

Aids and scutages: 1302-3 : Aid for getting the king's eldest daughter married : Introduction

The grant of an aid *pour fille marier* was authorized by parliament in May 1290 (*Rot parl* 1:25). (The daughter in question was Eleanor (b 1269), who had been promised to Alfonso III king of Aragon; the marriage never took place.) When this aid was first approved, it was explicitly granted on the same terms as the aid which had been granted to Henric III (in 1245-6) for getting his daughter married to the king of Scotland, except that the rate was to be higher this time, 480 pence per fee.

For reasons unknown to me, the aid was not actually collected till 1302-3. The collectors appointed for Kent were the sheriff (Henric de Cobeham) and Ricard de Rokesle: their commission is dated 7 Nov 1302 (*Cal pat rolls 1301-7*, 76-7). The collectors appointed for Derbyshire were instructed to deliver half of the money to the exchequer on 9 Feb 1303, the rest on 17 May (*Cal pat rolls 1301-7*, 144); presumably the same or similar instructions were sent to the collectors for Kent.

Their account does not survive in the original, but does survive after a fashion. A subsequent aid - the *aide pour faire fils chevalier* of 1346-7 - was modelled on the aid of 1302-3 (just as the aid of 1302-3 had been modelled on the aid of 1245-6), and a transcript of the 1302-3 account was sent to the collectors of this subsequent aid, so that they could use it as the basis for their own proceedings. The collectors for Lincolnshire were certainly supplied with such a transcript, a copy of which survives. (The heading reads: "A transcript of the rolls of details of account of the collectors of the aid granted to king Edward son of king Henric in the eighteenth year of his reign (1290) for getting his eldest daughter married ... to be sent to the collectors of the aid granted to king Edward the third in the twentieth year of his reign (1346) for getting his eldest son made a knight" (*Aids* 3:127).) It is clear that a similar transcript must have been sent to the collectors for Kent, because almost every entry in their account includes information quoted from an earlier account which - as I hope to prove below - can only have been the 1302-3 account.

Greenstreet (1876:109-10) came very close to recognizing that. Looking at an entry like this one,

From Roger de Northwode, for half a fee which Johan de Northwode held from Hamo Crevequer ...

he could see that the second name mentioned, in this instance Johan de Northwode, referred back to the state of affairs existing at the beginning of the fourteenth century. (Johan de Northwode died in 1319 (*CIPM* 6:108); Roger de Northwode was his grandson.) By putting all the evidence together, Greenstreet thought it possible to prove that the text underlying the 1346-7 account dated from between 1301 and 1306; and I am sure that he was right to that extent.

But in fact the dating can be sharpened up still further (with the result that the rest of Greenstreet's argument becomes untenable). At Stowting the former tenant is Christina Heringod; and Christina was not in sole possession till after the death of her husband, Willelm de Kirkeby, who died in 1302 (CIPM 4:54). At Boughton Aluph one of the former tenants is Thomas de Gatesdenne (who was the husband of one of the daughters of Stephan de Boctone), and Thomas died in 1303 (CIPM 4:91). (Soon after that, his widow sold her portion of the manor to Robert de Burghershe and his wife Mathildis (Gardiner 1939:124).) A list of tenants including these two names cannot (on the face of it) be earlier than 1302 nor later than 1303. There may perhaps be some anachronisms (I would not be surprised if there were); but in general it is clear that the people whose names occur in second position in 1346-7 are the people who had made payments in 1302-3.

The accompanying file should not be taken too seriously. All I have done is to make a copy of my translation of the 1346-7 account and delete from each entry the portion of the text which is specific to that account. The entry quoted above turns into this:

half a fee which Johan de Northwode holds from Hamo Crevequer ...

The 1302-3 account would not have said exactly that. Probably it said something like this:

From Johan de Northwode, for half a fee which (his predecessor) held from Hamo Crevequer ...

But I am not brave enough to reconstruct the whole text along those lines. For reference, I have retained the numbering of the entries; but of course I do not mean to imply that the ordering was identical in both accounts.

\* \* \*

In a seventeenth-century manuscript, Greenstreet discovered a text which may be a copy of the 1302-3 account for Kent. More precisely, it may be a copy (or a shortened copy, or a copy of a copy) of the transcript (like the one for Lincolnshire) which was sent to the men who were collecting the aid of 1346-7.

The manuscript (BL Lansdowne 309) was finished, as the scribe himself tells us (fo 157v), on 13 Dec 1662. From the look of it, I would guess that this is a copy made for antiquary A of a manuscript belonging to antiquary B; but I am not going to guess who A or B might have been. The text in question occupies fos 3v-13v. (As far as Greenstreet was aware, this was the only copy in existence; as far as I know, that is true.) It is followed (13v-14r) by a copy of the letter dated 1 Nov 1346 appointing the collectors for Kent of the *aide pour faire fils chevalier*.

It begins with this heading: "Fees of Kent as listed in the lord king's exchequer, by means of which scutage was levied in the

county of Kent in the twenty-first year of the reign of king Edward, the third after the conquest, for making his eldest (son) a knight" (Greenstreet 1876:108-9). This does not read like an original title: I take it to be a title added later, by somebody who (so it seems) had compared this list with the 1346-7 account (probably the copy of it to be found in the "Book of Aid") and drawn the correct conclusion.

A few of the entries in this text were printed by Greenstreet (1877:367-9). I reproduce them here, so that they can be compared with the parallel entries in my reconstruction.

#### Hundred of Worth

(099) From Robert de Sharsted - for a sixteenth part of a fee at Tatenham of the fee of Selling

#### Hundred of Oxney

(102) From Jacob de Palstre - for half a fee of the honour of Leeds

(103) From the same Jacob (de Palstre) and Ricard de Wytrishamme - for half a fee (which they hold) from the archbishop - the said Jacob holds a third part of it

#### Hundred of Stowting

(114) From the prior of Horton - for one fee in Horton and Titindone

(116) From Stephan Gerrard - for a third part <read "three parts", i.e. three quarters> of half a quarter of one fee in Leigh

#### Hundred of Street

(126) From Johan de ..... , Willelm de Burkhell, and Robert Schortede - for one knight's fee, excluding a sixteenth part of one which is (listed) above in the hundred of Worth

#### Hundred of Loningborough

(149) From the heirs of Simon de Holt - for one quarter of one fee in Halirod (which they hold) from the heirs of Willelm de Aubervill - the abbot of Langdon has it now <reading "nunc" for "non"> but holds from ..... (*Abbas de Langdon non habet, sed tenet de et c'*)

#### Hundred of Calehill

(152) From Johan son of Radulph de Pevinton - for one fee in Pevington

#### Hundred of Longbridge

(161) From the same Willelm (de Leybourne) - for one fee in Estuer

(which he holds) from the heirs of Robert de Estuer

#### Hundred of Felborough

(189) From Hamo de Herst - for one knight's fee

(195) From Eudo de Shillingheld - for half a knight's fee

#### Hundred of Blackbourne

(246) From Willelm de Basings - for one fee in Kenardinton and Cokryd

If these dozen entries are a fair sample, I see no objection to the idea that this is a copy of a transcript made in 1346 of the collectors' account for 1301-2.

But there is another possibility. This text could also be a reconstruction. It is conceivable, in other words, that some seventeenth-century antiquary did the same thing that I have done, extracting these fragments of the earlier text from the 1346-7 account. I do not say that this is probable, only that it is possible. It would, I expect, take only a little work to eliminate the possibility. Not having done the work, I remain undecided.

#### References

*Aids = Inquisitions and assessments relating to feudal aids*, 6 vols (HMSO for PRO, 1899-1920).

D. Gardiner, 'The manor of Boughton Aluph and Sir Thomas de Aldon', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 50 (1939), 122-30.

J. Greenstreet, 'Assessments in Kent for the aid to knight the Black Prince, anno 20 Edward III', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 10 (1876), 99-162.

J. Greenstreet, 'Fragment of the Kent portion of Kirkby's Inquest temp. Edward I', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 11 (1877), 365-9.

*Rot parl = Rotuli parliamentorum*, 6 vols (London, 1767-77).

First posted Feb 2010