

Aids and scutages: 1346-7 : Aid for getting the king's eldest son made a knight : Exchequer audit

<The sums accounted for by the collectors are summarized hundred by hundred in this table.

hundreds	pence	knight's fees
Westgate	1120	2 + 1/3
Ringslow	2520	5 + 1/4
Kinghamford	1080	2 + 1/4
Whitstable	1080	2 + 1/4
Downhamford	720	1 + 1/2
Preston	480	1
Cornilo	2400	5
Bridge	1896	3 + 1/2 + 1/4 + 1/5
Petham	588	1 + 1/5 + 1/40
Eastry	6534	13 + 1/2 + 1/10 + 1/80
Beswborough	6060	12 + 1/2 + 1/8
Blengate	840	1 + 1/2 + 1/4
Wingham	2892	6 + 1/40
	<hr/>	
	28210	
Worth	990	2 + 1/16
Aloesbridge	480	1
Oxney	480	1
Bircholt F	160	1/3
St Martin's	120	1/4
Heane	1566.75	3 + 1/4 + 1/70
Ham	967	2 + 1/68
Stowting	1140	2 + 1/4 + 1/8
Street	2910	6 + 1/16
Newchurch	407	1/2 + 1/4 + 1/10 - 1/480
Folkestone	5620	11 + 1/2 + 1/8 + 1/12
Loningborough	900	1 + 1/2 + 1/4 + 1/8
	<hr/>	
	15740.75	
Calehill	1440	3
Chart	400	3/4 + 1/12
Longbridge	1080	2 + 1/4
Wye	4140	8 + 1/2 + 1/8
Boughton	480	1
Bircholt B	1460	3 + 1/24
Felborough	3856	8 + 1/30
Faversham	7612	15 + 1/2 + 1/3 + 1/40
Milton	2542.75	5 + 1/4 + 1/21
Cranbrook	120	1/4
Tenterden	480	1
Barnfield	60	1/8
Barkley	24	1/20
Rolvenden	1320	2 + 3/4
Selbritten	200	1/4 + 1/6
Blackbourne	751	1 + 1/2 + 1/20 + 1/68

	25965.75	
Eyhorne	12012	25 + 1/40
Toltingtrough	2160	4 + 1/2
Shamell	5400	11 + 1/4
Larkfield	4328	9 + 1/60
Hoo	1080	2 + 1/4
Twyford	3072	6 + 1/4 + 1/8 + 1/40
Wrotham	1656	3 + 1/4 + 1/5
Brenchley	840	1 + 3/4
Maidstone	1800	3 + 3/4
Chatham & G	840	1 + 3/4
Littlefield	960	2
Watchlingstone	1760	3 + 1/2 + 1/6

---

35908

Westerham	1080	2 + 1/4
Summerden	120	1/4
Blackheath	1104	2 + 1/4 + 1/20
Bromley & B	500	1 + 1/24
Littleleigh	240	1/2
Axstone	7068	14 + 1/2 + 1/5 + 1/40
Ruxley	7520	15 + 1/2 + 1/6
Codsheath	2448	5 + 1/10

---

20080

There were also a few small sums which the collectors had not collected because they had been ordered not to, the king having decided that these payments should be remitted. When the collectors submitted their account, instead of producing the money, they produced the writs which instructed them not to collect it.

remitted	920	1 + 1/2 + 1/3 + 1/12
----------	-----	----------------------

Retabulated lath by lath, the collectors' account can be summed up as follows.

laths	collected	remitted	total
St Augustine's	28210	240	28450
Shepway	15740.75	320	16060.75
Shrewinghope	25965.75	120	26085.75
Aylesford	35908	240	36148
Sutton	20080		20080
	125904.5	920	126824.5

In one respect the Exchequer officials who dealt with this account were pleasantly surprised: the total was rather greater than they had anticipated. On the evidence of their own records, they had expected the yield to be 124539.5 pence: the collectors had turned up an extra 2285 pence. It is not clear to me where this extra

money had come from, and I doubt whether it was clear to the Exchequer officials either. But they were happy to accept it. (If some people had paid too little in 1302-3, that was beyond remedy; if some people had paid too much now, that was their own fault.)

In other respects they remained unsatisfied. Some further research into their records led them to suspect that the list which the collectors had been using was incomplete. They discovered, for instance, that Philip de le Rokele had paid relief for a knight's fee in Beckenham (that would have been in 1277), and there was no corresponding entry in the collectors' account. In consequence Mauricius le Brun (who was married to Philip's daughter) found himself charged with a debt of 480 pence, payable at the Exchequer. Roger de Northwode incurred a debt of 1.25 pence, because the collectors had mistakenly charged him for 1/21 of a fee (22.75 pence), not for 1/20 (22.75 + 1.25 = 24 pence). The Exchequer also discovered that Robert de Crevequer had once acknowledged owing the service of two knights for Chatham and West Farleigh, and the corresponding sum was therefore charged to the present owners - Johan Typtot for Chatham (600 pence), the prior of Christ Church for West Farleigh (360 pence).

Taking all of these facts into consideration, the Exchequer officials could now recalculate the sum which they would expect to receive from any future aid. The new total came to 128805.75 pence. Rounded down, that represents 268 knight's fees and a yield of £536.

The amounts which enter into the Exchequer's calculations are listed here, in case anyone wants to work through the following arithmetic.

collected	125904.5	[1]
remitted	920	[2]
accounted for	126824.5	[3] = [1] + [2]
expected	124539.5	[4]
unexpected	2285	[5] = [3] - [4]
reliefs etc	1021.25	[6]
marshalcy	960	[7]
future aid	128805.75	[8] = [4] + [5] + [6] + [7]

My translation is mostly based on Greenstreet's edition; a few phrases are missing from the PRO edition.>

Of this total [1] - in accordance with earlier records, deducting 920 pence [2] for which they are not answerable (see below), 123619.5 pence [4] - [2]

newly discovered by inquiry, 2285 pence [5]

Fees charged at the Exchequer to top up the account, in accordance with the records of reliefs for fees beyond those listed above

<"The full extracts on which the following entries are based may

be found in Lay Subsidies 123/3" (PRO), i.e. E 179/123/3.>

(444) From Mauricius de <read "le"> Brun knight - for one fee which Philip de la Rokele held in Beghenham (hundred of Beckenham, lath of Sutton) from the lord king - 480 pence

(445) From the heirs of Johan de Morton' and his partners - for an eighth part of one fee which the same Johan de Morton' held in Sturmothe (hundred of Blengate, lath of St Augustine) from the archbishop of Canterbury - 60 pence

(446) From Johan de Asphal - for one quarter of one fee which Roger de Asphal held in Nesshyndenn' (hundred of Larkfield, lath of Aylesford) from the lord king, to answer for one whole fee in accordance with the said records, because he was previously charged (311) in the said hundred for (only) three quarters of that fee - 120 pence

(447) From sir Johan de Cobham, Johan Mortimer, and the heirs of Johan de Swafham - for one quarter of one fee which Willelm de Godyenton' <add "and others"> held in Nether Hardres (hundred of Bridge, lath of St Augustine), to answer for one whole fee in accordance with the said records, because he was <read "they were"> previously charged (035) in the said hundred for (only) three quarters of that fee - 120 pence

(448) From Roger de Northewode knight - to answer for a twenty-third <read "twentieth"> part of one knight's fee which Johan de Northewode held in Scapeya (hundred of Milton, lath of Shrewinghope), as appears by the records of reliefs sent to the collectors under the foot of the seal, because in the account he is charged in the said hundred (229) for only a twenty-first part of a fee - 1.25 pence

(449) From Thomas de Deen' - for half a knight's fee in Thrulegh' (208) (and) Bokton' and Worneshull' (265), to answer in full for three fees, with the heirs of Johan Petyt who hold half a fee (186) in the hundred of Felborough, in accordance with the records of reliefs charged to Hamo de Gatton' - 240 pence

Total - 1021.25 pence [6]

(450) From Johan Typtot - for one fee and one quarter of one fee which Robert Creuker held in Chetham (hundred of Chatham, lath of Aylesford), of those two fees in Chetham and Farlegh' for which the said Robert (Creuker) made fine for his service in the king's army, as appears by a roll of the Marshalcy kept in the Exchequer and by a schedule attached to this roll - 600 pence

(451) From the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury - for three quarters of one fee in Farlegh' (hundred of Twyford, lath of Aylesford) which the said Robert (Creuker) held there, to answer in full for the said two fees (in Chetham and Farlegh') - 360 pence

Total - 960 pence [7]

Total sum charged - 127885.75 pence [8] - [2]

In accordance with various writs of the king, they are not answerable for 920 pence [2] for one fee and a half and a third part and a twelfth part of one knight's fee listed in earlier records under the names of the abbot of Robertsbridge (242) (353) and the prior of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem in England (067) (119) (135)

Combined sum - 128805.75 [8]

Of which - to agree with earlier records of the time of king Edward (the present king's) grandfather - 124539.5 pence [4]

newly discovered by inquiries taken this time - 2285 pence [5]

charged in accordance with the records of reliefs, as appears above - 1021.25 pence [6]

charged in accordance with the records of the rolls of the Marshalcy, as appears above - 960 pence [7]

<A number of supporting documents were attached to the roll, and three of them survive: a schedule recording the commissioners' answers to various questions put to them by the Exchequer, and two writs procured by the abbot of Robertsbridge. (The schedule can be found in both editions, the writs only in the PRO edition. There ought also to be a writ for the Hospitallers, but apparently that has been lost.) I have not translated any of these attachments.>

First posted Feb 2010