26/5f.160.

Other references

DIMENSIONS
Nave 18.20 x 5.35 m (59 ft x 17 ft 4 ins)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The external walls are of coursed sandstone rubble. With the exception of the tower, all of the walls were rebuilt or re-faced in 1883. Internally the earliest (thirteenth-century) work is in Caen stone.

DEVELOPMENT
By the eighteenth century, there was no chancel and all of the church east of the nave dates from 1883 (A). 1

Phase 1. The nave has asymmetrical Apuldram arcades. Until the 1883 rebuilding it had thin walls and piers offset slightly from the walls above.2 In 1875 Hills found the remains of an arch at the eastern end of the north arcade. This could have been the continuation of the nave or an archway from a demolished chancel to a side chapel.3 If it was the former, then phase 1 would have been a unitary church at least 22.2 m long (B).

Subsequent phases. The north arcade (C) may have superseded earlier archways at the east end of the nave, since the piers are irregularly-spaced and the central pier is octagonal and crudely carved, unlike the rest. Two lancets formerly in the east window (D) may date from this period. There was lancet at the west end of the north aisle, but if there were other thirteenth-century windows to the low, narrow aisles, they had been removed by 1772.4 A west tower was added in the sixteenth century.

1 Par141/4/3.
2 Par141/4/3.
4 Grimm (SE).

Other references
Epl/26/5f.100; Epl/40/5147; Par141/7/12; Visitations, p.216; J.F. (N,E,SW); Sharpe (SW); Tracey (SE); Nibbs (E); Burrell,3699f.267; Glynne,101f.55; Harrison, p.126; Horsfield 2, p.46; Nairn, p.275; Peat, pp.110-33; V.C.H.4, pp.164-5.
DIMENSIONS
Nave 17.55 x 6.15 m (57 x 20 ft)
Chancel 10.45 x 6.15 m (34 x 20 ft)
Nave walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel walls 760 mm (2 ft 6 ins)

MATERIALS
The walls are mainly sandstone rubble, but with some beach pebbles. The external ashlar is of sandstone and Caen stone: the internal is mainly Caen.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Peat and Hasted noted ‘traces of Norman work in the tower’ and in 1940 stones of a ‘much earlier date’ than the Apuldram style arcades (sh.4.6) were ‘built into the north wall of the chancel’. None of this is evident today, and windows with ‘Norman’ heads in the east chancel wall described by Elwes in 1872 may have been seventeenth-century. A plaque put up after the 1881 restoration refers to the ‘formerly Norman’ church.

The nave arcades are symmetrical and it is possible that the church was newly-built to an aisled plan in the thirteenth century. However, the nave is approximately three-square, there is no evidence of a chancel arch and the chancel walls are continuous with those of the nave. It is possible, therefore, that phase 1 was either a three-square nave with or without a chancel, or a long, unitary church similar to Pagham phase 2 (B, sh.M3).

Phase 2. If the proposed phase 1 is correct, phase 2 consisted of the cutting of arcades, construction of narrow north and south aisles, the chancel and west tower (C).

Other references
Epl/26/5f.129; Epl/88/3f.8; M.P.443; Visitations, pp.227,233; Grimm (SW); J.F. (SW); Sharpe (SW); Tracey (W); Nibbs (SW); Glynne,55f.265; Nairn, p.101.

1 W.S.R.O.Add.Ms.35970; Peat, p.87.
DEVELOPMENT
The present church of St. Bartholomew was built in 1832 near the site of a church said to have been demolished during the Civil War.\(^1\) The latter is shown on two seventeenth-century prints (A, B).\(^2\) It was round with an entrance on the east side and buttresses on the west. The remains of the mound on which it stood are now about 7.5 m across, narrowing to the east with the western slope cut off by a wall. There were single-light round-headed windows. B shows another structure either on the north side of the church or behind it, but at the same level. Round parish churches are generally early twelfth-century, which would fit the shape of the windows.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Epl/26/5/f. 27.
\(^2\) P. Freeman, 'On the site of "a temple by Chichester" as etched by John Dunstall', S.A.C. 7 (1854), pp.56-60; D. Morgan, Chichester a Pictorial History (1992), p.85; Rev. Dr. Wellesley, 'On two engravings, by John Dunstall of "a temple by Chichester", S.A.C. 5 (1852), pp.277-280.
\(^3\) Clapham, After, p.110.

Other references
V.C.H.3, p.165.
DIMENSIONS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel Phase 1</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel Phase 2</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel Phase 3</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave south wall</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave north wall</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower walls</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

The earliest phases have Roman brick and masonry and sandstone rubble. The base of the chancel arch was once thought to be in situ Roman, but is now generally accepted as re-used material. Older phases are in Quarr, Binsted, Caen, Ditrapa limestone, tufa and other stones.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. The earliest fabric is the lower three stages of the tower, the west and upper walls of the nave, the south-eastern corners of the nave (B) and the western third of the chancel. Externally (C), the lower part of the tower/western porticus has long and short quoins, a plinth, five single-splayed windows (sh.2.1) two string courses, a single belfry window, a double belfry (sh.2.9) and a corbelled eaves course with corbel table. Internally (D) the tower arch (sh.3.2) the triangular-headed doorway above (sh.1.8) and a small square window are also phase 1. The chancel has a blocked rubble-headed window (sh.2.1) and a blocked entrance on the south side (sh.1.3). A recently-discovered Anglo-Saxon capital built into the north aisle may be of this phase.

Phase 2 comprised the insertion of the chancel arch (sh.3.2) the extension of the chancel in herringbone, the re-facing of the lower tower windows and the addition of another storey to the tower with a corbel table and belfry window (sh.2.9) (E). Two blocked windows/doorways are said to have been visible above the chancel arch in the east wall of the nave. It is difficult to believe that these were early features since the late medieval roof would have been below this level (F).

Phase 2a. Fragments of voussoirs dated to c. 1125x1145 were taken from the north wall in the 1930s. Morrison and Baxter suggest that a Romanesque arcade may have preceded the present one, but there is no evidence for this and the fragments are more likely to have been a doorway.

Phase 3. The church took approximately its present form in the thirteenth century (E): the cutting of arcades, the addition of aisles, the construction of the crypt, the extension of the chancel and addition of a vestry may all be roughly contemporary. The crypt, which has thirteenth-century vaulting, was probably originally a charnel house abutting the south nave wall. The round piers of the arcade are large versions of the Apuldram type (sh.4.6) with arches of two chamfered orders. The aisle windows were mainly replaced by traceried...
windows in the fourteenth century, copied at the restoration of 1865 (F) when three round clerestory windows were added (sh.2.8).\textsuperscript{7} The vestry is of two storeys and originally had a roof of similar pitch to the north aisle.\textsuperscript{8}

Subsequent phases. In the sixteenth century the roof was lowered (F), only being restored to its medieval position in 1865.\textsuperscript{9} This restoration required substantial rebuilding of the upper parts of the walls and re-roofing of the aisles. This masonry difference is readily apparent.

1 Baldwin Brown, p.444; Fisher, p.56-61; Taylor, pp.81-4. However excavations (J. Kenny, ‘Bosham Holy Trinity Church’, A.C.D. (1991), pp.21-23) indicate a possible occupation site under the church or to the south or east.


3 Tweddle, pp.125-6.


7 K.H. MacDermott, \textit{Bosham Church its History and Antiquities} (1911), pp.31-40; Glynne, 55,6.23-5.

8 Grimm (W); J.F. (E,S,W); Sharpe (SE); Nibbs (E).


Other references
DIMENSIONS
Tower 3.35 x 5.25 (10 ft 9 ins x 17 ft 3 ins)
North and west tower walls 1 m (3 ft 4 ins)
South and east tower walls 900 mm (3 ft)

MATERIALS
The church is of local sandstone with coursed irregular blocks in the tower and mainly ashlar elsewhere.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. Before 1881 the church consisted of: a continuous chancel and nave; the Montague Chapel south of the chancel which was isolated from the rest of the church; a rectangular tower at the centre of the south side; and a small aisle at the south-west end (A). It seems likely that the first phase was the tower (B). This has two widely-splayed early thirteenth-century windows on the south side. A door of the same period below them was removed in 1881 (D). There was no entrance in the east wall until 1881, and the one on the west side is sixteenth-century. The north entrance is thirteenth-century in style, perhaps later than the south windows. If there was another phase 1 part of the church to the north, there is now no evidence for it.

Subsequent phases. The next period for which there is evidence is the fifteenth-century east window of the chancel (C), but no other features of this period survive and the west end was completely rebuilt in 1881. In the sixteenth century the Montague Chapel and south aisle were built.

1 Par138/4/3-4; Epl/40/4661.

Other references
Epl/26/5f.95; Par135/7/10; Visitation, p.31; Sharpe (SE); Burrell,3699f.260-3; Dunkin, 43f.996; Harrison, p.125; Naim, p.217; V.C.H.4, p.78.
**DIMENSIONS**

Nave  20.70 x 8.55 m (68 x 28 ft)
Chancel  5.80 x 14.30 m (19 x 47 ft)
North transept  3.65 x 7.60 m (12 x 25 ft)
West wall of N. Transept  700 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
Nave walls  690-760 mm (2 ft 4 ins - 2 ft 6 ins)
Chancel south Wall  690 mm (2 ft 4 ins)

**MATERIALS**
The pre-restoration masonry is sandstone.

**DEVELOPMENT**
The church was restored and partially rebuilt by Barry in 1827 and enlarged again in 1904. As a result, the medieval history is difficult to interpret.

**Phase 1.** A 'Norman' window was found in the west wall of the north transept in 1903-4. The wall is of roughly-dressed sandstone with a very weathered doorway, now the entrance to an upper gallery (D) which appears to be a re-used twelfth-century one. It is probable that phase 1 was an unaisled cruciform church of the early twelfth century or Overlap period (B). However, the chancel walls are not aligned on the nave inner walls but set about 600 mm in from this alignment, and it is possible that either there was originally a narrower nave approximately three-square or, less probably, that the chancel was originally wider.

**Subsequent phases.** The next datable features are the three thirteenth-century windows in the south chancel wall (C). The south transept was rebuilt as a tower with much thicker walls c. 1350. The south aisle was built in 1827 when the arcade to the north aisle was completely renewed, although the fourteenth-century style may be a copy of the original, but it was again renewed in 1904. The spacing of the original piers is unknown. St. Thomas's chapel appears to be fourteenth-fifteenth-century and there was a large Decorated window in the west front, all of which was substantially changed in Barry's restoration.

1 Epl/40/5655; Par149/4/4-5; P.H.A.6492,5199; P.D.1411,1836.
2 Par149/4/5.
3 Nairn, pp.294-5.
4 Epl/40/5655; Par149/4/5.

**Other references**

Epl/26/5.f.107; Epl/40/4373,4053; Epl/88/3f.32; Par149/4/1; P.H.A.8773,8480-8502,8623; Visitations, pp.201-2,251; Grimm (W); Sharpe (S); P.D.1071; Burrell,369f.94; Dunkin,43 f.1680; Glynne,102f.47; Harrison, p.132; Nairn,pp.294-5.

---

**A. The church in 1904**

**B. Phase 1**

1. Possible earlier phase.
2. Chancel of unknown date.

**C. Outline of subsequent phases**

1. C14/15 aisle.
2. C14 window.
3. C14/15 but rebuilt in C19.
5. C14/15 chapel.
6. C13 chancel.

---

D. The west wall of the north transept
St Mary
DIMENSIONS

Nave 10.95 x 4.95 m (36 ft x 16 ft 3 ins)
Tower 5.35 x 5.20 m (17 ft 6 ins x 17 ft)
Chancel 5.80 x 4.55 m (19 ft x 15 ft)
Tower walls 790 mm (2 ft 7 ins)
Nave walls upper 610 mm (2 ft)

MATERIALS
The church is of flint with Quarr stone and Bembridge limestone ashlar and post-medieval brick.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The oldest part of the church appears to be the lower 8 m of the tower (B,E), the upper part, including the eleventh-century window, having been rebuilt. An unpublished excavation discovered foundations of the 'Saxon' nave, the present nave wall being 610 mm wide in its upper section. There was unspecified evidence that the tower was added to the nave. However, the exposed north-east quoin of the tower within the north aisle and Taylor's analysis suggests that the tower came first. The upper doorway from the tower into the nave may indicate that this was not the case, although the walls are rendered, so it may have been an insertion. It may have had a chamber on the west side, but Aldsworth found no evidence for this. The tower has a chamfered plinth, side-alternate quoins and herringbone construction. There are four double-splayed windows (sh.2.7), a string course and a gable-headed doorway (sh.1.8), similar to Bosham, in the east wall (C).

Phase 2. If the excavation evidence is correct, the nave may have been contemporary with a chancel arch of the Cocking type (sh.3.4), of which only the responds and jambs survive.

Subsequent phases. Phase 3 probably consisted of the rebuilding of the chancel and the addition of aisles. There is a blocked thirteenth-century lancet on the south side of the chancel and the arcade is of the Apuldram type (sh.4.6). Johnston and the V.C.H. stated that they were thirteenth-century arcades and aisles which were raised and refenestrated in the sixteenth century.

Aldsworth, 'Singleton', pp.61-71.
Aldsworth, 'Singleton', p.86; Par174/12/14; Peat, pp.138-41; V.C.H. 4, pp.118-20; Epi/40/5572.

Other references
Epi/28/ff.124; Epi/40/5887,5400,4370,3109,1789; Epi/88/3f.35; Par174/4/1,3; Par174/7/1,14; Visitations, p.28-9,219-20,238; Grimm (N); J.F. (SE, NW); Sharpe (N); Tracey (NE); Burrell 3699,f.295; Dunkin,43f.1242; Glynne,102f.45; Harrison, pp.152-3; Jessep, pp.35-6; Nairn, p.325.

A. Present state
B. Phase 1
C. Phase 2 1. C12 nave?
D. Phase 3
E. The tower (after Aldsworth)

1. South elevation. 2. East elevation. 3. Rubble. 4. Herringbone. 5. Quarr dressing to window. 6. First floor doorway. 7. Chancel with Cocking type jambs.
DIMENSIONS

Nave 12.95 x 6.00 m (42 x 19 ft 6 ins)
Nave to east wall 17.25 x 6.00 m (56 x 19 ft 6 ins)
South transept 4.30 x 1.85 m (14 x 6 ft)
N. transept 4.30 x 6.45 m (14 x 21 ft)
Nave south wall 790 mm (2 ft 7 ins)
Nave north wall 790 mm (2 ft 7 ins)

MATERIALS

Externally the church is mainly sandstone. There are patches of clunch and other stones in blocked wall openings. The south side is rendered and there is eighteenth-century and later brick in the north. Internally, there is Caen stone.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. Godfrey noted a superficial similarity to the church at North Elmham (A) but the obvious parallel is with aisled transeptal churches with eastern apses, such as Westham.

The central blocked opening at the eastern end could have led to an apse, with a smaller apse via the blocked arch on the south side (B). The corresponding northern opening has the remains of two blocked late twelfth-century archways similar to those at West Wittering (A). These are the earliest datable features and presumably led to a chapel (B). Thus if there was originally an eleventh-/twelfth-century plan of the Westham type, then it must have been rebuilt and refenestrated in the early thirteenth century, which is the date of most of the fabric. The archway present until 1814 at the eastern end of the nave could have been the remains of a tower crossing, although there is no other evidence of this and the east wall has been substantially rebuilt.2

Subsequent phases. The V.C.H. considers that the transepts of c. 1200 with long, simple lancets are about 20 years earlier than the arcade and aisled walls. The blocked lancets in the aisle walls are of a very simple type and could be early, one having a single stone head, but these walls are thinner than those of the transepts and so may not be contemporary. A large window was inserted next to the blocked archway in the south transept in the fourteenth century with a piscina adjacent: perhaps the archway was blocked at the same time (C). In the following century, a west tower was built.3

1 Plans, 39,3.
2 Plaque in church.
3 Nairn, p.325.
4 V.C.H.4, pp.213-5.

Other references

Epl/26/5f.123; Epl/88/3f.35; Par200/4/1-2,14-15,18,20; Par200/7/10; M.P.1830; Visitation, pp.7,29,218,239-41,242; J.F. (SE,NW); Sharpe (NE); Tracey (NE); Burrell,369f.293; Glynne,55f.26; Harrison, p.152; Peat, pp.135-7.
St James

DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave, external</td>
<td>12.95 x 7.80 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower, external</td>
<td>6.85 x 5.80 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower, internal</td>
<td>5.05 x 3.95 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel, external</td>
<td>8.65 x 5.20 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel, N. wall</td>
<td>560 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel, S. wall</td>
<td>610 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower walls</td>
<td>915 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The medieval church was demolished, with the exception of the tower, in 1850.

MATERIALS

Butler described mid-eleventh-century grave covers and markers of sandstone, blank slabs, and masonry with cable moulding recovered from the demolished nave. The remainder of the demolished building and the coursed work in the tower were also sandstone.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. The church had an axial tower plan (A, B). Harcourt's drawings show Tangmere windows (sh.2.3) in the north wall. These were built into the west and south nave walls of the new church and Harcourt showed thirteenth-century lancets in the chancel. The one high on the south wall may have replaced a twelfth-century one. There is no evidence of north or south nave doors, so the entrance shown in 1848 via a west porch of unknown date, may have been original.

Phase 2. Harcourt showed later windows ranging from thirteenth- to sixteenth-century but there was no modification to the axial tower plan.

Phase 3. The tower was rebuilt in 1873 and is very similar to the one at East Lavant (sh.11). Very large stones below the old roof lines within the tower and on the quoins may be from the original church. The east and west tower arches appear to be re-working of thirteenth-century ones (C).

References

3. Tracey, (SW).
4. V.C.H.4, p.82.

Other references

Epl/26/5f.132; Epl/88/3f.27; Epl/40/1557; Par182/7/2; Visitations, pp.30,203; Burrell,369f.298; Dunkin,39f.28, 43f,1278,1283; Grimm (SW); Sharpe (S); Fisher, pp.81-2; Godfrey, 'Axial', p.110; Jessep, pp.60-1, Lower 2, p.76; Poole, p.55.
DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td>15.85 x 7.30 m</td>
<td>(52 ft 1 in x 24 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td>7.30 x 5.60 m</td>
<td>(24 ft x 18 ft 4 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porticus</td>
<td>5.45 x 4.00 mm</td>
<td>(17 ft 11 ins x 13 ft 1 in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave north and south walls</td>
<td>735 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 5 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave west wall</td>
<td>780 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 5 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel west wall</td>
<td>785 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 7 ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel east wall</td>
<td>700 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 3½ ins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porticus</td>
<td>660 mm</td>
<td>(2 ft 2 ins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATERIALS

The church is of flint. The quoins and windows are Quarr and the internal stone is Quarr and Bembridge Limestone.

DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1. The north and south nave walls, north and south porticus and eastern end of the nave survive from a salient corner plan (B). There is no evidence of walls west of the porticus that would have formed the western wall of a crossing in the Breamore and Dover manner, although where such a wall would be expected, the nave walls lean inwards to the east and outwards to the west of it. Resistivity survey shows that the original west end is unlikely to have extended much beyond the present one (Appendix 3). The south porticus walls were exposed in 1991 and have herringbone masonry (D). The chancel arch and wall (sh.3.2) are probably original features and the porticus arches, although rebuilt in the twelfth century, probably incorporate some of the original masonry (sh.3.8). There are double-splayed windows (sh.2.7) in the west wall of each porticus. The nave north and south doorways are high (N. 2.75m, S. 2.13m) and narrow and Taylor recorded probable original rear-arches, but these are no longer visible. The chancel was rebuilt in 1879: when it was underpinned in 1948 no earlier features were found.

Phase 2. The west wall was rebuilt at an unknown date (C).

Phase 3. The porticus arches were rebuilt in a style very similar to the cathedral retrochoir (sh.3.8) of 1188-1207. This was probably contemporary with the insertion of windows in the chancel wall (sh.2.10).

Phase 4. Probably in the early thirteenth century, large windows were inserted in the north and south walls of the porticus and up at the east end of the nave. Taylor considered that they replaced Anglo-Saxon ones, and that they have reused Quarr voussoirs. The nave doorways were inserted into higher earlier doorways and four lancet windows were placed in the chancel.

Phase 5. In the fourteenth century the south porticus was raised to form a low tower (C, D) and the present west window was inserted.

Phase 6. At some time between the end of the twelfth century and the eighteenth, the chancel roof was lowered, cutting off the tops of the north and south windows (E). The nave roof was altered from its original pitch to a very shallow one. The present roof dates from the 1879 restoration.

---

Other references
Epl/26/5f.136; Par189/4/5.10-12; Par189/7/2,6; Visitations, pp.26.219; J.F. (NE,SW); Sharpe (SE); Tracey (SW); Baldwin Brown, pp.341-2; Burrell,3699f.300; Dunkin,40f.243; Fisher, pp.192-3; Glynne,101f.75; Jessep, pp.39-40; Nairn, pp.344-5; Peat, pp.154-5; V.C.H.4, pp.124-5.
St. Thomas Becket

DIMENSIONS
Chancel 17.10 x 4.75 m (45 ft x 16 ft 16 in)
Nave 12.65 x 5.85 m (41 ft x 19 ft)
Tower (external) 2.75 x 2.75 m (9 ft x 9 ft)
Nave north wall 585 mm (1 ft 11 in)
Nave south wall 660 mm (2 ft 2 ins)
Chancel walls 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
Tower walls 685 mm (2 ft 3 ins)

MATERIALS
The unrestored parts of the church are of flint, Roman tile and rubble, similar to the oldest parts of Bosham. Bembridge limestone has been used in the quoins.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. At the centre of the church is a tower which was found to have an Anglo-Saxon middle section when the church was restored between 1810 and 1830 (A). The lower part has been removed and replaced by two archways (A). The Anglo-Saxon part is of rubble with doors on each side (sh. 1.8). The Greens suggest that there were lean-to structures against the base of the tower, but the apparent evidence for this, a weather moulding strip on the north side, is more likely to relate to the steeper, lower pitch of the roof before restoration. It has been suggested that the tower was a western tower/porticus, with the present chancel being on the site of the Anglo-Saxon church (C). However, it is unusual that such elaborate efforts would have been made to retain a small tower and it is possible that there were originally two churches linked by a tower, like Jarrow (B). This would then have been retained for structural reasons. The present chancel is approximately three-square. It was rebuilt and completely refaced in the nineteenth century, but was previously 'rough, random masonry'. The earliest dateable feature is the thirteenth-century lancet discovered during restoration. The vestry (A) is also thirteenth-century, but the east wall shows that it is later than the chancel. The chancel may thus be on the footprint of part of the Anglo-Saxon unitary church.

Phase 2. The nave is separated from the north aisle by an Apuldram arcade (sh. 4.6). It is only 585 mm thick and probably inserted, but is likely to have been rebuilt when the roof was raised in the early nineteenth century. The arcade on the south side has elaborate compound pillars. The west elevation (E) shows a difference between the lower parts of the nave and aisle walls, with the remains of possible quoining now disguised by buttresses and complicated by the blocking of an eighteenth-century west door which led to a gallery. This phase is therefore likely to have consisted of the addition of north and south aisles and the formation of the chancel arch (D). The chancel was rebuilt, enlarged or refenestrated at the same time, although the lancet uncovered during restoration is now the only evidence of this phase.

Subsequent phases. The vestry may have been added in phase 2 or soon after. In the late thirteenth century, windows were inserted at the east ends of the aisles and chancel. The

[Diagram of St. Thomas Becket with annotations A, B, C, D, and a scale bar 20m (60ft)]
aisles have wall tombs and piscinas and may have been established as chantries at about this date. At some time before 1810 dormer windows were inserted in the north and south aisles and churchwarden windows in the chancel. In the early nineteenth-century restoration, the nave roof was raised and the upper part of the tower rebuilt, together with substantial parts of the walls.

4 Taylor, p. 986.
6 H.R.O.M65/410F/7.

Other references
H.R.O.M85/410F1-8, Top325/1/1; Glynne, 29ff. 77-9.
Decolletation of St. John the Baptist

DIMENSION
Nave 11.70 x 6.60 m (38 x 21 ft 6 ins)
Chancel 6.60 x 5.55 m (22 x 18 ft)
Tower external 7.25 x 6.60 m (23 ft 6 ins x 21 ft 6 ins)
Tower internal 5.55 x 5.10 m (18 x 16 ft 6 ins)
Nave walls 710 mm (2 ft 4 ins)
Chancel walls 785 mm (2 ft 7 ins)
Aisle walls 560 mm (1 ft 10 ins)

MATERIALS
The church is built of clunch, flint and small sandstone rubble. There is some ashlar from earlier phases present in the tower and nave walls and the sacristy has large, probably re-used, quoin stones.

DEVELOPMENT
Phase 1. The oldest features, uncovered in the 1864 restoration, are a 'Norman' window high up in the nave/tower wall, now blocked by the bell frame, and the bases of 'Norman' piers on which the present nave piers rest. No wall footings are mentioned in the restorers' account.

The jambs of the chancel arch are of the Cocking type (sh.3.4) but the top was rebuilt in the sixteenth century. Godfrey shows an early thirteenth-century nave west wall embedded within the west wall of the tower, but there is no evidence of this now.

There appear to be three possible first phases (B1, 2, 3). If the tower window is Norman, there could have been a short nave and west tower (B1). The nave could originally have been three-square with the tower being built over the west end (B2) or, if the restorers' observations are correct, there could originally have been a short, aisled nave (B3).

Phase 2. The chancel was built or rebuilt in the thirteenth century (C). Previous writers considered that north and south aisles were built in the thirteenth century as far as the tower, but there is now no evidence of this.

The windows, like those of the chancel, are dated to c. 1400.

Phase 3. Sperling and others suggested that the massive buttress on the south aisle wall west of the porch (A) is the remains of a tower in the south-east corner, with the remains of a respond on the inside wall. However, the buttress is of ashlar (rather than flint like the rest of the fabric) and is matched by a shorter buttress on the north side. It seems more likely that they were built to support the extended walls or even the galleries and stairs to them built in the eighteenth century. Phase 3 probably therefore comprised the refenestration of the aisles, with phase 4 being of the construction of the tower and rebuilding of the arcades in the sixteenth century (D, E).

2 V.C.H. 4, p.130.
5 Sperling, 'Westbourne', pp.80-1.
Decolletation of St. John the Baptist

6 Sperling, 'Magazines'; Nairn, p. 365-6;
Par26/7/26.

Other references
Epl/28/5f.10Epl/88/3f.40;
Par206/2/2,4,36-8; Visitations,
pp.26,226; Grimm (S); J.F. (SW);
Sharpe (SE); Tracey (S); Burrell,
369f.321; Dunkin 43,ff.1485,90,93;
Glynne, 55f.49; Gomme, p. 329;
Harrison, p. 173; Horsfield 2, p. 76; Nairn,
pp.365-6; Peat, pp.166-9.

C. Possible phase 2
1. Probable C13 aisles.
2. Rebuilding of chancel.

D. Phase 3
1. C14/15 vestry.
2. Rebuilding/refenestration and extension in c. 1400.

E. Phase 4
1. C16 tower and rebuilt nave.
KEY TO FIGURES AND CHURCH INFORMATION SHEETS

TOPOGRAPHICAL KEY

- Churchyard
- Manor house
- Possible boundary of enclosure
- Water
- Common
- Former common
- Glebe

CHURCH INFORMATION SHEETS

w  west
n  north
s  south
e  east
N  nave
C  chancel

First phase
Mid-twelfth-century
Late-twelfth-century
Thirteenth-century
Fourteenth-century
Fifteenth/sixteenth-century
Post-medieval
Uncertain

ABBREVIATIONS

Burrell, 3699 = B.L. Add. Ms. 3699.
Other abbreviations in Volume 1 Abbreviations Used.